

PREVIOUS ACCUMULATION, ARTICULATION AND REGULATION ASPECTS OF A GLOBAL THEORY OF REGULATION

SABAH ALNASSERI

INDEX

I. PREVIOUS ACCUMULATION.....	3
II. MODE OF PRODUCTION, SOCIAL FORMATIONS, IMPERIALISTIC CHAIN AND WORLD SYSTEM.....	6
III. THE ARTICULATION OF DIFFERENT MODES OF PRODUCTION.....	11
IV. THE REGULATION OF THE ARTICULATION RELATION.....	14
V. SUMMARY AND VIEWPOINT.....	16

1. In this paper I will examine the terms “previous accumulation” and “articulation”. These aspects are hardly mentioned in the *regulation theory*¹, mainly as the theory not only has difficulties with the analysis of peripheral social formations, but also with questions about the periodization of the capitalist mode of production (in relation to this please see the problematic of Postfordism, Candeias/Deppe 2001). In a methodical sense the articulation between different —capitalistic and non-capitalistic— modes and forms² of production is central, whereby it is important that this relationship should not be determined as functional, but rather more as an internal contradiction. The fundamental question here is theoretically the following: “In the historical reality of capitalism the capitalist relation of production designates the dominating, but not the exclusive mode of societalization. It is always *combined* with other

relations of production and forms of societalization [...] but in a historically changing way. A more exact analysis would show that the capitalist relation of societalization characterized by commodity exchange without the others [...] *cannot exist at all.*” (Hirsch 1990: 33, emphasized and translated³. SA⁴). On which theoretical basis is it now possible to determine this organic relationship more exactly? I would firstly like to examine the Marxist consideration that the so-called “previous accumulation” does not represent a historical residual category, but theoretically one of the forming moments of the s, to be determined historically as “force relation” The accumulation represents only a sequential process, which in the previous accumulation appears as a special historical process, as a developing process of the capital and a transition from one mode of production to the other.“ (Marx 1968: 268, Translation. SA). As capital is always to be determined in historical-concrete terms, so the

¹ - One can dispute whether this is a “theory”, an “approach” or a “research program” (Jessop). Moreover, an introduction to the regulation theory ought to be inserted as the next step, but because I do not wish to make this paper too lengthy, I refer to the following authors for more insight into the theory: Aglietta 1979; Lipierz 1985; Lipietz 1987; Jessop 1989; Hübner 1990; Boyer 1990 among others.

² - Poulantzas (1975: 22) differentiated between the mode of production and production forms. The latter represents a weakened, non-independent production unit.

³ - All quotations are translated by the author, with the exception of the quotations from Marx which remain in the original (German). Exception is here the first quotation of Marx (p. 1) and due to shortage of time, those of Althusser/Balibar (p.3f).

⁴ - All expressions within quotation marks, those not – like here – separately characterized, come from the respective authors themselves.

expression previous accumulation is to be understood as one moment of “developing- and transition processes”, as well as an “ongoing” process. The previous accumulation is therefore theoretically crucial for the determination of the articulation of different modes of production. It is generally regarded that the articulation does not mean a symmetrical relation, but a dominance of the capitalist on non-capitalist modes of production. In a second step, the articulation of modes and forms of production (AMP/F) will be determined as an institutional form in the sense of the regulation theory. In the sense of concretizing, this means thirdly that the political-spatial compression, the concrete form of the AMP/F qua dominance, constitutes a social formation and at the same time globally an “imperialist chain” (Poulantzas) and/or always historically concrete forms of the capitalist world system (Wallerstein). In order to unfold this argumentation, I will proceed as follows: Firstly, according to Marx, Althusser and Balibar, I will try to determine the theoretical status of the term previous accumulation more precisely (1). Subsequently, I will explore the concepts of the mode production and social formation, which have developed further following on from the Marxist theory, as well as globally the “imperialist chain” and the “world system”: The three categories social formation, imperialist chain and world system designate the historically-concrete term “place” (Poulantzas) in articulating the different modes of production (2). Thereafter, I will try to characterize more precisely the relationship between capitalist and non-capitalist modes of production (3), to finally explore it analytically as an institutional form in terms of the regulation theory (4). For the Marx argumentation I follow Louis Althusser and Étienne Balibar: According to them, the economic writings of Marx can be understood as the epitome of the construction of the capitalist mode of production in its “ideellen Durchschnitt” (Marx). This means two different things: The “mode of representation” remains methodically abstract throughout, particularly in *Capital* (see Schwarz 1974). It is the “movement form” of the terms/categories, i.e. their interior- exterior exposition. Therefore the Marx method, ascending from the abstract to the concrete, means to remain in the term, to determine it diversely and to enrich it by its conditions of existence (see Althusser/Balibar

