

Untranslated Chapter 6 of Marx's Capital, original ending of the work. *Boas 12*

Archives of M & E. (Moscow, 1938), Vol. II (VII) (Agoratsky)

1. I, Capital

1.6, The Results of the Direct Process of Production ✓

"In this chapter it is necessary to consider three questions:

- 1) Commodities as products of capital, of cap. prod.
- 2) Cap. prod. is the prod. of s.v.
- 3) It is, finally, the prod. & reprod. of the whole relationship thanks to which this direct process of prod. is characterized as specifically capitalistic.

(Since Mr. noted that heading one should really be 3 since it would serve as transition to his vol. 2 of Capital, the Rus. ed. followed that arrangement so that I below is the same as 2 above, II below is 3 above and III below is 1 above. --FP)

Capitalist Prod. as Prod. of S.V.

...."In its 1st, preliminary (so to speak) form, as money (as the point of departure of the formation of capital), capital exists only as money, i.e. as a sum of exchange values in an independent form of exchange value, its money expression. But these moneys must increase their value... Consequently, this money becomes capital thanks to the fact that its magnitude increases, that it is transformed into a variable magnitude... Only in itself this money is capital, i.e. according to its designation, only because it must adapt itself, be spent in such a manner that its aim is its augmentation because it is spent with the aim of augmentation. If in relation to its present sum of value or money sum it is has its designation, its motive force, tendency, then in relation to the capitalist, i.e. the owner of this money in whose hands it must execute its function -- as an intention, an aim. In this 1st simple value or money expression of capital (that which capital) has to become, where it is abstracted from every relation to use value, where it falls off -- falls off likewise every interfering element and as a consequence confusing accidental factors of the actual process of prod. (prod. of commodities, etc.) and in just as abstract simple form is revealed the characteristic specific the cap. process of prod.

W.B.

III

?

-2-

p.11

Thus, precisely the specific function of capital as capital is the prod. of s.v., which, as is revealed later, is nothing other than as the prod. of surplus labor, appropriation, in the actual process of prod., of the unpaid labor, which is represented itself, materializes itself as s.v.

For

it was further revealed that/the transformation of x into capital, in x^* , it is necessary that the value or sum of money x be transformed into factors of the process of prod., 1st of all into factors of the actual labor process. In certain branches of prod. it happens that part of the means of prod.--the subj. of labor--has no value, is not a commodity, although it is a use value. In that case part of x is transformed only into means of prod., & the subject of labor, to the extent that we are dealing with the transformation of x, i.e. about the purchase of commodities, ~~xxxx~~ going into the labor process, for x is limited by the purchase of m.p. One factor of the labor process, the subject of labor, is here equal to 0, to the extent that we are dealing with value. But we are considering the question in its full form, where the subject of labor also is a commodity. In the circumstance where this is not true, then this factor, to the extent that we are discussing value, is equated to 0 and a deduction is made in the calculation.

p.13

Just as a commodity is the direct unity of use v. & ex. v., so the process of prod., which is a process of prod. of commodities, represents a direct unity of labor process & the process of augmentation of value. Just as commodities, i.e. direct unity of use v. & ex. v. come out of the process as a result, as a product, so they enter it as one of its formative elements.

In general, there can never come but something of the process of prod. which did not enter into it in the form of a condition of prod.

The transformation of the advanced sum of money, sums of money having to augment themselves in value & transform themselves into capital, into factors of the process of prod., is an act of commodity circulation, process of exchange and falls into a series of purchases. Consequently the act already occurs outside of the direct process of prod. It is only its introduction, but it is a necessary prerequisite & then we examine not the direct process of prod. but cap. prod. as a whole in its uninterruptedness, then this transformation of money into factors of the prod. process, purchase of m.p. & capacity to labor, form in their turn the immanent moment of the aggregate process.

If however we examine the formation of capital within the direct process of prod., then it, as a simple commodity, has the qual form of use. & ex. v.. But in both forms there enter further determinations which are distinct from the determinations of simple, independently considered commodities, more developed determinations.

p. 13, 13.17
 Regarding list of all the use v., then its particular content, its further determination were completely indifferent for the determination of the understanding of a commodity... It is different with the ex. v. of commodities, functioning in the process of prod. Thanks to the nature of the labor process the m.p. fall into, list of ex. v., the subj. of labor & the means of labor, or, to define this more accurately, into raw materials, on the one hand, instruments, auxiliary materials on the other. This is the determination of the form of use v. which arises out of the nature of the labor process itself & thus use v. in relation to the m.p. receives a further determination. The determination of the form of use value itself here becomes essential for the dev. essential for the dev. of the acc. relation, acc. category.

In the future, however, use values entering the labor process fall into the strongly delimited moments of concepts, or contradictions (just as, as has been shown above, this occurs with the material m.p.) on the one hand, the material m.p., the obj. conditions of prod., on the other hand, the functioning capacity to labor, the expeditiously manifested labor power, the subjective condition of prod. This is the further determination of the form of capital to the extent that it appears sub species of use v. within the direct process of prod. In the simple commodity the determined expedient labor--spinning, weaving, etc.--is absorbed, materialized in the yarn, cotton, etc. The expedient form of the product is the only trace, left by expedient labor, and even this trace can be erased if the product has the form of a product of nature as cattle, wheat, etc. In the commodity use value appears as something present which in the labor process appears only as a product. An individual commodity is in fact a ready product, besides which there lies the process of its manifestation, the product, in which the process, thanks to which useful trade labor was incorporated in it is removed. The commodity arises in the process of prod. it constantly is moved away from the process as a product, so that the product itself appears only as a moment of the process. Part of the use value in which capital appears within the process of prod., is the same living capacity to labor, but as a capacity to labor determined, corresponding to the special use value of the m.p., of a specific & as a functioning capacity to labor, as an expeditiously manifested labor power which makes the m.p. material moments of its own activity & transforms them thus from their primary form of their use v. into a new form of the product. The use values themselves go through therefore within the labor process the real process of transformation whether it be of a mechanical, chemical or physical character. Thus the form which capital, as a use value, assumes in the labor process falls into 1st, m.p. divided in concept but mutual-linked; 2ndly, the objective conditions of labor (m.p.), corresponding to the concept & arising out of the nature of the labor process, & the subjective conditions of labor --expeditiously functioning capacity to labor, i.e. by labor itself. Thirdly, analysing the process as a whole, the use value of capital here appears as producing use value, in which m.p. function in correspondence to their specific determination, as m.p. expeditiously functioning, corresponding to their determined nature of the specific capacity to labor. Or the aggregate labor process

as such, in living interaction of its objective & subjective moments, appears as the aggregate form of use v., i.e. as the real form of capital in the process of prod.

Handwritten notes: *1835*, *17*, *1835*

Handwritten note: *See 1835*

p.1719

looked upon from its real aspect--or analyzing it as a process thanks to which useful labor over use values form new use values--the process of prod. of capital is, 1st of all, the real ^{labor} process. Its moments as such--its determined component parts, corresponding to its own concept, are moments and component parts of the labor process in general, of every labor process, no matter what degree of eco. development on what basis the method of prod. occurred. Consequently, since the real form or form of objective use values of which capital consists, its material substratum is necessarily the form of the m.p.--means of labor & subj. of labor--which serve for the prod. of new products; further, since in the process of circulation, in the form of commodities, consequently within the possession of the capitalist as a commodity owner, these use values are already present (on the market) before they function in the labor process in correspondence to their specific aim; consequently, since capital--to the extent that it presents it all in the objective conditions of labor,--consists out of m.p. in their use value--raw materials, auxiliary materials & means of labor--instrumental things, machines, etc.--then from here ~~flows~~ ^{is drawn} the conclusion that all m.p. potentially and to the extent that they function as m.p., are capital actu & that therefore capital is the necessary moment of the human labor process in general independent of any kind of historic form and, consequently, ~~is something~~ ^{is something} eternal, conditioned by the nature of human labor. In the same manner (the conclusion is drawn) that since the process of prod. of capital is in general the labor process, then the labor process as such is the labor process under all social forms, is necessarily the labor process of capital. Thus capital is looked upon as a thing which plays a certain material role in the process of prod., a role characteristic of it as a thing. This is the same type of logic on the basis of which it is concluded that since money is gold, then gold in itself is money, that since wage labor is labor, then every kind of labor is necessarily wage labor. Thus identity is proven by this that the identity is fixed to attributed to the processes of prod. in distinction from their specific differences.....

Handwritten scribbles and marks on the left margin.

Handwritten scribbles and marks on the left margin.

Handwritten notes on the left margin: "Mc.", "Work", "p. 1719", "1719".

First of all, the commodities which the capitalist bought in order to use them as m.p. in the process of prod. --or in labor process--are his property. From here on the basis of cap. process of prod. this indispensable conclusion of use values in which capital functions in the form of m.p. & the designation of these m.p., these things as capital, is the definite (social relation) of production, so within the limits of this method of prod., for those confused, a product is considered a commodity. This forms the basis of the fetishism of pol. eco.

