

**Studies**  
**on**  
**the**  
**left**

volume 7, no. 1 1967  
\$1

**INDEPENDENT POLITICS**

**BEYOND PROTEST**

Editorial Statement

**HEGELIAN CHOREOGRAPHY  
AND THE CAPITALIST DIALECTIC**

Martin Nicolaus

**NOTES ON THE NEED FOR A  
SOCIALIST PARTY**

**THE SCHEER CAMPAIGN**

**THE COOK CAMPAIGN**

## PROLETARIAT AND MIDDLE CLASS IN MARX: HEGELIAN CHOREOGRAPHY AND THE CAPITALIST DIALECTIC

Martin Nicolaus

*The historical dust has not settled, but at this moment it seems clear that a proletariat which does not embrace Marxism is entirely possible. Why not, then, Marxism without a proletariat? In a thoughtful article, "Radical Chains: The Marxian Concept of Proletarian Mission" (Studies on the Left, September-October, 1966), Oscar Berland argues that this is not only a thinkable but also a necessary thought. Ronald Aronson's "Reply" to Berland agrees that the proletariat has lost its revolutionary potential, but forcefully asserts that to scuttle the concept of proletarian mission is to scuttle Marx himself. The present paper in general sustains Berland, but puts the argument in sharper terms. At the same time, and this is its major purpose, this paper attempts to show that Marx's mature economic theorizing (the core of which Berland rejects as "droll") was by no means centered around the concept of a "mission," proletarian or otherwise, and that Marx's formulation of the laws of capitalist development—unfortunately, for the proletarian cause—can be shown to have been depressingly ac-*

---

Martin Nicolaus is a teaching assistant in Sociology at Simon Fraser University, Vancouver.

*curate and realistic. Bringing to light a much-neglected aspect of Marx's work, this paper hopes to stimulate interest in investigating the usefulness of the surplus-value concept for the understanding of modern capitalist class structure.*

### I. Hegelian Choreography

TO BRING MORE CLARITY into the delicate subject of Marx's Hegelianism, it is necessary to make a distinction among three aspects of the dialectic. There is, first, the *context* of the dialectical movement, which in Hegel is either the timeless realm of pure logic or a sphere which is called History but is only the ephemeral context in which an abstract Idea unfolds its purpose. Second, there is the *content* of the dialectical categories, which in Hegel is typically abstract, void of concrete reference. Finally, there is the dialectical *movement* itself, the inevitable process by which contradictions unfold, affirm, negate and gracefully vanish from the scene with a dazzling *Aufhebung*—annulment, preservation and supercession in one motion. With polemical intent I have called this *movement* of the categories in Hegel his "choreography," for, it seems to me, Marx remained under the spell of this dance long after he had succeeded in bringing the *context* and the *content* of the dialectic down to earth and under a plain light. It was Marx's captivation with this choreography, I shall argue, which led him to the prediction that capitalist society must inevitably become polarized into two directly antagonistic classes, and that, in this polarization, the industrial proletariat must play the role of successful negation.

That this prediction has proved to be mistaken, and that its fulfillment seems least probable precisely where it was most to be expected, namely in the *advanced* industrial nations, has been apparent for some time. In the second section of this paper, I argue that Marx himself developed the theoretical principles on which this prediction can be shown to be invalid, and that on occasion these principles led Marx himself to make predictions which explicitly contradict those of the *Communist Manifesto*. My thesis is that Marx's major contributions to the understanding of capitalism—the labor theory of value, the theory of the surplus, the law of the tendential decline of the

profit rate—constitute a body of theory from which the failure of capitalist society to polarize, the rise of a new middle class, and the declining militancy of the industrial proletariat—in other words, the essential features of advanced industrial society—can be accurately predicted and explained, and indeed that Marx himself did so. In discussing Marx's theory of classes I shall be concerned chiefly with his theory of classes arising out of industrial capitalism and not with his general theory. By the latter I understand the series of propositions centered on the ideas that class struggles are the moving force of history, that classes and their conflicts arise out of contradictions in the means and modes of production, etc. Nothing in this general theory, unfortunately, permits instant and spontaneous deductions to the specific conditions which prevail in a given society. In the *German Ideology* Marx was quite unambiguous about the necessity for empirical investigation. The general theory is that "given individuals who are active in production in a given way, enter into certain social and political relationships." However, "The connection between production and the social and political structure must in every case be uncovered by empirical observation, without mystification or speculation."<sup>1</sup> But Marx himself did not carry out a program of thorough empirical investigation of capitalist production until several years after the *Manifesto*, and it was the resulting weakness in his understanding of the capitalist social structure which permitted the Hegelian choreography to exercise so strong a hold over him.

Although biographical information about the genesis of an idea can provide no more than circumstantial evidence, that sort of evidence has its usefulness when it arouses skepticism; and when skepticism leads to a fresh examination of certain ritual formulations, then the introduction of biographical evidence may prove to be instrumental in bringing back to life an idea long after the period out of which it first arose. In the present case, the key item of circumstantial information which should arouse our skepticism and lead us to look at Marx afresh is the biographical fact that Marx proclaimed the historic liberating mission of the proletariat *before* he had more than the vaguest notions of the political economy of capitalism, before

he had read the bourgeois economists of his day, and long before he had grappled with the economic problems to which his mature theory is the solution.

The proclamation that the proletariat would make the revolution came in the third of a series of philosophical papers in which the young Marx worked out a critical stance toward Hegel and his followers. In the first of these papers, the *Kritik des Hegelschen Staatsrechts* (written summer 1843, when Marx was 25 years old), he still held, with the Hegelians, that the French Revolution had created a political state in which the distinctions that existed in the private lives of its citizens, in "civil society," had no material relevance, or, in other words, that rich and poor were equal in the political sphere.<sup>2</sup> In the second paper *Zur Judenfrage* (autumn 1843), he amends this position drastically by stating that differences of civil standing might not be of importance in the political sphere, but that the political sphere itself was of little importance, and that civil distinctions nevertheless remained civil distinctions, which must not be ignored.<sup>3</sup> A short time later in the *Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie, Einleitung* (winter 1843-1844), the "distinctions" of civil standing become "contradictions within civil society," a most important change; the relevance of the political sphere and of the philosophy that deals with it as if the state were the celestial realm here on earth is completely denied; philosophy itself is given a properly philosophical funeral with the proclamation that deeds, not words, will change society; and finally, the men who will wield the historical broom to sweep German thought and German politics clear of their interlocking cobwebs are ushered onstage:

Where, then, is the *positive* possibility of German emancipation? *Answer:* In the formation of a class with *radical chains*, a class within civil society which is not a class of civil society, an estate which is the dissolution of all estates, a sphere which possesses a universal character because of its universal suffering. . . . This dissolution of society as a special estate is the *proletariat*.<sup>4</sup>

Here the Hegelian context has been liquidated, and the Hegelian categories have received a historical content, but the choreo-

graphy has, for all that, emerged more strongly. Marx has discovered no more about the proletariat than that it develops and grows larger as industry does,<sup>5</sup> and already he has it dancing the leading negative role in the dialectic of History. Only after this proclamation did Marx begin to read the political economists to find, as he wrote later, the anatomy of civil society.<sup>6</sup>

The record of the collision between Hegelian philosophy and the political economy of Adam Smith, Ricardo, and others, appears in Marx's *Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. None of his works reveals more clearly the difficulties Marx experienced, and probably those which anyone must experience, in attempting to grasp the dismally pragmatic confusion of data and theory that prevails in so unpoetic a discipline as economics with the intellectual equipment of a sphere so clear, uncluttered and even elegant as the Hegelian philosophy. The struggle is uncompromising and complex. On the one hand, Marx writes that ". . . my conclusions are the fruit of an entirely empirical analysis, based upon a careful critical study of political economy."<sup>7</sup> And then: "Political economy has merely formulated the laws of alienated labor."<sup>8</sup> However: "Hegel's standpoint is that of modern political economy. He conceives *labor* as the *essence*, the self-confirming essence of man."<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless: Hegel is wrong "because his conception is *formal* and *abstract*, [and therefore] the annulment of alienation becomes a confirmation of alienation."<sup>10</sup> This is a battle of methods, of ways of seeing and explaining the world, a struggle between disparate epistemologies. Here the dialectic power of German idealism struggles like Hercules against the giant, Antaeus, the son of Earth; and, it must be said, the outcome is the same as in that mythical trial: philosophy lifts its antagonist off the ground, away from the source of his strength, and crushes him in midair. Thus Marx seizes upon the capitalist production process, its relations of property, together with its system of exchange and circulation, and lifts this entire edifice of empirical fact and empirical fancy into the Hegelian air, where he compresses the pragmatic giant into the single concept of "alienated labor." And Marx aims higher than Hercules; he not only crushes his antagonist, but he also be-

lieves that he can then reconstitute him on a higher level by unfolding the content of the fundamental core to which he has been reduced. Thus he writes, as only a philosophical idealist could write:

As we have discovered the concept of *private property* by an *analysis* of the concept of *alienated labor*, so with the aid of these two factors we can evolve all the categories of political economy, and in every category, e.g. trade, competition, capital, money, we shall discover only a particular and developed expression of these fundamental elements.<sup>11</sup>

Here metaphysics has won over empiricism, not only in method but also in substance. Marx's theory of classes, as it was forged in this crucible, represents a two-fold defeat for economics. First, Marx sees both the division of society into classes and the division of labor as equivalent aspects of the touchstone concept "alienated labor."<sup>12</sup> Only from a perspective beyond economics can one afford to ignore the difference between them. A political economist, on the other hand, must grasp and explicate the fact that the division of labor is not the same thing as class division, or else his entire craft runs into confusion. As late as the *German Ideology* (1846) Marx still stands outside political economy in that respect, as is shown by his famous remark that communism will abolish the division of labor, so that man may be a hunter, a fisherman, or a critic as he pleases.<sup>13</sup> This is a brilliant philosophical vision, but a less poetic spirit would not have ventured it without first asking where the hunter is to get his rifle, the fisherman his rod and reel, and the critic his books—and the answer to those questions is again within the realm of the economist, not of the philosopher. There is a measure of irony in the fact that Marx puts the division of labor and the division of classes into proper economic perspective only when he notes that Proudhon has committed a similar philosophic confusion—for Marx himself, he later wrote, was responsible for "infecting" Proudhon with Hegelianism.<sup>14</sup>

The second and more disastrous effect of the victory of philosophy over economics on Marx's theory of classes was his discovery that the antagonism of labor vs. capital could

be made to "fit" neatly into the dialectical pattern. The earlier proclamation of the proletariat as universal negation was strengthened and amplified here to the point where the development of capitalist industrialization appeared to Marx as a fateful unfolding of a contradiction whose path *must* conform to the choreography *because* it was dialectical. "The relations of private property," he writes—and here he still speaks of "private property" instead of capitalism, of "*buergerliche Gesellschaft*" (civil society) instead of bourgeois society—"are capital, labor, and their interconnections." And then the pattern that is fundamental to his thought: "The movements through which these elements have to go are: First—*unmediated and mediated unity of the two . . . [then:] opposition between the two . . . opposition of each to itself . . . [and] clash of reciprocal contradictions.*"<sup>15</sup> Although it became filled out with a great deal of historical material, this dialectical schema remained the basis of Marx's view of social classes and their conflict up to and including the *Manifesto*, and to a great extent for the rest of his life. The notion that "capital" and "labor" may not be the only determining components of a fully developed capitalist society, and the idea that "the movements through which these elements have to go" may not be the movements through which any self-respecting dialectical contradiction must go, but that these movements may be determined by the specifically capitalist contradiction, which may be quite different—these notions do not occur until later in his work and will be discussed in the second part of this paper. Meanwhile, however, the movement of history seemed to confirm the dialectical prognosis, making a detailed analysis of the capitalist economic process unnecessary; for it was a fact, as Engels reported in his *Condition of the Working Class in England*, that the onrush of industrial capitalism was destroying the previous small middle classes of tradesmen, manufacturers and craftsmen, and that the social and economic distance between a small number of big capitalists and the swelling propertyless proletarians was growing wider and wider.<sup>16</sup> Was it so wrong to project the impact of primary capitalist accumulation into the future, as in this crucial passage from the *Manifesto*?



Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, the distinctive feature that it has simplified class contradictions. The whole society more and more splits into two great antagonistic camps, two great classes directly opposed to one another: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.<sup>17</sup>

Only a small leap of faith was required to envision a society in which this initial polarization had continued to sharpen, finally reaching the outer limits of human endurance; that is, a society in which an absolutely wealthy capitalist class confronts an absolutely impoverished proletariat—and one does not need to be a Hegelian to predict that a revolution will occur under such circumstances. Yet it was a peculiarly Hegelian exaggeration, a Hegelian leap of faith, to assume that the contradiction between capital and labor would continue to develop and unfold in this manner until the two classes confronted each other with all the unmediated antagonism of a pure negation confronting an absolute affirmation. To assume without further analysis of the capitalist economic process that the dialectic of capitalism must conform to the dialectic of ideas was a most Hegelian error of procedure; and the error of procedure resulted in an error of substance. The advance of capitalist society has not meant increasingly sharp conflict between capital and labor. The most industrially advanced capitalist nations typically have the most quiescent, noninsurrectionary proletariats—witness the United States; and in every capitalist country there has arisen a broad, vocal and specifically new middle class to thwart Marxist theory and to stifle and crush Marxist action. Marx's captivation with the Hegelian choreography has cost his followers in advanced industrial society a heavy price. The prophets of class conflict have too often stood powerless to explain or to deal with the class structure of the society that their reading of Marx leads them to think should never have been.

## II. The Capitalist Dialectic

### A. *The Model of Capitalist Economics in the Manifesto*

Marx's contributions to political economy—the labor theory of value, the theory of the surplus, the law of the tendential fall

of the profit rate—all date from about 1857-1858, the years during which Marx wrote the *Grundrisse*.<sup>18</sup> None of these discoveries is foreshadowed in the *Manifesto* (1848), and indeed this early work shows no clear evidence that Marx had yet become aware of the *problems* to which his later contributions were the *solutions*.

Although Marx writes repeatedly in the *Manifesto* that capital employs labor in order to increase or augment itself (*vermehrten*),<sup>19</sup> one looks in vain here for a theory of precisely how this process of capital accumulation takes place. The closest approach to an understanding of capitalist accumulation, and thereby to a theory of the surplus, comes when Marx mentions that communism wants to do away with the capitalist's appropriation of the net yield (*Reinertrag*) of production.<sup>20</sup> But this insight remains unconscious of itself, and the various references to capital accumulation are so rudimentary and cursory that no systematic theory of accumulation can be extracted from them or projected into them. The *Manifesto's* economic theorizing in general suffers from a great amount of vagueness. Here, for instance, is one example of a powerful prediction based on a chain of diffuse economic reasoning:

The essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeois class, is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labor. *Wage-labor rests exclusively on competition between the laborers.* The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the laborers, due to competition, by their involuntary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry therefore cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.<sup>21</sup>

I have italicized the phrase "wage-labor rests exclusively on competition between the laborers" in order to emphasize what strikes me as the weakest link in this argument. The statement is at best a half-truth; it is not even a full truth if one says

that the *level of wages* rests exclusively on competition. But even if the statement were correct, then the conclusion that workers' associations will bury the bourgeoisie does not follow; the only thing that follows is that wage labor will get more expensive, from the capitalist's standpoint. And that, of course, is precisely what has occurred wherever workers' associations (unions) have succeeded in defeating competition from non-unionized labor; the reduction of competition has by no means done away with wage labor or with capitalism. Only if the bourgeoisie were absolutely economically incapable of granting wage demands put forth by associated workers would there be any necessary revolutionary consequences in the elimination of competition between the laborers. Had Marx at this time worked out an economic theory to account for the fact that the bourgeoisie is *not* incapable of raising wages, this particular prediction would have had to be argued differently. What the excerpt above shows chiefly is that Marx's analysis of bourgeois production had at this point penetrated little further than the insight that the bourgeoisie turns all human values into market values, all human beings into commodities. Thus, here and elsewhere in the *Manifesto*, Marx sees the *market* as the center of gravity of bourgeois society; in this case he goes so far as to believe that a change in the market (the labor market, here) will produce a drastic change in the whole social structure. While this emphasis on the importance of the market cannot be discounted, Marx himself in his mature economic works came to see the market as a dependent variable, and he then identified *capital accumulation* and *production* as the real fulcrum around which all the other phenomena of bourgeois society gravitate.<sup>22</sup>

Insofar as the *Manifesto* contains any theory of capitalist accumulation and production at all, which is debatable, that theory centers on the concept of exploitation. "Wage labor," Marx writes, "creates capital, i.e. that kind of property which exploits wage labor, and which cannot increase except upon condition of creating a new supply of wage labor for fresh exploitation."<sup>23</sup> But here all clarity stops, for what exactly does exploitation mean? It should be noted that in *Capital*, after Marx had developed the theory of the surplus, he gives

this term a very precise, quantifiable meaning; here, however, it is more a physical and moral term, denoting suffering, degradation, destruction, dehumanization, etc. The closest economic term for this usage of "exploitation" would be destructive consumption; that is, capital is accumulated by using up, destroying the labor commodity in the act of production. The more the capitalist deprives the laborer of his commodity, labor, the richer the capitalist gets; the fatter the capitalist, the leaner the worker. Eventually the workers will become absolutely impoverished, and at the same time, the capitalists will have all the wealth of any kind in the nation. The capitalists will have everything but no one to sell it to, and the workers will have nothing but a world to win. Then, in the terms of the *Manifesto*, a classic overproduction crisis sets in ("too much civilization, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce"<sup>24</sup>), or rather, there is a series of such crises, which culminates in the grand, final crisis which will bring the revolution. That approximately is the *Manifesto's* model of capitalist accumulation, and this also appears to be the model many Marxists still cling to.

The affinities between this model and the Hegelian choreography should strike the eye. For if this is indeed how capitalism operates, then it follows that capitalism must throw all possible parts of the population into the industrial labor supply, which means that all intermediate classes must and will be destroyed (which is exactly what the *Manifesto* says), thus creating a society perfectly polarized between an absolutely rich capitalist class and an absolutely poor industrial proletariat, the two facing each other with the undiluted antagonism of a logical contradiction. And then indeed the *Aufhebung* is nigh.

But, to return a last time to this economic model, what if for one reason or another the total wealth of the nation were not a fixed constant; what if there were an increment, say  $x$ , which arose to augment the total without diminishing the wealth of either labor or capital proportionately? The existence of this extra increment, this surplus, removes the weight of the iron law of destructive consumption. Absolute wealth on one side would not necessarily mean absolute impoverishment on the other side; which means that capitalist accumulation would

not necessarily mean absolute social polarization. And this would be especially true if it were discovered that this  $x$  were not an arbitrary *deus ex machina* conjured into the system from outside, but a regular and essential feature of capitalist production itself.

