



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2018

Time subsumed or time sublated?

Steineck, Raji C

Abstract: Rezensierte Publikation : Harry D. Harootunian: Marx after Marx: History and time in the expansion of capitalism. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015, 312 pp., ISBN 978-0-231-17480-0

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/asia-2017-0060>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-151553>

Journal Article

Published Version

Originally published at:

Steineck, Raji C (2018). Time subsumed or time sublated? *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques*, 71(4):1339-1353.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/asia-2017-0060>

Rezensionen – Comptes rendus – Reviews

Harry D. Harootunian: *Marx after Marx: History and time in the expansion of capitalism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015, 312 pp., ISBN 978-0-231-17480-0.

Reviewed by **Raji C. Steineck**, Asien-Orient-Institut, University of Zurich, Zürichbergstrasse 4, 8032 Zürich, Switzerland. E-mail: raji.steineck@aoi.uzh.ch

<https://doi.org/10.1515/asia-2017-0060>

1 Overview of the argument

To put the conclusion first: this is not an easy book to read, and while it raises problems and questions that are very much worthwhile considering, it does not offer a consistent and well-stated argument for its cause. There are three main reasons behind this: first, the author himself appears to be of two minds about his subject. Second, while the book takes the form of an extended literature review, Harootunian does not offer a critical appraisal of the positions he wishes us to consider in the light of pertinent research. Finally, in terms of form, the book has clearly not undergone a rigorous editing process. In the following, I will shortly present the author and contextualize the book in light of his previous writings, before I summarize the book's main argument and its most important insights. I will then consider where Harootunian fails to deliver on his theoretical ambition and point to more convincing approaches and solutions. Finally, a short appendix offers a select list of the editorial lapses that make the book unnecessarily difficult to read.

2 The author

Harry Harootunian has made a name for himself as an intellectual historian of early modern to contemporary Japan, whose work is informed by strong theoretical ambition. His books on the Edo period School of National Learning, or, as he termed it, “Nativism” (*kokugaku* 国学),¹ on thinkers “overcome by modernity” in the early twentieth century,² or on postmodernism in Japan³ have all won

1 Harootunian 1988.

2 Harootunian 2000a.

3 Miyoshi / Harootunian 1989.

praise for providing fresh views on their subjects and introducing new sources to Western readers, although critics have also noted that his readings of these sources are at times forced or inaccurate.⁴ From the outset of his career, Harootunian has also consistently striven to integrate his work as an intellectual historian of Japan with larger theoretical issues and agendas, and he has been a vociferous critic of patterns in Western Japanese studies, history, and social theory that worked to parochialize the Japanese (or any other Non-Western) experience, or place it on the Procrustes' bed of a standard Western model of modernization.⁵ This agenda is also clearly visible in the book under consideration.

3 The argument in *Marx after Marx*

Marx after Marx follows a trend of recent decades to interpret the history of capitalism through the lens of the categories of formal and real subsumption.⁶ It may be best understood as an extended meditation on the following statement from the draft chapter on the results of the direct production process for *Capital*, Vol. I:

The labour process becomes the instrument of the valorization process, the process of the self-valorization of capital—the manufacture of surplus-value. The labour process is subsumed under capital (it is its own process) and the capitalist intervenes in the process as its director, manager. For him it also represents the direct exploitation of the labour of others. It is this that I refer to as the *formal subsumption of labour under capital*. It is the general form of every capitalist process of production; at the same time, however, it can be found as a *particular* form alongside the *specifically capitalist mode of production* in its developed form, because although the latter entails the former, the converse does not necessarily obtain [i. e. the formal subsumption can be found in the absence of the specifically capitalist mode of production.]⁷

To put it briefly, in the social form of capitalism, the labour process is geared towards the production of surplus value, either *formally*, when its material configuration is largely left to independent agents of production, or both *formally and materially*, when its whole configuration comes to be

4 Nakai 1989; Linhart 2001.

5 Harootunian 2000b; Harootunian 2004; Kuklick 2006.

6 For an instructive critical review, see Endnotes 2010.

7 Marx 1990: 1019.

organised by the managing agents of capital.⁸ Whether labour is subsumed in one or the other form depends not only on the development of the means of production, but also on the actual dynamics between the social forces at work in a given situation — including not only the state of class relations, but also competition between different groups of capitalists, political powers and so forth.

