

297

STATE, CAPITAL AND MIGRANT LABOUR

STATE, CAPITAL AND AND MIGRANT LABOUR:

A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

By

GEORGOS ODYSSEAS TSOBANOGLOU, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

September 1980

MASTER OF ARTS (1980)
(Sociology)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: State, Capital and Migrant Labour: A Theoretical
Perspective

AUTHOR: Georgos Odysseas Tsobanoglou, B.A. (Trent University -
McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Carl Cuneo

NUMBER OF PAGES: I-X, 114, tables I-VII

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Professors Carl Cuneo, Wallace Clement, Ernesto Laclau and Geoffrey Kay as well as a number of others in various institutions without whose contact my ideas would not have reached to maturity and bear this fruition.

For Michalis E. Roidis and Nicos Poulantzas

ABSTRACT

The bourgeois liberal system of rights representing the constitution of the State in law and the formation of the circulation sphere anticipates the modern production conditions which are "supported" by abstract "bearers", constituted as "economic subjects" positioned in production relations. Such positions are invested with abstract economic, dehistoricized and depoliticized, aestheticized and metaphysical connotations and ideology. These positions which have been formed during the last phase of the transformation of capitalism are not constituted in law. In the present conjuncture capitalism does not require the system of rights necessary for the competitive 19th century conjuncture. Modern migration phenomena point and attest to these phenomena imposed by imperialism in the "electronic age". Our gaze is directed towards the phenomenon of the guest-workers in the Federal Republic of Germany. The continuities of this phenomenon with the role of the State and the labour-process as well as the system of rights that are entrenched presently by current measures are established.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
PREFACE		I-X
CHAPTER I	Fetishism and Immigrant Labour	
	Introduction and Mode of Presentation	1
	Language, Discourse, Materialism	2
	Language and the "Social" or Civil Society	17
	Concluding Remarks	24
CHAPTER II	The Periodization of the State-form and the Constitution and Circulation of <u>Economic Subjects</u>	28
	Persona and the Legal Constitution of the State	28
	Law and Circulation	31
	The Modern State and Rooseveltism as a "Passive Revolution"	33
	Modern "Economic-Subjects". Guest-labour	45
	Concluding Remarks	46
CHAPTER III	Labour-power as a Produced Commodity.	
	The historicity of labour-forms: Labour constituted in law and modern forms of labour appropriation	48
	Labour-power as a Produced Commodity	48
	Abstract-Homogenous Labour	52
	Conclusion	58
CHAPTER IV	"Société de Consommation" and Modern Reproduction	60
	"Société de Consommation" and Modern Reproduction	60
	Fordism and Neo-Fordism as moments in the total administration of the social formation	60
CHAPTER V	The Atlanticization of the Old Continent: Potemkin Europe	81
	Centre-Periphery Continua.	
	Continuities and Discontinuities	81
	Repressive State Apparatuses.	
	Effects	84

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER V (Cont'd)	
Culturally Heterogenous Migrants as Bearers of Homogenous Labour (Labour-Power)	85
Value over-accumulation and social meaning (semantisation)	91
CONCLUSION	97
GLOSSARY	102
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	105
APPENDIX: TABLES	I-VII

PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is to show the fundamental relation between capital and labour, analytically and conjuncturally, in the "post-war American settlement" in Europe. The centrality of the phenomenon of the import of "guest-workers" in the Federal Republic of Germany is considered as a sign of a fundamentally new form of a labour-process constituted in the European West. This labour process may be called, following A. Gramsci, Fordism, Americanism, or Rooseveltism since it has the following characteristics, namely a series of phenomena whose real determination is traced as a valorization process that spreads over all areas of the public sphere, displacing-suppressing non-commodity relations, thus increasing the accumulation of value over living labour, (the surplus-value relation determines directly "man" or anthropos), the expansion of value over the reproduction domain (Department of produced means of consumption) and hence expansion of homogenization/abstraction and exploitation in the Marxist sense.

The expansion of the abstract-homogenous-decentered space of value formation over the non-commodity area of reproduction of labour and the reconstitution of labour-power by living labour via the wage-form demands energies that cannot be met by the integrated socialized-circulating abstract "subjects", for the simple reason that the constant crystallization of labour and the expansion of value into the reproduction sphere, expressed epiphenomenally by the universalization of the

wage-form, reaches a crescendo¹ at the level of the accumulation of value giving form to antagonistic contradictions between labour and capital.

The State administration of labour-power, i.e. the new role of the State which regulates the expanded reproduction of capitalist relations of production, also pertains to the transnational appropriation of living labour (bearing the capacity to value creation), itself necessitated by the law of value and accumulation which constantly develops-expands further the homogenization of social space in the capitalistic centres.

The bearers of such "social" space are defined in abstract, economic terms as "economic subjects" and are remunerated by the wage-form. The state acts as the forerunner for such an anticipated materiality by setting up gradually mechanisms for the policing and administration of crises, simultaneously reconstituting subjects as depoliticized, abstract "homo oeconomicus", bearing "statements of account", etc., etc. The homogenization process by which heterogenous historical elements are penetrated-absorbed or put out of circulation, i.e., in asylums, prisons or exiles, is a general process particularly acute during the 1960's-70's in the West. This penetration-incorporation process produces "social" integration defined by the laws of value and accumulation and renders political antagonisms as "social" conflicts or diffused politics. The politics of labour (production), being fragmented, are dispersed knocking

-
1. One can claim after Marx that the labour of past generations weighs heavily upon the minds of the living. Also we would like to say that Fordism denotes a radical discontinuity between the labour process and the labourers that are the source of value and also between their constitution as bearers of a commodity (labour-power) and their means of reproduction in a fetishistic sphere.

on every discursive practice and system of narratives (everyday routine, housework, offices, both public and private spheres, everywhere where value is constituted-produced).

Social conflicts, cross-cutting class-antagonisms, are the abstract moment of the general valorization of a "social" formation continually reproduced by the State administrative apparatus. In this conjuncture, it must be stated, social conflicts need to be regulated, rather than abolished,¹ for they constitute the umbilical cord of value. This is also the umbilical cord of history/reality, the elliptical centrum of capitalism. The "guest-worker" presents us with the most clear analytical properties of the advanced highly valorised capitalist synchronic structures in demand of that diachronic centrum.

The above articulation of the present conjuncture is an end-product of a certain methodology by which the "given" phenomena are de-naturalized, de-fetishized and historically are deconstructed to their analytical properties, in other words is a form of genealogy by which we can re-constitute existing concepts and thus produce the knowledge of the historical genealogy of the State-form, Capital, the "Self" and the modern "société de consommation", or public happiness. In this we must note that we are not exploring an "etymology" but rather the "first sign or movement of "common use" sketched, sketched from life,

1. This is a theme of peripheral social formations where traditionally composed "historic blocs" are crystallized by imperialism frustrating historical development by a "freezing" of the contradictions via a repressive apparatus. The "freezing" denotes the suppression or denegation of the historical contradictions, i.e., the popular democratic and class struggles.

from the 'first denotation'"¹ a process that draws inspiration from the seminal work of Michel Foucault and his associates as well as Poulantzas, E. Laclau, B. Edelman, L. Althusser et al.

The influence nevertheless is indirect and only connotes a trajectory that is historical materialist and draws material from fields recently constituted as scientific in the humanities domain, namely history, structuralist poetics² and psychoanalysis.

This process by which the naturalized by the common ideology, (doxa), "givens" are deconstructed and periodicized or historically constituted-determined is a materialist method that came about after a slow, tiresome process, multiple, repetitive which eventually converged at certain nodal points representing various real-theoretical objects.³

One of these real-theoretical objects is the "politico-historical" instance, involving the problems of the State-form and its socio-economic determinations, of juridical ideology, of "circulation" and finally of "subjects" constituted as indetermined, abstract "economic" subjects via a combination of a system of powers invested with the image

-
1. Jean Pierre Faye, "The critique of language and its economy", Economy & Society, Vol. 5, No. 1, February 1976, pp. 52-73, p. 56.
 2. Linguistics in the name of Saussure, psychoanalysis in the name of J. Lacan and in general structuralism as a method developed originally by the Russian Formalist School.
 3. I adhere here to the distinction between real-theoretical objects capable of producing a knowledge-effect vis-à-vis ideological-doxastic objects capable only in reproducing mystification. It is quite evident that I do not use a "spontaneous" language throughout this work.

in mind of a new disciplined form of a "subject",

... with increased its capacities (in economic terms of utility), but with diminished these very same forces (in political terms of obedience).¹ In short, it is an image which by dissociating power from the body; on the one hand, it turns it into an "aptitude", a "capacity", which it seeks to increase; on the other hand, it reverses the course of the energy, the power that might result from it, and turns it into a relation of strict subjection. If economic exploitation separates the force and the product of labour, let us say that disciplinary coercion establishes in the body the constricting link between an increased aptitude and an increased domination.²

This new historical modality articulating the new "subject" bearer of modernity, the periodization of the State-form and its relation to the genealogy of capital or civil society and finally the last expansion of the accumulation process undertaken-constituted by the Rooseveltist State (New Deal), denotes a number of forms which involve

a) the management of labour-power by the State, i.e., the direct undertaking of the reproductive schema by the state administrative apparatus,

b) a new deskilling of the labour-force or better an application of unskilled, peasant (of Central and East European origin) immigrant labour, (during the turn of the century and the inter-war period towards the United States), into a new labour-process named Fordism and c) a conjunctural correspondence between the two Departments of the capitalist economy, i.e., of production and consumption³. This marks the expansion

1. See Michel Foucault, "Discipline and Punish", tr. by A. Sheridan, New York, Vintage Books, February 1979, pp. 135-141.

2. Ibid., my emphasis, p. 138.

3. See M. Aglietta, "A theory of Capitalist Regulation," NLB, 1979, London, p. 153.

of value into the reproductive domain. This new mode of accumulation is a response to the crisis of European capitalism during the first half of this century and involves a specific response, defined in abstract, a-political, "economic terms", by the State.

It is defined as such for it requires a specially constituted bearer represented by an unskilled, uneducated immigrant force. The modern Robinsonades. The European crisis was defined by the organic crisis of the historic bloc that in the process of development gave impetus to political forms (workers councils, soviets, mass-Communist parties) of working class power that actively posed the possibility of alternative systems of "democracy", primarily resting upon determinations by the popular masses rather than the ones of capital represented by the hypostasized "liberal" forms of governing. The crisis resulted in the rise of the exceptional capitalist states (German National Socialism, Italian Fascism) which destroyed political forms via physical extermination and eventually led to militaristic ends. The reconstitution of a modern European economy under the American tutelage (Marshall Plan) provided a new basis for the constitution of a new labour-process defined by the hegemony of the capitalist state. The concrétion of this reality came around the 1960's in the case of the Federal Republic of Germany in the form of the import of migrant, "guest", workers heralding the formation of a new reality based on Fordism.

Carchedi¹ mentions, referring to K. Heinz Roth's conclusion, that:

-
1. G. Carchedi, "Authority and Foreign Labour. Some notes on a late Capitalist form of Capital Accumulation and State Intervention," p. 16, paper presented at the Workshop on Authority in Industrial Societies at the Session of the E.C.P.R./C.P.S.A. in Brussels, 17-21st April, 1979.

the great influx of migrant workers in the 1960's in Germany was not determined by the relative scarcity of labour-power but by the resistance of the autochthonous mass-worker to the de-humanising conditions of work, i.e., by the struggle (even though conducted in a passive way) of the mass-worker. In short, the migrant worker is capital's weapon against the insubordination of the autochthonous workers.

The guest-workers represent, to go one step further, the abstract moment of history directly determined by the surplus-value relation. The worker exists only as a pure, abstract bearer of energy. It is interchangeable and homogenous. Being cleansed from historical, political determinations, the "guest-worker" represents the modern modality of labour required by capital in the silicon age.

The chapters are articulated as follows.

Chapter 1 deals schematically with the main themes of the study. It is an introduction to the problems considered throughout the text. It deals with the problem of communication, language largely utilizing categories from general linguistics and structuralism. It deals with the general tendency of humans to communicate with language and the contradictory form of capitalism which, albeit the first "social"¹ system, presents itself as a "natural" system utilizing a basically Aristotelian mode of articulation, corresponding to modern forms of political representation, hypostasized, etc. This mimetic correspondence

-
1. First time in history where the basic classes participate organically in production which is "socially" defined. Before the emergence of capitalism, the relation of man to nature had been an organic one.

between the body natural and the body politic, both constituted as inanimate "natural" objects, is the discourse of an economic system bearing a specific, analytical conception of man and its relation to history, politics and nature. This analytical trajectory has been materialized in the West during the first half of the 20th century. It is constituted in the Fordised labour-process, and the corresponding "société de consommation".

This process requires a depoliticized mass-movement and requires the State's direct administration of labour-power through the wage-form, i.e., it marks the era by which the State directly, as compared to the indirect form of management during the 18th and 19th centuries, undertakes the reproduction of the expanded accumulation process. This faculty of the state to draw living-labour from peripheral "developing" capitalist social formations represents a process of abstraction and valorization: it is a two-way process, i.e., import of labourers and export of value or technology.

Chapter 2 deals exclusively with the problem of the subject and its relation to civil society as a par-excellence "social" system. The political constitution of factors of production, the displacement of Aristotelian metaphysics and the constitution of the State in law (Kant, Fichte, Hegel) denotes the separation of the formerly indistinguishable forms of the science of police (meaning power, from the Greek πολιτεία, Latin politia) and administration.

The labourer is constituted as a subject in law invested with the meaning of a system of rights. These refer to the movement of labour-power and the circulation of subjects in the abstract space of a market. This refers to the formal subordination, i.e., extra-political, of labour

to capital and the State. The reproduction of a labour-process administered by the State during the era of finance capitalism, where the administration undertakes moves that the capitalists are unwilling to take, requires a new type of labour to be "borrowed" in completely dehumanized terms from peripheral social formations. Part and parcel of this imported commodity, or "natural" resource, is the divorce from any matters of historicity, i.e., of reproduction that is undertaken by the peripheral societies. It also pertains to the fact that no civil or political rights are inscribed in these "subjects". There is a continuity regarding their historical status in their motherland and the one in the host country despite the radical discontinuity between their positions in the respective countries.

This drawing of living-labour represents a crucial moment in the development of capitalism in Europe. The valorization of pre-capitalist forms leads to the appropriation of living-labour from historical structures that have been retarded by imperialism (backward capitalist or non-capitalist).

Chapter 3. As the thesis develops, we move from general themes to particular ones. The central theme pertains to the historical constitution of labour-power as a commodity and the problem of the appropriation of the working class as a homogenous bearer of an abstract property.

The problem of the mystification that divorces reality from the experienced, "spontaneous", sensual world is explored pointing out the problem of a decentered structure where the bearers are divorced from their energies which are hypostasized and achieve an independent existence.

This abstraction-constitution of "capacities" and "energies" in a thingly-form is the analytical property of capital. It is always anticipated but historically materialized under a new labour process that requires unskilled, interchangeable labour, a process dealt with in the following chapter 4. Linked to this articulation is the problem of the new state-form that manages the reproduction of labour-power. This is a direct development of a political form that undertakes the mediation of the extended reproduction of the capitalist value-accumulation process. This mode of mediation is considered as the temporal-dialectical-historical element that is inserted into the synchronic, dominated by dead labour (value technology) capitalist social matrices. The phenomenon of Fordism is analysed in here.

The final chapter mainly attempts to articulate the phenomenon of "guest-workers" as the representatives for the European new model of capitalist expansion and labour-process that requires the interchangeability of labour. This interchangeability, homogeneity, is a specific political result for a labour process extremely degrading, that treats labourers as beasts existing in the "parenthesis" of a matrix that requires the "marginalization"- naturalization of living labour defined as pure energy, depoliticized, illiterate with no means of communication but as bearers-supports of analytically defined properties. The condition of the "migrant-labourer" in the West represents the decomposition of the working-class political organisations in recipient countries and is the new anticipatory point for a general state of a new order of things to come. The total administrative state.

CHAPTER I.

FETISHISM AND IMMIGRANT LABOUR

INTRODUCTION AND MODE OF PRESENTATION

This study is more or less the culmination of research being carried over quite a number of years representing the abstract moment of a trajectory that has explored a number of disciplines in the horizon of human sciences (anthropology, semiotics, epistemology, history, philosophy, classics, literary criticism, sociology and historical materialism): The object of investigation is the "real" and the relation of man to man and to "nature", the process of linguistic signification and its "naturalization" under a determinate system of production which, by the mythic (natural) discourse, transmutates history into nature. Signification is a process without a "subject" or content. It is a structure of relations of the elements of a system-field within which the relations find their meaning. Each formal structure has a universal equivalent or a code which acts as an organon and a condition of intelligibility for the apprehension of the "reality" of the structure. Louis Hjelmslev posited in 1944 a structure as being "an autonomous entity of internal dependencies". He states:

the analysis of this entity permits the disengagement of mutually defining parts, each dependent on certain others and neither conceivable nor definable without these other parts. It reduces its object to a network of dependencies ...¹

-
1. Louis Hjelmslev "Acta Linguistica" IV Fasc. 3 1944 p. 3. in S. Heath, "Towards Textual Semiotics" pp. 18-19 in Signs of the Times: Introductory readings in textual semiotics, Granta, Cambridge, U.K., 1971.

This analysis will constitute the core of the apprehension of the modern capitalist reality and the inter-dependency of centre-periphery continua.

Language, Discourse, Materialism

What is necessary to elaborate here is that language reproduces reality or appropriates reality in which we are inserted since our birth. An approach in which language is a "given", a natural, ahistorical, a priori, conceals the "social" nature of language and reality. "Language is innocent or transparent,"¹

For the speaking subject, there is equivalence between language and reality: the sign covers and governs reality; better, it is that reality.²

Language is understood as the practical appropriation of the empirical-real as "given"; hence as the natural expression of reality.

It is presented in a hypostasized mode radically divorced from a dependency network, from history, from the knowledge of its actual presence. Discourse acts in such a way that modern forms of property and value conceal history, the very moment of their necessary production; history itself the product of class-struggles. The continuous displacement of use-value or labour by exchange-value due to its continuous over accumulation produces as an "effect" of its structuration a phenomenal "naturalization" of production and

1. Stephen Heath, Ibid., p. 19.

2. Emile Benveniste, Problèmes de la linguistique générale, Paris, 1966, p. 52 in S. Heath, Ibid., p. 19.

reproduction. Both appear as "givens" thus they are only surfaces whose flows, mutations and figures were determined in this regime of accumulation by the universal equivalent of money.¹ "Except as personified capital, the capitalist has no historical value, and no right to that historical existence, which, to use an expression of the witty Lichnowski, "hasn't got no date". And so far only is the necessity for his own transitory existence implied in the transitory necessity for the capitalist mode of production.² This opaque ahistoricity allows the registration of the new codification of capitalist production as a "natural fact".

The same problem pertains to a "naturalization" of language, a process of mythos-generation which universalizes certain ideosyncratic forms which are projected as images over the "real" and constitute it as a pure-total form which by virtue of its catholic (all-encompassing) view is blurring its horizon i.e. its limitations. Thus it is represented as a matter of course. Myth or modern doxa is the universal equivalent of the universalised system of commodity-production.

Our aim is therefore to decipher modern forms of given reality and deconstruct/decompose it so as to arrive at the moment of original intersection of the associated elements-energies and thus articulate in language the absences and concealments of the modern doxas as they

1. "It is a basic principle of capitalist production that money, as an independent form of value, stands in opposition to commodities, or that exchange-value must assume an independent form in money; and this is only possible when a definite commodity becomes the general commodity, the commodity par excellence - as distinguished from all other commodities." K. Marx, "Capital", Vol. III, Int./nal Publishers, 1967, pp. 516.

2. "Capital", Vol. 1, 1967, p. 592, emphasis mine.

appropriate the "real". It is in other words a paradoxical discursive practice that attempts to articulate the modern reality.

My main object of research has been to appropriate the "concrete in thought" by an analytical-cum-dialectical process by which categories are constituted not as "givens" to our senses but through a digression by which the "taken-for-granted" are deconstructed to their constituent elements and then are re-constituted. In the words of C. Levi-Strauss

... dialectical reason is always constitutive: it is the bridge, forever extended and improved, which analytical reason throws out over an abyss; it is unable to see the further shore but it knows that it is there, even should it be constantly receding. The term dialectical reason thus covers the perpetual efforts analytical reason must make to reform itself if it aspires to account for language, society and thought; and the distinction between the two forms of reason in my view rests only on the temporary gap separating analytical reason from the understanding of life.¹

That abyss to which analytical reason throws out its ropes, bridges, is filled with images of what is to be found, which should not be fixed but always ready to be over-turned, reformulated, deconstructed, for what we try to make of the future will bear no connection with the actual reality to be constituted as such.

For Marx:

Bourgeois society is the most developed and the most complex historic organization of production. The categories which express its relations, the comprehension of its structure, thereby also allows insights into the structure and the relations of production of all the vanished social formations out of whose ruins and

1. Claude Levi-Strauss, The Savage Mind, The University of Chicago Press, 1966, p. 246.

elements it built itself up, whose partly still unconquered remnants it carries along with it, whose mere nuances have developed in explicit significance within it, etc. Human anatomy contains a key to the anatomy of the ape. The intimations of higher development among the subordinate animal species, however, can be understood only after the higher development is already known.

It would therefore be unfeasible and wrong to let the economic categories follow one another in the same sequence as that in which they were historically decisive. Their sequence is determined, rather, by their relation to one another in modern bourgeois society, which is precisely the opposite of that which seems to be their natural order or which corresponds to historical development. The point is not the historic position of the economic relations in the succession of different forms of society ... rather, their order within modern bourgeois society.¹

This method lucidly enough marks a break with a historicist generic conception of history and sets the route for the two trajectories provided by Marx's general corpus which has been appropriated by a number of schools of modern materialist thought as constituting two methodological Marxisms,² i.e. that of the "young" Marx constituting an idealist problematic and that of the "mature" Marx constituting the scientific or materialist problematic including the texts of "Das Kapital" and the "Theories of Surplus Value". Both "readings" are true and false simultaneously and equally serve to articulate different positions. These two conceptions-appropriations of Marx's "oeuvre" revolve around the conception of anthropos (labourer or "man" as homo

1. K. Marx, The Grundrisse, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1973, pp. 105, 107-8.

2. These emanate quite explicitly from the apparent absence of dialectical thinking in the modern liberal world. It is a sign of modernity the fact that even analytical thought has been in eclipse since it became a branch of the discrete artificial language of mathematics.

faber, etc.). Marx uses his concretion in thought of capitalist production in the text of Capital and in his analysis of politics, philosophy and other reproductive or superstructural themes.

