

The Determination of Concrete and Abstract Labour

Kjell Bjørgeengen

Translated by Filip Niklas, PhD.

Nature does not produce on the one side owners of money or commodities, and on the other men possessing nothing but their own labour-power. This relation has no *natural* basis, neither is its *social* basis one that is common to all historical periods. It is clearly the result of a past historical development, the product of many economic revolutions, of the extinction of a whole series of older forms of social production.

Karl Marx

Contents

Introduction.....	4
I. The Substance of the Commodity and of Value.....	5
II. Forms of Value.....	12
The Simple Form of Value	12
III. The Special Commodity Labour Power.....	19
IV. Formal and Real Subsumption of Labour under Capital	21
V. The Abstraction.....	24
VI. Desire	26
VII. Recognition and the Concept of the Concrete Labour	29
VIII. The Moments and Subsumption of the Labour Process	35
Bibliography	38

Introduction

This thesis is in the first instance an attempt to determine the substance of value in order to then follow its development and the most important presuppositions for the real subsumption of the labour process under capital. I then try to show how the concept of concrete work is constituted in Hegel's *Phänomenologie des Geistes*. In my interpretation of Hegel, I go against Marx's statement that Hegel *only* knows pure thinking and I attempt to show how one from Hegel's conceptions of recognition and desire can construe a concept about concrete social labour. (In this part I will also broach time as this was decisive in the determination of the substance of value.)

I. The Substance of the Commodity and of Value

The wealth of the societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails appears as a tremendous accumulation of commodities, the single commodity as its elementary form. Our investigation therefore begins with the analysis of the commodity.¹

When Marx in this way begins *Das Kapital* with the commodity, he does so because the commodity first under capitalism becomes the product's 'universal elementary form [allgemeine elementarische Form]'.² On this level, it is by necessity producing commodities.

The development of commodity production has to, on the other hand, have reached a certain level such that the formation of capital can freely develop and where the capitalistic production method can take root. 'We treat the commodity as such a presupposition, starting from it as the simplest element of capitalist production'.³ But the exchange of commodities forms only one condition for emergence of capital in history. Commodity production leads to capitalistic production in the moment the worker is expropriated from the means of production and the labour *power* itself takes on the form of a commodity.⁴ The expropriation of the worker from the means of production occurs historically by extra-economic force, and it would therefore be wrong if one from the commodity as a precondition tried to derive the emergence of capital historically.⁵

¹ 'Der Reichtum der Gesellschaften, in welchen kapitalistische Produktionsweise herrscht, erscheint als eine 'ungeheure Warensammlung', die einzelne Ware als seine Elementarform. Unsere Untersuchung beginnt daher mit der Analyse der Ware' (Marx, *Das Capital*, 49).

² Marx, "Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses", 92.

³ 'Als solche Voraussetzung behandeln wir die Ware, indem wir von ihr als dem einfachsten Element der kapitalistischen Produktion ausgehen' (Marx, "Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses", 90).

⁴ The slave is, for example, not separated from the production condition, but is himself a means of production like, for example, cows and goats.

⁵ Friedrich Engels interprets the commodity analysis as historical. The thinking of Marx is, in his "(Renzension zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie", 'not ... as the mirror image ... of the historical course [nicht ... als das Spiegelbild ... des historischen Verlaufs]' (*Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 13, 475).

The starting point of the investigation is the capitalistically produced commodity, which contains in itself its historical presuppositions, and it would be correct to say that Marx only in this respect has an element outside of capitalism contained at the outset. ‘What is first presented as its element later presents itself as its own [capitalistic KB] product.’⁶ The commodity contains as a historic presupposition its relation of value, but this is not yet generally developed, and at the outset this only exists in the universally developing commodity.

Marx says himself about his starting point:

What I am assuming is the simplest social form in which the product of labour is represented in *today's* [my emphasis, KB] society, and this is the “commodity”. I analyze it initially in the *form in which it appears*. Here I now find that, on the one hand, in its natural form it is a *useful thing*, that is, a *use value*; on the other hand, bearers of *exchange value*, and from this point of view even “exchange value” itself. Further analysis of the latter shows me that exchange value is only an “appearance”, an independent way of representing the value contained in the commodity.⁷

The commodity is first and foremost an external object, a thing that appears as a whole of properties both quantitative and qualitative. This thing’s usefulness turns it into a *use value*. To discover the thing’s different uses and purposes is a historical action (*geschichtliche Tat*). The unit of measure of the thing, for example, hangs both together with its peculiarity as an object and its springing out of conventions. The use value constitutes the materials content of wealth, something which will be common to all

⁶ ‘Was erst als ihr Element, stellt sich später als ihr [der kapitalistisches Produktion KB] eigenes Produkt dar’ (Marx, “Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses“, 90).

⁷ ‘Wovon ich ausgehe, ist die einfachste gesellschaftliche Form, worin sich das Arbeitsproduct in der jetzigen [my emphasis, KB] Gesellschaft darstellt, und dies ist die “Ware”. Sie analysiere ich, und zwar zunächst in der Form, worin sie ercheint. Hier finde ich nun, dass sie einerseits in ihrer Naturalform ein Gebrauchsding, alias Gebrauchswert ist; andererseits Träger von Tauschwert, und under diesem Gesichtspunkt selbst “Tauschwert”. Weitere Analyse des letzteren zeigt mir, dass der Tauschwert nur eine “Ercheinungsform”, selbständige Darstellungsweise des in der Ware enthaltenen Werts ist’ (Marx *Randglossen zu A. Wagners „Lehrbuch der politischen Ökonomie“*, 369).

production methods in history⁸, however, '[i]n the type of society we are looking at, they also form the material carriers of – exchange value.'⁹ Every use value actualizes itself first through use or consumption, that is to say, it is concrete, woven to the human being and its needs.

The *exchange value* appears as a quantitative relation, namely, as a proportion where the use values exchange among themselves. The exchange value seems at first to be completely arbitrary, inasmuch a commodity, for example, wheat, can be exchanged to the most divergent proportions with other commodities. That being so, the individual commodity's exchange value is the same whether it exchange with one commodity or another. 'It [the commodity's exchange value, KB] must therefore be distinguishable from these *various expressions*'.¹⁰ Whatever the exchange relation, one can put up the following equation: 20 yards of linen = 1 coat. Immediately, the equation says that the commodities in some sense are equal. 'Both are therefore equal to a *third*, which in and of itself is neither one nor the other. Each of the two, insofar as it has exchange value, must therefore, independently of the other, be reducible to this third.'¹¹ As objects of use, that is, as a result of the many different concrete labours that is put into the commodities, so are commodities things made of different materials whereby human needs are satisfied. 'Their *value-being*, in contrast, forms their unity.'¹² In the same way one dissolves figures into different triangles, the exchange value is reduced to a common substance of which it expresses more or less. This substance is constituted through an abstraction from the use value producing labour. 'The common social substance, which is

⁸ 'Labour is *not the source* to all wealth. *Nature* is as much a source to the use values ... as labour' (Marx, *Kritikk av Gotha-programmet*, 209).

⁹ 'In der von uns zo betrachtenden Gesellschaftsform bilden sie zugleich die stofflichen Träger des – Tauscherts.' (Marx, *Das Kapital*, 50).

¹⁰ 'Es muss also von diesen einen verschiedenen *Ausdruckweisen* unterscheidbar sein' (Marx, *Das Kapital – Ware und Geld*, 217).

¹¹ 'Beide sind also gleich einem *Dritten*, das an und für sich weder das eine, noch das andere ist. Jedes der beiden, soweit es Tauschwert, muss also, unabhängig von dem andern, auf dies Dritte reduzierbar sein.' (Marx, *Das Kapital – Ware und Geld*, 217).

¹² 'Ihr *Wertsein* bildet dagegen ihre Einheit' (Marx, *Das Kapital – Ware und Geld*, 217).

only constituted in different ways in different use values, is – work’, and continued; ‘As values, commodities are nothing but *crystallized* labour’.¹³

This value = abstract labour, that is to say, labour abstracted from all the different concrete labours, can be measured through that quantum of socially necessary labour¹⁴ that has gone into the manufacture of the commodity. The measure of this amount is the labour time: ‘As values, all commodities are only a certain amount of *congealed labour time*.’¹⁵ The equality that is sought must be separable from the concrete relation between two commodity makeups, which as concrete labour products are not equal but different. If one abstracts from the difference of the products, then one is left with the product as such, i.e. the only commonality is that the commodities are produced, that they are the result of labour. This is not immediately visible from the form: x commodity A = y commodity B. This form states only that when two different commodities set themselves equal in the exchange, then they set themselves as unequal, i.e. they set themselves equal to a third, but the form alone does not make explicit what this third is.

To find the unknown third, one has to dive down into the individual commodity’s material process of emergence and look at the commodity as a product of a concrete labour process. This concrete labour has resulted in two different products which proved to have a common unity. If the commodities are reduced to *products as such*, then so is also the labour that manufactures these products reduced to labour as such, and we have the abstract labour = the substance of value. Labour itself is not a product and has no value, and therefore it distinguishes itself from the commodities in the equation. (The common third has to be different from the products stated in the equation.) The labourer is, however, a product made up of nerves, flesh and blood, and may therefore, in the moment he becomes separated from the means of production, himself appear on the

¹³ ‘Die gemeinsame gesellschaftliche Substanz, die sich in verschiedenen Gebrauchswerten nur verschieden darstellt, ist – die arbeit ... Als Werte sind die Waren nichts als *kristallisierte Arbeit*’ (Marx, *Das Kapital – Ware und Geld*, 217).

