

In Marx's Laboratory

Critical Interpretations of the *Grundrisse*

Edited by

Riccardo Bellofiore, Guido Starosta, and
Peter D. Thomas



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

Historical Materialism Book Series

Editorial Board

Sébastien Budgen, *Paris* – Steve Edwards, *London*
Marcel van der Linden, *Amsterdam* – Peter Thomas, *London*

VOLUME 48

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/hm

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

In Marx's laboratory : critical interpretations of the Grundrisse / edited by Riccardo Bellofiore, Guido Starosta, and Peter D. Thomas.

pages cm. — (Historical materialism book series ; volume 48)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-23676-9 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-25259-2 (e-book) 1. Marx, Karl, 1818–1883. Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen ?konomie. 2. Marxian economics. I. Bellofiore, R. (Riccardo) II. Starosta, Guido. III. Thomas, Peter D.

HB97.5.M3319I52 2013

335.4'12—dc23

2013012459

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1570-1522

ISBN 978-90-04-23676-9 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-25259-2 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Part Four: Technology, Domination, Emancipation

The ‘Fragment on Machines’: A Marxian Misconception in the *Grundrisse* and its Overcoming in *Capital* 197
Michael Heinrich

The ‘General Intellect’ in the *Grundrisse* and Beyond 213
Tony Smith

The System of Machinery and Determinations of Revolutionary Subjectivity in the *Grundrisse* and *Capital* 233
Guido Starosta

From the *Grundrisse* to *Capital* and Beyond: Then and Now 265
George Caffentzis

Part Five: Competition, Cycles and Crisis

The Whole and the Parts: The Early Development of Marx’s Theory of the Distribution of Surplus-Value in the *Grundrisse* 285
Fred Moseley

Marx’s *Grundrisse* and the Monetary Business-Cycle 303
Jan Toporowski

Crisis and the Rate of Profit in Marx’s Laboratory 311
Peter D. Thomas and Geert Reuten

Part Six: Society and History in the *Grundrisse*

Between Pre-Capitalist Forms and Capitalism: The Problem of Society in the *Grundrisse* 331
Luca Basso

Second Nature: Gender in Marx’s *Grundrisse* 347
Amy E. Wendling

Uneven Developments: From the *Grundrisse* to *Capital* 371
Joel Wainwright

Pre-Capitalistic Forms of Production and Primitive Accumulation. Marx’s Historiography from the *Grundrisse* to *Capital* 393
Massimiliano Tomba

References 413

Index of Names 429

Index of Subjects 432

The 'Fragment on Machines': A Marxian Misconception in the *Grundrisse* and its Overcoming in *Capital*

Michael Heinrich

The *Grundrisse* still belongs to the most beloved texts of Marx's interpreters. Some authors argue that the so-called 'Fragment on machines' is a central document for a Marxian theory of capitalist 'catastrophes', a kind of 'break-down theory' of capitalism, or at least a description of a process in which a new mode of production emerges, inaugurated by capitalism itself but in contradiction with the logic of capital. In such considerations, the results of the 'Fragment' are taken for granted. However, the results of this 'Fragment on machines' derive, on the one hand, from a one-sided conception of crisis in Marx's thinking since the early 1850s, and, on the other hand, from some shortcomings in the conception of basic categories in the *Grundrisse*. In the years after the *Grundrisse*, Marx overcame both misconceptions. In *Capital* Volume I, when dealing with the production of relative surplus-value, we can find an implicit critique of the 'Fragment on machines'. Ignoring Marx's theoretical development, as does Antonio Negri when he states that the *Grundrisse* should be read 'for itself',¹ one can easily neglect a discussion of this implicit self-critique of Marx. Reading the text for itself means accepting uncritically the results of the text. In order to discuss the *Grundrisse* productively today, we have to contextualise the text not only in the development of Marx's thought. We also have to situate our reading of the *Grundrisse*

1. Negri 1984, p. 15.

in the development of the discussion about Marx in the twentieth century, because this development has shaped many of the ways in which the *Grundrisse* was and still is read.

1. The reception of the *Grundrisse* in the twentieth century

When we discuss the work of a significant author, we always do so in a determinate historical situation, which provides us with specific problems and reservations. Certain things appear to us to be obvious, while others seem to be questionable or superannuated. Some of these evaluations would have appeared very differently thirty or forty years earlier. In the case of Marx, furthermore, there is the fact that many texts that are today very important for the debate were not even published during his lifetime. His work has become accessible in its totality only slowly. Not only the respective historical context, but also the respective state of publication of his texts, influenced the direction and the course of many debates.

Even in the case of *Capital*, Marx could only publish the first volume. Engels published the second and third volumes after Marx's death, with considerable editorial interventions. Only in the last years have Marx's original manuscripts for these volumes been published in the context of the *Marx Engels Gesamtausgabe* (MEGA). Thus, it is only now, after more than 100 years, that we can identify Engels's editorial interventions and discuss their conceptual and substantial relevance. At the beginning of the twentieth century, after Karl Kautsky published the *Theories of Surplus-Value* between 1905–1910, it appeared as if all of Marx's critique of political economy was completely available, as the *Theories* were regarded as the fourth volume of *Capital* dealing with the history of the theory, which Marx had planned.² In the reading that was then predominant, Marx was regarded as the great socialist economist, who had demonstrated the exploitation of the working class, the crises-prone nature of capitalism and the inevitable transition to socialism, first in the *Communist Manifesto* and then later, on a broader foundation, in *Capital*. Most Marxists celebrated these findings as the triumph of 'scientific socialism'. Beginning in the 1920s, however, there was a strengthening of the critique of actual or supposed tendencies in Marx's theory of 'economism', 'determinism' and, above all, 'objectivism'. In this context, the publication of Marx's early works, particularly the *Economic and Philosophical*

2. They are not: not only because, rather than the planned history of economic theory, only the history of one single category is given (with significant digressions into other fields), but also because the *Theories*, written in 1861–3, are not yet at the level of knowledge of *Capital*. Rather, they represent only a first (important) step in the development of this level of knowledge.

Manuscripts of 1844, were like a bombshell. Here, apparently, the broad philosophical and socio-theoretical background of Marx's economic analyses, his considerations of the 'human essence' and 'alienation' in capitalism, became clear. The objectivism that has previously been so roundly criticised, along with the lack of a theory of the subject, could, so it seemed at least, be overcome on these foundations.

This transformed reception was not a purely inner-theoretical phenomenon, but the result of a determinate political reading, which in different ways was deployed against the tendencies towards petrification and dogmatism of official-party Marxism. Fascism and Stalinism, however, made it impossible for the discussion that began in the early 1930s to develop in a significant sense. This occurred only in the 1960s, when the conditions of the debate had substantially changed. Above all, the reception of Marx's early writing had lost its almost automatically assured anti-dogmatic impulse. In the meantime, these texts had been integrated by the Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy to a large extent. When, for example, Louis Althusser, in 1965, criticised Marx's early writings as 'ideological' and introduced the specific form of scientificity of *Capital*, this was also a critique of this orthodoxy. However, his strongly argued position also earned him the accusation – precisely from the anti-orthodox side – of having banished the subject and social struggles from the theoretical discussion. The debates over the relation between 'early' (philosophical) and 'late' (economic-theoretical) Marx had multiplied, just as the political perspectives connected to the individual positions within these debates had. It was in this context that there really began for the first time a widespread reading of the *Grundrisse* – which enduringly influenced the terms and conditions of its interpretation.

The *Grundrisse*, which was first published in 1939–41 in Moscow, was accorded only sporadic interest during the war and in the immediate post-war period. Even when the text was reprinted in the GDR in 1953, the text did not initially have many readers. This changed with the publication in 1968 of Roman Rosdolsky's commentary on the *Grundrisse*.³ The *Grundrisse* was then discussed widely not only in Germany, but, with the French translation of 1967 and the first English translation of 1973, the debate began in many other countries as well.

The *Grundrisse* appeared to be the magic-wand with which one could solve the problems in Marx's theory that had been discussed up until then. The contraposition of a young philosophical Marx and a mature economic-theoretic Marx was seemingly lessened, but nevertheless found a mediating connecting link in the *Grundrisse*: this text made it clear that the mature Marx's economic writings

3. Rosdolsky 1977.

also were based upon a developed philosophical foundation. What was lacking in *Capital* seemed to be present in the *Grundrisse*.

While Marx dealt with methodological questions in *Capital* almost only in the prefaces and afterwords, this problematic was raised continuously in the course of the presentation in the *Grundrisse*. There is also a much clearer reference to Hegel's philosophy in the *Grundrisse*. Something similar is the case with the question of subjectivity: much more strongly than in *Capital*, labour is conceptualised as the subjective counterpoint to capital. Additionally, the six-book plan that Marx envisaged as he wrote the *Grundrisse* (capital, landed property, wage-labour, state, international trade, world market) made clear that the intended object of investigation was much broader than that treated by Marx in *Capital*. Finally, the *Grundrisse* seemed to be a supplement to *Capital*, since here a series of themes were discussed that received no corresponding treatment in the presentation of *Capital*. The most well-known of these themes occurs in the *Grundrisse* under the heading of 'Forms that precede capitalist production' and in that 'Fragment on machines' that was discussed very early in Italian workerism.⁴

The *Grundrisse* thus seemed to offer something for everybody. Today, the discussion of Marx is not conceivable without the *Grundrisse*.⁵ Indeed, the *Grundrisse* are a fascinating work and reading them is a singular intellectual adventure. As if we were looking over his shoulder, we can observe Marx in the process of his analysis and the formation of his theory; the grasp of the material is much freer, and less regimented than in *Capital*. All too often, however, this understandable fascination leads to an uncritical enthusiasm.

2. The *Grundrisse* in the development of Marx's theory

If the *Grundrisse* are posited simply as a supplement beside Marx's *Capital*, then the inner-theoretical process of development of Marx's critique of political economy and the transitory character of the *Grundrisse* are ignored. Let us recall very briefly this development. Following the *Theses on Feuerbach* and the *German Ideology*, Marx's work in 1845–6 issued in a fundamental critique of any approach to economic theory centred on human species-being and alienation. Nevertheless, at that stage, Marx did not have very much that he could put in the place of these conceptions. Positively, the *German Ideology* offered above all a turn to the empirical. Again and again, Marx and Engels stressed there that 'positive science', the registration of the empirical state of affairs and relations, needed to take the place of philosophical speculation.

4. Cf. on this history Bellofiore and Tomba 2009.

5. On the international reception of the *Grundrisse*, cf. Musto 2008.

Against this background, Marx accepted the political economy of Ricardo and the class-theory of French historians as substantially correct descriptions of capitalist reality. In his engagement with Proudhon in the *Poverty of Philosophy* (1847), Marx continually praised Ricardo in the highest terms for the acuity of his analysis.⁶ In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx referred without hesitation to the bourgeois class-analysis that can be found in French historians such as Guizot or Thierry in their analysis of the French Revolution. The only thing that he found in Ricardo to criticise at this point in time was his conception that capitalism was not an historically determinate mode of production, but rather an eternal, quasi-natural one.⁷ Something similar is the case for class-theory: Marx did not claim that he had discovered the existence of classes and the class-struggle, but rather that the class-struggle must ultimately lead to a classless society.⁸ In the second half of the 1840s, we find in Marx a *critical deployment* of the given bourgeois political economy and class-theory, but still no fundamental *critique of the categories* of political economy.

This critique was developed only after Marx's forced emigration to London. Here, in the heart of the capitalist world-system in that period, and with the help of the enormous stock of books of the British Museum, Marx started his economic studies 'again from the very beginning', as he himself emphasised in the 1859 'Preface' of *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.⁹ Only now did he begin to develop a critique of the categories as well. Initially, Marx criticised Ricardo's theory of money and rent; as he progressed, the critique became increasingly fundamental. When Marx wrote the 'Introduction' in 1857 and thus began the *Grundrisse*, this was not only the beginning of a development of his critique of economics that would eventually lead to *Capital*. It was also, and above all, an inventory taking of what he had achieved in terms of theoretical insights in the previous years. The attempt to set down these insights in a coherent way, however, still entailed a daunting process of research, during which Marx came up against more than merely one theoretical lacuna.