1972: 256).⁵ The representation for Marx thus means the converse historical development of the term. At the same time, historical-concrete conditions float the abstract categories forwards. This means that the former are not analyzed empirically, but that they find their status as historical “places” in theoretical representation (see Marx 1974: 22f., 364f. and 391f.). This concerns a genetic de- and a progressive re-construction of the capital relationship: Because the unit is contradictory, the different elements (worker, means of production, food etc..) can be dissolved into their so-called “ursprüngliche Einheit” and built up again. The term “ursprünglicher Einheit” implies the total connection of possession and property, which is characterized as “primitive communism” and/or the common property as the social “Urform” (see MEW 13: 21. Fn. 1). What stands in the “Ursprung” or the “Stamm” is capital as community. The different forms of the separation/connection represent periodization formula of capital self, not pre-historic origins and their straight-line self development. Serfdom, slavery, ‘fronarbeit’ etc. have together with the wage labor that they represent all historical forms of the surplus work as forced labor, i.e. they are not pre- capitalist, but visible faces of wage labor. “Es ist dasselbe, als arbeite er [Lohnarbeiter] 3 Tage in der Woche für sich und 3 Tage in der Woche umsonst für den Kapitalisten. Aber ,dies ist nicht sichtbar’. Mehrarbeit und notwendige Arbeit verschwimmen ineinander. Anders mit der Fronarbeit [...]” (MEW 23: 251. Emphasized. SA). Expressed differently: Wage labor can assume other distorted faces in combination with other forms of forced labor. As soon as non-capitalist modes of production are integrated into the world market, “wird den barbarischen Gräueln der Sklaverei, Leibeigenschaft usw. der zivilisierte Gräuel der Überarbeit aufgepfropft [...]. Es galt nicht mehr, eine gewisse Masse nützlicher Produkte aus ihm [dem Sklaven in den südlichen Staaten Amerikas, SA] herauszuschlagen. Es galt nun der Produktion des Mehrwerts selbst. Ähnlich mit der Fronarbeit,

⁵ - To progress from the simple to the more complex means the determination of the connection (articulation) of necessary categories, which constitute the concrete whole, thus the articulation of necessary, correlated social conditions at all levels (see Jessop 1989; 1990).

z.B. in den Donaufürstentümern.“ (ibid.: 250). Since on the other hand the Marxist method sees itself as critical of the classical and vulgar political economy and through this criticism the Marxist term of the economy has developed, the argument against and the “puring” of the “dullness” (Marx) of this theory is a methodical-analytic requirement. These impurities and constant confusions in the classical political economy are connected with questions of the articulation of different modes of production, which I will examine later.

I. PREVIOUS ACCUMULATION.

2. Important with the determination of the Marx representation method by Althusser is the status of the term “ursprüngliche Akkumulation”. Chapter 24 in the first volume of *Capital* is to be understood not as an historical-empirical outline of the actual developing history of the capitalist mode of production, but as an “Illustration” of the Marxist term of the previous accumulation as expropriation and commodification. Marx determines the previous accumulation as one of the three forming moments of capital (see Marx 1974: 225f.), that is why it cannot be a residual, historically overhauled moment, but is always inherent to the production and reproduction of capital. This, on the basis of English history is just as important as the determination of the term of the previous accumulation, not only “pure” economic relations are constitutional, but also political and ideological-cultural conditions of existence. Exactly the abstraction of the latter in the determination of the economy tempts theoretical “Tauschungen” and adventurous constructions, which can now be briefly illustrated on the basis of the problematic of the “non- or extra-economic”, because they are important for the detection of the term of the previous accumulation.