### B. *The Discovery of Surplus Value*

If I am correct in saying that the validity of the Hegelian social choreography depends on the validity of the simple, surplus-less model of destructive consumption outlined above, then the liquidation by Marx of the Hegelian choreography can be fixed in time and space with considerable precision. The spell of that dance is broken in principle in the *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Oekonomie (Rohentwurf)* of 1857-1858, a voluminous work which has not been translated into English. After a lengthy critique of economic theory which treats capitalist production as if it were production in general, as if its special characteristics were not worth investigating, Marx brings up the central problem of the theory of capitalism and proceeds to solve it. How is it, he asks, that at the end of the production process the capitalist has a commodity which is worth more than the elements that went into it? He pays the price of machinery, raw materials and the price of labor, yet the product is worth more than all three together. What, in other words, is the source of the surplus value (*Mehrwert*) which the capitalist appropriates? The problem is insoluble, Marx writes, so long as "labor" is considered a commodity like any other commodity (as it was, specifically, in the *Manifesto*).<sup>25</sup> If labor were such a commodity, then capitalist production would be: price of machinery + price of raw materials + price of labor = price of product. Where, then, is the capitalist's profit? If we evade the question by saying that the capitalist fixes an arbitrary profit percentage and simply adds it to the price of the product, as high as the market will bear, then it appears that the buyer of the commodity is the source of the capitalist's profit. Yet what the capitalist gains in this way, the buyer loses, and it is impossible to see how an aggregate surplus could arise out of such transactions. Marx rejected this mercantilist theory, according to

which one nation could get richer only by cheating another in commerce. This theory is overcome, and the problem of surplus value is solved, when one realizes that the worker sells the capitalist not "labor," but labor *power* (*Arbeitskraft*). Although its price varies with supply and demand, this specific commodity has the exceptional quality of being able to produce more value than is necessary to reproduce it.<sup>26</sup> For example, all the commodities necessary to keep a worker alive and able to work, i.e. groceries, clothes, shelter, etc., have a value represented by the letter  $n$ . Working in a factory, the worker produces for the capitalist a quantity of commodities whose value is equal to the value of the commodities he needs to consume, in  $n$  hours. This  $n$  is what Marx calls necessary labor time, that is, the time necessary to produce enough value to allow the worker to live and work on. But once he is fed and clothed, the worker is able to continue to work more than  $n$  hours, and that is exactly what the capitalist forces him to do. If at a given stage of social productivity it takes on the average six hours to produce enough for the worker to live, i.e. if  $n$  is 6, then any hours worked in addition to 6 are what Marx calls surplus labor, and the product of this surplus labor is the surplus product, which, when sold, yields surplus value, a part of which the capitalist pockets as profit.

The specific nature of capitalist production, then, is the creation and appropriation of surplus value by the capitalist class. To increase surplus value, the capitalist must increase the amount of the workers' surplus labor. Marx distinguishes between two methods of increasing surplus labor. In the early stages of industrialization the first method was the prolongation of the working day over and above the necessary labor time, thus stretching the day to 12, 14, 16 and more hours, up to and beyond the limits of human endurance. This form of surplus accumulation Marx calls the production of "absolute surplus."<sup>27</sup> However, eventually the labor force becomes exhausted in this way; the worker dies too young, the laboring population diminishes through disease and wages must rise. Then, Marx writes, the capitalist class finds it in its own interests to limit the working day by law to a humanly endurable "normal" length.<sup>28</sup> Once that stage has been reached, a

point which according to Marx occurs when capitalism has taken over all branches of production and becomes altogether the dominant form of production,<sup>29</sup> then the capitalist class turns to the creation of what Marx calls "relative surplus," that is, the extraction of more surplus labor within a fixed number of hours.<sup>30</sup> While the production of absolute surplus is possible with the instruments and machinery of earlier periods, the relative surplus can only be increased by revolutionizing the whole basis of production, which means principally the rapid introduction of modern machinery. Machinery raises the productivity of each worker, so that he produces the equivalent value necessary to sustain him in less time; that is, *n*, necessary labor time, is reduced relative to surplus labor time. In this way, the capitalist can appropriate greater and greater amounts of surplus without necessarily working the worker to death in the process, although he can also do both. For Marx, the production of relative surplus by the use of ever more efficient machinery resulting in ever greater productivity was one of capitalism's fundamental historical tendencies.

Here we must briefly discuss what Marx called the solution to the mystery which had plagued all of political economy since Adam Smith, namely, the "law of the tendential decline of the profit rate."<sup>31</sup> This law states quite simply that as the capitalist class as a whole invests more and more heavily in machinery, and proportionally less in wages, the *rate* of profit will tend to decline. The fact that Marx assumed competitive market conditions, and that these no longer are typical today, however, does not destroy the usefulness of this law as an explanatory concept. What Baran and Sweezy in *Monopoly Capital* have called the "tendency of the surplus to rise" is not only not contradictory to Marx's law, but is in fact only another aspect of it.<sup>32</sup> Marx was quite specific, and repeatedly so, in stating that the tendential decline in the profit *rate* not only can but *must* lead to a corresponding rise in the *mass* of profits, and that a decline in the profit *rate* *must* tend to *increase* both the *rate* and the *mass* of the *surplus*.<sup>33</sup> (The surplus is computed only on the basis of necessary versus surplus labor time; but the profit is computed on the basis of invest-

ment in machinery also, which explains the seemingly contradictory movement of profit and surplus.) Thus in the course of capitalist development, Marx held, the capitalist class tends to realize a smaller profit rate on its investments, but the volume of profits, as well as the rate and volume of the surplus which it controls, tends to grow disproportionately faster. For example, an 18th-century manufacturer employing one thousand workers with hand tools might make a profit of fifty percent, for a mass of profit measured in a few thousands of dollars; but a modern corporation with an equal number of workers, and a multi-million-dollar investment in machinery, may make only five percent, but its profits may also be in the millions.