¹⁴ Quantum social necessary labour is that labour time which goes into generating a use value with the average existing conditions of production and labour intensity.

¹⁵ ‘Als Werte sind alle Waren nur bestimmte Masse *festgeronnener Arbeitszeit*’ (Marx, *Das Kapital – Ware und Geld*, 218).

commodity market. The labourer then sells his labour power, the possibility to work, while the labour itself procures value without *itself* having value.¹⁶

Marx does not go any further in his reasons for the abstract labour in *Das Kapital*.¹⁷ Nonetheless, one finds in Marx approaches for continued argumentation. Marx says, in the commodity- and money chapter from 1867, that the two commodities in the equation have to ‘independent of the other, be reducible to the third’¹⁸; and in *Grundrisse*: ‘On the basis of *exchange values* (my emphasis, KB) is the work first *through by the exchange set* as general.’¹⁹ The commodities *appear* that they are equal in their actual exchange in the moment they are exchanged, but for the exchange to even take place, the labour put into each individual commodity has to be reduced to abstract general labour in advance. The problem is to find that property within the commodities that makes it possible that they can be put into the equation, and this property cannot be theoretically determined through an *ex post* investigation of two products that already are embedded in a equation. ‘It is only through its externalization that the individual labour really presents itself as its opposite. But the labour must have this general expression before it is externalized.’²⁰

¹⁶ ‘... what is bought and sold is the use of this capacity, i.e., the work itself [which is generated through the labour power’s consumption, KB], even though the value of the goods sold is not the value of the work (an irrational expression), but the value of labour capacity [... was gekauft wird und verkauft, ist der Gebrauch dieses Vermögens, also die Arbeit selbst, obgleich der Wert der verkauften Ware nicht der Wert der Arbeit (ein irrationeller Ausdruck), sondern der Wert des Arbeitsvermögens ist]’ (Marx, “Theorien über den Mehrwert”, 383).

¹⁷ ‘Marx lets the thorough demonstration here rely upon the fact that there does not exist any other *natural* property by the products that is common to them other than that they are the result of human labour and that their unity therefore lies in this labour [Marx lar her – gjennomgående – bevisføring bero på at da det ikke eksisterer noe annen *naturlig* egenskap ved produktene som er felles for dem enn at de er resultater av menneskelig arbeid, så ligger deres enhet nødvendigvis i dette arbeidet]’ (Sandemose, *Ricardo, Marx og Sraffa*, 136.)

¹⁸ ‘Unabhängig von dem andern, auf dies Dritte reduzierbar sein’ (Marx, *Das Kapital – Ware und Geld*, 217).

¹⁹ ‘Auf der Grundlage der Tauschwerte wird die Arbeit erst *durch* den *Austausch* als allgemein *gesetzt*’ (Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 88).

²⁰ ‘Nur durch ihre Veräußerung stellt sich die individuelle Arbeit wirklich als ihr Gegenteil dar. Aber die Arbeit muss diesen allgemeinen Ausdruck besitzen, bevor sie veräußert ist’ (*Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 26.3, 133).

As a result of Marx's account, a need presses itself forth to examine the commodity *before* it goes into the equation of x commodity A = y commodity B. We therefore pull one of the commodities *out* of the equation and try to examine it as is *an sich*. We see in the moment we pull out one product that it is a result of a material process of manufacture, in other words, of a concrete labour that can be measured in time. We have isolated the product and can measure the time that has gone into the production of *this* product. But already it proves to be difficult to maintain the isolation of the product. Since we say *this* product, then we have already said that it is *this*, not "this and that", and then we have already said that *this* product does not really let itself be separated from "this and that" in its property in being "this". In the moment we say *this*, then we have just defined the product as concrete and unique in relation to an infinite series of other products. And inasmuch as we have said that we can measure one concrete amount of labour in time, then we have already committed ourselves to say that we can measure all amounts of labour in time. We abstract therefore from the concrete time that has gone into the production of the individual product and posit the products equal in time. 'They have time in common.'²¹ Already in the attempt to isolate the unique product, we had to exactly isolate it, namely, to pull it out from all other products. The isolation presupposes initially the totality of the product. When the products were posited as equal in time, we abstracted from the different concrete labour times, and through a higher concept encompassing the concrete times we received an abstract labour time, a pure clock time that encompasses the sought after common third. The abstract labour time in reality expresses itself first completely through the development of gold as universally equivalent²², but the conceptual development of the universally equivalent presupposes that the products are put as equal in abstract labour time.

²¹ Sandemose, *Ricardo, Marx og Sraffa*, 28.

²² 'Labour, on the basis of exchange values, presupposes that neither the work of the individual nor his product is *immediately* universal; that it takes this form only through *mutual mediation*, through a different amount of money from it [Die Arbeit, auf Grundlage der Tauschwerte, setzt eben voraus, dass weder die Arbeit des Einzelnen noch sein Produkt *unmittelbar* allgemein; dass es diese Form erst durch eine *gegenständliche Vermittlung* erlangt, durch ein von ihm verschiedenes Geld]' (Marx, *Grundrisse*, 89).

When two commodities are exchanged, then is ‘their existence as embodied work their unity, their identical element. As such, they are qualitatively the same and are only differentiated quantitatively, depending on whether they represent more or less of the same, the working time’.²³ In order that the two commodities can be put as quantitatively equal, they must in advance²⁴ consist of the same amount of an equal *quality*. As use

²³ ‘...ihr Dasein als verkörperte Arbeit ihre *Einheit*, ihr *identisches Element*. Als solche sind sie qualitative dasselbe und unterscheiden sie sich nur noch *quantitativ*, je nachdem sie mehr oder weniger von *demselben*, der arbeitszeit, darstellen’ (Marx, *Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 26.3, 124).

²⁴ I will refer to Marx’s critique of Bailey in order to expand on this relation. Marx continues to argue here that the commodities must be put as equal before they enter into the exchange. Bailey says in his polemic against Ricardo: ‘Just as little can we speak of that distance one object possesses, without thereby also eye another object, which this and the former relation (namely, the distance) exist – we speak as such of one commodity’s value with a view to another commodity, of which it is compared with. A thing can just as little be valuable in itself without its relation to another, as a thing in itself can have *distance* without relation to another thing [Like lite som vi kan tale om den avstand en gjenstand besitter, uten dermed også ha for øye en annen gjenstand, mellom hvilken og den førstnevnte denne relasjonen (nemlig avstanden) eksisterer – slik kan vi også tale om en vares verdi med henblikk på en annen vare, som den blir sammenliknet med. En ting kan like lite være verdifull i seg selv uten gjennom sitt forhold til en annen ting, som en ting i seg selv kan ha *avstand* uten relasjon til en annen ting]’ (*Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 26.3, 140). And here, after Jørgen Sandemose (*Ricardo, Marx og Sraffa*, 138). – To this Marx replies that Bailey has not taken into account the relation that makes it so that the concept of distance between two things becomes meaningful. ‘When one thing has distance to another, then the distance is certainly a relation between the one thing and the other: but the distance is at the same time something different from this relation between the two things. It is *a dimension of the space*. It is a measure which well could express the distance between the two other things right next to those which actually were compared. But that is not all. If we speak of the distance as a relation between two things, then we presuppose something “immanent”, a kind of “property” of the things themselves, which enables them to have a distance to each other. What is the distance between the syllable A and a desk? [Translator’s note: originally, the object here is “table” but the Norwegian word does not contain the letter A, and the point is to show the potential infinite distance between a syllable not used directly in a word but nonetheless is serves to determine it negatively.] The question would be absurd. When we speak of the distance between to things, then we speak of their difference in space. Thus we set them equal by treated them both as spatial existents, and it is only after having set them as equal *sub specie spatii* that we identify them as different points in space. To belong to the space is their unity.’ ... ‘When he says that A has a distance to B, then he does not compare—does not set them as equal—but *differentiates* them spatially. They assume *not the same* space. Nonetheless, he utters of both that they are *spatial* and that they become differentiated as belonging to the space. He sets them thus first as equal and gives them the same unity. But the concern here is about setting as equal [Når en ting har en avstand til en annen, så er avstanden riktignok en relasjon mellom den ene tingen og den andre: men avstanden er samtidig noe forskjellig fra denne relasjonen mellom de to ting. Den er *en dimensjon av rommet*. Den er en lengde som godt kunne uttrykke avstanden mellom de to andre ting ved siden av de som faktisk ble sammenliknet. Med det er ikke alt. Hvis vi snakker om avstanden som en relasjon mellom to ting, så forutsetter vi noe «immanent», en slags «egenskap» ved tingene selv, som setter dem i stand til å ha en avstand til hverandre. Hva er avstanden mellom stavelsen A og et bord? Spørsmålet ville være absurd. Når vi taler om avstanden mellom to ting, så taler vi om deres forskjell i rommet. Dermed forutsetter vi at de begge er punkter i rommet. Dermed setter vi dem like ved å behandle dem begge som romlige eksistenser, og det er bare etter å ha satt dem lik *sub specie spatii* at vi identifiserer dem som forskjellige punkter i rommet. Å tilhøre rommet er deres enhet. ... Når han sier at A har en avstand til B, så sammenlikner han dem ikke, setter dem ikke like, men *differensierer* dem romlig. De inntar *ikke det samme* rom. Likevel utsier han om begge at de er *romlige* og at de blir differensiert sm tilhørende rommet. Han setter dem altså først like, gir dem den samme enhet. Men her dreier det seg om likesetting]’.