When Marx began the *Grundrisse*, he already had a mass of material for his planned economic work, but was still far from a finished concept. The *Grundrisse* in fact has no genuine beginning: a critique of Daimon, a student of Proudhon who wanted to overcome capitalism by means of the monetary system, indiscernibly passes over into an engagement with the categorical foundations that are necessary for such a critique. Here, we can clearly see that Marx still had serious

6. Cf., for example, Marx and Engels 1976, pp. 123–4.

7. Cf., for example, the letter to Annenkov of 28 December 1846 (Marx 1975–2005e, p. 100).

8. Cf. Marx's letter to Weydemeyer of 5 March 1852 in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, pp. 62–5.

9. Marx 1859, p. 265.

difficulties with the categories of value, money and exchange. A close reading of the 'Chapter on money' clearly shows that it is not yet a unitary attempt at presentation, but rather, a superimposition of numerous, continuously renewed attempts at presentation.¹⁰

That Marx, despite these unsolved problems, did not fall back into yet another research-process, was due to an external motive: the world-economic crisis that commenced in 1857. Marx had been impatiently waiting for years for such a crisis, anticipating that violent economic tremors and revolutionary revolts would follow in its wake. His book had been supposed to provide support for the revolutionary movement and now Marx feared that he would be too late.¹¹

During his work on the *Grundrisse*, Marx made enormous advances in his knowledge. His analysis, however, also had significant deficiencies, which many enthusiastic readings do not seem to discern. Marx himself wrote that this manuscript is 'a real hotchpotch, much of it intended for much later sections'.¹² He did not merely mean the ordering of the material, the large number of digressions and intimations. The order of the presented categories is itself the bearer of a determinate yield of information: it shows the connection of these categories, the interconnection that exists between them. Categories like the commodity, money, capital, wage-labour, and so forth, are theoretical expressions of social relations in a developed capitalist society. These relations not only appear simultaneously; they mutually presuppose each other in social reality. Only theoretical analysis allows one to distinguish between simple and complex categories and to express the conceptual-theoretical connection between the categories.¹³ When the manuscript's coherence breaks down, however, it is precisely this conceptual connection between the individual categories that is not yet clearly grasped. That means that there are still not insignificant deficiencies in the conceptual fixing of these categories.

We will discuss some of these deficiencies in the next section. The fact that Marx removed some of these deficiencies in the 1860s does not mean, however, that there might be a linear progressive development, a continuous refinement from the *Grundrisse* to *Capital*. Such an idea, however, guided the editors of the *MEGA* in the 1970s and 1980s, who characterised the *Grundrisse*, the *Manuscripts of 1961–2* (*MEGA* II/3.1–3.6) and the *Manuscripts of 1863–5* (*MEGA* II/4.1–4.2) as the 'three drafts of *Capital*', thus implying that *Capital* (by which was meant the three-volume work edited by Engels) was the goal towards which a develop-

10. Cf. PEM 1973.

11. Cf. His letter to Lassalle, 22 February 1858, in Marx and Engels 1983, p. 271.

12. Letter to Engels, 31 May 1858, in Marx and Engels 1983, p. 318.

13. This is the core of what Marx means by 'dialectical presentation'. For a more extensive discussion cf. Heinrich 1999, pp. 171 ff.

mental process moved, beginning precisely with the *Grundrisse*. Besides the improvement of the presentation and the overcoming of theoretical deficiencies, however, we can also observe an opposed tendency in this development. Marx himself spoke often of 'popularisation' of his presentation. A first popularisation can be observed in the *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* of 1859; a second attempt at popularisation consists in the second edition of *Capital* Volume I. These popularisations have their price: determinate conceptual contexts are sometimes obscured; other connections no longer appear in *Capital*, such as, for example, the transition from money to capital.¹⁴ Thus, Hans-Georg Backhaus and Helmut Reichelt in particular have understood this development from the *Grundrisse* to *Capital* not as an improvement, let alone a refinement of the presentation, but rather, as a tale of decline away from an originally very strongly composed presentation.¹⁵

Both positions – the idea of a continuous refinement, as well as that of a constant theoretical regress – seem nevertheless to be inadequate. This is not only because both improvement as well as deterioration can be observed, but above all, because in this way we neglect that the path from the *Grundrisse* to *Capital* witnesses not only transformations of individual aspects, but also of the fundamental conceptual questions. The six-book plan as well as the concept of 'capital in general' – Marx develops both during his work on the *Grundrisse*, and redevelops them in the *Manuscripts of 1861–3* – is given up. With *Capital*, for which the *Manuscripts of 1863–5* are the first and not the third draft, Marx develops a new theoretical frame of reference, for which the distinction between individual capital and social total capital is decisive.¹⁶ Indeed, we have to distinguish between two different projects: 'Critique of Political Economy' in six books, for which two drafts exist (*Grundrisse* and the *Manuscript of 1861–3*); and *Capital* in four books with three drafts (*Manuscripts of 1863–5*, *Manuscripts of 1866–71*, including the first edition of *Capital* Volume I, and the *Manuscripts of 1871–81*).¹⁷

3. Marx's Argument in the 'Fragment on machines' and its errors

At the beginning of the manuscript of the *Grundrisse*, Marx does not yet operate on the basis of developed value-theoretic considerations. Rather, he initially attempts to determine the status of money within commodity-circulation. In particular, he has still not clarified the distinction between abstract and concrete labour – a configuration that he describes in *Capital* as the 'crucial point' of the

14. Cf. Heinrich 1999, pp. 253 ff.

15. Cf. Backhaus 1997, Reichelt 2008.

16. Cf. Heinrich 1989.

17. Cf. Heinrich 2009 and, especially for Marx's work in the 1870s, Heinrich 2011.

understanding of political economy, and in a letter to Engels of 8 January 1868, as ‘the whole secret of the critical conception’.¹⁸ The clear fixing of the distinction between abstract and concrete labour, with which Marx completely broke with Ricardo’s value-theory, occurred only in the *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859).¹⁹ Indeed, Marx distinguishes also in the *Grundrisse* clearly between use-value and value (but not yet as clearly between exchange-value and value; he does this only in the second edition of *Capital*, Volume I). When he speaks of value-determining labour-time, it is a case, as in Smith and Ricardo, of merely a ‘labour *sans phrase*’, which does not prevent the determinations of abstract and concrete labour from being confused.²⁰

The analysis of the capitalist production-process as a unity of labour- and valorisation-processes occurs only in preliminary hypotheses. Marx thus had difficulties to hold on to the form-determination of constant capital, so that he frequently went back to the question of how it is possible that labour can both add new value and also carry over the value of the utilised means of production onto the product.²¹ The back and forth of Marx’s attempt at explanation – now with ‘form’ and ‘substance’ of labour, now with ‘quality’ and ‘quantity’ of labour – is extensively analysed in a volume published by the *Projektgruppe Entwicklung des Marxschen Systems* (PEM).²²

As Marx still had problems with the concept of constant capital, he saw the actual capitalist form-determination of the means of labour only in the category of *capital fixe*;²³ that is, of a form-determination that contains the means of labour only in circulation. Thus, the much discussed ‘Fragment on machines’ occurs in the section on the capitalist circulation-process – although problems are treated that belong to the analysis of the capitalist production-process.

Marx initially maintains that the means of labour in the capitalist production-process ‘passes through a series of metamorphoses until it ends up as the *machine* or rather as an *automatic system or machinery*’.²⁴ Here, the activity of the worker is also transformed. It ‘is determined and governed in every respect

18. Marx 1976a, p. 132; Marx 1987b, p. 514.

19. As Schrader (Schrader 1980, pp. 194 ff.) plausibly argues, the significance of this distinction first became clear to Marx as he made his excerpts from Franklin, which he most probably wrote in 1858–9 during his preparation for *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. However, with this, the development of Marx’s value-theory is not yet complete; only during his engagement with Samuel Bailey, in the *Theories of Surplus-Value*, does the complete significance of the analysis of the value-form become clear to him, which was only briefly and unsatisfactorily treated in the *Contribution*.

20. Marx himself emphasises that the analysis could not be left at ‘labour *sans phrase*’ in the previously cited letter to Engels (Marx 1987b, p. 514).

21. Marx 1975–2005a, pp. 179–91.

22. PEM 1978, pp. 113 ff.

23. Marx 1975–2005c, p. 81.

24. Marx 1975–2005c, p. 82.

by the movement of the machinery, not vice versa'.²⁵ This entire development, Marx argues: 'is not a matter of chance for capital, but the historical transformation of the traditional means of labour, as handed down from the past, into a form adequate to capital. The accumulation of knowledge and skill, of the general productive forces of the social mind, is thus absorbed in capital as opposed to labour, and hence appears as a property of capital, more precisely, of *fixed capital*, to the extent that it enters into the production process as means of production in strict sense'.²⁶

Shortly afterwards, Marx summarises thus:

Hence, the full development of capital only takes place – or capital has only posited the mode of production corresponding to it – when the means of labour is not merely formally determined as fixed capital but is superseded in its immediate form, and *fixed capital* confronts labour within the production process as machinery. The entire production process then appears no longer as subsumed under the immediate skill of the worker, but as technological application of science. Capital thus tends to impart a scientific character to production, and immediate labour is reduced to a mere moment of this process.²⁷

In the nineteenth century, a contemporary observer could not fail to note that machinery had an increasing significance in capitalist production, that the application of science was increasing, and that the individual worker played an ever smaller role. The fact that Marx here notes these developments is no particular analytic achievement. Such an achievement could only consist in the ordering and explanation of this process.

Marx treats these developments as a process that capital necessarily produced; capital 'posits the mode of production corresponding to it'. Why, however, is the employment of machinery and the increasingly scientific nature of production adequate for capital? Marx's answer is vague: in the first cited passage, he argues that the 'general productive forces of the social mind' are 'absorbed' by capital; in the second citation, he emphasises that the scientific production-process is no longer 'subsumed under the immediate skill of the worker'. In other words, on the basis of the capitalist appropriation of socially produced knowledge, the power of capital over labour increases, capital increasingly becomes independent from single workers and their skills. This increasing power is a positive effect for capital. The goal of capital, however, is the production of surplus-value. If we wish to show that the developments named by Marx represent the 'mode of production corresponding' to capital, we must refer to the production of surplus-value. In

25. Marx 1975–2005c, p. 83.

26. Marx 1975–2005c, p. 84.

27. Marx 1975–2005c, p. 85.

this citation, however, Marx is still a long way from this, since he does not have an adequate concept of the production of relative surplus-value. That means that he can deal with the increasing application of machinery and the growing scientific nature of production only as an empirically noticeable tendency, and *claim* that they are a development that is adequate for capital. He cannot yet, however, *justify* them as this adequate development.

Instead of providing such a justification, he emphasises an (apparent) contradiction taken from the empirical evidence: ‘In the same measure as labour time – the simple quantity of labour – is posited by capital as the sole determinant of value, immediate labour and its quantity disappear as the determining principle of production, of the creation of use values. It is reduced both quantitatively, in that its proportion declines, and qualitatively, in that it, though still indispensable, becomes a subaltern moment in comparison to general scientific work...’.²⁸

Marx then immediately draws the following far-reaching conclusion: ‘Thus capital works to dissolve itself as the form which dominates production’.

This surprising result is not further justified at this stage. Instead, Marx deals with the problem of the way in which *capital fixe* contributes to the value of the produced product, in order to be able to oppose Lauderdale’s conception that *capital fixe* is a source of value that is independent from labour-time. Only a few pages later, he comes back to this contradiction. He holds that the presupposition of the capital-relation is ‘the sheer volume of immediate labour time, the quantity of labour employed, as the decisive factor in the production of wealth’.²⁹

This presupposition, however, is undermined by the development of industry itself: ‘But in the degree, in which large-scale industry develops, the creation of real wealth becomes less dependent upon labour time and the quantity of labour employed than upon the power of agents set in motion during labour time’.³⁰

However, if immediate labour-time plays an ever smaller role, what does the worker still do in the process of production?

