

JE KINDLE-NOTITIES VOOR:

Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844: With linked Table of Contents

door Karl Marx, Martin Milligan

Gratis directe Kindle-preview: https://a.co/dkeRnNk

38 Highlights

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 302

> When the capitals and revenues of a country are growing. But this is only possible (a) as the result of the accumulation of much labor, capital being accumulated labor; as the result, therefore, of the fact that his products are being taken in ever-increasing degree from the hands of the workers, that to an increasing extent his own labor confronts him as another's property and that the means of his existence and his activity are increasingly concentrated in the hands of the capitalist. (b) The accumulation of capital increases the division of labor, and the division of labor increases the numbers of the workers. Conversely, the workers' numbers increase the division of labor, just as the division of labor increases the accumulation of capitals. With this division of labor on the one hand and the accumulation of capitals on the other, the worker becomes ever more exclusively dependent on labor, and on a particular, very one-sided, machine-like labor. Just as he is thus depressed spiritually and physically to the condition of a machine and from being a man becomes an abstract activity and a stomach, so he also becomes ever more dependent on every fluctuation in market-price, on the application of capitals, and on the mood of the rich. Equally, the increase in the class of people wholly dependent on work intensifies competition among them, thus lowering their price. In the factory-system this situation of the worker reaches its climax. (c) In an increasingly prosperous society it is only the very richest people who can go on living on money-interest. Everyone else has to carry on a business with his capital, or venture it in trade. As a result, the competition between capitals becomes more intense. The concentration of capitals increases, the big capitalists ruin the small, and a section of the erstwhile capitalists sinks into the working class, which as a result of this supply again suffers to some extent a depression of wages and passes into a still greater dependence on the few big capitalists. The number of capitalists having been diminished, their competition with respect to workers scarcely exists any longer; and the number of workers having been augmented, their competition among themselves has become all the more intense, unnatural and violent. Consequently, a section of the working class falls into the ranks of beggary or starvation just as necessarily as a section of the middle capitalists falls into the working class.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 377

> While according to the political economists labor is the sole constant price of things, there is nothing more contingent than the price of labor, nothing exposed to greater fluctuations. While the division of labor raises the productive power of labor and increases the wealth and refinement of society, it impoverishes the worker and reduces him to a machine. While labor brings about the accumulation of capitals and with this the increasing prosperity of society, it renders the worker ever more dependent on the capitalist, leads him into competition of a

> new intensity, and drives him into the headlong rush of over-production, with its subsequent corresponding slump.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 587

> Capital is thus the governing power over labor and its products. The capitalist possesses this power, not on account of his personal or human qualities, but inasmuch as he is an owner of capital. His power is the purchasing power of his capital, which noting can withstand. Later we shall see first how the capitalist, by means of capital, exercises his governing power over labor, then, however, we shall see the governing power of capital over the capitalist himself.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 659

> Thus the advance made by human labor in converting the product of nature into the manufactured product of nature increases, not the wages of labor, but in part the number of profitable capitals, and in part the size of every subsequent capital in comparison with the foregoing.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 670

> It goes without saying that profits also rise if the means of circulation become less expensive or easier available (e.g., paper money).

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 679

> The most useful employment of capital for the capitalist is that which, risks being equal, yields him the greatest profit. This employment is not always the most useful for society: the most useful employment is that which draws benefit from the productive powers of nature. (Say, t. II, pp. 130-31.)

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 684

> But the rate of profit does not, like rent and wages, rise with the prosperity and fall with the declension of the society. On the contrary, it is naturally low in rich and high in poor countries, and it is always highest in the countries which are going fastest to ruin. The interest of this class, therefore, has not the same connection with the general interest of the society as that of the other two. . . . The particular interest of the dealers in any particular branch of trade or manufactures is always in some respects different from, and frequently even in sharp opposition to, that of the public. To widen the market and to narrow the sellers' competition is always the interest of the dealer. This is a class of people whose interest is never exactly the same as that of society, a class of people who have generally an interest to deceive and to oppress the public. (Smith, Vol. I, pp. 231-32.)