The capitalist structure of production is a decentered structure whose "bearers" or "supports" are absent-present¹ i.e. are radically divorced from a universe where commodities are circulating, being produced by the commodity labour-power whose centrality is mystified and concealed. An absence (abstraction to misrepresentation) of politics constitutes the necessary pre-condition for that system of production to take place. The product of heterogenous labour becomes the abstract, homogenous commodity of labour-power;

the commodity becomes exchange value; the exchange value of commodities is their inherent monetary property; and this monetary property is severed from them in the form of money, and achieves a social existence apart from all commodities and their natural mode of existence. The relation of the product to itself as an exchange value becomes its relation to money existing alongside it, or of all products to the money that exists outside them all.²

This hypostasization of the product of labour from its source and itself allows the constitution of an image which is "natural", atemporal and tautological. Mutations occur in a homogenous space, that alone acts as its own referent. This is the reason labour-power appears as "an indeterminate abstraction" (to borrow a concept used by Galvano Della Volpe) from the "base", from history and therefore politics. Labour itself constitutes the realm of what we have named

-
1. Absent as concrete historical agents, present as abstract-economic subjects.
 2. K. Marx, Grundrisse, ed. & trans. D. McLellan, London, 1971, pp. 39-61.

the "theatron politicon"¹ or the "social" whose historical existence is positioned at the "moment" politics are displaced i.e. the politics-reality of the producers, of history. This is the one process presented in Capital which is coupled with the other in which Man confronts a fettered form of nature, an inanimate object, in order to humanize it to decompose it and form the "social" from its constituent elements.

Just as society itself produces man as man, so is society produced by him. Activity and mind, both in their content and in their mode of existence, are social: social activity and social mind. The human essence of nature first exists only for social man; for only here does nature exist as a bond for him with man - as his existence for the other and the other's existence for him - as the life element of human reality. Only here does nature exist as the foundation of his own human existence, and nature becomes man for him. Thus society is the unity of being of man with nature, the naturalism of man and the humanism of nature both brought to fulfilment.²

Man constitutes the "base" of a system of production, in which for the first time in history the basic classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, constitute an integral part; they are organically linked in a form of social chemistry never before actualised in history; they are part of a system of production, which conceals its centrality and abstracts in law the "bearers/agents" or the anthropological category of Man, as an economic subject whose relation to its capacity to labour amounts to that of a thing (res-in L.) (the relation of myself to mine in Kant³).

-
1. The term is borrowed from Pasquale Pasquino but the application is different. See Pasquino, P. "Theatrum Politicum. The Genealogy of Capital-Police and the State of Prosperity." Ideology & Consciousness Vol. 1, No. 4, 1978, pp. 41-54.
 2. Marx-Engels, Gesamtausgabe I. 3. Berlin 1932, p. 116, S. Heath, op.cit., p. 17, emphasis mine.
 3. See Bernard Edelman, The Ownership of the Image, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1978, p. 171.

The capacity to labour is transformed, due to the contractual relation in law into an abstraction and commodity whose centrality as the source of value is displaced, from the privileged position it occupies in reference to investments of history and culture, the very moment its appropriation constitutes the main preoccupation of its "owners". (Capital) By this I denote the "real" owners of capital as they perform in the abstract space of the administered "theatron politicon" as already having their capacities appropriated by capital.¹

The duality of myself and mine is the prolegomenon for a system of rights in law that emanates from a system of property relations invested to "things" or "abilities", "capacities", "potentialities" and is represented in a meta-juridical field, the terrain of civil-society divorced from the state which appears as a depolitisized administrative apparatus.

This "indeterminate abstraction" as a natural form of production where history and culture are reduced to silence and absence (absence) or "naturalization" is actually a "determinate abstraction" historically constituted yet radically discontinued from history. For Marx capitalist production exists in terms of human creativity and as a relation between economic agents defining themselves unconsciously i.e. independently of a subjectivist-will/ego-centred reality. Marx rejects the anthropology of the cogito-consciousness and establishes via the concept of science (paradox, anti-doxa) an "alienation effect". In this

1. "This socius as full body has become directly economic as capital-money; it does not tolerate any other preconditions. What is described or marked is no longer the producers or non producers, but the forces and means of production as abstract quantities that become effectively concrete in their becoming related or their conjunction: labour capacity or capital, constant capital or variable capital, capital of filiation or capital of alliance." G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, The Viking Press, New York, 1977, p. 263.

respect one can safely say that he anticipated Freud in the manner that the latter established, in a most crucial moment, the decentering of meaning from consciousness. He did so by depriving consciousness from the right to constitute the centre of the production of meaning. Freud ceases to consider the "I", "ego" etc. as having the common meaning of philosophy and modern psychology - as capable of knowing recognizing the very same self. For Freud, meaning-noesis-intelligibility is decentered from the immediate consciousness, which is the main category of all idealist philosophies. The problem of "subject" and "existence" is absent from Freudian psychoanalysis for the reason that its mode of operation utilizes terms which are economic¹ and a structure of a psychic "apparatus" which leaves no space for the dominant in consciousness unit i.e. the thinking subject of idealist philosophy.²

It is quite enlightening to note that modern appearance, as represented in language, practice, common-sense (doxa), can quite possibly be articulated in Aristotelian terms.

-
1. The regime of psychic energies constitutes the so called, by the F. Guattari-G. Deleuze School, Libidinal economy.
 2. The Lacanian appropriation-translation of Freud by way of the great Genevan linguist F. de Saussure here is the centre of my analysis. For Freud the unconscious is an autonomous space-topos where psychic representations are inscribed and meaning is produced. The content of the unconscious is the symbolism of desire written as representing the drive. By this is meant the basic tendency of desire of human beings apart from any biologicistic needs to turn towards lógos, towards language the tendency-orientation that obliges us to pass from the simple drive or human desire.

Aristotle as well as the whole intellectual tradition of metaphysics conceive of language as representation, and, in fact, in the specific sense of a substitute whose immediate reality is the absence of the things it designates, which themselves are constituted as self-identical before all symbolization ...¹

Aristotle had formulated the notion of verisimilitude (aletho-phanes) articulating the relations between knowledge and representation (mimesis of nature, ana-parastasis) as the concealment of the real. He indicated that whenever oneself knows something, it is necessary to know it equally well and as a form of representation, for the representation is a sensation (aisthesis) without a material object. In this statement we can detect the presence of the source which constitutes one of the characteristics of idealism.

Everyday facts and events are separated into res or things and their systems of generation. (Labour from Labour-power). This separation is articulated in a particular translation-constitution of the real, called positivism.² Therefore the world is composed of a set of interacting facts which in a speculative manner are appropriated and organized, arranging structures whose tautological value appears to have escaped³ modern social engineers.

This binary structure or structures is not symmetrical but one over-determines the other. The Euclidean space of geographers and engineers is the technical organon which constitutes the technical

-
1. R. Nagel, "The provocation of Jacques Lacan", New German Critique No. 16, 1979, pp. 5-29, p. 21.
 2. See L. Kolakowski, Positivist Philosophy from Hume to The Vienna Circle, London, Harmondsworth, 1972.
 3. D. & J. Miller, Systematic Empiricism, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1975, particularly chapter 5.

division of labour which, radically ruptured from the "social", confronts it. In the capitalist system the "technical" division of labour is hypostasized and "free" and appears as determining the "social" division of labour. Economic development one-dimensionally denoting the privileged position of the real appropriation connexion (surplus-value relation) conceals its history and culture i.e., its human source or reproduction. The relation of appearance to reality is inverted and by no means positioned in a symmetrical Euclidian space; rather, the space is Riemannian.

The conception or the mirror-image of the bourgeois system of production as an analytical, formal-logical "natural" system i.e. not dialectically intelligible (historically) encompassing in its spatio-temporal matrix "past", "present" and "future", can only be made intelligible by opposing nature to culture and society to history which in reality are one.

The development of clinical, objectivist thought during the 17th and 18th centuries in a West led by a hegemonic bourgeoisie, the "subjects"-centre of history, denoted such a distancing from the concept of "nature" not so much through a particular content as through its contradictory relationship to the concept of "sociality". Nature stood for the first time in opposition to the "social", yet it embodied society as Utopia, as a unity of the "social" whose projected mirror-image was the "natural". For the early 18th century bourgeoisie, nature was the place from which and to which humans were supposed to emancipate themselves. We can see a similar claim in some of the representatives of the Vienna Circle, notably Wittgenstein, whose influence on linguistics and philosophy in Britain is prominent, as well as in some

of the German social theorists like Habermas and Marcuse.¹ This absolute freedom in "nature" is brought about with the most extreme development of capitalism as a result of the technical changes and the formation of a new type of political system which allows such an expanded accumulation to take place; namely, Taylorism, Fordism and Rooseveltism (American Keynesianism).

The dialectic of social development is united with analytical properties, a-historical formal-logical, such as labour-power, (a commodity part of a logical-formal system producing commodities by means of commodities) and is collapsed in it. With Fordism reproduction collapses; it becomes as production. Fordism and Neo-Fordism constitute the expression of the principle of socialization of the means of consumption, of Department II, intersecting with the principle of the socialization of the means of production, of Department I, in a capitalist economy.

This intersection of the two departments of a capitalist economy brings about the total décentring of the capitalist structure; labour as a produced commodity, labour-power, materially circulates in a homogenous abstract universe of circulating commodities. A further point is that its means of reproduction, namely the wage-form, constitutes the new field for the production of surplus-value and therefore the accumulation of capital. This apparent "freedom" or indeterminacy appearing phenomenally as the "société de consommation" will be dealt with in a later chapter.

1. See L. Colletti, From Rousseau to Lenin, New Left Books, 1976, London.

What can be stated here is that the constitution of the wage-form, the use-values necessary for the reproduction of labourers, as part of the accumulation process of capital denotes an even greater increase in the diminishing returns the labourer derives. We should notice that this process empirically and in the thought of the labourer appears quite differently. Marx wrote quite lucidly that;

... capital subordinates labour on the basis of the technical conditions in which it historically finds it.
 If we consider the process of production from the point of view of the simple labour-process, the labourer stands in relation to the means of production, not in their quality as capital, but as the mere means and material of his own intelligent productive activity But it is different as soon as we deal with the process of production from the point of view of the process of creation of surplus-value. The means of production are at once changes into means for the absorption of the labour of others. It is now no longer the labourer that employs the means of production, but the means of production that employ the labourer. Instead of being consumed by him as material elements of his productive activity, they consume him as the ferment necessary to their own life-process, and the life-process of capital consists only in its movement as value constantly expanding, constantly multiplying itself. Furnaces and workshops that stand idle by night, and absorb no living labour, are "mere loss" to the capitalist. Hence, furnaces and workshops constitute lawful claims upon the night-labour of the workpeople. The simple transformation of money into the material factors of the process of production, into the means of production, transforms the latter into a title and a right to the labour and surplus-labour of others. An example will show, in conclusion, how this sophistication, peculiar to and characteristic of capitalist production, this complete inversion of the relation between dead and living labour, between value and the force that creates values, mirrors itself in the consciousness of capitalists.¹

1. K. Marx, Capital, International Publishers, New York, N.Y., 1967, Vol. 1, p. 310, emphasis mine.

This quotation articulates essential properties of the modern capitalist system which are the focused points in this work. Notice the richness of language. "Instead of being consumed by him, as material elements of his productive activity, they consume him as the ferment necessary to their own life process "... "... the life process of capital ... is its movement as value constantly expanding ..." and "Furnaces ... absorb living labour".

This process constitutes a Right in Law, a title in the form of contract when labour in its capacity to produce labour-power is contracted in law. Furthermore ... "this complete inversion of the relation between dead and living labour, between value and the force ..."

It is here that I want to refer to the decentered process of history and the decentered structure of bourgeois production. In bourgeois discursive practice, the "subject" acts as the centre of an indeterminate universe appropriating the common-opinion (doxa) of the individual labourer as he stands and translates subjectively his position constituted by the means of production. The subjective appropriation is of course very different from the point of view of the determinant surplus-value relation. These two views, radically divorced and apparently opposed in modern society, form the double of humanism-economism, speculative metaphysics-empiricism, etc.

The "subjectivist" element in the bourgeois discourse represents the way the bourgeoisie views the world i.e. in an inverted, Aristotelian, idealist manner.

Reality, nevertheless, is not anthropomorphic. The ideology found circulating in the dominant discourses namely the fact that "Man" is liberal and free, expressed in the formula $\frac{\text{Living labour (force)}}{\text{Dead labour (value)}}$ is in reality an inverted formula namely $\frac{\text{Dead labour (value)}}{\text{Living labour (force)}}$ or the

principle that man is dominated by his own crystalized labours.

In the bourgeois retina, the crowned "subject" (for the sophisticated reason that living labour is the only source of surplus-value in the "social") is fixed as the agent that transforms "nature" and, as a reflexion of nature, is pure and simple a "natural resource" or inanimate object.

It is a magical cosmos in which the base is part of nature or is constituted as 'anti-physis' (anti-human nature)¹; humankind is a cultural-social animate object. (The exclusion of historicity of "man" leads to a humanist metaphysics in which history is equated with the "subject" whose identity is constitutive yet appears as interior self-consciousness.)

Modern discourses based on a metaphysical conception of history interpellate "subjects" as "natural" objects, articulating thus the logic of the dominant surplus-value relation and the idiosyncratic hegemony of a class-system.

The above leads to the formulation of the following syllogism. If the labourers constitute the centre of a production process, and production is the base, yet they are absent as such, in capitalist forms of representation legally present in law as groups entitled to the bourgeois right to form a union, to demonstrate grievances, to strike (a right to legitimate violence granted by the State) interpellated as such as "people" or "persons" or "groups", entitled to "collective bargaining", then we must notice the radical break between popular

1. Physis is Nature in Greek. The nature of humanity is cultural and ideological, i.e., historically specific and not "eternal" or "natural".

democracy and liberal democracy for this interpellation constitutes the labourers as "subjects" moving in a meta-juridical terrain. In short, we can see the specific trajectory of labourers' organization from an outlawed, almost clandestine, existence or a para-juridical (or pre-juridical) place to a meta-juridical field or the micro-level of civil society.¹ The former constitutes the reality in the 'peripheral', less developed social formations usually run by a military junta; the latter is the reality in most advanced capitalist social formations where the "realization" in nature (a-historization) is more developed. There inhabits the autonomous ego, blessed and illuminated.

The paradox of this 'meta-physin' position of the living-bearers of the capitalist structure signifies the emergence of a psychoanalytic-cum-linguistic field² which being woven in the social canvas denoted the over-determinance, over individual "subjectivities", of symbols and signs. The material reproduction of the collectivities is regulated by the state and its apparati of numerous sorts. As the valorisation process penetrates every terrain, it enters the state form and privatizes³ it. Only in such an historical moment is the true nature of the capitalist state manifested.

The extreme multiplication of symbols, "subjectivities" and

-
1. To the degree it is cut off from a genuine workers' political representation.
 2. This refers to the moment such a knowledge started being produced (around the turn of the century) in the persons of S. Freud and F. de Saussure.
 3. This refers to corporatism.

"languages" in a field where dead labour (value) dominates living labour (activity)¹ means the constitution of artificial languages, information systems, and various codes over a reality marked by a general absence of semantic communication or a form of semantic aphasia.² Energies are appropriated and are continuously valorised, or idealised.

Language and the "Social" or Civil Society

Language is centred on its social being, on communication. It is impossible to separate it from culture and history without consequences. For Antonio Gramsci:

Language was above all else the place where social distinctions became stratified and expressed, and cultural inequalities were ossified. Metaphor as the permanent reinscription of the outer levels of language, and the anticipation of concepts scarcely yet formalized: this is the index of that opacity of the signifier that excludes any reduction of human language to an ideal language.³

Gramsci articulated the need to constitute a common unifying language which will form the base for an accumulation process whose knowledge effects will establish the possibility of an intellectual order.⁴

-
1. One can almost recognize this invention in the recognition of the phenomenon of bourgeois revolutions which are of a passive or economic type. One has in mind Taylorism, Fordism, etc.
 2. Lack of language.
 3. Christine Buci-Glucksmann, Gramsci and the State, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1980, p. 369.
 4. Incidentally, this was also a call by Manuel Castells for an International of social scientists to oppose the International of technocrats. See M. Castells, The Urban Question, E. Arnold, London, 1975.

Jacques Lacan, in a section called "The agency of the letter in the unconscious or reason after Freud" in his "Écrits", refers to the meaning of the "Letter" as designating "the material support that concrete discourse borrows from language."¹ For the Lacanian School of Psychoanalysis the unconscious is structured like a language rather than, as the American reading of Freud has established, being the site of the instincts.

... language and its structure exist prior to the moment at which each subject at a certain point in his mental development makes his entry into it.²

Thus the subject, too, if he can appear to be the slave of language is all the more so of a discourse in the universal movement in which his place is already inscribed at birth, if only by virtue of his proper name.

Reference to the experience of the community, or to the substance of this discourse, settles nothing, for this experience assumes its essential dimension in the tradition that this discourse itself establishes. This tradition, long before the drama of history is inscribed in it, lays down the elementary structures of culture. And these very structures reveal an ordering of possible exchanges which, even if unconscious, is inconceivable outside the permutations authorised by language. With the result that the ethnographic duality of nature and culture is giving way to a ternary conception of the human condition—nature, society and culture—the last terms of which could well be reduced to language, or that which essentially distinguishes human society from natural societies.³

There is a cultural ahistoricism akin to formal positivism's "the meaning of meaning" that is circular and very peculiar to America that began to establish itself in Europe during the past few decades.

-
1. Jacques Lacan, Écrits, Tavistock Publications, London, 1977, p. 147.
 2. J. Lacan, Ibid., p. 148, emphasis mine.
 3. Ibid., emphasis mine.

It is something that relates more and more to immigrants as the robinsonades upon entrance to America. There is a colour-less, ahistoric phenomenon defined as assimilation or homogenization socially required if one is to be recognized in the society constituted by that culture.

It was to its summons that a group of emigrants had to respond—men who, in order to be recognized, could only stress their difference, but whose function pre-supposed history in its very principle, their discipline being that which had re-established the bridge linking modern man to the ancient myths.¹

The "creation" principle, itself a bourgeois symptom of the constant preoccupation with "origins", is a myth, for culture in an immigrant or migrant community is nothing² but an application of pre-existing knowledge, traditions and language. Our gaze is directed to that "nightmare" of history (production for capital) that produces the radical discontinuity between labourers and their conditions of existence and is being determined totally by the value-relation. That is why the fertile soil for capital is an ahistorical parenthesis when its constitution requires history to take effect.³ Now that we have located our problem, we will try to articulate it from various angles.

The lack of any historical social formations constituted (in America) a clear ground where ethnic minorities had to establish themselves in a spatio-temporal matrix where money was the universal equivalent and therefore value-relations were dominant. Such conditions

1. J. Lacan, Ibid., p. 115, emphasis mine.

2. In this I am backed up by the works of C-L Strauss, and J. Lacan.

3. Although the relations of production are historically determined, production itself is the site where nature is decomposed and recombined. The higher the productive capacity of a social form the greater its proximity to a laboratory i.e. an analytic matrix.

promoted the economic development of capital accumulation while culture and history as far as the base was concerned were retarded since most of the labourers were uneducated, illiterate¹ and unskilled. Any problems in a civil society, where the Hobbesian "bellum omnia contra omnes" found its more acute concretion, were simply discarded as emanating from the incomplete applications of the principles of "freedom" (indeterminacy) and of individual competition in the market.

The new model of value-expansion necessitated the constitution of a new liberal democracy more expansive than the Continental one. (One can recognize in Nazism and Fascism some incomplete attempts to set up the new factors of production associated with Fordism). This expansion marked the entrance of the state apparatus into new areas of direct hegemonic control namely the regulation of labour-power and of the money form.

The reproduction of labour power by the state brings it very close to an identification with the historical-temporal dimension, the very meaning of reproduction.

"Capital" constitutes a synchronic model, a skeleton devoid of flesh, blood, circulation, mutation, history, life. This is the reason the product of class-conflict, value, is divorced from its actual force of generation which is living labour. This was done so as to establish the secrets of the surplus-value creation, understood only in a parenthesis, without forgetting the historical side or the site of reproduction. Quite the opposite occurred in the thought of

1. The Carnegie Foundation's "Report on Education" claimed that approximately 25% of Americans are functionally illiterate, 1980 data.

Marx and in this we agree with Claude Meillassoux, namely, that the material of history, reproduction, class-struggle was the initial point of departure and the necessary one in order to establish the science of capital as historical materialism. This thought finds its modern analogon in the import of living labour from peripheral social formations where value-relations are not determinant to a high-degree, or the ratio of dead to living labour is lower than one.

$\frac{\text{dead labour (value)}}{\text{living labour (force)}} < 1$. There, in the "countryside", an anthropology expressed as a political humanism is very strong since living labour and the struggle for the transformation of nature determines directly the various levels of the social formation. The real being has not been concretised into a legal "I" or a "subject" possessing both a civil status and a statement of account (the mine) as in Hegel.¹ In most cases the labourers' organizations are illegal and thus along with them production is mystified²; military juntas (the most popular form of governing in the world) attempt to constitute "theatra politica", stages where the private "subjects", divorced from themselves, will operate freely as meta-juridical entities, as "people" (the very moment that return will be phantom-like and as such belonging to a separate reality.)

The import of labour to such advanced social matrices as the Western European ones (namely the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Switzerland, Belgium, Netherlands, Italy and Sweden) will be the main

1. J. Lacan, op.cit., p. 126.

2. See the illuminating article by H. Vidal "The Politics of the Body: The Chilean Junta and the Anti-Fascist Struggle", Social Text 2, Summer, 1979, pp. 104-120.

focus of illustrating the previously advanced schemata.

The State constitutes the main agent which regulates the reproduction of civil society which has reached a maturity over which any further mutation or transition cannot be interior or atemporal to it but needs a break from the circle towards historicity or democratic socialism. Either way, the arrest of time, which is the mark of the bourgeois system, reaches certain limits whenever all relations are transformed into value relations and the wage-form predominates.

The State, understood as the material condensation of a combination of powers representing value-relations, regulates this transition or mode of reproduction of the synchronic structure of capital in a specific bourgeois form; namely, making sure that all energies hegemonically lead towards the expansion of the circle by the accumulation of value and not towards the break of such development. This infinite interiorization leads to an ever increasing barbarism, de-humanization, all condensed in the form of the "guest-worker".

Yet the problem historically appears coloured, as the new Marx was quite aware, by the relation of the category of "population" itself, a concept constituted with the emergence of modern industry.