This tendency has important implications for the relationship between the capitalist class and the working class. One of them is that the process of advanced capitalist development enables the capitalist class to face workers' demands for higher wages with an unprecedented degree of flexibility. The small capitalist of an earlier period sometimes literally could not increase wages without eventually going out of business. For the huge corporation with its voluminous reserves, the refusal to grant wage increases is less a matter of life-and-death necessity and more a matter of policy. What happens then, Marx foresaw, is that the workers' submission to the capitalist class is clothed

. . . in bearable, or, as Eden says, "comfortable and liberal" forms. . . . From the workers' own swelling surplus product, a part of which is constantly being converted into additional capital, a greater portion flows back to them in cash, so that they can broaden the sphere of their consumption, equip themselves better with clothing and furniture, etc., and develop a small reserve of savings.<sup>34</sup>

Since a large capital can and does expand faster, although with a smaller profit rate, than smaller capital, wage increases of this sort at this stage of capitalist development may be safely granted, for they in no way hinder the accumulation of capital or its concentration in the hands of the class of big capitalists.<sup>35</sup> Elsewhere, Marx writes that what really matters under capitalism is not the absolute level of wages, but the incomes of the



classes relative to one another.<sup>36</sup> Once capital has accumulated a certain volume of surplus, in other words, the absolute impoverishment of the workers becomes a negligible possibility because it is no longer the essential precondition of capitalist accumulation. Exploitation itself becomes a relative term; in *Capital* the rate of exploitation means the ratio of necessary labor to surplus labor in the working day. Thus the rate of exploitation may escalate almost *ad infinitum*, yet at the same time the working class may live more comfortably than ever. The rising surplus makes it possible for the capitalist class to exchange its tyranny for a benevolent despotism.

The saddest victims of capitalist accumulation in its advanced stage, as Marx charted it, are not the workers but the unemployed, the "industrial reserve army." As productivity rises, the demand for productive labor in a given industry or in all industries generally may drop temporarily, or in the long run, will tend to drop permanently. Thus is created a constant stream of underemployed, unemployed, prematurely used up, obsolete, or unemployable individuals.<sup>37</sup> When unskilled labor is the standard mode in the society, as Marx posited in *Capital*, then this reserve army serves to depress the wages of the employed; but, he might have added, at a certain stage in the development of productivity only skilled labor can be used (e.g. the replacement of ditch-digging gangs by earth-moving machinery), so that the unskilled unemployed lose even their competitive link with the working class, and as one generation of unemployed begets another, a permanent welfare class comes into being. At the same time, the greater volume of surplus makes it possible to support growing numbers of these people, however miserably. In the advanced stages of capitalist development, the "exploitation" of the working class appears as prosperity beside the poverty of this never-working sub-proletariat.

The implications of Marx's theory of the surplus, in short, destroy the relationship between capital and labor which the *Manifesto* had foreseen. In the hands of an intelligent capitalist class bent on its own survival, the swelling surplus provides a cushion against the more acute forms of class conflict, and prevents absolute social polarization along the lines laid out by

the Hegelian choreography. The specifically capitalist dialectic does not obey the laws of the great philosopher.

### *C. The Rise of the Surplus Class*

The rise of the surplus not only alters the relationship between the capitalist class and the working class, but it also creates an entirely new class between them. While the term "surplus class" to designate this stratum does not to my knowledge occur in Marx's writings, the idea and its implications were clearly seized and expressed by him.

The essential feature of capitalism, Marx says, is to appropriate surplus labor. That is to say, labor is productive for capitalism only insofar as it yields surplus labor; or, as Marx put it succinctly, "labor is productive only insofar as it produces its own opposite."<sup>38</sup> As labor becomes more and more productive, it produces more and more of its own opposite. This tendency yields what may be called the "law of the surplus class" in its most general form: as less and less people are forced to produce more and more, more and more people are forced to produce less and less. As Marx put it:

Given an advance of industrial productivity to the point where only one third of the population takes a direct part in material production, instead of two thirds as before, then one third furnish the means of life for the whole, whereas before two thirds were required to do so. Before, one third was net revenue (as distinct from the workers' income), now net revenue is two thirds. Disregarding the class contradiction, the whole nation would now need only one third of its time for direct production, whereas earlier it had needed two thirds. With equal distribution, everyone would now have two thirds of his time for unproductive labor and for leisure. But in capitalist production, everything appears and is contradictory.<sup>39</sup>

The contradiction resides in the fact that the distribution of disposable time cannot be equal so long as the capitalist system operates by appropriating surplus labor, i.e. so long as it is the capitalist system of production; for if everyone worked only long enough to reproduce the means of life, there would be no surplus for the capitalists to appropriate. What does happen,

under capitalism, to the mass of people who are released from direct, productive labor by the advance of productivity? The question is the same as the question of what happens to the mass of surplus value generated by advanced capitalist production.

Marx divided the surplus value into a number of categories, of which we need distinguish only the broadest, capital and revenue. Capital is that part of the surplus value which the capitalist reinvests in further production. Revenue includes everything the capitalist pays out to himself and others, such as dividends, interest payments, land rent, taxes, and most importantly, payment for services rendered to his enterprise by *other than productive workers*. A great number of people who produce no commodities for profitable sale are essential to the capitalist enterprise and consume a part of its revenue; e.g. bookkeepers, clerks, secretaries, lawyers, designers, engineers, salesmen, etc.—in general, all the people who do not themselves control capital (as bankers do) and who fulfill a function in the vast system of financing, distributing, exchanging, improving and maintaining the commodities produced by the proletariat and appropriated by the capitalist class.<sup>40</sup> From the law of the rising surplus, it follows that except during times of exceptionally heavy capital investment, the mass of disposable revenue must also tend to rise; that is, there must be an increase in that part of the surplus which can be expended for the utilization of unproductive labor.

The surplus not only can, it *must* be expended for unproductive labor, for two reasons.

First, as productivity rises, the number of unproductive laborers required to service and maintain the growing capital establishment also rises. The number of the traditional unproductive workers increases, e.g. clerks, bookkeepers. More significantly, entirely new branches of unproductive work are called into being, of which the banking system, the credit system, insurance empires and advertising are the most obvious examples, but the growth of the scientific and technological establishments, as well as an increase in public education generally, are also in this category. Marx himself pointed to the growth of this requirement for nonproductive services.<sup>41</sup>

The second reason why there must be an increase of non-productive workers is that an increase in the surplus product requires an increase in the number of people who can afford to consume it. Surplus production requires surplus consumption. The capitalist system is based on the extraction from the laboring class of more commodities than that class is permitted to consume; the system would collapse if there were not also a class which consumed more than it produced. Some excerpts from Marx on this problem will be quoted below.