Harootunian works through the consequences of this idea in order to argue in favour of a non-linear conception of history, and for a dynamic understanding of capitalist accumulation as an ongoing process. His fundamental hypothesis is that formal subsumption must be understood not as a finite historical stage, but as an articulation of capitalist relations of production that exists at each phase in the history of capitalism, from its past to any of its possible futures: “The importance of the copresence of both formal subsumption and primitive accumulation in future presents alongside capitalist accumulation ... constitutes one of the principal arguments of this book.” (10) The concept, Harootunian holds, allows us to grasp diverging trajectories within capitalism’s development, in accordance with the relevant constellations of technological, social and political factors. It therefore provides, in his words, “[...] a way out of both the vulgate Marxian and modernizing bourgeois historical narratives constrained to fulfilling teleologically determined agendas of capitalism that have claimed the unfolding of a singular trajectory everywhere.” (19) What he hopes to achieve is a more apposite and empathetic understanding of the specific constellations engendered by the process of capitalist accumulation in Non-Western countries:

It is the argument of this book that the production of unevenness, like capitalism’s organization of the workday, was empowered to act as an agent disposing people into disciplined routines, creating the occasions for animating political events and action. Beyond that, it might additionally be suggested that the experience of the interaction of ‘lateness’ and necessity of living through more intensely and consciously the spectacle of unevenness early persuaded societies like Japan to recognize that they were being forced to live comparatively. (16–17)

This passage, which by the way gives a good impression of Harootunian’s style, also illuminates the particular approach he takes to realize his agenda. The perspective he offers on the subject of Capitalist subsumption and on Capitalism in general has as its vanishing point the term “unevenness.” To be sure, ‘uneven development’ has been a topic of fruitful discussion for some decades now. The debate has moved the concept far beyond its Trotskyan roots,

8 For a more detailed explanation of the concept, see Murray 2004.

providing important arguments against the neo-liberal ideology of convergence.⁹ Harootunian is, however, less interested in empirical or theoretical research on the mechanisms of capitalist accumulation. He takes ‘unevenness’ to mean the co-existence of forms of social organisation that were initially formed in different historical epochs and conform to different temporalities. He furthermore holds this kind of unevenness to be essential to the existence of capitalism, which, he maintains, cannot survive without reproducing it. At the same time, he takes it to be capitalism’s essential fault line, which provides the opening for various forms of resistance and alternative roads of development of and beyond capitalism:

If capitalism failed to completely control the uneven mix, the practices and institutions embodying the different historical temporalities it retained from the past to serve the pursuit of value, it was because it needed to produce unevenness as a condition of its own continuing condition. (20)

The very unevenness shared by different presents put into question the illusory claim of capitalism’s inevitable completion everywhere and its claims to sameness and supplied inducements to consider instances attesting to successful resistances to the prevailing forms of capitalism beyond Euro-America. (19)

This basic idea is developed through a re-reading of authors that are placed in opposition to Western Marxism. Chapter headings such as “Marxism’s Eastward Migration” (chapter 2) and “Opening to the Global South” (chapter 3) indicate the intention to rectify a perceived self-absorbedness of much of the tradition of Marxism in the West, which Harootunian identifies largely with the cultural critique of the Frankfurt school and accuses of political quietism. (68)¹⁰ In order for things to fall into this scheme, however, he has to ignore or misread a substantial part of the literature (from authors like Ernest Mandel and the representatives of the “Neue Marx Lektüre”,¹¹ to the extensive literature on “uneven development”), and to re-assign authors like Rosa Luxemburg and Gramsci to the global East or South. More importantly, the decision to foreground a spatial division in his appreciation of the Marxian traditions only echoes the fundamental conviction expressed in his choice to posit “unevenness” as the essential line of conflict in capitalism. Cultural identities and their

⁹ Harvey 1975; Smith 1984; Wainwright 2013.