What experience shows to the capitalist generally is a constant excess of population, i.e., an excess in relation to the momentary requirements of surplus-labour absorbing capital, although this excess is made up of generations of human beings stunted, short-lived, swiftly replacing each other, plucked, so to say, before maturity.¹

-
1. The over-worked "die off with strange rapidity; but the places of those who perish are instantly filled, and a frequent change of persons makes no alteration in the scene" (England and America , London, 1833, Vol. 1, p. 55 by E.G. Wakefield) in K. Marx, Capital, Vol. 1, p. 269, Footnote 1.

And, indeed, experience shows to the intelligent observer with what swiftness and grip the capitalist mode of production, dating, historically speaking, only from yesterday, has seized the vital power of the people by the very root-shows how the dégénération of the industrial population is only retarded by the constant absorption of primitive and physically uncorrupted elements from the country-shows how even the country labourers, in spite of fresh air and the principle of natural selection, that works so powerfully among them, and only permits the survival of the strongest, are already beginning to die off.¹

What is strangely fresh in Marx's analysis, written more than a century ago, is the fact that a similar process goes on full swing in Western Europe. In 1972 at least 10% of the working population was composed of legal migrants and immigrants.²

The indigenous producers usually displaced to a position of legality inscribed with civil and political rights are absorbed to more elevated, mental labour, away from manual jobs. According to official statistics in the Federal Republic of Germany, 59.99% of migrant labourers were employed in manufacturing during 1975. They constituted 13.33% of total employment in that sector. The energy and mines sector was composed of 14.85% of guest-workers. Manuel Castells estimated that 46% of all semi-skilled workers work on the assembly-line in France.³ In Switzerland almost 40% of workers in factories are foreigners and "when one considers solely directly productive work, they already constitute a clear majority".⁴ It might sound paradoxical, but the

1. Ibid., emphasis is mine.

2. The F.R. of Germany and Switzerland employ migrant labour contracted usually for a year. France employs labourers settled in the aftermath of the decomposition of her African colonial empire i.e. Algeria, Senegal, Cameroons, etc.

3. M. Castells, "Immigrant workers and Class Struggles in Advanced Capitalism: the Western European Experience", Politics & Society, No. 5, 1975, pp. 33-66.

4. Ibid., p. 38.

base is imported. The structure is permanent but the living labourers are rotating on an average of a four to five year stay.

As a matter of course, migrant labourers do not have either civil rights or political rights in the place of work in the host-country; it is such a case in the home-country where dictatorial regimes ruled till 1974 in Greece and Portugal and 1975 in Spain, posing a "freeze" over a system of rights granted by liberal democratic rule. The foreign labourer (whether migrant or immigrant) consumes below the socially established norm, for he is there to accumulate in order to build a home, buy an automobile or open a shop in the home country. In doing this he "reduces inflationary tensions in expansionary periods and cushions the decline in demand in recessionary periods".¹

All the above lead to a consolidation modelled after the "German" mode of labour-importation: it uses mostly "unmarried workers" in the most productive ages which are policed. They live in company-barracks (total control of their day-activities) and their exploitation combines absolute and relative surplus-value production. This is the solution after which the British Immigration Act, the Swiss measures, and the French Fontanet-Marcellin circular are fashioned.²

Concluding Remarks

The capitalist structure is "natural", synchronic, analytical. As such we can study it scientifically since in "nature" what occurs is

1. M. Castells, Ibid., p. 56.

2. M. Castells, Ibid., p. 57.

the decomposition of the constituents of the "natural" body, the body politic.

In actuality, the molecules of that "social" body decompose. This provides what Claude Levi-Strauss stressed as "an efficacious method of putting them by so that they can be recovered in case of need and their properties be better studied."¹ This organon for the scientific appropriation of reality is the product of a moment sustained by a state apparatus-administration that actively penetrates peripheral social formations (usually where democracy has been suspended, as in Turkey, itself the biggest source of labour in West Germany) setting up recruitment offices thus appropriating raw-energy to feed its production furnaces and accumulate crystals of value. In this way the ratio of dead to living labour follows the equation $\frac{\text{dead labour (value)}}{\text{living labour (force)}} > 1$, or dead labour dominates living labour. The imported labourers, unconscious elements, with no language that corresponds to the one of the host-country, are the condensed abstract moment representing the condition of man in relation to capital. Their language and therefore thought is in a condition of a "semantic aphasia", for they are pure energy, pure homogenous, abstract labour within and outside the factory gates, existing only to produce abstract wealth, value.

The guest-workers are never inserted into the hegemonic discursive practice of the advanced liberal social formations. They do not exist as humans bearing capacities and potential but rather as inanimate

1. Claude Levi-Strauss, The Savage Mind, p. 247. Emphasis mine.

"natural" objects bearing energy as is with any "natural resource".¹

Discriminatory legislation (in Germany the Ausländergesetz - Foreigners law - of 1965; in Britain the 1971 Immigration Act) denies vital civil and political rights to the already underprivileged section of the working class, which deepens the split.²

The frightening ostracism of democratic principles, rights of minorities, family, youth, "natives" etc. etc. in advanced "social" formations shows that the concretion of homo sapiens as "homo economicus" is based on a radical retardation of politics, democracy, justice, history and culture. It points to a "naturalized" society, the anti-physis of a human society whose "nature" is cultural and historical.

It is supportive to the position advanced that the Federal Republic of Germany recruits 26.21% (1975) of its foreign labour, mostly unskilled, from Turkey. For the more advanced the home-condition the more the chances to form unions that will fight to minimize the over-exploitation of labour by bringing it to a correspondence with the socially determined one.

It appears that the higher the organic composition of capital, the higher the rate of surplus-value and therefore the rate of exploitation, the sooner the labourers are to form groups of organized resistance as a means of ensuring the reproduction of themselves as

-
1. The reality is closer to home than one can imagine. Early this summer in a prominent location upon the entrance to the centre of the city, Hamilton, Ont., one could read the following:

DEVELOP A NATURAL RESOURCE

HIRE A STUDENT!

The anonymous author was articulating very clearly how capital sees humans.

2. S. Castles and G. Kosack, "Immigrant Workers and Trade Unions in the German Federal Republic" Radical America, Vol. 8, No. 6, 1974, pp. 55-77, pp. 58-9.

workers. I suspect the rotation-system introduced as a "rotation-policy" by the state government of Bavaria in the Federal Republic according to which no immigrant should be allowed to stay more than five years¹ is adapted to this, technically, determined phenomenon.

I close with the following quotation characteristic or rather endemic in economic literature.

As long as employees can be replaced it does not matter for our purpose whether the labour force always contains the same person or is a rapidly changing group. The labour force as a whole is constantly associated with the firm, and it can be constructively regarded as "owned" by it. In modern economics where firms are usually purchased as going concerns, payment is often made for intangible assets such as a stable and high quality labour force.²

-
1. S. Castles and G. Kosack, "Immigrant workers and Trade Unions in the German Federal Republic", op.cit., p. 62.
 2. B. Lev. and A. Schwartz, "On the Use of the Economic Concept of Human Capital in Financial Statements", Accounting Review, vol. 46, January 1971 in E.R. Chang, K. Hilton and H.A. Yaseen, "The Stock of Human Capital in the U.S. 1975: A Preliminary Estimate", pp. 198-211, in Patterson & Schott, (eds.), The Measurement of Capital, MacMillan 1979, London.

CHAPTER II

THE PERIODIZATION OF THE STATE-FORM AND
THE CONSTITUTION AND CIRCULATION OF ECONOMIC SUBJECTS.

What we will attempt here is a genealogy of the over-determined or multiplex reality of capital (surplus-value relation) by a deconstruction of the categories of persona or "self" and its relation to the science of police as a concept bearing various meanings invested in its relation to state and administration. All this leads us to a reconstruction, albeit schematic, of a course where the organicism of a history, whose pertinent effectivity was dialectical in relation to the formulated "synchronic" structure and is posed as the new reproductive modality. This modality is represented by an administrative form of a State that directs the new expansion of the value-relation over new areas, under a new politico-economic structure, which is named after Gramsci as Fordism.

Persona and the Legal Constitution of the State

The notions of the "subject", "consciousness", "self", are part of an ensemble of concepts, mutually interdependent, positioned at the intersection of different historical periods incorporating the concept of politics, police, (from the Greek πολιτεια or Latin politia) and the State. Such an historical deconstruction aims at constituting the relation of such categories to one another in modern capitalist reality whose ensemble of combinatory relations is a result of a series of breaks conjuncturally transformed/translated by the constellation of hegemonic forces and thus given new conceptual meaning.

Marcel Mauss begins to elaborate on the concept of persona (Latin) as follows:

You all know how normal and classic the Latin notion of the persona is: the mask, the tragic mask, the ritual mask and the ancestral mask. It is a datum at the beginning of Latin civilization.¹

The concept of personae etymologically comes from per/sonare, the mask through (per) which the voice (of the actor) comes² after Benveniste. It may be a product of the Etruscan appropriation of the Greek *πρόσωπον* (perso).³ The bearer of a persona is a Roman citizen bearing the right to the autochthonous determination over his body as his property.

Persona, Mauss reminds us, was synonymous with the true nature of the individual but remained foreign to the "self". A moral meaning was invested through the Stoics' concept of conscience. A moral person of principles was self-conscious. The concept of the person had a Janus-like image, one pertaining to a "mask" and "role" and another to "type" and "character".⁴ Christianity further inserts a metaphysical, abstract, element in the form of a universalization and "freedom" in relation to Christ. The human person is born.⁵

Renaissance and Descartes constituted the famous "cogito ergo sum" but it was the various sectarian movements of Puritans, Pietists as was Kant and Wesleyans that formed the basis for the transition of the meaning of the person to self, to consciousness.⁶ Kant posed the

1. Mauss, Sociology and Psychology, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979, p. 81.

2. M. Mauss, ibid., p. 78.

3. Mauss, ibid., p. 78.

4. Epictetus, M. Aurelius in J. Ernest in M. Mauss, ibid., p. 84.

5. Edelman, B., The Ownership of the Image, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979, p. 171.

6. Mauss, op.cit., p. 88.

possibility of the "ego", "I", as being a primordial category. This development, greatly echoing the determination of property over the "subject", also conceptually represents the difference between the "I" and the "thing".¹

Kant differentiated between "sensible possession and intelligible possession", or, "physical possession" and "purely de jure possession".¹ This denotes that;

... the thing possesses a reality which is external to the subject and that the subject is able to appropriate it only in the name of a degree of reason.²

This radical break in the structure of the "subject", fully developed in Hegel's "Philosophy of Right", marks the point of formation of a new (capitalist) mode of production in which the "subject" is freed from the land in order to "circulate" as an abstract bearer of rights. The French Revolution historically marked that radical break of the new modern present. The present is governed by a concept of the state founded upon law and a system of rights. This 18th century innovation broke away from Aristotelian meta-physics,³ making the individual consciousness the basis for Practical Reason.⁴ Knemeyer views a radical separation regarding the concept of Police in relation to the State.⁵ Usually the science of police was associated with the

1. E. Kant, The Metaphysical Elements of Justice, tr. J. Ladd, Bobbs-Merrill, New York, 1965, p. 1 in Edelman, op.cit.

2. Ibid.

3. Knemeyer, Franz-Ludwig "Polizei" Economy & Society, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1980, p. 185.

4. Mauss, op.cit., p. 89.

5. Knemeyer, op.cit.

notion of social welfare or public happiness. This eudaemonian domain rather euphemistically represents nothing short of the political constitution of factors of production through the constitution of a labour market.¹

This labour market is nothing less than the terrain of circulation where commodities circulate and where that primordial category of the "ego", "self", brings its owned commodity for sale. In this sphere the autonomous self floats "freely", creating value. As Marx said:

The consumption of labour-power is at one and the same time the production of commodities and of surplus value. The consumption of labour-power is completed, as in the case of every other commodity, outside the limits of the market or the sphere of circulation.

Accompanied by Mr. Moneybags and by the possessor of labour-power, we therefore take leave for a time of this noisy sphere, where everything takes place on the surface and in view of all men, and follow them both into the hidden abode of production, on whose threshold there, stares us in the face: No admittance except on business.²

Law and Circulation

The law fixes the sphere of circulation as a natural given and this is what makes the consumption of labour complete and the production therefore initiated.³ The constitution of the category labour-power as a produced commodity is simultaneously a formal subordination of living labour totally conditioned by its appropriated

1. See Piven, F.F. and R.A. Cloward, Regulating the Poor, New York, Random House, 1972, p. 80, Thompson, E.P. "Time, Work, Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism", Past & Present, 1967, 38:56-97, Curtis, B., Edginton, B. "Uneven institutional development and the "staple" approach: a problem of method", Canadian Journal of Sociology 4(3), 1979, pp. 257-273.

2. K. Marx, Capital, op.cit., pp. 175-76.

3. Edelman, op.cit., pp. 93-108.

energies and capacities engaged in a fierce struggle to reproduce its existence, fighting to keep its position, which, while valorised, the formal logic of capitalist production forces the cost of living labour, accrued in the form of wages, down. Marx read in capitalist production:

The overwork of the employed part of the working-class swells the ranks of the reserve, whilst conversely the greater pressure the latter by its competition exerts on the former, forces these to submit to over-work and to subjugation under the dictates of capital.¹

The constitution of circulation, or of the private "social" - civil society, appears to curtail the public welfare domain or the general concept of police, i.e., the charging with care and well-being of all the subjects, and confines it to the practical meaning of welfare administration. The constitution of a system of rights inscribed to subjects bearing possessions for exchange was aimed at expanding civil society and limiting the power of the police. The "Staatsrecht der constitutionellen Monarchie" of 1839 argued:

No governmental power is more dangerous to freedom than that of Polizei - not simply the so-called superior or secret police, but the so-called welfare "Polizei" above all. The prime function of the state should be solely to secure the domination of law. According to basic constitutional principles there is only one possible place for Polizei, and that is the responsibility for security and order in the state; what is known as welfare "Polizei" (especially surveillance and welfare "Polizei") is nothing but open interference with the freedom of the citizen.²

Fichte was the one responsible for the development of the idea of elimination of welfare or "social" measures by the assignment to

-
1. K. Marx, Capital, Vol. 1, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1954, p. 595 in Jill Rubery, "Structured labour markets, worker organisation and low pay", Cambridge Journal of Economics, 1978, pp. 18-36.
 2. Von Aretin/von Rotteck, 1839, Vol. 2, p. 165 in Knemeyer, op.cit. p. 188.

police of two central spheres, the protection from danger and the function of security, and the supervision and upholding of the laws.¹ Interestingly enough it was Fichte who made the category of the "ego" the pre-condition of consciousness and science, of Pure Reason.²

Since the 18th century, we see the parallel separation of the general science of police and its Aristotelian meta-physics-constituting the state welfare policies and institutions (goals, schools, prisons, asylums) - from the state administration and the development of the autonomous subject as the primordial category of an emerging civil society. This is the reign of the legal subject, of rationality and competition.

The Modern State and Rooseveltism as a "Passive Revolution"

The 20th century shows the over-determination of collective or group phenomena over individual phenomena. The development of the joint-stock company, the fusion of industrial and banking capitals to form finance capital, the transformation in the labour process through Taylorism, to Fordism and Rooseveltism (1930-38), mark a new era in which the principles of civil society do not seem to function satisfactorily. The collapse of the market system lay in its inability to solve the basic production problem itself. The president of Columbia University, N.M. Butler, declared (1931) that planning was essential and the situation necessitated a general plan for American Business.³

1. Fichte, Grundlage des Naturrechts nach Principen der Wissenschaftslehre (1797), Gesamtausgabe Vol. 4, p. 85, 91 in Kuemeyer, op.cit., p. 189.

2. M. Mauss, op.cit., p. 89.

3. N.M. Butler, "A Planless World" in America faces the Future, by C.A. Beard (ed.), Boston, 1932, pp. 11-19 referred to in Z. Keilany "Capitalism in the United States and Germany 1930-1934", Il Politico, 43, No. 2, 1978, pp. 309-319.

Furthermore,

at the moment of President Roosevelt's inauguration in 1933, American Businessmen desperately importuned the federal government for drastic action by which they meant, primarily, sanction of the "right of self-government" in addition to some sort of emergency extension of credit.¹

H.I. Harriman, the president-elect of U.S. Chamber of Commerce, (in 1932), suggested the amending of anti-trust laws to allow business concerns to share the market.

The government, he said, must have the power to disallow excessive prices. He also advocated the creation of strong trade organizations provided the anti-trust laws were modified so as to enable their organizations to act in an efficient manner.²

Therefore we see some new drastic moves in the post 1929-crash American economy. The year 1933 saw the formation of the National Recovery Administration (N.R.A.) which "linked together the development of trade associations policy and the regulation of competition by turning over to the associations themselves a large share of responsibility for redefining unfair competition."³

The dramatic "economic-corporative" integration of the working-class into formal decision-making structures constitutes its complete formal subordination to a semi-automatic labour process. The value-relation determines the base whose integration denotes that hegemony

1. Ibid., p. 310.

2. Ibid., p. 311.

3. Ibid., p. 312 for the movement of trade-unions in the United States see M. Faisod and L. Gordon, Government and the American Economy, 3rd ed., Norton and Co., N.Y., 1948, pp. 528-557. My emphasis.

is inscribed in the positions therein. The political and ideological instances mediate the reproduction of the economic structure. This is the field of the public sphere,¹ institutionalised by the State, aiming at the provision of facilities for collective consumption, regulation of the labour markets, and acting as the hegemonic relation that actively appropriates energy in the form of living-labour as a resource for the formation of value. The notion of the state which we have implicitly utilised so far and which we are to articulate more explicitly pertains to the idea of the State as an apparatus that is not viewed classically, as in the Leninist and Social Democratic traditions, i.e. as separated from the "social", civil society, but rather as a unity of political society and civil society. For Antonio Gramsci the "State = political society + civil society, in other words, hegemony protected by the armour of coercion".²

For Gramsci the State is "... not only the apparatus of government but also the "private" apparatus of "hegemony" or civil society".³ It is very clear that his conception of the State is expansive and includes both political society as the constituent element and "... that of relations of force as the first condition for the formation of an historic bloc". Furthermore "Against a whole line of interpretation that identifies the social totality with unification of base and superstructures in a single historic bloc, Badaloni remarks

-
1. The domain of public sphere as an object of investigation by J. Habermas, O. Negt et al, provides some interesting insights. See the review by P.U. Hohendahl, "Critical Theory, Public Sphere and Culture: Jurgen Habermas and his Critics" in New German Critique No. 16, 1979, pp. 89-118.
 2. A. Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, International Publishers, New York, 1975, p. 263.
 3. C. Buci-Glucksmann, Gramsci and the State, p. 70.

that the formation (or not) of a historic bloc relates to the objective conditions that make it possible";¹ rather than the other way round. That reversal or abstract universalization or hypostasization is a hegelianization of Gramsci's thought. Thus the specificity of the "conjuncture" is the crucial element in an articulation of the base and super-structure in a single bloc. This "conjuncture" was defined by Gramsci as Americanism - referred elsewhere throughout this text as Fordism, etc. - bearing the birth certificate of a particular model of capitalism developed early in this century in America and politically constituted by the direct hegemony of the State during Roosevelt's years.² The mirror-image of this particular development, or the specific imposition of a historic bloc under different historical conditions in Germany during the 1930's period, led to the constitution of National-Socialism. During the 1933-36 period the Nazi State encompassed all factors of production, imposing a codification system over them, subjugating them to a state administration yet without altering the

1. Ibid., p. 71, emphasis mine.

2. Suzanne de Brunhoff in The State, Capital and Economic Policy, London, Pluto Press, 1978, uses the term "economic policy" as a synonym of "fordism" (our equivalent) and writes on p. 67-8 "economic policy presupposes the unification of the working class as an economic subject, receiving and spending a monetary income - in other words, a particular form of alienation. It is true that before the working class could be recognized as an economic subject with demands affecting the state's management, it had to have broken through as a political subject (in the Russian revolution and the international cycle of struggles following the first world war)." Emphasis mine.

nature of the property relation.¹ For Gramsci, Rooseveltism was a genuine form of capitalist revolution, a "passive" revolution² or restoration. Passive revolution is the expression of a blocked (historical dialectic), as opposed to a dialectical supercession in struggle and the development of struggles.³ The idiosyncrasy of the American model is based on the peculiarity of the properties of a "population" defined in totally economistic-corporatist, ahistorical, and apolitical terms peculiar to a "social" formation constituted by immigrants.

Every "passive revolution" is historically based on a gradual incorporation of the leadership of the antagonistic classes or groups. In America this absorption was a result of the universalization of monetary relations, i.e. proletarianization.⁴

The form of decapitation of the leadership of collectivities

-
1. See Keilany, Ziad, op.cit., p. 315 and C.B. Glucksmann, particularly pp. 314-324 where Gramsci elaborates on the complex relationship between Fascism, Passive (economic-technicist) revolution and the American Model.

One can now bring to mind similar differences between the hegemonic power (U.S.) and its client states which bear the metaphysical potentiality of becoming a truly Americanized version of capital. Reality and appearance are too abyssmally distant from that imagery. See the very pertinent text by H. Vidal "The Politics of the Body", Social Text, 1979, No. 2, Summer 1979, pp. 104-120.

2. This term was borrowed by Gramsci from Vincenzo Cuoco; see Glucksmann, op.cit., p. 314.
3. Glucksmann, Ibid., p. 315.
4. Ibid., p. 321.

located in positions antagonistic to the dominant ensemble of forces is defined politically under fascism, i.e. physical extermination, force, and repression. The "passive" revolution in Europe was one-dimensional: it was confined only to the level of economic policy. The dominant forms of political coercion and ideological organization of the masses gave the specific aura to a system whose content analytically was similar to the American model. In America, the economic definition/identification of the popular masses or their constitution of a market (consumerism) was the homogenous element, their abstraction, that was thought to magically overcome any contradiction or antagonism with the surplus-value relation or capital and its hypostasis, the State.

This formation of a "société de consommation" or a "state of prosperity" in Europe in the thirties was the latent meaning of fascism in "social" formations where the market for industry was foreign trade,¹ rather than the popular masses.

The possibility of capitalist accumulation on a new model during the New Deal era was a result of a homogeneity of the superstructures that allowed the "relativism" or cultural a-historicism of the masses constituted as rational economic subjects by the universal equivalent of money:

... the rationalization and simplification of the superstructures on a more direct industrial basis, implies the absence of "historical sediments, of such parasitic strata as the clergy, traditional intellectuals, state functionaries, etc., that arose from an earlier mode of production. This meant that American capitalism, as Gramsci analyzed it, presupposed "a rationalization of the population", "a formidable accumulation of capital ... on a sound basis".²

1.C.Buci-Glucksmann, op.cit., p. 322.