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 701

> Since we already know that monopoly-prices are as high as possible, since the interest of the capitalists, even from the point of view commonly held by political economists, stands in hostile opposition to society, and since a rise of profit operates like compound interest on the price of the commodity (Ibid., pp. 87-88), it follows that

> the sole defense against the capitalists is competition, which according to the evidence of political economy acts beneficently by both raising wages and lowering the prices of commodities to the advantage of the consuming public. But competition is only possible if capitals multiply, and are held in many hands. The formation of many capitals is only possible as a result of multilateral accumulation, since capital comes into being only by accumulation; and multilateral accumulation necessarily turns into unilateral accumulation. Competition among capitals increases accumulation of capitals. Accumulation, where private property prevails, is the concentration of capital in the hands of a few, it is in general an inevitable consequence if capitails are left to follow their natural course, and it is precisely through competition that the way is cleared for this natural destination of capital. We have been told that the profit on capital is in proportion to the size of the capital. A large capital therefore accumulates more quickly than a small capital in proportion to its size, even if we disregard for the time being deliberate competition. Accordingly, the accumulation of large capital proceeds much more rapidly than that of smaller capital, quite irrespective of competition. But let us follow this process further. With the increase of capitals the profits on the capitals diminish, because of competition. The first to suffer, therefore, is the small capitalist. The increase of capitals and a large number

---

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 742

> Thus the small capitalist has the choice: 1) either to consume his capital, since he can no longer live on the interest—and thus cease to be a capitalist; or: 2) to set up a business himself, sell his commodity cheaper, buy dearer than the wealthier capitalist, and pay increased wages—thus ruining himself, the market-price being already very low as a result of the intense competition presupposed. If, however, the big capitalist wants to squeeze out the smaller capitalist, he has all the advantages over him which the capitalist has as a capitalist over the worker. The larger size of his capital compensates him for the smaller profits, and he can even bear temporary losses until the smaller capitalist is ruined and he finds himself freed from this competition. In this way, he accumulates the small capitalist’s profits. Furthermore: the big capitalist always buys cheaper than the small one, because he buys bigger quantities. He can therefore well afford to sell cheaper.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 759

> If, however, this large capital is opposed by small capitals with small profits, as it is under the presupposed condition of intense competition, it crushes them completely. The necessary result of this competition is a general deterioration of commodities, adulteration, fake-production and universal poisoning, evident in large towns.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 778

> It is clear from the outset that the relationship of fixed capital and circulating capital is much more favorable to the big capitalist than to the smaller capitalist. The extra fixed capital required by a very big banker as against a very small one is insignificant. Their fixed capital amounts to nothing more than the office. The equipment of the bigger landowner does not increase in proportion to the size of his estate. Similarly, the credit which a big capitalist enjoys compared with a smaller one means for him all the greater saving in fixed capital—that is, in the amount of ready money he must always have at hand. Finally, it is obvious that where industrial labor has reached a high level, and where therefore almost all manual labor has become factory-labor, the entire capital of a small capitalist does not suffice to provide him even with the necessary fixed capital.4 [4.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1022

> Let us now see how the landlord exploits everything from which society benefits. (1) The rent of land increases with population. (Ibid., p. 146.) (2) We have already learned from Say how the rent of land increases with railways, etc., with the improvement, safety, and multiplication of the means of communication. (3) “Every improvement in the circumstances of the society tends either directly or indirectly to raise the real rent of land, to increase the real wealth of the landlord, his power of purchasing the labor, or the produce of the labor of other people. . . . The extension of improvement and cultivation tends to raise it directly. The landlord’s share of the produce necessarily increases with the increase of the produce. The rise in the real price of those parts of the rude produce of land, ... the rise in the price of cattle, for example, tends too to raise the rent of land directly, and in a still greater proportion. The real value of the landlord’s share, his real command of the labor of other people, not only rises with the real value of the produce, but the proportion of his share to the whole produce rises with it. That produce, after the rise in its real price, requires no more labor to collect it than before. A smaller proportion of it will, therefore, be sufficient to replace, with the ordinary profit, the stock which employs that labor. A greater proportion of it must, consequently, belong to the landlord.” (Ibid., pp. 228-29.) The greater demand for raw produce, and therefore the rise in value, may in part result from the increase of population and from the increase of their needs. But every new invention, every new application in manufacture of a previously unused or little-used raw material, augments the rent of the land. Thus, for example, there was a tremendous rise in the rent of coal-mines with the advent of the railways, steamships, etc.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1048

> But it is absurd to conclude, as Smith does, that since the landlord exploits every benefit which comes to society, the interest of the landlord is always identical with that of society. (Ibid., p. 230.) In the economic system, under the rule of private property, the interest which an individual has in society is in precisely inverse proportion to the interest society has in him—just as the interest of the money-lender in the spendthrift is by no means identical with the interest of the spendthrift.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1073