Together, these two corollaries of Marx's theory of the surplus make up what I have called the "law of the surplus class," that is, the law of the tendential rise of a new middle class.

That Marx formulated precisely such a law may come as something of a surprise to many Marxists. The reasons for this surprise, if my conjecture is correct in that regard, are not difficult to find. First, Marx's theory of the new middle class remained embryonic, though explicit; it was one of the many implications of his economic discoveries which he chose not to develop further, or was prevented by time from developing. The phenomenon which this theory describes, after all, had not emerged in its full dominance at the time he wrote. Secondly, the works in which Marx does develop this theory most clearly (the *Grundrisse* and the *Theorien Ueber den Mehrwert*) have not been translated into English (as far as I know), and the originals are not available in every library. Third, the theory of the middle class follows directly from the labor theory of value, the theory of the surplus and the law of the tendential fall in the profit rate, and there seems to be considerable tacit acquiescence on the left in the orthodoxly academic refusal to take these Marxist theses seriously.<sup>42</sup> Finally, there are still some Marxists, particularly in the new left, who have not taken the trouble to read attentively anything that Marx wrote after the *Manifesto*, or, worse, anything after the *1844 Manuscripts*. There is an amusing tendency, at least in the academic circles known to me, to repeat an experiment Marx ventured when he was twenty-six, namely to try to squeeze the concept of alienated labor hard enough to make all the categories of sociology, politics and economics come dripping out of it, as

if this philosopher's touchstone were a lemon. The drippings are flavorful but somewhat lacking in substance.

To make the data on Marx's theory of the middle class more widely available, I should like here to quote a number of excerpts at length, all of them from the untranslated works.

It was apparent to Marx from the beginning of his investigation of the surplus problem that the class of capitalists could not and did not consume all of the surplus which it extracted from the workers. Thus, in the *Grundrisse*, a few dozen pages after the surplus problem has been raised, we find the following footnote:

. . . the creation of surplus labor on one side corresponds to the creation of minus-labor, relative idleness (or *non-productive* labor at best) on the other. That goes without saying as far as the capitalist class itself is concerned; but it also holds for the classes with whom it divides; thus, for the paupers, flunkeys, bootlickers and the whole train of retainers living off the surplus product; the part of the *servant* class which lives not from capital but from revenue. Essential difference between this *servant* class and the *working* class. . . . Thus Malthus is entirely logical when he calls not only for surplus labor and surplus capital but also for surplus idlers, consuming without producing, or the necessity for waste, luxury, ostentatious philanthropy, etc.<sup>48</sup>

Here Marx is thinking only of workers, rather, nonworkers who perform *personal* services for the capitalist, not those who fulfill a necessary unproductive function for the capital establishment. As the following excerpt from the *Theorien Ueber den Mehrwert* shows, he is not entirely clear that there is a difference.

Although the bourgeoisie is initially very frugal, with the growth in the productivity of its capital, i.e. its workers, it imitates the feudal system of retainers. According to the last (1861 or 1862) Factory Report, the total number of persons employed in the factories of the United Kingdom (managers included) was only 775,534—while the number of female servants in England alone was one million. What a beautiful arrangement, where a factory girl sweats in the shop for 12 long hours so that the factory owner can use a

part of her unpaid labor to take her sister as maid, her brother as groom, and her cousin as policeman or soldier into his personal service!<sup>44</sup>

When one sees the individual capitalist as the embodiment of the capitalist class, however, as Marx does consistently, the inclusion of soldiers and policemen together with domestic servants in the single category of *servants* makes more sense. In a relatively well-known section of *Capital*, he measures out his scorn and ridicule impartially to all unproductive workers, including valets, politicians, churchmen, lawyers, soldiers, landowners, rentiers, paupers, vagabonds and criminals,<sup>45</sup> regardless of whether they perform their services for the individual capitalist or for the class as a whole.

His contempt for these people vents itself with particular fury (in the *Theorien*) on the dismal parson, Malthus, who advocated the creation of ever larger masses of these idlers to keep the capitalist economy going by consuming its surplus product. "What a ridiculous idea," Marx writes, "that the surplus has to be consumed by servants and cannot be consumed by the productive workers themselves."<sup>46</sup> Yet, he writes that Malthus is right about the necessity for unproductive consumers in a *capitalist* economy.<sup>47</sup> The fact that Malthus' "remedies" for the evil of overproduction—"heavy taxes, a mass of state and church sinecures, great armies, pensioners, tithes for the churchmen, a heavy national debt and periodic costly wars"<sup>48</sup>—have been in great part adopted by every advanced capitalist system would not have surprised Marx. He writes of Malthus that

His greatest hope—which he himself indicates as more or less utopian—is that the middle class will grow in size and that the working proletariat will make up a constantly decreasing proportion of the total population (even if it grows in absolute numbers). That, in fact, is the course of bourgeois society. [*Das ist in der Tat der Gang der Bourgeoisgesellschaft.*]<sup>49</sup>

Although Marx had nothing but spit and venom for any scheme designed deliberately to foster the growth of an unpro-

ductive class, he was repeatedly forced to recognize that the growth of productivity, i.e. the rise of the surplus, created precisely such a class. A few excerpts will make that clear:

In order to produce "productively" one has to produce in a manner that excludes the mass of the producers from a part of the market demand for the product; one must produce in contradiction to a class whose consumption stands in no relationship to its production—since precisely this excess of production over consumption makes up the profit of capital. On the other hand, one has to produce for classes which consume without producing.<sup>50</sup>

On a low level of development of the social productivity of labor, where therefore surplus labor is relatively small, the class of those who live off the labor of others will in principle be small in relation to the number of workers. This class can grow to significant proportions to the degree that productivity, i.e. relative surplus value, develops.<sup>51</sup>

The progressive transformation of a part of the workers into servants is a lovely prospect, just as it is a great consolation for them [the workers] that, as a consequence of the growth of the net product, more spheres open up for unproductive workers who live off surplus labor and whose interests more or less compete with the directly exploiting class in exploiting them.<sup>52</sup>