3. The “non-economic” represents for the classical as well as vulgar political economist a pre-capitalist moment: on the basis of cultural, legal-political or violent conditions it laid claim to the capitalistically produced surplus value, i.e. the rent. These, just like the interest, do not seem to be directly involved in the working process, but appear as a condition and

prerequisite of labor⁶. This conception becomes even clearer, as on the one hand these forms (interest, rent) existed historically before industrial capital (see Marx 1968: 460f.). On the other hand, at this level of circulation the results of the production process then appear as if they were self-centered and independent phenomena from the production process, which are then perceived and represented theoretically as outside the production process and condition of the same (ibid.: 497f.). This “*Truebheit*” (Marx) in the theory is methodically conditioned (see ibid.: 472f.; MEW 25: 637f.), i.e. what appears as pre-capitalist economics, represents nothing more than the capitalist surplus value in its articulated form with non-capitalist relations, which clouds the purity in the theory (see MEW 25: 795f.). According to Marx, selfdom, slave economy, house economy etc. is neither historically, nor logically pre-capitalist, but under the rule of capital, articulated modes of production, which are to be understood in the representation as “*Andeutungen*” in the term of capital. These modes of production have just as illustrative a character in the representation of Marx as English capitalism. “*Die Vergleichung des Heißhungers nach Mehrarbeit in den Donaufürstentümern mit demselben Heißhunger in englischen Fabriken bietet ein besonderes Interesse, weil die Mehrarbeit in der Fronarbeit eine selbständige, sinnlich wahrnehmbare Form besitzt.*” (MEW 23: 250f.). And Marx does exactly this in the representation of the ground rent (MEW 25: 627f.) – in particular regarding the genesis of the capitalistic ground rent (see ibid.: 790f.). In this sense Balibar’s distinctions appear significant to me. On the one hand, he differentiates between history as origin of “capitalism” and a “pre-history”⁷ as history of “capital”, i.e. between historical and abstract origin of the development: a history in Feudalismus (another mode of production) and one of the different ways, the element formation of capital (Althusser/Balibar 1972: 372f.). On the other hand, he differentiates between the time of dynamics (i.e. theoretical time in the sense of tendencies of the structure

⁶ - For the rent see MEW 25: 627f., in particular 647f.; for the interest see Marx 1968: 445f.; for the commercial capital ibid.: 460f.

⁷ - The “pre-history” (Marx/Balibar) is that of the theoretical constitution of the bourgeoisie society and/or the demystification of its natural, voluntary-contractual origins.

contradictions) and the time of history and/or material time (ibid.: 403). It is important with the first fact that we have to do in terms of capital and of the “sketches of the criticism of the political economy” with theoretical constructions. The representation may not be misunderstood empirically: The space (England) is illustrative in the representation of Marx and the time represents no historical evolution, but dynamics, a movement of the terms and not those of real development. On the other hand, each form of the historical Determinismus (succession models of the modes of production) and any origin myths and causal nexus in the development should be excluded with these distinctions. Thus history regains its open character. These distinctions are important for two reasons. Firstly: As example of a diachrone analysis (the time of the transition of a mode of production to the other, i.e. “eine Zeit, die bestimmt ist durch das Ersetzen und Transformieren der Produktionsverhältnisse...”, ibid.: 400), represents the previous accumulation, i.e. the theoretical (genealogische) reconstruction of the elements of the capitalist mode of production (see ibid.). The “Übergang wird nicht auf der Ebene der Strukturen, sondern auf der Ebene der Elemente gedacht. Diese Form erklärt nicht nur, warum wir es hier nicht mit einer echten Geschichte im theoretischen Sinne zu tun haben“, but —and this is the second analytically important reason both for the analysis of “genesis, transition and sequential processes” and for the concrete situation— “ sie ist auch die Bedingung für die Entdeckung einer sehr wichtigen Tatsache: der relativen Unabhängigkeit der Formation verschiedener Elemente der kapitalistischen Struktur und der *Mannigfaltigkeit der geschichtlichen Wege* dieser Formation.” (ibid.: 376), i.e. the elements have different sources and different processes, which do not attract themselves inevitably or magnet-like, but is a relation of determination, in which the elements shift depending upon specific points and change their ranking, in which “marginale” elements can dominate, i.e. “ ein und dasselbe Ensemble von Voraussetzungen entspricht mehreren Reihen historischer Bedingungen” (ibid.: 379). This moment of the previous accumulation thus understands the capital in its emergence, its mode of existence and its becoming. The Marx term of the previous accumulation is not the same term as in the