Secondly, m.p. enter the labor process from the process of circulation as definite commodities, for ex., cotton, coal etc. They enter it in the form of use values, which they had while they were still in the process of circulation as commodities. Entering the process they function in correspondence to their use values.... It is otherwise with that part of capital which we call variable & which only thanks to its exchange for capacity to labor actually is transformed into variable part of capital. Analyzed according to their real form money--that part of capital which the capitalist spent in buying capacity to labor--represents nothing other than existing on the market (or under certain conditions

thrown on the market) means of existence, going into the individual consumption of the work...a process which directly has nothing in

common with the direct process of prod. ... Indeed one part of capital, and thanks to this the aggregate capital, is transformed into a variable magnitude precisely because instead of money, the value of a constant magnitude, or means of existence, in which they can be represented, also the value of a constant magnitude, there on the contrary results in exchange an element, the living capacity to labor, creative of value & which as an element creative value can be more or less, can be represented as a variable magnitude, enters, in general under all circumstances, as a factor in the process of prod. only as a fluid, becoming-- and therefore containing itself in different limits--, a becoming magnitude & not one that has already become ...

p. 25

In any case the part of capital spent for wages formally appears as a part, already not belonging to the capitalist but to the wr., only then does it assume its real form, the form of entering the consumption of the wr's means of existence. Consequently, the form of use value which it has as a commodity up to the entry into the process of prod.--as means of existence, is completely different from the form which it manifests in the activity of l.p. & therefore in living labor... the form of use v. in which capital exists at the end of the process of prod., is a form of the product & this product exists both in the form of the m.p. & in the form of m.c.; consequently both the one & the other are present as capital, which means are present also in contradiction to living capacity to labor. (to be later dev'd. ... nd ed)

Let us proceed to the process of the augmentation of value.

There is again revealed in relation to ex.v. the difference between a commodity & capital finding itself in the process of augmentation of value.

Ex. v. entering the process of prod. of capital is less than was the ex. v. thrown on the market or advanced capital since this is only the value of commodities which enter the process as m.p., i.e. the value of the constant part of capital, which enter the process of prod. as value. In place of the value of the variable part of cap. we now have the augmentation of value as a process, we have what is in actu the augmentation of the value of labor, which constantly realizes itself as value & which in fluid (current) form goes outside of the limits of the given values, creating value.

p. 31, 33

In the actual labor process he (wr.) uses the means of labor as the conductor of his labor & subject of his labor as the material in which his labor expresses itself. Precisely thanks to this he transforms m.p. into a form of product corresponding to the given aim. However the matter represents itself from the point of view of the process of the augmentation of value. It is not the worker who ~~uses~~ the m.p. but the m.p. the worker. It is not living labor which realizes itself in objectified labor as its objective organ but materialized labor preserves itself & augments itself by means of sucking living labor & thanks to this becomes value, augmenting in value, capital, functions as such. The m.p. now ~~only~~ only as the swallower of the greatest possible quantity of living labor... As an effort, as expenditure of living force, labor is the personal activity of the worker. But as formative of value,

as finding itself in the process of its own materialization, the labor of the worker, just as soon as the latter entered the

process of prod. is in its turn the method of existence of the value of capital, united to it. This use value & creative of new value is therefore the force of capital & this process appears as a process of self-expansion of value &, on the contrary, the impoverishment of the worker who produces the value created by him as a value alien to himself.

On the basis of cap. prod. this capacity of materialized labor to transform itself into capital, i.e. to turn mean.p. into means commanding living labor & its exploitation, represents itself as characteristic of itself (as it is already potentially linked with this on that basis), individualized in it; that is, a characteristic belonging to it as things, as use values, as M.W.. The latter represent themselves therefore as capital and from here capital, expressing a definite relation of production, in a definite social relation in which with prod. the owner of the condition of prod. enter to the living capacity to labor,--represents itself as a thing, exactly as value represented itself as a characteristic of thing, & the economic definition of things as commodities--as its material quality, exactly as the social form which labor received in money represented itself as characteristic of things.
2) In reality, the domination of the capitalist over the worker is only the domination of the conditions of labor to which in addition to the objective conditions of the process of prod.--M.D.--belongs also the objective conditions of the preservation & efficacy of l.p., i.e. means existence (having become independent in relation to the worker, altho this relation is realized only in the real process of prod. which, as a law, is essentially the process of prod. of E.V., which includes the preservation of the old value, is the process of self-expansion of value of the advanced capital. In circulation the capitalist & worker met each other as sellers of commodities; however, thanks to the specific contradictory nature of the kinds of commodities which they sold each other, the worker necessarily enters the process of prod. as a component part of the use value, of the real being of capital, altho this relation is realized only within the process of prod. & the capitalist, as buyer of labor existing potentially only becomes the real capitalist only then when the worker, having become transformed eventualiter (under the circumstances), thanks to the sale of his capacity to labor, into a wage laborer, only in this process really enters under the command of capital. The functions, executed by the capitalist, that only the functions of capital itself--the values, augmenting the value by sucking living labor--with consciousness & will. The capitalist functions only as the personification capital, capital as being, just as the worker is only the personification labor, which for him is only suffering strain, belongs to the capitalist as creating and multiplying his wealth, which it is in fact, as an element united to capital (in the process of prod.), its living variable factor. The mastery of the capitalist over the worker is therefore only the mastery of things over man, of dead labor over living labor, over the product over the producer, since in fact commodities which becomes means of domination over labor (but only as means of mastery of capital itself)..... This is the process of alienation of his own labor. The worker here from the very beginning stands alien than the capitalist to the extent that the latter goes with his roots into this process of alienation & finds in it absolute satisfaction while the worker as its victim from the very beginning rises against it and perceives it as a process of impoverishment.... But the labor process appears only as a means of the process of augmentation of value, just as the use value of a product is only the carrier of its exchange value. Self-expansion of the

Rel's part as

Component part

Key

Alienation Key

value of capital, creation of s.v. is, therefore, the determined, dominating and all-enveloping aim of the capitalist, the absolute strife and content of his activity, in reality is only the rationalized aim and aim of the hoarder of treasures, a completely beggarly and abstract content which forces the capitalist, on the other hand, to appear under the slavery of the capitalist relationship exactly as the worker, although from the other end--on the opposite pole.

p.37

Just as the first relation in which both (skr. comp. - IT) meet each other, in appearance, as commodity owners, is the prerequisite it is in the same manner, as we shall see later, the result and product of the cap. method of prod. However, both acts should be distinguished. The first concerns circulation. The second develops out on the basis of the first only in the real process of prod.

The process of production is the direct unity of the process of labor and process of augmentation of value exactly as its direct result, a commodity, is the direct unity of use v. & ex. v. But the labor process is only the means of the processor augmentation of value, and the process of the augmentation of value as such is in essence the prod. of s.v., i.e. the process of the materialization of unpaid labor. By that token the whole character of the process of prod. is determined.

When we examine the process of prod. from two points of view, 1) as labor process, 2) as process of augmentation of value, then here is already posited the fact that it is only one indivisible labor process. Labor is not expended twice--once in order to produce a product, a use value corresponding to the given aim, in order to transform the m.p. into products, and another time to create value & s.v., in order to augment value. Labor is united only in its definite, concrete, specific form, method of existence, activity, which it is directed to a definite aim, which transforms m.p. into a definite product, for ex. spindle and cotton in weaving.

p.38

I have already earlier shown that the analysis of a commodity, reducing it to "labor" as was done by all preceding economists is ambiguous and incomplete. It is insufficient to reduce a commodity to "labor" but it is necessary to reduce it to labor in a dual form in which, on the one hand, it is concrete labor expresses itself in the use v. of the commodity & on the other hand, as socially necessary labor, is calculated as ex. v. within the process of prod. this distinction appears before us actively. It is not any longer we who make it, but it is created in the process of prod.

p.41

The distinction between materialized labor and living develops in the real labor process.....further in the labor process materialized labor develops as the material moment, as an element for the realization of living labor.

Altogether differently, however, the matter stands when we analyze the process of augmentation of value, of formation and creation of new value.

Here labor contained in the m.p. is only a definite quantity of general social labor & is therefore expressed in the value of a definite magnitude or in a monetary sum, factually in the price of these m.p. Labor which is added is a definite additional

quantity of general social labor is expressed as an additional magnitude of value or monetary sum. Labor which is contained in the m.p. is analogical to newly added labor. They are distinguished only by this that one is materialized in the use values, the other finds itself in the process of this materialization, one is past labor, the other present labor, one dead, the other living, one materialized in past time, the other materializing in present time. In this comprehensive scope, in which the past labor replaces living, it itself becomes the process, augments in value... This sucking up by the addition of living labor in the process of augmentation of its value by it, its actual transformation into capital, into a self-expanding value, is a transformation from a socially necessary magnitude of value into a variable one in the form of the social magnitude of value. Therefore, the superiority in this sense--in relation to the process of augmentation of value, the generation of a product--capital as materialized labor (added to labor formerly existing labor etc.) is counterposed to living labor (direct labor etc) as is counterposed to it by economists. However, they have constantly fall into a contradiction and ambiguity--that is true even on a cardo--since they did not clearly work out the analysis of a commodity as a product of labor in a cash form.

p.45

free market

Only thanks to the 1st process of exchange between capitalist and worker--as commodity owners--the living factor, capacity to labor, enters the process of prod. as a moment of the real form of capital. But only in the process of prod. itself does materialized labor by means of sucking up living labor, become transformed into capital, and thus labor becomes transformed into capital.