Marx's consistency in this matter can be tested negatively as well; if he agrees, as we have seen, with economists who predict a growth of the unproductive class in the course of capitalist development, then he should also disagree with economists who think that they can do away with this class without abolishing the capitalist system itself. The bourgeois economist Ramsay advocated the abolition of interest on capital, i.e. the dividends paid by industrialists to investors and coupon-clippers, and the abolition of land rent. Ramsay saw no useful function for either of these groups. Marx's acid comment on this proposal should be read with the phrase about the simplification of class contradictions (from the *Manifesto*) in mind:

If this bourgeois ideal could really be put into practice, its consequence could only be that the entire surplus value would fall directly into the hands of the industrial capitalists, and all of society would be economically reduced to the simple contradiction between capital and wage labor, a simplification which certainly would hasten the dissolution of this form of production.<sup>53</sup>

Here again is the role of the surplus as a complicator of the simple class antagonisms reckoned with earlier. (A further, minor, example of the distance Marx's theory has carried him comes when he discusses economic crises in Volume II, part 2 of the *Theorien*; he writes that his analysis proceeds without dealing with "the real constitution of society, which by no means consists only of the class of workers and the class of industrial capitalists.")<sup>54</sup>

The clearest statement of Marx's theory of the middle class known to me occurs in his critique of Ricardo's analysis of the effect of increased productivity on the labor force. Ricardo, like Marx, was a bitter enemy of all forms of unproductive labor, which were to him as to Marx so many "*faux frais de production*," false production costs; and consequently Ricardo called for the extension of productive labor on a maximal scale. While Ricardo saw that only machinery permits the efficient utilization of vast quantities of industrial laborers, he was troubled by the fact that the growing productivity of machinery tended at the same time to make the worker superfluous. Marx comments:

One tendency throws the workers onto the pavement and creates a superfluous population. The other tendency absorbs it again and expands wage slavery on an absolute scale, so that the worker's lot changes constantly but he can never escape it. That is why the worker correctly considers the development of the productive capacities of his labor as a hostile tendency, and why the capitalist treats him as an element to be constantly eliminated from production. These are the contradictions with which Ricardo struggles in this chapter. *What he forgets to emphasize is the constant increase of the middle classes, who stand in the middle between the*



*workers on one side and the capitalists and landed proprietors on the other side, who are for the most part supported directly by revenue, who rest as a burden on the laboring foundation, and who increase the social security and the power of the upper ten thousand.*<sup>56</sup> (Italics mine—MN)

These excerpts represent, as far as I know, the most explicit statements of Marx's theory of the new middle class in the entire Marxian opus. It seems entirely possible to explain why Marx did not carry this theory further, and it may even be possible for someone to show somehow that this theory does not contradict Marx's prediction of class polarization and proletarian revolution (although I doubt it); but one thing cannot be done with Marx's theory of the middle class: it cannot be explained away. Even if Marx himself had never mentioned the terms "unproductive class" or "middle class," someone else would have to draw these implications of his theory, for the rise of the middle class follows directly from the law of the tendency of the surplus to rise, which is part of the law of the tendency of the profit rate to fall, which arises directly out of the solution of the surplus value problem, which consists of the labor theory of value. Let me review this chain of ideas once more. The labor theory of value holds that the only agency which is capable of creating more value than it represents is labor; that is, only labor is capable of creating *surplus* value. The capitalist system of production consists of the appropriation by the capitalist class of ever greater quantities of this surplus value. In a developed capitalist system, the capitalist class will concentrate on increasing *relative* surplus value. That is, it will introduce machinery in order to decrease that portion of the working day which is necessary to reproduce the workers' labor power, and to increase that portion which is surplus labor. On the one hand, increased productivity requires increased investment in machinery, so that the *rate* of profit will tend to fall. On the other hand, the mass of profit will rise, and both the *rate* and the *volume* of surplus must rise. What happens to this swelling surplus? It *enables* the capitalist class to create a class of people who are not productive workers, but who perform services either for individual capitalists or,

more important, for the capitalist class as a whole; and at the same time, the rise of productivity *requires* such a class of unproductive workers to fulfill the functions of distributing, marketing, researching, financing, managing, keeping track of and glorifying the swelling surplus product. This class of unproductive workers, service workers, or servants for short, is the middle class. In short, the middle class follows from the central principles which Marx spent the best decades of his life and his health in elaborating, and which he considered his historic contribution to the understanding of capitalism. If one denies, as it seems to me one must, the validity of Marx's class polarization and proletarian revolution predictions from the *Manifesto*, one does not deny that Marx was a champion of the proletarian cause; one cuts out of Marxism only its youthful optimism, the product of excessive captivation with the elegance of Hegelian idealism. But in order to cut out of Marx his theory of the middle class, one has to overthrow Marxism, scientific socialism, at its core—and fly in the face of contemporary reality. There *is* after all a middle class in advanced industrial society; and it must be considered one of Marx's great scientific achievements (and a great personal achievement, considering where his sentiments lay) to have not only predicted that such a new middle class would arise, but also to have laid down the fundamental economic and sociological principles which explain its rise and its role in the larger class structure. The outlines of what may become an adequate theory to account for the generation, growth, economic function and movement of the middle class have to my knowledge not been contributed by any other social scientist before Marx or after him. Here is a rare accomplishment and a rare challenge.