¹⁰ This accusation is also directed at Antonio Negri, who, although he is dismissed with two cursory remarks (2, 68), seems to be very much on Harootunian’s mind, as evident from his choice of title, which obviously parodies Negri’s *Marx beyond Marx*. Negri 1979; 1991.

¹¹ Only Backhaus is mentioned once, and dismissed as a “stagist” (68).

differences are thus placed in a paramount position on the level of theory as well as on the level of social analysis.

Fortunately, however, Harootunian retains enough of Marxian theory to not fully fall for such a culturalist view. Having spent much effort on a vociferous criticism of traditional Marxist stage theory (see eg. 67–72, 215–218, 224) —which appears to me as a dead horse not in need of further flogging— he moves on, in the final chapter of this book, to a concise criticism of postmodernist/postcolonial hypostases of alterity. In the said chapter, Harootunian takes Dipesh Chakrabarty and other proponents of postcolonialism to task for juxtaposing a reified model of capitalist relations of production with an equally reified vision of purportedly non-capitalist cultures (Chakrabarty’s “history 2”¹²):

By misrecognizing the operation of formal subsumption and its appropriation of what it considered useful from the precapitalist past, each [scil. Banaji and Chakrabarty] would transmute historically derived practices into ahistorical components of an irreducible cultural essence that defied both history’s and time’s erosions and asymmetries. (226)

This is certainly a valid and important point to make. Unfortunately, Harootunian stops here instead of digging deeper into the framework that supports the said misrecognition. Most significantly, he fails to take note of a seminal conceptual mistake in Chakrabarty’s analysis of labour and labour relations, that is, his conflation of abstract labour with the homogenised labour of the modern factory.

4 Abstract and concrete labour

In Marx’s view, the value of each commodity is qualitatively determined as “abstract labour” and quantitatively measured by the labour time socially necessary for its production that is validated in the process of exchange. Marx develops this concept of “abstract labour” in opposition to the idea of “concrete labour”, i. e. the labour that was actually exerted when the commodity was produced; he uses it to explain that the value of a commodity originates in a specific social relation, and not (as the classical labour theory of value had it) from the fact that so much human effort was used to generate the product.¹³ Chakrabarty, however, identifies abstract labour with a *concrete labour process*, namely that of the modern factory, which is the result of real subsumption. In

¹² Chakrabarty 2000: 62–71.

¹³ For a useful discussion of the intricacies of the concept of ‘abstract’ vs. ‘concrete’ labour in Marx, see Murray 2000.

his theory, abstract labour becomes a *mode* of concrete labour, which means that the conceptual difference between the two has collapsed.¹⁴ Conversely, he believes that there exists, in capitalism, spheres of purely concrete labour, in which pre-capitalist formations of the metabolism of human beings with their environment remain intact. In other words, he succumbs to an essentialism of the concrete that is also the hallmark of the fetishism of use value—meaning the identification of the production of use values as the ultimate goal of capitalist production and the concomitant glorification of concrete labour and its products over and against abstract labour and money.¹⁵ This is no minor mistake, because it is precisely the elation of use value that consistently supports reactionary anti-capitalism.¹⁶

5 Formal and real subsumption

I have digressed here on Chakrabarty because, as indicated, for the major part of his book Harootunian falls prey to a similar misconception. He treats formal subsumption as a particular form that would leave pre-extant social formations and ideas substantially intact. Following the received, underconsumptionist reading of Luxemburg, he contends that capitalism will never achieve full-fledged “real subsumption,” because it needs buyers not fully integrated into its system in order to realise surplus value (95–96).¹⁷ Formal subsumption as a separate social configuration would then be necessary to stabilise spheres of non-capitalist socio-cultural forms.