Y

The capitalist process aimed. is a unity of the labor process and process of augmentation of value. In order to transform money into capital they transform it into commodities, comprising factors of the labor process.... And to him (capitalist) belongs not only separate elements of the labor process but the whole labor process.

The capital which formerly existed in the form of money now exists in the form of the labor process. However, as a result of this that capital lords over the labor process & that the worker thus works for the capitalist instead for himself, the labor process does not change its general nature.....

But if we examine, on one hand, the aggregate capital, consequently the aggregate of buyers of capacities to labor, and the aggregate sellers of the capacity to labor on the other, then it is the worker precisely who must, instead of a commodity, sell his own capacity to labor as a commodity, because all m.p., all material conditions of labor, even as all m.c., money, m.p. & m.c. meet each other on opposite sides, as alien property because all material wealth meets (is counterposed to) the laborer as the property of commodity owners. It is surmised that the worker works as one having no property and that the condition of his labor are counterposed to him as alien property.... It is not the worker who buys m.c. & m.p. but m.c. which buys the worker in order to unite him with m.p.

Mar 15 1847
the cap. who
whole own
or man's work in

Condition of labor is labor

Mar 15

7

p.67,69

To the extent that the process of production is simply the labor process the wkr. uses in this process the m.p. simply as means of the existence of labor. But to the extent that the process of prod. is at the same time the process of the augmentation of value, the capitalist user in it the capacity to labor of the worker or appropriates to itself living labor as the (life juices of capital). Raw materials, the subject of labor in general, serve only in order to suck up alien labor & the instrument of labor serves only as a conductor, as that which directs in this process of suction. Thanks to the fact that the living capacity to labor is united with the material component parts of capital, the latter becomes a monster receiving life and begins to act "exactly as if awakened by lust". Since labor only in its definite useful form creates value & since each specific useful form of labor needs material and means of a specific use value ---- capital can be absorbed only to the extent that capital assumes the image of the needed definite processes of labor of specific m.p. & only in this form can it suck up living labor. Thus, from here it is understandable why the capitalist, worker and political economist who can think of the labor process only as the labor process, appropriated by capital, considers the material elements of labor as capital because of their material characteristics & why he (pol.-eco) is incapable of separating their material existence as simple factors of the labor process from the soldered with it social characteristics which make it capital. He is incapable of doing this because it is precisely the same, single labor process in which m.p., thanks to their material characteristics serve as means of existence of labor, transforms these same m.p. into simple means of sucking up labor. In the labor process, considered by itself, the worker uses the m.p. In the labor process which is at the same time the capitalist process of prod., the m.p. use the wkr., so that labor appears only as a means, with the help of which a definite magnitude of value, i.e. a definite quantity of materialized labor absorbs living labor in order to preserve & augment itself. Thus the labor process appears as the process of augmentation of value materialized by labor thru means of living labor. ~~Capital uses the worker & not the worker capital & only things which use the wkr., which therefore in the eyes of the capitalist possess value by its own consciousness & its own will are in essence capital.~~ To the extent that labor process is only the means & real form of a process of augmentation of value, i.e. to the extent that it is a process consisting of this, that besides labor materialized in wages, is materialized in commodities a surplus of unpaid labor, surplus value i.e. to produce s.v. -- the point of departure of this whole process is the exchange of materialized labor for living labor, the exchange of a lesser quantity of materialized labor for a greater quantity of living labor. In....

Chummy change

18

p.71

Therefore the great service of classical pol. eco. was this, that it represented the whole process of prod. as such a process between materialized labor & living labor & thus represented capital in counterposition to living labor only as materialized labor, i.e. as value, augmenting itself by means of living labor. Its insufficiency is this only, that the economists, first of all, were incapable

S.P. 1

Handwritten signatures and scribbles at the bottom of the page.

to show how this exchange of a greater quantity of living labor for a lesser quantity of materialized labor corresponds to the law of the exchange of commodities to the definition of value of commodities by labor time, and that they therefore confuse the exchange of a definite quantity of materialized labor for the capacity to labor in the process of circulation directly with the sucking of living labor occurring in the process of prod., (which is present in the form of the m.p.) by materialized labor.

The process of exchange between v.c. & capacity to labor they confuse with the process of sucking up living labor by constant capital. This insufficiency flows also from their "bourgeois" limitedness since to the capitalist himself who pays labor only after he augmented his value, the exchange of a small quantity of materialized labor for a greater quantity of living labor presents itself as a single direct process. Thus in the content of any economist's counter-poses capital to living labor or materialized labor then he understands under living labor the products of labor not to the extent that they have a use value & are the absorber of delimited useful works but to the extent that in them there is materialized a definite quantity of the general social labor, that is to the extent that they are value, money which augment their value thru the process of appropriation of alien living labor. This appropriation is materialized by the exchange occurring on the commodity market between v.c. & capacity to labor but is completed only in the real process of prod.

p.77

But capital in itself is indifferent to the peculiarities of each sphere of prod., & only the greater or lesser difficulty in sale of commodities or this or that sphere of prod. defines itself, where it is invested, how it is invested, in what volume it goes from one sphere of prod. into another or changes its distribution between different spheres of prod. In actuality this fluidity of capital meets with friction which we cannot go into here more accurately. But, as we shall see further, it, on one hand, creates for itself means to overcome these frictions to the extent that they arise only from the nature of the very relation of prod., & on the other hand, it eliminates (ystranyaet) with the dev. of the method of prod. characteristic for it, all established hindrances established by law & outside of the sphere of economics.

On its own free movement in different spheres of prod.

First of all it upsets all traditional limitations established by law which hinder him, according to his view, to buy that or another form of the capacity to labor or in any manner to appropriate that or another aspect of labor. Further, although the capacity to labor in each special sphere of prod. has its special mode, as the capacity to weave, make shoes, etc. & therefore for each special sphere of prod. there is needed a capacity to labor which had a certain development...it insulates this capacity to labor, however, this fluidity of capital presupposes its indifference to a special character of the labor process which he appropriates... We will see that the cap. method of prod. itself creates these eco. hindrances contradicting its own tendency, but it eliminates the hindrances of this fickleness established by law and non-eco.

p.79

.....In order to present the laws of pol. eco. in pure form, abstracting from them all hindrances, is the same as in pure mechanics to abstract all hindrances which it is necessary to overcome in each separate instance of its application.

The slump
1st round to cap
into 7/7/11

p.81,83

On the strictly commodity market the worker in reality, as every other owner of money, is distinguished only as a buyer from the owner of commodities as a seller. But on the labor market, on the contrary, money is always counterposed to him as a money form of capital & therefore the owner of money -- as the personification of capital, the capitalist while, on his side, is counterposed to the owner of money only as the personification of the capacity to labor, & consequently, labor, as a worker. (Here there is a footnote where Marx quotes Engels, Conditions, etc. p. 329: The relation of the cap. to the worker is a purely economic one. The cap. -- what is "capital", the worker -- that is labor".) What is counterposed to each other is not a simple buyer and not a simple seller, but a capitalist & a worker are counterposed to each other in the sphere of exchange, in the market in the capacity of buyer and seller. Their relationship as capitalist & worker is the prerequisite of their relation as buyer & seller. This is not, as is the case with other owners of commodities, a relation which merely flows from the nature of the products themselves, but precisely from the fact that one produces directly the products of their life's needs & each produces a definite product as a commodity, through the sale of which he appropriates for himself the product of others. It is not the social div. of labor.... but precisely thanks to the div. of mutually-linked elements of the process of prod. itself & the appropriation by it of the independence of money in relation to each other, reaching to the reciprocal personification, of money as the general form of materialized labor become the buyer of the capacity to labor, of the new source of ex. v. & consequently wealth.....

p.83

Since s.v. is the specific product of the process of prod., its product is not only a commodity but capital. Within the process of prod. labor is becomes transformed into capital. The activity of the capacity to labor, i.e. labor, is materialized in the process of prod., thus becomes value, but since labor has, before it begins, ceased to belong to the worker himself, that which is materialized for him, is the materialization of alien labor & therefore -- value, independently counterposed to the capacity to labor, capital. The product belongs to the capitalist & it represents capital in relation to the laborer, even as the elements of production do. On the other hand, real value -- or none -- becomes really capital only, when, 1st, it is represented as a value augmenting in value, as a value, achieving process, & as such it represents itself. Thanks to this, that the activity of alien capacity to labor, labor, sets in the process of prod. as an energy united to it, and belonging to it, & 2ndly, thanks to this, that as s.v. it is distinguished from itself as from an originally designated beforehand value, which in its turn is a result of the materialization of surplus labor.

p.83,85

In the process of prod. labor becomes materialized labor in contradistinction to living capacity to labor, i.e. capital, & 2ndly, thanks to the very sucking up of & appropriation of labor in the process of prod. the predestinated value becomes value, achieving the process & therefore value which created s.v. distinct from itself. Only thanks to this that labor in the course of the process of prod. becomes capital, a predestinated sum of value, which was potentially capital is realized as real capital.