2. C. Buci-Glucksmann, Ibid. , p. 83.

What is specific to the American model of capitalist production, not immune from developments in the East or the problem of production without "workers councils", is that hegemony is constituted in the positions of the factory shop-floor. The "fordised" factory is the primordial category of this new "social" ordering. Yet hegemony over the base is the hegemony over the whole social formation. Hegemony within the factory cannot exist without hegemony outside the factory. This requires a stabilization of workers' lives through the wage-form and through a total system that codifies/fixes and regulates private lives in the form of the company-town.

In the company-town, or the "fordised-town", we see in embryo labour's incorporation in the "fordised-social" where value relations directly determine every aspect of the "social".¹ The universalization of value-relations is the concrétion of the analogon to the metaphysical catholic Aristotelian universe begun by the Reformation and Kant. The new universal equivalent of money has analogous hold over the totality of the "social" as the old abstract universal equivalent of God. Both mystifications of the real reach their apogee when their horizon can be envisaged.

The meeting with the neo-catholic² is the realization of the

-
1. See Sergio Bologna, "Class composition and the theory of the party at the origin of the worker's councils movement", p. 68-91, Series No. 1, Conference of Socialist Economists Pamphlet, 1976.
 2. The word "catholic" denotes a totality. The universal equivalent of the Middle Ages was a religious form representing the apparent over-determination of the superstructures. Catholic is Greek composed of two words $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon-\omicron\lambda\omicron$ (catho-holo) or every-whole. A paradox of the wording of every "catholic" or "cosmology" is the connotation of a negation in the manner of limitation. Such a totalization ultimately is ahistorical or metaphysical. It is a pure denegation of reality, history and production. The absolute denegation. In modern Greek "catholou" denotes "nothing" i.e. every-total "nothing".

limits of capitalist expansion to the degree that the value encompasses the totality of the "social".

This total valorisation of the "social" through the constitution of hegemony at the "base", the point of attention of working-class political organizations, was primarily possible in the United States through an extra-political form (which was not possible in Central and Southern Europe, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal) due to the fact that the pertinent weight of previous historical modes of production was absent and therefore a radical discontinuity with a historical past was constituted as the pre-condition of American development. The absence of traditional intellectuals, a stratum that organises consent, allowed the general homogenization of ideologies, economism, "pragmatism", which itself, once politics were displaced, acted directly in the organization of the factory-base and therefore indirectly upon all the "social body". Managers, administering production, play a strategic role in this model where the antagonisms of the base, relation of labour and capital, are the "object"-subject to an administration.

All responsibility for work falls into the domain of techno-crats, the labourer is simply an executor. We see the standardization of the dichotomy of mental labour and manual labour.¹

In actual fact, Taylor expresses with brutal cynicism the general goal of American society: to develop in the worker the highest degree of machine-oriented and automatic attitudes, breaking the former system of mental and physical connections characteristic of skilled work.

-
1. One can see the importance of this separation for capital in the insistence of positivism on this dichotomy. See Karl Popper & J.C. Eccles in The Self and its Brain: An Argument for Interactionism, London, Springer-Verlag, 1977.

All selection methods are acceptable if they have this end in mind. The element of the so-called high wages also depends on this necessity. It is the instrument used to select and maintain in stability a skilled labour force suited to the system of production and work.¹

The direct determination by the value-relation leaves no ambiguity regarding its relation to the worker. "The worker is simply a profitable object".² It is an object, subject to the tele-control of an administrative apparatus which is itself an hypostasization, directly representing value-relations.

The State in this "conjuncture", the State of the New Deal, and the totality of its ideological apparati, mediate the extended reproduction of the "social".³ This mediation appears as intervention to many, but it cannot be understood as such without violating the essence of the political form determinant under finance capitalism. The state absorbs the "social", "representing" in a true Aristotelian sense the surplus-value relation; i.e. not the interests of its constituent collectivities in an anthropological sense. It is interesting to note that the new constitution of welfare policies in the "New Deal" capitalist period did not necessarily alter the old notion of "what is good for business is good for the public". This itself

1. Glucksmann, op.cit., p. 84.

2. Ibid., emphasis mine.

3. Economic policy involves the management of money, labour-power and the relationship of the two. We should note that such management of the circulation of capital involves a compromise between capitalists and labourers which the bearers of capital, unable to achieve directly, are represented by the state.

depended upon the principle of "free market" competition.¹ The principle of res-publica was not fundamentally altered, but reached a closer-approximation to its essential meaning; namely, the public domain as the organon for the constitution of a private market. This reality can be seen in every state under the Western umbrella irrespective of the magnitude of the home-market.²

The valorization of the public-sphere in areas of collective consumption, welfare policy, environment, administration of every aspect of the "social" requires the circulation of subjects and the appropriation of new energy sources (human and natural) as the numbers of bearers being "priced-out" of the market increases along with the intensification of a labour-process in the manner of a maximization of relative and absolute surplus-value.

The tendency is to replace gradually indigenous workers by rotating guest-labourers which fill positions where value is formed, i.e. production and reproduction (construction).

The absence of production in law, the primordial category of the "subject" imposed by the logical formal separation of the labourer and his produced commodity labour-power, i.e. the apparent determination of consumption and symbols over materiality, production, reaches its perfect

1. See Keilany, op.cit., p. 315.

2. Usually most foreign aid is appropriated by the administrators themselves. The rationality points to the fact that such private-agents would invest, constituting members of civil society. In our times this privatization-valorization of the public-sphere or the state administration has reached extreme proportions.

expression in law, where workers are either a meta-juridical category, "people" or "persons" or an illegal category as in pre-liberal social formations. The reality is one and better represented by the "fordised" factories, where the direct administration of production is accompanied by an intensified system of ethical-moral constraints outside the factory gates destined to preserve the physical energy of the labourers. (In the case of "guest-labourers", the complete alienation of a stormy insertion into a "social", slightly decades or even centuries ahead, imposes a mode of existence that is simply "parenthetic". Work acts as the sole form of activity-practice.¹ It is the only consolation for them.)

One can stress that the geographical distance between work and habitation in modern America is the empirical proof of such a surpassing of the "fordised-plant". The answer is that although empirical reality as such is based on a topography, itself represents a form of fetishism since although in appearance in capitalism the technical division of labour or the world of engineers and other technocrats, (stressing the real appropriation/transformation of nature relation while mystifying the "socio-historical" nature of that base) is phenomenally dominant, in reality it is over-determined by the "social" relations of production. Symbolically, one can say that the distance, primarily confined to mental labour, between work and "leisure" is representing the distance between production and consumption. If we look closely enough, we will see that the so called liberation of "man" from work is more a mystification than a reality. It represents a different content of a similar form. The

1. We must not forget that our manual labourers are from areas where practical activity or homo faber is the central relation.

"freedom" of the modern "subject", or its liberalism from thought, deduction, abstraction, rationality and logos or language is a "catholic" freedom i.e. from everything and nothing. The idea is that matters are as they should be.

The constitution of legal-subjects, birth-registered as bearers of rights circulating in the level of exchange, a homogenous, non-differentiated terrain where every subject in law is the equal of every other subject in law, is the point of intersection between production and circulation. It is also posing the importance of circulation in the reproduction of capital;

... in the market-place, two equally matched commodity owners confront each other, and that they, like all other commodity owners, are distinguishable only by the material content of their goods ... Or in other words, the original relation remains intact, but survives only as the illusory reflection of the capitalist relation underlying it.¹

Living labour is no more than the means of maintaining and increasing the objective labour and making it independent of him. This form of mediation is intrinsic to this mode of production. It perpetuates the relation between capital as the buyer and the worker as the seller of labour. It is a form, however, which can be distinguished only formally from other more direct forms of the enslavement of labour and the ownership of it as perpetuated by the owners of the means of production,² even more the formal relationship between two owners, the contract, makes it possible for "class political power to take the form of public authority".³

In the abstract, homogenous sphere of circulation of commodities, the specificity or centrality of labour-power is lost or concealed.

-
1. Marx, Capital, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1976, appendix, Results of the Immediate Process of Production, pp. 1062-3 in B. Edelman, The Ownership of the Image, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979, p. 106. Emphasis in Edelman.
 2. Ibid., pp. 1063-4. Emphasis in Edelman.
 3. E.B. Pashukanis, La Théorie générale du droit et le marxisme, Paris 1970, p. 129, quoted in S. de Brunhoff, op.cit., p. 67, ft. 13.

What matters for circulation is the movement of exchange value, that is, the abstract movement of property.¹

The production of value in the form of the transformation of nature is always the property of "subjects" in law but does not have to be generated by those "subjects". To the degree that law exists only in circulation, a system of rights in the production process is possible to be abstracted or eliminated during a certain conjuncture. Such cases pertain to migrant workers in most Western European countries.

Modern "Economic-Subjects". Guest-Labour.

Guest-labour as modern "economic subjects" takes the legal form of refusing labourers the basic rights possessed by other labourers (located in a different temporality). They are simply the empirically observable "guests" bearing the capacity, force to be appropriated as a commodity, even before arrival at the factory barracks. To the degree that the very form of the "subject" is constituted in law pertaining to a sphere "other" than production, the "guest-workers" exist in the fringes, parapets of the advanced "social matrices", a literally "natural" force outside the "social".

Their illegality or para-legality is similar to their status as "people" in their home base, where usually authoritarian governments have "abolished" reality by suppressing the antagonism (political) between the classes.

The treatment of "guest-workers" in the West is the exemplary point where bourgeois law and its primordial category, the "subject"

1. Edelman, op.cit., p. 106, my emphasis.

(consciousness), show very clearly the idiosyncracies of their represented values in the manner of their determinations which are nothing more than the realization of private property. The treatment of guest-workers also indicates how so called "peripheral societies", existing in differential temporality in relation to the "imperialist centres", by the production of labourers for export can show us in the opacity of advanced labour-processes the radical transformation that has taken place in the West since World War II and can clearly point out to what a great degree modern capitalist "société de consommation" rests on a tomb of struggles, absorbed into conflicts, canalized by the administration. Modern capitalist societies are reproduced by the appropriation of living-labour from an imperialist chain of client states. They themselves constitute the abstract, somewhat broken, mirror-image of capital.

pleasure
capital's
interest
or
int'l
class

Concluding Remarks

A genealogy of the concepts of "self", "subject" and forms of police and state allowed us to glimpse into a long process of formation of certain concepts that can be taken as "givens". The concept of personae from mask, to consciousness, "self" and modern "subject" expresses the determinations of private property. The pre-liberal mercantilist state, once the factors of production were constituted, gave way to a liberal industrial system that showed the expansion of "civil society" and a system of rights. The State was constituted in law. The development of finance capitalism constituted the State as the conscious articulator of the interests of capital far beyond individual idiosyncracies. The formation of Taylorism, Fordism and economic policy

required the transformation of workers as economic subjects defined by the wage-relation. The articulation between the juridical and the political are in relation to the wage-relation. The subordination of the labourer to the hegemony of the State complements their subordination to the capitalist.

Yet this subordination is formal, i.e. extra-political. State actions appear as public actions exogenous to private capitalist one's.

The reproduction of labour-power and the import of a portion of it that does not exist in the sphere of circulation, i.e. as subject in law, shows analytically the necessity of para-legal or pre-liberal modes of reproduction of labour-power appropriated and exploited by advanced social structures.

CHAPTER III

LABOUR-POWER AS A PRODUCED COMMODITY

The Historicity of Labour-Forms: Labour constituted in
law and modern forms of labour appropriation.

Colletti has established that the principal difference of Marx's theory of value from classical political economy lies in his insistence in the identity of the value-form with the theory of the fetishism of commodities.¹ The theme explored in this chapter regards the modes of labour appropriation and the pertinent historicity of such forms.

Labour-power as a Produced Commodity

Labour-power does not appear as a commodity in every social formation. It appears as such only when the labourer becomes "free" from the bonds to the land. This of course denotes the dissolution of the various pre-capitalist modes of production that gravitate around the ground-rent relation (feudal modes).

When the producers become "free" from politico-personal ties of dependence the certain type of informal subordination to a labour process that is constituted, renders them as the source of historical mutations. The so-called "primitive accumulation" process allows for the "historical" possibility for a basis for capital formation and hence accumulation to occur. In a general sense the constitution of producers as the direct source of surplus-value, indeed that very relation of surplus-value, allows for the first time "production" to take place. It is an antagonistic relation though for the "social economy" that is being established is a "production for capital".

The labourer in this mode of production enters into a "free" or liberal "economic" relation by which he sells his working capacities, so as to receive in return his means of reproduction. This is realized

1. L. Colletti, From Rousseau to Lenin, New Left Books, London, 1976, p. 77.

via the medium of the wage-relation. The labourer bearing a system of rights inscribed in law enters the market to exchange his labouring capacity. Those juridical rights are for property, i.e. the freedom to dispose of himself or "alienate" from the "I" the "myself" which is expropriated in order to produce the means of subsistence by the possession of the commodities produced by a "socially" constituted production.

Locke had declared that "One's labour is one's property",¹ establishing the general form of bourgeois law, basing it on such an identity which is formed by a radical separation of labour and the bearing "subject" possessing the right to contract and be contracted in a system of "generalised" exchange. In this manner the "subject" is unable to appropriate his own commodity unless it is expended or divorced from its source, labour, which is treated by capital as its variable portion, i.e. it can be part of an analytical formal-system of production radically discontinued from its living source, the "subject", which exists "according to his economic conditions as a pure living working capacity."²

It must be stressed that the political-moral form of equal-rights or civil rights (rights in the "social") is a necessary correspondence to a system of generalised exchange. Each labourer has the right to accumulate an unlimited amount of money or capital in a monied form so as to increase its capacities or "properties" in a system where forms determine contents and law ensures the circulation

-
1. J. Locke, Two Treatises of Government, ed. Peter Laslett, Cambridge, 1960.
 2. K. Marx, Grundrisse, p. 497, cited in L. Colletti, op.cit., p. 94. Emphasis mine.

and reproduction of a system of rights of property-owners in abstractio, (since they own their capacity in a phenomenal level only). This constitution of legal forms ensures the radical constitution of the producers in a meta-politico-juridical level where their produced capacities circulate and produce surplus-value (the determinant relation under capitalism) as economic forms phenomenally constituted as "things". This is the reification (res-thing in Latin) process which is the real material constitution of the capitalist revolution by man, which is inverted in his relation to his labour/capacities, which appear as an animate object, determining in itself and thus exercising an independence over its real source, an independence which constitutes the source of fetishism and mystification. This mystification is the result of the tendency of capital to develop into a structure in which living labour is dominated by dead-labour. In parallel terms there is a process whereby the popular and class agents are constituted in space and time as the bearers of specifically invested "subjectivities", namely democratic, ideological, "modern" or traditional.¹ There is a process of "representation" by which the exogenously "animated" labourers (by means of "capital")² (the atomized bearers of the abstract category "labour-power"), take personified forms (mask = personae in Roman times) as social and economic subjects bearing specific "privileges". Commodities although are the products of the labourer's only property³ they appear as of not-belonging to their source; the alienated labour-power or the

1. See L. Althusser's "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" in Lenin and Philosophy, N.L.B., London, 1971 and E. Laclau, Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory, N.L.B., London, 1977.

2. We refer here to the so-called "value" of labour-power in that as a "value" it is itself part of capital. (L. Colletti, From Rousseau to Lenin, op.cit., p. 85.).

3. The ambiguity of the term won't be explored herein.

"subject".. The owner of labour-power appears to be the one that rightfully contracts the labourer who is nothing but the "productive power of capital itself", to refer to Marx's remarkable point.¹

Labour-power as a produced commodity is part of capital itself. This constitution is not a "natural" condition but a historically determined form of "social" production which is determined by the man to man social relation, by which, for the first time, production is established and based upon both the social form of capital and labour. Such a constitution marks the full-development of a system of production in which the condition of intelligibility of one, i.e. labour, cannot be met without establishing the understanding of the other, i.e. capital. In modern production, i.e. the "fordised factory", it is not the labourer that applies the conditions of labour but the conditions of the labour-process that apply the labourer, who acts as the living appendix of the machine which is itself nothing less than accumulated labour.

... labour alienated from itself which confronts the wealth it creates as the wealth of a stranger, its own productivity as the productivity of its product its own enrichment as self-improvement, its social power as the power of society over it.²

Human capacities and energies are fixed as "crystals" of labour which is "value" of "things" and as such constitute a distinct entity determining their source, i.e. the labourer.

1. See L. Colletti, From Rousseau to Lenin, p. 86.

2. K. Marx, Theorien über den Mehrwert, Part III, p. 255 in L. Colletti, ibid., p. 86. Emphasis mine.

Abstract Homogenous Labour

The form of labour constituted as a commodity is equally called abstract, homogenous labour. Abstract labour, in other words, is the average, equal, basic element to all concrete labour (mental and manual), when expenditures of energy are divorced from the specific material real objects to whose transformation labour-power is applied. The exchange of commodities is an act characterised by a total abstraction from use-value.¹

As use-values, commodities are, above all, of different qualities, but as exchange-values they are merely different quantities, and consequently do not contain an atom of use-value.²

And

Along with the useful qualities of the products themselves, we put out of sight both the useful character of the various kinds of labour embodied in them, and the concrete forms of that labour; there is nothing left but what is common to them all; all are reduced to one and the same sort of labour, human labour in the abstract.³

The mode of expenditure of abstract labour, namely the production of value, is radically separate from the content of labour, namely the temporality of the agents of production. We must bear this in mind when the paradox of peasants labouring as proletarians will occupy us later.

As products of abstract labour, all the products of concrete forms of labour lose their perceptible or real qualities and now represent only the fact that ... "human labour-power has been expended in their production, that human labour is embodied in them; ... as crystals of this social substance, common to them all, they are - Values".⁴

1. K. Marx, Capital, 1967, Vol. I, p. 37.

2. Ibid., pp. 37-8.

3. Ibid., p. 38, emphasis mine.

4. Ibid.

What determines the value of a commodity is the socially necessary labour-time for its reproduction (social).

The value of one commodity is to the value of any other, as the labour-time necessary for the production of the one is to that necessary for the production of the other. "As values, all commodities are only definite masses of congealed labour-time".¹

It is evident by now why Marx sees Capital as characterised by a craziness (Verrucktheit) for its production is based in the transformation of human capacities into a commodity form.

Taylorism as the abstract moment whereby under the name of the "scientific organization of labour" a formidable basis for the accumulation of capital became a reality based on the commodification of labour. This principle is expressed empirically in the reversion of the relationship between the animate object and its inanimate product, the machine.

By transferring the qualitative characteristic of labour to the machine, mechanization reduces labour to a cycle of repetitive movements that is characterised solely by its duration, the output norm. This is the foundation of the homogenization of labour in production.²

The Marxian theory of exploitation applies only to such economies with homogenous labour in the production-process. This is the formal condition by which the synchronic structure of capitalist production can effectively operate. (determined by its basic relation of surplus-value). This formal abstraction is not an indeterminate abstraction in a Della Volpean sense, but, as Sweezy wrote;

1. K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, pp. 39-40.

2. M. Aglietta, A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The U.S. Experience, London, NLB, 1979, p. 113.

the reduction of all labour to a common denominator ... is not an arbitrary abstraction ... It is rather, as Lukacs correctly observes, an abstraction "which belongs to the essence of capitalism".¹ (Lukacs "Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein", p. 18)

Therefore it is a historically determinate abstraction, pertaining to a historical conjuncture, which is represented as "natural".

Furthermore, this analytical principle denoting relations of exchange should not be confused with use-value. In a letter to Engels, written in 1867, Marx had described one of the two "best points" of Capital as:

the double character of labour, according to whether it is expressed in use-value or exchange value (all understanding of the facts depends upon this, it is emphasized immediately in the first chapter)²

The formation of a generalised system of exchange denotes a formal system by which human labour is equalised and abstracted from its source, therefore, ipso facto, from that which serves to differentiate it, be it skill, technique, national, historical, racial or geographical properties, in a few words, concrete heterogeneous labour. This is the level of production in which labour-power is a produced commodity. It is a factor of production and exchange in an abstract, ahistorical field in which the two departments of production (Dept. I denoting the production

1. P. Sweezy, Theory of Capitalist Development, M.R.B. New York, 1970, p. 31 in S. Bowles & H. Gintis, "The Marxian Theory of Value and Heterogeneous Labour: a critique and reformulation". Cambridge Journal of Economics, 1977, 1, 173-192. Emphasis mine.
2. Marx to Engels, 1934 (Correspondence, 1846-1895: A Selection With Commentary and Notes) London, Martin Lawrence, pp. 226-27 in A.K. Sen, "On the Labour Theory of Value"; Cambridge Journal of Economics, 1978, 2, pp. 175-186, p. 190, "The other "best point" was seen by Marx as: "the treatment of surplus-value independently of its particular forms of profit, interest (both epiphenomenal forms, G.T.) ground rent (which constitutes a subordinate relation analytically pertaining to feudal relations. G.T.), etc...."

of means of production and Dept. II denoting the production of the means of consumption) are directly linked. Historically the assembly line, presented as technology, brings about the destruction of the political basis of the worker's self-management schema. The abstraction of labour marks the emergence of a regime of accumulation whereby the mass-abstract labourer is the bearer of production. At the same time the Rooseveltist re-distribution of income in order to allow wages to rise allows the integration of labour to capital since its mode of reproduction becomes part of the process of capital accumulation.

The historical constitution of abstract-mass labour during the "post war settlement" in Western Europe has been viewed here through the prism of the rotation-system of migrant labour administered by the West German state etc.¹ The current period of the process of accumulation in the West in order to be realised required a continuous import, in a rotation-system, of migrant labour as the mark of the formation of abstract labour.

The dynamic yet abstract formalism of the capitalist "system" in which privately contracted individual labourers are transformed into "mass" collectivised labour through the mediation of relations of exchange in the state-monopolistic period where the "social" is reproduced through a regulatory process operated by the State, resembles the very didactic indeed metaphor used by Marx ...

As the heavenly bodies, once thrown into a certain definite motion, always repeat this, so it is with social production as soon as it is once thrown into this movement of alternate expansion and contraction. Effects, in their turn, become causes, and the varying accidents

-
1. The reference to the West German State denotes a reference of a theoretical nature since that state exhibits in a more pure form the rationale of our thesis. In Italy and France the state presence in the management of labour-power and its importation is not so pure and clear.

of the whole process, which always reproduces its own conditions, take on the form of periodicity.¹

This system of social production, itself located at the point of the radical "freedom" of the labourer from his capacity, constituted as the "value" of "things" to labour, is liberated from any constraints imposed by the expenditure of those energies by the individual human beings. This is the spatio-temporal matrix of "social capital" which is characterized by collective or group phenomena.