This vision is supported by a sympathy Harootunian shares with a large part of his sources for the “traditional communism” of pre-capitalist societies, such as the Incas (see eg. 139–140, here referring to Mariátegui). Several times he returns to Marx’s draft letters to Vera Zasulich to argue that the existence, by virtue of formal subsumption, of older strata of communal cooperative values and forms of organisation in capitalist societies offers the chance of a historical

¹⁴ Murray 2000: 51–57. Chakrabarty is certainly not the only one to commit this “tempting conceptual mistake,” as Chris Arthur has called it. See Arthur 2000: 9, and his subsequent elucidation, Arthur 2000: 9–10.

¹⁵ Chakrabarty explicitly makes the link to “use value” and goes on to connect that concept to Heideggerian considerations of “ontic belonging”, see Chakrabarty 2000: 67–71.

¹⁶ Postone 1980: 110–111.

¹⁷ The references are to: Luxemburg 2003: 309–327, 332. Harootunian’s reading of Luxemburg may be overly simplified, see Bellofiore 2004.

trajectory sidestepping hallmarks of classical individualistic capitalism and its political forms (53, 76,101–102, 221). There remains, in his words

the intimation of a time external to and dissimilar from capitalism, a world where use-value and the nondifferentiation of subject and object still supposedly prevailed, bringing with it possibilities for different forms of political community (55).

This quote clearly demonstrates that Harootunian shares in that inadequate criticism of capitalism and exchange value which directly connects to the fetishisation of use-value. As a consequence, when defining the main goal of his intervention, Harootunian shifts the emphasis from the contradiction/conflict inherent to the value form (that between capital and labour) to the differences between various instances of formal subsumption and their constellations of purely capitalist and earlier relations of production (and social domination):

[...] it seems to me that this was a crucial problem in all those earlier Marxist tactical controversies that sought to align peasants, living under semifeudal conditions belonging more to medieval agricultural life than modernity, to industrial workers, without considering the different temporal regimes characterizing and separating each. It was even truer of the encounter of industrial capitalism and the victims of colonial seizure. (26–27)

In terms of “tactical controversies,” Harootunian has a valid point. Attention to different temporalities in the organisation of daily lives, and concomitant value orientations, will indeed be important when attempting to integrate peasants and industrial workers into one political movement. But framing this as the co-existence of different *historical* temporalities reifies the respective forms of temporal organization into isolated and static entities. It also overlooks how capitalism transforms, in the course of its making, those older forms it encounters and, at first, formally subsumes.

6 Theory and empiry in the study of historical trajectories: Uno Kōzō and the agricultural question in Japan

This movement of reification is directly related to another problematic feature of the book. Throughout his discussion, Harootunian substitutes theory for engagement with historical sources and literature. His treatment of Uno Kōzō’s assessment concerning the development of capitalism in Japan is a case in

point. Harootunian marshals the thought of Uno as a witness for theorising unevenness, because of Uno's understanding that the development of capitalism may differ between societies and economies depending on the historical point in time in which it occurs. He realises that, for Uno, such difference in development does not lead to ossified forms of different capitalisms (189–190¹⁸). Specifically, Uno demonstrated how in Japan, capitalist industrialization did not require the forced separation of large numbers of the workforce from the land. Furthermore, like other latecomers to capitalism, Japan achieved the necessary pooling of large amounts of capital through a bank-based joint-stock system.¹⁹ This aspect was recently elaborated by Lapavitsas in his comparative analysis of finance capital.²⁰ Research into the transformation of local lenders into urban financial agents in the late Edo period has furthermore shed light on the historical basis of this developmental trajectory.²¹ In contrast, agriculture in Japan continued to be dominated by the small-scale, subsistence-based farm, with the concomitant continuation of patriarchal forms of social organization and life in the village, because under capitalist conditions these farms and villages provided for a large surplus labour force even without eviction of small-scale proprietors from their land.²² As Harootunian duly notes, Uno insisted, against traditional Marxist readings, that this did not mean the coexistence of 'old' (feudal) and 'new' (capitalist) social forms, because rural life had already been transformed by the demands of capitalist production: The commodification of land and of raw materials had subjected production to the monetarised economy, and complementary small-scale, subsistence based artisanship had been crowded out by urban industrial production (190–191²³). However, in a paradoxical move Harootunian announces all this to mean that "... bypassing the grosser effects of primitive accumulation permitted maintaining the prior medieval village intact in a society like Japan ..." (186). This is in contrast not only to Uno, but also contradicts, without any adduction of evidence, a host of research in recent decades which has demonstrated how commodification of Japanese agriculture had changed the realities of rural life to a large extent long before the forced restructuring of the country in the late nineteenth century.²⁴