> In general the relationship of large and small landed property is like that of big and small capital. But in addition, there are special circumstances which lead inevitably to the accumulation of large landed property and to the absorption of small property by it.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1204

> Large landed property, as we see in England, has already cast off its feudal character and adopted an industrial character insofar as it is aiming to make as much money as possible. To the owner it yields the utmost possible rent, to the tenant farmer the utmost possible profit on his capital. The workers on the land, in consequence, have already been reduced to the minimum, and the class of tenant farmers already represent within landed property the power of industry and capital. As a result of foreign competition, rent of land can in most cases form no longer an independent income. A large number of landowners have to displace farmers, some of whom in this way sink into the proletariat. On the other hand, many farmers will take over landed property; for the big proprietors who with their comfortable incomes have mostly given themselves over to extravagance are for the

> most part, not competent to conduct large-scale agriculture, and in some cases possess neither the capital nor the ability for the exploitation of the land. Hence a section of this class, too, is completely ruined. Eventually wages, which have already been reduced to a minimum, must be reduced yet further, to meet the new competition. This then necessarily leads to revolution.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1242

> The only wheels which political economy sets in motion are avarice and the war among the avaricious—competition.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1258

> The worker becomes all the poorer the more wealth he produces, the more his production increases in power and range. The worker becomes an ever cheaper commodity the more commodities he creates. With the increasing value of the world of things proceeds in direct proportion the devaluation of the world of men. Labor produces not only commodities: it produces itself and the worker as a commodity—and does so in the proportion in which it produces commodities generally.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1262

> This fact expresses merely the object which labor produces— labor's product—confronts it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer. The product of labor is labor which has been congealed in an object, which has become material: it is the objectification of labor. Labor's realization is its objectification. In the conditions dealt with by political economy this realization of labor appears as loss of reality for the workers; objectification as loss of the object and object-bondage; appropriation asestrangement, as alienation.2

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1278

> The worker puts his life into the object; but now his life no longer belongs to him but to the object. Hence, the greater this activity, the greater is the worker's lack of objects. Whatever the product of his labor is, he is not. Therefore the greater this product, the less is he himself. The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power on its own confronting him; it means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1321

> What, then, constitutes the alienation of labor? First, the fact that labor is external to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his essential being; that in his work, therefore, he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy, does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind. The worker therefore only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself. He is at home when he is not working, and when he is working he is not at home. His labor is therefore not voluntary, but coerced; it is forced labor. It is therefore not the satisfaction of a need; it is merely a means to satisfy needs external to it.

---

kindle

Certainly drinking, eating, procreating, etc., are also genuinely human functions. But in the abstraction which separates them from the sphere of all other human activity and turns them into sole and ultimate ends, they are animal. We have considered the act of estranging practical human activity, labor, in two of its aspects. (1) The relation of the worker to the product of labor as an alien object exercising power over him. This relation is at the same time the relation to the sensuous external world, to the objects of nature as an alien world antagonistically opposed to him. (2) The relation of labor to the act of production within the labor process. This relation is the relation of the worker to his own activity as an alien activity not belonging to him; it is activity as suffering, strength as weakness, begetting as emasculating, the worker's own physical and mental energy, his personal life or what is life other than activity—as an activity which is turned against him, neither depends on nor belongs to him. Here we have self-estrangement, as we had previously the estrangement of the thing. We have yet a third aspect of estranged labor to deduce from the two already considered. Man is a species being, not only because in practice and in theory he adopts the species as his object (his own as well as those of other things), but—and this is only another way of expressing it—but also because he treats himself as the actual, living species; because he treats himself as a universal and therefore a free being. The life of the species, both in man and in animals, consists physically in the fact that man (like the animal) lives on inorganic nature; and the more universal man is compared with an animal, the more universal is the sphere of inorganic nature on which he lives. Just as plants, animals, stones, the air, light, etc., constitute a part of human consciousness in the realm of theory, partly as objects of natural science, partly as objects of art—his spiritual inorganic nature, spiritual nourishment which he must first prepare to make it palatable and digestable—so too in the realm of practice they constitute a part of human life and human activity. Physically man lives only on these products of nature, whether they appear in the form of food, heating, clothes, a dwelling, or whatever it may be. The universality of man is in practice manifested precisely in the universality which makes all nature his inorganic body—both inasmuch as nature is (1) his direct means of life, and (2) the material, the object, and the instrument of his life-activity. Nature is man's inorganic body— nature, that is, insofar as it is not itself the human body. Man lives on nature—means that nature is his body, with which he must remain in continuous intercourse if he is not to die. That man's physical and spiritual life is linked to nature means simply that nature is linked to itself, for man is a part of nature. In estranging from man (1) nature, and (2) himself, his own active functions, his life-activity, estranged labor estranges the species from man. It turns for him the life of the species into a means of individual life. First it estranges the life of the species and individual life, and secondly it makes individual life in its abstract form the purpose of the life of the species, likewise in its abstract and estranged form. For in the first place labor, life-activity, productive life itself, appears to man merely as a means of satisfying a need—the need to maintain the physical existence. Yet the productive life is the life of the species. It is life-engendering life. The whole character of a species—its species character—is contained in the character of its life-activity; and free, conscious activity is man's species character. Life itself appears only as a means to life. The animal is immediately identical with its life-activity. It does not distinguish itself from it. It is its life-activity. Man makes his life-activity itself the object of his will and of his consciousness. He has conscious life-activity. It is not a determination with which he directly merges. Conscious life-activity directly distinguishes man from animal life-activity. It is just because of this that he is a species being. Or it is only because he is a species being that he is a Conscious Being, i.e., that his own life is an object for him. Only because of that is his activity free activity. Estranged labor reverses this relationship, so that it is just because man is a conscious being that he makes his life-activity, his essential being, a mere means to his existence. In creating an objective world by his practical activity, in working-up inorganic nature, man proves himself a conscious species being, i.e., as a being that treats