Labour no longer appears so much as included in the production process, but rather man relates himself to that process as overseer and regulator... He stands besides the production process, rather than being its main agent.³¹

28. Marx 1975–2005c, pp. 85–6.

29. Marx 1975–2005c, p. 90.

30. *Ibid.*

31. Marx 1975–2005c, p. 91.

Here, it is no longer a case of 'immediate labour performed by man himself', but rather, of the 'appropriation of his own general productive power',³² on the basis of which Marx then draws an extremely far-reaching conclusion:

As soon as labour in its immediate form has ceased to be the great source of wealth, labour time ceases and must cease to be its measure, and therefore exchange value [must cease to be the measure] of use value. The *surplus labour of the masses* has ceased to be the condition for the development of general wealth, just as the *non-labour of a few* has ceased to be the condition for the development of the general powers of the human mind. As a result, production based upon exchange value collapses...³³

While these sentences are often cited, it is worthwhile to look more closely at whether and how Marx *justifies* them. Marx's starting point is the empirically noticeable tendency that the use of machinery and the increasing scientific dimension of production steadily advance in the capitalist mode of production. This uncontroversial observation then serves him as the foundation of deductions that are based upon each other:

- a) Marx sees 'immediate labour' increasingly disappearing from the production-process, from which should then follow
- b) that immediate labour is no longer the great source of wealth; rather, this is increasingly constituted by science, or general social knowledge;
- c) in this case, labour-time is no longer the 'measure' of wealth,
- d) which should have the consequence that capitalist production ('production based upon exchange-value') collapses.

If we consider carefully these deductions in detail, we see that the lacking distinction between concrete useful labour, which produces use-values, and abstract human labour, which is represented in value, has decisive consequences:

Regarding a): Marx extrapolates limitlessly the empirical observation of the progressive deployment of machinery. It would, however, be necessary first to explain whether or not there really are no limits in the capitalist production-process for the replacement of 'immediate labour' by machines. If we consider only concrete useful labour, then there does indeed appear to be no limit for the

32. Slightly later, Marx explains that 'The development of fixed capital shows the degree to which society's general science, KNOWLEDGE, has become an *immediate productive force*, and hence the degree to which the conditions of the social life process itself have been brought under the control of the GENERAL INTELLECT and remoulded according to it' (Marx 1975–2005c, p. 92). This is the only passage in which Marx speaks of the 'GENERAL INTELLECT', which some authors quote with relish today.

33. Marx 1975–2005c, p. 91.

increase in productivity by means of the increasing deployment of machinery (although the period of time in which this occurs remains an open question). We should bear in mind, however, that it is a case of a capitalist production-process, for there is certainly a limit to the employment of machinery. The machine used in a capitalist way is itself a value-object, which yields the average expenditure of value to the produced product (if a given machine produces 10 000 pieces before it is worn out, then the machine yields $1/10000$ of its value to the individual product). As Marx discusses extensively in the second section of the fifteenth chapter of *Capital* Volume I, the employment of machinery in the capitalist production-process is only worthwhile if the production-costs of the product are reduced. And that only occurs when the value-yield of the machine to the product is lower than the reduction of costs that occurs due to the reduced expenditure of living labour. If the employment of machinery saves an hour in the production of a piece, then the capitalist saves the wage for this one hour. If the value-yield of the machine to the product is higher than the wage for an hour, then the capitalist will not employ the machine, since the machine may indeed make labour more productive, but nevertheless raise the production-costs. Only when the value-yield of the machine is less than the saved wage-costs is the machine employed.

Regarding b): It is unclear what Marx means, here, by 'wealth'. If it is *material* wealth, namely the mass of use-values, then 'immediate labour' would never be the 'great' source of wealth, as, besides concrete-useful labour, the natural productive forces (like, for example, fertility of the land) and the productive forces created by humans would be equally great sources of wealth. However, if Marx means here the *social form* of wealth in capitalist societies, that is, the 'value' of the 'immense accumulation of commodities', then this value is the representation of abstract human labour, which has produced the commodities. Here, it is not important which part of this abstract human labour is an expression of the 'immediate labour' that was expended in the (last) production-process, and which part is an expression of the labour objectified in the machines, the value of which is carried over to the product. Even if an increasingly larger part of the product's value is traced back to the value-transfer by the used machines, abstract labour remains the substance of value.

Regarding c): if, however, abstract labour remains the substance of value, then labour-time also remains the immanent measure of it, even if the 'immediate labour time' in production plays an increasingly reduced role. *Immediate* labour-time was at any rate never the measure of value: immediate labour-time is that quantity of concrete labour that is expended by an individual producer. However, the individual expenditure of concrete labour-time does not form value; rather, value is formed by that quantity of abstract human labour that results only from the *average social relations*.

Regarding d): if labour-time remains the (immanent) measure of value, then the argument given by Marx for his last deduction, the collapse of 'production based upon exchange-value', is no longer valid either. Indeed, with this last deduction, it remained completely unclear from the outset how the difficulties of measuring value (insofar as this is supposed to occur) should then lead immediately to the *collapse* of capitalist production.

Above all, the weakness of the last deduction is clear and it is amazing that Marx himself did not notice how weak the argument is. An explanation lies in the conception of crisis with which he operated before the drafting of the *Grundrisse*. The *Communist Manifesto* claimed that 'the commercial crises [...] by their periodical return put on its trial, each time more threateningly, the existence of the entire bourgeois society'.³⁴ Some years later, Marx and Engels then claimed a close connection between crisis and revolution: 'A new revolution is possible only in consequence of a new crisis. It is, however, just as certain as this crisis'.³⁵ That Marx, while composing the manuscript of the *Grundrisse*, saw in crisis not only the catalyst of a political process, but also the beginnings of an economic collapse, is clear from an early draft plan. There, he writes: 'Crises. Dissolution of the mode of production and form of society based upon exchange value'.³⁶

At the beginning of his work on the *Grundrisse*, Marx was convinced that the crisis would lead to the dissolution of the capitalist mode of production, and that in the course of its development this mode of production would finally 'collapse'. Now, as the first great crisis of the world-market had begun that would lead to the 'deluge', he had only to sketch out the mechanism that formed the basis of this process.³⁷

We know, however, that something very different occurred. Although the first genuine crisis of the world-market occurred in 1857–8, it was neither a catalyst of revolutionary unrest, nor did it announce the collapse of production based upon exchange-value. On the contrary: the crisis was quickly over and capitalist production emerged from it strengthened. Marx learnt this lesson thoroughly and never forgot it. When Danielson pressured him to finish *Capital* in the late 1870s, Marx replied to him that he couldn't finish *Capital* before the current crisis reached its highpoint, because it showed entirely new phenomena that he still had to comprehend theoretically.³⁸ Nothing is left of any ideas of collapse

34. Marx and Engels 1976, p. 489.

35. Marx and Engels 1975–2005a, p. 510.

36. Marx 1975–2005a, p. 195.

37. Marx and Engels 1983, p. 217.

38. Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 45, p. 354.

or even his fear during the composition of the *Grundrisse* that he would be ‘too late’ with his book.

4. Quesnay’s riddle and its solution

The phenomena that Marx analysed in the *Grundrisse* in relation to *capital fixe* appear in *Capital* Volume I in different places – as a component part of the investigation of the production of relative surplus-value, a category that was only present in a rudimentary form in the *Grundrisse*, but which is developed in *Capital* on the basis of a precise distinction between concrete useful labour and abstract human labour, and between constant and variable capital, as well as the comprehension of the capitalist production-process as a unity of the labour- and valorisation-process.

Developments of productive power are now not only empirically or factually included, but grasped as the systematic methods of the production of relative surplus-value, in which consists the fundamental possibility of an increase in productive power in the cooperation of the individual labour-powers, the division of labour (analysed paradigmatically in light of manufacture) and the employment of machinery (paradigmatically in ‘large-scale industry’). On all three levels, the social productive power of labour appears as the productive power of capital, and ‘the intellectual potentialities [*geistige Potenzen*] of the material process of production [appear to the workers] as the property of another and as a power which rules over him’.³⁹ However, this is not the case in the same way on all three levels:

This process of separation starts in simple co-operation, where the capitalist represents to the individual workers the unity and the will of the whole body of social labour. It is developed in manufacture, which mutilates the worker, turning him into a fragment of himself. It is completed in large-scale industry, which makes science a potentiality for production which is distinct from labour and presses it into the service of capital.⁴⁰

Marx then summarises in his analysis of machinery and large-scale industry in Chapter Fifteen:

Every kind of capitalist production, in so far as it is not only a labour process but also capital’s process of valorization, has this in common, but it is not the worker who employs the conditions of his work, but rather the reverse, the conditions of work employ the worker. However it is only with the com-

39. Marx 1976a, p. 482.

40. Ibid.

ing of machinery that this inversion first acquires a technical and palpable reality. Owing to its conversion into an automaton, the instrument of labour confronts the worker during the labor process in the shape of capital, dead labour, which dominates and soaks up living labour-power. The separation of the intellectual faculties of the production process from manual labour and the transformation of such faculties into powers exercised by capital over labour, is, as we have already shown, finally completed by large-scale industry erected on the foundation of machinery. The special skill of each individual machine-operator, who has now been deprived of all significance, vanishes as an infinitesimal quantity in the face of science, the gigantic natural forces, and the mass of social labour embodied in the system of machinery...⁴¹

By analysing changes in the production-process in the context of the production of relative surplus-value (an increase in productive power leads to a reduction of the value of labour-power and thus the necessary labour-time, so that surplus labour-time correspondingly increases), Marx could not merely claim the necessity of this development, as in the *Grundrisse*, but also justify it. It also became clear to him that the separation of the intellectual potentialities of the production-process from the workers is a tendency that is immanent to all capitalist production. This process found a highpoint in machine-production, but not a tipping point that put capitalist production into question. That the detail-skills of the individual worker become minute beside the employment of science, and thus beside the 'general intellect', does not threaten value-production. This state of affairs, rather, alters the concept of the productive worker, as is rather parenthetically noted in Chapter Sixteen.

In *Capital*, Marx studies the same developments as those examined in the 'Fragment on machines'. Nowhere, however, does he claim that (abstract) labour is no longer the substance of value, or that labour as a measure of value is placed in question – for good reason.

The value-dimension now comes into play on an entirely different level. In the treatment of the 'concept of relative surplus-value' in Chapter Twelve, Marx speaks of the 'riddle' with which one of the founders of political economy, Quesnay, had tormented his opponents and for which they owed him an answer: namely, the fact that, on the one hand, capitalists were only interested in exchange-value; but that, on the other hand, they constantly sought to lower the exchange-value of their products.⁴² Marx also could not provide an answer to this riddle in the *Grundrisse*. There, he had effectively named the contradiction nominated by Quesnay. But rather than resolving it, he had comprehended

41. Marx 1976a, pp. 548–9.

42. Marx 1976a, p. 437.

it as a contradiction of capital: 'By striving to reduce labour time to a minimum, while, on the other hand, positing labour time as the sole measure and source of wealth, capital itself is a contradiction-in-process'.⁴³

In the *Grundrisse*, Marx had ascribed to this 'contradiction' a potential to overthrow the capitalist mode of production. In *Capital*, against the background of the analysis of the production of relative surplus-value, this contradiction is resolved: the capitalist is not interested in the absolute value of the commodity, but rather, merely in surplus-value contained within it and able to be realised by means of sale. And 'since the same process both cheapens commodities and augments the surplus-value contained in them, we have here the solution of the following riddle: why does the capitalist, whose sole concern is to produce exchange-value, continually strive to bring down the exchange-value of commodities?'⁴⁴ The contradiction that had so astounded Marx in 1857–8 in the *Grundrisse* that he had immediately seen the collapse of all production based upon exchange-value, is reduced in *Capital* in 1867 to a riddle from the history of the theory, and one which has a simple solution. Those interpreters who have stopped at the *Grundrisse* have not accompanied Marx in these decisive theoretical advances.