Concept of labor
inferred

Handwritten notes and diagrams at the bottom of the page, including phrases like "But when labor is materialized", "the value is realized", and "the value is realized as real capital". There are also some scribbles and arrows.

p.85
 First of all, buying & selling of capacity to labor, an act which relates to the sphere of circulation, but when looking upon at the process of prod. as a whole comprises not only one of the moments and prerequisite but also the constant result of the latter. This buying & selling of the capacity to labor presupposes a separation of the material conditions of labor, i.e. -- means of existence -- from the living capacity to labor, since the latter is the only (single) property which is at the disposal of the worker & his only commodity for sale. The separation has proceeded so far that these conditions of prod. are counterposed to the worker's independence since the capitalist as their owner is only their personification in a strict distinction to the worker as the owner of merely the capacity to labor. This division (separation) and appropriation of independence is the prerequisite for this that there occur the buying & selling of capacity to labor, consequently, that living labor in general was united to dead labor as a means of its preservation and self-enrichment, i.e. self-growth. Without the exchange of v.c. for capacity to labor there would be no place for the self-growth of the aggregate capital & consequently also the formation of capital or transformation of v.c. into capital; the second moment is the actual process of prod., i.e. consequently the actual process of the utilization of the capacity to labor bought by the owner of money or commodities.

p.87
 In the actual process of prod. the material conditions of labor -- material and means of labor -- serve not only for this, that living labor become materialized but in order that there be materialized more labor than was contained in v.c. Consequently, they serve as means as means of swallowing up and squeezing out surplus labor which represents itself in surplus value (and surplus product). Thus if we are to look both moments: the first of all, the exchange of capacity to labor for v.c. & secondly the real process of prod. (in which living labor is added to capital as an active force) then the whole process is a process in which 1) less quantity of materialized labor is exchanged for a greater quantity of living labor to the extent that what the capitalist really receives in ex. of wages is living labor & 2) material forms in which capital directly represents itself in the labor process of prod. (i.e. again materialized labor) as means of squeezing out and swallowing this living labor -- as a whole, as a process, accomplishes between materialized & living labor, a process which not only transforms materialized ~~labor~~ living labor into materialized labor, but with it transforms also living labor into capital. Thus this process in which not a commodity but s.v. is produced is also capital.

M.p. here are represented not only as means of realizing labor but in an equal measure as means of exploiting alien labor.

-13-

Formal subordination of labor to capital

p.85,87

The labor process becomes the means of the process of augmentation of value, the process of self-expansion of the value of capital -- the prod. of s.v. The labor process is subordinated to capital (this is its own process) & the capitalist enters it as manager, as director; & this process is for him at the same time the direct process of exploitation of alien labor. This I call the formal subordination of labor to capital.....

The process of prod. becomes the process of capital itself. This is the process occurring with factors of the labor process in which the money of the capitalist becomes transformed & occurring under his leadership with the aim of making more money into more money.....

...when the former slaveowner uses his former slaves as wage workers... then the process of prod. with other social determinations become transformed into the cap. process of prod....The slaves cease to be an ^{element} ~~element~~ of prod. belonging to him who uses him....Till the process of prod. they met each other as commodity owners and there existed between them only a monetary relation, within the process of prod. they are counterposed to each other as the personified functionaries of factors of this process, the capitalist as "capital" & the direct producer as "labor" and their relation is determined by this that labor ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ has become a simple factor of self-expansion of capital.

p.93

There arises also the immanent capitalist justification of the cap. relation. The capacity to labor to preserve the value appears as capacity of capital for self-preservation, the capacity of labor to create value appears as the capacity of capital to self-expansion & as a whole according to the as-enceof understanding materialized labor appears as a factor applying living labor.

p.97,99 Real subordination of labor to capital, or the specifically cap. method of prod.

In Ch. III, there was shown in detail how, with the prod. of relative s.v. (stimulated for the individual capitalist to the extent that he takes the initiative, by this, that the value equal to the socially necessary labor time, materialized in the product, that consequently, there is created for him s.v.; as only an individual value of his product proves less than the social value & therefore the product can be sold above its individual value) there is changed the whole real form of the method of prod. and there arises the specifically cap. method of prod. (also technologically) only on the basis of which & simultaneously with the development of which there develops also prod. relations corresponding to the process of prod. between the various agents of prod. & particularly between the capitalist & wage worker.

....this dev. of the productive force of socialized labor in contrast more or less to the isolated labor of an individual etc. & together with it the application of science, of this common product of social development, to the direct process of prod. --all this represents itself as the productive force of capital & not the productive force of labor, or the productive force of labor only to the extent that it

It is identical with capital & in any case not the productive force of an individual workers nor the workers combined in the process of prod. The mystification ~~is~~ in the ~~process~~ capitalist relation in general now develops considerably further that it could ~~be~~ merely under the formal subordination of labor to capital. On the other hand, only here does there appear (specifically appear) with especial clarity both the historic significance of the cap. prod. precisely thanks to the retransformation of the process of prod. itself and the development of the social productive forces of labor.

It was shown above (Ch.III) how the "social" etc. in the labor of the worker not only "in imagination" but "actually" is counterposed to the worker not only as something alien, but as something hostile and antithetical, as the materialization & personification in capital.

p.101

Just as the prod. of absolute s.v. can be considered as the material expression of the formal subordination of labor to capital, so the prod. of relative s.v. can be considered the expression of the real subordination of labor to capital.

Supplement to the formal subordination of labor to capital

p.101,103

The following essentially exist under the formal subordination:

1) the purely money relation between him who appropriates for himself surplus labor & him who gives it up; to the extent that there arises a subordination, it arises from the definite content of the sale & not from the subordination preceding it, thanks to which the producer would have been put in a different than money relation (relation of commodity owner to commodity owner) to the exploiter of his labor as a consequence of the political etc. relation; precisely only as an owner of the conditions of labor the buyer here puts the seller in an economic dependence upon him; this is not a political and socially fixed relation of mastery and subjection;

2) in the first relation there is already included that circumstance - because in the opposite case the worker would not need to sell his capacity to labor -- that his objective conditions of labor (m.p.) & subjective conditions of labor (means of existence) are counterposed to him as capital, as his capacities to labor monopolized by the buyer. The greater degree in which these conditions of labor fully are counterposed to him as alien property, the fuller does the formal relation of capital and wage labor, i.e. formal subordination of labor to capital, become the condition & prerequisite of the real subordination.

In the method of prod. itself there is yet no difference. Considered technologically, the labor process is accomplished just as before, only now as a labor process subordinated to capital. However, in the process of prod. itself there develops, as was formerly described: 1) the economic relation of mastery & subordination thanks to the fact that the utilization of the capacity to labor is materialized by the capitalist, that is, under his overserhip & leadership; 2) there develops a great uninterruptedness and intensity of labor & great economy in the conditions of the application of labor since all forces are applied in order that the product represented ~~is~~ the only socially-necessary (or better

still less) labor time, & this, both in relation to living labor used for its prod. and in relation to materialized labor which, as value of the utilized m.p. enters into it as a value-forming factor.

(Here Marx quotes approvingly in footnote which he says belongs in the next section from Grundrisse: "The free worker ordinarily is free to change masters: this freedom distinguishes him from a slave to the same extent as the English sailor on a military boat is distinguished from a worker on a commercial boat...The condition of the worker is better than that of the slave because the worker considers himself free & this conviction, no matter how mistaken, has not a little influence on the character of the population.")

p.107

If the relation of mastery & subjection arises instead of slavery, serfdom, vassal relations, patriarchal unx etc., forms of subordination, then there occurs only a change in the form of this relation. The form becomes freer because it now has a material character, formally voluntary, surely economic etc.

p.119 Real subordination of labor to capital

The general characteristic feature of the normal subordination remains, and precisely the direct subordination of the process of labor to cap., no matter on what technologic base it occurred. However, on this base arises technologically & in other relations, the specifically cap. method of prod., reorganizing the real nature of the labor process & its real conditions of prod. Only with the appearance of the latter is there place for the real subordination of labor to capital.

p.121

The real subordination of labor to capital develops in all these forms which develop relative surplus value in distinction from absolute.

With the real subordination of labor to capital occurs a full (and constantly continuing & repetitive) revolution in the very method of prod., in the productivity of labor in relation of the cap. & wkr.

Under the real subordination of labor to capital there advances all earlier changes in the very process of labor that were developed by us. There develops the social productive forces of labor & with labor on a large scale there develops the application of science & machines in the direct process. On the one hand, the cap. method of prod. which now becomes formed as a method of prod. of a special kind, creates the altered method of material prod. On the other hand, this alteration in the material form creates a basis for the development of the cap. relation, an adequate manner of which therefore corresponds to the definite degree of development of the productive forces of labor.

p.123, 125

The material product of cap. prod., relative apart from the development of the social productive forces of labor, is the increase of the

mass of products & augmentation of the quantity & varied spheres of

prod. & their branching out & only with this correspondingly develops ex. v. of products & that sphere in which they act as ex. v. or
are realized.

p.125

"Prod. fo. the sake of prod" --prod. as a self-aim -- appears, it is true, already under the formal subordination of labor to capital, just as soon ^{in general} the direct aim of prod. becomes to produce an ever greater & greater s.v., just as soon as in general the ex. v. of the product becomes the decisive aim. However, this immanent tendency of cap. relation is realized in an adequate manner --and itself becomes the necessary condition also technologically, -- only then when there developed the socially cap. method of prod. & with it the real subordination of labor to capital.