Because of that they are already put as equal ‘under the point of view of time’, the commodities are set into

values, the commodities are different, as a result of the most divergent kinds of concrete labour. Exchange value, however, which expresses the foundational value, is an expression that the commodity has a substance different from its existence as a thing. There is then no natural necessity in use value being infested with value, as this relation is historically and socially restricted and can therefore be dissolved. It is exactly the isolation by the producers from each other that makes it necessary to exchange the products. If the production was in its entirety controlled by a collective subject, then it would be immediately social, and the mediation of the products through exchange would fall away.²⁵

II. Forms of Value

The Simple Form of Value

The products of labour are now posited as equal in time. The equation “x commodity A = y commodity B” is possible because the species of commodities have shown themselves to contain a common substance; they are put qualitatively equal as parts of the abstract labour time. The relation of value is in reality a relation of equality, namely, a relation that expresses a commodity’s being as value. The commodity’s value receives in the equation an expression; it expresses itself in a relation where another species of commodity, for example, a coat, is current as its *Wesensgleiches* (identical in essence). The coat is an exchange value only to the extent that it is a thing-like expression of the abstract labour time.²⁶ The linen cannot relate to the coat and its corporeality without relating to it as a corporeality that contains abstract human labour, and ‘Labour time is

a relation that expresses the amount of abstract labour time which is put down into the product. ‘Commodities are already assumed as values, as *values* distinct from their use values, before this value can be represented in a particular commodity [Die Waren sind schon als Werte, als von ihren Gebrauchswerten unterschiedne *Werte* unterstellt, eh es sich von einer Darstellung dieses Werts in einer besondern Ware handeln kann]’ (Marx, *Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 26.3, 132).

²⁵ ‘Where work is communal, the relationships of people in their social production do not present themselves as “values” of “things” [Wo die Arbeit gemeinschaftlich ist, stellen sich die Verhältnisse der Menschen in ihrer gesellschaftlichen Produktion nicht als „values“ of „things“ dar]’ (Marx, *Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 26.3, 127).

²⁶ ‘The labour-time objectified in the use values of commodities is just as much the substance that makes them exchange values and therefore commodities, as their specific value measures [Die in den Gebrauchswerten der waren vergegenständlichte Arbeitszeit ist ebensowohl die Substanz, die sie zu Tauschwerten macht und daher zu Waren, wie sie ihre bestimmte Wertgrösse misst]’ (Marx, *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 18).

the living existence of work, indifferent to its form, its content and its individuality’.²⁷ The coat is a sensuous form of appearance of the value of the linen. ‘Thus, by means of the relation of value, or the value of one commodity, is expressed in the use value of another commodity; that is, in another commodity body different from itself.’²⁸ The linen puts itself qualitatively equal the coat in the moment it relates to the coat *as Vergegenständlichung gleichartiger* (objectification of like kinds) of human labour. But, in the moment one commodity relates itself to another as equal to itself, then not only does it separate the other commodity from its use value, but also separates itself from its own use value. ‘In equating the *other* commodity as value, it relates itself to itself as value. By referring to itself as value, and at the same time it differs from itself as use value. By expressing its value—and value is both value in general and quantitatively measured value—in the coat, it gives its value being a form of value that is different from its immediate existence.’²⁹

When the linen in this way appears as differentiated, then it appears as an actual commodity, a naturally useful thing that also has value. As an independent thing, the linen is a use value, and its value can only appear in the relation to another commodity that is put as qualitatively equal the linen and by the feature of being a material entity it also counts as a determined quantity. The value of the linen manifests itself first in its relation to the coat, and, in order to achieve a sensuous expression, the value has to assume a form outside the linen. The coat becomes the form of value which the value of the linen has to assume, and the linen doubles itself by giving the coat its form of value split from its own natural form. The linen cannot *express* its value in another value, because value is only abstract labour time and has no other existence besides this

²⁷ ‘Areitszeit ist das lebendige Dasein der Arbeit, gleichgültig gegen ihre Form, ihren Inhalt, ihre Individualität’ (Marx, *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 17).

²⁸ ‘So wird vermittelt des Wertverhältnisses, oder Werth einer Waare im Gebrauchswerth einer andern Waare ausgedrückt, d. h. in einem andern, von ihm selbst verschiedenartigen Waarenkörper’ (Marx, “Die Werthform“, 767).

²⁹ ‘Indem sie die *andere* Ware sich *als* Werth gleichsetzt, *bezieht sie sich auf sich selbst als Wert*. Indem sie sich auf sich selbst *als Wert* bezieht, unterscheidet sie sich zugleich *von sich selbst als Gebrauchswert*. Indem sie ihre Wertgrösse – und Wertgrösse ist beides, Wert überhaupt und quantitativ gemessener Wert – *im Rocke ausdrückt*, gibt sie ihrem *Wertsein* eine von ihrem unmittelbaren Dasein unterschiedene Wertform’ (Marx, *Das Kapital – Ware und Geld*, 226).

abstraction. The coat's natural form becomes a form of appearance of the value of the linen, which need not assume a form outside its own natural form to express the value of the *linen*. The coat assumes the form of being immediately *exchangeable* and is valid only as making corporeal the abstract labour time as such. That labour which is materialized in the coat *is* itself not abstract labour without determinations, but a determined useful labour, namely, the work of tailoring. Only in the concrete labour time³⁰ which is put down into the coat exists in this and posited as qualitatively *equal* to the abstract labour time. 'Human work in general, an expenditure of human labour power, is capable of any determination, but is in and for itself indeterminate. It can only materialize as soon as human labour-power is given in a *certain form*, as *determinate* labour, because only *determinate* work is opposed to a natural substance, an external material, in which it becomes objectified.'³¹ The moment the linen makes its value appear in the other commodity, and this commodity has a determined size or magnitude, then it makes its own value appear as exchange value in the other commodity. That commodity—the coat—in which the value is expressed, achieves the form of immediate exchangeability or the form of equivalence. The *form* of equivalence is exactly the essence of exchange as such and contains no quantitative determination but is only what the material quantity can be determined in. The linen expresses its value *relatively* in the use value of the coat, and this is on its side equivalent or exchangeable. The whole relation with both moments is inclusively grasped in the concept of *exchange value*.

Here it emerges logically for the first time the inversion that characterizes the whole of bourgeoisie. That the coat as use value is exchangeable seduces one to believe that the exchangeability itself is something that belongs to the coat in its property as a

³⁰ The labour time which is objectified in the coat is the concrete labour time that has gone into the production of *this* use value, and this time is filled with a particular content (tailoring). The concrete labour time which is put down in one product could, for example—if the productivity here is lower than normal in this production sphere—be longer than the value putting abstract labour time. A portion of the concrete labour time which is put down in *this* product will therefore not *count as* abstract labour time, but becomes unproductive.

³¹ 'Menschliche Arbeit schlechthin, Verausgabung, menschlicher Arbeitskraft, ist zwar jeder Bestimmung fähig, aber an und für sich unbestimmt. Verwirklichen, vergegenständlichen kann sie sich nur, sobald die menschliche Arbeitskraft in bestimmter Form vorausgibt wird, als bestimmte Arbeit, denn nur der bestimmten Arbeit steht ein Naturstoff gegenüber, ein äusseres Material, worin sie sich vergegenständlicht' (Marx, *Das Kapital – Ware und Geld*, 226).

thing. But the coat assumes this form only because the linen relates itself to it and uses it as a form of appearance for its own value. The linen relates itself to the corporeality of the coat only to the extent that this is *valid as* equal to itself and can make possible the appearance of the double character of the linen. The use value of the coat therefore becomes the appearance form of the value, and thereby the concrete labour that is put into this commodity becomes the form of appearance of the abstract labour. Further on, the labour time that has gone into the production of the coat now counts as the appearance of abstract labour time in general, since only in the product of labour does it obtain a sensuous existence.³²

The total or unfolded relative form of value is really just a continuation of the simple relative form of value where one commodity expresses its value in another commodity's use value. That 20 yards of linen can be put as equal to a coat determines at once that 20 yards of linen can be put as equal to any other type of commodity, since the coat is only valid here as matter for the value. The new form becomes 20 yards of linen = 1 coat, or 10 pounds of tea, or 2 ounces of gold, or what have you. Every other type of commodity becomes now a mirror to the value of the linen. The value hereby appears as undifferentiated human labour as such. The linen does not through its form of value stand in relation to an *individual* type of commodity, but to the world of commodities in its entirety. As a commodity, the thing has become a "citizen of this world". The value expresses itself now in an infinite series of other types of commodities, and shows thereby that it is indifferent with regards to the special use value it appears in.

One commodity is as good as the next. The determined natural forms of each commodity are *next to* each other *particular* forms of equivalents. Even though the singular commodity now expresses its value in an infinite series of particular equivalences, and in this way detaches from having to express itself in *one* special use value, the value expresses itself only in one particular equivalent at a time. The moment the value expresses itself in one particular equivalent, it misses its relationship to the

³² 'As exchange value, all commodities are only a certain amount of fixed labour time [Als Tauschwert sind alle Waren nur bestimmte Masse festgorennener Arbeitszeit]' (Marx, *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 18).

world of commodities as a whole and falls back to the simple relative form of value. The value has the possibility to express itself in all *other* commodities, but the relationship is lost sight of in the moment it actually expresses itself. The value displays moreover a lack insofar as it expresses itself in an *infinite* series of particular equivalents. If we look at the side of equivalents, then we see that it is the concrete labour as particular from everything else that ought to express the human labour as such. The abstract labour expresses itself in the gathered *circle of particular* forms of appearance, but in *this* way does not possess the abstract as a *united* expression. The infinite series of simple relative expressions of value can also be set up in the following way:

20 yards of linen = 1 coat

20 yards of linen = 10 pounds of tea

20 yards of linen = 2 ounces of gold, etc.