Translated by Peter D. Thomas

43. Marx 1975–2005c, p. 91.

44. Marx 1976a, p. 437.

References

- Anonymous 2002, 'Patently Absurd', *The Economist*, June 23, 40–2.
- Althusser, Louis 1971, 'Preface to *Capital* Volume One' in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- 1994, *Écrits philosophiques et politiques*, Tome I, edited by François Matheron, Paris: Éditions Stock/IMEC.
- Althusser, Louis and Étienne Balibar 1997 [1970], *Reading Capital*, New York: Verso.
- Amin, Samir 1976, *Unequal Development: An Essay on The Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism*, New York: Monthly Review.
- Anderson, Kevin B. 2002, 'Marx's Late Writings on Non-Western and Precapitalist Societies and Gender', *Rethinking Marx*, 14, 4: 84–96.
- Arbeitsblätter 1979a, *Arbeitsblätter zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 8, Halle (Saale).
- 1979b, *Arbeitsblätter zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 9, Halle (Saale).
- Arrighi, Giovanni and Beverly J. Silver 1999, *Chaos and Governance in The Modern World System*, Minneapolis-London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arthur, Christopher J. 1979, 'Dialectics and Labour' in Mephram and Ruben (eds.) 1979.
- 1993, 'Hegel's *Logic* and Marx's *Capital*', in Moseley (ed.) 1993.
- 2002a, 'Capital in General and Marx's Capital' in Campbell and Reuten (eds.) 2002.
- 2002b, *The New Dialectic and Marx's 'Capital'*, Leiden: Brill.
- 2005a, 'Reply to Critics', *Historical Materialism*, 13, 2: 189–221.
- 2005b, 'Value and Money' in Moseley (ed.) 2005.
- 2008, 'Dissemination and Reception of The *Grundrisse*: USA, Britain, Australia and Canada', in Musto (ed.) 2008.
- 2009a, 'Contradiction and Abstraction: A Reply to Finelli', *Historical Materialism*, 17, 1: 170–82.
- 2009b, 'The Possessive Spirit of Capital: Subsumption/Inversion/Contradiction', in Bellofiore and Fineschi (eds.) 2009.
- Arthur, Christopher J. and Geert Reuten (eds.) 1998, *The Circulation of Capital: Essays on Volume Two of Marx's 'Capital'*, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Backhaus, Hans-Georg 1969, 'Zur Dialektik der Wertform', in Schmidt (ed.) 1969.
- 1974, 'Materialien zur Rekonstruktion der Marxschen Werttheorie', *Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen Theorie*, 1, Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- 1975, 'Materialien zur Rekonstruktion der Marxschen Werttheorie 2', *Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen Theorie*, 3, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- 1978, 'Materialien zur Rekonstruktion der Marxschen Werttheorie 3', *Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen Theorie*, 11, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- 1980, 'On the Dialectics of The Value-Form', *Thesis Eleven*, 1: 99–120.
- 1997, *Dialektik der Wertform. Untersuchungen zur marxschen Ökonomiekritik*, Freiburg: ça ira.
- Balconi, Margherita 2002, 'Tacitness, codification of Technological Knowledge and The Organization of Industry', *Research Policy*, 31, 3: 357–79.
- Baldissara, Luca (ed.) 2001, *Le radici della crisi. L'Italia tra gli anni Sessanta e gli anni Settanta*, Rome: Carocci.

- Balibar, Etienne and Immanuel Wallerstein 1988, *Race nation classe. Les identités ambiguës*, Paris: La Découverte.
- Banaji, Jairus 1979, 'From The Commodity to Capital: Hegel's Dialectic in Marx's *Capital*', in Elson (ed.) 1979.
- Barrett, Michèle 1986, 'Introduction', in Engels 1972.
- Bartolovich, Crystal and Neil Lazarus (eds.) 2002, *Marxism, Modernity, and Postcolonial Studies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Basso, Luca 2001, 'Critica dell'individualismo moderno e realizzazione del singolo nell'*Ideologia tedesca*', *Filosofia politica*, 2: 233–56.
- 2012a [2008], *Marx and Singularity. From the Early Writings to the 'Grundrisse'*, translated by Arianna Bove, Leiden: Brill.
- 2008, 'Tra forme precapitalistiche e capitalismo: il problema della società nei *Grundrisse*,' in Sacchetto and Tomba (eds.) 2008.
- 2012b, *Agire in comune. Antropologia e politica nell'ultimo Marx*, Verona: ombre corte.
- Bellofiore, Riccardo 1982, 'L'operaismo italiano e la critica dell'economia politica, *Unità Proletaria*', 1–2, 100–12.
- 1989, 'A Monetary Labor Theory of Value', *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 21, 1–2: 1–25.
- 1998, 'The Concept of Labor in Marx', *International Journal of Political Economy*, 28, 3: 4–34.
- (ed.) 1998, *Marxian Economics. A Centenary Appraisal, Volume I, Essays on Volume III of Capital: Method, Value and Money*, London: Macmillan.
- 1999, 'After Fordism, What? Capitalism at The End of The Century: Beyond the Myths', in Riccardo Bellofiore (ed.) 1999, *Which Labour Next? Global Money, Capital Restructuring And The Changing Patterns of Production*, Aldershot: Elgar.
- 2001, 'I lunghi anni Settanta. Crisi sociale e integrazione economica internazionale', in Baldissara (ed.) 2001.
- 2002, 'Transformation and the Monetary Circuit: Marx as a Monetary Theorist of Production', in Campbell and Reuten (eds.) 2002.
- 2004, 'Marx and The Macro-foundation of Microeconomics', in Riccardo Bellofiore and Nicola Taylor (eds.) 2004.
- 2007, 'Quelli del lavoro vivo', in Riccardo Bellofiore (ed.) 2007, *Da Marx a Marx? Un bilancio dei marxismi italiani del Novecento*, Rome: manifestolibri.
- 2008a, 'La farfalla e il vampiro. Sulla teoria marxiana del valore e della crisi', *Alternative per il socialismo*, 1, 1: 32–43.
- 2008b, 'Dai *Manoscritti del 1844* al *Capitale*, e ritorno. Storia e natura, universalità e lavoro, crisi e lotta di classe nei *Grundrisse*', in Sacchetto and Tomba (eds.) 2008.
- 2009a, 'A Ghost Turning into A Vampire. The Concept of Capital and Living Labour', in Bellofiore and Fineschi (eds.) 2009.
- 2009b 'Teoria del valore, crisi generale e capitale monopolistico. Napoleoni in dialogo con Sweezy', *Quaderni materialisti*, 7: 9–48.
- Bellofiore, Riccardo and Roberto Finelli 1998, 'Capital, Labour and Time. The Marxian Monetary Labour Theory of Value as a Theory of Exploitation', in Bellofiore (ed.) 1998.
- Bellofiore, Riccardo and Roberto Fineschi (eds.) 2009, *Re-reading Marx: New Perspectives after The Critical Edition*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bellofiore, Riccardo and Joseph Halevi 2009a, 'Deconstructing Labour. What Is "New" in Contemporary Capitalism and Economic Policies: a Marxian-Kaleckian Perspective', in Gnos and Rochon (eds.) 2009.
- 2009b, 'A Minsky Moment? The 2007 Subprime Crisis And The "New" Capitalism', in Gnos and Rochon (eds.) 2009.
- Bellofiore, Riccardo and Nicola Taylor (eds.) 2004, *The Constitution of Capital: Essays on Volume I of Marx's Capital*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bellofiore, Riccardo and Massimiliano Tomba 2008, 'Quale attualità dell'operaismo', in Wright 2008.
- 2009, 'Lesarten des Maschinesfragments. Perspektiven und Grenzen des operaistischen Auseinandersetzung mit Marx', in Van der Linden and Roth (eds.) 2009.

- Bensaïd, Daniel 1996, *Marx l'intempestif: Grandeurs et misères d'une aventure critique (XIX^e, XX^e siècles)*, Paris: Fayard.
- Bettelheim, Charles 1975, *Economic Calculation and Forms of Property*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bidet, Jacques 2005, 'The Dialectician's Interpretation of Capital', *Historical Materialism*, 13, 2: 121–46.
- 2007, *Exploring Marx's Capital: Philosophical, Economic and Political Dimensions*, translated by David Fernbach, Leiden: Brill.
- Bidet, Jacques and Stathis Kouvelakis (eds.) 2008, *Critical Companion to Contemporary Marxism*, Leiden: Brill.
- Boldyrew, Igor 1989, 'Wie und wann entstand das 1. Kapitel der Erstauflage des "Kapitals" (1867)?', *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 27: 157–65.
- Bond, Patrick 1999, 'Uneven Development', in O'Hara (ed.) 1999.
- Bonefeld, Werner 1992, 'Social Constitution and the Form of the Capitalist State', in Bonefeld, Gunn and Psychopedis (eds.) 1992.
- 1995, 'Capital as Subject and the Existence of Labour', in Bonefeld *et al.* (ed.) 1995.
- 2001, 'The permanence of primitive accumulation: commodity fetishism and social constitution', in *The Commoner*, 2, available at: <http://www.commoner.org.uk/02bonefeld.pdf>.
- 2010, 'Abstract Labour: Against its Nature and on its Time', *Capital & Class*, 34, 2: 257–76.
- Bonefeld, Werner, Richard Gunn, and Kosmas Psychopedis (eds.) 1992, 'Introduction', in Bonefeld, Gunn and Psychopedis (eds.) 1992a.
- (eds.) 1992a, *Open Marxism. Volume 2: Theory and Practice*, London: Pluto Press.
- (eds.) 1992b, *Open Marxism. Dialectics and History*, London: Pluto Press.
- Bonefeld, Werner, *et al.* (ed.) 1995, *Emancipating Marx, Open Marxism 3*, London: Pluto Press.
- Boyd, Richard 1979, 'Metaphor and Theory Change', in Ortony (ed.) 1979.
- 1999, 'Kinds as the "Workmanship of Men": Realism, Constructivism, and Natural Kinds', in Nida-Rumelin (ed.) 1999.
- Braverman, Harry 1998, *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, New York: Monthly Review.
- Brenner, Robert 2002, *The Boom and The Bubble*, London: Verso.
- 2006 [1998], *The Economics of Global Turbulence*, London: Verso.
- and Mark Glick 1991, 'The Regulation Approach: Theory and History', *New Left Review*, 188: 45–119.
- Brewster, Ben 1997 [1970], 'Glossary', in Althusser and Balibar 1997.
- Browne, M. 1999, 'Glenn Seaborg, Leader of the Team that found Plutonium, dies at 86', *The New York Times*, 27 February, 1999; Section A, p. 1.
- Brunner, Otto, 1968, 'Das "Ganze Haus" und die alteuropäische "Ökonomik"', *Neue Wege der Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Brunner, Otto, Werner Conze and Reinhart Koselleck (eds.) 1992, *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, Volume 2, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Burkett, Paul and John Bellamy Foster 2009, 'The Podolinsky Myth: an Obituary', *Historical Materialism*, 16, 1: 115–61.
- Burns, Tony 2000, 'Marx and Scientific Method: a Non-Metaphysical View', in Burns and Fraser (eds.) 2000.
- Burns, Tony and Ian Fraser (eds.) 2000, *The Hegel-Marx Connection*, London: MacMillan Press.
- Butler, Judith 2006 [1989], *Gender Trouble: Feminism & The Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge.
- Caffentzis, George 1999, 'On the Notion of a Crisis of Social Reproduction: A Theoretical Review' in Dalla Costa and Dalla Costa (eds.) 1999.
- 2008, 'Dai Grundrisse al Capitale e oltre: allora e adesso', in Sacchetto and Tomba (eds.) 2008.
- Camfield, David 2007, 'The Multitude and the Kangaroo: A Critique of Hardt and Negri's Theory of Immaterial Labour', *Historical Materialism*, 15, 2: 21–52.
- Campbell, Martha 1993, 'Marx's Concept of Economic Relations and The Method of Capital', in Moseley (ed.) 1993.