This last moment was already earlier examined in detail so that we can be very brief here. This is prod. which is not tied up with predetermining a predetermined limits of needs. Its contradictory character includes the limits of prod. from which it constantly strives to come out. From this we have crises, overprod. etc., This is one side in distinction from the former method of prod; if convenient, the positive side. On the other hand there is the negative or contradictory character; prod. in contradiction to the producer & unconcerned about him. The real producer as a simple means of prod., material wealth as a self-aim. And from this the development of this material wealth in opposition to the human individual and at his expense.....

Productive & nonproductive labor

p.127

Just as the direct aim and peculiar product of cap. prod: is s.v., so only that labor is productive which produces directly s.v. & only he who applies his capacity of labor is a productive worker who produces directly sv; consequently, it is only that labor which is utilized in the process of prod. for the augmentation of the value of capital.

p.129

That wkr. is productive who accomplishes productive labor & that labor is productive, which creates s.v., i.e. augments the value of capital.

p.137

The cap. process of prod. is not only the prod. of commodities. It is a process which swallows up unpaid labor, makes of the m.p. the means of sucking in unpaid labor.

From the foregoing it follows that to be a productive labor is a designation of labor which in itself has absolutely nothing in common with the definite content of labor, with its special usefulness or its peculiar use v. in which it expresses itself.....

p.143

The tendency to determine prod. & non-productive labor by its material content arises from three sources:

- 1) Characteristic to the cap. method of prod. & flowing from its essence the fetishistic ^{view} that examines the economic determinations of form --as to be a commodity, to be productive labor etc.-- as a characteristic belonging to the material bearers of these determinations of the forms or categories in themselves.
- 2) That, if we are to examine the labor process as such, only that labor is productive, the result of which is a product (a material product because the question here deals only with material wealth);
- 3) That in the actual process of prod. --if we are to examine its real moments -- there exists a great difference in the relation of the formation etc. of wealth between labor which is expressed in subjective serving for reprod. and labor expressed only in articles of luxury.

1849

p.145

The distinction between productive & nonproductive labor consists only in this, is labor exchanged for money as money, or for money as capital. If, for ex., I buy a commodity from an independent worker, craftsman etc., then ~~xxxxxxx~~ there cannot be any question about this category in general because here there is no direct exchange between money & some form of labor but is an exchange between money and a commodity.

p.147

The distinction between productive & non prod. labor is important in relation to accumulation since only the exchange for productive labor is one of the conditions of the reverse transformation of s.v. into capital.

The capitalist, as the representative of capital, finding itself in the process of augmentation of its value -- of the productive capital -- executes a productive function which consists precisely in ~~ihixixixi~~ order to direct and exploit productive labor. In contrast to other co-participants in the use of s.v. who do not find themselves in such a direct and active relation to their prod., that class is a productive class par excellence. (As a leader of the labor process the capitalist can execute productive labor in this sense that its labor is included in the aggregate labor process which is swallowed up in the product) Here we know capital only within the direct process of prod.

Thus, the determination of productive labor (& consequently nonproductive labor as its opposite) is based on this that prod. of cap. is prod. of s.v. & that labor applied by it is labor producing s.v.

Gross and net product

(Perhaps belongs better to Vol.III, Ch.III)

p.147

Since the aim of cap. prod. (& therefore productive labor as well. is included not in the (safeguarding) of the existence of the producers but in the prod. of s.v., then the whole necessary labor which does not produce surplus labor is surplus & has no value for the cap. prod. This circumstance has force also in relation to the capitalist nation (as a whole). The whole gross product which merely reproduces the worker, i.e. does not produce a ~~xxxx~~ net product (surplus product) is also surplus excess, as is the worker who produces it.... In other words, there is needed only that number of people who can bring profit to capital. The same applies to a capitalist nation.....

The at the aim of cap. prod. is the net product, is in fact posited already in the form of surplus product in which s.v. is represented, in this that cap. prod. in its very essence is prod. of s.v.

p.151

However by tradition there are linked a series of confused ideas in the distinction between gross and net product. The source of these partly are the physiocrats (cf. Bk.IV) & partly A. Smith who still mixes up cap. prod. with prod. for direct producers.

When an individual capitalist transfers money abroad where he receives 10% profit at the time when within the country he could give work to a greater number of surplus population, then from the capitalist point of view he deserves the highest praise since this conscientious bourgeois executes the law which distributes capital both on the world market and within the limits of a definite society in correspondence to the rate of profit which supplies to separate branches of prod. precisely in this manner, equalizing (evening out) the branches & realizing definite proportions in prod. (In this case it is a matter of indifference, for ex., when the Russian Czar has money for war with Turkey, etc.) Acting in this manner, the individual capitalist

follows only the inherent law & consequently also the moral of capital -- to produce as much s.v. as possible. But this has nothing in common with an examination of the direct process of prod.

p.153

In general we have seen that the law of cap. prod. is included in the augmentation of constant in relation to v. & s.v., to the next product; andly, in the augmentation of the net prod. in relation to that part of the prod. which reimburses capital, i.e. wages. These two things are confused. If the aggregate product is to be called the gross product, then under the cap. method of prod. it grows in relation to the net product; if ~~we~~ ~~we~~ to call the net product that part of the product which fall into wages plus net product, so the net product grows in relation to the gross product. Only in agriculture (thanks to the transformation of arable land into pastures) the net product often grows (increases) at the expense of the gross (of the whole mass of products), as a consequence of certain characteristic determination for rent which is not concern us here.

For the rest the teaching about net product as a secret in a higher aim of prod. is merely the vulgar but true expression of this, that the augmentation of the value of capital & consequently, the creation of s.v. without any concern for the worker is the motive goal of cap. prod.

The mystification of capital etc.

p.153, 4

Since living labor -- in the process of prod. -- is already annexed to capital, so all the social productive forces of labor are represented as productive forces characteristic of capital, exactly as in money the universal character of labor, to the extent that it forms value, has been represented by the characteristic of things. That all the more appears so because

1) altho labor, as the manifestation of the capacity to labor, as a force belonging to the individual worker, this is what in reality he pays to the capitalist, which he gives to him), despite the fact that when materialized in a product, it (1) belongs to the capitalist, -- despite that, that social combination in which separate capacities to labor function only as special organs of the aggregate capacity to labor, comprising the factory as a whole, belongs not to him, but on the contrary, opposes him as a capitalist org., forces itself upon him;

2) these social productive forces of labor or prod. forces of social labor develop historically only together with the specifically-cap. method of prod. i.e. ~~develop~~ ~~develop~~ as something immanent to the cap. relation & indivisible from it;

3) ~~that~~ the objective conditions of labor, with the dev. of the cap. method of prod. assume an altered form thanks to the scale in which they are applied, & the economy with which they are used (completely leaving aside the machine system) etc.) They become more developed as concentrated m.p., representing social wealth & that, strictly, exhausts in the scope & results of productive conditions of socially-combined labor. Leaving aside the combination of labor itself, this social character of the conditions of labor -- to which, by the way, belongs their form as a machine system, and basic capital in any form -- is represented as something independent, existing independently of the workers. In a yet greater degree than the social character of their own labor, the social character which assumes the conditions of prod. as joint conditions of prod. of combined labor, is represented as a capitalistic character, inherent in these conditions of prod. as such independent of the workers.

p.157

Science, as the general spiritual product of social dev., here likewise develops as something directly annexed to capital (thx its application as

As usual
"Cap. employs labor"
with the Eng. of the world.

science in the material process of production separate from the knowledge and ability of separate workers) & the dev. of society as a whole, thanks to this, that it is exploited by capital in relation to labor, acts as a productive force in relation to labor, is represented by the development of capital itself & this all the more because for the tremendous majority this goes hand in hand with the ravaging (entleerung) of the capacity to labor.

157

Productivity of capital consists first of all, if we are to examine the formal subordination, only in the coercion to surplus labor; coercion which the cap. method of prod. shares with former method of prod. but realizes it in a form more advantageous for prod.

universal

158

Even if we examine the surplus formal relation, the general form of cap. prod. which both more & less developed methods of this prod. share--the means of prod. & material conditions of labor develop not as subordinated to the laborer but, on the contrary, to which he is subordinated. Capital employs labor. This simple relation already is the personification of things and reification of people.

This relation becomes more complex & appears more mysterious thanks to this, that with the dev. of the specifically cap. method of prod. not only these things, these products of labor as use values & exchange values assert themselves in relation to the wrk. as are counterposed to him as "capital" but are represented by the social form of labor by the forms of development of capital & therefore developing in this manner productive forces of social labor are represented as productive forces of capital. As such social forces they are "capitalized" in relation to labor.....

p.161

Capital itself has a dual character since it consists of commodities:
(1) Ex. v. (money) but self-expanding value which creates value, increases as value, receives an increase --thanks to this that it is value. This is reduced to the exchange of a given quantity of materialized labor for a greater quantity of living labor.

(2) Use value & here capital develops from the sides of its definite relations in the labor process. But here precisely capital does not remain on material of labor, means of labor, to which labor belongs, which annexed labor to themselves but with labor (it annexes to itself) also its social combination & dev. of means of labor corresponding to this social combination. Cap. prod. develops at first on a large scale--the greater part independent of individual independent workers--the conditions of the labor process as material as well as objective forces but develops them as dominating over the individual worker & alien to him.

Thus capital becomes a very mystifying being.