> the species as its own essential being, or that treats itself as a species being. Admittedly animals also produce. They build themselves nests, dwellings, like the bees, beavers, ants, etc. But an animal only produces what it immediately needs for itself or its young. It produces one-sidedly, while man produces universally. It produces only under the dominion of immediate physical need, while man produces even when he is free from physical need and only truly produces in freedom therefrom. An animal produces only itself, while man reproduces the whole of nature. An animal's product belongs immediately to its physical body, while man freely confronts his product. An animal forms things in accordance with the standard and the need of the species to which it belongs, while man knows how to produce in accordance with the standard of every species, and knows how to apply everywhere the inherent standard to the object. Man therefore also forms things in accordance with the laws of beauty.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1386

> The object of labor is, therefore, the objectification of man's species life: for he duplicates himself not only, as in consciousness, intellectually, but also actively, in reality, and therefore he contemplates himself in a world that he has created. In tearing away from man the object of his production, therefore, estranged labor tears from him his species life, his real species objectivity, and transforms his advantage over animals into the disadvantage that his inorganic body, nature, is taken from him. Similarly, in degrading spontaneous activity, free activity, to a means, estranged labor makes man's species life a means to his physical existence.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1395

> Estranged labor turns thus: (3) Man's species being, both nature and his spiritual species property, into a being alien to him, into a means to his individual existence. It estranges man's own body from him, as it does external nature and his spiritual essence, his human being. (4) An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labor, from his life-activity, from his species being is the estrangement of man from man. If a man is confronted by himself, he is confronted by the other man. What applies to a man's relation to his work, to the product of his labor and to himself, also holds of a man's relation to the other man, and to the other man's labor and object of labor.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1487

> Before considering this configuration, however, let us try to solve two problems. (1) To define the general nature of private property, as it has arisen as a result of estranged labor, in its relations to truly human, social property. (2) We have accepted the estrangement of labor, its alienation, as a fact, and we have analyzed this fact. How, we now ask, does man come to alienate, to estrange, his labor? How is this estrangement rooted in the nature of human development? We have already gone a long way to the solution of this problem by transforming the question as to the origin of private property into the question as to the relation of alienated labor to the course of humanity's development. For when one speaks of private property, one thinks of being concerned with something external to man. When one speaks of labor, one is directly concerned with man himself. This new formulation of question already contains its solution.

---

kindle

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1507

> Having seen that in relation to the worker who appropriates nature by means of his labor, this appropriation appears as estrangement, his own spontaneous activity as activity for another and as an activity of another, vitality as a sacrifice of life, production of the object as loss of the object to an alien power, to an alien person—we shall now consider the relation to the worker, to labor and its object of this person who is alien to labor and the worker. First it has to be noted, that everything which appears in the worker as an activity of alienation, of estrangement, appears in the non-worker as a state of alienation, of estrangement. Secondly, that the worker's real, practical attitude in production and to the product (as a state of mind) appears in the non-worker confronting him as a theoretical attitude. Thirdly, the non-worker does everything against the worker which the worker does against himself; but he does not do against himself what he does against the worker. Let us look more closely at these three relations.4 [4. At this point the first manuscript breaks off unfinished.—Ed.]