- 1997, 'Marx's Theory of Money: A Defense', in Moseley and Campbell (eds.) 1997.
- 2005, 'Marx's Explanation of Money's Functions: Overturning the Quantity Theory,' in Moseley (ed.) 2005.
- Campbell, Martha and Geert Reuten (eds.) 2002, *The Culmination of Capital: Essays on Volume 3 of Capital*, London: Palgrave.
- Carandini, Andrea 1979, 'L'anatomia della scimmia'. *La formazione economica della società prima del capitale*, Turin: Einaudi.
- Carchedi, Guglielmo 1987, *Class Analysis and Social Research*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- 1993, 'Marx's Logic of Inquiry and Price Formation' in Moseley (ed.) 1993.
- 2009, 'The Fallacies of "New Dialectics" and Value-Form Theory', *Historical Materialism* 17, 1: 145–69.
- Carnap, Rudolf 1959 [1930–1], 'The Old and the New Logic', in Ayer (ed.) 1959.
- Carver, Terrell (ed.) 2002, *Later Political Writings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chakrabarty Dipesh 2000, *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chattopadhyay, Paresh 1992, 'The Economic Content of Socialism. Marx vs. Lenin', *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 24, 3/4: 90–110.
- 2001, 'Marx on Women's Question', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36, 26: 2455–7.
- Cleaver, Harry 1992, 'The Inversion of Class Perspective in Marxian Theory: From Valorisation to Self-Valorisation', in Bonefeld, Gunn and Psychopedis (eds.) 1992a.
- Dalla Costa, Mariarosa and Selma James 1973, *The Power of Women and The Subversion of the Community*, Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- Dalla Costa, Mariarosa and Giovanna Franca Dalla Costa (eds.) 1999, *Women, Development and The Labour of Reproduction*, Lawrenceville, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Dankert, Clyde E. Floyd C. Mann and Herbert R. Northrup (eds.) 1965, *Hours of Work*, New York: Harper & Row.
- De Angelis, Massimo 1995, 'Beyond The Technological and Social Paradigms: A Political Reading of Abstract Labour as the Substance of Value', *Capital and Class*, 57: 107–34.
- 2007, *The Beginning of History: Value Struggles and Global Capital*, London: Pluto Press.
- De Beauvoir, Simone 1989 [1949], *The Second Sex*, translated by H.M. Parshley, New York: Vintage.
- De Janvry, Alain 1981, *The Agrarian Question and Reformism in Latin America*, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- Dechert, Charles R. (ed.) 1996, *The Social Impact of Cybernetics*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Denison, Edward F. 1962, *The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States and the Alternatives Before Us*. Supplemental Paper, 13, New York: Committee for Economic Development.
- Derrida, Jacques 1994, *Spectres of Marx*, New York: Routledge.
- Dragstedt, Albert (trans.) 1976, *Value: Studies by Karl Marx*, London: New Park Publications.
- Dumont, Louis 1977, *Homo aequalis. Genèse et épanouissement de l'idéologie économique*, Paris: Gallimard.
- 1983, *Essais sur l'individualisme. Une perspective anthropologique sur l'idéologie moderne*, Paris: Seuil.
- Dunayevskaya, Raya 1989, *Filosofía y Revolución. De Hegel a Sartre y de Marx a Mao*, Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
- Dussel, Enrique 1985, *La producción teórica de Marx. Un comentario a los 'Grundrisse'*, Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
- 1990, 'Marx's Economic Manuscripts of 1861–63 and The "Concept" of Dependency', *Latin American Perspectives*, 17, 2: 62–101.
- 2001 [1988], *Towards an Unknown Marx: A Commentary on the Manuscripts of 1861–63*, New York: Routledge.
- 2008, 'The Discovery of the Category of Surplus Value', in Musto (ed.) 2008.
- Dyer-Witheford, Nick 1999, *Cyber-Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Elbe, Ingo 2008, *Marx im Westen. Die neue Marx-Lektüre in der Bundesrepublik seit 1965*, Berlin: Akademie.

- Eldred, Michael, and Marnie Hanlon 1981, 'Reconstructing Value-Form Analysis', *Capital & Class*, 13: 24–60.
- Elson, Diane (ed.) 1979, *Value: The Representation of Labour in Capitalism*, Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press Inc., and London: CSE Books.
- Engels, Friedrich 1972, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- 1975–2005, 'Letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht, 1 March 1879', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 45.
- Engelskirchen, Howard 2007, 'Why is This Labour Value? – Commodity Producing Labour as a Social Kind', in Pearce and Frauley (eds.) 2007.
- 2008, 'On the Clear Comprehension of Political Economy: Social Kinds and the Significance of §2 of Marx's *Capital*', in Groff (ed.) 2008.
- 2011, *Capital as a Social Kind: Definitions and Transformations in the Critique of Political Economy*, London: Routledge.
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne 1992, *Myths of Gender: Biological Theories about Men and Women*, New York: Basic Books.
- Federici, Silvia 1974, *Wages Against Housework*, Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- 2004, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*, New York: Autonomedia.
- Fetscher, Iring (ed.) 1966, *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels: Studienausgabe in 4 Bänden, Volume 2: Politische Oekonomie*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Finelli, Roberto 1987, *Astrazione e dialettica dal romanticismo al capitalismo. Saggio su Marx*, Rome: Bulzoni.
- 2007, 'Abstraction versus Contradiction: Observations on Chris Arthur's *The New Dialectic and Marx's "Capital"*', *Historical Materialism* 15, 2: 61–74.
- 2008, 'Marxismo della "contraddizione" e marxismo dell' "astrazione"', in Sacchetto and Tomba (eds.) 2008.
- Fineschi, Roberto 2001, *Ripartire da Marx. Processo storico ed economia politica nella teoria del 'capitale'*, Naples: La Città del Sole.
- 2006a, *Marx e Hegel. Contributi a una rilettura*, Rome: Carocci.
- 2006b, 'Nochmals zum Verhältnis Wertgorn – Geldsform – Austauschprozess', *Neue Aspekte von Marx' Kapitalismus Kritik*, Berlin: Argument.
- 2008, *Un nuovo Marx. Filologia e interpretazione dopo la nuova edizione storico-critica (MEGA²)*, Rome: Carocci.
- 2009a, '"Capital in General" and "Competition" in the Making of Capital: The German Debate', *Science & Society*, 17, 1: 54–76.
- 2009b, 'Dialectic of the Commodity and Its Exposition. The German Debate in the 1970s – A Personal Survey', in Bellofiore and Fineschi (eds.) 2009.
- 2011, 'Überlegungen zu Marx' Plänen einer Kapitaltheorie zwischen 1857 und 1865' in Vollgraf, Sperl and Hecker (eds.) 2011.
- Foley, Duncan 1986, *Understanding Capital: Marx's Economic Theory*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Francois, William 1964, *Automation: Two Centuries in the Making*, New York: Collier Books.
- Fraser, Ian 1997, 'Two of a kind: Hegel, Marx, Dialectic and Form', *Capital and Class*, 61: 81–106.
- Freeman, Alan, Andrew Kliman and Julian Wells (eds.) 2004, *The New Value Controversy and the Foundations of Economics*, London: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Fumagalli, Andrea 2008, *Bioeconomia e capitalismo cognitivo*, Rome: Carocci.
- Gambino, Ferruccio 2003, *Migranti nella tempesta. Avvistamenti per l'inizio del nuovo millennio*, Verona: Ombre Corte.
- Gidwani, Vinay 2004, 'The Limits to Capital: Questions of Provenance and Politics', *Antipode*, 36, 3: 521–42.
- 2008, 'Capitalism's Anxious Whole: Fear, Capture and Escape in the Grundrisse', *Antipode*, 40, 5: 857–8.
- Gilbert, Alan 1981, *Marx's Politics. Communists and Citizens*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Givsan, Hassan 1981, *Materialismus und Geschichte. Studie zu einer radikalen Historisierung der Kategorien*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Glassman, Jim 2006, 'Primitive accumulation, accumulation by dispossession,

- accumulation by “extra-economic” means’, *Progress in Human Geography*, 30: 608–25.
- Gnos, Claude and Louis-Phillipe Rochon (eds.) 2009, *Credit, Money and Macroeconomic Policy. A Post-Keynesian Approach*, Cheltenham: Elgar.
- Groff, Ruth (ed.) 2008, *Revitalizing Causality: Realism About Causality in Philosophy and Social Science*, London: Routledge.
- Gulli, Bruno 2005, *Labour of Fire: The Ontology of Labour Between Economy and Culture*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Haraway, Donna 1991, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, New York: Routledge.
- Harman, Chris 2002, ‘The Workers of the World’, *International Socialism*, 2, 96, available at: <<http://pubs.socialist-reviewindex.org.uk/isj96/harman.htm>>.
- 2007, ‘The rate of profit and the world today’, *International Socialism*, 115: 141–61.
- Hart, Herbert Lionel Adolphus 1970, *The Concept of Law*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Harvey, David 1981, ‘The Spatial Fix: Hegel, Von Thunen, and Marx’, *Antipode*, 13, 3: 1–12.
- 1982, *The Limits to Capital*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 2006, ‘Notes Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development’, in *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*, New York: Verso.
- 2010, *A Companion to Marx’s Capital*, New York: Verso.
- Hatem, Jad 2006, *Marx, Philosophe du mal*, Paris: L’Harmattan.
- Haug, Wolfgang Fritz (ed.) 1997, *Historisch-Kritisches Wörterbuch des Marxismus*, Band 3, Hamburg: Argument.
- Head, Simon 2003, *The New Ruthless Economy: Work and Power in the Digital Age*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hecker, Rolf 1987, ‘Zur Entwicklung der Werttheorie von der 1. zur 3. Auflage des ersten Bandes des “Kapitals” von Karl Marx (1867–1883)’, *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch*, 10: 147–98.
- 1995, ‘Zur Herausgeberschaft des “Kapitals” durch Engels. Resümee der bisherigen Edition in der MEGA², UTOPIE kreativ, Berlin: 14–24.
- 1997, ‘Einfache Warenproduktion’, in Haug (ed.) 1997.
- 2009, ‘New Perspectives Opened by the Publication of Marx’s Manuscripts of Capital, Vol. II’, in Bellofiore and Fin-eschi (eds.) 2009.
- Hecker, Rolf, Jürgen Jungnickel and Carl-Erich Vollgraf 1989, ‘Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des ersten Bandes des “Kapitals” (1867 bis 1890)’, *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 27: 16–32.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 1977 [1807], *Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1995/6, *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- 1996a, *Wissenschaft der Logik*, volume 1, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- 1996b, *Wissenschaft der Logik*, volume 2, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- 1969, *Hegel’s Science of Logic*, translated by Arnold V. Miller, George Allen & Unwin.
- 1975 [1873], *Hegel’s Logic*, translated by William Wallace, with a foreword by John Niemeyer Findlay, Clarendon Press.
- 1999 [1812–16], *Hegel’s Science of Logic*, Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.
- Heinrich, Michael 1989, ‘Capital in General and the Structure of Marx’s Capital. New Insights from Marx’s “Economic Manuscript of 1861–63”’, *Capital & Class*, 38: 63–79.
- 1999, *Die Wissenschaft vom Wert. Die Marxsche Kritik der politischen Ökonomie zwischen wissenschaftlicher Revolution und klassischer Tradition*, Überarbeitete und erweiterte Neuauflage, Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- 2003, *Die Wissenschaft vom Wert. Die Marxsche Kritik der politischen Ökonomie zwischen wissenschaftlicher Revolution und klassischer Tradition*, third edition, Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- 2004, ‘Ambivalences of Marx’s Critique of Political Economy as Obstacles for the Analysis of Contemporary Capitalism’, available at: <<http://www.oekonomiekritik.de/310Ambivalences.rtf>>.
- 2007a, ‘Review Article: Karl Marx, *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie, Dritter Band*’, *Historical Materialism*, 15: 195–210.