The new form of value of the linen distinguishes itself more completely from the use value of the linen in relation to the simple relative form of value, the moment the whole series of *other* possible use values become materials for the value. But the essential in this other form is when the value *can* express itself contingently in soon the one, soon the other commodity, and this simultaneously means that it can express itself in both the one and the other commodity.

Each of the equations in the unfolded relative form of value can without further ado be turned around, since the moment the value of the linen can express itself in all other commodities, then this also applies to the other commodities. We turn therefore the value equation in its unfolded relative form and receive the universal form of value:

1 coat =	}	20 yards of linen
10 pounds of tea =		
2 ounces of gold =		
x commodity A =		
etc.		

Now it is no longer just one value that expresses its value in the linen, but the entire world of commodities. All values express themselves now simply, i.e., in one simple corporeal commodity, and, unitarily, i.e., in the same corporeal commodity. The linen now applies to all the different commodities as their universal appearance of value. One commodity's form of value differentiates itself now not just as value from its own existence as use value (the simple form of value) but relates itself as value to all other commodities as being equal to itself. Mediated through the universal equivalence, the commodities posit themselves as equal to each other as value. The form of value aligns with the concept of value the moment it has achieved a universal character. The commodities now appear for one another as '...mere jelly of indistinguishable, uniform, human labour'.³³ The qualitative substance of value has received an expression of thinghood, and the world of commodities in its entirety puts itself as qualitatively equal and quantitatively comparable. The form of the linen as universally equivalent is the form for exchangeability with all other commodities, a natural form that has been given a universal social form. Even if the simple commodities contain different concrete labour and the labour that has been put into the linen is concrete too, what is *relevant* now is their form of appearance for the abstract labour as such. The commodities are not as immediate use value exchangeable, but they assume the form exchangeability between themselves through the mediation of the universal equivalence.

The development of the form of equivalence to universal equivalence is nothing else than a development of what was already contained in the simple relative form of

³³ '...blosse Gallerte unterschiedloser, gleichartiger, menschlicher Arbeit' (Marx, "Die Werthform", 779).

value. One commodity's value in the simple relative form of value is expressed simply in just one other type of commodity, but exactly which commodity this is turned out to be a matter of indifference. The commodity achieved here a form of value different from its own natural form. On the other hand, this commodity's equivalence only achieved a simple form of equivalence. The form was in the unfolded simple form of value generally the same, but the series was extended such that the linen could reflect its value in the *series* of possible particular equivalents. When this series became turned around, the world of commodities achieved a universal form of value by excluding the one particular commodity from itself so as to express the value simply and unitarily. The *excluded* commodity assumed thereby the form of universal equivalence. The world of commodities assumed its social form in the universal *relative* form of value only by excluding *one other* commodity from its relative form, and thereby they excluded themselves also from the universal form of equivalence. If the universal equivalence should also have the form of universal *relative* form of value, then we should have the equation 20 yards of linen = 20 yards of linen. It appears that in order to express the relative value that exists in the universal equivalent, we must turn around our last form and go back to the unfolded relative form of value. The unfolded relative form of value becomes in this way the specific relative form of value for the commodity that has taken the position as universally equivalent.

The transition to the form of money contains generally nothing new in relation to the universal form of value. Gold historically has taken the position as universally equivalent as the commodity the world of commodities have excluded from itself and reflects its values in.

The abstract labour time constitutes the substance of value and its immanent measure; it is a pure quality that is not suitable for anything other than quantification. Time, which itself is not thing-like, but a medium for life and history as such, appears now in spatial form in the gold. 'Time – what is not thing-like – appears as concretized in Gold.'³⁴ Gold is thus seen for natural consciousness to be wealth itself, but in reality, gold

³⁴ 'Zeit – das was nicht dinglich ist – erscheint als verdinglicht, im Geld' (Krahl, "Konstitution und Klassenkampf", 77).

represents as a commodity of money only labour time as that which was common to the commodities between themselves.

The commodities compare themselves with each other through gold in the form of money, and this shows itself in actuality when commodities are exchanged with each other through the help of money. Instead of the simple exchange of commodities where one commodity (C_1) is exchanged with another (C_2), we have the form, $C_1 - M - C_2$, where money mediates the exchange.

III. The Special Commodity Labour Power

Buying and selling of the commodity of labour power is specific to the capitalistic society. Labourer and capitalist meet each other in a market (more precisely the labour market) and exchange their commodities with each other. This exchange distinguishes itself in no way from the universal exchange of commodities, ‘the special use value of the commodities does not change the economic form of transaction, nor does it change the fact that the buyer represents money and the seller represents commodities’.³⁵ If we look at the sale of labour power, we then see that the *conditions* under which the labourer at all sells his labour power are special. He has no other commodity to sell. The sale of labour power presupposes that the worker is without property and that he has nothing else to sell than a special determination of himself, namely, the *ability* to work. The labourer is forced to sell his possibility of labour because he lacks what he needs to maintain life. The possibility to work is realized through the consumption of labour power. The labour itself is the labour power’s use value and provides as abstract labour value and as concrete labour use value. When the labourer exchanges his labour power for money, it seems as if the labourer is paid for the labour he performs. Especially it seems like this for the labourer himself since he does not get paid his wage before the labour power is

³⁵ ‘Der besondere Gebrauchswert der Waren ändert durchaus nichts an der ökonomischen Formbestimmtheit der Transaktion, nichts daran, dass der Käufer Geld und der Verkäufer Ware vorstellt’ (Marx, “Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses”, 29).

consumed in the process of production.³⁶ For example, he receives his wage after having *worked* a month.

The worker sells his labour power according to its value and the capitalist acquires its use value—the labour itself—in order to fuse it with the means of production. ‘Thus, although the *purchase and sale of labour capacity*, upon which the transformation of part of the capital into variable capital is *conditioned*, is a process separate and distinct from the *immediate process of production* and antecedent to it, it forms the *absolute basis* of the capitalist process of production and constitutes a *moment* of this process of production itself, if we consider it as a whole and not only at the moment of immediate commodity production.’³⁷

The exchange of the commodity labour power is a condition for the capitalistic process to get started, at the same time as it has shown itself that the split of society into propertyless and property possessors constitutes an absolute presupposition for this exchange taking place. The labourer does not enter into history as wage labourer before he is expropriated from the means of production, and ‘...money cannot become capital without being exchanged for labour capacity’.³⁸

The value of labour power is called variable capital (V), and the value of the means of production (instruments and raw material) are called constant capital (C). The means of production as well as labour-power are both actualized in the process of labour.

³⁶ If we compare, for example, the bartering system that the serf is subordinated, then one *sees* that this labours, for example, half a day for himself and half a day for the master. The slave on its side is fully owned by the master, and it looks like the slave *only* labours for the master, but in reality, he labours a portion of the day only to reproduce himself. For the wage labourer it seems like he is paid for the labour in its entirety since the extra labour does not sensibly let itself be separated.

The wage form secures also the reproduction of the very relation of capital. In the moment the labourer first receives his means of living after having laboured, he is forced continuously to labour in order for the salary to be paid out. All products accrue first the capitalist in the power of his property. A portion of the value is turned into wages only after this acquisition.

³⁷ ‘Obgleich also der *Kauf und Verkauf des Arbeitsvermögens*, wodurch die Verwandlung eines Teils des Kapitals in variables Kapital *bedingt* ist, ein vom *unmittelbaren Produktionsprozess* getrennter und selbständiger, ihm vorhergehender Prozess ist, bildet er *die absolute Grundlage* des kapitalistischen Produktionsprozess und bildet ein *Moment* dieses Produktionsprozesses selbst, wenn wir ihn als Ganzes betrachten und nicht nur im Augenblick der unmittelbaren Warenproduktion’ (Marx, “Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses”, 32).

³⁸ ‘Das Geld kann nicht Kapital werden, ohne sich gegen Arbeitsvermögen... auszutauschen’ (Marx, “Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses”, 32).

The moment the living labour is fused together with the means of production—and this is the use of variable capital—then the initial value of capital *varies* with a surplus value as a larger quantum of living labour is squeezed out than what is contained in the labour *power*.

From this one can express the difference between the process of production and the circulation process by that relation the labour power has to V in the circulation and the relation it has to C in the production. The double character of labour power as value and use value divides itself here in relation to the circulation process and the production process. In the exchange in the *circulation*, the capitalist receives the right of disposal of the labour power, and he actualizes, by the latter's consumption, its *use value*, the living labour in the *production process*. 'But what decided, what the specific use value of this commodity is, to be a source of value and of more value than itself. This is the specific service that the capitalist expects of it'.³⁹

IV. Formal and Real Subsumption of Labour under Capital

The capitalist, in the preceding, acquired the labour power of the commodity because this commodity's consumption generates a larger value than what is needed in order to reproduce the labour power, that is to say, to keep the labourer alive. When I said that the means of production *squeezed out* more labour out of the labourer than what corresponds to the value of labour power, then at this current stage the former is not immediately right. The moment the capitalist for the first time acquires the labour power in order to put its use in connection with the conditions of production, then this does not in the first instance change the *labour process* itself. The capital must subsume an already available concrete labour process under itself and must take its point of departure in a labour process whose technical nature is determined in advance. Marx calls this subsumption formal, since as formal it does not change the concrete labour process. It is therefore

³⁹ 'Wer aber entschied, wer der spezifische Gebrauchswert dieser Ware, Quelle von Wert zu sein und von mehr Wert, als sie selbst hat. Dies ist der spezifische Dienst, den der Kapitalist von ihr erwartet.' (Marx, *Das Kapital*, 208).

more accurate to say that the labourer generates a surplus of value, since a squeezing out of labour presupposes that the concrete labour process assumes new *modified* forms. At the current stage, the labourer is in one sense still a subject; he applies the means of production in an appropriate way, not the other way around. In another sense, the labourer is being reduced to a means, namely, means to complete the movement from money to more money (M – M'). This is the goal of production from the standpoint of *capital*.⁴⁰

Economically, the labourer is formally determined to a mere means for the value increasing process. Concretely, however, the labour process is the same as before it was subsumed under capital. The formal subsumption affects only the economical determination of form, not the technical content of the labour process.⁴¹

To complete the movement M – M', M has to change in V and C, that is, through the labour process generate a production volume that can again be transformed into M'. The movement M – M' must be conveyed through a material production of use values which is the bearer of value. But exactly the material production puts thereby *limits* for the movement of M – M'. The movement of M – M' is according to its abstract form *limitless*. The concrete labour process is limited by, for example, the length of the workday. The moment capital formally subsumes the labour process under itself as it finds it, it is also referred to an existing and limited force of production.