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1645

> The real course of development (to be inserted at this point) results in the necessary victory of the capitalist over the landowner—that is to say, of developed over undeveloped immature private property—just as generally movement must triumph over immobility—open, self-conscious baseness over hidden, unconscious baseness; avarice over self-indulgence; the avowedly restless, adroit self-interest of enlightenment over the parochial, worldwise, naive, idle and deluded self-interest of superstition; and moneyover the other forms of private property.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1862

> Communism as the positive transcendence of private property, as human self-estrangement, and therefore as the real appropriation of the human essence by and for man; communism therefore as the complete return of man to himself as a social (i.e., human) being—a return become conscious, and accomplished within the entire wealth of previous development. This communism, as fully-developed naturalism, equals humanism, and as fully-developed humanism equals naturalism; it is the genuine resolution of the conflict between man and nature and between man and man—the true resolution of the strife between existence and essence, between objectification and self-confirmation, between freedom and necessity, between the individual and the species. Communism is the riddle of history solved, and it knows itself to be this solution. The

---

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1935

> Man appropriates his total essence in a total manner, that is to say, as a whole man. Each of his human relations to the world—seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling, thinking, being aware, sensing, wanting, acting, loving—in short, all the organs of his individual being, like those organs which are directly social in their form, are in their objective orientation or in their orientation to the object, the appropriation of that object, the appropriation of the human world; their orientation to the object is the manifestation of the human world;3 it is human efficaciousness and human suffering, for suffering, apprehended humanly, is an enjoyment of self in man.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1943

> Private property has made us so stupid and one-sided that an object is only ours when we have it—when it exists for us as capital, or when it is directly possessed, eaten, drunk, worn, inhabited, etc.,—in short, when it is used by us. Although private property itself again conceives all these direct realizations of possession as means of life, and the life which they serve as means is the life of private property—labor and conversion into capital. In place of all these physical and mental senses there has therefore come the sheer estrangement of all these senses —the sense of having. The human being had to be reduced to this absolute poverty in order that he might yield his inner wealth to the outer world. (On the category of “having,” see Hess in the Twenty-One Sheets.4)

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 1953

> The transcendence of private property is therefore the complete emancipation of all human senses and attributes; but it is this emancipation precisely because these senses and attributes have become, subjectively and objectively, human. The eye has become a human eye, just as its object has become a social, human object—an object emanating from man for man. The senses have therefore become directly in their practice theoreticians. They relate themselves to the thing for the sake of the thing, but the thing itself is an objective human relation to itself and to man,5 and vice versa Need or enjoyment have consequently lost their egotistical nature, and nature has lost its mere utility by use becoming human use.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 2086

> Socialism is man’s positive self-consciousness, no longer mediated through the annulment of religion, just as real life is man’s positive reality, no longer mediated through the annulment of private property, through communism. Communism is the position as the negation of the negation, and is hence the actual phase necessary for the next stage of historical development in the process of human emancipation and recovery. Communism is the necessary pattern and the dynamic principle of the immediate future, but communism as such8 is not the goal of human development—the structure of human society.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 2306

> The diminution in the interest on money, which Proudhon regards as the annulling of capital and as the tendency to socialize capital, is really and immediately, therefore, only a symptom of the total victory of working capital over extravagant wealth— i.e., the transformation of all private property into industrial capital. It is a total victory of private property over all those of its qualities which are still in appearance human, and the complete subjection of the owner of private property to the essence of private property—labor. To be sure, the industrial capitalist also takes his pleasures. He does not by any means return to the unnatural simplicity of need; but his pleasure is only a side-issue—recuperation—something subordinated to production: at the same time it is a calculatedand, therefore, itself an economical pleasure. For he debits it to his capital’s expense-account, and what is squandered on his pleasure must therefore amount to no more than will be replaced with profit through the reproduction of capital. Pleasure is therefore subsumed under capital, and the pleasure-taking individual under the capital-accumulating individual, while formerly the contrary was the case. The decrease in the interest-rate is therefore a symptom of the annulment of capital only inasmuch as it is a symptom of the rule of capital in the process of perfecting itself—of the estrangement in the process of becoming fully-developed and therefore of hastening to its annulment. This is indeed the only way in which that which exists affirms its opposite.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 2422