- 2007b, 'Begründungsprobleme. Zur Debatte über das Marxsche "Gesetz vom tendenziellen Fall der Profitrate"', in *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch*, 2006, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- 2009, 'Reconstruction or Deconstruction? Methodological Controversies about Value and Capital, and New Insights from the Critical Edition', in Bellofiore and Fineschi (eds.) 2009.
- 2011, 'Entstehungs- und Auflösungsgeschichte des Marxschen *Kapitals*', in Bonefeld and Heinrich (eds.) 2011.
- Hempel, Carl 1965, *Aspects of Scientific Explanation and other Essays in the Philosophy of Science*, New York: Free Press.
- Henschel, Bernhard, Werner Krause and Hans-Manfred Miltz 1989, 'Die wissenschaftliche Bedeutung und die Übersetzungsproblematik der französischen Ausgabe des ersten Bandes des "Kapitals" von 1872–1875', *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch*, 12: 184–202.
- Hilferding, Rudolf 1981 [1910], *Finance Capital: A Study of the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development*, edited and introduced by Tom Bottomore, translated by Morris Watnick and Sam Gordon, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hindess, Barry and Hirst, Paul 1975, *Pre-capitalist Modes of Production*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1964, 'Introduction', in Marx 1964.
- hooks, bell 1981, *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*, Boston: South End Press.
- Howitt, William 1838 [2002], *Colonization and Christianity. A Popular History of the Treatment of the Natives by the Europeans in All Their Colonies*, London: Book-Surge Publishing.
- Huws, Ursula 2003, *The Making of a Cyberariat: Virtual Work in a Real World*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- (ed.) 2007, *Defragmenting: Towards a Critical Understanding of the New Global Division of Labour*, London: Merlin.
- (ed.) 2008, *Break or Weld? Trade Union Responses to Global Value Chain Restructuring*, London: Merlin.
- Iacono, Alfonso Maurizio 1982, *Il borghese e il selvaggio: l'immagine dell'uomo isolato nei paradigmi di Defoe, Turgot e Adam Smith*, Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Ilyenkov, Evald 1982 [1960], *The Dialectics of the Abstract and the Concrete in Marx's 'Capital'*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Iñigo Carrera, Juan 1992, *El Conocimiento Dialéctico*, Buenos Aires: Centro para la Investigación como Crítica Práctica.
- 2003, *El Capital: Razón Histórica, Sujeto Revolucionario y Conciencia*, Buenos Aires: Ediciones Cooperativas.
- 2007, *Conocer el capital hoy. Usar críticamente 'El capital'*, Vol. 1, Buenos Aires: Imago Mundi.
- 2008 [2003], *El Capital: Razón Histórica, Sujeto Revolucionario y Conciencia*, Buenos Aires: Imago Mundi.
- Inwood, Michael 1992, *A Hegel Dictionary*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jaffe, Hosea 2007, *Davanti al colonialismo: Engels, Marx e il marxismo*, Milan: Jaca Book.
- Jahn, Wolfgang and Dietrich Noske 1979, *Arbeitsblätter zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 7.
- Jahn, Wolfgang and Roland Nietzold 1978, 'Probleme der Entwicklung der Marxschen politischen Ökonomie im Zeitraum von 1850 bis 1863', in *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch*, 1: 145–74.
- Jahn, Wolfgang and Thomas Marxhausen 1983, 'Die Stellung der "Theorien über den Mehrwert" in der Entstehungsgeschichte des "Kapitals"', in *Der zweite Entwurf des "Kapitals"*: *Analysen – Aspekte – Argumente*, Berlin: Dietz Verlag.
- Jani, Pranav 2002, 'Karl Marx, Eurocentrism, and the 1857 Revolt in British India', in Bartolovich and Lazarus (eds.) 2002.
- Janoska, Judith (ed.) 1994, *Das 'Methodenkapitel' von Karl Marx*, Basel: Schwabe.
- Jevons, William Stanley 1970 [1871], *The Theory of Political Economy*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Joja, Athanase 1969, *La Lógica Dialéctica y las Ciencias*, Buenos Aires: Juárez Editor.
- Jungnickel, Jürgen 1989, 'Die Stellung der 2. Auflage des ersten Bandes des "Kapitals" in der Entwicklungsgeschichte der ökonomischen Theorie von Marx', in *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch*, 12: 92–125.

- Kabadayi, Mustafa Erdem and Tobias Reichardt (eds.) 2007, *Unfreie Arbeit. Ökonomische und kulturgeschichtliche Perspektiven*, Hilesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Kain, Philip J. 1992, 'Modern Feminism and Marx', *Studies in Soviet Thought*, 44, 3: 159–92.
- Karatani, Kojin 2003, *Transcritique: on Kant and Marx*, Boston: MIT Press.
- Kates, Gary 1995, *Monsieur d'Eon is a Woman: A Tale of Political Intrigue and Sexual Masquerade*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kay, Geoffrey 1999, 'Abstract Labour and Capital', *Historical Materialism*, 5: 225–79.
- Kelly, Joan 1982, 'Early Feminist Theory and the "Querelle des Femmes"', 1400–1789', *Signs*, 8, 1: 4–28.
- Keynes, John Maynard 1963, 'The Economic Prospects of Our Grandchildren', in *Essays in Persuasion*, New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Kicillof, Alex and Guido Starosta 2007a, 'On Materiality and Social Form: A Political Critique of Rubin's Value-Form Theory', *Historical Materialism*, 15, 3: 9–43.
- 2007b, 'Value-Form and Class Struggle. A Critique of the Autonomist Theory of Value', *Capital and Class*, 92: 1–32.
- Kliman, Andrew 2007, *Reclaiming Marx's 'Capital': A Refutation of the Myth of Inconsistency*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Kornblith, Hilary 1993, *Inductive Inference and its Natural Ground: An Essay in Naturalistic Epistemology*, Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- 2002, *Knowledge and Its Place in Nature*, New York: Oxford.
- Koselleck, Reinhart 2000, *Zeitschichten: Studien zur Historik*, mit einem Beitrag von Hans-Georg Gadamer, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Kouvelakis, Stathis 2005, 'Marx e la critica della politica', in Musto (ed.) 2005.
- Krader, Lawrence (ed.) 1974, *The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx*, Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Krahl, Hans Jürgen 1971, *Konstitution und Klassenkämpfe*, Frankfurt: Verlag Neue Kritik.
- Krätke, Michael R. 2008a, 'The First World Economic Crisis of 1857–8', in Musto (ed.) 2008.
- 2008b, 'Marx's Book of Crisis of 1857–8', in Musto (ed.) 2008.
- Kuhn, Thomas 1970 [1962], *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, second edition, Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Lazzarato, Maurizio 1996, 'Immaterial Labour', in Virno and Hardt (eds.) 1996.
- Le Goff, Jacques 1960, 'Au Moyen Age: temps de l'Eglise et temps du marchand', *Annales economies, sociétés, civilisations*, XV, 3: 417–33.
- Lebowitz, Michael A. 2003, *Beyond Capital. Marx's Political Economy of the Working Class*, second edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lefebvre, Henri 1984 [1969], *Lógica formal, lógica dialéctica*, Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
- Lefort, Claude 1978, *Les formes de l'histoire. Essais d'anthropologie politique*, Paris: Gallimard.
- 1986, 'Marx: From One Vision of History to Another', in *The Political Forms of Modern Society*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Lenin, Vladimir 1939 [1915], *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, New York: International.
- 2000 [1899], *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, in Lenin 1964–72, Volume 3, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- 1964–72, *Collected Works*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Lietz, Barbara 1987a, 'Zur Entwicklung der Werttheorie in den "Ergänzungen und Veränderungen zum ersten Band des "Kapitals" (Dezember 1871–Januar 1872)', *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 23: 26–33.
- 1987b, 'Ein Ausgangsmaterial für die 2. deutsche Auflage und die autorisierte französische Ausgabe des ersten Bandes des "Kapitals"', *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 24: 76–84.
- Linebaugh, Peter 2008, *The Magna Carta Manifesto*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Locke, John 1975 [1690], *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, edited by P.H. Nidditch, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lohmann, Georg 1991, *Indifferenz und Gesellschaft*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

- Lukács, Georg 1967 [1923], *History and Class Consciousness*, London: Merlin Press.
- Luxemburg, Rosa 1913, *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals*, Berlin: Vorwärts.
- Mandel, Ernest 1971, *The Formation of the Economic Thought of Karl Marx: 1843 to 'Capital'*, translated by Brian Pearce, New York: Monthly Review.
- Mann, Geoff 2008, 'A Negative Geography of Necessity', *Antipode*, 40, 5: 921–34.
- Mann, Geoff and Joel Wainwright 2008, 'Marx Without Guardrails: Geographies of the *Grundrisse*', *Antipode*, 40, 5: 848–56.
- Marcuse, Herbert 1928, 'Beiträge zu einer Phänomenologie des Historischen Materialismus', *Philosophische Hefte*, 1: 45–68.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro 1991, *Dialéctica de la dependencia*, Mexico: Ediciones Era.
- Marramao, Giacomo 1975/6, 'Theory of Crisis and the Problem of Constitution', *Telos*, 26: 143–64.
- 1982, *Lo Político y las Transformaciones. Crítica del Capitalismo e Ideologías de la Crisis entre los Años 20 y 30*, Mexico City: Pasado y Presente.
- Marx, Karl 1852, 'Excerpt from Volume XIX', unpublished excerpt-notebook, International Institute of Social History (IISG), archival collections, call no. B61, Amsterdam.
- 1857–8a [1987], *Economic Manuscripts of 1857–58*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 29.
- 1857–8b [1973], *Grundrisse*, translated by Martin Nicolaus, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- 1858a [1974], 'Urtext "Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie"' in Marx 1983.
- 1858b [1987], 'Original Text of A Contribution to The Critique of Political Economy' in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 29.
- 1859 [1987], *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 29.
- 1861–63a [1988], *Economic Manuscript of 1861–63*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 30.
- 1861–63b [1991], *Economic Manuscript of 1861–63*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 33.
- 1867a [1977], *Capital Volume I*, translated by Ben Fowkes, New York: Vintage Books.
- 1867b, *Das Kapital. Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, Erster Band, Hamburg, in Marx and Engels 1976–, volume II/5.
- 1872–5, *Le Capital*, Paris, in Marx and Engels 1976–, volume II/7.
- 1883, *Das Kapital. Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, Erster Band, Hamburg, in Marx and Engels 1976–, Vol. II/8.
- 1911 [1859], *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Chicago: C. H. Kerr.
- 1939–41 [1857–8], *Grundrisse der Kritik*, Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt.
- 1952 [1890], *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie, Erster Band, Buch I: Der Produktionsprozess des Kapitals*, in Marx and Engels 1956–1990, volume 23.
- 1954, *Briefe über 'Das Kapital'*, Berlin: Dietz Verlag.
- 1959, *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy. Volume III The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole*, edited by F. Engels, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- 1963a [1847], *The Poverty of Philosophy*, New York: International Publishers.
- 1963b [1861–3], *Theories of Surplus Value*, volume 1, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- 1964, *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- 1965 [1867], *Capital Volume I*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- 1966a [1861–79], *Capital Volume III*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- 1966b [1867], 'Ware und Geld' (*Das Kapital*, 1. Auflage 1867, 1. Buch Kapital 1), in Fetscher (ed.) 1966.
- 1967 [1867], *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume I*, translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, New York: International Publishers.
- 1968 [1853], *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels on Colonialism*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- 1969, *Le Capital, Livre I*, Paris: Garnier-Flammarion.
- 1970 [1859], *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, translated by S. W. Ryazanskaya and edited by Maurice Dobb, New York: International Publishers.
- 1971 [1861–3], *Theories of Surplus Value*, Part III, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- 1972 [1894E], *Das Kapital: Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie. Vol. III, Der Gesamtprozeß der kapitalistischen Produktion*, edited by Friedrich Engels, in Marx and Engels 1956–1990, Vol. 25.
- 1973 [1857–8], *Grundrisse*, translated by Martin Nicolaus, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- 1974, 'Briefe. Oktober 1864 bis Dezember 1867', in Marx and Engels 1956–1990, volume 31.
- 1974a [1894U], *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Vol. III, The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole*, 1909 translation of Marx 1972 by Ernest Untermann, London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- 1975, *El Capital. Tomo 1*, translated by Pedro Scaron, Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
- 1975–2005a, *Grundrisse*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 28.
- 1975–2005b, 'Machinery and Modern Industry', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 25.
- 1975–2005c, 'Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 29.
- 1975–2005d, *Capital Volume I*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 35.
- 1975–2005e, 'Letter to Annenkov, 28 December 1846', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 38.
- 1975–2005f, 'Letter to Weydemeyer, 5 March 1852', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 39.
- 1975–2005g, 'Wage Labour and Capital', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 9.
- 1975–2005h, 'Economic Manuscript of 1861–63. A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (Continuation)' in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 33.
- 1976a, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. 1, translated by Ben Fowkes, London: Penguin.
- 1976b, 'Results of the Immediate Process of Production', in Marx 1976a.
- 1976c, *Capital Volume I* first edition [1867], in Dragstedt (trans.) 1976.
- 1976–81, 'Ökonomische Manuskripte 1857/58', 2 volumes, in Marx and Engels 1976–, II/1.
- 1976–82, *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe (MEGA)*, Division 2, Volume 3, Parts 1–6, Berlin: Dietz Verlag.
- 1977 [1859], *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, New York: International Publishers.
- 1978, *The German Ideology*, in Tucker (ed.) 1978.
- 1979, *The Future Results Of British Rule In India*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, volume 12.
- 1981 [1894F], *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Volume III, translated by David Fernbach. New York: Penguin.
- 1982 [1843], *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1983 [1857–8], *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie (1857–58)*, in Marx and Engels 1956–1990, Vol. 42.
- 1986 [1857–8], *Economic Works 1857–1858*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, volume 28, translated by Ernst Wangermann, New York: International.
- 1987 [1857–8], *Economic Works 1857–1861*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 29.
- 1987a [1866], 'Letter to Kugelmann, 13 October 1866', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 42.
- 1987b [1868], 'Letter to Engels, 8 January 1868', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 42.
- 1988 [1861], *Economic Works 1861–3*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, volume 30, translated by Ben Fowkes and Emile Burns, New York: International Publishers.
- 1989a, *Economic Manuscript of 1861–3*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 32, New York: International Publishers.
- 1990a [1867], *Capital Volume I*, translated by Ben Fowkes, London: Penguin.
- 1991, 'Economic Manuscript of 1861–1863 (Continuation)', translated by Ben Fowkes, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 33.
- 1991a, 'Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie. Erster Band. Hamburg 1890', in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Gesamtausgabe, MEGA*² II/10.
- 1991b, *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy*, Volume III, translated by David Fernbach, London: Penguin.

