

MARX ON PEASANTS AND SMALL-SCALE INDUSTRY
—THE CHANGES OF MARX'S INSIGHT INTO THE PRE-CAPITALIST SOCIETIES—

TOMONAGA TAIRAKO*

I. *An Ambiguous Historical Character of the Small-Scale Industry and Peasantry*

According to the conventional interpretation of Marx, the peasantry mode of production has been characterized as a premodern or underdeveloped mode of production that was destined to be demolished by the primitive accumulation of capital. This interpretation has recourse to such passages as found in the *First Volume of Capital*:

Diese Produktionsweise unterstellt Zersplitterung des Bodens und der übrigen Produktionsmittel. Mit der Konzentration der letzteren schließt sie die Kooperation, Theilung der Arbeit innerhalb derselben Produktionsprocesse, gesellschaftliche Beherrschung und Regelung der Natur, freie Entwicklung der gesellschaftlichen Produktivkräfte aus. Sie ist nur verträglich mit engen naturwüchsigen Schranken der Produktion und der Gesellschaft. Auf einem gewissen Höhegrad bringt sie die materiellen Mittel ihrer eignen Vernichtung zur Welt. Sie muß vernichtet werden, sie wird vernichtet. Ihre Vernichtung, die Verwandlung der individuellen und zersplitterten Produktionsmittel in gesellschaftlich konzentrierte, daher des zwerghaften Eigenthums Vieler in das massenhafte Eigenthum Weniger, daher die Expropriation der großen Volksmasse von Grund und Boden und Lebensmitteln und Arbeitsinstrumenten, diese furchtbare und schwierige Expropriation der Volksmasse bildet die Vorgeschichte des Kapitals. (*MEGA II/6*: 681)

[This mode of production presupposes parceling of the soil, and scattering of the other means of production. As it excludes the concentration of these means of production, so also it excludes cooperation, division of labor within each separate process of production, the control over, and the productive application of the forces of Nature by society, and the free development of the social productive forces. It is compatible only with a system of production, and a society, moving within narrow and more or less primitive bounds. To perpetuate it would be, as Pecqueur rightly says, "to decree universal mediocrity". At a certain stage of development, it brings forth the material agencies for its own dissolution. It must be annihilated; it is annihilated. Its annihilation, the transformation of the individualized and scattered means of production into socially concentrated ones, of the pigmy property of the many into the huge property of the few, the expropriation of the great mass of the people from the soil, from the means of subsistence, and from the means of labor, this fearful and painful expropriation of the mass of the people forms the prelude to the history of capital. (*MECW 35*: 749)]

* Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo.

As long as we interpret Marx's notion of the peasantry mode of production from the above-quoted passage it seems to be an obsolete one that must historically be overcome. However, if we take the whole context in *Capital* and *Economic Manuscripts* into consideration we see that the peasantry mode of production plays a highly positive role in Marx's theory of human history. In fact, the above-quoted passage is preceded by the following sentences:

Das Privateigenthum des Arbeiters an seinen Produktionsmitteln ist die Grundlage des Kleinbetriebs, der Kleinbetrieb eine nothwendige Bedingung für die Entwicklung der gesellschaftlichen Produktion und der freien Individualität des Arbeiters selbst. Allerdings existirt diese Produktionsweise auch innerhalb der Sklaverei, Leibeigenschaft und anderer Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse. Aber sie blüht nur, schnellt nur ihre ganze Energie, erobert nur die adäquate klassische Form, wo der Arbeiter freier Privateigenthümer seiner von ihm selbst gehandhabten Arbeitsbedingungen ist, der Bauer des Ackers, den er bestellt, der Handwerker des Instruments, womit er als Virtuose spielt. (*MEGA* II/6: 681)

[The private property of the laborer in his means of production is the foundation of small-scale industry, whether agricultural, manufacturing, or both; small-scale industry, again, is an essential condition for the development of social production and of the free individuality of the laborer himself. Of course, this small-scale industry exists also under slavery, serfdom, and other states of dependence. But it flourishes, it lets loose its whole energy, it attains its adequate classical form, only where the laborer is the private owner of his own means of labor set in action by himself: the peasant of the land which he cultivates, the artisan of the tool which he handles as a virtuoso. (*MECW* 35: 749)]

From the above-quoted sentences we can see the following points:

(1) Private property of the laborer in his means of production is the foundation of the small-scale industry [der Kleinbetrieb]. It comprises both agricultural and manufacturing small business. Although it excludes the free development of social productive forces, and is compatible only with narrow and more or less primitive bounds, Marx still regards it as a necessary condition for the development of the free individuality of the laborer himself. From this we can see that, for Marx, the development of the free individuality of the working subjects does not necessarily presuppose the free development of the social productive forces under the capitalist mode of production.

(2) The small-scale industry in a broad sense is common to all forms of production that precede the capitalist mode of production while there are some particular historical periods when it most 'flourishes', and 'attains its adequate classical form.'

(3) The small-scale industry exists even inside the slavery and the serfdom; in other words, the slavery and the serfdom can be classified as particular types of the small-scale industry because, as a matter of fact, they guarantee laborers' property in or, at least, possession of their own means of production.

II. *Marx on Free Competition and Individual Freedom* —*The Dialectics of Grenze and Schranke*—

Before we consider Marx's notion of the small-scale industry we have to consider that

Marx comprehend freedom in history in terms of the dialectics of limits (Grenze) and bounds (Schranke), which he borrows from Hegel's *Logik*. In the *Grundrisse* Marx characterizes free competition in the capitalist society in a very interesting way:

Wenn die freie Concurrenz aufgelöst hat die Schranken früherer Productionsverhältnisse und -weisen, so muß d'abord betrachtet werden, daß was für sie Schranke, für frühere Productionsweisen immanente Grenze war, worin sie sich naturgemäß entwickelten und bewegten. Schranken werden diese Grenzen erst nachdem die Productivkräfte und Verkehrsverhältnisse sich hinreichend entwickelt, damit das Capital als solches beginnen konnte als das regelnde Prinzip der Production aufzutreten. Die Grenzen, die es niederriß, waren Schranken für seine Bewegung, Entwicklung, Verwirklichung. Es hob damit keineswegs alle Grenzen auf, noch alle Schranken; sondern nur die ihm nicht entsprechenden Grenzen, die für es Schranken waren. Innerhalb seiner eignen Grenzen - so sehr sie von einem höhern Gesichtspunkt aus als Schranken der Production erscheinen und als solche durch seine eigne historische Entwicklung gesetzt werden- fühlt es sich frei, schrankenlos, d. h. nur durch sich selbst, nur durch seine eignen Lebensbedingungen begrenzt.

[When free competition has demolished bounds of relations and modes of production of the past, we must first consider that what a bound for it was an immanent limit for the modes of production of the past, in which they developed and moved in a natural way. These limits do not become bounds before the forces of production and the relations of intercourse developed to such a degree that capital as such could begin to appear as a principle regulating production. The limits that capital pulled down were bounds for capital's movement, development and realization. By this capital neither abolished all limits nor all bounds but nothing but limits that did not correspond to it and were already bounds for it. Inside its own limits, — however much they may, from a higher viewpoint, appear as bounds of production, and be set as such bounds by its own historical development — capital feels itself free, boundless, namely limited only by itself, only by its own conditions of life.] (*MEGA* II/1.2:533)

From the above-quoted passage, we can see that the limits (Grenze) of a certain mode of production are not yet its bounds (Schranke). What are bounds for capital are not yet bounds but still immanent limits for the modes of production previous to capitalism. Inside these immanent limits each mode of production could move and develop in a natural way. Therefore, for Marx freedom in a certain society is always historically determined in terms of immanent limits that each historical mode of production allows. At the same time, we can see that members of each historical society can enjoy their own individual freedom inside immanent limits of the society in which they live. In order to understand why, in many passages in the economic manuscripts, Marx positively estimates the development of free individuality of laborers in the small-scale industry we have to keep in mind the historically determined character of freedom and the dialectics of limits and bounds as considered above.

It is in this context that Marx characterizes the freedom of a guild in a following way:

Ganz wie die zünftige Industrie zu ihrer Blüthezeit in der zünftigen Organisation vollständig die Freiheit fand, deren sie bedurfte, d. h. die ihr entsprechenden Productionsverhältnisse. Sie selbst setzte sie ja aus sich heraus und entwickelte sie als ihre

immanenten Bedingungen, und daher keineswegs als äusserliche und beengende Schranken. Die historische Seite der Negation des Zunft- etc -wesens von Seite des Capitals durch die freie Concurrenz, heißt weiter nichts, als daß das hinreichend erstarkte Capital durch die ihm adaequate Verkehrsweise die historischen Schranken niederriß, die die ihm adaequate Bewegung genirten und hemmten.

[Thus, guild industry found, in its heyday, freedom that it required in a perfect way in the guild organization, namely the production relations corresponding to it. Guild industry set it from itself and developed it as its immanent conditions, which were, therefore, not external and restricting bounds at all. The historical side of the negation of the guild etc. system by capital through free competition signifies nothing but that capital, as soon as it became strong enough, pulled down through the mode of intercourse adequate for capital historical bounds that had disturbed and hindered the movement adequate for capital.] (MEGA II/1.2:533)

From the above-quoted passages we can see that, according to Marx, the guild organization guaranteed its members freedom in a perfect way inside its immanent limits in which they were able to feel themselves free.

On the other hand, Marx characterizes free competition in the capitalist system in the following way:

Nicht die Individuen sind frei gesetzt in der freien Concurrenz; sondern das Capital ist frei gesetzt. So lange die auf dem Capital ruhnde Production die nothwendige, daher die angemessenste Form für die Entwicklung der gesellschaftlichen Productivkraft, erscheint das Bewegen der Individuen innerhalb der reinen Bedingungen des Capitals als ihre Freiheit; die aber dann auch dogmatisch als solche versichert wird durch beständige Reflection auf die von der freien Concurrenz niedergerißnen Schranken.

[What is set as free in free competition are not individuals but capital. As long as the production based upon capital is the necessary, therefore the most adequate form for the development of social production force, the movement of individuals inside the pure conditions of capital appears as their freedom, which is then also dogmatically affirmed as such through incessantly reflecting upon the bounds pulled down by free competition.] (MEGA II/1.2: 533-534)

According to Marx, free competition is a particular form of freedom inside immanent limits that the capitalist mode of production admits; although individuals can freely move only inside these limits, they feel themselves absolutely free. Their sense of freedom is then dogmatically legitimated by constantly referring to the historical past devoid of freedom that they are now enjoying. In reference to the future, free competition could appear to be a restricted form of freedom while, in reference to the past, it would appear to be a perfect form of it. This is a reason why bourgeois theoreticians constantly legitimate freedom that they enjoy by referring to the past because the reference to the past witnesses how much capitalism has overcome the past and contributed to the development of human freedom and happiness.

Daher andererseits die Abgeschmacktheit die freie Concurrenz als die letzte Entwicklung der menschlichen Freiheit zu betrachten; und Negation der freien Concurrenz = Negation individueller und auf individueller Freiheit gegründeter gesellschaftlicher Production. Es ist eben nur die freie Entwicklung auf einer bornirten Grundlage -der Grundlage der

Herrschaft des Capitals. Diese Art individueller Freiheit ist daher zugleich die völlige Aufhebung aller individuellen Freiheit und die völlige Unterjochung der Individualität unter gesellschaftliche Bedingungen, die die Form von sachlichen Mächten, ja von übermächtigen Sachen - von den sich beziehenden Individuen selbst unabhängigen Sachen annehmen. Sobald übrigens die Illusion über die Concurrenz als die angebliche absolute Form der freien Individualität verschwindet, ist dieß ein Beweis, daß die Bedingungen der Concurrenz, d. h. der auf das Capital gegründeten Production, schon als Schranken gefühlt und gedacht werden, und es daher schon sind und mehr und mehr werden.

[From this, on the other hand, arises such a tasteless way of thinking to regard free competition as the last development of human freedom, and the negation of free competition as equal to that of individual freedom and social production based upon individual freedom. This is nothing but the free development on a restricted basis, namely that of the sway of capital. Therefore, this kind of individual freedom is at the same time the most perfect abolition of all individual freedom and the perfect subjugation of individuality to social conditions that assume a form of reified [sachlich] powers, or rather of overpowering things [Sachen], namely things independent of individuals themselves relating to each other. By the way, if the illusion about free competition as the so-called absolute form of free individuality disappears, it demonstrates that the conditions of competition, namely production based upon capital have already been assumed and regarded as bounds [Schranken], and, therefore, already are and will become more and more so.] (*MEGA I/1.2*: 534, 537)

From the above-quoted passage we can see that Marx comprehends individual freedom based upon free competition as 'the most perfect abolition of all individual freedom and the perfect subjugation of individuality' to the reified powers. There is an antagonism between individual freedom and free competition as the sway of things over individuals.

To sum up, according to Marx, the character of freedom in any society is determined in relation to limits that it admits. Therefore, all historically existing societies spontaneously develop and guarantee their members' freedom inside their own limits. The limits of societies preceding the capitalism become bounds only after capital becomes a regulating principle of production, and are then treated as not free and inconvenient. It is only inside the limits of the capitalist system that the capitalist society appears to guarantee the highest degree of human freedom while, from a higher viewpoint, the limits of capitalist society would be treated as bounds. The claim to regard individual freedom based upon free competition as the most perfect form of freedom can be established as a dominant doctrine by referring to societies preceding capitalism that were treated and demolished as 'bounds' for the people that feel themselves free as long as they behave and think inside the capitalist limits. In this sense, the idea of free competition, in order to justify itself, requires premodern or non-European societies that should be denounced as obsolete.

On the other hand, according to Marx, individual freedom based upon free competition is freedom based upon the sway of capital, or perfect subjugation of individuals to reified powers of capital, which, in the final analysis, leads to 'the most perfect abolition of all individual freedom.' It is one of the most important tasks of the critique of the political economy for Marx to theoretically demonstrate the above-mentioned dialectics concerning human freedom,

which at the same time makes it possible to rediscover the historical meaning of pre-capitalist societies.

In his economic manuscripts Marx comprehensively discusses about the problem of freedom of producers inside the limits of pre-capitalist societies. His argument is focused on the notion of self-employed producers (peasants and craftsmen) in the small-scale industry, which we will in detail discuss in the following chapters.

III. *The Small-Scale Industry and Self-Sustaining Peasants*

The basic forms of small-scale-industrial producers consist of self-sustaining producers: peasants in the country and craftsmen in the city.¹

Marx considers the small-scale industry as a basis for an original form of property in which producers relate to land and other means of production as their own. This mode of production prevails among all forms of production preceding capitalist production including the Asian form, the slavery (except large-scale slavery and domestic slavery) and the serfdom.

Das freie Eigenthum des selbstwirthschaftenden Bauern ist offenbar die normalste Form des Grundeigenthums für den kleinen Betrieb; d. h. für eine Productionsweise, worin das Eigenthum an Grund und Boden eine Bedingung für das Eigenthum an dem Product seiner eignen Arbeit ist, und worin, er mag freier Eigenthümer oder Untersasse sein, der Ackerbauer stets seine Subsistenzmittel sich selbst, unabhängig, und als vereinzelter Arbeiter mit seiner Familie zu produciren hat. Das Eigenthum an Grund und Boden ist zur vollständigen Entwicklung dieser Betriebsweise ebenso nöthig, wie das Eigenthum am Instrument zur freien Entwicklung des handwerksmässigen Betriebs. Es bildet hier die Basis zur Entwicklung der persönlichen Selbstständigkeit. Es ist für die Entwicklung der Agricultur selbst ein nothwendiger Durchgangspunkt.