“previous accumulation” by Adam Smith, i.e. in the sense of an allegedly pre-capitalist, past developing moment. The Marxist term does not designate a past, causally working moment, but a present-future moment: The previous accumulation is not in front of, but behind capital. The cause, the origin or the prototype have their place in the future. There is no capital on its own, which develops historically or theoretically at one time and first attempts and affects, but capital is only to be understood in its motion. The previous accumulation is the theoretical and historical act of the appropriation and the commodification. The term capital is thus always determined non-capitalistically, the contradiction however is unevenly, asymmetrical and unequal in terms of time: Exchange in relation to use value, utilization versus value-added process, relations of production versus productive forces, constant versus variable capital etc.. The previous accumulation is thus the process of the creation and/or the class formation of property lots and private owners. Which historical and social conditions are however necessary to ensure that this process is reproduced/regulated, as neither the money is per se capital, nor the property lots a free worker, but both have to be made as such?. The value is enabled by the “Auflösung der alten Produktionsweisen befähigt [...] einerseits zu kaufen die objektiven Bedingungen der Arbeit, andererseits die lebendige Arbeit selbst gegen Geld von freigewordenen Arbeitern einzutauschen“ (Marx 1974: 405f.). This is first the “historic field”, but in order to set it in motion, it requires more than the forced economic relations. Here lies one of the first critical moments of the reproduction/regulation of the capital relationship, just because the elements have “verschiedene, von einander unabhängige Ursprünge” (Althusser/Balibar 1972: 377). The unity of both does not take place by itself. In order that both meet and chain themselves together to a subordinate position, requires “de[s] systematischen Einsatz[es] einer außerökonomischen Gewalt (Recht, Politik, Militär)“ (ibid.: 379), i.e. only by force, power, violence, struggle is this relation created, reproduced and regulated. The question of the previous accumulation not only refers to the “Mindestgröße der Wertsumme” intended for the formation of capital (ibid.: 370), but it concerns the “formation of the capitalist social relations” (ibid.:

371). Herein the ideological term of the previous accumulation first gains importance, i.e. according to Marx, the apologetic function of the myth, which gains expression through perpetuating the economic categories of capitalism (s. *ibid.*: 372), i.e. by projecting capitalist relations of production on “the past” and by stating that “der spätere Kapitalist habe sich, sein Anfangskapital, bevor es die Form von Löhnen und Produktionsmitteln angenommen habe, vom Produkt seiner Arbeit gespart, verschafft sie [die klassische Ökonomie] den Gesetzen des Äquivalententauschs und dem auf legalisierter Verfügungsgewalt über die Gesamtheit der Produktionsfaktoren beruhenden Eigentum am Produkt eine rückwirkende Geltung.” (*ibid.*: 371). Since however neither “die Vergangenheit” nor the “Rueckwirkung” rest in the past, but both always represent present relations (see *ibid.*: 373), the private owner is constructed as a self-creating individual, who „durch seine Sparsamkeit die Möglichkeit geschaffen hat, sich das Produkt aus der Mehrarbeit anderer unbegrenzt anzueignen.“ (*ibid.*: 372). This is, however, only the one side of the previous accumulation and/or the making of the relation of capital, i.e. the bourgeois myth of the “Kapitalbildung durch die Eigenbewegung einer privaten, potentiell bereits kapitalistischen Produktion und die Selbsterzeugung des Kapitals.“ (*ibid.*: 371). However, how does the bourgeois/civil society produce and reproduce the class of private owners, “where do the capitalists come from?” (Marx). This question can be treated only in relation to the Marxist term of the previous accumulation. The “sogenannte ursprüngliche Akkumulation ist also nichts als der historische Scheidungsprozeß von Produzent und Produktionsmittel. Er erscheint als ursprünglich, weil er die Vorgeschichte des Kapitals und der ihm entsprechenden Produktionsweise bildet.” (MEW 23: 742). The “pre-history” is not only to be understood here in the sense of other modes of production, thus the organic interrelation between “capital and its appropriate mode of production”, but also as criticism of this apologetic function: the attempt of the bourgeois/civil society to reproduce the relation of capital —separation and commodification— on extended ladder, i.e. to create the “prerequisites” of the implementation of this relation under the given “historical conditions” (see *ibid.*: 375). In this sense the question of the AMP/F is of importance, thus the “verschiedenen