The contradiction between the abstract and concrete labour shows itself now in that capital, in its attempt to actually achieve its concept of M – M', has to change the

⁴⁰ 'The labour process becomes the means of the valorization process, the process of the self-valorization of capital – the production of surplus value. The labour process is subsumed under capital (it is its *own* process) and the capitalist enters the process as a conductor, manager; for *him* (my emphasis, KB) it is at the same time a direct process of exploiting someone else's work. This is what I call the *formal* subsumption of labour under capital [Der Arbeitsprozess wird zum Mittel des Verwertungsprozesses, des Prozesses der Selbstverwertung des Kapitals – der Fabrikation von Mehrwert. Der Arbeitsprozess wird subsumiert unter Das Kapital (es ist sein eigener Prozess) und der Kapitalist tritt in den Prozess als Dirigent, Leiter, es ist für ihn zugleich unmittelbar Exploitationsprozess fremder Arbeit. Dies nenne ich die formelle Subsumption der Arbeit unter das Kapital.]' (Marx, "Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses", 45).

⁴¹ Under the capitalist's control, the labour process is somewhat changed by the production becoming *distressed*, that is to say, the labourer can, for example, not take a break when it suits him, *the tool* must be treated carefully, etc. But this does not in itself change the technical level of development of the production.

material production process, that is to say, develop machinery. If the production process is developed without barriers, then it is clear that the existing labour process is not adequate and the labour process itself must be changed in order to increase the productivity. On the ground of the formal subsumption, ‘...a technologically and otherwise *specific* mode of production arises that transforms the *real nature of the labour process and its real conditions – the capitalist mode of production*’.⁴²

By the real subsumption of the labour process under capital and the following development of a large-scale industry, the inversion (*Verkehrung*) that happened when the M – M’ relation reduced the worker from a subject in the concrete working process to a means for the production of value, now enters an expanded validity. In the moment the material content of the concrete labour process is being modified, the labourer is not the subject that applies the means of labour, but the machine applies the labourer and reduces him to a mere appendage.⁴³ The development of the labourer’s production powers is hereby liberated from its *previous* use value restrictions and the production process is revolutionized. The labourer must, in the moment he himself is subsumed under capital, put aside all his *particularities* which were connected to previously locally narrow minded forms for production. Marx describes the historic progressive development of the powers of production under capital in the following way: ‘In this way, capital creates bourgeois society and the universal appropriation of nature and of the social interrelations through the division of society. Hence the great civilizing force of capital; its production of a level of society in comparison to which all earlier ones only appear as local developments of mankind and as idolatry of nature.’⁴⁴

⁴² ‘...erhebt sich eine technologisch und sonstig *spezifische*, die *reale Natur des Arbeitsprozesses* und *seine realen Bedingungen umwandelnde Produktionsweise*, - *kapitalistische Produktionsweise*.’ (Marx, “Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses”, 60). The transition from formal to real subsumption is equivalent to the transition from absolute to relative surplus-value production.

⁴³ ‘It is no longer the worker who pushes the modified natural object between the object and himself; but the natural process which he transforms into an industrial one, he pushes as a means between himself and the inorganic nature, which he masters [Es ist nicht mehr der Arbeiter, der modifizierten Naturgegenstand zwischen das Objekt und sich einschiebt; sondern den Naturprozess, den er in einen industriellen umwandelt, schiebt er als Mittel zwischen sich und die unorganischen Natur, deren er sich bemeistert]’ (Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 592).

⁴⁴ ‘So schafft das Kapital erst die bürgerliche Gesellschaft und die universelle Aneignung der Natur wie des gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhangs selbst durch die Glieder des Gesellschaft. Daher die große zivilisatorische Kraft des Kapitals; seine Produktion einer Gesellschaftsstufe, gegen die alle frühen nur als *lokale Entwicklungen* der Menschheit und als *Naturidolatrie* erscheinen’ (Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der*

V. The Abstraction

The presupposition for the presentation of the *concrete labour process* in its universality should now be present. The following will be an attempt to thematize the concrete labour process which has all the time been a presupposition for the presentation of the abstract labour and the next development of the forms of value. The concept of labour was in pre-capitalistic societies bound to the labour that created special use value—and it was particularly agricultural labour which was dominating. In contrast to this, the modern industry has detached labour from all locally grounded forms and presented labour as an abstract totality.

Indifference to a particular kind of work presupposes a very developed totality of real kinds of work, none of which is the dominant one. Thus, the most general abstractions arise only in the rich concrete development, where one thing appears common to many, common to all. Then it ceases to be able to be thought only in a particular form. ... Indifference to specific work corresponds to a form of society in which individuals easily pass from one job to another and the specific type of

Politischen Ökonomie, 313). Marx continues: ‘According to this tendency, capital drives just as much beyond national barriers and prejudices as it does beyond the deification of nature and the traditional satisfaction of existing needs, self-sufficiently within certain limits, and the reproduction of old ways of life.

It is destructive to all this and constantly revolutionary, breaking down all barriers which check the development of the productive forces, the expansion of needs, the multiplicity of production, and the exploitation and exchange of the natural and spiritual forces’ [Das Kapital triebt dieser seiner Tendenz nach ebensowohl hinaus über nationale Schranken und Vorurteile, wie über Naturvergötterung und überlieferte, in bestimmten Grenzen selbstgenügsam eingepfählte Befriedigung vorhandener Bedürfnisse und Reproduktion alter Lebensweise.

Es ist destruktiv gegen alles dies und beständig revolutionierend, alle Schranken niederreissend, die die Entwicklung der Produktivkräfte, die Erweiterung der Bedürfnisse, die Mannigfaltigkeit der Produktion und die Exploitation und den Austausch der Natur- und Geisteskräfte hemmen.] (Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 313).

Lenin draws the *political* conclusion that capitalism (and therewith imperialism) is progress in comparison to earlier epochs: ‘Imperialism is our “mortal enemy” just as much as capitalism. That is so. But no Marxist will forget that capitalism is progressive when compared to feudalism, and that imperialism is progressive compared to pre-monopolitical capitalism. It follows that we should *not* support any struggle against imperialism. We will *not* support a struggle on the side of the reactionary class against imperialism; we will *not* support a rebellion of the reactionary classes against imperialism and capitalism [Imperialismen er vår “dødsfiende” like mye som kapitalismen er det. Det er så. Men ingen Marxist vil glemme at kapitalismen er progressiv sammenliknet med føydalismen, og at imperialismen er progressive sammenliknet med førmonopolitisk kapitalisme. Følgelig bør vi *ikke* støtte enhver kamp mot imperialismen. Vi vil *ikke* støtte en kamp fra de reaksjonære klassers side mot imperialismen; vi vil *ikke* støtte et opprør av de reaksjonære klasser mot imperialismen og kapitalismen]’ (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Band 23, 63).

work is accidental to them and therefore irrelevant (*gleichgültig*). Labour has become here not only in the category, but, in reality, as a means of creating wealth in general, and has ceased to have the determination of being grown together with individuals in a particularity.⁴⁵

Exactly the socialization of labour under capitalism enables one to see what distinguishes bourgeois society from previous epochs, but the moment one sees what it is that distinguishes social formations from one another, one sees also what is common to them. Capitalism is precisely *not* able to free itself from the use value as the carrier of value, and the labour that creates use value, or the human being's material exchange with nature, is an *eternal* natural necessity. The possibility to think of labour as universal emerges in the background of a historically grown *real* abstraction, namely, the value producing abstract labour. This abstraction, which is only fully valid under capitalism, subsumes also the material production process and thereby makes possible that this can be thought independently of determined historical forms. 'This example of the work shows strikingly how even the most abstract categories, despite their validity—precisely because of their abstraction—for all epochs, but in the specificity of this abstraction are themselves just as much the product of historical conditions and have their full validity only for and within these conditions.'⁴⁶

The concrete labour is first and foremost connected to human needs or desires. It is therefore natural in the attempt to go through the constitution of the concrete labour to take the point of departure in desire.