[Free property of self-employed peasants is evidently the most normal form of property in land for the small-scale industry, namely for a mode of production in which property in land is a condition for property in the product of his own labor, and in which, whether he may be a free proprietor or a subordinate, a peasant has to constantly produce his own means of subsistence by himself, independently and as an isolated laborer together with his family. Property in land is necessary for the complete development of this mode of industry in the same way as property in the instrument is necessary for the free development of handcraft industry. Here, it constitutes a basis for the development of

¹ “Die charakteristischen Formen jedoch, worin das *Wuchercapital* in den Vorzeiten der capitalistischen Productionsweise existirt, sind zweierlei: *Wucher* durch Geldverleihen an verschwenderische Grosse (essentielle *Grundeigenthümer*); zweitens: *Wucher* durch Geldverleihen an den kleinen, im Besitz seiner eignen Arbeitsbedingungen befindlichen Producenten, worin der Handwerker eingeschlossen ist; aber ganz spezifisch der *Bauer*, da überhaupt in Zuständen, wo diese Productionsweise vorherrscht, die Bauernklasse die grosse Majorität jener kleinen self sustaining producers sein muß. [However, the characteristic forms in which usurer’s capital exists in the periods previous to the capitalist mode of production are twofold: *usury* through lending money to extravagant heavyweights (essentially *landowners*); secondly, usury through lending money to a small-scale producer in possession of his own conditions of labor, which includes a craftsman as well but properly a peasant because, in circumstances where this mode of production prevails, the peasant class must be a great majority of those small-scale self-sustaining producers.]” (*MEGA* II/4.2: 647)

personal independence. It is a necessary point of transition for the development of agriculture itself.] (*MEGA II/4.2: 747*)

As is shown in the above-quoted passage Marx considers free property of self-employed peasants in land firstly as ‘the most normal form of property for the small-scale industry,’ secondly as ‘a basis for the development of personal independence,’ and lastly as ‘a necessary point of transition for the development of agriculture itself.’ It interests us that he understands by ‘free property of self-employed peasants in land’ not only a free land owner but also a subordinate cultivator: “whether he may be a free proprietor or a subordinate,” Marx’s recognition of a subordinate peasant as factual land owner is derived from the first form of labor funds by Richard Jones as we will see in the next chapter. Any type of cultivator, whether he may keep perfect property in land or not, is classified as a certain type of free self-employed peasant as long as he, based upon his factual possession of land, produces his own means of subsistence by himself with his family, and directly consumes it.

IV. *Marx on Richard Jones*

In this chapter we will discuss how Marx characterizes slavery and serfdom through different phases of his own theoretical development.

1. *The Grundrisse*

In the *Grundrisse*, (1) slaves and serfs belong to objective conditions of labor, and their own personality is not recognized at all; (2) Although they are deprived of property in land as well as instruments of labor, they are still allowed to relate themselves as proprietors to means of subsistence² in sharp contrast with completely property-less laborers in the capitalist production that are deprived of property not only in means of production but also in means of subsistence; (3) In this connection, slavery and serfdom are classified as secondary forms of original property because the original unity between the laboring subject and the objective conditions of labor in terms of means of subsistence is guaranteed in slavery and serfdom.

The relations of subordination in the pre-capitalist societies factually presuppose laborer’s property in means of subsistence, of which the laborer in the capitalist system is deprived, as we see in the following passage:

Solche historische Auflösungsprozesse sind sowohl Auflösung der Hörigkeitsverhältnisse, die den Arbeiter an Grund und Boden und den Herrn des Grund und Bodens fesseln, aber sein Eigenthum an Lebensmitteln faktisch voraussetzen.

² “Die 3te mögliche Form, sich als Eigenthümer zu verhalten nur zu den Lebensmitteln, sie vorfinden als natürliche Bedingung des arbeitenden Subjekts, ohne weder zum Grund und Boden, noch zum Instrument, also auch nicht der Arbeit selbst sich als eignen zu verhalten, ist au fond die Formel der Sklaverei und Leibeigenschaft, die ebenfalls negirt ist, als historisch aufgelöster Zustand gesetzt ist im Verhältniß des Arbeiters zu den Productionsbedingungen als Capital. [The *third possible form* to relate oneself as proprietor only to means of subsistence, or to find it as a natural condition of a laboring subject, neither relating oneself as proprietor to land nor to the instrument, therefore, nor to the labor itself, is in fact that of slavery and serfdom, which is in the relation of the laborer to the conditions of labor as capital denied and treated as a historically dissolved state.]” (*MEGA II/1.2: 403*)

[Such historical dissolution processes are also dissolution of the relations of subordination that tie up the laborer to land and the land owner but factually presuppose the laborer's property in means of subsistence.] (*MEGA* II/1.2: 405)

2. Marx on Richard Jones in the *Economic Manuscript of 1861-1863*

In the *Economic Manuscript of 1861-1863*, Marx quotes many pages from Richard Jones (*MEGA* II/3.5: 1835-1887). Marx highly estimates his keen sense to understand the historical difference among various modes of production, because of which he excels all English economists since James Stuart.³

Marx is especially impressed by his analysis of three historical forms of labor funds:

“Der labor funds”, sagt J. “kann eingetheilt werden in 3 Klassen: 1) Revenues producirt durch die laborers, die sie selbst consumiren und nie andren Personen angehören.” (In diesem Fall, welches immer die besondere Form, muß der Arbeiter faktisch Besitzer seiner Productionsinstrumente sein.); 2) “Revenues belonging to classes distinct from the laborers, and expended by those classes in the direct maintenance of labor”; 3) “Capital im eigentlichen Sinn.

[“The labor funds,” says Jones, “can be classified into three classes: (1) Revenues that are produced by laborers, and that they consume themselves, and do not belong to other persons.” (In this case, whatever its specific form may be, the laborer must factually be a possessor of his instruments of labor.); (2) “Revenues belonging to classes distinct from the laborers, and expended by those classes in the direct maintenance of labor”; (3) “Capital in the proper sense.”] (*MEGA* II/3.5:1849)

According to Jones, the first form of labor funds refers to revenues produced and at the same time consumed by laborers themselves; the second form refers to those expended in the direct maintenance of laborers by classes distinct from the laborers; the third refers to capital invested in wages.

What interests us most among these three forms is the first one because Marx completely agrees with Jones in asserting that, as long as laborers are allowed to directly consume what they produce themselves, whether they may be slaves or serfs, they must factually be possessors of their own instruments of labor including land.

Was hier das Charakteristische: Der Arbeiter reproducirt für sich selbst den labor funds. Er verwandelt sich nicht in Capital. Wie er ihn direkt producirt, so eignet er ihn direkt an, obgleich seine surplus labor, je nach der besondern Form, worin er sich zu seinen Productionsbedingungen verhält, von ihm selbst ganz oder theilweise, oder von andren Klassen ganz angeeignet wird.

[Here, it is characteristic that the laborer reproduces the labor funds for himself. It is not

³ “Rev. R. Jones. *An Essay on the Distribution of Wealth and the Sources of Taxation*. Lond. 1831. Part. I. Rent. Schon diese erste Schrift *on Rent* zeichnet sich durch das aus, was allen englischen Oekonomen seit Sir James Stuart fehlt, Sinn für den *historischen* Unterschied der Produktionsweisen. [The Reverend R. Jones, *An Essay on the Distribution of Wealth and the Sources of Taxation*. London. 1831. Part. I. Rent. This first work *on Rent* is already distinguished for what all English economists since Sir James Stuart lack, namely the sense of the *historical* difference among various modes of production.]” (*MEGA* II/3.5: 1835)

transformed into capital. As he directly produces them, so he directly acquires them, although his surplus labor, according to the special form in which he relates to his conditions of labor, is entirely or partially acquired by him, or entirely appropriated by other classes.] (*MEGA* II/3.5:1849)

According to Marx, even if the whole amount of his surplus product is appropriated by members of other classes, the cultivator still remains a possessor of land and other instruments of labor as long as he directly acquires what he produces by himself. Surprisingly, the way how and to what extent the surplus-products of cultivators are exploited by other classes does not matter in determining their historical character. The first form comprises a great variety of different kinds of cultivators in pre-capitalist societies that are generally characterized as ‘the laboring peasants’ as is shown in the following passage:

Ad a) “Die wages of laboring cultivators, or occupying peasants. Diese laboring cultivators or peasants sind hereditary o c c u p i e r s, proprietors, tenants. Die tenants sind serfs, metayers, cottiers.- Leztre Irland eigenthümlich. Etwas wie Rent oder Profit oft mit den revenues der peasant cultivators of all classes vermischt, aber when their subsistence is essentially dependent on the reward of their manual labor sind sie als wages laborers zu betrachten. Von den laboring peasants also: α) Hereditary occupiers, who are laboring cultivators. Ancient Greece. Modern Asia, besonders India. β) Proprietors. France, Germany, America, Australia, Alt Palästina. γ) cottiers.”

[ad a) “Die wages of laboring cultivators, or occupying peasants. These laboring cultivators or peasants are hereditary o c c u p i e r s, proprietors, tenants. The tenants are serfs, metayers, cottiers.- The latter are unique to Ireland. Something like rent or profit is often confounded with revenues of peasant cultivators of all classes, but when their subsistence is essentially dependent on the reward of their manual labor they should be regarded as wages laborers. To the laboring peasants belong also: α) hereditary occupiers, who are laboring cultivators. Ancient Greece. Modern Asia, especially India. β) Proprietors. France, Germany, America, Australia, Ancient Palästina. γ) cottiers.”] (*MEGA* II/3.5:1849)

According to these three forms of the labor funds, slavery as well is classified into the following three forms: (1) cultivating peasants, (2) menials or artisans, maintained from the incomes of the rich, (3) laborers maintained from capital or laborers that acquire revenues through exchange with capital.⁴

Although we can find three different types of laborers according to three different types of the labor funds, a great majority of people in the human history belong to the first type of people called ‘the laboring or cultivating peasants.’⁵

⁴ ““Slaves may be divided into pastoral-*praedial-domestic-slaves* of a mixed character, between *praedial* and *domestic*. Wir finden slaves als cultivating peasants, als menials or artisans, maintained from the incomes of the rich, as *laborers maintained from capital*.” (59) Aber so lange Sklaverei herrscht, kann das Capitalverhältniß immer nur sporadisch, untergeordnet, nie als beherrschend erscheinen. [Slaves may be divided into pastoral-*praedial-domestic-slaves* of a mixed character, between *praedial* and *domestic*. We find slaves as cultivating peasants, as menials or artisans, maintained from the incomes of the rich, as *laborers maintained from capital*.” (59) However, as long as slavery prevails, the capital relation can always appear only sporadically, in a subordinate way, never as a prevailing form.]” (*MEGA* II/3.5: 1851)

⁵ “In every nation of the Old World, except England and Holland, the *wages* of the agriculturists are not advanced

As we have already seen, cultivating slaves and serfs are also included in the first type. They are factually possessors of land and other labor instruments, in whatever manner their surplus labor or products are exploited by members of other classes. In the *Grundrisse*, they are allowed to have possession of nothing but means of subsistence while they have property in neither land nor the labor instruments. However, having read Richard Jones, Marx revised his opinion and regarded them as 'the laboring or cultivating peasants' in terms of factual possessors of not only means of subsistence but also land and other labor instruments. In this sense, they share the original property with full-fledged free members of a community.

The notion of 'the laboring or cultivating peasants' that Marx learned from Richard Jones⁶ plays a very important role for his understanding of the human history in the following two respects: (1) 'the laboring or cultivating peasants' have a historical character completely different from the modern wage laborers in terms of their respective relation to the objective conditions of labor although both are commonly characterized as exploited classes. (2) What is more important, Marx has finally found out the most comprehensive category representative of all modes of production in pre-capitalist societies in terms of the laboring or cultivating peasants.

Die Bedingungen, unter denen das [capitalistische] Verhältniß ursprünglich erscheint, oder die als historische Voraussetzung seines Werdens erscheinen, zeigen auf den ersten Blick doppelseitigen Charakter - auf der einen Seite Auflösung niedrigerer Form der lebendigen Arbeit - auf der andren Seite Auflösung glücklicher Verhältnisse für den unmittelbaren Producenten. Einerseits Auflösung von Sklaverei und Leibeigenschaft. Andererseits Auflösung der Form, worin die Productionsmittel unmittelbar als Eigenthum des unmittelbaren Producenten vorhanden sind, sei es daß seine Arbeit vorwiegend auf Gebrauchswerth (Agricultur) oder Tauschwerth (städtische Arbeit) gerichtet ist. Endlich Auflösung der Form des Gemeinwesens, worin der Arbeiter als Organ dieses naturwüchsigen Gemeinwesens zugleich als Eigenthümer oder Besitzer über seine Productionsmittel gesetzt ist.)

[The conditions under which the [capitalist] relation for the first time appears, or those that appear as historical presupposition of its coming into existence at a glance shows a two-sided character - on the one hand, the dissolution of a lower form of the living labor - on the other hand, that of happier relations for the direct producer. On the one hand, the dissolution of slavery and serfdom. On the other hand, the dissolution of the form in which the means of production directly exist as property of the direct producer, whether his labor may be directed mainly towards use value (agriculture) or towards exchange value (urban labor). Lastly, the dissolution of the form of a community in which the laborer is determined as an organ of this natural-genetic community and, at the same time,

out of the funds which have been saved and accumulated from revenues, but are produced by the laborers themselves, and never exist in any other shape than that of a stock for their own immediate consumption." (37) (MEGA II/3.5: 1855-1856)

⁶ In the *Economic Manuscript of 1861-1863* Marx heaps the highest praise on Jones's theoretical contribution in the following way: "Was Jones vor den übrigen Oekonomen (mit Ausnahme etwa von Sismondi) auszeichnet, ist daß er die sociale Formbestimmtheit des Capitals als das Wesentliche betont, und den ganzen Unterschied der capitalistischen Productionsweise von andren Weisen derselben auf diese Formbestimmtheit reducirt. [What distinguishes Jones from other economists (probably except Sismondi) is that he insists on the social form-determination of capital as an essential matter, and ascribes the whole difference of the capitalist mode of production from other modes of it to this form-determination.]" (MEGA II/3.5: 1856)

as a proprietor or a possessor of his means of production.] (*MEGA* II/3.6: 2288)

From the above-quoted passage we can see that, according to this historical framework, Marx describes the presuppositions for the emergence of the capitalist production relations as the dissolution of three different forms of production: (1) the first form refers to the form of production in which 'the means of production directly exist as property of the direct producer, whether his labor may be directed mainly towards use value (agriculture) or towards exchange value (urban labor).' He names this form 'happier relations for the direct producer' because, in this form, the direct producer in agriculture as well as in urban industry is recognized as a full-fledged proprietor of the means of production. (2) The second form refers to slavery and serfdom, in which the direct producer still remains a factual possessor of the means of production although this form is called 'a lower form of the living labor.' (3) The last form refers to 'the form of a community in which the laborer is determined as an organ of this natural-genetic [naturwüchsig] community and, at the same time, as a proprietor or a possessor of his means of production.' This description most properly applies to the Asian community. What interests us most is that Marx counts the Asian community in a form of property in which community members are treated as proprietors or possessors of his means of production.

From the *Grundrisse* to the *Economic Manuscript of 1861-1863* by acquiring a new concept of 'the laboring or cultivating peasants' that correspond to the first form of the labor funds, and are commonly found in all pre-capitalist production, Marx changes his opinion on the subordinate cultivators in the second (slavery and serfdom) and the third form of production (the Asian community) and grants them a higher degree of independence as a factual possessor of the means of production than in the *Grundrisse*.

This theoretical construction is also maintained in the following phase of the development of Marx's theory of human history. In the *Economic Manuscripts of 1863-1867* we find the following passage:

Es ist ferner klar, daß in allen Formen, worin der unmittelbare Arbeiter "Besitzer" der zur Production seiner eignen Subsistenzmittel nothwendigen Productionsmittel oder Arbeitsbedingungen bleibt, das Eigenthumsverhältniß zugleich als unmittelbares Herrschafts- und Knechtschaftsverhältniß auftreten muß, der unmittelbare Producent also als Unfreier; eine Unfreiheit, die sich von der Leibeigenschaft, Frohnarbeit, bis zur blossen Tributpflichtigkeit abschwächen kann. Da der unmittelbare Producent sich hier der Voraussetzung nach im Besitz seiner eignen Productionsmittel (der zur Verwirklichung seiner Arbeit und Schöpfung seiner Subsistenzmittel nothwendigen objectiven Arbeitsbedingungen) befindet und seinen Ackerbau, wie die damit verknüpfte ländlich häusliche Industrie selbstständig betreibt (eine Selbstständigkeit, die nicht dadurch aufgehoben ist, daß etwa wie in Indien u. s. w. diese selfsustaining peasants untereinander ein mehr oder minder naturwüchsiges Productions-Gemeinwesen bilden, da es sich hier nur von der Selbstständigkeit gegenüber dem nominellen Eigenthümer handelt), so kann ihnen die Surplusarbeit für den nominellen Grundeigenthümer nur durch ausserökonomischen Zwang abgepreßt werden, welche Form dieselbe immer annehme.