## FOOTNOTES

1. "Die Deutsche Ideologie," in Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, *Werke* (Dietz, Berlin) Vol. 3, p. 25.
2. Cf. *Werke*, Vol. 1, esp. pp. 283-4.
3. Cf. *Werke*, Vol. 1, esp. pp. 354-5, 368-9.
4. *Werke*, Vol. 1, p. 390.
5. *Ibid.*
6. "Zur Kritik der Politischen Oekonomie. Vorwort," *Werke* 13, p. 8.
7. For reasons unclear to me, the *Werke* edition does not contain the 1844 MSS. Because of its reliability and wide availability, I have quoted from the Bottomore translation, in Erich Fromm, *Marx's Concept of Man* (Ungar, New York, 1961). The present quotation is on p. 91.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 177.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 189.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 107.
12. "The consideration of *division of labor and exchange* is of the greatest interest, since they are the *perceptible, alienated* expression of human activity and capacities as the activity and capacities *proper to a species.*" *Ibid.*, p. 161.
13. *Werke* 3, p. 33. A page earlier, Marx writes that "private property and division of labor are identical expressions" for the same thing, i.e. that the division of classes is only another aspect of the division of labor, and vice versa.
14. "Ueber P.-J. Proudhon" in *Werke* 16, p. 27. For Marx's clarification of the difference between division of labor and division of classes see *Misere de la Philosophie* (1847) in *Werke* 4, pp. 122, 144-156.
15. "Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844" in Fromm, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-118.
16. "Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England," in *Werke* 2, pp. 250-251.
17. "Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei," in *Werke* 4, p. 463. I have relied in general on the English translation appearing in *The Communist Manifesto* (Monthly Review Press, New York, 1964) for my renderings of the original. However, some of the technical economic terms in that translation are not quite accurately put; see footnotes 20 and 23 below.
18. Karl Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Oekonomie (Rohentwurf)*, Marx-Engels-Lenin Institut, Moscow (Dietz, Berlin, 1953). The actual *Grundrisse* of 1857-58 occupy 760 pages in this huge volume. A complete translation, or at the very least a translation of selected excerpts, would be highly desirable.
19. *Werke* 4, pp. 468, 473, 475.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 476. "Reinertrag" is misleadingly rendered as "surplus" in the English translation cited above, footnote 17.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 474.
22. For example, see Marx's polemic against the tendency to "explain" capitalist economics with reference to the so-called laws of supply and demand, i.e. the laws of the market, in *Kapital III, Werke* 25, p. 191 and elsewhere.
23. *Werke* 4, p. 475. The English translation renders "erzeugen" as "getting" instead of "creating" a new supply of wage labor; the point, however, is not vital.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 468.
25. "Der Preis einer Ware, also auch der Arbeit, ist aber gleich ihren Produktionskosten." *Ibid.*, p. 469. The editors of the *Werke* duly note that Marx would have said "Arbeitskraft" instead of "Arbeit" in his later writings, a crucial difference on which may be said to hinge the entire distinction between Marxist and non-Marxist economics—as well as the distinction, perhaps, between the "young Marx" and the "mature Marx." See *Ibid.*, footnote 298, p. 649, and footnote 198, p. 636.
26. This definition is restated frequently, notably in "Lohn, Preis und Profit," *Werke* 16, pp. 121-132, in *Capital*, and elsewhere.
27. *Kapital I, Werke* 23, p. 532.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 281.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 533.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 534.
31. *Kapital III, Werke* 25, p. 223.
32. Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy, *Monopoly Capital* (Monthly Review Press, New York and London, 1966). The authors of this monumental study consider the "law of the rising surplus" a substitution for Marx's law of the tendential fall of the profit rate (see p. 72) without however discussing the fact that the law of the rising surplus is really no substitution at all, but merely another aspect of Marx's law.
33. This is already stated in *Grundrisse*, p. 649: "Thus the profit rate stands in an inverse relationship to the growth of relative surplus value. . . ." More explicitly in *Kapital III*: "As the process of production and accumulation progresses, the mass of surplus labor that can be and is appropriated, and thus the absolute mass of the profits appropriated by the capitalist class, *must* grow." (*Werke* 25, p. 229; also pages 228, 230, and elsewhere in the same chapter.
34. *Kapital I, Werke* 23, p. 646.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 647.
36. Karl Marx, *Theorien Ueber den Mehrwert*, Karl Kautsky, editor, (Dietz, Stuttgart, 1919), Volume II, part 1, p. 141. A new edition of this important work is being issued by the editors of the *Werke* series; however, only Volume I of the new edition was available to me, and I have preferred to quote from the Kautsky edition, which seems to be more widely available in libraries. This work, consisting of three volumes in four books, figures in the *Werke* edition as "Volume Four" of *Capital*; it was written in manuscript by Marx in 1861-1862, however, and thus predates the other volumes of *Capital*. I shall refer to it as "*Theorien*" in the notes below.
37. *Kapital I, Werke* 23, p. 673; also *Kapital III, Werke* 25, p. 232.
38. *Grundrisse*, p. 212.

39. *Theorien I*, p. 189; see also p. 199.
40. These are of course the so-called white-collar proletarians, and the fact that this class also works for wages has aroused hopes that it also might in time be stimulated to develop along the classic lines of increasing proletarian militancy. Whatever the merit of this idea, however, it should be clear that to Marx, the proletariat meant *productive* workers only. If the proletariat is defined to include all those who work for wages, then many corporation executives and managers are proletarians too. Marx's early view of wage labor shows, by contrast, considerable lack of rigor; thus in the *Manifesto* he writes that the bourgeoisie has turned the judge, the parson, the poet, the scientist into its "paid wage laborers" (*Werke* 4, p. 465), which would put these worthy gentlemen into the proletariat, too, or so it would seem. Here again, as mentioned before, Marx sees the transformation of human values into market values as the overriding characteristic of the capitalist epoch, and has not yet become aware of the profounder characteristic, namely the creation and appropriation of surplus by the capitalist class. The shift from the market concept to the surplus concept marks, in my opinion, the central difference between "young" and "mature" Marxist thought. See footnote 25, above.
41. *Kapital III*, *Werke* 25, p. 310. The necessary connection between the rising requirement for such auxiliary services and the rise of the middle class is evident, but Marx does not state it at this point.
42. For example, even so sympathetic an economist as Joan Robinson dismisses the labor theory of value as an "incantation" which is insubstantial for the rest of his work, which is a bit like saying that the concept of motion has no relevance for the understanding of Newton's laws. See Joan Robinson, *An Essay on Marxian Economics* (Macmillan, London, 1949), p. 22.
43. *Grundrisse*, pp. 304-5, fn.
44. *Theorien I*, p. 171. See also p. 189.
45. *Kapital I*, *Werke* 23, pp. 469-70. See also Engels summarizing Marx in "Zur Wohnungsfrage" *Werke* 18, p. 214, where he speaks of the division of the surplus among unproductive workers, ranging from valets to the Pope, the Kaiser, the night watchman, etc. At one point Marx calls the various strata of civil servants, churchmen, etc., nothing but "elegant paupers." (*Theorien I*, p. 189.)
46. *Theorien I*, p. 184.
47. *Ibid.*; see also footnote 43 above.
48. *Theorien III*, p. 49.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 139 fn.
51. *Theorien II*, part 1, p. 127.
52. *Theorien II*, part 2, p. 365.
53. *Theorien III*, p. 423.
54. *Theorien II*, part 2, p. 264.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 368. A part of this excerpt appears in a not-quite-tight translation in T. B. Bottomore and Maximilien Rubel, editors, *Karl Marx, Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy* (McGraw-Hill paperback, 1964), p. 191.