Produktionsweisen als ein geschichtliches *Sondieren der Wege*”, in which “die Trennung des Arbeiters von den Produktionsmitteln und die Bildung von Kapital als frei verfügbare Wertsumme” (*ibid.*) is carried out. Here we can say that to each historical formation there belongs a certain form of the previous accumulation, which functions as a condition of existence of the reproduction/regulation of capitalist relations of production.⁸ It is at the same time an act of “expropriation/commodification” of worker, knowledge, skill, means of production etc., which then appears as potential productive force of capital. Seen in this light, the analysis of the previous

⁸ - According to Althusser (1987: 24) this also applies politically in the sense of the “previous political accumulation, i.e. the beginnings of the national states”. Similar to the previous accumulation with Marx – not any “idyllic conditions”, but violence is the birth of capital –, Althusser determines (*ibid.*: 23f.) according to Machiavelli and Gramsci on the one hand the political previous accumulation as a “birth act of the state” carried out by power, violence and struggles; (*ibid.*: 24f.). Violence is therefore a condition of existence of the bourgeoisie power relation. This is expressed through the Marxist and the Althusserian violence term in the previous accumulation. On the other hand, Althusser emphasized the arbitrary coincidental moment, “the aleatory character of the formation of national states“ (*ibid.*: 25). Is the state now concretely determined in the sense of a “material condensation of social relations of force” (Poulantzas), whereby to these both bourgeoisie and non-bourgeoisie groups of class/layers belong, which consolidate themselves to an unequally weighty compromise, and is hegemony of a class over the others to be understood as cultural guidance and as dependent on the ability of the dominant class to open up to the supporting and subaltern classes development perspectives, so the “urge to conquest” and the expansionism are this relation of power inherently: “The prominent group will be anxious not only to retain the equilibrium best for their continuing but for its continuing under certain prospered conditions, and even to strengthen these conditions. But since the social space of each country is limited, it will be brought to expand it on the colonial and zones of influence and therefore step up in conflict with other prominent groups, which aim at the same goal, or at whose expense the expansion of the same would go necessarily, since the globe is also limited. Each leading group tends in abstracto to extend the basis of the labor society from which she can raise surplus value, but the abstract tendency becomes concrete and direct, if the raising of the surplus value within its historical basis beyond certain limits, which are nevertheless insufficient, is becoming difficult or dangerous.” (Gramsci 1991ff.: 1603f.) This necessary articulation between the “extension of the internal field of capital” (Marx) and the expansion urge of the national state is – despite all problems of – worked out impressively both in the classical and in the “neo” - imperialism theories.

accumulation and the articulation of different modes of production can help to identify the elements, those which develop and/or are made/set free on the “historical Field”, the given terrain and those which shift in the transition and can be consolidated to a possible formation (see *ibid.*). The previous accumulation therefore meant the permanent separation of the producers from means of production and their conversion into wage and non-wage worker, which they both caused and supplemented mutually (*ibid.*, see also Marx 1968: 267) and at the same time the commodification of social (and) natural relations. Two different aspects should be emphasised here: On the one hand, the modes of appropriation are always accompanied by force (as “economic potency”); on the other hand, the previous accumulation—separation/reintegration in the working process and commodification—can function as a distinction criterion of periodization (transition of a mode of production to the other). There are several forms of transition. The diversity of the forms, the “relative independence and historical difference in the developing processes of the capital bring Marx to express himself with the word “vorfinden” : the constitution of the structure is a “Fund” (*ibid.*: 380, see also Marx 1974: 375f.). The questions of the regulation theory are now concerned with the historical “Fundsachen” (Lipietz) and/or with the once found and reproduced capitalist relations of production; the theory introduced two historical-spatial like socio-economic breaks, which have a lasting negative effect in the present situation: indeed the periodization of the capitalist social formation since the “spezifischen capitalistic PW” (real Subsumtion, Marx) or the large-scale industry and thus the predominant autocentring of metropolitan economy; and on the other side the abstraction of the articulation of modes/forms of production. These two deficits can be waived with the help of the terms of the imperialistic chain and the world system, as in these concepts both the formal subsumtion and the articulation of the specific capitalist with non-capitalist modes of production are brought up for discussion. In this context the analysis of the previous accumulation and the articulation of different modes of production seems to me of strategic importance both for the respective social formations and globally.