[Furthermore, it is evident that, in all forms in which the direct producer remains a "possessor" of the means of production or the conditions of labor necessary for the production of his own means of subsistence, the relation of property must at the same time appear as the relation of direct dominion and servitude, and the direct producer must do

also as a non-free person; this non-freedom may gradually wane from serfdom, corvée up to a mere tribute-duty. As the direct laborer here, according to the presupposition, holds possession of his own means of production (namely the objective conditions of labor necessary for the implementation of his labor and the production of his own means of subsistence), independently cultivates his land and engages in rural household industry combined with farming (the independence of the direct laborer is not cancelled by the fact that, for example, in India etc., these self-sustaining peasants form a more or less natural-genetic production-community among themselves since, here, only the independence against the nominal proprietor matters), surplus labor cannot be seized from the self-sustaining peasants for the nominal land owner without non-economic compulsion, whatever form this compulsion may assume.] (*MEGA* II/4.2: 731-732)

The above-quoted passage refers to the second and the third form of production. Marx pays special attention to the independence of the self-sustaining peasants placed under the conditions of servitude.

V. *The Golden Age of Peasantry and Free Peasantry Property*

The existence of peasantry covers almost all human history preceding the capitalism. In most cases, peasantry and small-scale industry accompanies the relations of subordination and servitude to a smaller or greater degree. However, there were in the human history a few periods when peasantry and small-scale industry enjoyed the highest degree of flourishing and free development in which independent peasants related to their own means of production as their own property in a perfect way. At least in the self-sustaining agriculture, free property in land is the most favorable production condition for the direct producer as well as for the flourishing of this mode of production (*MEGA* II/4.2: 667).

In the *Grundrisse*, Marx describes the times of the decline of feudal system such as the 14th and the first half of the 15th century of England as 'a golden time for the labor that emancipates itself.'⁷

In the *Economic Manuscripts of 1863-1867*, he expands the golden age of peasantry into more different periods. What interests us most is that not only the times following the decline of feudal system but also the best times of classical antiquity count as the golden time.

Diese Form des freien Parcelleneigentums selbstwirtschaffender Bauern als herrschende normale Form bildet einerseits die ökonomische Grundlage der Gesellschaft in den besten Zeiten des klassischen Alterthums, andererseits finden wir sie als eine der Formen vor, die aus der Auflösung des feudalen Grundeigentums hervorgeht bei den modernen Völkern. So die Yeomanry in England, der Bauernstand in Schweden, die französischen Bauern.

[This form of free property of self-employed peasants in a parceled land as prevailing normal form, on the one hand, constitutes the economic basis of a society in the best times

⁷ "Nur in den Zeiten des Untergangs des Feudalwesens, wo es aber noch kämpft unter sich- so in England im 14 und ersten Hälfte des 15 Jhh. ist das goldne Zeitalter für die sich emancipirende Arbeit. [Only in times of the decline of the feudal system in which it still fight inside itself, for example, in England in the 14th and the first half of the 15th century, there is a golden time for the labor that emancipates itself.]" (*MEGA* II/1.2: 412)

of classical antiquity while, on the other hand, we find it as one of the forms that emerge from the dissolution of the feudal land ownership among the modern nations like the yeomanry in England, the peasantry in Sweden, the French peasants.] (*MEGA* II/4.2: 746-747)

Marx counts (1) classic antiquity and (2) Europa in the times succeeding the decline of feudal system as the prime of the small-scale industry (peasantry in the country as well as craft in the town). The same theoretical framework is also repeated in the *First Volume of Capital*:

Die kleine Bauernwirtschaft und der unabhängige Handwerksbetrieb, die beide theils die Basis der feudalen Produktionsweise bilden, theils nach deren Auflösung neben dem kapitalistischen Betrieb erscheinen, bilden zugleich die ökonomische Grundlage der klassischen Gemeinwesen zu ihrer besten Zeit, nachdem sich das ursprünglich orientalische Gemeineigenthum aufgelöst, und bevor sich die Sklaverei der Produktion ernsthaft bemächtigt hat.

[The small peasantry economy and the independent craftsmanship, the both of which, on the one hand, form a basis for the feudal mode of production and, on the other hand, after its dissolution appear beside the capitalist business, at the same time form the foundation of the antique communities in their best times, that is to say, after the original oriental community property was dissolved, and before slavery has seriously prevailed in production.] (*MEGA* II/6: 331)

In addition, Marx counts property in parceled land as a form in which self-employed peasants appear as free land proprietors:

Parzelleneigenthum. Der cultivator ist hier zugleich freier Eigenthümer seines Grundes und Bodens, der als sein Hauptproductionsinstrument erscheint, und das unentbehrliche field of employment für seine Arbeit und sein Capital. Es wird in dieser Form kein Pachtgeld gezahlt; die Rente erscheint also nicht als eine gesonderte Form des Surpluswerths.

[Property in parceled land. The cultivator is here at the same time a free proprietor in his land that appears as his main instrument of production, and as the indispensable field of employment for his labor and capital. In this form no rent for a tenancy is paid; therefore, the rent does not appear as a separated form of surplus value.] (*MEGA* II/4.2:744)

Lastly, the introduction of money rent brings about the free peasantry property [freies Bauerneigenthum] because “it makes it possible for the old possessor to buy his release from his duty to pay rent, and to transform himself into an independent peasant that acquires complete property in the land cultivated by him” as is written in the *Economic Manuscripts of 1863-1867*:

die Geldrente ist zugleich die Auflösungsform der bisher betrachteten, mit dem Surpluswerth und der Surplusarbeit zusammenfallenden Grundrente, der Grundrente als der normalen und herrschenden Form des Surpluswerths. Die Geldrente muß entweder zur Verwandlung des Grund und Bodens in freies Bauerneigenthum führen oder zur Form der kapitalistischen Produktionsweise, der Rente die der farmer-capitalist zahlt. Diese Verwandlung wird einerseits, unter sonst geeigneten allgemeinen Produktionsverhältnissen, dazu benutzt, den alten Besitzer nach und nach zu expropriiren und an seine Stelle einen capitalist-farmer zu setzen; andererseits kämmt es zum Loskauf des alten Besitzers von

seiner Rentpflichtigkeit und zu seiner Verwandlung in einen unabhängigen, volles Eigenthum an dem von ihm bestellten Boden erwerbenden Bauer.

[The money rent is at the same time a form of the dissolution of the already considered ground rent corresponding to surplus value and surplus labor, namely the ground rent as a normal and prevailing form of surplus value. The money rent must either lead to the transformation of land into free peasantry property or to a form of the capitalist mode of production, namely the ground rent that the farmer-capitalist pays. This transformation is, on the one hand, under the otherwise suitable general production relations, taken advantage of, to gradually appropriate the old possessor, and replace him with a capitalist-farmer; on the other hand, it makes it possible for the old possessor to buy his release from his duty to pay rent, and to transform himself into an independent peasant that acquires complete property in the land cultivated by him.] (*MEGA* II/4.2: 739)

VI. *Basic Forms of the Original Property and Small-Scale Free Land Property*

By 'original property (ursprüngliches Eigenthum)' Marx understands a form of property in which the laborers or cultivators relate to their own objective conditions of labor, which include not only means of labor, materials of production but also means of subsistence⁸, as their own property. The unity of the laborers with their objective conditions of labor is mediated and guaranteed by the community (*Gemeinwesen*) so that the laboring individuals are qualified as proprietors as long as they are recognized as members of the community. In the *Grundrisse*, Marx counts the Asian (oriental), Slavic, antique, and Germanic forms as those of original property.⁹

The Asian or oriental form of property keeps the most primitive original form of direct community property (*unmittelbares Gemeineigenthum*), this original form is already somehow modifies in the Slavic form while, in the antique and Germanic form, it is transformed into the completely reversed form opposite to the direct community property, that is to say, it results in the emergence of private property (in the antique form) or individual property (in the Germanic form). However, in the latter case, the community property still remains a secret though reversed foundation of property.¹⁰

⁸ It is often forgotten that, whenever Marx characterizes laborers in the capitalist production as property-less, he means that they are deprived of not only means of production but also means of subsistence.

⁹ "*Eigenthum* meint also ursprünglich - und so in seiner asiatischen, slawischen, antiken, germanischen Form - Verhalten des arbeitenden (producirenden) Subjekts (oder sich reproducirenden) zu den Bedingungen seiner Production oder Reproduction als den seinen. [Therefore, *property* originally - and namely in its Asian, Slavic, antique, Germanic form - means the behavioral relation of a laboring (producing) subject (or reproducing themselves) to the conditions of his production or reproduction as his own.]" (*MEGA* II/1.2: 399)

¹⁰ "Alle Formen, worin dies Eigenthum vorkommt, unterstellen ein *Gemeinwesen*, dessen Mitglieder, obgleich formelle Unterschiede zwischen ihnen sein mögen, als Mitglieder desselben *Eigenthümer* sind. Die ursprüngliche Form dieses Eigenthums ist daher selbst *unmittelbares Gemeineigenthum* (*orientalische Form*, modificirt im slawischen; bis zum Gegensatz entwickelt aber doch noch als die geheime, wenn auch gegensätzliche, Grundlage im antiken und germanischen Eigenthum). [All forms in which this property appears presuppose a *community* whose members are, although there may be formal differences among them, still as members of the *community proprietors*. Therefore, the original form of this property is *direct community property*, (which is at first the *oriental form*, and then is modified in the Slavic property, and is lastly developed up to its opposite form in the antique and Germanic form but, in spite of

Marx considers that there is a sharp contrast between the Asian and the Western form of community. The Asian community still preserves its archetypical shape up to the present day, and is most resistant to any changes while the Western form is more liable to transform itself and allow its members broader space for individual freedom.

Regarding this contrast, Marx counts the oriental and the Western community property as two fundamental forms of the original property, and characterizes, in contrast to the Asian community, the Western one as that consisting of free land proprietors, in which we can find a new definition of freedom that is unique to the Western community.¹¹ In another passage in the *Grundrisse*, Marx characterizes it as the small-scale free land property (das kleine freie Grundeigenthum).¹²

For the first time, in the *Economic Manuscript of 1861-1863*, Marx describes the Asian community (naturwüchsiger Communismus) and the small-scale family-agriculture¹³ as the two main forms of the original unity of the laborer with his conditions of labor:

Die ursprüngliche Einheit zwischen Arbeiter und Arbeitsbedingungen (vom Sklavenverhältniß abstrahirt, wo der Arbeiter selbst zu den objektiven Arbeitsbedingungen gehört), hat zwei Hauptformen: das asiatische Gemeinwesen (naturwüchsigen Communismus) und die kleine Familienagricultur (womit Hausindustrie verbunden) in one or the other form. Beide Formen sind Kinderformen und gleich wenig geeignet die Arbeit als gesellschaftliche Arbeit und die Productivkraft der gesellschaftlichen Arbeit zu entwickeln. Daher die Nothwendigkeit der Trennung, der Zerreissung, des Gegensatzes zwischen Arbeit und Eigenthum. (womit zu verstehn Eigenthum an den Productionsbedingungen). Die äusserste Form dieser Zerreissung, worin zugleich die productive forces of social labor are most powerfully developed, ist die des Capitals. Auf

this, still remains as a secret, though reverse, foundation).]” (MEGA II/1.2: 400)

¹¹ “Austausch vergegenständlichter Arbeit gegen lebendige Arbeit constituirt noch nicht, weder auf der einen Seite das Capital, noch auf der andren Seite die Lohnarbeit. Die ganze Klasse der s. g. *Dienste* vom Schuhputzer bis zum König fällt in diese Kategorie. Ebenso der freie Tagelöhner, den wir sporadisch finden überall, wo entweder das orientalische Gemeinwesen oder die westliche aus freien Grundeigenthümern bestehende Gemeinde sich auflöst in einzelne Elemente- in Folge der Vermehrung der Population, Entlassung von Kriegsgefangenen, Zufällen, wodurch der Einzelne verarmt und der objektiven Bedingungen seiner selfsustaining labor verloren geht, Folge der Theilung der Arbeit etc -. [Exchange of the objectified labor with the living labor does not constitute, on the one hand, capital or, on the other hand, wage labor yet. The whole class of the so-called *service* from a shoebblack to a king belongs to this category. The free day laborer as well that we sporadically find everywhere where either the oriental community or the western commune consisting of free land proprietors disintegrates into particular elements – as a result of the increase of a population, release of war prisoners, contingencies through which individuals are impoverished and deprived of the objective conditions of their self-sustaining labor, as a result of the division of labor etc.]” (MEGA II/1.2: 373)

¹² “Also vor allem Loslösung des Arbeiters von der Erde als seinem natürlichen Laboratorium – daher Auflösung des kleinen freien Grundeigenthums sowohl wie des gemeinschaftlichen auf der orientalischen Commune beruhenden Grundeigenthums. In beiden Formen verhält sich der Arbeiter zu den objektiven Bedingungen seiner Arbeit als seinem Eigenthum; es ist die natürliche Einheit der Arbeit mit ihren sachlichen Voraussetzungen. [Therefore, especially release of the laborer from land as his natural laboratory – therefore, dissolution of the small-scale free land property as well as the communal land property based upon the oriental commune. In the both forms, the laborer relates to the objective conditions of his labor as his property; this is the natural unity of labor with its material presuppositions.]” (MEGA II/1.2: 378-379)

¹³ In another passage of the same manuscripts, two main forms are “the Asian and the Western form.” “Im Gegensatz zu der asiatischen Form und westlichen Form (früher, zum Theil noch jetzt) auf dem Land, bildet die städtische Arbeit des Mittelalters schon grossen Fortschritt und Vorschule zur capitalistischen Productionsweise, continuity und steadiness

der materiellen Basis, die es schafft, und vermittelt der Revolutionen, die im Proceß dieser Schöpfung, die Arbeiterklasse und the whole society undergoes, kann erst wieder die ursprüngliche Einheit hergestellt werden.

[The original unity between the laborer and the conditions of labor (except the relation of slavery in which the laborer himself belongs to the objective conditions of labor) has two main forms: namely, the Asian community (natural-genetic communism) and the small-scale family-agriculture (with which a household industry is combined) in one or other form. Both forms are children-forms and in an equal degree little suitable to develop the labor as social labor and the productive force of social labor. From this comes the necessity of the division, the tearing-up or the opposition between labor and property (by which property in the production condition should be understood). The most extreme form of this tearing-up in which, at the same time, productive forces of social labor are most powerfully developed is that of capital. Only based upon a material basis that capital creates, and by means of revolutions that, in the process of the creation of this material basis, the working class and the whole society undergoes, the original unity can again be established.] (*MEGA II/3.5*: 1854-1855)

As we have seen, Marx classifies the original community or property into the Asian and the Western form. 'Natural-genetic (naturwüchsig) communism' is characteristic of the Asian form while the Western form is in a richer way characterized as (1) 'a commune consisting of free land proprietors' or as (2) small-scale free land property.