The conditions of labor are piled up as social forces directed against the worker & in this form they are capitalized.

p.163

Thus capital is productive

(1) as coercion to surplus labor. Labor is productive precisely as the executor of this surplus labor thanks to the difference between the value of the capacity to labor & the value received from its utilization.

(2) as a personification & representative --the materialized form of the "social prod. forces of labor" or productive forces of social labor.... The social natural force of labor develops not in the process of

augmentation of value as such but in the real labor process. Therefore

this force is represented as a characteristic inherent in capital as a

thing, as its use value. Productive labor as producing value always is opposed to capital as labor of individual workers no ~~xxixhx~~ matter in what social combinations these workers do not enter in the process of prod. At the time that capital thus represents, in relation to the worker the social productive force of labor, productive labor always represents in relation to capital only the labor of individual workers.

In the examination of the process of accumulation we saw in what manner the moment thanks to which the labor already gone through in the form of produced productive forces & conditions of prod. increases the scope of reprod. in relation to the use value & ex. v.--as a mass of value which is preserved by a definite quantity of living labor, so also the mass of use values which he produces grows--develops as the force immanent to capital since materialized labor always functions in relation to the worker as capitalised.....

p.165,167

Putting in place of the social productive forces of labor the material characteristics of capital has become so fixed in imagination that the superiority of machines, the application of science, inventions, etc. are represented in their their alienated form as the necessary form and therefore all this is represented by the characteristics of capital. The basis for this is: (1) the form in which this matter appears on the basis of cap. prod. & consequently also in the consciousness of the confused by it method of prod. (2) that historic fact that this dev. at first has place in distinction from other methods of prod. precisely under the capitalistic method of prod. & therefore the contradictory of this dev. appears to it as immanent.

Hyk.
1852

II- CAP. PROD. IS THE PROD. & REPROD. OF THE SUBJECTIVE CAPITALIST
RELATIVE TO PROD.

p.167,168

The product of cap. prod. is not only s.v. but capital.

Capital, as a use, is - - -, a self-expanding value. It generates v. what occurred during the process of its realization? The worker sold a right for the utilization of his capacity to labor for necessary means of existence, for a given value which is determined by the value of his capacity to labor. ... what did he give up for this? The capacity to labor which generates, creates, augments value, his labor. ... leaving aside the wearing out of his l...-... subjective l... which sustains itself through the process to preserve itself.

169 On the contrary, capital comes out of the process as he entered it. Only in it he has secured for himself additional capital, into a self-expanding value. The aggregate product is not in that form in which it exists as a having been realized capital. In that capacity it again counterposes labor as the prerogative of the capitalist, as an ind. force created by labor. Thus the process of prod. was not only the process of its reprod. but the process of its prod. as capital. Formerly the conditions of prod. were counterposed to the laborer as capital to the extent that he found them as having become independent in relation to him. Now this product of his own labor is that circumstance which in which he finds the conditions of prod. counterposed to him. That which was a prerequisite is now the result of the process of prod.

To this extent this circumstance that the process of prod. creates capital is only another expression for this that it creates s.v.

But it does not stop here. s.v. is transformed again into additional capital, it serves for the formation of new capital or for growing capital. Thus capital created capital and not merely only realized itself as capital. The process of accumulation is only the inherent moment of cap. process of prod. It includes in itself all bases for the creation of wage laborers. Labor produces its conditions of prod. as capital & capital & capital produces labor as means for its realization as capital, as wage labor. The capital-prod. is not only the reprod. of this relation, it is its reprod. in an ever growing widening scope, & to that degree in which with cap. method of prod. there develops the social productive force of labor, there grows as counterposition to the worker the piled-up wealth as wealth dominating him, as capital, there widens the counterposed to him world of wealth as alien to him, dominating him world & in opposition to this in the same degree there grows his own poverty, need and dependence. His devastation (entleering) and this abundance correspond to each other, go hand in hand. Together with this grows the mass of these living means of prod. of capital, the toiling proletariat.

p.171

Therefore the increase of capital & growth of the prod. develop as products of one & the same process, linked between each other, altho polarized.

.... From the point of view of the uninterruptedness of the process of prod. wages is only a part of the constantly produced product by the wrk. which as wages is circulated in means of existence & thus into means of preserving & augmenting the capacity to labor which are necessary to capital for its self-expansion, for its living process. Thus this preservation and multiplication of the capacities to labor as a result of process develops in its turn only as reprod. & expansion of the conditions of reprod. & conditions of accumulation belonging to it. (Cf. Yankee)

Together with this there disappears also the appearance which possessed this relation on the surface & that ^{that} is on the commodity market in circulation equal commodity owners meet each other, who ing as all commodity owners, are distinguished from each other by the material content of their commodities, by the specific use values of the commodities which they sell each other. Or this primary ^{preliminary} form of the relation remains only as the appearance posited at the base of the cap. relation.

p.171,172

It is necessary here to distinguish the moments by which the relation itself is reproduced in an ever widening scale as the result of the cap. process of prod. which is distinct from its first form, on the one hand, as it reveals historically, on the other hand, as it is constantly anew represented on the surface of a civilized society.

1) First of all, in relation to the introductory process which occurs in the frame of the process of circulation — buying & selling of capacity to labor.

....The buying & selling of the capacity to labor as the constant result of the capitalist process of prod. includes in itself that the worker must buy back part of his own product in exchange for his living labor. Thus there disappears the illusion of a relation or as a simple relation of commodity owners. This constant buying & selling of capacity of labor & constant counterposition of the commodity produced by the worker himself as the buyer of his capacity to labor & his c.c. encloses only as the mediating form of his subordination to capital (as a form) of living labor as simple means of preservation & multiplication of materialized having received independence in relation to him. This terminalization of the relation between capital as the buyer & the worker as the seller of labor is the immanent form of mediation of this method of prod., but it is a form which only in form is distinguished from other direct forms of impoverishing labor & ownership of it on the side of the owners of the conditions of prod.....

p.175

Consequently they are wrong:

who look upon wage labor, the sale of labor to capital & by that token the form of wage labor as inn external to the relationship of cap. prod; it is an essentially immanent form of mediation (materialization) of the latter, constantly reproduced by the cap. relation of prod. itself.

and they are wrong:

who in this superficial relation, in this essential formality, appearance of cap. relation find its very essence & therefore assert that they characterize this relation when they subordinate the worker & capitalist to the general mutual relation of commodity owners & by that token apologize for this relation, erasing its differential specificities.

2) In order that the (cap. relation) in general should arise, there is necessary as a prerequisite a definite historic degree & form of social prod. In the frame of the former method of prod. must develop means of communication, means of prod. & needs which go out of the limits of the old prod. relations & forces them to become transformed into a capitalist relation. But they must be developed only to the extent that they passed thru the formal subordination of labor to capital. On the basis of this changing relation there develops the specifically changed method of prod. which, on the one hand, creates new material productive forces, on the other hand, itself develops only on their basis & by that token in fact creates for itself new real conditions. Together with it there approaches a full economic revolution which, on the one hand, first creates real conditions for the domination of capital over labor, completes, gives to this corresponding form & on the other hand, in the

developed by it, in contradiction to the worker, productive forces of labor, in the conditions of production & communication creates real conditions for the new method of prod., eliminating the contradictory form of cap. method of prod. & creates thus the material basis for the retransformation anew of the social process of life & by that same token of a new social formation.

p.177
This concept is essentially different from the view of bourgeois economists, who are captives of the capitalist presentations, who although they see how production is realized within the capitalist relation, but at the same time do not understand, how this relation itself is created & how together with this are created the material conditions of its decomposition & by that token there is eliminated its historic justification as a necessary form of eco. development, of the prod. of social wealth.

We on the contrary say not only how capital produces but how it itself is produced & how it comes out of the produced process essentially changed in relation to how it entered it. On the one hand, it retransforms the method of prod., on the other hand, this entered method of prod. & the specific degree of development of the material productive forces is the basis & condition of its own formation.

The result of the direct process of prod.

Not only the material conditions of the process of prod. appear as its result but also their specifically social character, (social relations) & consequently also the social condition of the agents of prod. in relation to each other the production relations themselves are produced, the essence of the uninterruptedly renewing result of the process.

(end of Lx's MS as found--FF)

Transition from 1) & 2 of this ch. to 3) which we (MA) here examined as 1)

We saw that cap. prod. is the prod. of s.v. & how this prod. of s.v. (under accumulation) is at the same time the prod. of cap. & prod. & reprod. of the whole capitalist relation in an ever augmented scale. But s.v. is produced only as part of the commodity value & later is expressed also in a definite quantity of commodities or surplus products. Capital produces s.v. & reproduces itself only as a producer of commodities. Therefore we must first of all again take up the commodity as its direct product. But, as we saw, commodities, examined from the view of their form (their economically determined form) are incomplete results.

p.179

They must preliminarily go thru certain transformation of form-- they must again enter the process of exchange in which they go thru these transformations of form, before they can again function as wealth, in the form of money or as use value. Thus we must more closely examine now the commodity as the immediate result of the cap. process of prod. & later further process which it must go thru. Commodities are essentially elements of cap. prod. & commodities are essential products of the latter, the given of the form in which capital appears again at the end of the process of prod.

.....What was at the beginning an element of cap. prod., later proves to be its own product. Only on this basis does it become the universal form of the product --a commodity & the more it develops the more all ingredients of production enter the process as commodities.