- 1992a, *Karl Marx. Early Writings*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- 1992b [1894], *Ökonomische Manuskripte 1863–1867* in Marx and Engels 1976–, II/4, edited by Manfred Müller, Jürgen Jungnickel, Barbara Lietz, Christel Sander, and Artur Schnickmann, Berlin/Amsterdam: Dietz Verlag/Internationales Institut für Sozialgeschichte Amsterdam.
- 1992c, *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy*, Volume II, translated by David Fernbach, London: Penguin.
- 1993 [1857–8], *Grundrisse*, translated by Martin Nicolaus, London: Penguin Books.
- 1994, *Economic Works 1861–64*, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 34.
- 1996, *Capital* Volume I, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 35.
- 1998, *Capital* Volume III, in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 37.
- 2002 [1879–80], 'Notes on Adolph Wagner', in Carver (ed.) 2002, *Later Political Writings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2003, 'Manuskripte zum dritten Buch des Kapitals. 1871 bis 1882' in Marx and Engels 1976–, II/14.
- 2005 [1847], *The Poverty of Philosophy*, [United States]: Elibron Classics.
- 2006 [1857–8], *Ökonomische Manuskripte 1857/58* in Marx and Engels 1976–, II, 1, Amsterdam: Akademie.
- 2008, 'Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie, zweiter Band. Hamburg 1885', in Marx and Engels 1976–, II/13, Berlin: Dietz.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels 1956–1990, *Werke*, edited by Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus, Berlin: Dietz.
- 1973, *Briefe. Januar 1856 bis Dezember 1859*, in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels 1956–1990, Vol. 29.
- 1975a, 'The Holy Family' in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 4.
- 1975b, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- 1975–2005, *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, 50 volumes, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- 1976–, *Gesamtausgabe (MEGA²)*, Berlin: Dietz Verlag.
- 1983, 'Letter to Engels, 8 October 1858', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 40.
- 1986, 'Letters. January 1856–December 1859', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 40.
- 1992a [1863–67], 'Ökonomische Manuskripte 1863–67', Teil II, *MEGA* II, Abteilung, Band 4.2, Berlin: Dietz Verlag.
- 1992b, 'Letters 1880–83', in Marx and Engels 1975–2005, Vol. 46.
- 2004 [1845–6], *The German Ideology*, New York: International Publishers.
- Mattick, Paul 1993, 'Marx's Dialectic', in Moseley (ed.) 1993.
- Mazzone, Alessandro (ed.) 2002, *MEGA²: Marx ritrovato*, Rome: Mediaprint.
- Meaney, Mark 2002, *Capital as Organic Unity: The Role of Hegel's 'Science of Logic' in Marx's 'Grundrisse'*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Mephram, John 1989, 'The *Grundrisse*: Method or Metaphysics', in Rattansi (ed.) 1989.
- and David-Hillel Ruben (eds.) 1979, *Issues in Marxist Philosophy, Volume One Dialectics and Method*, Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Midnight Notes Collective 1992, 'The New Enclosures', in *Midnight Oil: Work, Energy, War 1973–1992*, edited by the Midnight Notes Collective, New York: Autonomedia.
- Minsky, Hyman P. 1975, *John Maynard Keynes*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mohri, Kenzo 1979, 'Marx and 'Underdevelopment'', *Monthly Review*, 30, 11: 32–42.
- Mohun, Simon (ed.) 1994, *Debates in Value Theory*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Morgan, Lewis H. 1877, *Ancient Society, Or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization*, London: MacMillan & Company.
- Moseley, Fred (ed.) 1993, *Marx's Method in 'Capital'*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- 1993, 'Marx's Logical Method and the "Transformation Problem"' in Moseley (ed.) 1993.
- 1995, 'Capital in General and Marx's Logical Method: A Response to Heinrich's Critique', *Capital and Class*, 55.

- 1997, 'The Development of Marx's Theory of the Distribution of Surplus-Value', in Moseley and Campbell (eds.) 1997.
- 2000, 'The New Solution to the Transformation Problem: A Sympathetic Critique', *Review of Radical Political Economics*.
- 2002, 'Hostile Brothers: Marx's Theory of the Distribution of Surplus-value in Volume 3 of *Capital*', in Reuten and Campbell (eds.) 2002.
- (ed.) 2005, *Marx's Theory of Money: Modern Appraisals*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 2008, 'The Development of Marx's Theory of the Distribution of Surplus-Value in the Manuscript of 1861–63', in Bellofiore and Fineschi (eds.) 2009.
- and Martha Campbell (eds.) 1997, *New Investigations of Marx's Method*, Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press International.
- Moulier-Boutang, Yann 2002, *Dalla schiavitù al lavoro salariato*, Rome: manifestolibri.
- Müller, Manfred 1978, 'Auf dem Wege zum "Kapital". Zur Entwicklung des Kapitalbegriffs von Marx in den Jahren 1857–1863', Berlin DDR: das europäische Buch.
- 1983, 'Die Bedeutung des Manuskripts "Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie" 1861–1863', in *Der zweite Entwurf. Analyse – Aspekte – Argumente*, Berlin DDR.
- Müller, Wolfgang, and Christel Neusüss 1975, 'The Illusion of State Socialism and the Contradiction between Wage Labor and Capital', *Telos*, 25: 13–90.
- Munzer, Steven R. 1990, *A Theory of Property*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murray, Patrick 1988, *Marx's Theory of Scientific Knowledge*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.
- 1993, 'The Necessity of Money: How Hegel Helped Marx to Surpass Ricardo's Theory of Value', in Moseley (ed.) 1993.
- 2000, 'Marx's "Truly Social" Labour Theory of Value. Part I, Abstract Labour in Marxian Value Theory', *Historical Materialism*, 6, 27–65.
- 2005, 'The New Giant's Staircase', *Historical Materialism*, 13, 2: 61–83.
- 2006, 'In Defence of the "Third Thing Argument": A Reply to James Furner's "Marx's Critique of Samuel Bailey"', *Historical Materialism*, 14, 2: 149–68.
- 2009, 'The Place of "The Results of the Immediate Production Process" in *Capital*', in Bellofiore and Fineschi (eds.) 2009.
- Musto, Marcello (ed.) 2005, *Sulle tracce di un fantasma. L'opera di Karl Marx tra filologia e filosofia*, Rome: Manifestolibri.
- 2008, 'History, Production and Method in the 1857 "Introduction"', in Musto (ed.) 2008.
- (ed.) 2008, *Karl Marx's Grundrisse. Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy 150 Years Later*: Routledge.
- Napoleoni, Claudio 1975 [1973], *Smith Ricardo Marx*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- 1976, *Valore*, Milan: Isedi.
- Negri, Antonio 1998 [1979], *Marx oltre Marx. Quaderno di lavoro sui "Grundrisse"*, Rome: manifestolibri.
- 1991, *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*, translated by Harry Cleaver, Michael Ryan and Maurizio Viano, New York: Autonomedia.
- 1992, *Fin de Siglo*, Barcelona: Paidós Iberica/I.C.E.-U.A.B.
- 1999, 'De la Transición al Poder Constituyente' in Negri and Guattari 1999.
- Negri, Antonio and Felix Guattari 1999, *Las Verdades Nomadas & General Intellect, Poder Constituyente, Comunismo*, Barcelona: Akal.
- Nicolaus, Martin 1993 [1973], 'Foreword' in Marx 1993.
- Nida-Rümelin, Julian (ed.) 1999, *Rationality, Realism Revision (Perspectives in Analytical Philosophy)*, 23, Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 52–89.
- Niebyl, Karl H. 1946, *Studies in the Classical Theories of Money*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Nietzold, Roland, Hannes Skambraks and Günter Wermusch (eds.) 1978, "'...unsrer Partei einen Sieg erringen". Studien zur Entstehungs- und Wirkungs-

- geschichte des "Kapitals" von Karl Marx*, East Berlin: Die Wirtschaft.
- Nimtze, August 2002, 'The Eurocentric Marx and Engels and Other Related Myths', in Bartolovich and Lazarus (eds.) 2002.
- Northrup, Herbert R. 1965, 'The Reduction in Hours' in Dankert, Mann and Northrup (eds.) 1965.
- O' Hara, Phillip Anthony (ed.) 1999, *The Encyclopedia of Political Economy*, London: Routledge.
- Ong, Nai-Pew 1983, 'The Logic of Marx's Theory of Money', *Social Concept*, 1, 1: 30–54.
- Ortony, Andrew (ed.) 1979, *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pappe, H.O. 1951, 'Wakefield and Marx', *The Economic History Review*, 4, 1: 88–97.
- Pateman, Carole 1988, *The Sexual Contract*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Pearce, Frank and Jon Frauley (eds.) 2007, *Critical Realism and the Social Sciences: Heterodox Elaborations*, edited by F. Pearce and J. Frauley, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Peet, Richard 1981, 'Historical Forms of the Property Relation: A Reconstruction of Marx's Theory', *Antipode*, 13, 3: 13–25.
- PEM (Projektgruppe Entwicklung des Marx'schen Systems) 1973, *Das Kapital vom Geld*, West Berlin: VSA.
- 1978, *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie (Rohentwurf)*. *Kommentar*, Hamburg: VSA.
- Pétré-Grenouilleau, Olivier 2004, *Les traites négrières. Essai d'histoire globale*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Postone, Moishe 1993, *Time, Labor and Social Domination: a Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Psychopedis, Kosmas 1992, 'Dialectical Theory: Problems of Reconstruction' in Bonefeld, Gunn and Psychopedis (eds.) 1992.
- Rattansi, Ali (ed.) 1989, *Ideology, Method and Marx: Essays from Economy and Society*, London: Routledge.
- Reichelt, Helmut 1973 [1970], *La struttura logica del concetto di capitale in Marx*, Bari: De Donato.
- 1995, 'Why did Marx Conceal his Dialectical Method?' in Bonefeld *et al.* (eds.) 1995.
- 2007, 'Marx's Critique of Economic Categories: Reflections on the Problem of Validity in the Dialectical Method of Presentation in *Capital*', *Historical Materialism*, 15: 3–52.
- 2008, *Neue Marx-Lektüre. Zur Kritik sozialwissenschaftlicher Logik*, Hamburg: VSA.
- Reuten, Geert 1988, 'Value as Social Form' in Williams (ed.) 1988.
- 1993, 'The Difficult Labour of a Theory of Social Value: Metaphors and Systematic Dialectics at the Beginning of Marx's *Capital*', in Moseley (ed.) 1993.
- 1997, 'The Notion of Tendency in Marx's 1894 Law of Profit', in Moseley and Campbell (eds.) 1997.
- 2004, "'Zirkel vicieux" or trend fall?; the course of the profit rate in Marx's "Capital III"', *History of Political Economy*, 36, 1: 163–86.
- 2005, 'Money as Constituent of Value' in Moseley (ed.) 2005.
- Ricardo, David 1821 [1817–21], *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, London: John Murray.
- Riedel, Manfred 1992, 'Gesellschaft-Gemeinschaft', in Brunner, Conze and Koselleck (eds.) 1992.
- Robles-Baez, Mario L. 2004, 'On the Abstraction of Labour as a Social Determination' in Freeman, Kliman and Wells (eds.) 2004.
- Rosdolsky, Roman 1977 [1968], *The Making of Marx's 'Capital'*, London: Pluto Press.
- Roth, Regina 2009, 'Karl Marx's Original Manuscripts in the Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe (MEGA): Another View on *Capital*', in Bellofiore and Fineschi (eds.) 2009.
- Rovatti, Pier Aldo 1973, *Critica e scientificità in Marx*, Milan: Feltrinelli.
- Rubin, Isaak Illich 1972 [1928], *Essays on Marx's Theory of Value*, translated by Milos Samardzija and Fredy Perlman, Detroit: Black & Red.
- 1994 [1927], 'Abstract Labour and Value in Marx's System', in Mohun (ed.) 1994.