The reason why in the Asian form any kind of freedom is never recognized is that (1) in many Asian societies the integrating unity (die zussammenfassende Einheit) that is embodied in the despot stands above all these small communities as a higher proprietor or as the only proprietor while, on the contrary, the real communities appear only as hereditary possessors. Since this unity is the real proprietor of communal property, it can itself appear as a particular entity above many real particular communities in which the individuals are legally property-less. For them, possession exists only in the form of the grant of the despot representing the total unity to them.¹⁴ (2) Even inside the basic real community, there is no particular space for the members' individual freedom relatively separated from the community as is seen in the Western community while they are completely subordinate to the norms of the community.

of labor. [In contrast to the Asian and the Western form (earlier, but partly still now) in the country, the urban labor of the middle age already makes great progress and a nursery school to the capitalist mode of production, namely continuity und steadiness of labor.]" (*MEGA II/3.5*: 1871)

¹⁴ "wie in den meisten *asiatischen* Grundformen, die *zusammenfassende Einheit*, die über allen diesen kleinen Gemeinwesen steht, als der *höhere Eigenthümer* oder als der *einzigste Eigenthümer* erscheint, die wirklichen Gemeinden daher nur als *erbliche* Besitzer. Da die *Einheit* der wirkliche Eigenthümer ist und die wirkliche Voraussetzung des gemeinschaftlichen Eigenthums - so kann diese selbst als ein *Besondres* über den vielen wirklichen besondern Gemeinwesen erscheinen, wo der Einzelne dann in fact Eigenthumslos ist, oder das Eigenthum für ihn vermittelt erscheint durch das Ablassen der Gesamteinheit, die im Despoten realisirt ist als dem Vater der vielen Gemeinwesen - an den Einzelnen durch die Vermittlung der besondern Gemeinde. [As in most *Asian* basic forms, the *integrating unity* that stands above all these small communities appears as a *higher proprietor* or as the *only proprietor*, and, therefore, the real communities only as hereditary possessors. As the *unity* is the real proprietor and the real presupposition of communal property, it can itself appear as a *particular entity* above many real particular communities in which the individual is, in this case in fact, property-less, or rather for him property appears mediated by the grant of the total unity, which is embodied in the despot as the father of many communities, to him through the mediation of a real commune.]" (*MEGA II/1.2*: 380)

However, in the *Economic Manuscript of 1861-1863*, Marx changes his earlier opinion on the property-less-ness of the members of the Asian community. What interests us most is that Marx counts the Asian community in a form of property in which community members are treated as proprietors or possessors of his means of production (*MEGA I/3.6: 2288*) as we have seen in the chapter IV.

Marx regards the Asian community not only negatively in terms of members' property-less-ness but also positively in terms of the autonomy of the basic community and the status of its members as factual possessors of land and other means of production. Although the Asian despot is legally recognized as the only proprietor of the whole territory ruled by him and collects almost all surplus products from the basic communities while, on the other hand, he does not intervene in the inner organization of them, and grants them self-management and autonomy. Each basic community, based upon a combination of manufacture and agriculture, comprises all conditions of reproduction and surplus-production in itself, and continues to be completely self-sustaining.¹⁵ Inside this basic community, each member as a self-sustaining peasant holds possession of his parcel of land and other instruments of labor as well as means of subsistence as we have already seen in the chapter IV.¹⁶ Moreover, Marx qualifies members of the Asian community even for private possession.¹⁷

It interests us most that, considering the above-mentioned unique character of the oriental despotism, Marx no longer classify the general slavery of the Orient (die allgemeine Sklaverei des Orients) as slavery in the European sense:

Sklaverei, Leibeigenschaft etc, wo der Arbeiter selbst unter den Naturbedingungen der Production für ein 3tes Individuum oder Gemeinwesen erscheint (dieß ist z. B. bei der allgemeinen Sklaverei des Orients nicht der Fall, nur vom europäischen point of view

¹⁵ "Das Surplusproduct gehört damit von selbst dieser höchsten Einheit. Mitten im orientalischen Despotismus und der Eigenthumslosigkeit, die juristisch in ihm zu existiren scheint, existirt daher in der That als Grundlage dieses Stamm- oder Gemeindeeigenthum, erzeugt meist durch eine Combination von Manufactur und Agricultur innerhalb der kleinen Gemeinde, die so durchaus self-sustaining wird und alle Bedingungen der Reproduction und Mehrproduction in sich selbst enthält. [Therefore, surplus product self-evidently belongs to this highest unity. Therefore, right in the midst of the oriental despotism and the property-less-ness that seems to legally exist in it, nevertheless factually exists as a foundation this property of the tribe or commune, mostly produced by a combination of manufacture and agriculture inside the small commune that, in this manner, becomes completely self-sustaining and comprises all conditions of reproduction and surplus production in itself.]” (*MEGA II/1.2: 380*)

¹⁶ "Das Eigenthum des Einzelnen hier nicht, wie im ersten case, selbst unmittelbar Gemeindeeigenthum, wonach also nicht Eigenthum des Einzelnen als von der Gemeinde getrennt, der vielmehr nur ihr Besitzer ist. [Property of an individual is here [in the antique community] not as in the first case [in the Asian form] itself directly property of a commune, in which there is not any property of an individual as that separated from the commune, and he is rather only its possessor.]” (*MEGA II/1.2: 82*) "In der asiatischen (wenigstens vorherrschenden) Form, kein Eigenthum, sondern nur Besitz des Einzelnen; die Gemeinde der eigentliche wirkliche Eigenthümer - also Eigenthum nur als *gemeinschaftliches Eigenthum* an dem Boden. [In the Asian (at least, prevailing) form, there is not any property of an individual but only his possession; the commune is the proper real proprietor - therefore, property exists only as *communal property* in land.]” (*MEGA II/1.2: 388*)

¹⁷ "wo das Eigenthum *nur* als Gemeindeeigenthum existirt, ist das Einzelne Glied als solches nur *Besitzer* eines besondern Theils, erblicher oder nicht Dieser Einzelne ist also nur *Besitzer*. Es existirt nur *Gemeinschaftliches Eigenthum*, und nur *Privatbesitz*. Die Weise dieses Besitzes im Verhältniß zum gemeinschaftlichen Eigenthum kann historisch, lokal etc ganz verschieden modificirt sein, je nachdem die Arbeit selbst von dem Privatbesitzer isolirt geschieht oder selbst wieder von der Gemeinde bestimmt ist oder der über der besondern Gemeinde schwebenden Einheit. [In places where property exists only as communal property the individual member as such is only a possessor

aus) –.

[Slavery, serfdom etc. in which the laborer himself appears to belong to the condition of production for the third individual or community (this is not the case, for example, in the general slavery of the Orient, which seems to be so only from the European point of view).] (*MEGA II/1.2*: 399)

In slavery and serfdom in the Western society, the laborer belongs to the conditions of production for the other person or community, which is not the case in the general slavery of the Orient; from this follows that the oriental general slavery is not slavery at all although it seems to be a form of slavery from the viewpoint of the European observers.

The reason why 'free property in land' is found in the Western community is that (1) in the antique community the citizens hold private property in parcels of land separated from property in land of the commune, and acquires a certain degree of independence from the commune; and that (2) in the Germanic community individual peasants' households constitute independent units while the community exists only in a very weak form such as 'meetings' or 'commons' so that it has little influence on cultivation by individual households. Marx characterizes property in the Germanic community as individual property in contrast to private property in the antique community.

As we have seen, in contrast to the Asian form, Marx characterizes the Western form as a whole in terms of 'small-scale free land property.' However, what troubles us most is that this form of freedom of self-sustaining peasants in fact refers only to the antique form as far as we judge from Marx's description in his manuscripts. We remember that, together with the times of the dissolution of feudal system, the best times of the classic antiquity counts as the golden times of 'free property of self-employed peasants in a parceled land.'¹⁸ On the contrary, he hardly discusses about freedom in the Germanic community except the following passage:

Bei den Germanen, wo die einzelnen Familienhäupter sich in Wäldern festsetzen, Gemeinde nur durch die jedesmalige Vereinigung der Gemeindeglieder Die Gemeinde erscheint also als Vereinigung, nicht als Verein, als Einigung, deren selbstständige Subjecte die Landeigenthümer bilden, nicht als Einheit. Die Gemeinde existirt daher in fact nicht als Staat, Staatswesen, wie bei den Antiken, weil sie nicht als Stadt existirt. Damit die Gemeinde in wirkliche Existenz trete, müssen die freien

of a particular part of land, whether hereditary or not Therefore, this individual is nothing but a possessor. There exists only *communal* property, and only *private possession*. The mode of this possession in relation to the communal property can historically, locally etc. be modified in a different way according to whether the labor of the private possessor itself takes place in an isolated way, or is determined by the commune or rather by the unity hovering above the particular commune.]" (*MEGA II/1.2*: 383-384)

¹⁸ "Concentration in der Stadt mit Land als Territorium; für den unmittelbaren Consum arbeitende kleine Landwirtschaft; Manufactur als häusliches Nebengewerb der Frauen und Töchter (Spinnen und Weben) oder nur verselbstständigt in einzelnen Branchen (fabri etc). Die Voraussetzung der Fortdauer dieses Gemeinwesens ist die Erhaltung der Gleichheit unter seinen freien self-sustaining peasants und die eigne Arbeit als die Bedingung der Fortdauer ihres Eigenthums. Sie verhalten sich als Eigenthümer zu den natürlichen Bedingungen der Arbeit. [Concentration in the city with land as territory; small-scale agriculture working for the direct consumption; manufacture as household side job of wives and daughters (spinning and weaving) or specialized only in particular branches (craftmen etc.). The presupposition of the continuance of this community is the preservation of equality among its free self-sustaining peasants and their own labor as the condition of the continuance of their property. They relate themselves as proprietors to the natural conditons of labor.]" (*MEGA II/1.2*: 382-383)

Landeigenthümer Versammlung halten.

[Among the Germanic people, where the particular patresfamilias settle down in the forests, the commune exists only through occasional unification of members of the community Therefore, the commune appears as unification but not as a united organization, as uniting, of which independent subjects constitute land proprietors, but not as a unity. Therefore, the commune does not in fact exist as state, state-institution as among the antique people because it does not exist as state. In order to bring the commune into real existence free land proprietors must hold a meeting.] (*MEGA II/1.2: 388*)

The above-quoted passage is almost the only one in which the members of the Germanic community are determined as 'free land proprietors.' Moreover, there are three keywords that characterize the Germanic community: namely (1) the individual property, (2) independent subjects and (3) a house as an independent unity or the economic whole. These terms are selected to differentiate the property in the Germanic community as individual property (*individuelles Eigenthum*)¹⁹ from private property [*Privateingenthum*] in the antique community because, in the Germanic community, community members are not excluded from the use of the commons (*ager publicus*, *das Gemeindeland*) while members of the antique community are only private proprietors because they are completely deprived (*privés*) of the use or access to the commons:

Zwar kommt auch bei den Germanen der *ager publicus*, das Gemeindeland vor oder Volksland, im Unterschied von dem Eigenthum des Einzelnen. Indeß erscheint nicht, wie bei den Römern z. B. dieser *ager publicus* als das besondere ökonomische Dasein des Staats neben den Privateigenthümern, so daß diese eigentlich Privateigenthümer als solche sind, so weit sie ausgeschlossen waren, privirt waren, wie die Plebejer [von] der Benutzung des *ager publicus*. Der *ager publicus* erscheint vielmehr nur als Ergänzung des individuellen Eigenthums bei den Germanen.

[Even among the Germanic people, there indeed exists the communal land or the people's land different from the property of an individual. However, this communal land does not appear as a particular economic existence in the form of state apart from private proprietors like, for examples, among the Romans, who are properly only private proprietors as such as far as they were excluded from or deprived of the use of the communal land like the plebeians. Among the Germanic people, the communal land rather appears only as a complement to individual property.] (*MEGA II/1.2: 388*)

Secondly, members of the Germanic community are determined as independent subjects (*die selbstständigen Subjecte*) instead of private proprietors as far as they holds not only individual property but also the right to freely use the communal land such as a hunting ground, a pasture and a cutover.²⁰

¹⁹ "Das individuelle Grundeigenthum erscheint hier nicht als gegensätzliche Form des Grundeigenthums der Gemeinde, noch als durch sie vermittelt, sondern umgekehrt. Die Gemeinde existirt nur in der Beziehung dieser individuellen Grundeigenthümer als solcher auf einander. [Here, the individual property neither appears as a form opposite to the property of the community [as in the case of the antique community] nor mediated by the community [as in the case of the Asian community] but the very opposite is the case. The community exists only in the relation of these individual land proprietors as such to each other.]" (*MEGA II/1.2: 389*)

²⁰ "Das Eigenthum des Einzelnen erscheint nicht vermittelt durch die Gemeinde, sondern das Dasein der Gemeinde

Lastly, what characterizes the Germanic community is that a particular house or a family of each member plays a decisive role as the economic whole (das ökonomische Ganze) or an independent unity (selbstständige Einheit):

Das ökonomische Ganze ist au fond in jedem Einzelnen Hause enthalten, das für sich ein selbstständiges Centrum der Production bildet (Manufactur rein als häusliche Nebenarbeit der Weiber etc). In der antiken Welt ist die Stadt mit ihrer Landmark das ökonomische Ganze; in der germanischen der einzelne Wohnsitz, der selbst nur als Punkt in dem zu ihm gehörigen Land erscheint, keine Concentration vieler Eigenthümer ist, sondern Familie als selbstständige Einheit.

[The economic whole is really contained in each particular house that as a single unit forms an independent center of production (manufacture exists barely as a household side job of wives etc.). In the antique world, the city with its country territory is the economic whole; in the Germanic one, the particular residence that appears itself only as a point in a land belonging to it; there is no concentration of many proprietors but a family exists as an independent unity.] (MEGA II/1.2: 388)

In the *Grundrisse*, Marx briefly characterizes the Germanic community and its form of property in terms of the above-mentioned three key-words in sharp contrast to the Asian and the antique form. However, the descriptions of the Germanic community in the *Grundrisse* have the following two defects;

Firstly, Marx nowhere mentions in what period of the European history the Germanic community exists in an original form in which, as we have just seen, members of a community are treated as free individual subjects, and when it begins to dissolve and transform itself into its secondary forms such as serfdom or feudal system while, concerning the antique form, he differentiates its 'best times' from the times of its decline. In the *Grundrisse*, we find only one passage that might help to specify the time for the Germanic form:

das Mittelalter (germanische Zeit) geht vom Land als Sitz der Geschichte aus, deren Fortentwicklung dann im Gegensatz von Stadt und Land vor sich geht; die moderne [Geschichte] ist Verstädtichung des Landes, nicht wie bei den Antiken Verländlichung der Stadt.

[The middle age (the Germanic age) starts from the country as a base of history, of which the further development, then, advances in a confrontation between city and country; the modern history is the urbanization of the country, not the transformation of the city into the country as in the antiquity.] (MEGA II/1.2: 387)

From the descriptions in the *Grundrisse*, we cannot identify when the middle age (the Germanic age) exactly starts from the country, and when it in its further development causes a confrontation between city and country.

The second defect is that Marx underestimates the influential power of the Germanic commune to regulate the allotment and re-allotment of arable land among the members of a

und des Gemeindeeigenthums als vermittelt d. h. als Beziehung der selbstständigen Subjecte auf einander. [The property of an individual does not appear to be mediated by the commune but, on the contrary, the existence of the commune appears to be mediated, that is to say, as a relation of independent individuals to each other.] (MEGA II/1.2: 388)

community. As we will see in the chapter X, Marx begins to study in 1868 and understand that the Germanic commune forces its members to regularly rotate their own arable land in order to maintain the economic equality among the members. In the letter to Engels of March 4, 1868, Marx writes:

Auf dem Museum u.a. die neuesten Schriften von old Maurer [habe Ich] geochst über deutsche Mark-, Dorf-, etc. Verfassung. Er zeigt ausführlich nach, dass das Privateigentum an Boden erst später entstand usw. Die blödsinnige westfälische Junkeransicht (Möser etc.), dass die Deutschen sich jeder für sich niedergelassen und erst nachher Dörfer, Gaue etc. gebildet, vollständig widerlegt. Interessant grade jetzt, dass die russische Manier der Wiederverteilung in bestimmten Terminen (in Deutschland erst jährlich) des Bodens sich in Deutschland stellenweis bis ins 18. und 19. Jahrhundert erhielt. Die von mir aufgestellte Ansicht, dass überall die asiatischen, res. indischen Eigentumsformen in Europa den Anfang bilden, erhält hier (obgleich M [aurer] nichts davon weiß) neuen Beweis.

[In the museum I studied hard the latest works on Germanic Mark-, Village-, etc. Constitution by the old Maurer. He demonstrates in detail that the private property of land was later introduced etc. A stupid assumption by Westphalian Junker (Möser etc.) that each of the Germanic people separately settled down and later formed villages, Gaus etc. is completely refuted. It is just now interesting that the Russian way to reallocate the land in a certain term (in Germany first annually) was preserved in places in Germany up to the 18th and 19th century. The hypothesis presented by me that the Asian or Indian property forms were everywhere in Europe the most primitive ones is here newly demonstrated although Maurer knows nothing about this.] (MEW 32:42)

As Engels received this letter he did not know what Marx had written in the *Grundrisse* ten years before. Now, we know that he shared 'a stupid assumption by Westphalian Junker (Möser etc.) that each of the Germanic people separately settled down and later formed villages' because, in the *Grundrisse*, he wrote:

Bei den Germanen, wo die einzelnen Familienhäupter sich in Wäldern festsetzen, Gemeinde nur durch die jedesmalige Vereinigung der Gemeindeglieder.