18 Referring to Uno 1973: 37–38.

19 Uno 1973: 48–55.

20 Lapavitsas 2013.

21 Toby 1991.

22 Uno 1973: 54–55.

23 Referring to Uno 1973: 54–55.

24 Saitō 1986; Toby 1991; Brandt 1993; Francks 2005; Marcon 2014. Most pertinent to Harootunian's focus on "uneven" temporal regimes and time consciousnesses is Smith 1986,

7 Authoritarianism, capitalist violence, and the rural village

By hypostatizing an unchanging “medieval village” as a source of resistance to capitalism, Harootunian loses sight of two real problems that he might otherwise have raised for the profit of his readers: First, why is it that the ‘modernised’ rural sector lends itself so well to mobilisation for authoritarian and nationalist projects? With regard to this question, he could have gone back to an observation by Marx in his “British Rule of India”:

[...] we must not forget that these idyllic village-communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies. [...] We must not forget that these little communities were contaminated by distinctions of caste and by slavery, that they subjugated man to external circumstances instead of elevating man the sovereign of circumstances [...].²⁵

The a-historical notion of “Oriental despotism” and illusions of human sovereignty aside, convictions that Marx parted with in *Capital*,²⁶ this is an observation all those still sympathising with archaic communism should take to heart. It is, incidentally, followed up by Uno in his analysis of the causal links between the social structure of rural Japan up to the time of his writing (1946, probably before the land reform of the same year, which is not part of his analysis) and the way this structure fostered authoritarian rule. As Uno explains in the pages immediately following those quoted by Harootunian, commodification of Japanese agriculture in the 19th and first half of the twentieth century did not lead to the expropriation of small-scale landholders. To the contrary, the numerically dominant group were petty agriculturalists who in addition to their small properties competed for leasehold in order to increase yield and income. This cohort, which in 1946 still amounted to 40–50 % of the Japanese workforce, depended mostly on family labour for production. Ruthless self-exploitation enabled them to accede to the payment of inordinately high rents. Because they neither entered into wage-

which provides forceful evidence that the monetarized economy of the Edo period already changed temporal regimes and time consciousness in rural villages towards a view of time as a quantitative resource concomitant with capitalism.

²⁵ Marx 2005 [1853].

²⁶ Tomba 2013.

labour themselves, nor contracted wage-labourers on a larger scale, they retained patrimonial relations within their production unit, and, more importantly in terms of their political outlook and impact, with the landlords from whom they obtained leaseholds. That is, until the land reform of 1946 many tenure contracts remained informal and unwritten, rent was often natural instead of monetary, and the tenants requested and regularly obtained cancellation of rent in case of severe crop failure.²⁷

Uno observes that in such a situation of informal patriarchal dependence, formally free elections and parliamentary government cannot function to properly represent the diverging forces in society. There is a pressure from below to retain patriarchal relations that translates into authoritarian politics.²⁸ One can only wonder why Harootunian ignored this point, instead of elaborating on it.

Writing in the 1940s, Uno was already far from ascribing this structure to some stable element of Japanese psychology. He envisioned substantial changes in the rural structure, concomitant with a large-scale shift in the composition of the workforce and a higher degree of integration of Japanese agriculture into a global competitive market.²⁹ Needless to say, this is largely what happened in the postwar period, starting with the land reform in 1946.