- Ryle, Gilbert 1984, *The Concept of Mind*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Saad-Filho, Alfredo 2002, *The Value of Marx*, London: Routledge.
- Sacchetto, Devi 2008, 'Mobilità della forza lavoro e del capitale. Alcune note a partire dalle esperienze dell'Europa orientale', in Sacchetto and Tomba (eds.) 2008.
- Sacchetto, Devi and Massimiliano Tomba (eds.) 2008, *La lunga accumulazione originaria. Politica e lavoro nel mercato mondiale*, Verona: Ombre Corte.
- Schkedow, Wlamidir 1987, 'Die Untersuchungsmethode der Entstehungs- und Entwicklungsgeschichte der kapitalistischen Produktionsweise im "Kapital"', in *Marxistische Studien. Jahrbuch des IMSF* 12, I: 232–7.
- Schmidt, Alfred (ed.) 1969, *Beiträge zur marxistischen Erkenntnistheorie*, Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- 1971, *The Concept of Nature in Marx*, London: NLB
- 1971a, *Geschichte und Struktur. Fragen einer marxistischen Historik*, Munich: Hanser.
- Schrader, Fred E. 1980, *Restauration und Revolution. Die Vorarbeiten zum 'Kapital' von Karl Marx in seinen Studienheften 1850–1858*, Hildesheim: Gerstenberg.
- Schwartz, Nancy L. 1979, 'Distinction Between Public and Private Life. Marx on the *zoon politikon*', *Political Theory*, 2: 245–66.
- Schwarz, Winfried 1974, 'Das "Kapital im Allgemeinen" und die "Konkurrenz" im ökonomischen Werk von Karl Marx. Zu Rosdolskys Fehlinterpretation der Gliederung des "Kapital"', in *Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen Theorie*, 1, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- 1978, *Vom 'Rohentwurf' zum 'Kapital'. Die Strukturgeschichte des Marxschen Hauptwerkes*, West Berlin: das europäische Buch.
- 1987, 'Die Geldform in der 1. und 2. Auflage des "Kapital". Zur Diskussion um die "Historisierung" der Wertformanalyse', in *Marxistische Studien. Jahrbuch des IMSF*, 12, I: 200–13.
- Scott, Joan 1988, 'Deconstructing Equality versus Difference, or, The Uses of Poststructuralist Theory for Feminism', *Feminist Studies*, 14, 1: 33–50.
- Semmel, Bernard 1961, 'The Philosophical Radicals and Colonialism', *The Journal of Economic History*, 21, 4: 513–25.
- Shanin, Teodor 1983, *Late Marx and the Russian Road. Marx and 'the Peripheries of Capitalism'*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Shortall, Felton 1994, *The Incomplete Marx*, Aldershot: Avebury.
- Silberman, Charles E. 1966, *The Myths of Automation*, New York: Harper.
- Silver, Beverly J. and Lu Zhang 2008, 'Cina: l'epicentro emergente del conflitto operaio mondiale?', in Sacchetto and Tomba (eds.) 2008.
- Skambraks, Hannes 1978, 'Der Platz des Manuskripts "Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie" von 1861–1863 im Prozeß der Ausarbeitung der proletarischen politischen Ökonomie durch Karl Marx', in Nietzold, Skambraks and Wermusch (eds.) 1978.
- Smith, Adam 1852 [1776], *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, London: T. Nelson & Sons.
- Smith, Neil 1984, *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*, London: Blackwell.
- 2005, *Endgame of Globalization*, New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Tony 1990, *The Logic of Marx's 'Capital'*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- 1993, 'Marx's Capital and Hegelian Dialectical Logic', in Moseley (ed.) 1993.
- 2000, *Technology and Capital in the Age of Lean Production. A Marxian Critique of the 'New Economy'*, Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- 2005, *Globalisation: A Systematic Marxian Account*, Leiden: Brill.
- Sofri, Gianni 1969, *Il modo di produzione asiatico*, Turin: Einaudi.
- Spivak, Gayatri 1994, 'Responsibility', *boundary 2*, 21, 3: 19–64.
- 1999, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason. Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stamford Raffles, Thomas 1817, *History of Java and its Dependencies*, London: Black, Parbury and Allen.
- Staples, David E. 2006, *No Place Like Home: Organizing Home-Based Labour in the*

- Era of Structural Adjustment*, New York: Routledge.
- Starosta, Guido 2003, 'Scientific Knowledge and Political Action: On the Antinomies of Lukács' Thought in *History and Class Consciousness*', *Science and Society*, 67, 1: 39–67.
- 2004, 'Rethinking Marx's Mature Social Theory', *Historical Materialism*, 12, 3: 43–52.
- 2005, *Science as Practical Criticism. An Investigation into Revolutionary Subjectivity in Marx's Critique of Political Economy*, unpublished PhD thesis, Coventry: Department of Sociology, University of Warwick.
- Strathern, Marilyn 1992, *Reproducing the Future: Essays on Anthropology, Kinship, and the New Reproductive Technologies*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Texier, Jacques 1992, 'Les formes historiques du lieu social dans les Grundrisse de Karl Marx', *Actuel Marx*, 11: 137–70.
- Theolald, Robert 1966, 'Cybernetics and the Problems of Social Reorganization' in Dechert (ed.) 1996.
- Tomba, Massimiliano 2002. *Crisi e critica in Bruno Bauer. Il principio di esclusione come fondamento del politico*. Naples: Bibliopolis.
- 2007, 'Differentials of Surplus-Value in the Contemporary Forms of Exploitation', *The Commoner*, 12: 23–37.
- 2009, 'From History of Capital to History in *Capital*', in Bellofiore and Fineschi (eds.) 2009.
- Tombazos, Stavros 1994, *Le temps dans l'analyse économique. Les catégories du temps dans le capital*, Paris: Chaier des saisons.
- Tomich, Dale W. 2004, *Through the Prism of Slavery. Labor, Capital, and World Economy*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Toporowski, Jan 2002, 'La banque mutuelle: de l'utopie au marché des capitaux. Le cas britannique', *Révue d'Économie Financière*, September, 67, 45–55.
- Toscano, Alberto 2007, 'From Pin Factories to Gold Farmers: Editorial Introduction to a Research Stream on Cognitive Capitalism, Immaterial Labour, and the General Intellect', *Historical Materialism*, 15, 1: 3–12.
- Tronti, Mario 1971, *Operai e capitale*, second edition, Turin: Einaudi.
- Trotsky, Leon 1959 [1932], *The History of the Russian Revolution*, edited by Frederick Wilcox Dupee, New York: Doubleday.
- 2002, *The Transitional Program [Electronic Version]*, retrieved February 10, 2005, available at: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/works/1938-tp/transprogram.pdf>.
- Tuchscheerer, Walter 1980 [1968], *Prima del 'Capitale'. La formazione del pensiero economico di Marx (1843/1858)*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Tucker, Robert (ed.) 1978, *The Marx Engels Reader*, New York: W.W. Norton.
- Turchetto, Maria 2008, 'From "Mass Worker" to "Empire": The Disconcerting Trajectory of Italian *Operaismo*', in Bidet and Kouvelakis (eds.) 2008.
- Twain, Mark 1961 [1905], *King Leopold's Soliloquy*, New York: International.
- Uchida, Hiroshi 1988, *Marx's 'Grundrisse' and Hegel's 'Logic'*, London: Routledge.
- Vadée, Michel 1992, *Marx penseur du possible*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- van der Linden, Marcel 2007, *Warum gab (und gibt) es Sklaverei im Kapitalismus? Eine einfache und dennoch schwer zu beantwortende Frage*, in Kabadayi and Reichardt (eds.) 2007.
- and Karl-Heinz Roth (eds.) 2009, *Über Marx Hinaus: Arbeitsgeschichte und Arbeitsbegriff in der Konfrontation mit den globalen Arbeitsverhältnissen des 21. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin: Assoziation A.
- Vercellone, Carlo 2007, 'From Formal Subsumption to General Intellect: Elements for a Marxist Reading of the Thesis of Cognitive Capitalism', *Historical Materialism*, 15, 1: 13–36.
- Virno, Paolo 2007, 'General Intellect', *Historical Materialism*, 15, 3: 3–8.
- and Michael Hardt (eds.) 1996, *Radical Thought in Italy. A Potential Politics*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Vygodskij, Vitali S. 1967, *Geschichte einer großen Entdeckung*, Berlin: Die Wirtschaft.
- 1975, *Il pensiero economico di Marx*, Rome: Editori Riuniti.
- Vollgraf, Carl-Erich, Richard Sperl und Rolf Hecker (eds.) 2011, *Das 'Kapital' und*

- Vorarbeiten, *Entwürfe und Exzerpte*, Berlin: Argument.
- Wainwright, Joel 2008a, 'Uneven Developments: From *Grundrisse* to *Capital*', in *Antipode*, 40, 5: 879–97.
- 2008b, *Decolonizing Development: Colonial Power and the Maya*, London: Blackwell.
- Wajcman, Judy 1991, *Feminism Confronts Technology*, University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Wakefield, Edward G. 1849, 'A View of the Art of Colonization, With Present Reference to the British Empire', in *Letters Between a Statesman and a Colonist*, London: John Parker.
- 1967 [1834], *England and America: A Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations*, New York: Harper & Brothers.
- 2001 [1849], 'A View of the Art of Colonization, With Present Reference to the British Empire', in *Letters Between a Statesman and a Colonist*, Kitchener, Ontario: Batoche Books Limited.
- Walker, Richard 1978, 'Two Sources of Uneven Development Under Advanced Capitalism: Spatial Differentiation and Capital Mobility', *Review of Radical Political Economy*, 10, 3: 28–37.
- Wendling, Amy 2009, *Karl Marx on Technology and Alienation*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Williams, Michael (ed.) 1988, *Value, Social Form and the State*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Wilson Hugh T. 1991, *Marx's Critical/Dialectical Procedure*, London: Routledge.
- Wolff, Edward N. 2002, *Recent Trends in Living Standards in the United States*, New York: New York University and the Jerome Levy Economics Institute.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins 2008, 'Historical Materialism in "Forms Which Precede Capitalist Production"', in Musto (ed.) 2008.
- Wright, Steve 2002, *Storming Heaven. Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*, London: Pluto Press.
- 2005, 'Reality Check: Are We Living in an Immaterial World?', *Mute (Underneath the Knowledge Commons)*, 2, 1: 34–45.
- 2008, *L'assalto al cielo: per una storia dell'operaismo*, Rome: Edizioni Alegre.
- Zanini, Adelino 2007, 'Sui "fondamenti filosofici" dell'operaismo italiano', in Riccardo Bellofiore (ed.), *Da Marx a Marx? Un bilancio dei marxismi italiani del Novecento*, Rome: manifestolibri.
- Zittrain, Jonathan 2008, *The Future of the Internet – and How to Stop It*, New Haven: Yale University Press.