[Among the Germanic people, where the particular patresfamilias settle down in the forests, the commune exists only through occasional unification of members of the community.] (MEGA II/1.2: 387-388)

While writing down the *Grundrisse*, he still thinks that, in the Germanic community, the individual member with his family settles down in the forests in a separated way, and does not gather together in the village. This idea is abandoned after he intensively studies Maurer.

VII. *The Metabolic Rift between Nature and Human Being Caused by Capitalist Agriculture*

1. **The Contradiction between Rational Agriculture and Private Property in Land**

While writing the manuscripts for the *Third Volume of Capital* Marx comes to understand

that capitalist agriculture brings about the unrestorable rift in the metabolism between nature and human being. Thus, he integrates into his criticism of capitalism not only the restoration of the unity between the laboring subjects and the objective conditions of labor but also the restoration of equilibrium in the metabolism between nature and human being. On the other hand, he also comes to understand that private property in land, whether it may be great or small, is incompatible with the rational agriculture. The capitalist mode of production, characterized as direct application of sciences into the production process, transforms agriculture into the application of agricultural chemistry and other natural sciences called rational agriculture while, at the same time, it requires the same rational use of ground itself, which more and more contradicts private property in land. In the manuscripts for the *Third Volume of Capital* Marx more than once mentions the contradiction between rational agriculture and private property in land:

Die Rationalisierung der Agricultur einerseits, die sie erst befähigt gesellschaftlich betrieben zu werden, die Rückführung des Grundeigentums ad absurdum, dieß sind die grossen Verdienste der capitalistischen Productionsweise, ein historisches Verdienst, das sie, wie alle ihre andern historischen Fortschritte, zunächst durch die völlige Verelendung der unmittelbaren Produzenten erkaufte.

[On the one hand, the rationalization of agriculture that, for the first time, enables it to be socially managed reduces property in land to absurdity; this is a great achievement of the capitalist mode of production; however, it atones for this historical achievement, like other historical advances done by it, with the perfect impoverishment of direct producers.] (*MEGA* II/4.2: 670-671)

Ganz conservative Agriculturchemiker wie Johnston (!) z. B. geben zu, daß eine wirklich rationelle Agricultur überall am Privateigentum unüberwindliche Schranken findet..... Die Johnston, Comte etc haben bei dem Widerspruch des Privateigentums mit einer rationellen Agronomie nur im Auge die Nothwendigkeit den Boden eines Landes als ein Ganzes zu bebauen. Aber die Abhängigkeit von und der beständige Wechsel der Cultur der besondern Erdproducte mit dem Wechsel der Marktpreise, der ganze Geist der capitalistischen Productionsweise, der auf unmittelbaren nächsten Geldgewinn gerichtet ist, widerspricht der Agricultur, die mit der beständigen Lebensbedingung der zusammenhängenden Menschengenerationen zu wirtschaften hat. Ein schlagendes Beispiel sind die Waldungen, die nur da einigermaßen dem Gesamtinteresse gemäß bewirtschaftet werden, wo sie nicht Privateigentum sind, sondern der Staatsverwaltung unterworfen sind.

[Quite conservative agricultural chemists like Johnston, for example, admit that the really rational agriculture everywhere finds in private property invincible bounds. People like Johnston, Comte etc. mean by the contradiction of private property with rational agronomics nothing but a necessity to cultivate the land of a country as a whole. However, the dependence of the cultivation of special land products upon the change of market prices, and the constant change of their cultivation according to the change of market prices, in other words, the whole spirit of the capitalist mode of production, which is directed towards direct short-time money gain, contradicts agriculture that has to take care of the constant life conditions of human generations connecting with each other. A compelling example is the forestry, which can be somehow administered according to the

general interest only in places where it is not private property but subject to the state control.] (*MEGA* II/4.2: 670)

Der Conflict zwischen dem Bodenpreis, als Element des Kostenpreisses für den Producenten und Nicht-Element des Productionspreisses für das Product ist nur eine der Formen, worin sich überhaupt der Widerspruch zwischen Privateigenthum an Grund und Boden mit einer rationellen Agricultur, mit normaler gesellschaftlicher Benutzung des Bodens, darstellt.

[The conflict between the price of land as an element of the cost price for the producer and the same as the non-element of the production price for the product is only one of the forms in which the contradiction between private property in land and rational agriculture with normal social use of land is in general expressed.] (*MEGA* II/4.2: 751-752)

Regarding the above-mentioned contradiction or incompatibility of rational agriculture with private property in land, Marx calls for the transformation of land from private property into common property, which enables human being to rationally treat land 'as the inalienable conditions of existence and reproduction of a series of the rotating human generations' instead of 'the exploitation and squandering of the soil fertility' as is the case in the capitalist mode of production and private property.²¹

2. The Rift in the Metabolism between Nature and Human Being Caused by the Capitalist Agriculture and Large-Scale Property in Land

One of the most important discoveries that Marx achieved for the first time in the manuscripts for the *Third Volume of Capital* is the rift in the metabolism between nature and human being caused by the capitalist agriculture and large-scale property in land:

Wenn das kleine Grundeigenthum voraussetzt, daß die bei weitem überwiegende Majorität der Bevölkerung ländlich und an die Stelle der gesellschaftlichen die isolirte Arbeit setzt, daher der Reichthum und die Entwicklung der Reproduction, sowohl ihrer geistigen wie materiellen Bedingungen, unter solchen Umständen ausgeschlossen ist, daher auch die Bedingungen einer rationellen Cultur, so producirt das grosse Grundeigenthum, indem es die agricole Bevölkerung auf ein beständig sinkendes Minimum reducirt und ihr eine

²¹ "Hier [bei der kleinen Agricultur] tritt der *Bodenpreis*, Form und Resultat des Privateigenthums am Boden, als Schranke der Production selbst auf. Bei der grossen Agricultur, und auf capitalistischer Betriebsweise beruhendem grossem Grundeigenthum, tritt das *Eigenthum* ebenso als Schranke auf, weil es den Pächter beschränkt in der productiven Capitalanlage, die in letzter Instanz nicht ihm, sondern dem Grundeigenthümer zu Gut kommt. Bei beiden tritt an die Stelle selbstbewußter rationeller Behandlung des Bodens als des gemeinschaftlichen und ewigen Eigenthums, der unveräusserlichen Existenz- und Reproductionsbedingung der Kette sich ablösender Menschengeschlechter, die Exploitation und Vergeudung der Bodenkräfte. [Here [in the case of small-scale agriculture], the *land price*, namely the form and result of private property in land appears as a bound of production itself. For the large-scale agriculture and large-scale land property based upon the capitalist mode of management as well, *property* also appears as a bound because it binds a tenant within the productive capital investment that, in the last analysis, is not profitable for him but a land owner. In the both cases of small-scale and large-scale agriculture, the exploitation and squandering of the soil fertility replaces the self-aware rational management of land as common and eternal property, and as the inalienable conditions of existence and reproduction of a series of the rotating human generations.]" (*MEGA* I/4.2: 752)

beständig wachsende, in grossen Städten agglomerirte Industriebevölkerung entgegengesetzt, Bedingungen, die einen unheilbaren Riß hervorbringen in dem Zusammenhang des gesellschaftlichen und natürlichen, durch die Naturgesetze des Bodens, vorgeschriebnen Stoffwechsels, in Folge wovon die Bodenkraft verwüstet und durch den Handel diese Verwüstung weit über die Grenzen des eignen Lands hinaus getragen wird.

[If small-scale property in land presupposes that the great majority of a population in the country engages in isolated labor instead of social labor, therefore, the wealth and the development of reproduction of their mental as well as material conditions are, under such circumstances, excluded, therefore, the conditions of rational cultivation as well is excluded, large-scale property in land, by reducing the agricultural population to the constantly decreasing minimum and opposing with this by constantly increasing industrial population gathering together in big cities, brings about conditions that causes an incurable rift in the interrelation of the social and natural metabolism ordered by the natural laws of land, as a result of which the fertility of soil is devastated and this devastation is, through trade, carried far beyond the limits of its own land.] (*MEGA I/4.2: 753*)

Marx's intensive attention to, and the ecological criticism towards the metabolic disorder caused by the capitalist agriculture armed with scientific technology goes through his whole life, and characterizes the late Marx. In the *First Volume of Capital* we find the following famous passages:

Mit dem stets wachsenden Uebergewicht der städtischen Bevölkerung, die sie in großen Centren zusammenhäuft, häuft die kapitalistische Produktion einerseits die geschichtliche Bewegungskraft der Gesellschaft, stört sie andererseits den Stoffwechsel zwischen Mensch und Erde, d. h. die Rückkehr der vom Menschen in der Form von Nahrungs- und Kleidungsmiteln vernutzten Bodenbestandtheile zum Boden, also die ewige Naturbedingung dauernder Bodenfruchtbarkeit. Sie zerstört damit zugleich die physische Gesundheit der Stadtarbeiter und das geistige Leben der Landarbeiter. Aber sie zwingt zugleich durch die Zerstörung der bloß naturwüchsig entstandnen Umstände jenes Stoffwechsels ihn systematisch als regelndes Gesetz der gesellschaftlichen Produktion und in einer der vollen menschlichen Entwicklung adäquaten Form herzustellen. Und jeder Fortschritt der kapitalistischen Agrikultur ist nicht nur ein Fortschritt in der Kunst den Arbeiter, sondern zugleich in der Kunst den Boden zu berauben, jeder Fortschritt in Steigerung seiner Fruchtbarkeit für eine gegebne Zeitfrist zugleich ein Fortschritt im Ruin der dauernden Quellen dieser Fruchtbarkeit. Je mehr ein Land, wie die Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika z. B., von der großen Industrie als dem Hintergrund seiner Entwicklung ausgeht, desto rascher dieser Zerstörungsproceß. Die kapitalistische Produktion entwickelt daher nur die Technik und Kombination des gesellschaftlichen Produktionsprocesses, indem sie zugleich die Springquellen allen Reichthums untergräbt: Die Erde und den Arbeiter.

[Together with the constantly increasing predominance of the urban population that the capitalist production piles up in great centers, it accumulates, on the one hand, the historical power of movement of a society while, on the other hand, it disturbs the metabolism between human being and earth, namely the return into the soil of soil components consumed by human being in the forms of means of nourishment and clothing, therefore, the eternal natural condition of sustainable soil fertility. At the same

time with this disturbance, the capitalist production destroys physical health of urban laborers and the mental life of country laborers. However, at the same time through the destruction of the barely natural-genetic conditions of that metabolism, it forces the society to systematically restore the metabolism as a regulative law of social production and in a form corresponding to perfect human development. And every advance in the capitalist agriculture is not only an advance in the art to deprive the laborer but also in the art to do the land, every advance in the art to increase the soil fertility for a certain period of time is at the same time also the advance in destruction of sustainable resources of this soil fertility. The more a country such as the United States depends upon the big industry as a background of its development, the faster this process of destruction advances. Therefore, the capitalist production develops only a technique and combination of the social production process by, at the same time, undermining the sources of all wealth: namely earth and laborer.] (*MEGA* II/6: 476-477)

Based upon a thorough critical analysis of the destruction of the equilibrium in the metabolic cycle between nature and human being, Marx proposes a new perspective on the overcoming of the capitalist mode of production, in other words, a new task for humanity to 'systematically restore the metabolism as a regulative law of social production and in a form corresponding to perfect human development.' This new perspective opens up a new political dimension that is not restricted to the so-called class-struggle politics for an associated society but contributes to the rational restoration of the sound balance not only for the human race but also for the whole nature.

VIII. *Marx's Revaluation of Rural Community and Peasantry*

What interests us most is that, the more Marx comes to recognize destructive effects of the capitalist production on nature and human being, the more he positively reassesses the cultural potentialities historically and geographically accumulated in the rural community, as is found in the following passage:

Wenn das kleine Grundeigenthum eine halb ausserhalb der Gesellschaft stehende Klasse von Vandalen schafft, die alle Rohheit primitiver Gesellschaftsformen mit allen Qualen und aller Misere civilisirter Staaten verbindet, so unterminirt das grosse Grundeigenthum die Arbeitskraft in der letzten Stätte, wohin sich ihre naturwüchsige Energie flüchtet und als Reservefonds für die Erneuerung der Lebenskraft der Nationen sich aufspeichert, auf dem Land selbst. Beide reichen sich die Hand: die grosse Industrie und die industriell betriebene Agricultur. Wenn sie sich dadurch ursprünglich scheiden, daß die erste mehr die Arbeitskraft und daher die Naturkraft des Menschen, die letztre mehr direkt die Naturkraft des Bodens verwüstet, und ruinirt, so reichen sich später, im Fortgang, beide die Hand, indem das industrielle System auf dem Land auch die Arbeiter entkräftet, und Industrie und Handel ihrerseits der Agricultur die Mittel zur Erschöpfung des Bodens verschaffen.

[If small-scale property in land creates a class of vandals, standing halfway outside the society, who combine all rudeness of primitive forms of a society with all sorts of torments and miseries of civilized states, large-scale property in land undermines labor forces in the country itself, namely in the last places in which their natural-genetic energy

takes refuge and accumulates itself as a reservoir for the revival of vital energy of the nations. Both of big industry and industrially administered agriculture work together. If they are at first separated from each other by the fact that the former more devastates and destroys labor forces and, therefore, natural forces of human being, and the latter more directly does natural forces of land, they both later progressively work together in such a way that the industrial system exhausts the laborers even in the country, and industry and trade provide the agriculture with the means to exhaust the soil.] (*MEGA II/4.2: 753*)

For the first time in his lifetime, Marx positively determines the rural community as 'the last places in which natural-genetic [naturwüchsig] energy of labor forces takes refuge and accumulates itself as a reservoir for the revival of vital energy of the nations.' Marx places more historical values on the peasantry mode of production in the rural community than before in contrast to the devastation of nature and the disturbance in the metabolism between nature and human being caused by big industry and industrially administered agriculture. The peasantry mode of production has been the one in which laborers have been keeping the relations to land and other means of production as their own property or at least their own possession, and which has been nourishing laborers' 'free individuality and 'personal independence' for many centuries. In this sense, we can understand why, in the manuscripts of the *Third Volume of Capital*, Marx characterizes the rural community as a reservoir in which cultural energy and resources of the people in all regions are historically accumulated.

However, Marx did not place such positive value on the rural community and the peasantry mode of production before then. In 1840s, he rather positively estimates a revolutionary role of bourgeoisie to completely annihilate pre-capitalist communities with peasants as their main constituent members, and to transform self-sustaining peasants into the proletariat. In a series of articles on Indian problems that he contributes to *New York Daily Tribune* in 1853, he still positively estimates the civilizing effect of capital [die zivilisierende Wirkung des Kapitals], and, from this perspective, affirms the rule of Great Britain over India because the British colonial rule has demolished the small-scale half barbarian, half civilized rural community in India and, in this manner, brought about the only social revolution that Asia had never experienced before (*MEW 9: 132*).