Second, and very important in a comparative perspective, by attributing the alleged persistence of intact pre-capitalist social forms under formal subsumption to a fundamental *incapacity* of capitalism to fully take control and establish real subsumption, Harootunian overlooks the violent ways in which the agents dominant in formal subsumption *prevent* development (both technological and social) if it is not in their immediate capitalist interest. To exemplify, let me quote from S. Banarjee's insightful article on the management of capitalism through the systematic infliction of violence:

The colonial expansionist practices of the British empire in the 1800s involved both capital appropriation and permanent destruction of manufacturing capacities in the colonies — the 'technological superiority' of the British textile industry, for example, was established as much by invention as by a systematic destruction of India's indigenous industry, including some innovative competitive strategies that involved cutting off the thumbs of master weavers in Bengal, the forced cultivation of indigo by Bihar's peasants as well as the slave trade from Africa that supplied cotton plantations in the US with free labor.³⁰

27 Uno 1973: 59. See also Uno 1973: 45–49.

28 Uno 1973: 60.

29 Uno 1973: 62.

30 Banerjee 2008: 1542, referring to Dutt 1970; Shiva 2001: 34.

8 The theory of capitalist subsumption

In terms of theory, this indicates that Harootunian's dichotomical juxtaposition of formal and real subsumption in itself is deeply problematic. To elaborate, as Murray argues in his lucid exploration of these notions in Marx, the terms are correlated to the creation of absolute and relative surplus value:

[...] the changes to the production process that Marx identifies with increasing absolute surplus-value involve simply formal subsumption, while those transformations required for relative surplus-value involve real subsumption. Between them, formal subsumption and real subsumption under capital bring about a continual hubbub of social and material revolution, yet in the same stroke, they enforce social stasis because they strengthen and expand the hold of the law of value and capital's web of value-forms.³¹

What follows from this is that,

[a]bsolute and relative surplus-value are 'flow' concepts; they discriminate, at any level of the development of productive power, whether an increase in surplus-value is due to extending the working day (absolute surplus-value) or increasing the productivity of labour (relative surplus-value).³²

Murray relates the increase of relative surplus-value mostly to technological strategies in the improvement of productivity. Technically speaking, however, relative surplus-value can also be increased by diminishing the value of labour-power through other means, such as forcing the labourers to accept a lower standard of living. This is simply the application of the same principle under different circumstances – relative surplus-value now is increased by coercively lowering the value of labor. More appropriately, one may say that technical innovation and degradation of the standards of living are two sides of the same coin: productivity is increased in agriculture to lower the costs of reproduction of labour, with the ensuing degradation of the quality of food and of the environment.³³ Real subsumption thus may as well take the form of controlled technological stagnation and social devolution. Needless to say, authoritarian regimes, which weaken the negotiating power of labour and assist in its coercive treatment, are most helpful in this regard, as are religious ideologies fostering

31 Murray 2004: 246.

32 Murray 2004: 248. On the dynamic interrelation of formal and real subsumption, see also Marx 1990: 646–647, and London 1997: 275–278. London's article also provides an insightful complement to Harootunian's abstract treatment of capitalism's development in Latin America.

33 I am indebted to Dr. Elena Lange for this theoretical clarification. See Marx 1990: 429–438. Bellofiore's (2004: 285–291) reading of Luxemburg is equally instructive in this regard. See also Luxemburg 1972: 156–167.

complacency and the idolatry of work. Both historically and systematically speaking, capitalism does not necessarily work in favour of liberal democracy.

Marx himself, in the text on the “Results of the Immediate Process of Production” which contains the passage that forms the starting point of Harootunian’s deliberations, describes another aspect of the dynamic interrelation of formal and real subsumption:

If the production of absolute surplus value was the material expression of the formal subsumption of labour under capital, then the production of relative surplus value may be viewed as its real subsumption.

At any rate, if we consider the two forms of surplus value, absolute and relative, separately, we shall see that absolute surplus-value always precedes relative. To these two forms of surplus value there correspond two separate forms of the subsumption of labour under capital, or two distinct forms of capitalist production. And here too one form always precedes the other, although the second form, the more highly developed one, can provide the foundations for the introduction of the first in new branches of industry.³⁴

In other words, far from envisioning the coexistence of formal and real subsumption as a sign of capitalism’s need to reproduce its own outside, as Harootunian would have it, Marx perceives formal subsumption as one element within the dynamics of capitalist development that serves to make inroads into new areas to be subjugated to capitalist production, paving the way for the re-structuring of additional sectors of social activity in accordance with capital’s need to valorize itself through the appropriation of surplus-value.