(INSERT HERE SECTION III COMMODITIES AS PRODUCTS OF CAPITAL--FF)

III. COMMODITIES AS PRODUCTS OF CAPITAL

p.181

A commodity as the elementary form of bourgeois wealth was our point of departure, the prerequisite of the appearance of capital. On the otherhand, commodities now appear as products of capital.

This ^{rotation} ~~knigevorot~~ of our description corresponds also to the his. dev. of capital for which the ex. of commodities, commodity trade is one of the conditions of appearance which however, in its turn, is formed on the basis of different degrees of dev. of prod., to all of which is general the condition that cap. prod. at these degrees does not yet exist or exists only sporadically. On the other hand, a developed ex. of commodities as the form of commodity as the generally necessary social form of the product are only a result of the cap. method of prod.

If we examine on the other hand a society with a dev. cap. prod. then the commodity appears as the constant, elementary prerequisite (condition of existence) of capital and also the direct result of the cap. process of prod., on the other hand.....

p.183,189

The transformation of money which are essentially only the transformed form of the commodity, has a place in capital only from the time when the capacity of labor has become transformed into a commodity for the worker himself, & consequently the category of commodity trade has already dominated the sphere which was formerly included or excluded from it only sporadically.

Only from the time when the working population has ceased belonging to the objective conditions of labor, or has ceased to appear on the mkt. as a commodity owner, from the moment when, on the contrary, it sells not the product of his labor, but labor itself, more correctly, his capacity to labor=prod. in all its sphere, in all its depth and width becomes commodity prod., the whole product has become transformed into a commodity & the material conditions of each separate sphere of prod. are included within it as a commodity. Only on the basis of cap. prod. does the commodity become the general elementary form of wealth. If for ex., capital has not yet dominated agric. then a great part of the product will still be produced directly as a means of supporting life, & not as a commodity; a great part of the working population will not yet have been transformed into wage laborers & a great part of the conditions of labor will not yet have become transformed into capital. Here is also included this, that a developed division of labor, as it appears accidentally within society & the cap. division of labor within the factory mutually condition & produce each other. Because a commodity as the direct form of the product & therefore ex the alienation of the product as the necessary form of its appropriation presupposes a completely developed div. of social labor at the same time as, on the other hand, only on the basis of cap. prod., consequently also of the cap. div. of labor within the factory, the whole product necessarily assumes the form of the commodity & all producers are therefore necessarily producers of commodities. Therefore only under cap. prod. the use value fully is materialised in the ex. v.

III, p. 28

cap / (1) paragraf
(2) memore as
(3) coming copies
individual
value

three points.

18

- 1) Only cap. prod. makes the commodity the prevailing form of all products.
- 2) Commodity prod. necessarily leads to cap. prod as soon as the workers ceased being a part of the conditions of prod. (slavery, serfdom) or the basis is not the primitive society (India), from the moment when labor power itself becomes a commodity.
- 3) Capitalist prod. eliminates (ystranyayet) the basis of commodity prod., isolated, independent prod. ex. of commodity owners or the ex. of equivalents. Exchange between capital & l.p. becomes formal.

From this point of view it is a matter of complete indifference in what form the conditions of prod. themselves enter the labor process, whether they yield--as, for ex. part of c.c., machines, etc.--their value to the product gradually or,--as raw material--go materially into the product; whether part of the prod.--as for ex., seeds in agriculture--again by the producers directly, as means of labor, or whether the product from the first is sold & then again is turned into a means of labor. All produced means of labor now function--independent of how they use value in the process of prod. serve,--together with them as elements of the process of the augmentation of value.

187

Commodity as the general necessary form of the product, as the specific peculiarity of the cap. method of prod. reveals itself in prod. on a wide scale which is brought about with the development of cap. prod. in the one-sidedness & mass character of the product which gives it (condition of prod.) a social and strictly linked with social relations character & leads to the fact that its direct relation as a use v. to the satisfaction of the needs of producers is something entirely accidental, indifferent & non-existent (nyesyshtchestvenoy). This mass product has to be realized as an ex. v., to go thru the metamorphosis of the commodity not only as a necessity for the satisfaction of the life of the producer who produces as a capitalist but also as a necessity for the renewal & uninterruptedness of the process of prod. itself....

p. 189

A commodity as it comes out of cap. prod. is distinctly different from a commodity as it is an element, a prerequisite of cap. prod. We proceeded from a separate commodity as an independent product in which is materialised a definite quantity of labor time & which therefore has an ex. v. of a definite magnitude.

Now a commodity appears in this dual determination:

1) There is materialised in it--outside of its use v.--a definite quantity of socially-necessary labor; but at the time when for it as a commodity as such it remains completely unknown (& factually immaterial) whose materialised labor, etc.--it is--the commodity as a product of capital contains part paid & part unpaid labor....

2) An individual commodity appears not only materially as part of the aggregate product of capital, as a small part of the

III, p. 26

mass produced by it. We in general have before us already not a separate independent commodity, not an individual product. It is not individual commodities that appear as a result of the process ^{but} the mass of commodities, in which is reproduced the value of the advanced capital plus s.v.--appropriated surplus labor & each separate commodity is the carrier of the value of capital & the ~~fixed~~ surplus labor produced by it... In the determination of price of a separate commodity it appears only as a single ideal part of the aggregate product in which capital is reprod.

3) As such--as a carrier of the aggregate value ^{of the} capital plus s.v. in distinction from a commodity which at first appeared before us as an independent--as a product of capital, in fact as a transformed form of capital which had gone thru its process of augmentation of value, a commodity now reveals itself in volume, within the dimensions of sale which must have a place in order that there may be realized the former value of capital & the already mentioned s.v. produced by it, which in no case can be realized (only) by this that individual commodities or part of them will be sold at their value.....

p. 193

When we examined the process of augmentation of value it was revealed that part of the advanced c.c., as buildings, machines, etc. yield to the product only definite shares of their value, which the c.c., as means of labor, loses in the labor process; that the c.c. never enters into the product materially in the form of its own use v.; that it during a rather lengthy period continues to serve in the labor process the production of a commodity & that that part of value which it during a determined period of time yields up to the produced product during this period, is determined by the relation of this determined period for the whole period, during which it is used up as a means of labor, loses as a consequence of this its whole value & transfers it to the product; as, for ex., when it serves during 10 yrs., it yields to the product during one yr. a 10th of its value, adds a 10th of its value to the annual product of capital. To the extent that this part of the c.c., after produce of a number of products, continues to serve as means of labor & continues still to represent the definite value according to our ex. above, it did not enter in the formation of the value of mass of products produced. ~~xxxxxxx~~

pp. 211, 213

general

It ~~xxxxxx~~ is necessary in ~~xxxxx~~ to note that when as a consequence of the lowering of wages (here as a result of the augmented productivity of labor) there is needed less v.c. for the application of a given quantity of labor, i.e. for the application of a given quantity of labor with greater advantage for capital, thanks to this, that the paid part of this quantity falls in comparison to the unpaid,--then in those instances when the capitalist continues to invest the former sum of v.c., he wins doubly since he receives not only the whole rate of s.v. on the former general sum but he also exploits with this whole rate of s.v. a greater quantity of labor, altho his v.c. did not grow in magnitude.

III, p. 1

Thus consequently there is revealed:

- 1) under changing commodity prices the rate & mass of s.v. can remain constant; &
- 2) under constant commodity prices the rate & mass of s.v. can change.

In general commodity prices, as was developed when we examined the prod. of s.v., influence it only to the extent that they enter into order of reproduction of capacity to labor & thus change its value////

From 1) it follows that the fall in commodity prices, cheapening of commodities, resulting from productivity of labor--leaving aside the part of the commodities which by their cheapening cheapen the capacity to labor.. signifies, it is ~~ade~~, that in individual commodities there is materialised less labor, or the same quantity of labor is expressed in a greater quantity of commodities, as a consequence of which there falls a lesser part of labor for a separate commodity; but this cheapening in itself does not signify that there is changed a proportional division, included in each separate commodity, of labor into paid & unpaid. ...

From 2) follows (see III & IIIa)--that altho commodity prices remain the same & productivity of living labor, applied directly in this sphere of prod., the result of which are these products, remains the same--the rate & mass of s.v. can increase. .. Explicitly, v.c. of a definite magnitude of value do not at all always bring into motion the same quantities of living labor; therefore, to the extent that it is considered as a simple symbol of these quantities of labor which it moves, it is a symbol of a variable magnitude.

The last remark (to a second law) shows that a commodity as a product of capital, as a separate part of capital, as a carrier of capital augmenting in value, including in itself therefore a part of s.v. produced by capital, can be considered other than we have considered it at the beginning of our investigation of an individual independent commodity.....

An individual commodity --as a product of capital, in fact as an elementary part of capital reproduced & augmented in value--reveals its distinction from an individual commodity which was our point of departure as a prerequisite of the formation of capital, from the independent commodity looked upon still in this--besides the point examined thus far & concerning determination of price--that when a commodity is sold at its price, the value of the capital spent on its prod., is not realised & still less is the s.v. created by this capital realised. As simple carriers of capital--not only materially as parts or use v. of which capital consists but also as carriers of value of which capital consists--commodities can be sold at price corresponding to their value & all the same be sold lower than their value, as products of capital & as component parts of the aggregate product in which there now exists a byzantish obrason exists the capital augments its value.