⁴⁵ 'Die Gleichgültigkeit gegen eine bestimmte Art der Arbeit setzt eine sehr entwickelte Totalität wirklicher Arbeitsarten voraus, von denen keine mehr die alles beherrschende ist. So entstehen die allgemeinsten Abstraktionen überhaupt nur bei den reichten konkreten Entwicklung, wo Eines vielen Gemeinsam erscheint, allen gemein. Dann hört es auf, nur in besonderer Form gedacht werden zu können. ... Die Gleichgültigkeit gegen die bestimmte Arbeit entspricht einer Gesellschaftsform, worin die Individuen mit Leichtigkeit aus einer Arbeit in die andre übergehen und die bestimmte Art der Arbeit ihnen zufällig, daher gleichgültig ist. Die Arbeit ist hier nicht nur in der Kategorie, sondern in der Wirklichkeit als Mittel zum Schaffen des Reichtums überhaupt geworden, und hat aufgehört als Bestimmung mit den Individuen in einer Besonderheit verwachsen zu sein.' (Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 25).

⁴⁶ 'Dies Beispiel der Arbeit zeigt schlagend, wie selbst die abstraktesten Kategorien, trotz ihrer Gültigkeit – eben wegen ihrer Abstraktion – für alle Epochen, doch in der Bestimmtheit dieser Abstraktion selbst ebenso sehr das Produkt historischer Verhältnisse sind und ihre Vollgültigkeit nur für und innerhalb dieser Verhältnisse besitzen' (Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 25).

VI. Desire

Marx criticizes in the *Randglossen*, that the human being, for a *Professoralschulemeister* (professorial schoolmaster), remains standing in a purely theoretical relation to nature. 'But people by no means begin "to stand in this theoretical relation to things in the outside world." Like any animal, they begin by eating, drinking, etc., that is, not "standing" in a relationship, but by behaving actively, taking control of certain things in the outside world through action, and thus to satisfy their needs.'⁴⁷ This immediate denial of the object is simply only a devouring and not a change in the form of the object.⁴⁸ Hegel expresses a parallel to Marx when he says: '... they (the animals, KB) do not remain (my emphasis, KB) in front of the sensual things as existing in themselves, but, despairing of this reality and in the complete certainty of their nothingness, grab them and consume them without further ado.'⁴⁹ The animal, through this *zulangen* and the following consumption, elevates itself over its surroundings, but nonetheless remains standing in a natural relationship to the world. The moment desire is satisfied, then the object of desire also vanishes, and the animal falls back to its previous existence as it was before the desire emerged. The animal has no distance neither to the surrounding world or to itself; it is missing the specifically human *self-consciousness*. Desire, and the accompanying self-feeling that is attached to this, cannot be a lasting self-consciousness, but remains completely punctual in its connection to the desire and its satisfaction.

The consciousness of desire has to turn the independence of the object into its own experience, but at this stage it is not able to achieve that. If the desire vanishes, then the object vanishes too.

⁴⁷ 'Aber die Menschen beginnen keineswegs damit, „in diesem theoretischen Verhältnis zu *Dingen* der *Aussenwelt* zu stehen“. Sie fangen, wie jedes Tier, damit an, *zu essen, zu trinken* etc., also nicht in einem Verhältnis zu „stehen“, sondern *sich aktiv zu verhalten*, sich gewisser Dinge der *Aussenwelt* zu bemächtigen durch die Tat, und so ihr Bedürfnis zu befriedigen' (Marx, *Randglossen zu A. Wagners* „Lehrbuch der politischen Ökonomie“, 362).

⁴⁸ When Marx after the listed quotation shoots in the parentheses: 'So they start the production [Sie beginnen also mit der Produktion]', this is not immediately correct if one does not, for example, interpret the digestion as production. I understand production instead as a change of the object which has a certain duration.

⁴⁹ '...sie bleiben nicht vor den sinnlichen Dingen als an sich seienden stehen sondern verzweifelnd an dieser Realität und in der völligen Gewissheit ihrer Nichtigkeit langen sie ohne weiteres zu und zehren sie auf' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 91).

Hegel distinguishes, already in his *Jenaer Realphilosophie* (1805-1806), the animal's mere activity from human labour. Labour makes it possible for the human being to elevate herself from the immediately natural circumstances where desire dominates. Labour mediates the realization of the human desire and distinguishes itself from animal activity: 'The mere activity is *pure* mediation, movement; the mere gratification of desire is pure annihilation of the object. The *labour* itself as such is not only activity... but reflected in itself, bringing forth, one-sided form of the content.'⁵⁰

What is decisive is the weight Hegel puts on the function of the *tool* in the human labour process. The tool stands higher in relation to the generation of the simple object, in that this is not content in a simple form, but carrier the universal within itself. 'In the tool ... I possess the possibility of presenting the content as a universal one. Therefore, the tool, the means, (is) more excellent than the purpose of desire, which is singular, it embraces all those singularities.'⁵¹ Only the human being can labour with the tool and has thereby the cunning (*die List*) to push the tool (*träges Ding*) between herself and the world. The human being makes use of nature's own '[a]ctivity ... the elasticity of the clock spring, water, wind ... to do in their sensual existence something quite different from what they wanted to do'.⁵²

Nature's own lawfulness is used through the tool against nature itself, and the human being labours her way out over this through the help of her labour in nature's own laws. An absolute contradiction between nature's causality and human teleology is in this way dissolved in the moment the human being becomes free to labour within the limits of nature's own determinacy.

⁵⁰ 'Die blosse Tätigkeit ist *reine* Vermittlung, Bewegung; die blosse Befriedigung der Begierde ist reines Vernichten des Gegenstandes. Die *Arbeit* selbst als solche ist nicht nur Tätigkeit..., sondern in sich reflektierte, Hervorbringen, einseitige Form des Inhalts' (Hegel, *Jenaer Realphilosophie*, 197)

⁵¹ 'In dem Verzeuge ... esitze ich die Möglichkeit, den Inhalt als einen allgemeinen. Darum (ist) das Werkzeug, Mittel vortrefflicher als der Zweck der Begierde, der einzelner ist, es umfasst alle jene Einzelheiten.' (Hegel, *Jenaer Realphilosophie*, 198).

⁵² 'Tätigkeit ... die Elastizität der Uhrfeder, Wasser, Wind ... um in ihrem sinnlichen Dasein etwas ganz Anderes zu tun, als sie tun wollten' (Hegel, *Jenaer Realphilosophie*, 198).

Labour is in *Jenaer Realphilosophie* essential for what is human, since the subject becomes objectivized⁵³ precisely in labour, and recognizes *her own self* again in the generated form. But the problem with Hegel's exposition of the concept of labour in *Jenaer Realphilosophie* is that there is a drive (*der Trieb*) as *unmediated* which brings forth also *the human labour*. The desire 'does not get to separate the labour from itself'.⁵⁴ For the human being this is also right, but Hegel introduces unmediated the human labour in relation to desire. Life's desire is not in itself enough to generate the labour, and we 'subordinate work in a form in which it belongs exclusively to man'.⁵⁵

The consciousness which is connected to desire alone is naturally bound and has therefore something compulsive over against itself; it does not go further than denying the external world and thereby through this also its own *self-feeling*. 'This gratification is ... itself only a vanishing, for it lacks the *objective* [*gegenständliche*] side or the subsistence [*Bestehen*].'⁵⁶

Consciousness must experience the object's independence. Consciousness does not reach self-consciousness by standing against the thing—the Other alone—but it has to assume a reflected relation to life. It must establish a distance to the desirous life which only denies its surrounding world in order to keep itself and the species alive. Only something that exists despite its own negated being, that is to say, something that exists despite of having negation within itself, will be a worthy negation for the subject⁵⁷ and can maintain this as self-consciousness. In order that self-consciousness shall be able to be maintained, the "object" must 'consummate this negation of itself as such'⁵⁸, and such

⁵³ 'In the work I make myself immediately a thing, (the) form that is being. I also divest myself of this existence of mine, make it *one* with *others* and *receive* myself in it [Ich mache mich unmittelbar zum Dinge, (zur) Form, die Sein ist, in der Arbeit. Dieses meines Dasein entäussere ich mich ebenso, mache es zu *einem* mit *fremden* und *erhalte* mich darin]' (Hegel, *Jenaer Realphilosophie*, 217).

⁵⁴ 'kommt nicht dazu, die Arbeit von sich abzutrennen' (Hegel, *Jenaer Realphilosophie*, 197)

⁵⁵ 'unterstellen die Arbeit in einer Form, worin sie dem Menschen ausschliesslich angehört' (Marx, *Das Kapital*, 193).

⁵⁶ 'Diese Befriedigung ist ... selbst nur ein Verschwinden, denn es fehlt ihr die *gegenständliche* Seite oder das *Bestehen*.' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 153).

⁵⁷ Self-consciousness stands over against a *negating* consciousness, and selv-consciousness stands therefore over against *both* a subject and an object.

⁵⁸ 'diese Negation seiner selbst an sich vollziehen' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 144).

an object is exactly an *other* self-consciousness. If self-consciousness is to achieve true self-consciousness, then it must find another self-consciousness to relate with.

VII. Recognition⁵⁹ and the Concept of the Concrete

Labour

Self-consciousness is *in* and *for itself* while it is in and for itself for an other; i.e., it is only as a recognized being.⁶⁰

In the moment the one self-consciousness stands over against the other, then self-consciousness has stepped outside itself. This means that self-consciousness loses itself in the moment it only finds itself in another being (*vesen*). But the instance it finds *itself* in another being⁶¹, and only itself in the other, then the other dissolves.⁶² In order to become certain of itself, self-consciousness must dissolve the other independent being in order to dissolve *its own being-for-other*, but self-consciousness hereby dissolves *itself*, since it saw only itself in this other. This double dissolvement of its double being-for-other is therefore ‘a dual return *into itself*’.⁶³ In the moment self-consciousness in the dissolvement keeps itself back and becomes equal to itself through the dissolvement of its being-for-other, then self-consciousness dissolves its being in the other and lets it go free, and the other regains its self-consciousness. Self-consciousness must of course dissolve the other, but in order to become certain of itself it must take itself back from its being-for-other, since in the other it only found itself, and in order to maintain itself as self-consciousness, then it cannot *only* see itself in the other, but this other must also be a

⁵⁹ In *The Kapital*, it is presupposed that commodity owners recognize each other reciprocally as producers of use values. Otherwise, the exchange could not have taken place.