II. MODE OF PRODUCTION, SOCIAL FORMATIONS, IMPERIALISTIC CHAIN AND WORLD SYSTEM.

4. “In allen Gesellschaftsformen ist es eine bestimmte Produktion, die allen übrigen, und deren Verhältnisse daher auch allen übrigen, Rang und Einfluss aufweist. Es ist eine allgemeine Beleuchtung, worein alle übrigen Farben getaucht sind und [welche] sie in ihrer Besonderheit modifiziert. Es ist ein besonderer Äther, der das spezifische Gewicht alles in ihm hervorstechenden Daseins bestimmt” (Marx 1974: 27).

5. If now with the abstract term of the mode of production there is still no concrete history to be written and an analysis can be only carried out at a concrete-complex level, then the question of the concrete contradictory units (spatial as politico-economic) becomes explosive. Since this is a very complex question, I will confine myself to the following three units, which were brought up for discussion in the tradition of the Marxist theory. Thereby no exhaustive analysis is offered on these objects and the representation will be limited to refer to the “concrete places” of the analysis.

6. According to Marx (MEW 25: 799f., Marx 1974: 9f.) a certain form of relations of production causes certain rule and exploitation forms, i.e. political and ideological relations (Althusser/Balibar 1972: 237). W. a. w., “specific relations of production” sets “as conditions of existence a legal-political and ideological supra structure” ahead and that “this supra structure is necessarily a specific supra structure.” (*ibid.*: 238). The relations of production *refer* thereby only to forms, but not to concrete configuration of relations: “The relations of production refer to the forms of the supra structure as terms of the actual conditions of their existence. One cannot therefore think the term of relations of production, if one abstracts them of their specific supra structural conditions of existence.” (*ibid.*) The political and the ideological are always present in the relations of production. “This means that if the structure of the relations of production determines the economic as such, the determination of the term of the relations of production of a mode of production must start from the determination of the term of the totality of the different social levels and

their specific *Gliederung* i.e. type of effect.” (ibid.: 239, Emphasized. SA). In a methodic sense, this means that the “term of the economic [...] must be constructed for each mode of production”, “just as the term of the “levels” belonging to a mode of production (politics, ideology etc.)” (ibid.: 246). Balibar differentiates between possession and property and/or between material appropriation in the working process by referring to the direct producers and relations of property. The first complex refers to the relationship between the elements, which characterizes all modes of production (see ibid. 284f.). “The second form of the ‘appropriation’ [...] designates the prerequisites of the capitalist production: the capital as owner of all means of production including the labor and therefore owner of the total product.” (ibid.: 285).⁹ Consequently, he determines the productive forces as a relation of production (see ibid.: 316, see also Hinds/Hirst 1981) and in such a way turns against every form of ‘Technicism’.

7. Poulantzas (1975), who makes the productive distinction between possession and property and between economic and legal property in the tradition of Althusser (see ibid.: 19f., to latter Althusser/Balibar 1972: 237f., Fn. 12), specifies: Ideological and political relations go constitutively into the determination of the relations of production as relations of property (see also Lefebvre 1974: 34f.), because the expropriation/separation of the direct producers must always be reproduced (see Poulantzas 1975: 21). In other words: “The production and exploitation process is at the same time the reproduction process of the political and ideological relations of power/subordination.” (ibid.). The mode of production is thus an abstract-general term, but in this abstractness it is complexly determined, i.e. economically, politically and ideologically (see ibid.: 22). The “modes of production exist and reproduce themselves only in historically determined social formations: France,

⁹ - This characterization of the specificity of the relation of private property in the capitalist mode of production emphasizes the difference to all other non-capitalist modes of production/forms. The neglect of this specific characteristic of the property tempts to idealistic conceptions of history and historical-concrete relations of production, since the differences are only specified in the idea. This evenly characterizes among other things the debate over the asiatic mode of production (see exemplary Wittfogel 1962).

Germany, England etc.” (ibid.). Furthermore: “The principle of the *Gliederung* of the practice forms exists in the “construction” or in the “mechanism” its reciprocal effect [structural causality after Althusser], where the social formation proves itself to be existing whole at different levels (‘instances’, ‘forms of practice’). Marx names three such levels: economic basis, legal and political supra structure and forms of social consciousness.” (Althusser/Balibar 1972: 272). This pattern is a first approximation to the epistemological question, raised by Balibar “how do different practice forms *structure* among themselves, which are expression of a division of labor, and how does their *structuring* change with a mutation (‘Einschnitt’) of the forms of practice?” (ibid.: 275, Fn. 5). In this context *er?* the term of the social formation is problematized: “The term ‘Gesellschaftsformation’ can be, as Marx uses it, both an empirical term [...] and an abstract term“ (ibid.: 276, Fn. 6), i.e. the term may not be seized as fixed object, but always as a concretely determining one. In order to determine the term of the social formation, which covers several modes of production, it would be necessary, “to analyze these modes of production [...] only on the laws of their *juxtaposition-existence* and their hierarchy” (ibid.: 277, Hvh. SA),¹⁰ i.e. in economic terms the different moments of the labor—and reproduction process (production, circulation, distribution and consumption) are to be determined as articulation of various (not only capitalist) relations of production under the dominance of a certain relation of production—in the capitalist mode of production this is the wage/commodity relation.¹¹ According to him, this *confusion* leads to the problem of the “mix-up of the social formations and their economic