The synchronic structure of capital obtains a produced commodity (labour-power) which is rather idiosyncratic in its physiognomy. As we stated earlier, the wage-relation constitutes the basic mode of "disciplining" labourers into entering the labour process for the production of surplus-value.

The transformation of heterogenous labour, where formally we cannot claim according to Marx to note the production of surplus-value and therefore exploitation, into homogenous labour by a system of conversion ratios² is determined according to different types of labour being calculated in terms of a common-unit. Marx determines the ratios so that they are equal to the labour-value costs of production of the respective types of labour. Morishima states that;

It is evident that more appropriate ratios, if they exist, should reflect the relative servicity and efficiency of different types of labour as well as their costs of production. Moreover, the conversion ratios may be determined in such a way that workers are encouraged to work at full capacity.³

-
1. K. Marx, Capital, 1967, Vol. 1, p. 633.
 2. This is Morishima's appropriation of Marx's economics. The complexities of the debate over value won't occupy us here.
 3. M. Morishima, "Bowles & Gintis on Heterogenous Labour and labour theory of value", Cambridge Journal of Economics, 1978, 2, pp. 305-309, p. 309.

It appears that Marx's theory of exploitation applies only to economies bearing the capacity to constitute abstract labour, i.e. the metropolis and the production sites (free-production zones etc.) established by the transnational companies where a historical separation has been established between labour and labour-power and where pre-capitalist forms of production have almost been completely destroyed. The State is the general administrator that regulates the reproduction of the "social", enforcing the abstract principle of right in law, the regulation and rotation of labourers and their subsequent reproduction via the wage-form and the provision of facilities for collective consumption (socialised consumption).¹

In such labour processes where common-labour is employed the guest-workers are no longer subjected in the long run to a constraint of personal obedience as in the home-country, but rather to the "social" collective constraint (informal subordination) of the labour process which imposes the socialization of labour as its internal logic derived primarily by a highly valorised process characterised by the dominance of dead/past labour over living labour. This ratio burdens the mental and physical faculties of the labourers. Quite paradoxically the more "natural", aphasic or "primitive" the migrants are,² the closer they (labourers) appear to be to the form "abstract labour" that is demanded by capital. (The materiality of Fordism allows for the appropriation

1. The guest-workers are excluded from the public sphere and its provisions, i.e. welfare, education, housing, etc. in most countries therefore, they are sited in a double historical field that intersects different periodicities in the transformation of capitalism.

2. The late tendency in the Federal Republic is to draw heavier labourers from the Turkish "Republic" i.e. the most underdeveloped country in the European periphery.

of such mass-labour).

In the abstract schema of capitalist production, the producers of the commodity labour-power that alone is capable of producing value in the labour-process, are not what liberal ideology and law interpellates¹ them as: i.e., "subjects" capable of becoming bearers of property (concrete) for, simply, the workers are not really petty capitalists.

Conclusion

The alienation of the "I" from the "mine" invested with properties engaged in advanced capitalist labour-processes will not survive the "subjects" historical real, concrete existence. "Economic" subjects are reproduced not because they are inscribed to a system of rights but because they constitute the necessary source of value. The logic and madness of capitalism is based, in the following schema: the constitution of its basic relation, i.e. surplus value commodifies the "mine" of its supports and continually sucks their energies which as value are represented as mystifications and in turn repress the "I" which invested with the "free" economic meaning (economic instead of a legal subject) is sited at a ground whereby it can accept as a consumer an unlimited accumulation of symbols and exchange-values. In reality modern "abstract labour" requires like all forms circulating in bourgeois society a legal status. Migrant labour exists in the fringes of the law

-
3. Interpellation denotes the calling of "subjects" as democratic, nationalist, racist or economic "subjects".

either as illegal or para-legal subjects. It is like the peripheral states governed by exceptional military regimes. Labour never participates in hegemonic discourses and practices systematically, but rather knocks on all discourses in a fragmented sense. It enters the discourse of the media, the administration, the academias not as canonical founding voice but as unconscious.¹ At the same time the reproduction and diffusion of the dominant ideology are not systematic but dissociated. The main reason can be found in the multiplicity of the centers of gravity of the ideological apparatuses which reproduce it, located not only in institutionally organized discourse (books, universities, schools, etc.) but in the mass media (radio, television, the mass press, the advertisements, etc.)

1. E. Barthes, Image, Music, Text, tr. Heath, N.Y., Hill & Wang, 1977, p. 212.

CHAPTER IV

SOCIETE DE CONSOMMATION AND MODERN REPRODUCTION

"Société de Consommation" and Modern Réproduction

In this study an attempt will be made to lay bare the current modality of transformations in the labour process; namely, the phenomena of Fordism and Neo-Fordism as analytically constituted and epiphenomenally manifested in the system of signs and symbols that is known to represent the consumer society. We will ascertain that the reality is quite different from the appearance in this world that stands on its head. It will be seen that this (Fordism) holds the key to the understanding of the politics of the modern state administration as the agent regulating the reproduction of capital by means of drawing from a culturally heterogenous labour force. This labour force is the mass of peasants which being "freed" from the land now occupy the fringes of urban centers in Mediterranean, Latin American, Asian and African countries. These marginal areas, form the base that produces the concrete labour that is transformed into abstract-homogenous labour when inserted into the advanced capitalist labour-process.

Fordism and Neo-Fordism¹ as moments in the total administration of the social formation

The mode of extraction of surplus-labour (social relations of production) specifies a mode of production. It is the difference between the social relations of production which differentiates one mode of

-
1. Neo-Fordism is a term proposed by Christian Palloix in his "Le procès de travail. Du Fordism au neofordisme", La Pensee, no. 185, February 1976 in M. Aglietta, A Theory of Capitalist Regulation, New Left Books, 1979, pp. 117-122 and C. Palloix "The labour process from Fordism to Neo-Fordism", C.S.E. Pamphlet No. 1 titled "The Labour process and class strategics", Series I, 1976.

production from another. The concept of a mode of production does not provide any more than general indications about the process of reproduction or the two theoretical categories of Department I (capital goods) and Department II (household consumer goods, etc.) in the case of capitalism. The articulation of the element of the mode of production signifies the fact that there is a variation in capitalism. This variation poses nothing short of the problem of the periodization of capitalism.

To periodise capitalism is not to draw a trajectory of the possible stages in the development of capitalism. The pertinent differences between different stages cannot be indicative of the pattern of a succession between those stages.¹ Variations of capitalism are products of concrete historical conjunctures and such an analysis would only provide us with the key to an understanding of the transition from one stage to another. The rationale of conjunctural study is that history is determined by a dialectical relation which, in the case of capitalism, changes as follows: capital arises from labour by way of valorization (the antagonistic contradiction between the two constituting the surplus-value relation is constituted as the rate of surplus-value), and labour-power as wage-labour which is inserted as "social" capital in determinate labour-processes, each of which is specified by a technical composition of capital, i.e., a combination of means of labour designed for specified uses, and labour-power that activates them.² As Aglietta quite

1. Athar Hussain, "Hiltending's Finance Capital", Conference of socialist economists - Bulletin, Vol. VI, Issue 13, 1976, p. 3.

2. See for further elaboration on this M. Aglietta, *op.cit.*, pp. 37-110.

vigorously points out: the hegemonic economistic/empiricist discourse excludes the first element (capital arises from labour, i.e., the social nature of capitalist production or the inseparability of the two main classes wage-labourers and capitalists as the organic constituents of the surplus-value relation) while the second component exists as "technology". The problem then becomes one of defining the categories of income and subsequently stratification, "on the basis of the heterogenous technical combinations that are empirically observable".¹ Therefore we see in condensation in this abstract moment (Fordism) the true essence of this mode of production. The politico-juridical constitution of the factors of production is simultaneously a de-negation that conceals and preserves in a Hegelian sense, the "social" nature of capital by means of the idealist constitution of culture as a "natural" object and therefore as an historically "indeterminate" liberal cosmos. This denotes the production of a specific appropriation of time and reality by a social class that considers itself as natural. It is the dialectical determination of history that poses the limit of founding the problematic of periodization and therefore mutations and transitions on the concept of mode of production alone.² The only way periodization can be specified is through the establishment of the differences in the mode of reproduction of the relations of production. The concept of reproduction is the very concept of historical continuity. "Reproduction", (and this is crucial for our exposition) "implies the permanence of the non-economic conditions of the production process, notably the legal

1. M. Aglietta, ibid., p. 53.

2. E. Balibar, "On Reproduction", p. 254-272, p. 257 in L. Althusser and E. Balibar, Reading Capital, London, New Left Books, 1975.

conditions."¹ Marx wrote that law constitutes and crystallises the pertinent effectivity of the mode of reproduction, of the continuity and mutation of the process of production:

It is in the interest of the ruling section of society to sanction the existing order as law and to legally establish its limits given through usage and tradition. Apart from all else, this, by the way, comes about of itself as soon as the constant reproduction of the basis of the existing order and its fundamental relations assumes a regulated and orderly form in the course of time. And such regulation and order are themselves indispensable elements of any mode of production, if it is to assume social stability and therefore its relative freedom from arbitrariness and mere chance. Under stagnant conditions of the production process as well as the corresponding social relations, it achieves this form by mere repetition of its own reproduction. If this has continued on for some time, it entrenches itself as custom and tradition and is finally sanctioned as an explicit law.²

The phenomenon of the "société de consommation" as the expression of the principle of Fordism and Neo-Fordism was established in the European West as a direct outcome of the post-war mode of administered capital accumulation under the form of the Marshall Plan. A specific socio-legal form became the dominant form, i.e., the form of the politics of "administration".³ By the constitution of its denoted relation as the production of the socialization of the means of consumption to correspond to the socialization of the means of production (capital goods), it brings about the intersection of production and reproduction of social capital. Thus the decentering of the production (base) process is

-
1. E. Balibar, "On Reproduction", p. 258 in L. Althusser and E. Balibar, Reading Capital, New Left Books, 1975, London. Emphasis mine.
 2. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. III, pp. 773-4 in E. Balibar, op.cit., p. 258. My emphasis.
 3. See P. Pasquino, "Introduction to Lorenz von Stein", Economy & Society, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1981 London, pp. 1-6 and Karl-Hermann Kastner, "From the social question to the social state", Vol. 10, No. 1, 1981, London, pp. 7-26.

understood only as the real appropriation connection.¹ This alone brings about the crystallization of the synchronic-analytic structure of capital which now is reproduced by the mediation of the formerly separate superstructural elements; namely, the abstract principle of the political, i.e., the State and the ideological (with both fields containing their own temporality). It must be stressed that this mediation is not an intervention in the economic at all, as so many "concrete" studies assert. This is a property of the political-moral (religious) conjuncture of the feudal mode of production. Reproduction can clearly indicate the mode of mutation of the static and synchronic structure/form of capital. As Balibar, quite to the point, stresses:

Reproduction appears to be the general form of permanence of the general conditions of production, which in the last analysis englobe the whole social structure, and therefore it is indeed essential that it should be the form of their change and restructuration too.²

Now that we have established the significance of the principle of reproduction, we can go on to the next step, namely Fordism³ and Neo-Fordism.

1. Essential is an understanding of the Balibar section titled "The Basic Concepts of Historical Materialism" in Reading Capital, op.cit., specifically Chapter 1 titled "From Periodization to the Modes of Production". Also Marta Harnecker's "Les concepts élémentaires du matérialisme historique", F. Maspero, Paris 1975, and C. Pallois, "The labour process from Fordism to Neo-Fordism", C.S.E. Pamphlet No. 1 London, 1976, titled "The labour process and class strategies" are helpful in understanding this point.
2. E. Balibar, op.cit., p. 259. Emphasis mine.
3. Fordism's synonyms are "Americanism", "Rooseveltism". At this point the relation of Fordism and Fascism in Italy and Germany which is dealt with quite extensively by A. Gramsci will not be considered. For Gramsci it appears that Taylorism is synonymous to Americanism-Fordism as a specific mode of accumulation of capital where the political instance simply mediates the expanded reproduction of a base determined directly by the relation of surplus-value, i.e., hegemony is constituted not by an exogenously imposed structure but rather by the creation of an absence of history and therefore the construction of an economic mechanized spatio-temporal matrix.

Fordism is the direct development of Taylorism, itself understood as the product of social relations of production in which the labourers-immigrants¹ inserted were fundamentally rendered into the economic discourse of the universal equivalent of "modernity", money. After the Civil War in America, the proportion of non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants fleeing from the absolutism of the Continental regimes increased rapidly and consisted of individuals possessing absolutely nothing besides their labour. The meta-physical liberal elements of the American Constitution represented a symbolic promise that was actually antagonistic with the harsh reality it was representing. This led to a dislocation in the form of struggles towards the "concretization" of the chimeric promises of the abstract liberal individualistic cosmos. Most of the struggles were directed and bitterly fought in the name of the principles of the commodity producing society itself rather than those of any proletarian ideology. "Conducted on a strictly economic basis, these struggles gave a powerful impetus to the transformation of working class living conditions in the directions of commodity relations."²

We must notice the similarities of the modern migration patterns in the European West with the one of late 19th century America.

Completely deracinated when they arrived, the workers of the new industrial centres had to struggle against conditions of life entirely imposed by capitalism, in towns where no previous urban community had ever existed; and ... In general, working-class housing was frightful: close to the factory, it typically belonged to the factory owners.³

-
1. Immigrants are labourers abstracted from their historico-cultural conditions of existence and are being introduced as such in the "new" society. Their loss of historical references purely demarcates their condition as abstract labour.
 2. M. Aglietta, *op.cit.*, p. 83.
 3. M. Aglietta, *ibid.*, p. 84, emphasis mine.

Taylorism,¹ established early in this century, represents in principle the actual transformation of labour to labour-power, i.e., the abstraction of labour in production. Taylorism is the abstract principle of the mechanization of living labour which is being reduced to the performance of repetitive motions determined by time-series studies. Taylorism constitutes the radical constitution of the surplus-value relation and hence marks a new era in the mode of the exploitation of labour, in the Marxist sense, by transforming heterogenous living labour into abstract, homogenous labour-power. Quantity is the determinant of economico-technical progress. The content of jobs is being radically altered so as to circumvent the labourers' resistance. The imposition of a radical separation between conception (managerial intervention) and execution by the labourers fixes the latter as inert aphasic "agents of production".

Labour, thus measured by time, does not seem, indeed, to be the labour of different persons, but on the contrary the different working individuals seem to be mere organs of this labour.²

For Aglietta, Taylorism culminated with the organization of work teams. The post-war era is characterised by such team-organization. In our understanding this represents the abstract expression of the dominance of group-phenomena in physics³ which are indissolubly linked

-
1. Taylorism is recognized as the abstract historical moment exchange value and abstract labour become universalized and therefore directly determinant over the production and reproduction of the materiality of extended and daily life.
 2. K. Marx; Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Progress Publishers, Moscow, p. 30. Emphasis mine.
 3. "Our views of matter and our views of ourselves are implicitly related. If a person is reluctant to believe that he is not a substance, he will be reluctant to believe that matter is not a substance." D.J. Bohm in conversation with Peat in Buckley & Peak, A Question of Physics, University of Toronto Press, 1979, p. 129.

to the economy via the real appropriation (nature) relation. A similar correspondence is the phenomenon of migration of large masses of workers which, divorced from all their historico-cultural ties to their communities of origin/genesis, played a decisive role in the formation of a highly mobile labour force which could be applied at decisive points of the production process whenever the need arose. Team-organization

represented the assimilation of Taylorist principles by managements, the establishment of time and motion study as an autonomous function in the charge of specialists placed closely under management control, and the formation of a vast reservoir of homogenous and mobile labour.¹

Concretely, two waves of migration occurred during the post-World War II era: one in the United States involving the movement into industry (North) of the black population of the South and its parallel in Western Europe that included successive waves of immigration from the Mediterranean periphery.²

Fordism supercedes Taylorism. It is a stage by which hegemony is constituted directly at the base. This is realised as the combination of a set of relations. The labour-process at the base is defined as a semi-automatic-assembly-line production. This is the condition that prevails not only in production proper (Department I) but also in the mode of consumption (Department II).³ Fordism therefore constitutes the decentering of the old base which has been understood as the only site for the production of surplus-value, i.e., a relation connected with the real appropriation connexion (transformation of nature). Under Fordism this determinant relation (of surplus-value) is not confined

1. Aglietta, op.cit., p. 116.

2. Aglietta, Ibid:

3. The so called tertiary sector.

to production proper but extends to the reproductive domain, i.e., the consumer market, itself constituted by the wage-form. The dominant relation under Fordism involves the correspondence between the socialization of the means of production and the socialization of the means of consumption.

This correspondence denotes a radical transformation of the labour-process and the condition of reproduction of the daily life of the working class. The wage-form constitutes a means by which the labourers reconstitute their expended energies; i.e., they reproduce their conditions of existence as bearers of capacities to labour. Under this new regime of accumulation, which itself is an effect of the tendency to lower the value of labour-power by lowering the cost of its reproduction, Fordism has also shortened the time of reconstitution of labour-power and expanded the law of value and therefore exploitation into the reproduction sphere. Generally, we have the universalization of the Taylorist mode of intensification of the tempo of the labour process (the specific determination of the "socially" determined temporality vis-à-vis the technico-material one of the engineer and geographer) into all areas of activity. Shock-waves are spreading from the industrial "base" where the intensity is greater and conditions worse to the totality of the "social".¹

Aglietta specifies that, in the post World War II period (1930's in America, 1940's in Western Europe), scientific progress is turned against the workers more radically due to the sharp discontinuity between

1. Note that the "social" is born under such moments.

mental and manual labour. This is not to say that scientists are not part of the working class. Quite the contrary, the "Fordised factory" very soon develops into a "Fordised society" where proletarianization is socialized (expanded) to such a degree as to necessitate the drive of labour towards unionization. It is interesting to note that such trends were defined in law in the United States, as combinations in restraint of trade, against which anti-monopoly laws were applied.¹

It is interesting to dwell for a moment on Gramsci's analysis of Fordism. Gramsci was concerned about the "old economic individualism" rampant among a European liberal bourgeoisie; namely, its political and economic impotence to solve the problem of the development of the productive forces.

During the biennio rosso, when revolution seemed possible, Gramsci ascribed the political impotence of the liberal state to the economic impotence of the bourgeoisie, its inability to ensure the development of the productive forces. This formed the basis for the factory councils experiment. In the Notebooks, Gramsci's point of view underwent a change, in that it was now a question of studying the capitalist response to the development of the productive forces. In this sense, Fordism was very much a "counter-model" to the state of workers councils.²

It is quite evident that the new transformation of the labour-process constitutes the working class as possessors of rights to strike and therefore bargain for the value of their produced commodity, labour-power. This constitution in law and the subsequent tool/right to

-
1. This, I found, extremely insightful, indicating the early view of the American State regarding the notion of labour-power as a produced commodity "beared" collectively by unions. See R.P. Wolff, "A Critique and Reinterpretation of Marx's Labour Theory of Value", Philosophy Dept. (Mimeo), University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., U.S.A.
 2. This parallel has been developed by M. Salvadori, mentioned by C. Buci-Glucksmann, Gramsci and the State, Lawrence & Wishart, 1980, p. 318. Emphasis mine.

to collective bargaining canalizes the antagonism between Capital and Labour into a regulated flow, subject to a permanent administration by the State. The bearers of the collective right to negotiate the terms of the class antagonisms in the modern phase constitute, like the State, a hypostacization of the "general, collective interest" which, in a true Aristotelian sense, has become independent and "alien", as a legal-symbolic representative form from the interests that constitute it.

The ideology of "social partnership" requires unions at least strong enough to canalize and restrict the demands of the workers.¹

Class-struggle therefore is transformed into class-conflict, and history, as the product of such struggles, is canalised into a meta-history.² The "fordised" social is a neutered abstract parenthesis, a static synchronic structure where the appropriation of living labour from the periphery, by the constitution of hegemony in production and the mode of consumption (reproduction), allows the recombination of history as a fragment of reality and therefore the rendering of it into the hegemonic discursive practices which are subject to the tutelage of the state administrative apparati. Thus reproduction becomes possible.

The labourers, in this regime of accumulation, are drawn by the economy i.e. informal subordination, of the labour-process and form collective bodies in law, i.e., unions. Such bodies (unions) should be

1. S. Castles and G. Kosack, "Immigrant Workers and Trade Unions in the German Federal Republic", Radical America, Vol. 8, No. 6, 1974, pp. 55-77, p. 62.

2. Capitalist democracy at the same time reduces class struggles to struggles over the realisation of immediate interests. The politics of administration direct canonically the modality of such interests.

seen as the abstract socio-economic supports of the "fordised" social matrix. They are the necessary requirement for the reproduction of the capital accumulation process. The labour-process is highly standardised (because it is decentered from concrete reality) while tasks are extremely fragmented at the micro-level yet highly centralised at nodal points. The value producing process is characterised by a quality that exceeds by far the atomized differences and limits of its constituent elements. The valorization process comprises of a system of rotation of labourers in which a circulation regarding positions over an abstract, economic field results in a deskilling process, and an increasing routinization, commodification and parcelling of positions. In this matrix symbolic signs are the hegemonic expression of a highly valorized mode of reproduction. These symbolic signs, the most developed form of informal control, have allowed the introduction of the fashionable ideology regarding the liberation of "subjects" from work to enter our consciousness.

Neo-Fordism is based on an organizing principle of the forces of production dictated by the needs of capitalist management of the work collective. The new complex of productive forces is automatic production control or automation; the principle of work organization now in embryo is known as the recomposition of tasks. The combination of these two lines of development has unleashed the most shameless propaganda about the liberation of man in work.¹

The hegemonic conception that sees only one dimension of reality, the indeterminate constitution of technology (which is nothing more or less than crystallised value), praises the virtues of natural science over an order of population that continuously receives diminishing returns

1. Aglietta, op.cit., p. 122.

on its invested labour-capacity. Such a population is clearly dominated by the accumulated labour of the past generations that very moment, paradoxically, such a labour appears as the liberator from work.¹ Technology constitutes the magical organon, the logos of dead-labour (value) as the hegemonic part of social capital, that mystifies and always rationalises its symbolic ideological re-composition in an abstract spatio-temporal matrix which is interior to itself. For this reason Capital, as a meta-historical category in its most developed form, can never develop its subjects' capacities, quite the contrary, with the canalization² of the antagonism between capital and labour, which is actually the source of value, capital turns its trajectory into an interiority. This interiority constitutes the abstract moment for the qualitative expansion of capital itself. Perhaps the hegemony of finance capital and the expansion of credit can be considered as the reason behind the return, in the human literary sciences, to the eternal bourgeois theme of the search for the beginning, the Origin.³ Elements like credit which are not capitalist in a pure form have given to capital an utmost sensitivity as incorporated elements into its own mechanism.⁴ In modern literature on the other hand the modern "self" oscillates between identification and estrangement which remains in an incomplete form.⁵ It appears that the greater is the intensity of

1. In the form of technology.

2. See Guido Baldi, "Theses on Mass Worker and Social Capital", Radical America, 6, 3, May-June 1972, pp. 3-21.

3. See Tzvetan, Todorov, "Reflections on Literature in Contemporary France", New Literary History, Vol. 10, Spring 1979, No. 3, pp. 511-531, p. 515.