> The whole of modern political economy agrees, however, that division of labor and wealth of production, division of labor and accumulation of capital, are mutually interrelated; just as it agrees that liberated private property alone—private property left to itself—can produce the most useful and comprehensive division of labor. Adam Smith's argument can be summed up as follows: Division of labor bestows on labor infinite production capacity. It stems from the propensity to exchange and barter, a specifically human propensity which is probably not fortuitous but is conditioned by the use of reason and speech. The motive of those who engage in exchange is not humanity but egoism. The diversity of human talents is more the effect than the cause of the division of labor—i.e., of exchange. Besides, it is only the latter which makes such diversity useful. The differences between the particular attributes to which nature gives rise within a species of animal are much more marked than the degrees of difference in human aptitude and activity. But because animals are unable to engage in exchange, no individual animal benefits from the difference in the attributes of animals of the same species but of different breeds. Animals are unable to combine the different attributes of their species, and are unable to contribute anything to the common advantage and comfort of the species. It is otherwise with men, among whom the most dissimilar talents and forms of activity are of use to one another, because they can bring their different products together into a common stock, from which each can purchase. As the division of labor springs from the propensity to exchange, it grows and is limited by the extent of exchange—by the extent of the market. In advanced conditions, every man is a merchant, and society is a commercial society. Say regards exchange as accidental and not fundamental. Society could exist without it. It becomes indispensable in the advanced state of society. Yet production cannot take place without it. Division of labor is a convenient, useful means—a skillful deployment of human powers for social wealth; but it reduces the ability of each person taken individually. The last remark is a step forward for Say.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 2445

> Mill presents trade as the consequence of the division of labor. With him human activity is reduced to mechanical motion. Division of labor and use of machinery promote wealth of production. Each person must be entrusted with as small a sphere of operations as possible. Division of labor and use of machinery for their part require the production of wealth, and therefore of the product, in large quantities. This is the reason for large manufactories.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 2449

> The examination of division of labor and exchange is of extreme interest, because these are perceptibly alienated expressions of human activity and of essential human power as a species activity and power. To assert that division of labor and exchange rest on private property is nothing short of asserting that labor is the essence of private property—an assertion which the political economist cannot prove and which we wish to prove for him. Precisely in the fact that division of labor and exchange are embodiments of private property lies the twofold proof, on the one hand that human life required private property for its realization, and on the other hand that it now requires the supersession of private property. Division of labor and exchange are the two phenomena in connection with which the political economist boasts of the social character of his science and in the same breath gives expression to the contradiction in his science—the establishment of society through unsocial, particular interests. The factors we have to consider are: the propensity to exchange—the basis of which is found in egoism

> —regarded as the cause or reciprocal effect of the division of labor. Say regards exchange as not fundamental to the nature of society. Wealth— production—is explained by division of labor and exchange. The impoverishment of individual activity, and its loss of character as a result of the division of labor, are admitted. Exchange and division of labor are acknowledged as the sources of the great diversity of human talents—a diversity which in its turn becomes useful as a result of exchange. Skarbek divides man's essential powers of production—or productive powers— into two parts: (1) those which are individual and inherent in him—his intelligence and his special disposition, or capacity, for work; and (2) those derived from society and not the actual individual—division of labor and exchange. Furthermore, the division of labor is limited by the market. Human labor is simple mechanical motion: the main work is done by the material properties of the objects. The fewest possible operations must be apportioned to any one individual. Splitting up of labor and concentration of capital; the nothingness of individual production and the production of wealth in large quantities. Meaning of free private property within the division of labor.13

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 2568

> Shakespeare excellently depicts the real nature of money. To understand him, let us begin, first of all, by expounding the passage from Goethe.

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 2587

> Shakespeare stresses especially two properties of money: (1) It is the visible divinity—the transformation of all human and natural properties into their contraries, the universal confounding and overturning of things: it makes brothers of impossibilities. (2) It is the common whore, the common pimp of people and nations. The

---

Highlight (Geel) | Locatie 2616

> Money, then, appears as this overturning power both against the individual and against the bonds of society, etc., which claim to be essences in themselves. It transforms fidelity into infidelity, love into hate, hate into love, virtue into vice, vice into virtue, servant into master, master into servant, idiocy into intelligence and intelligence into idiocy.