⁶⁰ ‘Das Selbstbewusstsein ist *an* und *für sich*, indem und dadurch, dass es für ein Anderes an und für sich ist; d.h. es ist nur als ein Anerkanntes’ (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 145).

⁶¹ ‘So it is not at all the being of the other that it sees, but only *its* otherness – i.e. its own otherness, in which it thinks it is confirming itself – and that cannot suffice [Es ist also gar nicht das Sein des Anderen, was es sieht, sondern nur sein Anderssein – d.h. das eigene Anderssein, worin es sich zu bestätigen vermeint – und das kann nicht genügen]’ (Gadamer, „Hegels Dialektik des Selbstbewusstseins“, 228).

⁶² Translator’s note: the Norwegian word here is *oppeheve* which is nearly exactly the same as the German *Aufhebung*, which is a key term in Hegel’s philosophy. In English, the German term is usually translated as *sublate*. This term contains the meanings “dissolve”, “preserve” and “lift up”. As this is a specifically technical term peculiar to Hegel studies, I have opted not to use the technical term and instead opted for the meaning that is most relevant in order to keep readability of the text. I note it here in passing in case those technically acquainted would like to be aware of the latent speculative content in the original text.

⁶³ ‘eine dobbeltsinnige Rückkehr *in sich selbst*’ (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 146).

free subject. The other is this too since what is the case for the one self-consciousness is also the case for the other. 'Each sees *the other* doing what it is doing; each does itself what it demands of the other, and therefore does what it does *only* in so far as the other does the same; the one-time action would be useless, because what is supposed to happen can only come about through both.'⁶⁴

Each self-consciousness mediates itself through the other⁶⁵, comes through the other outside itself and keeps itself back through the dissolvment of its being-for-other. Self-consciousness can only through the mediation through the other become being-for-itself, but it must also negate (*forinte*) this being-for-other in order to find itself in itself. Both self-consciousnesses are dependent upon each other and seek reciprocal recognition for itself.

Self-consciousness becomes first simple being-for-itself by excluding *everything else* from itself, and it is in *this* immediate relation to itself simply being-for-itself. Everything else that is *for* it is negatively designated as *object*. All other self-consciousnesses thereby become seen *as* objects. This has shown itself as an impossibility, since self-consciousness has shown itself in recognition to be dependent upon another self-consciousness to mediate itself own knowing of itself. In order to maintain its own self-consciousness as pure being-for-itself, self-consciousness must show itself 'to not be tied to any determinate existence ..., not to be tied to life'.⁶⁶ Both self-consciousnesses think this way, both are trying to *negate (forinte)* the other, and stake also their own lives in order to achieve recognition from the other. Both subjects stake their own lives in the fight for recognition and achieve thereby a reflected relation to life. In the moment the self-consciousnesses step into the fight, they view life with indifference in comparison to the recognition, but the struggle leads to the outcome whereby one of the subjects pull out of the struggle out of fear for death, and thus becomes recognized as the slave subject (*Knecht*).

⁶⁴ 'Jedes sieht das Andere dasselbe tun, was es tut; jedes tut selbst, was es an das Andere fordert, und tut darum, was es tut, auch nur insofern, als das Andere dasselbe tut; das einzeitige Tun wäre unnütze, weil was geschehen soll, nur durch beide zustände kommen kann.' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 146).

⁶⁵ From now on the matter concerns self-consciousness's *own* experience.

⁶⁶ 'an kein bestimmtes Dasein geknüpft..., nicht an das Leben geknüpft zu sein' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 148).

One of the subjects is now master (*Herr*), being-for-itself independent, since the slave's being is *for* the master. The master needs the slave as the other, since the master must be recognized by the slave in order to recognize himself.

The master subject behaves in the same manner towards both the slave and the object – he negates them both.

The master's relation to the object and the slave has come into being through the struggle where the object for the master only counts as something purely negative and is for him unessential, while for the slave it is regarded as essential. In the moment the master through the struggle did not find his independence in the object—while the slave became bounded to this—he put under himself both the slave and the object. The object belongs to the *master*.

The master relates himself to the object through the *slave*. The slave, in turn, relates himself to the object and negates this, but, through the denial of the object, the slave is not able to annihilate it completely, since the object precisely belongs to the master, thus the slave only limitedly *negates* (works upon) the object for the master. The master sees the slave *as an object* and pushes this (the slave subject as object) *between* himself and the object. The master thereby purely enjoys the object. 'Through this mediation, the immediate relationship [of the object, KB] *becomes* available to the master as his pure negation or enjoyment; what the desire did not succeed at, he manages to be over and done with it and to satisfy himself in pleasure.'⁶⁷ The master becomes therefore, mediated through the slave, standing in a pure subject-object relationship in the moment the master joins himself with the non-independence of the thing; 'he leaves the side of independence to the slave, who works on it [the thing, KB]'.⁶⁸

It turns out now that the recognitions that the master sought is not achieved. The slave has shown to be dependent in that he stands in a relationship of dependence to the object, but the moment the master wants to be free from this relationship of dependence,

⁶⁷ 'Dem Herrn ... *wird* durch diese Vermittlung die *unmittelbare* Beziehung als die reine Negation desselben oder der Genuss; das der Begierde nicht gelang, gelingt ihm, damit fertig zu werden und im Genusse sich zu befriedigen' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 151).

⁶⁸ 'die Seite des Selbständigkeit aber überlässt er dem Knechte, der es bearbeitet' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 151).

he becomes *dependent* on the slave. An unessential, slavish consciousness is the master's object, and it turns out that the two subjects become unequal in the attempt to achieve recognition. 'But the actual recognition lacks the moment, namely, of what the master does to the other, he also does to himself, and what the servant does to himself, he also does to the other. This has resulted in a one-sided and unequal recognition.'⁶⁹ The labour and its enjoyment fall apart from each other for the master, since the enjoyment is not generated by the master, and herewith the essential becomes lost in that the *presupposition of the enjoyment* falls to the slave. The master enjoys the object purely and thus he falls back into the position of animal desire.

It proves to be that 'the *truth* of the independent consciousness is ... the slavish consciousness'.⁷⁰ The master receives the object from the slave for enjoyment, but only in mediated form, that is to say, the master has to submit himself to the consciousness that labours on the object. When the master subject desires the thing in mediated form, then the master desires the slave's desire, while this again desires the object.⁷¹

The *master-slave* relationship is the beginning of the development of a concept about labour. The pure master subject pushes the slave as an object between himself and the object in order to purely enjoy the latter. Master subject, slave subject – the object relation is *for the master* a "subject – object (means) – object" relation.

But this relation becomes insufficient, since the master can neither find *himself* in the object or in the slave. The pure object serves the master only as satisfaction and 'this satisfaction is itself only a vanishing, because it lacks the *objective* side...'.⁷² At the same time the master cannot recognize himself in the slave, since precisely this one is broken and *not* an other independent self-consciousness.

⁶⁹ 'Aber zum eigentlichen Anerkennen fehlt das Moment, dass, was der Herr gegen den Anderen tut, er auch gegen sich selbst, und was der Knecht gegen sich, er auch gegen den Anderen tue. Es ist dadurch ein einseitiges und ungleichen Anerkennen entstanden' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 152).

⁷⁰ 'Die *Wahrheit* des selbständigen Bewusstsein ist ... das knechtische Bewusstsein' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 152).

⁷¹ 'His dependence is really that of desire, and not that of failing recognition [Seine Abhängigkeit ist in Wahrheit die der Begierde, und nicht die der scheiternden Anerkennung]' (Gadamer, „Hegels Dialektik des Selbstbewusstseins“, 233).

⁷² 'Diese Befriedigung ist aber deswegen selbst nur ein Verschwinden, denn es fehlt ihr die gegenständliche Seite...' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 153).

The moment the master desires the slave's desire, he directs himself towards something that is *not*, towards something that has to be constituted through labour.

The slave has in the struggle experiences the fear of death as all encompassing. Through this possibility of death, of non-being, the slave achieves consciousness of a *future* possibility. This future is now mediated through the fear of the master and is contained in the slave, the latter who is bound to life and the object-related. Life was previously in Hegel determined as the medium that object-relatedness became viewed through, and the subject's life also made its mark on the surrounding world which itself appeared as life. The moment the objects received a character of life and independence, they also were given the character of being time: it turned out, in the third chapter of *The Phenomenology*, that the supersensible universal world of laws could not be independently sustained. In the dialectic between law and appearance it was shown that it was only *life* that could maintain the universal in the particular singular appearances.⁷³ The moment that life holds up the identity among the singular appearances, a continuity is put into the world, and life shows itself as a process that through the movement towards and in the world of objects consumes the latter. Thereby the movement is put into the world and thus also *time*.⁷⁴ The slave labours and must form the object according to another consciousness. The slave's desire has to be formed *because* it takes place for another consciousness. If the slave is to labour *for* the master, then the labour must be goal-directed, and the slave does not any longer labour only in denial or in the manner of a mere animal.

The slave's labour *for* the master proves that time now becomes concretized in relation to the immediate future that emerged through the fear of death and connected to

⁷³ Translator's note: the original of "appearance" here is directly translated into "contingency" but the more apt counter-part to law is appearance. Now, the world of appearances is also that of contingency, so the content of the meaning should be essentially the same.