However, his encounter with the Taiping Rebellion in China (1851-1864) and the Sepoy Revolt in India (1857-1858) gradually motivates him to change his negative attitude towards self-sustaining Asian rural communities. What at first surprises him is a vast amount of political-military energy and powers resistant against the European colonial powers that emerges in midst of the Asian communities that are believed to passively accept any rule by a foreign conqueror, and to be only intent on maintaining the traditional self-sufficient way of production and life. Marx finds among the Asian communities a great amount of energy to tenaciously resist the capitalist globalization, and tries to theoretically explain these resistant powers in the theoretical framework of *Capital*:

Die Hindernisse, die die innre Festigkeit und Gliederung frührer nationaler Productionsweisen der auflösenden Wirkung des Handels entgegensetzt, zeigt sich schlagend z. B. in den Verhältnissen der Engländer in Indien, China etc. Die breite Basis der Productionsweise ist hier gebildet durch die Einheit kleiner Agricultur und häuslicher Industrie, wobei noch in Indien die Form der selfsustaining communities hinzukommt. In Indien wandten die Engländer zugleich ihre unmittelbare politische und ökonomische

Macht, als Herrscher und Grundrentner an, um diese kleinen ökonomischen Gemeinwesen zu sprengen. So weit ihr Handel hier revolutionierend auf die Produktionsweise wirkt, ist es nur so weit sie durch die Wohlfeilheit ihrer Waaren (und underselling) das Gemeinwesen zerreißen, indem sie die Spinnerei und Weberei, die einen uralte integrierenden Theil dieser Einheit der industriell-agricolen Production bildet, vernichten. Selbst hier gelingt ihnen die Auflösungswerk nur sehr allmählich. Noch weniger in China, wo die unmittelbar politische Macht nicht zur Hilfe kommt. Die grosse Oekonomie, und Zeitersparung, die aus der unmittelbaren Verbindung von Agriculture und Manufactur hervorgehen, bieten hier hartnäckigsten Widerstand den Producten der grossen Industrie.

[The obstacles that the inner stability and formation of earlier national modes of production put on the destructive effect of trade are evidently shown, for example, in the circumstances for the English in India, China etc. Here, a broad basis of the mode of production is formed by the unity of small-scale agriculture and household industry, to which, still in India, the form of self-sustaining communities is at the same time added. In India, the English at the same time applied their direct political and economic power, as rulers and land owners, to breaking up these small-scale economic communities. As far as their trade here revolutionarily influences the mode of production, this influence works only to the extent that they tear to pieces the community by means of the cheapness of their commodities (and underselling) since they destroy spinning and weaving that constitutes a very old part integrating this unity of industrial-agricultural production. Even here, they only very gradually succeed in this demolition work. They much less succeed in China, where the direct political power is not available. Here, the great economy and spare of time that derive from the direct combination of agriculture and manufacture put up a stubborn resistance to the products of big industry.] (*MEGA* II/4.2: 407-408)

According to Marx's new perspective, the Asian communities owe their very stubborn resistance to the foreign products made by big industries of the most developed European countries and to their colonial intervention to the unity of small-scale agriculture and household industry that provide the communities with sustainable and self-sustaining way of production and life.

IX. *The Road to The Late Marx—Studies on Marx's Excerpt-notebooks*

The greatest merit of the new *MEGA* consists in the ongoing publication of a great amount of Marx's excerpt-notebooks in its *Fourth Department*. From his youth, Marx had been extracting a lot of passages from books while reading them. This way of reading and extracting books had been maintained up to the end of his life. All excerpt-notebooks comprise the 32 volumes of the *Fourth Department* of *MEGA*; their whole amount is almost equal to the total amount of Marx' published writings, articles and manuscripts (except for the *Economic Manuscripts Preparing for Capital*) that comprises the 32 volumes of the *First Department* of *MEGA*.

The recent study clarifies that Marx had repeatedly been referring to the excerpt-notebooks while writing manuscripts; as long as we regard this way of thinking unique to Marx we should treat his excerpt-notebooks as indispensable components of his works. It has been

taken for granted for long that his manuscripts such as the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* and the *Economic Manuscripts Preparing for Capital* count as the most important texts for the studies on Marx. However, it has not yet been acknowledged that we cannot fully understand Marx's manuscripts without referring to the excerpt-notebooks to which Marx himself refers while he writes manuscripts.

The study on his excerpt-notebooks offers us another merit that, only by studying them, we can elucidate the whole vision of theoretical achievements made by the late Marx. Although he had uninterruptedly been developing his theories and ideas after the publication of the *First Volume of Capital*, he published very few theoretical works and wrote down very few manuscripts while he left a vast amount of excerpt-notebooks that comprise the 18th through the 31st volume of the *Fourth Department of MEGA*.

In his excerpt-notebooks after the publication of the *First Volume of Capital*, Marx deals with the following two main subjects: namely (1) studies on contemporary natural sciences and technologies, and (2) historical studies on ancient societies and communities as well as geographical and anthropological studies on non-European societies. The first group covers excerpts such as those from Carl Fraas, a German agro-chemist from Munich, (IV/18), those from physiology and the history of technology (IV/23), those from geology, mineralogy, pedology and agro-chemistry (IV/26), those from mathematics (IV/30), those from organic and inorganic chemistry while the second group covers excerpts such as those from Georg Ludwig von Maurer, a German historian of Markgenossenschaft in the ancient Germanic community (IV/18), those about the Irish history and problems (IV/21), those about the Russian history after the Reform (IV/22), those about the history of the ancient Greece (IV/23), those about the history of property in land, the Western and non-Western history of law (IV/24), those about ethnology, the ancient history and the history of property in land (IV/27), the French history, the Russian history and the agricultural history (IV/28), a chronological table of the world history (IV/30) etc.

By surveying the extracts contained in the 18th through the 31st volume of the *Fourth Department of MEGA*, we see that Marx dedicates his life after the publication of the *First Volume of Capital* mainly to natural sciences and historical studies on ancient societies, land property and communities. At first sight, these studies seem to deviate from the work for writing *Capital II* and *III*, and he seems to escape from his most difficult task: the completion of *Capital*. In fact, David Rjazanov, a talented Russian Marxian scholar that planned and edited the first *MEGA*, excluded Marx's excerpt-notebooks from the first *MEGA* because he regarded them as documents that witness Marx's intellectual decadence.

If we do not agree to such an easy interpretation on the late Marx we should ask the question in a different way from Rjazanov: how does Marx' study on natural sciences and historical studies come together into the further development of his work for *Capital*? We can find a theoretical junction for the two projects in the *Economic Manuscripts of 1864-65*, in which the Manuscripts for the *Third Volume of Capital* and *Results of the Direct Production Process* give us the most important clues.

In *Results of the Direct Production Process*, Marx definitely establishes such concepts as the production forces of capital and the real subsumption of labor under capital [die reele Subsumtion der Arbeit unter das Kapital]. By the formal subsumption of labor under capital [die formelle Subsumtion der Arbeit unter das Kapital] he understands a 'formal' application of the existing technical resources to the capitalist mode of production, in which technical bases

remain unchanged.

On the contrary, the real subsumption of labor under capital refers to an introduction of completely new technology and productive forces only created by capitalist production relations. The real subsumption causes a continuous revolution in the direct production process and the productive forces, which are termed productive forces of capital [Produktivkräfte des Kapitals] as long as new technologies and enhanced productive forces owe their creation to the subsumption of them under the capitalist production relations. By the real subsumption, the capitalist mode of production, by the introduction of machinery, releases the production process from every organic bound of physical and mental abilities of the human being while it successively revolutionizes technological bases in the labor process by the introduction of sciences into the production process. The mode of production unique to capitalism signifies a mode of production that causes continuous innovation in the technological production process in which capital as especially historical production relations takes the initiative and plays a leading role. Capital owes this overwhelming influence on and intervention in the structural transformation of productive forces to thingification [Verdinglichung], namely the coalescence of social-formal [formell] determinations with natural-material ones by means of which the changes in the production relations trigger the corresponding changes in the production forces²². Capital continuously creates sciences suitable for it and applies them to direct production process, which causes the continuous revolution in the production process. Therefore, the real subsumption must cover the real subsumption of sciences under capital. Skilled laborers no longer serve as essential factors of techniques in the capitalist production while the application of sciences to direct production process works as an essential factor of the capitalist technique, which, by this combination of techniques and sciences, becomes technology, namely techniques supported by sciences. In this sense, technology stands for a whole system of scientific knowledge, information and techniques in which sciences as thingified capital are continuously created and applied to the capitalist production process.

Erst die capitalistische Production verwandelt den materiellen Produktionsprozess in Anwendung der Wissenschaft auf die Production - science mise en pratique [Capitalist production for the first time transforms the material production process into the application of science to production - namely science put into practice] (*MEGA II/3.6: 2065*).

Wie der Produktionsprozess zur Anwendung der Wissenschaft, wird umgekehrt die Wissenschaft zu einem Factor, so zu sagen zu einer Function des Produktionsprocesses. Jede Entdeckung wird Basis neuer Erfindung oder neuer verbesserter Methoden der Production. Erst die capitalistische Produktionsweise macht die Naturwissenschaften dem unmittelbaren Produktionsproces dienstbar. Exploitation der Wissenschaft, des theoretischen Fortschritts der Menschheit. Das Capital schafft die Wissenschaft nicht, aber es exploitirt sie, eignet sie dem Produktionsproces an. Damit zugleich Trennung der Wissenschaft, als auf die Production angewandter Wissenschaft von der unmittelbaren Arbeit.

[As the production process is transformed into the application of science, science is, on the

²² For Marx's concepts of reification and thingification see Tairako (2017) and (2018).

contrary, transformed into a factor of the production process, so to speak, to a function of it. Each discovery becomes a base for a new invention or a new improved method. Capitalist production for the first time makes natural sciences serve for the immediate production process. This is namely the exploitation of science and that of the theoretical progress of humanity. Capital does not create science but exploits it, adapts it to the production process. Together with this, the separation of science as science applied to production from immediate labor] (*MEGA* II/3.6: 2060).

In the productive forces of capital, productive forces (the material factor of production) and production relations (the especially historic-social factor) can no longer be differentiated but inseparably coalesce with each other. Therefore, all kinds of sciences and technologies in the capitalist era are imprinted with capitalist characters as thingified capital while, at the same time, they enable the capitalist system to devastatingly intervene to the metabolism of nature and human being. Marx regards studies on contemporary natural sciences and technologies as indispensable tasks to comprehend productive forces of capital as thingified capital. This is the reason why, in his last decade, he concentrates on the studies on contemporary natural sciences and technologies, which comprise a necessary component of his economic theory.

The recognition of natural sciences and technologies as essential factors for the productive forces of capital distinguishes Marx from Engels. After 1870s Engels, motivated by Marx, concentrates on the studies on contemporary natural sciences; these studies result in *Anti-Dühring* and *Dialektik der Natur*. However, his theoretical interest exclusively consists in the discovery of materialistic-dialectic laws that generally apply to nature and society, by which he tries to lay the philosophical foundation of 'scientific' socialism while he has no idea on natural sciences and technologies as thingified capital. As a result, he still remains under the illusion that natural sciences as pure sciences are free from the capitalist determination.

The analysis of productive forces as reified capital leads Marx to understand that the capitalist mass production supported by sciences and technologies necessarily devastates the metabolism of nature and human being so that he proposes 'to systematically restore the metabolism as a regulative law of social production and in a form corresponding to perfect human development' (*MEGA* II/6: 476) as a compelling argument for the abolition of the capitalist system.

While Marx writes the manuscripts for the chapter on ground rent of the *Third Volume of Capital* (1864-1865), he intensively reads the literature by the contemporary leading scholars that critically cope with the devastation of soil by the capitalist agriculture such as Justus von Liebig (*Die Chemie in ihrer Anwendung auf Agricultur und Physiologie*, 7. Auflage, Braunschweig 1862) and James F. W. Johnston (*Notes on North America: Agricultural, Economical, and Social*, 2 Volumes, London 1851). Through studying the leading-edge literature of agro-chemistry of 1860s, Marx acquires a new perspective that the capitalist agriculture and private property in land are not compatible with the maintenance of the ecosystem and soil-fertility. Thus, he in his later years pioneers a scientific field that is today called ecology. His studies on natural sciences and technologies aim at founding a theory on ecology.

Liebig persuades Marx to comprehend that capitalist agriculture exhausts land and soil, and disturbs the metabolism between nature and human being. In the First Edition of the *First Volume of Capital* (1867), Marx inserts a brief remark on big industry and agriculture at the

end of the fourth chapter “Machinery and Big Industry” where he expresses the highest praise for Liebig:

Die Entwicklung der negativen Seite der modernen Agrikultur, vom naturwissenschaftlichen Standpunkt, ist eins der unsterblichen Verdienste Liebig's. Auch seine historischen Aperçus über die Geschichte der Agrikultur, obgleich nicht ohne grobe Irrthümer, enthalten mehr Lichtblicke als die Schriften sämmtlicher modernen politischen Oekonomen zusammengenommen.

[The elaboration of the negative side of the modern agriculture from the scientific viewpoint is one of the immortal achievements by Liebig. His historical sketches on the history of agriculture, not without rough mistakes, also contain more insight than the works by all modern political economists.] (*MEGA II/5*: 410)

But he does not stop in Liebig. In January of 1868, Marx encounters the works by a Munich agronomist, Carl Fraas (see the letter of Marx to Engels from January 3, 1868), who so profoundly impresses Marx that he drafts out detailed excerpts from Fraas. The *MEGA IV/18* is planned to comprise the excerpts from Carl Fraas. They show a new stage in the development of Marx's theory on ecology.

He gains a more serious notion concerning the disturbance in the metabolism from Fraas than from Liebig. Fraas illustrates in detail how forests lumbering for agriculture caused drying up and warming of the atmosphere that wasted land and, as a result, ruined many types of civilization. Marx owes it to Fraas that he gets to know that the conscious control over the metabolism between nature and human being is closely related to the problem on climate changes, which have a more long-term perspective than the history of capitalism. Opposing to Liebig that tries to cope with exhaustion of land by properly putting chemical fertilizer, Fraas proposes a technology to make the best use of restoring forces of nature like rivers alluvia. He names it *Kraftkultur* (force culture). As an alternative to exploitive agriculture, Marx now has in mind agriculture grounding in the restorative forces immanent in the metabolism itself.²³

Thus, Marx finally overcomes his earlier view on the civilizing effects of capital from the following two theoretical aspects that he gains in rather later phases in his life; (1) destruction and violence that West European capitalism inflicted on marginal regions of the world (not only capitalist colonies), and (2) the rift in the metabolism between nature and human being, the destruction of the ecological system and climate changes causing desertification. To measure the depth of Marx's criticism of capitalism, we have to consider that the late Marx combines an insight into the history of the pre-capitalist societies with a deep insight into ecology.

The last question is how Marx's studies on natural sciences and technologies, and historical studies on the ancient society and communities are interrelated to each other. The answer to this question is also suggested in the manuscripts for the *Third Volume of Capital* in the chapter on ground rent. As we have seen in the chapter VIII, Marx positively characterizes the rural community as 'the last places in which natural-genetic [naturwüchsig] energy of labor forces takes refuge and accumulates itself as a reservoir for the revival of vital energy of the nations' (*MEGA II/4.2*: 753) in contrast to the devastation of nature and to the disturbance of the metabolism between nature and human being. This is to be considered in the next, and last chapter.

²³ For more detailed arguments see Saito (2014), (2016) and Vollgraf (2016).

X. *A Turning Point in Marx's Theory on Pre-Capitalist Societies* —Marx's Excerpt-Notebooks on Maurer—

After the publication of the *First Volume of Capital* in September 1867, Marx immediately set about his work on the *Second Volume of Capital*. This work was, however, many times interrupted. As a result, he was not able to complete his main work during his lifetime. The reasons for this could be ascribed not only to bad health that had continuously tormented him or purely scientific problems that the *Second* and the *Third Volumes of Capital* had required him to solve, but also to the encounter with new theoretical topics that motivated him to expand his intellectual horizon of his knowledge. The newly obtained knowledge prompted him to critically reconsider arguments presented in the *First Volume of Capital*, partly modify them and, what is more, give up some of them. Marx's voluminous excerpt-notebooks, which are planned to comprise the *Fourth Department of MEGA*, document his process of thinking after 1868 that gives us a hint as to why *Capital* remained incomplete.

Marx gives up his opinion on the three basic forms of pre-capitalist communal property: The Asiatic, the antique and the Germanic forms, described in the *Grundrisse*, through his intensive study on Maurer (1790-1872) from 1868 onward. After the publication of the *First Volume of Capital* (the First Edition), in March 1868, Marx gets to know the works by Georg Ludwig von Maurer on mark-communes (Markgenossenschaften), which Marx regards as very important and draws up detailed excerpts from him twice (in 1868 and in 1876). Maurer directs Marx's attention to the fact that the regular allotment of arable lands takes place in the Germanic communes and this custom still survives even in the 19th century (especially in regions around Marx's birthplace Trier). The allotment of cultivated lands presupposes a large extent of power of communes to regulate the work and life of communal members. The Germanic commune is no longer regarded as the one consisting of independent individual farmers as was the case in the *Grundrisse*.