But even on a note closer to Harootunian’s agenda, in analysing the historical experiences of the ‘global South’, and the various states of unevenness, it will certainly be more helpful to resort to a dynamic understanding of formal and real subsumption in their mutual interaction. This will not only serve to better explain the realities of coercive capitalism, including its implication with political authoritarianism and massive violence. It would arguably also be more apposite in regard to current developments, both in the hubs of advanced technological development and in the peripheries churning out the mass of material commodities by which we live. The problems we face can hardly be explained by capitalism’s incapacity to ever fully come into its own; rather, they are problems of its relentless colonisation of all aspects of human life — that is, they are problems of real subsumption.

34 Marx 1990: 1025.

Funding: Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung, (Grant / Award Number: ‘100012_146246’).

Appendix

Select editorial lacunae

Misspellings, omissions, redundancies:

“in the capitalist mode of mode of production itself” (40); “it is formerly speaking voluntary” (56); “Be that has it may” (74); “With Chakrabarty, as shall see,” (229); “In Asia, only Japan managed to successfully to escape the direct consequences of imperial colonization ...” (153).

Convoluted, ungrammatical sentences

“This is in part the ‘secret of the commodity form itself,’ and the reason that ‘work assumed the form of value of a commodity’ is thus committed to ‘affirm [ing] its social character only in the commodity form of its product’” (58).

“Lenin ... acknowledged that an ‘infinitely diverse combinations of elements of this or that type of capitalist evolution are possible.’” (84)

“The changeover to rotation conformed to procedures belonging to industrial capitalism that was completed with the reorganization inserting the wretched cottage system into the production process.” (181)

“The purpose of the book was to show that when Marx assigned to the working class the role of history’s agent, he also implied that since the worker, as one of the personifications of capitalism (but not quite like the capitalist, actually the personification of labor in the capital-labor dyad, according to Marx), belonged to a class situated within bourgeois social relationships.” (227)

References

- Arthur, Christopher J. (2000): “Marx, Orthodoxy, Labour, Value”. *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung NF* 1999: 5–11.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata Bobby (2008): “[Necrocapitalism](#)”. *Organization Studies* 29.12: 1541–1563.
- Bellofiore, Riccardo (2004): “‘Like a Candle Burning at Both Ends’: Rosa Luxemburg and the Critique of Political Economy”. In: *Neoliberalism in Crisis, Accumulation, and Rosa Luxemburg’s Legacy*. Edited by Paul Zarembka and Susanne Soederberg. Bingley: Emerald, 279–298.