⁷⁴ 'The *essence* (life, KB) is infinity as the suspension of all differences, the pure axis-rotating movement, the rest of itself as an absolutely restless infinity; *independence* itself, in which the differences of movement are sublated; the simple essence of time, which in this self-identity has the dignified form of space [Das Wesen ist die Unendlichkeit als das aufgehobensein aller Unterschiede, die reine achsendrehende Bewegung, die Ruhe, ihrer selbst als absolut unruhiger Unendlichkeit; die Selbständigkeit selbst, in welcher die Unterschiede der Bewegung aufgehört sind; das einfache Wesen der Zeit, das in dieser Sich-selbstgleichheit die gediegene Gestalt des Raumes hat]' (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 140).

the working of the object that is for the master. The master forces the slave to organize time and to orient his labour purposefully.

The master dominates also over the object, and the labour of the slave becomes therefore a synthesis of the dialectic of recognition (S – S relation) and desire (S – O relation). There emerges a new structure for labour in the *slave's* relation to the object.

It looks like the negation first falls apart. The master seeks another self-consciousness and negates this one purely through thought. The master is himself not *active* vis-à-vis the world, but leaves the physical and the active negation of the world to the slave. But the physical activity and the thoughtful negation are connected in the moment the object is going to the master, and this presupposes a consciousness about the master.⁷⁵ The master subject enslaves the slave, and the labour situation becomes marked by reason. The slave on his side does not need another subject through which to know himself, but recognizes himself in the object in the moment he works upon it. The slave recognizes not only himself but masters the object and can thoroughly posit himself in the object and can develop *technique*.

In the moment the slave recognizes himself in the object, he also recognizes his own past. The worked upon object is a previous form which has *ceases to be* and carries traces of previous labour. The fear of the master forced the slave to work upon the object with a view of a future satisfaction for the master. But when the slave now stands over the worked upon object, the previous goal-directedness and future anticipation shows itself *as* past in the moment the object is formed and bears its marks.

A new labour relation is developed when the slave recognizes himself in the object: Subject – Means – Object.

It turns out that the master's negation of another subject and desire's negation of the object are connected. The master desires the slave because this one has the negativity within himself and delivers to him the object ready for enjoyment. But if the master is to stand in a relation of pure satisfaction of the object, the desire of the slave has to be curtailed. The pure satisfaction of the object accrued to the master which became

⁷⁵ The master becomes the slave's appearing form over against the object.

standing in an animal desire and the object became purely vanishing. ‘Labour, on the other hand, has *restrained* desire, *halted* vanishing, or it *educates*.’⁷⁶ The labour situation where the subject is capable of recognizing itself in the object cannot emerge in a simple subject-object relation, but in the synthesis of recognition of the master and of the animal desire the development of a purposeful dealings with the world becomes necessary.

The first labour relation that can be put up from the master’s viewpoint: “master subject – slave object – object”, is a presupposition for the development of the “subject-means-object” relation. The master-slave relation in the recognition shows how labour emerges, but in the moment the slave begins to work reasonably in order to satisfy the master, social labour emerges. The slave recognizes himself in the object and achieves the being-for-self that the master sought.

The result is a labouring subject that, in a reasonable fashion, pushes the means of labour between himself and the world.

VIII. The Moments and Subsumption of the Labour Process

Marx expresses the same labour relation that was developed in the slave like this: ‘The simple moments of the labour process are the purposeful activity or the work itself, its object and its means.’⁷⁷ We have previously seen that capital cannot free itself from the use value production in order to purely produce value. Use value production is in all societies necessary to reproduce human life.

The human labour process is purposeful and shows its specifically human nature in that the labourer has prior to the labour process an ideal representation of the result. The labourer does not empower himself immediately the object of labour, but the means of labour, ‘... a thing or a set of things which the worker puts between himself and the

⁷⁶ ‘Die Arbeit hingegen ist *gehemmte* Begierde, *aufgehaltenes* Verschwinden, oder sie *bildet*’ (Hegel, *Phänemologie des Geistes*, 153).

⁷⁷ ‘Die einfachen Momente des Arbeitsprozesses sind die zweckmässige Tätigkeit oder die Arbeit selbst, ihr Gegenstand und ihr Mittel.’ (Marx, *Das Kapital*, 193).

object of labour and which serve as a guide for his activity on this object'.⁷⁸ When the labour means serves as a "guide" for the activity, then the purpose does not become something absolutely first. The purpose of labour (both use value and production of value) has to be put through the material, and the means determine what *can become* the result of the labour production. Simultaneously, the object of labour and the raw materials determine what can be the purpose for the production and also which forms the labour means can assume. Labour must take place within the stuff's possibilities, and the material both makes possible and restricts different results. The universal structure that human beings must push the labour means between themselves and nature is valid in all use value production, but this structure appears as upside down in the capitalistic society.

We saw in the real subsumption of labour under capital that the very labour process become a means for the *value's* increase, and this characterized the labour process itself. When the purpose of production is P – P', the teleological relationship is changed, and the labourer becomes himself an object subsumed under the machine as subject. The labourer is reduced to a conscious organ for the unconscious machinery, - 'the workers are only as conscious organs subordinated to their unconscious organs and with the same subordinated to the central motive force'.⁷⁹

This wrongness that characterizes the capitalistic society is no necessity, but springs out of an anarchic manner of production where the producers are split from one another. 'But evidently this process of reversal is merely *historical* necessity, merely necessity for the development of the productive forces from a certain historical point of departure, or base, but by no means an *absolute* necessity of production; rather a vanishing one, and the result and purpose (immanent) of this process is to sublimate this basis itself, like this form of the process.'⁸⁰

⁷⁸ '... ein Ding oder ein Komplex von Dingen, die der Arbeiter zwischen sich und den Arbeitsgegenstand schiebt und die ihm als Leiter seiner Tätigkeit auf diesen Gegenstand dienen' (Marx, *Das Kapital*, 193).

⁷⁹ 'die Arbeiter sind nur als bewusste Organe seinen bewusstlosen Organen beigeordnet und mit denselben der zentralen Bewegungskraft untergeordnet' (Marx, *Das Kapital*, 442).

⁸⁰ 'Aber offenbar ist dieser Verkehrsprozess bloss historische Notwendigkeit, bloss Notwendigkeit für die Entwicklung der Produktivkräfte von einem bestimmten historischen Ausgangspunkt aus, oder Basis aus, aber keineswegs eine absolute Notwendigkeit der Produktion; vielmehr eine verschwindende, und das Resultat und der Zweck (immanente) dieses Prozesses ist diese Basis selbst aufzuheben, wie diese Form des Prozesses' (Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 716).

The subsumption of labour under capital is progressive in the understanding that the necessary labour time for the bringing forth of the use values decreases radically. All economy, also the communistic, lets itself in the end disband in a time economy. ‘The real economy - saving - consists in saving working time.’⁸¹ And this saving is identical with the development of the forces of production. Freedom consists in free time, but under capitalism the freedom of the labourers appears exactly as *leisure time* outside the production process.

The labourer stands in the production process over against his own work, but time is here objectified as *alien* labour time that subsumes the labour process under itself and reduces the labourer to means.

That labour time can appear as alien is because the abstract labour time as the substance of value is separated from the use value producing labour, but here lies also, as we have observed, the possibility to dissolve the production of value.

The liberation of time for the participation in the processes of social decision is a further condition for the functioning of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Politically, one can see it these days in the party struggles of China. The question here is how much time that is to be put aside to politics and how much time that is to be used to the development of the production forces.⁸²

⁸¹‘Die wirkliche Ökonomie – Ersparung – besteht in Ersparung von Arbeitszeit’ ... ‘If we did not find the material conditions of production and the conditions of interrelation corresponding to them for a classless society veiled in society as it is, all demolition tests would then be quixotic [Wenn wir nicht in der Gesellschaft, wie sie ist, die materiellen Produktionsbedingungen und ihnen entsprechenden Verkehrsverhältnisse für eine Klassenlose Gesellschaft verhüllt vorfinden, wären alle Sprengversuche Donquichoterie]’ (Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 77).

⁸² Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, 599

Bibliography

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. „Hegels Dialektik des Selbstbewusstseins“ in *Materialien zu Hegels Phänomenologie des Geistes*. Suhrkamp.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Jenaer Realphilosophie*. Felix Meiner.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phänemologie des Geistes*. Suhrkamp.

Lenin, Vladimir. *Collected Works*, Band 23.

Marx, Karl. *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*. Dietz.

Marx, Karl. *Das Kapital I*. Dietz

Marx, Karl. *Das Kapital – Ware und Geld*, Studienausgabe II, Fischer Verlag, 1867.

Marx, Karl. “Resultate des unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses”, *Neue Kritik*

Marx, Karl. *Randglossen zu A. Wagners „Lehrbuch der politischen Ökonomie“* in *Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 19.

Marx, Karl. *Kritikk av Gotha-programmet*, Verker i utvalg, Pax, Band 4.

Marx, Karl. “Theorien über den Mehrwert” in *Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 26.1.

Marx, Karl. *Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 26.3.

Marx, Karl. “Die Werthform”, *Til kritikken av den politiske økonomi 4*, Modtrykk.

Marx, Karl. *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie* in *Marx-Engels-Werke*, Band 13.

Krahl, H. J. “Konstitution und Klassenkampf”, *Neue Kritik*.

Sandemose, Jørgen. *Ricardo, Marx og Sraffa*. Gyldendal.