We can consider Marx's excerpt-notebooks on Georg Ludwig von Maurer as a turning point in his understanding on pre-capitalist societies. Marx mentions Maurer for the first time in his letter to Engels of March 4, 1868, which shows Marx's great interest in Maurer. This letter has already been quoted and interpreted in the chapter VI (See p.21).

Another letter to Engels of March 25, 1868 indicates that his interest in Maurer is increasing:

Seine Bücher sind außerordentlich bedeutend. Direkt in meiner Gegend, auf dem Hunsrück, hat das altdeutsche System bis in die letzten Jahre fortgedauert. Ich erinnere mich jetzt, dass mein Vater als Advocat mir davon sprach! so übersetzten Philologen von der force eines Grimm die einfachsten lateinischen Sätze falsch. Z.B. die bekannte Stelle bei Tacitus: avra per annos mutant, et superest ager, was heisst: sie wechseln (durch Los, daher auch sortes in allen Leges Barbarorum später) die Felder (avra), und es bleibt Gemeinland (ager im Gegensatz von avra als ager publicus) übrig, übersetzt Grimm etc.: sie bauen jedes Jahr neue Äcker, und es bleibt immer noch (unbebautes) Land übrig! Ebenso die Stelle: „Colunt discreti ac diversi“ sollte beweisen, dass die Deutschen von jeher als westfälische Junker auf Einzelhöfen wirtschafteten. Aber in derselben Stelle heisst es weiter: „Vicos locant non in nosrtum morem connexis et cohaerentibus aedificiis: suum

quisque locum spatio circumdat“, und solche germanische Urdörfer in der beschriebenen Form existieren noch hier und da in Dänemark. Skandinavien musste natürlich für deutsche Jurisprudenz und Ökonomie so wichtig werden wie für deutsche Mythologie. Und da ausgehend konnten wir erst wieder unsre Vergangenheit entziffern. Übrigens fanden ja selbst Grimm etc. bei Cäsar, dass die Deutschen sich immer als Geschlechtsgenossenschaften, nicht als Einzelne ansiedelten: „gentibus cognationibusque qui uno coiereant.“ Was würde aber old Hegel sagen, wenn er erführe jenseits, dass das Allgemeine im Deutschen und Nordischen nichts bedeutet als das Gemeinland, und das Sunde, Besondre, nichts als das aus dem Gemeinland ausgeschiedne Sondereigen? Da gehen denn doch verflucht die logischen Kategorien aus „unsrem Verkehr“ hervor.“

[Maurer's books are extremely important. Just in my region, in Hunsrück, the old Germanic system was preserved up to a few years ago. I still remember that my father as advocate told me this! Even talented philologists like Grimm mistranslated the simplest Latin sentences. For example, a well-known phrase from Tacitus: *avra per annos mutant, et superest ager*, which means that they change the fields [*avra*] (by means of *Los* [*lot*], therefore, they were also later called *sortes* [*lots*] in all *Leges Barbarorum* [*Barbarian Laws*]) and a common land (*ager* as *ager publicus* in contrast to *avra*) still remains. This phrase was translated by Grimm: They cultivate new fields every year and, notwithstanding, (uncultivated) ones still remain. Likewise, another phrase: *Colunt discreti ac diversi* seems to demonstrate that the Germanic people had from ancient times been administering individual farming like Westphalian Junker. However, the same phrase is accompanied by a following sentence: *Vicos locant non in nostrum morem connexis et cohaerentibus aedificiis: suum quisque locum spatio circumdat*, and such Germanic primitive villages in the described form still exist here and there in Denmark. Scandinavia must naturally get important for Germanic jurisprudence and economy as well as for Germanic mythology. And only starting from this, we were able to decipher our past again. By the way, even Grimm found in Caesar, that the Germanic people at all times settled down as *Geschlechtsgenossenschaften* [kinship communities], not as individuals: „*gentibus cognatibusque qui uno coiereant.*“²⁴] (*MEW* 32: 51-52)

In the above-quoted passages from Caesar and Tacitus Marx regards “ager” in general as well as “spatium” (*spatia* in the plural) as “ager publicus” (communal land).

Following Maurer, Caesar and Tacitus play an increasingly important role for his modified notion on the Germanic communal property. Maurer persuades Marx to consider Caesar and Tacitus as witnesses to two completely different stages of the development of Germanic commune before and after the Common Era, which are classified as the more archaic communities (*les communautés plus archaïques*) and the agrarian commune (*la commune agricole*) respectively.

The stage described by Caesar in the history of Germanic communes is characterized by the following features; in Caesar's times old Germanic communes are primarily organized as hunting and military ones. Among the Sueben thousand armed men are annually conscripted from each village (*pagus*). They wage war and plunder regions outside their country while the

²⁴ “uno coiereant” is not understandable and must have falsely been quoted by Marx, which, however, remains unnoticed by the editors of *MEW*. The original text by Caesar says *una coierunt* [have united].

at home remaining members, who cultivate the land, and engaged in hunting and stock farming, are responsible for providing for soldiers and their families. The next year, another thousand men that in the previous year engaged in cultivation and so on go to the battlefield while the soldiers come home and provide for the present soldiers and their families. “The tribal leaders (magistratus) and the tribal directors (principes) annually allot a piece of land for one year to tribes (gentes) and kindred (cognatus). The following year, they force them to leave their allotted land (Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum* 22-23).” A unit of allotment has not yet been an individual family as is the case in Tacitus’s times but a blood relative. Household industries like spinning and weaving that characterize Asian communities have not been established yet. Any individual or private property of land has not existed yet.

Between Caesar and Tacitus there exists a time lag of 150 years. During this period the old Germanic commune experiences a radical transformation. The stage described by Tacitus is characterized by a transition from a warriors’ commune to an agrarian one. “The Germanic people occupied arable lands at first as a whole in proportion to the number of cultivators, and then distributed them among them in proportion to their status (Tacitus, *Germania* 26).” The common property of land by a commune that Tacitus calls vicus is still preserved but independent households of individual families are increasingly expanded²⁵, although the arable fields in a commune are annually re-allotted to its members. Even in Tacitus’ times any household industry has not taken place yet. The stage described by Tacitus corresponds to the agrarian commune (la commune agricole) outlined in the drafts for the letter to Zassoulitch.

As Marx published in 1867 the *First Volume of Capital* he had not recognized the importance of works by Maurer yet. Maurer was for the first time mentioned in the Second Edition of *Capital* of 1873 (*MEGA* II/6: 102). Increasingly intensive study on Maurer leads Marx to change a view on Germanic communal property that he entertains in the section on the forms that precedes the capitalist production in the *Grundrisse* (1857/58), where the Germanic form of original communal property is characterized by the following two features: (1) Firstly, an individual household appeared as an independent unity (eine selbständige Einheit). (2) Secondly, the commune appears as no more than an appendix or a supplement to independent households as we have already discussed in the chapter VI.

In the *Grundrisse*, Marx has not yet noticed the annual re-allotment of arable lands to members of the commune as described by Caesar and Tacitus. Marx’s study on Maurer leads Marx to pay attention not only to the fact of land allotment but also to a multilayer structure of original Germanic community. Just after the above-quoted correspondence with Engels of March 1868, Marx starts to carefully read Maurer’s *Einleitung* (Maurer 1854) and drafts voluminous excerpts from him, which are contained in *MEGA* IV/18²⁶. He owes the overcoming of his former perspective on historical trajectories of pre-capitalist societies mainly to Maurer (as well as Caesar and Tacitus). Unfortunately, Marx wrote very few manuscripts during the last sixteen years after the publication of the *First Volume of Capital* that could help us to closely follow the trajectory of the transformation of his own way of thinking. The drafts

²⁵ “suum quisque locum spatio circumdat [each surrounds his place with free space] (Tacitus, *Germania* 16).” In contrast to Tacitus, Caesar reports that the whole tribe (not an individual household) surrounded their territory with a large empty space (Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum* 4-1).

²⁶ In 1868, Marx drafts the following two excerpts from Maurer’s *Einleitung*: (1) Exzerptheft IISG (B112) (Mai-December 1869), pp.116-140, pp.144-162. (2) Exzerptheft IISG B128 (B112) (April- November 1868), pp.5-21.

for the letter to Zassoulitch, which he wrote in February 1881, just two years before his death, are the only documents that bear witness to the conclusion he reached through his last struggle to understand the pre-capitalist history.

According to the drafts for the letter to Zassoulitch, Marx classifies three successive phases in the development of the Germanic commune:

(1) The first form corresponds to the Germanic commune before the coming into existence of the agrarian commune as described in *Bellum Gallicum* by Caesar. Marx regards this stage as a more archaic type (un type plus archaïque) of the Germanic commune, which is characterized by the fact that the fields are annually allotted to groups of the same commune (called *gentes* and *cognatus*), but have not yet been allotted to any individual household and cultivation is also collectively done by groups.²⁷

(2) The second form is called the agrarian commune (la commune agricole), which is characterized by the fact that the independent management by individual households in the same commune has already been introduced, while the annual re-allotment of fields through the commune still continues and private property by individual farmers has not yet been established as described in *Germania* by Tacitus.

Comme dernière phase de la formation primitive de la société la commune agricole est en même temps phase de transition à la formation secondaire, donc transition de la société, fondée sur la propriété commune, à la société, fondée sur la propriété privée. La formation secondaire, bien entendu, embrasse la série des sociétés reposant sur l'esclavage et le servage.

[The agrarian commune as the last phase of primitive formation of the society is at the same time a phase of transition to the secondary formation, therefore, transition from the society based on communal property to the society based on private property. The secondary formation, to be sure, comprehends a series of societies grounded on the slavery and the serfdom.] (Troisième projet de la lettre à Zassoulitch. *MEGA I/25*: 237-238)

(3) The third form is called the secondary formation of the society or the new commune (la nouvelle commune), which originates in the transformation of the agrarian commune, which is characterized by two main factors: (1) the last phase of primitive formation of the society, and at the same time (2) a phase of transition to the secondary formation. The secondary formation is characterized by the fact that the fields already belong to individual farmers as their private property while forests, pastures, uncultivated lands etc. still remain communal property²⁸. Furthermore, this formation comprises “a series of societies grounded on the slavery

²⁷ “A l’époque de Jules César il y avait déjà une répartition annuelle de la terre laborable entre des groupes, les *gentes* et les *tribus*, mais pas encore entre les familles individuelles d’une commune; probablement la culture se fit aussi par groupe, en commun. [In the times of Julius Caesar there had already been the annual allotment of arable lands among the groups, the *gentes* and the *tribes* but not yet among individual families of a commune.]” (*MEGA I/25*, p.236)

²⁸ “Mais ce qu’il y a de plus important, nous trouvons l’empreinte de cette «commune agricole» si bien tracée sur la nouvelle commune qui en sortit, que Maurer, en déchiffrant celle-ci, put reconstruire celle-là. La nouvelle commune, où la terre laborable appartient en propriété privée aux cultivateurs, en même temps que forêt, pâtures, terres vagues etc. restent encore propriété commune, fut introduite par les Germains dans tous les pays conquis. [However, what is more important, we can so clearly trace the vestige of this «agrarian commune» on the new commune originating from it that Maurer, by deciphering the new commune, could reconstruct the agrarian one. The new commune, where the arable land belongs to cultivators as their private property while at the same time forests, pastures and vague lands etc. still remain common property, was introduced by the Germanic people into all territories conquered by them.]” (*MEGA*

and the serfdom.” This formation corresponds to the Germanic form of original property (*MEGA* II/I: 399) or the Germanic property (*MEGA* II/I: 383) described in the *Grundrisse*. By this we can recognize that Marx’s perspective on the Germanic commune in the *Grundrisse* is confined to the latest (third) stage of its development and does not cover its earlier stages that Marx in the drafts for the Letter to Zassoulitch introduces to his concept of the history of pre-capitalist societies. To be sure, we must not underestimate a substantial difference between the third form called the new commune (*la nouvelle commune*) in the drafts for the letter to Zassoulitch and the Germanic commune in the *Grundrisse* because Marx recognizes the emergence of private property in the new commune while, in the *Grundrisse*, the Germanic commune does not admit private property yet but only individual property.

It interests us that, in the third draft for the letter to Zassoulitch, Marx considers the transition from the first to the second form as a natural development.²⁹ In contrast to this, the disappearance of the agrarian commune and its transition to the new commune take place as a result of uninterrupted wars and the Germanic migration. Therefore, the second transition could not be regarded as an inevitable spontaneous process. “Depuis son temps nous la (= la commune agricole) perdons de vue. Elle périt obscurément au milieu des guerres et migrations incessantes; elle mourut peut-être de mort violente [Since that time, we lose sight of the agrarian commune. It obscurely perishes in the midst of incessant wars and migrations. It probably died from violent death]” (*MEGA* I/25: 236). He contends that, without the encroachment of alien tribes and incessant wars, the agrarian commune could have survived through the whole medieval ages. Here, we can assume that Marx recognizes two types of historical development of various socio-economic formations; that is to say, (1) the first type of transition consists in the one inside the primitive formation of the societies from a commune without any private property to a commune accompanied by private property of individual households defined as the agrarian commune. This transition mainly takes place based on a natural spontaneous development immanent in the primitive formation of the societies. (2) On the contrary, the second type of it consists in a more radical transformation from the primitive formation to the secondary formation: namely “transition from the society based on communal property to the society based on private property.” The second transition is caused by the violence inflicted on it by extraneous forces like wars or invasion of alien ethnic groups.

According to the latest Marx, the introduction and the establishment of private property is no longer an historical necessity that founds on a spontaneous development immanent to a society but a result of unnatural changes inflicted by alien powers.

It is important that Marx derives the origin of the freedom in the West from the agrarian commune (before the introduction of private property):

Grâce aux caractères empruntés à son prototype, elle (= la nouvelle commune) devenait pendant tout le moyen âge le seul foyer de liberté et de vie populaire.

[Thanks to the characters inherited from its prototype, the new commune became during the whole medieval ages the sole origin of freedom and popular life] (*MEGA* I/25: 236).

I/25: 236)

²⁹ “Sur le sol germain même cette communauté au type plus archaïque s’est transformée par un développement naturel en commune agricole, tel que l’a décrite Tacite. [Upon the Germanic ground itself, this community of a more archaic type has been transformed through a natural development into the agrarian commune as Tacitus has described.]” (*MEGA* I/25: 236)

In his latest opinion, an exceptionally immense vitality of agrarian commune consists in a sort of combination or dualism of communal land property (a collective element) and independent management by individual households accompanied by private appropriation of land products (an individual element). Marx distinguishes the agrarian commune from the more archaic communes through the following features:

(1) La «commune agricole» fut le premier groupement social d'hommes libres, non resserré par les liens du sang. [The agrarian commune was the first social grouping of free men not restricted by blood ties.]

(2) Dans la commune agricole la maison et son complément, la cour, appartiennent en particulier au cultivateur. La maison commune et l'habitation collective étaient au contraire une base économique des communautés plus primitives, et cela déjà longtemps avant l'introduction de la vie pastorale ou agricole. [In the agrarian commune, the house and a complement to it, the court, separately belong to the individual cultivator. In contrast, the common house and the collective dwelling were an economic base of more primitive communities, and this had already been established long before the introduction of the pastoral or agrarian life.]

(3) La terre laborable, propriété inaliénable et commune, se divise périodiquement entre les membres de la commune agricole, de sorte que chacun exploite à son propre compte les champs assignés à lui et s'en approprie les fruits en particulier. Dans les communautés plus primitives le travail se fait en commun et le produit commun, sauf la quote-part réservée pour la reproduction, se répartit à fur et mesure des besoins de la consommation. On comprend que le dualisme inhérent à la constitution de la commune agricole puisse la douer d'une vie vigoureuse. [The arable land as inalienable and common property is periodically divided among the members of the agrarian commune so that each member on his own account uses the fields allotted to him and individually possesses the products from them. In the more primitive communities, the labor is done in common and the common product, apart from parts reserved for reproduction, is distributed according to needs of consumption. We understand that the dualism inherent to the constitution of the agrarian commune could provide it with a vigorous life.] (Troisième projet de la lettre à Zassoulitch. *MEGA I/25* : 237f.)