213

See notebook
p 213
215

but also of the value of cap. which amounts

III, p. 4

Direct

p. 217, 218

Rev 5th 9302

In Ch. 2, sec. 3 of this first book we saw how separate parts of the value of the product of capital--value of the c.c., value of the v.c. & s.v.--represent on one hand, these themselves, repeat themselves in their proportional parts in each individual commodity as a ~~part~~ ^{multiple} part of the aggregate use v. produced & as a ~~part~~ ^{multiple} part of the aggregate value produced; how, on the other hand, the aggregate product must be divided into its definite parts, the share of the product of the produced use v., out of which one part represents only the value of the c.c., another as only the value of the v.c. & 3rd, finally, as s.v. Alth both these expressions, as was earlier shown, are in essence identical, they are contradictory in the method of their expression. Because in the final understanding individual commodities belonging to the 1st part reproducing merely the value of the c.c. appear as if they expressed only the labor materialized up to the process of prod. Consequently, for ex., 800 meters equal 800 equal the value of the advanced c.c. represent only the value of the consumed ~~of iron, oil, coal,~~ ^{of iron} machines, etc. but do not represent any part of the newly added labor of ~~possible,~~ ^{possible,} at the same time as on the other hand, each meter of ~~iron,~~ ^{iron,} looked upon as a use value, includes besides the (1na) ~~flux~~ etc. a definite amt. of labor of ~~iron~~ ^{iron} (sketch) which gave it the form of ~~iron~~ ^{iron} (alotna), & in its price of 2sh. contains 16p/ c.c. reproduced by it, 4 p. wages & 4 p. unpd. labor materialized in it. This seeming contradiction--the incapacity to resolve this, as we will see later, gave way to fundamental mistakes in the analysis--at first glance completely throws off balance also him who has in mind only the price of the individual commodity as, for. ex., the aforementioned proposition, that an individual commodity or definite share of aggregate product can be sold at price, less than price & higher than price lower than its price. An ex. of this confusion is Proudhon. (See later)

...At first we took the separate commodity independently as a result & direct product of a definite quantity of labor. Now when it is the result, product of capital the matter changed formally (later actually in the prices of prod.) thus: The mass of produced use value represent a quantity of labor equivalent to the value of the consumed (yielded by it to the product quantity of materialized labor) plus a quantity of labor changed for v.c., one part of which replaces the value of the v.c. & the other forms the s.v. If the labor time contained in capital, expressed in money equals \$100, of which \$40 are v.c. & rate of s.v. is 50% then the aggregate mass of labor contained in the produce is expressed in \$120. Before the commodity can enter into exchange, its ex. v. must be preliminarily transformed into a price. Therefore, if the aggregate product is not one indivisible product when the whole ~~prod~~ capital is reproduced in a single product, as for ex., a house, then the capital must single out the price of an individual commodity, i.e. express the ex. v. of an ind. commodity in money of acct. depending upon the different productivity of labor, the aggregate value of \$120 will be divided into a greater or lesser quantity of products, consequently the price of an individual commodity will represent, in reverse relation to the general quantity of commodity, a greater or lesser part of the \$120 in units of commodities.

III, p. 221

... Thus the price of an individual commodity is equal to the aggregate price of the product over the general quantity of products, the aggregate price, divided by the general quantity of products which is measured by different measures in correspondence to the use v. of the product....

p. 223

Consequently, then when under the former supposition the share of s.v. in the price of an individual commodity was proportional to the share which this price comprised in the aggregate value, in the aggregate price, -- ~~now~~ so now, despite the fall in the price of the product, the part of this price expressing s.v. will grow. But that occurs only because as a result of the growth in the productivity of labor s.v. occupies a proportionally greater place in the aggregate price of the product. The same cause-- increasing productivity of labor (the reverse would take place under decreasing productivity) following which the same quantity of labor, the same value of 120 represents itself in a greater mass of products & therefore the price of a single commodity is lowered,-- decreases the value of the capacity to labor. Therefore, altho the price of an individual commodity falls, altho the general quantity of labor included in it & also its value decreases,-- the proportional component part of its price which consists of s.v. is increased, or under a lesser general quantity of labor included in an individual commodity, for ex., in a separate ton, which included in it a greater quantity of unpd. labor than before when labor was less productive, the mass of the products was less, the price of an individual commodity was higher. In the aggregate price of 120 is included now greater unpd. labor & consequently in each of the multiple parts of these 120.

(As Proudhon) ~~xxxxxxx~~ buy back product which contains ~~xxxxxxx~~ gets paid only plus ~~xxxx~~

p. 225

Pr. How is it possible then that the wkg. class with its weekly income which is equal only to wages can buy a mass of commodities which is equal to wages plus s.v.? Since the weekly wages, looked upon in relation to the wkg. class as a whole, is equal only to the weekly sum of the means of existence, it is clear as day that the workers cannot buy the necessary means of existence with the sum of wages he received. Because the sum of money is equal to the weekly wages, the weekly price of his labor, while the price of the necessary weekly means of existence is equal to the weekly price include in it of labor plus price which expresses unpd. labor. Consequently, "it is impossible that...the worker could again buy what he produce. To live as a worker" is therefore under these condition comprises a "contradiction". Proudhon is completely right insofar as the question is one of appearance. But if, instead of looking at the commodity individually, will look at it as a product of capital, he will find that the weekly product on one parts falls into the price equal to wages, equal to the v.c. spent upon it during the week, does not contain s.v. etc. & and her part, the price of which is equal to the s.v. etc.; altho the price of the commodity includes in itself all these elements etc. but the worker merely buys only this 1st part (in which circumstances it is a matter of indifference that in this reverse buying he can be cheated & in actuality is cheated by petty traders etc.)

III, p. 229

p. 227, 229
 Now there is resolved together with it the difficulty about which we spoke in ch. 1. If commodities comprising the product of capital, are sold at prices corresponding to their value, if, consequently, the whole class of capitalist sell the commodities at their value, then each realizes s.v., i.e. he sells part of the value of commodities which cost him nothing, for which he did not pay. Thus, the profits which they receive, are reached not by mutual accounting--this latter can consist only in this that one takes away from another part of the s.v. that belongs to the other,--not in that they sell each other commodities above their value, but in that they sell each other commodities at value. This prerequisite that commodities sell at prices corresponding to their value, comprises also the basis of the investigations included in the next book.

The immediate result of the direct process of prod., its product that is the commodities, in those prices there is reimbursed not only the value of the advanced capital consumed during the time of their production, but there is also with it materialised as s.v., the surplus labor utilised during the time of their production. As a commodity, a product of capital must enter the process of exchange of commodities & at the same time not only enter the actual exchange of things but at the same time go through the transformations of form which we described as the metamorphosis of commodities. To the extent that it is a question only of formal transformations--the transformation of these commodities into money & their reverse transformation into a commodity--this process is already described in what we called "single exchange"--exchange of commodities as such. But these commodities now must are at the same time carriers of capital; they are now capital itself, augmenting in value, fructified by s.v. And in this relation their exchange which is not at the same time the process of the reprod. of capital, includes in itself further determinations which are alien to the abstract examination of the exchange of commodities. Therefore we now must turn to the exchange of commodities as the process of the circulation of capital. This is done in the following book.

EX-
Circulation

Plan of Capital appears in one of his notebooks in the series dated 1861-1863. In the 18th notebook, toward the end of 1862, Marx gives the following variant for the construction of his work:

- "Part One: Process of prod. of capital is to be divided thus:
1. Introduction, Commodities, money.
 2. Transformation of money into capital.
 3. Absolute s.v.: a) Labor process and process of augmentation of value; b) C.C. and v.c.; c) Absolute s.v. d) struggle for a normal working day; e) Simultaneous wkz.days (quantity of simultaneously occupied workers. Sum of surplus value & rate of s.v. (magnitude & height?).
 4. Relative s.v.: a) Simple cooperation; b) div. of labor; c) Machines etc.
 5. Combination of absolute and relative s.v. Relationship (proportion) between wage labor & s.v. Formal & real subordination of labor to capital. Productive & nonproductive labor.
 6. Reverse transformation of s.v. into capital. Primary accumulation. Colonial theory by Wakefield.
 7. Results of the process of prod. The changes in the appearance of the law of appropriation can be described either under 6 or 7.
 8. Theories of S.V.
 9. Theories of productive labor."

The 1st 6 points coincide with the first appearance of Vol. I. The 1st edition consisted of 6 chapters, as noted above. For future editions the chapters were made into parts, and ch. 5 was divided into two parts; thus there were 7 parts. On the other hand, the last 3 points of the above plan have not entered into Capital --and that includes point 7.

Having completed 23 in his series of notebooks in 1865, Marx proceeded to rewrite & prepare work for printer. On July 31, 1865 Marx writes Engels that there remain only 3 chapters and the 3 vols. will have been completed. In Jan. 1866 undertakes to prepare 1st vol. for publication. It was April 1867 before the 1st vol. was completed. The Part 6 then is evidently from the 1st rewriting in 1863-1865 which served as basis for final rewriting. In the process Marx evidently decided not to include the 6th large part. & 1st vol. was concluded with the accumulation of capital. Some of the thoughts in the 6th part were included into this new section of accumulation.

The individual pages were written however later, not earlier than 1867.