4. Suzanne de Brunhoff, Marx on Money, Urizen Books, New York, 1976, p. 115.

5. T. Todorov, *op.cit.*, p. 527.

the accumulation process, the higher is the rate of rotation and development towards an interior cosmos the further the point away from concrete reality. Reality becomes decomposed, fragmented; as fragmented is the discourse of the modern "self" that is always seeking a re-birth (like Phoenix), the more the fragments the more the discontinuities the more the beginnings. Reality's centre of gravity therefore becomes multiple. There are many reference points symbolically reproduced in the spatio-temporal matrix of advanced capital over and meta history.

This cosmos, constituted by abstract-property bearers interpellated¹ as the veritable consumers of economics, cultural/semantic subjectivities, is the historical outcome of the diffusion of class struggles and their regulation by the state administrative apparatus. This can be interpreted as the "socialization" of power and property or the apparent "democratization of capitalism", by means of the New Deal. The New Deal allowed the constitution of an advanced regime of accumulation based on the generalization of the system of rights distributed and constituted in law namely the legalization of the working class as organized "labour" and therefore its constitution as a legitimate agent-"support" of civil-society bearing the abstract-homogenous property of labour-power. Such a re-composition of the real that is based on the institutionalization of the working class and consequently of every social activity subjects the contradictions, arising from the dislocations in the "social", namely; the principle of patriarchy, from which the feminist movement, the youth question and

1. For this concept see L. Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" in Lenin and Philosophy, M.R., New York, 1971, E. Laclau, Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory, N.L.B., 1977 London, and E. Laclau, Democratic Antagonisms and the State, paper delivered at the E.P.S.A. Conference, Brussels, March, 1979.

the family which is the locus of consumption and reproduction of labourers arise; the principle of the ecology movement denoting the increasing destruction of the natural environment in favour of an artificial one, as well as other social principles arising from racial, regional, ethnic antagonisms, under the tutelage of the politics of administration. This institutionalizing of the class struggle and therefore history is the abstract moment whereby democratic struggles cross-cut the class-struggle, for their formation point is not the surplus-value relation in a paleo-Marxist sense. They signify a decentering of the "social" formation's basis from the "other place", that "secret laboratory of production", the factory, and an expansion of value to the areas of the society in general, namely the reproduction sphere or the "consumption" field.¹

Materially the semi-automatic to automatic production and reproduction of Fordism and Neo-Fordism diffuses the former concentration in space of secondary industry by divorcing production from the assembly points by means of the formation of a tele-controlled system in which the privileged position lies in the laboratories where Research and Development is performed. These are the new centres where hegemony needs to be established and constituted.

Gramsci was more than insightful when he observed that the American model of development (and therefore Taylorism-Fordism and their latest expression, Neo-Fordism) is inseparably linked with a different form of organization of hegemony from the dominant class's

1. See J. Baudrillard, For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign, Telos Press, St. Louis, Mo., 1981.

standpoint. The hegemonic apparatus does not rest primarily on the "professionals" of politics and ideology; it is not exogenously imposed but rather

hegemony here is born in the factory and requires for its exercise only a minute quantity of professional political and ideological intermediaries.¹

Through a combination of coercion directed against the political organizations of the working class and/or other social-historical groups and consent, through a wage-system, itself the basis for the "societe de consommation" and psychologism (romantic moralism and religiosity), Fordism, as the most developed rationalization-standardization of production is mainly the tendency of capital to appropriate the labourer in toto, i.e. inside the factory and outside it as well. Hegemony constituted inside the "fordised" factory cannot exist without hegemony outside the factory and, from this standpoint, Taylor's "Principles of Scientific Management" expressed the real "practical" philosophy of capitalism.² By "practical" philosophy we denote the rendering of the daily life of the labouring classes into the hegemonic discourse of capital itself. Capital in this regime of its accumulation takes an institutional hold over the working class by the participation of the state in the reproduction of labour-power.

With Fordism capital recognizes the working classes as "organized labour" for the first time and consequently absorbs society by means of a homogenization between the factory and society. For the first time

1. This idea is found in Notebook I (1929-30), fragment 61. Gramsci stresses here that Americanism requires the absence of a parasitic class; hence of intellectuals in a Gramscian sense, in C. Buci-Glucksmann, op.cit., p. 83 and p. 417. Emphasis mine.

2. C. B.-Glucksmann, ibid., pp. 83-4.

during the Rooseveltist "New Deal" and the Wagner Act we see the explicit formation of the state as a meta-juridical economic subject which is to administer the whole of society.

Capital's plan is outgrowing the factory to include society through a centralized state.¹

And,

... the state-form has moved through stages as it has increasingly exercised political control over parts of the circuit of capital to arrive in the contemporary state at "functional control of circulation, of the dynamic nexus linking production and reproduction".²

Simultaneously industrial production is declining in a physico-material sense and develops around the concept of mental labour³ (a specific reflection of the rising organic composition of capital and valorisation). It seems that power is dislocated from formal institutional centres to informal (community) networks.

Social networks will then become the dominant unit of power production and reproduction, a source of power which is diffuse and interstitial and which as a consequence is as familiar as it is remote.⁴

The declination of the factory-system is structurally homologous to the apparent decline of the "physical" locus of state power⁵. The process of "tertiarization" that has expanded vis-à-vis the secondary sector heralds the specific expansion of the category "abstract labour" into

-
1. G. Baldi, "Theses on Mass Worker and Social Capital", Radical America 6, 3, 1972, pp. 3-21, p. 16.
 2. B. Lumley's review of "Working Class Autonomy and the Crisis-Italian Marxist Texts of the Theory and Practice of a Class Movement 1964-79" in Capital and Class, 12, 1980-81, pp. 123-135.
 3. This refers to the tendency by modern firms to utilize the maximum of the mental capacity of the worker by means of participation in managing the business.
 4. B.S. Santos, "Nature of state power in late capitalism", International Journal of the Sociology of Law, 1980, 8, p. 392.
 5. Ibid., emphasis mine.

the so-called re-productive terrain.

This regime of accumulation (state directed) has institutionalized history, meaning and therefore class struggle ergo it has incorporated the totality of social determinations and consequently the law of value has expanded so as to cover all fields. This process allows the accumulation/crystallization of labour power as value to act as the determinant relation.

Abstract labour and therefore the possibility for the accumulation of value has expanded over the re-productive domain of social culture.

As Jameson has said mass culture must be grasped,

as a transformational work on social and political anxieties and fantasies which must then have some effective presence in the mass cultural text in order subsequently to be managed or repressed.¹

To return back to the concept of Fordism and Taylorism it is interesting to note how ideologies, rooted in the "social" base, proceed by way of "private initiatives" (Taylor and Ford) of members of the hegemonic class and later advance to the position of a "state ideology".² It also seems that general political objectives of capitalism at a particular conjuncture, namely the institutional hold of the working class, have had to be translatable into individual grievances for;

This individualization is what the legal form provides in a mystified way since in it individualization means insulation and atomization.³

The institutional hold of the working class by accomodating the

-
1. F. Jameson, "Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture", Social Text, 1, 1979, p. 141, emphasis mine.
 2. C. Buci-Glucksmann, Gramsci and the State, p. 88.
 3. B.S. Santos, op.cit., p. 396. Institutionalization denotes a mode of legalization.

mode of reproduction of the category labour, i.e., the wage-form, as part of the field of capital accumulation, has constituted the sound basis for that sonorous field called "société de consommation". This sociality is founded on the double field of a state administration (the stage is no longer a juridical subject but an economic subject) and a form of repression/exploitation emanating from the law of value and the movement of abstract labour.

The universal equivalent of this mass spectacle society is money.

The expansion of value over reproduction undermines that relation and creates a permanent crisis situation. The hegemonic state has to be able to constitute a system of states in order to appropriate energies. The specific spatio-temporal matrix whereby non-capitalist or non-valorized historical formations provide a supply of heterogenous concrete labour (migrants) necessary for the expanded reproduction of the advanced liberal social matrix is an institutional form whereby the state administers and constitutes as its opposition civil society.

By the use of the term "fordised society", borrowed from A. Gramsci, we want to articulate somehow the liberality of modern capitalism in terms of its capacity to institutionalize historical forms of the past and the present and to be able to call juridico-political currents according to its economic rationale. The "fordised society" is administered by a state as an "economic subject" which regulates the antagonism between capital and labour under the aegis of a technobureaucratic form. The institutionalization of history marks a radical break from all previous forms of social structures and relegates time as the absolute property of capital. The historical markings of time

namely, past, present and future which were the property of industrial/entrepreneurial era and of the legal/juridical state have been interiorized to the capitalist temporal matrix which is administered by the socio-economic state. (Late liberal capitalism.)

The course or trajectory of capitalist development in the West has reached its full development by meeting its enunciated Origins, i.e., nature. It was bound to do so since it is over-determined by historical relations which always conceal-mystify their historical/political constitution and specificity by appearing as "given". It was shown that such a development was possible since the "social" precondition for the production of surplus-value encompasses the totality of the protagonist classes. This "social" totality, a "theatrum politicum", was constituted in an one-dimensional way during the post-industrial phase of the 20's and 30's,¹ bearing the singular logic of a regime of accumulation with a new combinatorial settlement of the political and the economic. This represents a development whose uneven relations (archaic "property" relations over-determining advanced forces of production) can only form a circle. The only difference being the differences in the magnitude of the circumference (something between

-
1. Note that A. Lincoln (1861 in his first annual message to Congress) had said "labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labour, and could never have existed if labour had not first existed. Labour is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration." One notes that this judgement was made at a time when industrializing capital was about successfully to ensure that the commoditized market of "free" labourers would become the dominant socioeconomic relationship in the United States, as it had rather less biolently become in Britain a half-century previously." In A. Wilden, System and Structure Essays in Communication and Exchange, Tavistock Publications, 1980, Second Edition, New York, p. xxxiv, Introduction.

Britain and the United States or better the United States of Europe and the United States of America). This circle, and this is the basic thesis of this work, can be expanded via the incorporation of states (imperialism) or the import of labour which basically allows the accelerated production of surplus-value and expanded reproduction of advanced capitalist social formations under the tutelage of state administration.

This will safeguard the expansion of the circle and the blocking of the possibility of its supersession at all costs.

CHAPTER V

THE ATLANTICIZATION OF THE "OLD CONTINENT":

POTEMKIN EUROPE

THE "ATLANTICIZATION" OF THE "OLD CONTINENT": POTESKIN EUROPE

Centre-hinterland Continua. Continuities and Discontinuities

In this chapter, it is essential that we keep in mind the variables we analysed so far in our relatively schematic course regarding the genealogy of modern forms that reproduce the "social" totality in advanced western societies. It is important always to bear in mind that the development of the capitalist "social" resembles the expansion of the periphery of the circle whose circumference is greater, the greater the degree of accumulation or socialization of the means and relations of production and consumption is both being expressed as the abstract moments of the private appropriation relation. The expanded advanced liberal state forms a circle that is directly defined by value-economic relations. It is constituted by "economic subjects" forming corporations whose reproduction is mediated by the state form according to the laws of value accumulation. The field of active politics or of political subjects is repressed or denegated. Here the historical trajectory of auto-determination is blocked by a State system constituting a chain.

The capacities and potentialities of "developing" countries have to be realised in a certain interiority and circularity in an abstract, homogeneous, terrain where the future is a mirror-image of a present appropriated by the past, i.e., temporal boundaries are collapsed. In other words, it appears that there is an intersection between the constellation of forces in the social formation of the "centered"

(labour-intensive) periphery and the State administrative apparatus of the decentered (capital-intensive) advanced "social" matrices in the Imperialist chain. This intersection between two different historical temporalities (one objective from humanity, the other subjective to humanity), is realised due to the specificity of capitalist temporality which is linear or better its language is a discrete, artificial structure that unfolds in the manner of the Hegelian Spirit. The constitution of the working class as an economic subject, in other words its depoliticization, abstraction, total remuneration by the wage form and the pertinent ensemble of characterizations in the mass-consumer culture, is the corresponding liberal representation of the symbolic-cum-conceptual categories of real objects. This specific envelopment of social agents by the money-form produces a semantic field that as an abstraction from its real object is projected over a peripheral social formation (determined by a differential temporality) where the multiplicity of political and socio-economic relations, overdetermined by the political-ideological instances, constitute "subjects" as democratic agents. It is ironic to state that the constitution of the working class as homo-oeconomicus defined exclusively by the wage-relation constitutes a deformation, a caricature, of the political "subject". Its broken-distorted image is but the appearance of a necessary condition created by the dominance of the value-relation (dead-labour) signified by the determination of circulation (where value is exchanged) over production. This determination masks the domus, abode, of the combination of capitalist exploitation and state oppression allowing for the various divisions along politico-cultural and economic lines among labourers.¹ The future of the

1. Suzanne de Brunhoff, The State, Capital and Economic Policy, London, Pluto, 1978, p. 68.

"periphery" is appropriated by the advanced decentered capitalist spatio-temporal matrices in the very same way capital appropriates living labour. In an extension of this we can say that the very same way the faculties of living labour are projected as the faculties of capital, value, or dead labour (the fetishism of technocracy) at the centre, the faculties and capacities of the modern periphery are projected/appropriated as the faculties of the core "social" formations.

The modern non-valorised hinterland, (non-capitalist institutions expressed by the voluntary associations of civil society or of ethnic minorities) is necessary for the reproduction of capital. By its provision of services for the unemployed, the ill, the youth and the elderly, the reconstitution of the labourer's capacities (labour-power) by such sources forms an integral part in the reproduction of the relations of production of the "social" capitalist formation.

Meillassoux has shown that "non-capitalist institutions are ... indispensable for the management of the "stock" of labour power needed by capitalists, but which they themselves cannot secure directly."¹ Although the reference is explicitly to voluntary associations, philanthropic societies etc., I do not think that it is going too far to suggest that the "periphery" acts in a similar manner as the centre for the no-costs provision of labourers. What is also interesting in the administration of the reproduction of the conditions for surplus-value is the necessity of maintaining insecurity of employment, while limiting its effects.

1. C. Meillassoux, Femmes, Greniers et Capitaux, Paris, Maspero, 1975 in S. de Brunhoff, op.cit., p. 10.

Repressive state apparatuses. Effects.

The principle of modern welfare, while aiming at relief of the marginalized reserve army, maintains discipline at work. The old prison-factory institution of the nineteenth-century English workhouse represents the articulation of a coercive apparatus necessary for the constitution of the surplus-value relation. This is the necessary abstraction of individual subjects whose political-materialist constitution ought to be broken and transformed into a symbolic-ideal-metaphysical terrain outside production. This allows the constitution of "economic subjects" in law, i.e. in the sphere of circulation. These subjects thus invested with the determinations of private property, namely, freedom and equality, circulate in the homogenous field of a market.

The factory-prisons¹ are the beginnings of the modern relations of production. Although this system has physically disappeared, its principle has survived in other forms.² Here as always the reality is extremely complex and polysemic. The appropriation of its determinations in thought requires in our case the articulation of a double historical field; namely, that of the synchronic analytical structure of capital managed by the State in advanced social matrices, and that of the dialectical or diachronic temporality of the formations at the periphery. In the first, the State ideological apparatuses, schools, prisons, asylums, church, family, media, the role of N.A.T.O. armed forces, stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy, are mechanisms

1. F.F. Piven and R.A. Cloward, Regulating the Poor, N.Y., Vintage, 1972. Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish; The Birth of the Prison, New York, Vintage, 1979. Eric J. Hobsbawm, Industry and Empire: The Making of Modern English Society, Vol. II (1750 to Present), New York, Pantheon, 1968.

2. S. de Brunhoff, op.cit., p. 10.

Repressive state apparatuses. Effects.

The principle of modern welfare, while aiming at relief of the marginalized reserve army, maintains discipline at work. The old prison-factory institution of the nineteenth-century English workhouse represents the articulation of a coercive apparatus necessary for the constitution of the surplus-value relation. This is the necessary abstraction of individual subjects whose political-materialist constitution ought to be broken and transformed into a symbolic-ideal-metaphysical terrain outside production. This allows the constitution of "economic subjects" in law, i.e. in the sphere of circulation. These subjects thus invested with the determinations of private property, namely, freedom and equality, circulate in the homogenous field of a market.

The factory-prisons¹ are the beginnings of the modern relations of production. Although this system has physically disappeared, its principle has survived in other forms.² Here as always the reality is extremely complex and polysemic. The appropriation of its determinations in thought requires in our case the articulation of a double historical field; namely, that of the synchronic analytical structure of capital managed by the State in advanced social matrices, and that of the dialectical or diachronic temporality of the formations at the periphery. In the first, the State ideological apparatuses, schools, prisons, asylums, church, family, media, the role of N.A.T.O. armed forces, stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy, are mechanisms

1. F.F. Piven and R.A. Cloward, Regulating the Poor, N.Y., Vintage, 1972. Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish; The Birth of the Prison, New York, Vintage, 1979. Eric J. Hobsbawm, Industry and Empire: The Making of Modern English Society, Vol. II (1750 to Present), New York, Pantheon, 1968.

2. S. de Brunhoff, op.cit., p. 10.

by which the state absorbs conflicts and canalizes their impetus towards the production of value. Police, laws, investigation of political opinions are aiming at the complete naturalization-dehistorization of "subjects"¹ to a degree that their only determination is the calculation of monetary forms, and last but not least, the prohibition of free thought.² The last few categories are more extreme in the case of the Federal Republic of Germany. The general emphasis is in the production of labour-power by the continuous stress by the public sphere of the "three elements - work discipline, insecurity of employment and a permanent supply of proletarian labour-power costing as little as possible".³

Brunhoff stresses that the "exteriority of the state's management of labour-power is the actual precondition of its immanent quality".⁴

Culturally heterogenous migrants as bearers of homogenous labour (labour-power).

All the above articulate in the advanced "social" matrices a radical discontinuity between concrete heterogenous labour and abstract homogenous labour-power.

The expanded accumulation of capital under this administered regime of production diffuses this discontinuity by the constitution of

-
1. That is to say their "economic constitution".
 2. See Oskar Negt, "Terrorism and the German State's Absorption of Conflicts", New German Critique, No. 12, 1977, pp. 15-27, p. 23.
 3. Brunhoff, op.cit., p. 11.
 4. Ibid.

a structure of circular causality and in the manner of an extended homogeneity and abstraction over the totality of "social" space. This is expressed in the institutionalization of the wage-form which remunerates the bearers of the commodity labour-power, i.e., it constitutes economic "subjects".¹

This homogenous, abstract space where production is absent and commodity relations (circulation) constitute the fantastic symbolic-ideal distorted shadow theatre of commodities is the sphere in which the guest-workers are inserted. Their movement within this "social" space is the pure, abstract movement of labour-power. The homogeneity and abstraction of their trajectory acts in a more chilling way than the prison-factories of the nineteenth (19th) century. Their baptism into the static, a-historical structure resembles in themselves a total, pure denegation of their previous existence. Their stay in the country resembles the parenthetical life of solitary confinement. An arresting, immobilization of historical time replaced by the factory time-measurement devices, resembles the "freezing" of a democratic process at home by "exceptional political" forms, by the military that illegalized the workers (production) and the students (intellectuals), i.e., the only active classes in society. It is this nightmare that created the dislocations and the mass-exodus.

Positionality of migrant-labour

The movement of migrant labourers from the moment of their

1. This leads to the constitution of homo-oeconomicus' alter ego, i.e., the Neuter which indeed is the modern "subject" registered in the parenthetical structure of late capitalism.

medical examination and the verification of prescribed "qualities" - all administered by German authorities in Examination centers in Istanbul, Athens, Belgrade, etc. - is totally in the hands of the State until the point of destination, i.e., the production sites close to the company-owned barracks. state
law

As such the migrants are the most extreme form of human alienation to the degree that the human, historical, social dimension, i.e., what separates humans from wolves,¹ is displaced by the abstract, homogenous quality of a commodity, of value, their labour-power. (They constitute the lower stratum of the modern proletariat. Meillassoux has differentiated between "three main strata within the proletariat":

The first is the integrated or stabilised proletariat, which is paid both a direct and an indirect wage or, in other words, whose labour-power is theoretically paid for at its price of production.

The second consists of peasant-proletarians, who receive only the direct means for the reconstitution of their labour-power from capitalism, but not the value of its maintenance and reproduction, which are carried out in the framework of the household economy.

The third component is made up of the proletariat which has no means of reproduction in any part of society."²

This last component is migrant labour, which has access to only the "subordinate, most unstable, mostly badly-paid end of the labour market".³ add'l copy of ...

Henri Bartoli writes:

Rather than the birth of a new working class, we are witnessing a restructuring of the working class between

-
1. See the study. Malson/Itard, Wolf Children, N.Y., Monthly Review Press, 1976.
 2. Meillassoux, pp. 197-200 quoted in Suzanne de Brunhoff, op.cit., p. 26.
 3. Ibid., p. 27.

a sub-proletariat (external and internal migrants) and a proletariat with a higher standard of living, but with depersonalized living and working conditions.¹

(Given this, the high mobility of migrant-labour means their expulsion during periods of high unemployment and their attraction during periods of high conjuncture.) Carchedi has emphatically stated that:

the presence of foreign labour power is a condition for the full employment of the indigenous labour power in times of high conjuncture and of reduced unemployment in times of low conjuncture. Without the foreign workers, in the former case the swiftly sailing ship of the economy would run onto the rocks of the rapidly increasing level of wages. In the latter case, if all foreign workers were subjected to forced repatriation, the reduced supply of labour power would further increase the economic difficulties (producing among other things, an increase in wages and a decrease in profits) and thus increase unemployment.²

(The guest-worker is a condensed version of the determination of the absence of the right to work in bourgeois legal practice.) This absence, a conspicuous silence, produces a field (where the source of value, i.e., labour, is appropriated by capital as a commodity - historically realised under finance capitalism) whose determinations are found in the intersection of class determinations and the unconscious. Labour is rendered into a circulation process under conditions of a discontinued, fragmented and disarticulate semantisation process.