Together with a modified view on the Germanic commune, Marx also changes his opinion on the Asian commune. This is no longer regarded as the oldest form of the primitive commune that every civilized nation must have once gone through at the outset but the latest, newest form of the archaic social formation, which can be qualified to persistently survive. This opinion implies a self-criticism to his former opinion on the Asian, especially Indian, communal property as the oldest form of it.³⁰

³⁰ "Ein genaueres Studium der asiatischen, speciell der indischen Gemeineigenthumsformen, würde nachweisen, wie aus den verschiedenen Formen des naturwüchsigen Gemeineigenthums sich verschiedene Formen seiner Auflösung ergeben. So lassen sich z.B. die verschiedenen Originaltypen von römischem und germanischem Privateigenthum aus verschiedenen Formen von indischem Gemeineigenthum ableiten. [A more exact study on the Asian, especially Indian forms of communal property would demonstrate how from various forms of natural-gnetic communal property arise various forms of their dissolution. Thus, we can derive for example different original types of the Roman and Germanic private property from different forms of the Indian communal property.]" (*Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie. Erstes*

Marx no longer emphasizes the civilizing role of the British rule over India as is the case in 1850s in a series of articles on India contributing to *New York Tribune*.³¹ In contrast to 1850s, the latest Marx expresses the British colonialist rule over India as an act of vandalism, which reminds us of the Vandals and the other nomadic tribes that violently interrupted a natural spontaneous development of the Germanic primitive communes and destroyed the agrarian commune. The British capitalism no longer represents the highest stage of an inevitable immanent development of economic forces and relations.

As a result, he recognizes the Russian rural commune as a possible starting point for the overcoming of the capitalist system.

This theoretical change implies criticism of Engels of 1875 because he still, even in 1875, sticks to a conviction concerning the revolutionary role of the bourgeoisie, which he shared with Marx when they wrote the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848. In an article of 1875 titled *Literature in Exile*, Engels criticizes Tkatschoff in a following way:

Die vom modernen Sozialismus erstrebte Umwälzung ist, kurz ausgedrückt, der Sieg des Proletariats über die Bourgeoisie, und die Neuorganisation der Gesellschaft durch Vernichtung aller Klassenunterschiede. Dazu gehört nicht nur ein Proletariat, das diese Umwälzung durchführt, sondern auch eine Bourgeoisie, in deren Händen sich die gesellschaftlichen Produktionskräfte soweit entwickelt haben, dass sie die endgültige Vernichtung der Klassenunterschiede gestatten. Auch bei Wilden und Halbwilden bestehn häufig keine Klassenunterschiede, und jedes Volk hat einen solchen Zustand durchgemacht. Ihn wieder herzustellen, kann uns schon deswegen nicht einfallen, weil aus ihm, mit der Entwicklung der gesellschaftlichen Produktivkräfte, die Klassenunterschiede nothwendig hervorgehn. Erst auf einem gewissen, für unsere Zeitverhältnisse sogar sehr hohen Entwicklungsgrad der gesellschaftlichen Produktivkräfte wird es möglich, die Produktion so hoch zu steigern, dass die Abschaffung der Klassenunterschiede ein wirklicher Fortschritt, dass sie von Dauer sein kann, ohne einen Stillstand oder gar Rückgang in der gesellschaftlichen Produktionsweise herbeizuführen. Diesen Entwicklungsgrad haben die Produktivkräfte aber erst erhalten in den Händen der Bourgeoisie. Die Bourgeoisie ist demnach auch nach dieser Seite hin eine ebenso nothwendige Vorbedingung der sozialistischen Revolution wie das Proletariat selbst. Ein Mann, also, der sagen kann, dass diese Revolution in einem Land leichter durchzuführen sei, weil dasselbe zwar kein Proletariat aber auch keine Bourgeoisie besitze, beweist damit nur, dass er vom Sozialismus noch das ABC zu lernen hat.

[To the new organization of a society through the abolition of all class discrimination contributes not only a proletariat that performs this transformation but also a bourgeoisie in whose hands social productive forces have so much developed as they make the final abolition of class discrimination possible. Even among the savages and the half-savages there is no class discrimination, and each nation has gone through such a phase. This should not be restored just because, together with the development of social productive forces, class discrimination inevitably arises from it. The productive forces have reached this developmental level first in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Therefore, the

Hefi.MEGA II/2: 113)

³¹ See Tairako (2003).

bourgeoisie is also from this aspect a necessary precondition of socialist revolution like the proletariat itself. If a man can contend that this revolution can be more easily achieved in a country because this country has not only no proletariat but also no bourgeoisie, he, thereby, demonstrates that he must learn the ABC about the socialism.] (Engels, *Flüchtlingsliteratur V*, MEGA I/24: 414-415).

Marx constantly changes his opinion on the pre-capitalist societies in their historical constellation from the *German Ideology* and the *Communist Manifesto* of the 1840s to the drafts for the letter to Zassoulitch and the Preface to the Russian Edition of the *Communist Manifesto* of his latest life stage. Furthermore, Marx's opinion on the transition from the pre-capitalist societies to the capitalist society changes from the model of uni-linear development, according to which historical processes of the emergence of modern Western Europe are generally applicable as a universally valid law of history, to that of the multi-linear development, according to which historical processes different from those of Western Europe are positively accepted.³²

Together with this change, his view on rural communities still existent in most of non-Western societies drastically changes. In *Tribune* essays on India of 1853, he regards rural communities negatively as causing backward stagnancy and 'oriental despotism' in non-Western societies. However, Marx begins to revise such a negative notion when he writes in 1857 a series of *Tribune* essays on India and China concerning the Sepoy and the Taiping Revolt. He openly supports the cause of the Chinese people against the British encroachment. In the same year, Marx begins to write the *Grundrisse*, his first attempt to draft a system of the critique of the political economy and at the same time to elaborate an idea on multilinear historical development.

Throughout 1860s, Marx gets involved in issues on ethnicity, race and colonialism. In 1864, an international network of the working class to support the Union during the Civil War in the United States as well as the Polish Revolt of 1863 is formed. This finally leads to the establishment of the International Workingmen's Association. This fact illustrates how much the issues about class, ethnicity and race are intertwined with each other in the historical context as well as in the theoretical development by Marx as Kevin Anderson writes in *Marx at the Margins* in a compelling way.

The development of Marx's thought and theory is characterized by the intersectionality of class, ethnicity, race, nationalism (and gender in his latest years); he prognosticates that, during the Civil War, the white labor movements in the United States would be destined to lose without demanding the abolition of slavery and racial discrimination against colored laborers, and that the English workers would also be destined to lose without supporting the cause of the Irish people for the independent Ireland.³³ Throughout his intellectual life, Marx has been shifting his views towards giving more weight to nationalist movements of subordinate nations like the Polish, the Irish and the Indian etc. than the interests of the workers' movements in the most developed countries. In order to exactly comprehend the interrelationship of class, ethnicity, race and gender in Marx, it is necessary to carefully analyze excerpt-notebooks written by the late Marx.

³² See Anderson (2010).

³³ See Tairako (2003).

One of the most important tasks in the studies on Marx that have not been fulfilled as yet consists in studying Marx after the publication of the *First Volume of Capital*; this task cannot be achieved without integrating the as yet unpublished excerpt-notebooks and the corresponding letters from Marx and Engels as well as those from the third persons to the both of 1868-1881.³⁴

In the French Edition of *Capital* (1872-75), Marx openly contends that the historical transition from the feudal mode of production to the capitalist one, described in the section on 'Primitive Accumulation,' could apply to no other regions than the West-European countries.

Mais la base de toute cette évolution, c'est l'expropriation des cultivateurs. Elle ne s'est encore accomplie d'une manière radicale qu'en Angleterre: ce pays jouera donc nécessairement le premier rôle dans notre esquisse. Mais tous les autres pays de l'Europe occidentale parcourent le même mouvement.

[But the basis of this whole development is the expropriation of the cultivators. So far, it has been carried out in a radical manner only in England: therefore, this country will necessarily play the leading role in our sketch. But all the countries of Western Europe are going through the same development.] (Karl Marx, *Le Capital* Paris 1872-1875. *MEGA* II/7: 634)

Through the confinement of the validity of *Capital* to Western Europe, Marx is confronted with a new task to conceptualize trajectories of historical development in the non-European societies and corresponding possibilities to overcome capitalism.

What interests Marx in his excerpt-notebooks is to confirm that communal social forms in the non-European societies has gone through historical development and, as a result, could play a positive role as an effective stronghold of resistance against Western colonialism. With this perspective, Marx is able to finally overcome his former Eurocentric ideas such as those on the progressiveness of British colonialism and the civilizing effect of capital.

Marx's comprehensive studies on Russian rural communities during 1870s are embodied in his two latest works: the drafts for the letter to Zassoulitch (1881) and the Preface to the Russian Edition of the *Communist Manifesto* (1882), in which he expresses his final view that Russian rural communities could become a starting point to cause the socialist transformation in Russia.

Wird die russische Revolution das Signal einer proletarischen Revolution im Westen, sodass beide einander ergänzen, so kann das jetzige russische Gemeineigentum am Boden zum Ausgangspunkt einer kommunistischen Entwicklung dienen.

[When the Russian revolution gives a signal to a proletarian revolution in the West so that the both mutually play complementary roles, today's Russian communal property in land serves as a starting point for a communist development.] (*MEGA* I/25: 296)

However, Marx does not forget to insist upon the necessity for the Russian rural communes to link up with the revolutionary movements of the working class as well as technologies in the West-European societies as prerequisite conditions for the success of the

³⁴ Recent papers by Vollgraf (2013), (2016) offer us a scientific model for studying *MEGA* by integrating the whole four departments of it, especially integrating letters from Marx and Engels as well as those from the third persons to the both as a new resource of evidence.

village-based revolution in Russia. Marx argues that a communist development would be a real possibility in non-capitalist Russia if a Russian revolution could link up with its counterpart based on the Western labor movement.

Marx admits that (1) the rural community guarantees peasants' property or possession of their own parcel of land and other means of production, (2) it nurtures peasants' free individuality and personal independence, in a smaller or larger degree, inside the community, (3) as a result, it serves as 'the last places in which natural-genetic [naturwüchsig] energy of labor forces takes refuge and accumulates itself as a reservoir for the revival of vital energy of the nations' (*MEGA* I/4.2: 753), and (4) it serves as a stronghold for stubborn resistance to devastating encroachment of the global capitalism, and as a reservoir for the political-military energy of colossal peasantry revolts.

Unfortunately, Marx died in 1883. He had no time to further develop a theory of the relations of the peasantry and the agricultural community to capitalism. We are sure that he could have not stopped at the theoretical position that he reached in his latest years if he had lived longer. Now, it is our task and our responsibility to make further steps in the direction that he had been advancing. A further step forward might be to admit that the peasantry and the rural community could offer indispensable energy for the non-European regions to transform themselves into capitalist societies in which the spontaneous energy in the peasants could be transformed into that of capitalist modernization if effective institutional framework is arranged.

The primitive accumulation of capital is not only a negative process in which peasants are forcibly deprived of their lands and transformed into the laborers without property but also a positive process in which traditional ethos, knowledge, techniques and culture embodied in the rural villages and peasants are made the best use of as historic-cultural resources for setting up the capitalist system in each region in the non-European world.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

MEW: Karl Marx- Friedrich Engels Werke, Dietz Verlag, Berlin.

MEGA: Marx/ Engels Gesamtausgabe, Dietz Verlag oder Akademie Verlag, Berlin.

MECW: Marx- Engels- Collected Works, International Publishers, New York.

Anderson, Kevin B. (2010), *Marx at the Margins: On Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Non-Western Societies*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Liebig, Justus von (1862), *Chemie und ihre Anwendung auf Physiologie*. Siebte Auflage, Braunschweig.

Marx, Karl (1962), *Das Kapital, Erster Band*, *MEW* Bd. 23, Dietz Verlag, Berlin.

— (1976) *Ökonomische Manuskripte 1857/58*, Teil 1, *MEGA* II/1.1, Dietz Verlag, Berlin.

— (1976a) *Capital, Volume I*, Translated by Ben Fowkes, Penguin Books, London.

— (1979) *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie (Manuskript 1861-1863)*, Teil 4, *MEGA* II/3.4, Dietz Verlag, Berlin.

— (1980) *Ökonomische Manuskripte und Schriften 1858-1861*, *MEGA* II/2, Dietz Verlag, Berlin.

— (1980a) *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie (Manuskript 1861-1863)*, Teil 5, *MEGA*

- II/3.5, Diez Verlag, Berlin.
- (1981) *Ökonomische Manuskripte 1857/58, Teil 2*, MEGA II/1.2, Diez Verlag, Berlin.
- (1982) *Ökonomisch-philosophische Manuskripte*, MEGA I/2, Diez Verlag, Berlin.
- (1982a) *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie (Manuskript 1861-1863), Teil 6*, MEGA II/3.6, Diez Verlag, Berlin.
- (1987) *Ergänzungen und Veränderungen zum ersten Band des "Kapitals"*, MEGA II/6, Diez Verlag, Berlin.
- (1988) *Resultate des Unmittelbaren Produktionsprozesses*, In: *Ökonomische Manuskripte 1863-1867, Teil 1*, MEGA II/4.1, Diez Verlag, Berlin.
- (1989) *Le Capital*, Traduction de M. J. Roy, entierement revisee par l'auteur. Paris 1872-1875, MEGA II/7, Dietz Verlag, Berlin.
- Maurer, Georg Ludwig von (1854), *Einleitung zur Geschichte der Mark-, Hof-, Dorf- und Stadt-Verfassung*, München (Nr. 880, *Die Bibliotheken von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels Annotiertes Verzeichnis des Ermittelten Bestandes*, MEGA IV/32, pp. 456f.).
- (1856), *Geschichte der Markenverfassung in Deutschland*. Erlangen.
- (1862-63), *Geschichte der Fronhöfe, der Bauernhöfe und der Hofverfassung in Deutschland*. 4 Bde. Erlangen.
- (1865-66), *Geschichte der Dorfverfassung in Deutschland*. 2 Bde. Erlangen.
- (1869-71), *Geschichte der Städteverfassung in Deutschland*. 4 Bde. Erlangen.
- Saito, Kohei (2014), *The Emergence of Marx's Critique of Modern Agriculture. Ecological Insights from his Excerpt Notebooks*. Monthly Review. October, pp.25-46.
- (2016), *Natur gegen Kapital. Marx' Ökologie in seiner unvollendeten Kritik des Kapitalismus*. Campus Verlag, Frankfurt am Main/New York.
- Tairako, Tomonaga (2003), Marx on Capitalist Globalization. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 1, Tokyo, July, pp.11-16.
- (2010) Neue Akzente von Marx' Forschungen nach 1868 – Exzerpte aus den Werken von Georg Ludwig von Maurer, Carl-Erich Vollgraf, Richard Sperl und Rolf Hecker (Hrsg.), *Beiträge zur Marx- Engels- Forschung Neue Folge 2010. Das Kapital und Vorarbeiten Entwürfe und Exzerpte*. Argument Verlag, Hamburg (272 Seiten), S. 157- 171.
- (2016) A Turning Point in Marx's Theory of Pre-Capitalist Societies – Marx's Excerpt Notebooks on Maurer in MEGA IV/18, *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, Vol. 47-1, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, January, pp.1-10.
- (2017) Versachlichung and Verdinglichung – Basic Categories of Marx's Theory of Reification and Their Logical Construction –, *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, Vol. 48-1, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, January, pp.1-26.
- (2018) Reification-Thingification and Alienation – Basic Concepts of Marx's Critique of Political Economy and Practical Materialism, *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, Vol. 49-1, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, January, pp.1-28.
- Vollgraf, Carl-Erich (2013), *Das Kapital – bis zuletzt ein Werk im Werden*, *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch 2012/13*, Berlin, pp.113-33.
- (2016), Marx über die sukzessive Untergrabung des Stoffwechsels der Gesellschaft bei entfalteter kapitalistischer Produktion, *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung. Neue Folge 2014*, Hamburg, pp.106-132.