- Brandt, Loren (1993): "Interwar Japanese Agriculture: Revisionist Views on the Impact of the Colonial Rice Policy and the Labor-Surplus Hypothesis". *Explorations in Economic History* 30.3: 259–293.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh (2000): *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dutt, R. Palme (1970). *India Today*. Calcutta: Manisha.
- Endnotes (2010): "The History of Subsumption by Endnotes". <https://endnotes.org.uk/issues/2/en/endnotes-the-history-of-subsumption> (05/17/2017).
- Francks, Penelope (2005): "Multiple Choices: Rural Household Diversification and Japan's Path to Industrialization". *Journal of Agrarian Change* 5.4: 451–475.
- Harootunian, Harry D. (1988): *Things Seen and Unseen: Discourse and Ideology in Tokugawa Nativism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Harootunian, Harry D. (2000a): *Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Harootunian, Harry D. (2000b): *History's Disquiet: Modernity, Cultural Practice, and the Question of Everyday Life*. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press.
- Harootunian, Harry D. (2004): *The Empire's New Clothes: Paradigm Lost, and Regained*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm.
- Harvey, David (1975): "The Geography of Capitalist Accumulation: A Reconstruction of the Marxian Theory". *Antipode* 7.2: 9–21.
- Kuklick, Bruce (2006): "Review of Harootunian, *The Empire's New Clothes: Paradigm Lost and Regained*". *Pacific Historical Review* 75.2: 329–330.
- Lapavistas, Costas (2013): *Profiting without Producing: How Finance Exploits Us All*. London: Verso.
- Linhart, Sepp (2001): "Review of *History's Disquiet: Modernity, Cultural Practice, and the Question of Everyday Life; Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan*, by Harry Harootunian". *Monumenta Nipponica* 56.3: 409–413.
- London, Christopher E. (1997): "Class Relations and Capitalist Development: Subsumption in the Colombian Coffee Industry, 1928–92". *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 24.4: 269–295.
- Luxemburg, Rosa (1972): *Einführung in die Nationalökonomie*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Luxemburg, Rosa (2003): *The Accumulation of Capital*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Marcon, Federico (2014): "Satō Nobuhiro and the Political Economy of Natural History in Nineteenth-Century Japan". *Japanese Studies* 34.3: 265–287.
- Marx, Karl (1990): *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. I. Transl. Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin books.
- Marx, Karl (2005 [1853]). "The British Rule in India by Karl Marx". <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1853/06/25.htm> (05/17/2017).
- Miyoshi, Masao, Harootunian, Harry D. (1989): *Postmodernism and Japan. Post-Contemporary Interventions*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Murray, Patrick (2000): "Marx's 'Truly Social' Labour Theory of Value: Part I, Abstract Labour in Marxian Value Theory". *Historical Materialism* 6.1: 27–66.
- Murray, Patrick (2004): "The Social and Material Transformation of Production by Capital: Formal and Real Subsumption in Capital". In: *The Constitution of Capital*, Vol. I. Edited by Roberto Bellofiore and Nicola Taylor. New York: Springer, 243–273.
- Nakai, Kate Wildman (1989): Review of *Things Seen and Unseen: Discourse and Ideology in Tokugawa Nativism*, by H. D. Harootunian. *Monumenta Nipponica* 44.2: 224–228.

- Negri, Antonio (1979): *Marx Oltre Marx: Quaderno Di Lavoro Sui Grundrisse* Materiali marxisti; 14. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Negri, Antonio (1991): *Marx beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Autonomedia : Pluto.
- Postone, Moishe (1980): "Anti-Semitism and National Socialism: Notes on the German Reaction to 'Holocaust'". *New German Critique* 19: 97–115.
- Saitō, Osamu (1986): "The Rural Economy: Commercial Agriculture, By-Employment, and Wage Work". In: *Japan in Transition: From Tokugawa to Meiji*. ed. Marius B. Jansen and Gilbert Rozman. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 400–420.
- Shiva, Vandana (2001): *Protect or Plunder?: Understanding Intellectual Property Rights*. London et al.: Palgrave.
- Smith, Neil (1984): *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, Thomas C. (1986): "Peasant Time and Factory Time in Japan". *Past & Present* 111: 165–197.
- Toby, Ronald P. (1991): "Both a Borrower and a Lender Be. From Village Moneylender to Rural Banker in the Tempo Era". *Monumenta Nipponica* 46.4: 483–512.
- Tomba, Massimiliano (2013): "Pre-Capitalistic Forms of Production and Primitive Accumulation". In: *In Marx's Laboratory : Critical Interpretations of the Grundrisse*. Edited by Riccardo Bellofiore. Historical Materialism Book Series 48. Leiden: Brill, 394–411.
- Uno, Kōzō 宇野弘藏 (1973): *Uno Kōzō Chosakushū Dai8kan, Nōgyō Mondai Joron* 宇野弘藏著作集第 8 卷, 農業問題序論 (Uno Kōzō: Works, Vol. 8. Prolegomena on the agricultural question.). Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten.
- Wainwright, Joel (2013): "Uneven Developments: From the Grundrisse to Capital". In: *In Marx's Laboratory : Critical Interpretations of the Grundrisse*. Edited by Riccardo Bellofiore. Historical Materialism Book Series; 48. Leiden: Brill, 371–391.