Such a semantisation process in the case of "guest-workers" reaches its most complete form as an aphasia (semantic) due to their stasis-arrest as concrete democratic subjects (or due to backward

-
1. H. Bartoli, "Liasous sociales - documents" (No. 119/65, 17 November 1965), p. 2. In S. Castles, G. Kosack, Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe, Oxford University Press, 1973, p. 464.
 2. G. Carchedi, "Authority and Foreign Labour: Some Notes on a Late Capitalist Form of Capital Accumulation and State Intervention", Studies in Political Economy, No. 2, pp 37-74, p. 54.

historical conditions and the state form in the periphery) that are constituted directly by the surplus-value relation. This mobility,¹ coupled with the backwardness of the ethno-social conditions of the country or origin and the advanced state of economic determinations in the host country, (social and geographical), induces the workers to an extreme docility and allows the direct hegemony of the state and capital in defining the totality of social determinations. (Furthermore, the guest-workers are not bearers of even the basic bourgeois rights granted to other sections of the population, such as equality or "freedom".) Albert Delpérée, General Secretary of the Belgian Ministry of Social Welfare, has said:

state
has Of course there is frequent talk of equal rights, human dignity, worker's solidarity. But in practice there remain unavoidable conditions of discrimination, inequality, handicaps. Foreign employees are often the true proletarians of this second half of the twentieth century.²

It is also necessary to stress the fact that migrant guest-workers in Germany and Switzerland and immigrant workers in Sweden and France always contribute more to the host "social formation than the benefits they derive.

-
1. Generally both intra-state and inter-state mobility is movement in a social space articulated as a hierarchical constellation of "social" matrices constituted in differential temporalities. We must notice that the acceptance of the guest-labourer and its complete envelopment by an Imperialist state acting as the diachronic-historical (active) agent of capital is an advancement in the eyes of the "subject" transported and in the eyes of a community suffocating by a blockage by dictatorial "exceptional forms of state". From my national experience (Hellenic) I know that usually pure-clean "subjects", loyal to King and the laws, i.e., right wing or apolitical were only permitted to emigrate. Thus the "subject" sent to Germany is immune from any democratic viruses.
 2. A. Delpérée, "Die Wauderung von Arbeitnehmevn", Deutsche Versicherruugszeitschrift, (March 1965), p. 71 in S. Castles & G. Kosack, op.cit., p. 463.

The level of employee's contributions as a share of French immigrant worker's wages is always higher than in wages as a whole, while the benefits are lower than those available to French workers. There is a net redistribution away from the immigrant worker in favour of the unemployed national. In the case of immigrant workers, capital's norms of the costs of the reproduction of labour-power are maintained on the side of contributions, but disregarded on the side of benefits.¹

The extreme impoverishment of guest-workers in cultural, historical and social terms, in other words, their total deprivation, produces a "social amnesia", from an apolitic past to a depoliticized present.

The modern Babylon, by a body of workers composed by extreme linguistic, cultural and historical heterogeneity in the most dynamic capitalist economy in Western Europe constitutes the concrete formation of abstract labour that exists as pure potentiality for crystals of value. Their heterogeneity, individuality and subjectivity is totally eclipsed and ostracised during their "visit". Any human attributes are absent or displaced. Their "naturalness" as bearers of "energy" is specific to their inferior position in the class-struggle. They are actually agents representing, to the degree that they attempt to form collective bodies of resistance to over-exploitation, the basic antagonistic contradiction in capitalist society namely that between Capital and Labour. This is an expression of the principle of the contradiction between abstract-homogenous labour (its socio-economic forms, i.e., trade unions) and capital, rather than the principle of the contradiction between heterogenous and homogenous labour defined as the popular democratic struggle of politically interpellated "subjects"

1. Suzanne de Brunhoff, op.cit., p. 34.

against their abstraction or reformulation as "economic subjects" (represented by static-transhistorical discursive practices) totally renumerated by the wage-form.

The principal antagonistic contradiction between labour-power and capital is located in the production of a constant valorization process that displaces living labour (unemployment) under conditions of an inverted relation, i.e., dominance of dead-labour (value). In everyday terms, this means that the bearers of the commodity or even the consumers of commodities always derive diminishing returns on their invested capital, i.e., commodity owned.

Value over-accumulation and social meaning (semantisation)

The site where we find the modern "guest-worker" is nothing but the prismatic reflection of conditions in the high social levels of the host economy. As we have said before, what goes on in the production sphere goes on in the reproductive sphere outside it. In common terms, what exists within the factory is found outside it. For this reason "hegemony in the factory is accompanied by an intensified system of ideological and moral constraints outside work; bearing precisely on modes of living".¹ Value relations expand to the sphere of "consumption" and therefore penetrate and transform every "social" (economic, political, etc.) field. Symptoms of valorization akin to advanced western societies pertain to the phenomenon of erosion of the political, cultural and historical fabric of a "social" system and its direct determination by the

1. Christine Buci-Glucksmann, op.cit., p. 83.

"economic" structure which is effectively represented by the modern hypostasised state-form. The pertinent effects of the mis-recognition of the historical nature of production constitute certain deformities that alienate the agents of modern capitalism causing physical, mental and psychic disturbances. In the Federal Republic of Germany alone:

800,000 people are without shelter, 300,000 urban and rural vagrants; over 4,000,000 suffering from physical and mental handicaps; one out of every five Germans is or has been mentally ill; 1,200,000 to 1,800,000 are drug addicts; 6,000,000 have criminal records.¹

Furthermore, this erosion-valorization process poses the basic problem of legitimation to a system that requires for its reproduction the production of a homogeneous/mass process of semanticization or meaning mediated by the organic intellectuals. The vacuum that needs to be covered by noises so as to conceal the fundamental antagonism (at the base) and also to help in the accommodation-distillation of social conflicts, requires the production of ideological "subjects" that could perform such a function. The intelligentsia plays a fundamentally passive role due to its inability to constitute a hegemonic alliance with the popular masses and thus transform the cul-de-sac of "economism" in an active, political way. This passivity, still a denegation to state policies, poses a major problem for the hegemonic forces in the German State, which requires the services of a cultural-ideological apparatus that will act under the direct hegemony of the Right, that political voice of Capital. The intellectuals have even gone so far as to envisage the constitution of a new-class, which, standing at the

1. Official statistics of the Bundes Republic in Frankfurter Hefte, (April, 1976) in Negt, op.cit., p. 22.

pinnacle of society's power structure, would be composed of producers of meaning and mediators of meaning. Schelsky is referred to by Negt as the articulator of such a semantic practice. Negt further comments on the matter:

How meaningless, by the way, must Schelsky consider living in this society if an entire class of producers of meaning can be educated and succeed in ruling!¹

What we can certainly derive from this exchange is a double relation. One concerns the importance of ideology as an organiser of legitimation, of consent among the masses, resulting in the definition-constitution of the various positions in the social space where people are being inserted and thus appropriate the meaning of their history. This ideological effectivity acts as the "social cement" that consolidates the hegemony of a class. It is the historical struggle for the development of a "sociality" via capital accumulation, which is based into the canalization of class struggles into social conflicts situated in a multiplicity of centres. The other regards the specificity of the West German social formation which is elliptical² of a centre, i.e., the privileged field of a discursive practice determined by the historico-material reality. In a parallel manner the "subject" and the "cogito" constituted as a centre during the competitive-liberal era (nineteenth century) is diffused and interpellated during the late phase in the transformation of capital, as an abstract "neuter", bearing statements of account and a multiplicity of determinations operating in a number of fields. This privileged centre of gravitation is located in

1. O. Negt, ibid., p. 23.

2. Such an ellipsis or absence speaks for the decentered structure of capital which is determined by commodity production by means of the fact that the source of value labour-power is formally indistinguishable from the other commodities.

a field which by definition allows the emergence of a centre embedded in a process of unconscious semanticization. This centre is invested with the meaning that the anthropology of a specific class (the bourgeois), constituting itself the centre for the articulation of the discourse of capital for capital, has disappeared by the displacement of the logic of capital accumulation and valorization into the hands of a state administrative apparatus - particularly during the 30's in America and during the 50's and 60's in the European West - administrative apparatus.

The above results in a process by which the "state absorbs the social"; it pertains to the management of the production and circulation of money and labour-power and the articulation between the two. Nevertheless, the decentering of the structure and the displacement of historical mutation under the tutelage of the state would necessitate the constitution of a new technologically oriented intelligentsia based on the American model. To this orientation the German Right wing intellectual Schelsky addresses his discourse. He is presenting us with a phenomenon characteristic of post-1968 developments in the European West; namely, the further development of monopoly capital and the increase in the percentage occupied by migrant and immigrant labourers in the labour process. (In 1965 the "stock" of foreign labour in the five European Community Countries, BENELUX, FRANCE and GERMANY,¹ was 2,594,000 or 6.1% which went up to 4,340,000 or 9.8% in 1975. The largest increase was in the Federal Republic of Germany, from 5.5% to 10.3%. See Table I).

1. Italy being an exporter of labour is omitted.

In brief, the valorization process that spreads over all areas of the public sphere by displacing and transforming non-commodity relations and increasing the accumulation of value over living labour (anthropos), the expansion of value over the reproduction domain and hence over exploitation, the expansion of the abstract-homogenous space of value formation over the non-commodity area of reproduction of labour and reconstitution of labour-power by living labour, demands energies that cannot - due to valorization - be met by the integrated social "subjects". The import and rotation of labour by the state supplies this labour-power and thus develops and expands further the homogenization of social-space, by an increase in the rate of capital accumulation. The gradual establishment of mechanisms by the state, (policing the crisis, crisis management, new authoritarian laws),¹ are the material representation of a penetration and absorption process of heterogenous, non-economic elements that resist neutralization, homogenization and abstraction. The latter produces "social" integration through the wage-relation and therefore it canalizes political struggles into social conflicts. Social conflicts are the abstract moments of the general valorization of a "social" formation which is continually being reproduced by the administrative politics of the state. Such conflicts cannot be abolished, for they constitute the umbilical cord of value. They also constitute the umbilical cord of historical reality, that very elliptical centrum of capitalism.

1. It almost suffices to mention the "Berufsverbote" (roughly: professional proscription) campaigns since 1972 as well as the anti-terrorist law of 20/8/76 which mobilizes the population into the roles of the policeman and the informer.

The guest-worker is presenting us with the most clear analytical properties of the advanced, highly valorised, capitalist structures in demand of that centrum. See Table VII in the Appendix.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

The focus of this study has been on the modern forms of the advanced "liberal" labour-processes and the corresponding state-form which was constituted during the post-war II "settlement" in Western Europe. The multiplicity of determinations of the phenomenon of the import of labour during this period has been explored in order to articulate, albeit schematically, the fields of practice and discourse in which modern "subjects" have been inserted/positioned and registered. The event of production and its "agents" that is superceded yet preserved (in the Hegelian sense) has been historically registered as fordism, corporatism, etc. It is vividly manifested in the event and condition of the "new working class" (guest-labourers) that enters the decentered (capital-intensive) capitalist social matrix under the tutelage/hegemony of the state form. The repression of the historic, semantic, etc. lineages and subjectivities in this regime of accumulation along with the marked absence of socio-legal codifications in the manner of the formerly enjoyed as an indispensable attribute of the liberal democracy system of rights, bears tremendous currency in terms of understanding the present phenomena of neo-conservatism, neo-authoritarianism and irrationality marking the post-'68 Western Europe.

Our present reality is indissolubly linked with this state of affairs. The western dilemma in its Atlanticist form is determined by the contradiction between an abstract-ahistorical image of reality whose mirror-image is projected over the world and concrete reality itself! It is manifested in the attempt to launch frozen-passive revolutions

instituted from above via the intervention of the coercive apparatus on the hegemonic state (in Iran, Greece, Turkey, most of South America, S.E. Asia, etc.) and the actual historical conjuncture whose inherent popular-democratic contradictions express a reality that wages the struggle to overcome the burden of "nature" by transforming it. Such transformation as it has been established, be it capitalist or what have you, requires recognition of the primacy of the "social" relations of production or of the "social" nature of capital over the forces of production. Namely the recognition of the axiomatic principle of production that registers the primacy of labour over capital. This recognition is effectively blocked by the axiomatic of late monopoly capital.

Therefore, we have to take account of the position of the state which is seen as the expression of the material condensation of a combination of powers (Poulantzas) or as Gramsci wrote "State = political society + civil society, in other words hegemony protected by the armour of coercion."¹ Furthermore, the imperialist chain by the imposition of a system of state forms as static crystallizations of ahistorical, abstract, meta-physical schemas blocks historical transitions, mutations and reinforces existing antagonisms which are accumulated.

Capitalist penetration accentuates asymmetrical political influences and discourses and allows them to become discontinued from a base/production. The periphery therefore fails to "take-off" as a canonically founded system, for the canons are internationally constituted.

1. A. Gramsci, Prison Notebooks, p. 263.

Development after imperialism denotes a stasis of history and reality which is being appropriated and displaced by an atemporal-tautological system which by repressive, coercive measures attempts to abstract, in order to constitute a "reality"/materiality in which the democratic contradictions, are suppressed while an alternative course is indicated (narrated). Capitalism uses the tissue of solidarity and reciprocal-voluntary associations of social formations dominated by transitional modes of production and reproduction. But capitalism dynamically transforms such traditional norms (communal) and valorises them by constituting them as fields for the accumulation of capital (via the extension of the wage-relation). In a "social" determined by a universalization of commodity relations, new norms are institutionalised by the state which mainly are concerned with the expansion of civil society. This is the function of the "instituted" regimes¹ over the worlds' countryside which attempt to develop civil-society and therefore abstract commodity relations over social formations of uneven-historical development whose specificity is radically ignored and substituted by a homogenous package. This entails a crystallization process as a radical consolidation of a system of states, an essentially anachronistic amalgamation of heterogenous elements, which by the stasis of history appropriate the present and future and thus guarantee a universal, homogenous system where capital can recognise its mirror-image and thus safely circulate and accumulate. All this entails the radical attempt to appropriate historical time, replacing it by a re-structuring of events and a general recomposition of reality. The effects of the

1. By Imperialism.

latter are concentration camps, prisons, legitimate violence "contra omnes" but the agents of imperialism.

This is the beginning of a global convenience. Migrant workers relieve unemployment at their own countries while they constitute the source of the much needed low-valued labour-power at the centre which is far below the established institutionalized value of labour level. The popular masses as an animate object (from the peripheral states) are the source of raw-energy for the advanced "social" spatio-temporal matrices which are highly valorised and the cost of labour-power as a factor of production is high due to wage-demands by organised labour (high reproductive costs). The ahistoricity of the advanced capitalist state allows it to appropriate living-labour from heterogenous backgrounds (origins) and to storm them into areas where the transformation of nature is taking place (the actual productive base). This is the determinant economic relation in which living bearers from the "periphery" are the producers of the central-basic surplus-value relation. They are at the centre of exploitation, a centre which empirically¹ is absent for it is concealed. Their over-exploitation lies in the fact that although they are receiving low wages they are actually accumulating savings, in order to reproduce their families upon their return.

this migration is like an event in a dream dreamt by another (the Other² G.T.). As a figure in a dream dreamt by an unknown sleeper, he appears to act autonomously, at times unexpectedly; but everything he does - unless he revolts - is determined by the needs of the dreamer's mind. Abandon the metaphor. The migrant's intentionality

1. Perceptually.

2. In this I denote "Capital".

is permeated by historical necessities of which neither he nor anybody he meets is aware. That is why it is as if his life were being dreamt by another.¹

The image unfortunately has universal currency in the West.

The tele-motivated trajectory of the migrant worker which is positioned as a rigid-inanimate object at the centre is set in motion by relations beyond its control. It represents the abstract course of the development of capitalism and the transformation of life by it. It concerns us all!

John Kenneth Galbraith speaking recently² to a convention said some very interesting things.

"The Canadian and U.S. governments should rely on wage and price controls instead of "escapist" monetary policies to fight inflation" and Mr. Galbraith also said Canadians and Americans should reassess their image of immigrants. "It will be Mexicans who rescue Detroit," he said. "Immigrants can help offset the effects of the industrial age. Contrary to popular belief, immigrants do not contribute to unemployment," he said. "Not spoiled by high standards of living, they are often willing to take jobs that other skilled labourers ignore."

It can be safely noted that monetary policies are the common-antidote for democratic deviations such as during the Allende United Popular government in Chile.

1. Such is the poetic imagination of J. Berger, A Seventh Man, London, Penguin, 1975, p. 43.

2. The Spectator, Hamilton, Wednesday, July 30, 1980, p. 44.

GLOSSARY

GLOSSARY

"Consumer society". Analytically this refers to a social norm of working-class consumption which represents the extension of the area of surplus-value (valorization) into the wage-form (reproduction of the labour-power). Social consumption is incorporated into the conditions of production and thus revolutionized.

Departments I and II. The two Departments of production. Department I denotes the production of capital goods. Department II denotes the production of consumer goods. Capitalism can develop only when mass-commodities for consumption are produced thus transforming the conditions of reproduction of labour-power. Advances in productivity in Department I expand into Department II and thus both Departments are integrated in the process of capital accumulation (Fordism).

Exploitation. This denotes the production and appropriation of surplus-value derived from the commodity labour-power. The ability to constitute such a commodity is a conjunctureally formed condition that is determined by the State-form and the rate of surplus-value. The Constitution of the homogenous category labour-power from historically heterogenous subjects is central for our understanding of the guest-labour phenomenon.

Fordism. It is a particular phase in the transformation of capitalism. It is best marked by the specific State-form that undertakes the direct administration of civil society for the purposes of an expanded accumulation of capital. The logic of capital accumulation is displaced to a State-form that regulates the totality of the "social" activities. Analytically fordism represents the intersection of the two Departments of production, namely production of capital goods and consumption goods. In other words, it represents the integration/combination of the labour-process with the social consumption norm. Historically, fordism represents the successful constitution by capital of "economic subjects" divorced from their political, cultural and conscious associations.

Guest-worker or "gastarbeiter". A system of labour importation institutionalized by the Federal State of Germany during the late 50's to early 60's. The guest-worker is the mass-abstract worker - culturally heterogenous -

economically homogenous since he exists solely as the producer of the commodity labour-power. The problem of "migration" as a mobility of "subjects" from differential spatio-temporal formations is viewed from the specificity of its determinations by the advanced liberal state-form. The various periodicities of the state-forms, i.e., centre-periphery, when intersect produce certain dislocations and displacements one of which is the mass-migration of labour.

Homogenization-abstraction. This is directly linked to the other terms such as valorization and exploitation. Therefore it is a combination of all. It denotes the specific labour-process that once it incorporates and preserves traditional forms of production thus transforming them and subjecting them to the law of value accumulation, i.e., socializes the means of production (Fordism). It expands into the other area of consumption and socializes its means. The result is decentering of the spatio-temporal matrix and its abstraction, i.e., the constitution of a space totally determined by its own interior laws of development. It represses or denegates reality.

Reproduction domain. This denotes the consumption necessary for the reconstitution of the energies of the bearers of labour-power, i.e., the wage form.

"Social" space. I am using this to denote the specificity of the capitalist mode production as a par excellence "social" space, that is to say that it has its own specific determinations of time and space vis à vis the geographical/seasonal one. It is also determined by a relation, i.e., surplus-value, which collectively constraints the two protagonist categories of labour and capital (not personally). In order for production to take place, both these categories need to come together. The feudal space is the par excellence historical space.

Synchronic structure - diachronic centrum.

- (a) Synchronic structure - capital-intensive. Denotes the direct determination of the surplus-value relation. It pertains to the conditions of the advanced liberal social formations, whereby dead-labour or technology is directly dominating living-labour. This conjuncture represents the domination of techno-morphism and the diffusion of class-struggles into social-conflicts.

The state directly administers civil-society. The working-class is constituted as a collective "economic" subject".

- (b) Diachronic centrum - labour-intensive. The world of periphery. Labour-centered before the surplus-value relation becomes directly determinant. Popular democratic and class struggles over-determine reality. The personal relation and constraint in the labour-process determines the production of an anthropomorphism in the politico-historical field.

Valorization. This term denotes primarily the expansion of the law of surplus-value accumulation into the reproduction domain, the destruction of traditional modalities of consumption and their transformation by the law of value accumulation, i.e., consumer society. Fordism first by constituting the socialization of the means of production allows the law of value to expand into every area of the "social".

Select Bibliography

Books

- Aglietta, M. A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: the U.S. Experience. London: New Left Books, 1978.
- Althusser, L. For Marx. London: Penguin Books, 1969.
- . Reading Capital. London: New Left Books, 1970.
- . Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays. London: New Left Books, 1975.
- . Essays in Self Criticism. London: New Left Books, 1976.
- Amin, S. Unequal Development. New York: Monthly Review Books, 1976.
- Bachelard, G. The Philosophy of No. Orion Press, 1968.
- . The Psychoanalysis of Fire. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Balibar, E. "The basic concepts of Historical Materialism".
In L. Althusser, Reading Capital, London: New Left Books, 1976.
- Barthes, R. Mythologies. London: Jonathan Cape, 1972.
- . Image, Music, Text. New York: Hill & Wang, 1977.
- . Roland Barthes. New York: Hill & Wang, 1978.
- Benveniste, E. Problemes de la linguistique generale. Paris: 1966.
- Berger, J. A Seventh Man. London: Penguin Books, 1975.
- Bettelheim, C. Economic calculation and forms of property. New York: Monthly Review Books, 1975.

- Bloch, M. Feudal Society. Vols. I, II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Braudel, F. Capitalism and Material Life. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.
- Breverman, H. Labor and Monopoly Capital. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.
- Brunhoff, S. de. The State, Capital and Economic Policy. London: Pluto Press, 1978.
- Buckley & Peat (eds.). A Question of Physics: Conversations in Physics and Biology. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- Burawoy, M. Manufacturing Consent. Chicago: 1979.
- Castells, M. The Urban Question. London: E. Arnold, 1975.
- Castles, S. & K. Kosack. Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Clammer, J. "Economic Anthropology and the Sociology of Development: 'Liberal' anthropology and its French critics." In Oxaal, Barnett, Booth (eds.), Beyond the Sociology of Development, London: MacMillan, 1975, pp. 208-228.
- Colletti, L. From Rousseau to Lenin. London: New Left Books, 1976.
- Coward & Ellis. Language and Materialism. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Dunzellot, G. The Policing of Families. New York: Pantheon, 1978.
- Eagleton, T. Criticism and Ideology. London: New Left Review Editions (Verso), 1978.
- Edelman, B. Ownership of the Image. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Engels, F. The Condition of the Working Class in England. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1962.
- Faisod, M. and L. Gordon. Government and the American Economy. New York: Norton & Co., 1948.

- Foucault, M. The Order of Things. London: Tavistock, 1970.
- . The Archaeology of Knowledge. London: Tavistock, 1972.
- . Discipline and Punish. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- . The history of sexuality, Vol. I: An Introduction. New York: Vintage, 1980.
- Glucksmann, C-B. Gramsci and the State. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1980.
- Godelier, M. Rationality and Irrationality in Economics. London: New Left Books, 1972.
- Goldthorpe, J.H., D. Lockwood, F. Bechhofer and J. Platt. The affluent worker in the class structure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Gorz, A. (ed.). The Division of Labour: The labour-process and Class-struggle in Modern Capitalism. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1976.
- Gramsci, A. Prison Notebooks. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1975.
- Harnecker, M. Les Concepts Elementaires du materialisme historique. Paris: Maspero, 1975.
- Heath, S. Signs of the Times: Introductory Readings in Textual Semiotics. London.
- Hindess, B. and P. Hirst. Pre-Capitalist Modes of Production. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Hjelmslev, L. "Acta Linguistica". IV, Fasc. 3, Copenhagen, in Heath, S., Signs of the Times, London.
- Hobsbawm, E. Primitive Rebels. New York: Norton, 1965.
- Kant, E. The Metaphysical elements of Justice. Tr. J. Ladd, New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965.
- Kay, G. Development and Underdevelopment: A Marxist Analysis. London: MacMillan, 1975.
- . The Political Economy of the Working Class. London: MacMillan, 1979.

- . The State. London: MacMillan (forthcoming).
- Kindleberger, C.P. Europe's postwar growth - the role of labour supply. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- King & Howard. Marx's Political Economy. London: Longman, 1975.
- Kolakowsky, L. Positivist Philosophy from Hume to the Vienna Circle. London: Harmondsworth, 1972.
- Korsch, K. Marxism and Philosophy. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970.
- Lacan, J. Ecrits. Tr. A. Sheridan, London: Tavistock, 1977.
- . The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1977.
- Laclau, E. Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory. London: New Left Books, 1977.
- Lenin, V.I. The Development of Capitalism in Russia. Vol. III of Collected Works. Moscow: Progress, 1972.
- Macherey, P. A Theory of Literary Production. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Macpherson, C-B. Possessive Individualism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- . Democratic Theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- . On Property. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Marshall, A. The Import of Labour: the case of the Netherlands. Rotterdam: Rotterdam University Press, 1975.
- Marx, K. The German Ideology. Moscow: Progress, 1972.
- . Grundrisse. New York, Toronto: Vintage Books, 1973.
- . A Contribution to the Critique of the Political Economy. Moscow: Progress, 1975.
- . Capital. Vols. I, II and III. International Publishers, New York, N.Y., 1967.

- Mauss, M. Sociology and Psychology. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Meillassoux, C. Femmes, Greniers et Capitaux. Paris: F. Maspero, 1975.
- Pashukanis, E. Marxismos uai Dikaio. Intr. Cerroni, U., Odysseas, editions, Athens (in Greek) and Law and Marxism, Ink Links, 1978, London: 1977.
- Pêcheux, M. "Are the Masses an Inanimate Object?" In Linguistic Variation: Models and Methods, Sankoff, D. (ed.), New York: Academic Press, 1978.
- Piven & Cloward. Regulating the Poor. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Poulantzas, N. Political Power and Social Classes. London: New Left Books, 1973.
- . Fascism and Dictatorship. London: New Left Books, 1974.
- . La Crise de L'Etat. Paris: P.U.F., 1975.
- . The crisis of the dictatorships. London: New Left Books, 1976.
- . Classes in Contemporary Capitalism. London: New Left Books, 1977.
- . State Power and Socialism. London: New Left Books, 1978.
- Stavenhagen, R. Social Classes in Agrarian Societies. New York: Anchor Books, 1975.
- Strauss, C-L. The Savage Mind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Taylor, J. From Modernization to Modes of Production. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1979.
- Todorov, T. The Fantastic. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1975.
- Tribe, K. Land, Labour and Economic Discourse. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Vergopoulos, K. & S. Amin. Le Question Paysanne et le Capitalisme. Paris: Anthropos, 1975.

- Volpe, Galvano della. Rousseau and Marx. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1978.
- Willer, D. & J. Willer. Systematic Empiricism. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1975.
- Williams, R. Culture and Society. London: Penguin, 1958.
- Wright, E.O. Class, Crisis and the State. London: New Left Books, 1978.
- Zubaida, S. Race and Racialism. London: Tavistock, 1970.

Articles

- Amyot, G. "Strategic Innovation in the Italian Trade-Union Movement." Paper presented to CPSA/ECPR Joint Workshop, Brussels, April, 1979.
- Banaji, J. "Modes of Production in a Materialist Conception of History." Capital and Class, 3, Autumn 1977, pp. 1-44.
- Bandyopadhyay, P. "The Value Controversy: in Defence of a Post-Sraffa Marxian Approach." (Mimeo) Department of Sociology, Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario, 1979.
- Belessiotis, A. "Aspects of the Employment of Foreign Labour in Western Europe: the case of West Germany." (Mimeo) Department of Economics, MacMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1980.
- Bologna, S. "Class composition and the theory of the party of the origin of the workers councils movement." Pamphlet, Conference of Socialist Economists, Series No. 1, pp. 68-91.
- Bowles, S. & H. Gintis. "The Marxian Theory of Value and Heterogeneous Labour: a critique and reformulation." Cambridge Journal of Economics, I, 1977, pp. 173-192.
- Bradby, B. "The Destruction of Natural Economy." Economy & Society, 4 (2), 1975, pp. 127-161.
- Brenner, R. "The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neosmithian Marxism." New Left Review, No. 109, 1977, pp. 25-92.
- Brewster, B. "Althusser and Bachelard." Theoretical Practice, Vol. 3/4, 1972, pp. 25-37.

- Buck, P. "Seventeenth century political arithmetic: civil strife and vital statistics." Isis, Vol. 68, No. 241, 1977, pp. 67-84.
- Burawoy, M. "The functions and Reproduction of Migrant Labour." American Journal of Sociology, 81 (5) 1977, pp. 1050-1087.
- "Towards a Marxist Theory of the Labour Process." Politics & Society, 8, 1978, p. 34.
- Castells, M. "Immigrant Workers and Class Struggles in Advanced Capitalism: the Western European Experience." Politics & Society, No. 5, 1975, pp. 33-66.
- Castles, S. "The social time-bomb: education of an underclass in West Germany." Race & Class, XXI, 4, 1980, pp. 369-387.
- Carchedi, G. "Authority and Foreign Labour: Some Notes on a Late Capitalist Form of Capital Accumulation and State Intervention." Paper presented at the Workshop on Authority in Industrial Societies, E.C.R.P.-C.P.S.A. Session, Brussels, 17-21st April, 1979.
- Cerroni, U. "Democracy & Socialism." Economy & Society, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1978, pp. 241-283.
- Clement, W. "Class and Property Relations: An Exploration of the rights of property and the obligations of labour." Working paper, No. 10, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto, 1980.
- Curtis, B. and B. Edginton. "Uneven institutional development and the 'staple' approach: a problem of method." Canadian Journal of Sociology, 4 (3) 1979, pp. 257-273.
- Faye, J-P. "The Critique of Language and its Economy." Economy & Society, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1976, pp. 52-73.
- Fine, B. "On the Origins of Capitalist Development." New Left Review, No. 109, 1978, pp. 88-95.
- Fletcher, R. "Bernstein in Britain: Revisionism and Foreign Affairs." International History Review, Vol. I, No. 3, 1979, pp. 349-475.
- Godelier, M. "On the definition of a social formation." Critique of Anthropology, 1, 1974, pp. 63-73.

- Gorz, A. "Immigrant Labour." New Left Review, No. 61, May 1970, pp. 28-31.
- Gough, I. "State Expenditure in Advanced Capitalism." New Left Review, No. 92, July-August 1975.
- Hirst, P. "Althusser and the Theory of Ideology." Economy and Society, Vol. 5, No. 4, 1976, pp. 385-412.
- Hohendahl, P.U. "Critical Theory, Public Sphere and Culture, Jurgen Habermas and his Critics." New German Critique, No. 16, 1979, pp. 89-118.
- Humphries, J. "Class struggle and the persistence of the working-class family." Cambridge Journal of Economics, 1, 1977, pp. 241-258.
- Jameson, F. "Marxism and Historicism." New Literary History, Vol. XI, No. 1, 1979, pp. 41-73.
- . "Imaginary and Symbolic in Lacan: Marxism, Psychoanalytic Criticism and the Problem of the Subject." Yale French Studies, double issue, No. 55/56, pp. 338-395.
- Jenkins, J. "The Demand for Immigrant Workers: Labour Scarcity or Social Control?" International Migration Review, 12:4, 1978, pp. 514-35.
- Jessop, B. "Recent Theories of the Capitalist State." Cambridge Journal of Economics, I, 1977, pp. 353-373.
- Kayser, B. "European Migration: The New Pattern." International Migration Review, 11:2, 1977, pp. 232-40.
- Keilany, Z. "Capitalism in the United States and Germany 1930-1934." Il Politico, 43, No. 2, 1978, pp. 309-319.
- Knemeyer, F-L. "Polizei." Economy & Society, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1980, pp. 172-196.
- Kosack, G. "Migrant Women: The move to Western Europe...A Step Towards Emancipation?" Race & Class, XVII:4, 1976, pp. 369-379.
- Lanza, L. "Fascism and Techno-Bureaucracy." Our Generation, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1977, pp. 45-57.
- Luporini, C. "Reality and Historicity: economy and dialectics in Marxism." Economy & Society, Parts I & II, Vol. 4, 1975, Vol. I pp. 206-231, Vol. II pp. 283-308.

- O'Laughlin, B. "Marxist Approaches in Anthropology." Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol. 4, 1975, pp. 341-370.
- Marx, K. "Marginal Notes on Adolph Wagner's 'Lehrbuch der politischen ökonomie'." Theoretical Practice, No. 5, 1972, pp. 40-65.
- Meillassoux, C. "From Reproduction to Production." Economy & Society, Vol. 1, No. 6, 1972, pp. 95-106.
- . "Historical modalities of the exploitation and over-exploitation of labour." Critique of Anthropology, No. 13/14, 1977, pp. 7-16.
- Morishima, M. "Bowles & Gintis on Heterogenous Labour and Labour Theory of Value." Cambridge Journal of Economics, No. 1, 1978, pp. 305-309.
- Negt, O. "Terrorism and the German State's Absorption of Conflicts." New German Critique, No. 12, 1977, pp. 15-27.
- Nicolinakos, M. "Notes on an economic theory of Racism." Race, XIV, No. 4, 1973.
- . "Notes towards a general theory of migration in late Capitalism." Race & Class, Vol. XVII, No. 7, 1975, pp. 5-16.
- Paloix, C. "The labour process from fordism to neofordism." Conference of Socialist Economists pamphlet, No. 1, The labour process and class strategies, Series 1, pp. 46-67.
- Pasquino, P. "Theatrum Politicum. The Genealogy of Capital-Police and the State of Prosperity." Ideology & Consciousness, No. 4, 1978, pp. 41-54.
- Pickvance, C. "Marxist approaches to the study of urban politics." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Vol. 1, 1977, pp. 219-255.
- Portes, A. "Migration and Underdevelopment." Politics and Society, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1978, pp. 1-48.
- Rubery, J. "Structured Labour Markets, Worker Organization and Low Pay." Cambridge Journal of Economics, 1978, pp. 18-36.

- Sivanandan, A. "Imperialism and disorganic development in the silicon age." Race & Class, XXI, 2, 1979, pp. 111-126.
- Taylor, J. and A. Cutler. "Theoretical Remarks on the Theory of the Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism." Theoretical Practice, Vol. 3, 1973.
- Todorov, T. "Reflections on Literature in Contemporary France." New Literary History, Vol. 10, No. 3, 1979, pp. 511-531.
- Vidal, H. "The Politics of the Body." Social Text, No. 2, Summer 1, 1979, pp. 104-120.
- Vergopoulos, K. "The State in Peripheral Capitalism." (mimeo) Department of Political Economy, University of Paris VIII, 1980.
- Weidjao, A. "Social Welfare in Canada: Ideology and Reality." Social Praxis, 6, 1-2, 1979, pp. 35-53.
- Williams, G. "The concept of 'egemonia' in the thought of Antonio Gramsci." Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. XXI, No. 4.
- Wolpe, H. "Capitalism and cheap labour-power in South Africa: from Segregation to Apartheid." Economy & Society, Vol. I, No. 4, 1970.
- Wright, E.O. and L. Perrone. "Marxist Class Categories and Income Inequality." American Sociological Review, 42:1, 1977.
- Wright, E.O. "Race, Class and Income Inequality." American Journal of Sociology, May 1978.

APPENDIX: TABLES

Stocks of Foreign Labour In EEC Countries (1000's and %)

	1960	1965	1970	1973	1975
<u>Belgium</u>					
E		2,814	2,972	3,102	3,113
FE		182 ¹	209	211	205
%		6.5	6.9	6.8	6.6
%C		4.3	3.9	3.9	3.7
<u>W. Germany</u>					
E		21,289	21,747	22,054	20,095
FE		1,164	1,839	2,519	2,071
%		5.5	8.5	11.4	10.3
%C		2.1	2.2	2.6	2.2
<u>France</u>					
E		14,482	15,874	16,776	17,400
FE		1,158 ²	1,600	1,900	1,900
%		8.0	10.0	11.0	10.9
%C		1.8	1.7	1.8	1.7
<u>Luxembourg</u>					
E		102	110	123	133
FE		28	33	43	47
%		27.5	30.1	35.0	35.0
%C		23.4	23.6	24.0	22.6
<u>Netherlands</u>					
E		3,556	3,822	3,853	3,855
FE		62	120	121	117
%		1.8	3.2	3.2	3.0
%C		0.7	1.3	1.4	1.3
<u>Community 5</u>					
E		42,243	44,525	45,908	44,596
FE		2,594	3,792	4,794	4,340
%		6.1	8.5	10.5	9.8
%C		2.0	2.1	2.3	2.0

Source: A. Belessiotis (mimeo), "Aspects of the Employment of Foreign Labour in Western Europe: the case of West Germany", Department of Economics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1980, quoted with permission.

Notes on Table I

1 : 1967

2 : 1968

E : Employees in employment

FE : Foreign employees in employment

%C : Community employees in employment , percentage

% : Foreign employees in employment , percentage

Community 5 : The five EEC countries of the table

Table II

Selected Variables in Five Recruiting Countries

(% , annual averages)

France	1960-65	1965-70	1970-73	1960-73
Employment Growth	0.87	0.82	1.03	0.87
Unempl Rate	1.36	1.67	2.21	1.65
GDP Growth	6.01	4.95	4.59	5.55
IP Growth	6.77	3.88	4.48	5.72
FL Growth	8.35	5.27	4.48	6.04
<u>Belgium</u>				
Employment Growth	0.98	0.27	0.51	0.66
Unempl Rate	2.12	2.18	2.03	2.17
GNP Growth	5.17	4.65	5.76	5.11
IP Growth	6.42	4.05	4.70	5.43
FL Growth	6.81	2.02	na	3.47
<u>Netherlands</u>				
Employment Growth	1.74	0.92	0.75	1.15
Unempl Rate	0.88	1.39	1.90	1.37
GNP Growth	4.94	5.51	5.31	5.17
IP Growth	6.57	6.71	6.76	6.60
FL Growth	41.69	24.38	15.89	27.11
<u>Austria</u>				
Employment Growth				
Unempl Rate	2.86	4.00	2.00	2.60
GNP Growth	5.03	4.81	6.29	5.21
IP Growth	5.52	6.32	6.68	5.98
FL Growth	36.10	32.06	31.36	31.01
<u>Switzerland</u>				
Employment Growth				
Unempl Rate	(e)	(e)	(e)	(e)
GNP Growth	5.13	4.26	4.24	4.45
IP Growth	6.15	5.79	4.38	5.30
FL Growth	10.70	-1.43	-1.47	3.99

Source: A. Belessiotis (mimeo), op. cit.

Table III

Flows of Foreign Labour into the EEC , by Country of Origin

	<u>1960</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Total	333000	713000	946000	668000	266000
EEC	207000=62%	261000=37%	205000=22%	158000=24%	98000=37%
Italians	121000=51%	235000=33%	176000=19%	110000=16%	55000=21%
Non-EEC					
Total	126000=38%	452000=63%	741000=78%	510000=76%	168000=63%
Greece	7%	9%	7%	1.4%	0.8%
Yugoslavia	1.3%	5.5%	23%	13%	4.2%
Spain	15%	19%	8%	6%	4%
Portugal	1%	8.5%	12%	9%	7.3%
Turkey	.	10%	15%	19%	7.7%
Algeria	.	.	.	0.03%	0.5%
Marocco	.	3%	3.5%	4%	5.5%
Tunisia	.	.	1.7%	3%	1.6%
Other	14%	9%	9%	13%	29.44%

Source: A. Belessiotis(mimeo), table I.

Table IV

W. Germany : Composition of the Foreign Labour Force by

Nationality and Sex

	1960	1965	1970	1975
<u>Greece</u>				
Total	13005	187160	242184	196210
%FE	4.65	15.38	12.43	9.62
%Male	88.27	63.15	57.45	57.42
%Female	11.73	36.85	42.55	42.58
<u>Yugoslavia</u>				
Total	8826	64060	423228	415883
%FE	3.16	5.26	21.72	20.40
%Male	81.23	77.45	70.34	64.40
%Female	18.77	22.55	29.66	35.60
<u>Italy</u>				
Total	121685	372297	381840	292435
%FE	43.55	30.60	19.59	14.34
%Male	93.57	84.62	76.34	73.19
<u>Turkey</u>				
Total	2495	132777	353898	534326
%FE	0.89	10.91	18.16	26.21
%Male	91.98	86.62	78.13	75.35
%Female	8.02	13.38	21.87	24.65
<u>Spain</u>				
Total	9454	182754	171671	124533
%FE	3.38	15.02	8.81	6.11
%male	82.59	70.44	70.56	67.81
%Female	17.41	29.56	29.44	32.19
<u>Portugal</u>				
Total	261	14014	44796	68324
%FE	0.09	1.15	2.30	3.35
%Male	85.82	86.86	72.95	67.90
%Female	14.18	13.14	27.05	32.10

Source: A. Belessiotis (mimeo), see table I.

Table V

W.Germany : Sex Composition of the Foreign Labour

Force by Nationality

	1960		1965		1970		1975	
1. Total	279390		1216804		1948951		2038779	
2. Male	236197		933340		1390962		1400267	
3. Female (15.46)	43193		283464(23.30)		557989(28.63)		638512 (31.32)	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Greece								
%of1.:	4.11	0.55	9.71	5.67	7.14	5.29	5.53	4.10
%of2.:	4.86		12.66		10.00		8.05	
%of3.:		3.53		24.33		18.47		13.09
Italy								
%of1. :	40.76	2.80	25.89	4.71	14.96	4.64	10.50	3.85
%of2. :	48.21		33.75		20.96		15.29	
%of3. :		18.10		20.20		16.19		12.28
Yugoslavia								
%of1. :	2.57	0.59	4.08	1.19	15.28	6.44	13.14	7.26
%of2. :	3.04		5.32		21.40		19.13	
%of3. :		3.84		5.10		22.50		23.19
Turkey								
%of1. :	0.82	0.07	9.45	1.46	14.19	3.97	19.75	6.90
%of2. :	0.97		12.32		19.88		28.75	
%of3. :		0.08		6.26		13.87		22.04
Spain								
%of1. :	2.79	0.59	10.69	4.33	6.21	2.59	4.14	1.97
%of2. :	3.31		13.93		8.71		6.03	
%of3. :		3.81		18.60		9.06		6.28
Portugal								
%of1. :	0.08	0.01	1.00	0.15	1.68	0.62	2.28	1.08
%of2. :	0.09		1.30		2.35		3.31	
%of3. :		0.09		0.65		2.17		3.44

Source: A. Belessiotis(mimeo), see table I.

Table VI

Stock of Foreign Labour by Nationality and Host Country

		1960		1965		1970	
		Total	%FE	Total	%FE	Total	%FE
<u>Greeks in:</u>							
W.Germany		13005	4.65	187160	15.38	242184	12.43
France		10425	0.64	11161	0.42	10190	0.30
Netherlamds		400	5.97	.2300	4.39	3500	2.99
<u>Yugoslavians in:</u>							
W.Germany		8826	3.16	64060	5.26	423228	21.72
France		13510	0.83	27022	1.01	56091	1.65
Netherlands		900	13.43	1700	3.25	8000	6.82
<u>Portuguese in:</u>							
W.Germany		261	0.09	14014	1.15	44796	3.35
France		44530	2.73	243093	9.06	607069	17.89
Netherlands		100	1.49	1650	3.15	5100	4.35
<u>Italians in:</u>							
W.Germany		121685	43.55	372297	30.60	381840	19.59
France		688474	42.15	684862	25.52	592737	17.47
Netherlands		5000	74.63	12700	24.26	18300	15.61
<u>Turks in:</u>							
W.Germany		2495	0.89	132777	10.91	353898	26.21
France		3336	0.20	5164	0.19	15027	0.44
Netherlands		100	1.49	8700	16.62	31300	26.70
<u>Spaniards in:</u>							
W.Germany		9454	3.38	182754	15.02	171671	8.81
France		308356	18.88	631899	23.55	601095	17.71
Netherlands		200	2.99	19500	37.25	28000	23.88
				1975			
		W.Germany		(1972) France		Netherlands	
Greeks :		196210	9.62	12479	0.5	4133	2.19
Yugoslavs :		415883	20.40	73810	2.7	13580	7.19
Portuguese:		68324	3.35	538659	19.4	8155	4.32
Italians :		292435	14.34	490059	17.6	19823	10.50
Turks :		534326	26.21	8911	0.3	69201	36.66
Spaniards:		124533	6.11	598330	21.5	28932	15.33

Table VII

Sectoral Distribution of Foreign Labour in West
Germany (%)

	1962	1965	1970	1972	1975
<u>Primary Sector</u>					
%FE	1.46	1.06	0.88	0.92	0.97
%TE	0.31	0.41	0.70	1.03	1.10
<u>Energy & Mines</u>					
%FE	6.41	2.81	1.45	1.48	1.80
%TE	6.52	7.44	8.65	12.08	14.85
<u>Manufacturing</u>					
%FE	52.58	62.97	65.68	61.27	59.99
%TE	3.73	6.93	11.53	13.90	13.33
<u>Construction</u>					
%FE	24.34	18.12	15.31	16.77	10.67
%TE	7.96	8.66	12.84	17.64	12.41
<u>Services</u>					
%FE	4.68	10.42	12.50	14.99	19.13
%TE	1.34	4.37	7.67	11.32	12.87

%FE = foreign employment in activity i as % of total
foreign employment

%TE = foreign employment in activity i as % of total
employment