¹⁰ - This spatial separation (next to each other) and vertical connection (hierarchy) is the principle continuous analytic-determining by Balibar, by means of which he problematizes the question of articulation. The formalism of these methods is unmistakable.

¹¹ - Politically this means that the condensation into the respective relations of production entangled classes, layers and groups in the State can be characterized as capitalist, because the capitalist mode of production dominates. This characterization is however at the same time insufficient: The capitalist state is always non-capitalistally structured (see Poulantzas 1974: 166f.).

infrastructure [...], frequently referred only to one mode of production“ (ibid.).

8. Poulantzas therefore determines the social formation as an ever specific articulation of several modes (and forms) of production (see Poulantzas 1975: 22). In a social formation a certain production form dominates the others and makes its mark on the later. The articulation of this dominance relationship implies “complex effects of dissolution preservation¹² on other modes- and forms of production” and “assigned this social formations its character” (ibid.).

9. For the purpose of the historical-concrete determination of the capitalist social formation Poulantzas himself now uses the term “imperialistic chain”. The imperialistic chain therefore reflects itself in each chain link (in the sense of a social formation) in special form, which depends again on the dominance of the capitalist mode of production over other modes of production in the respective social formations. “In fact the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production in its double tendency testifies that this can only exist by subjecting the other modes and forms of production and appropriate their elements (worker, means of production). In its reproduction the straight linkage of the capitalist mode of production generates with the other modes and forms of production in social formations the unequal development.” (ibid., Empha. SA). What differentiates the imperialistic stage from the previous is that the dependent social formations are no longer “externally” bound to the metropolises: From now on, they become “internally” controlled (ibid.: 40), as the dominance of the capitalist mode of production also intersperses itself in these social formations: “*The mode of production of the metropolises reproduces itself in specific form inside the controlled and*

¹² - This is the Marxist determination of the articulation relation from view of the capital (see below). What is missing in this determination, is, as suggested, the analysis of the NKPW/F. Only on this basis can the articulation relation be concretized. This determination with Marx and Poulantzas is justified, when it is not only connected with its object (capitalist mode of production), but also because the capitalist mode of production is dominant, i.e. that the articulation is to be determined according to the dominant form of the capitalist mode of production. The problem here is only that this determination tempts towards functionalism (reproduction requirements of the capitalist mode of production).

dependent formations themselves. This does not prevent that contrary to what happens in the metropolises, the retaining effects can keep the upper hand here over the dissolving one, in the double tendency, which the capitalist mode of production imposes upon the internal rule of the other modes- and forms of production of these formations. In addition, this phase is characterized by the fact that this reproduction induced from the capitalist mode of production crucially interferes within these formations with the range of its state apparatuses and its ideological forms.” (ibid.: 43). This periodization of the concrete formations is directed against the abstract representation, in which the modes of production appear as subjects. The social formation appears in the imperialism theories of the 70s (see ibid.: 45f.) as “spatial order” of the moments of the process of the mode of production as such: “The class struggle is thereby expelled from it.” (ibid.: 45). Poulantzas neither proceeds from an abstract, global mode of production, nor does he understand relations of power as a result of simply added units. He determines it as “imperialistische Kette”: “*The imperialistic chain is nothing but the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production in the social formations under certain economic, political and ideological conditions, and the members of this chain—social formations—constitute the place of the existence of this process.*“ (ibid.: 46).

10. This not systemic, but constructively understood contradictory unit seems to be created on two methodical assumptions: on the one hand Althusser’s “overdetermination” and on the other hand the primacy of the national space, the state with Poulantzas. The latter is in as much consequent, as like represented, to the term of the mode of production not only economic relations are constitutive, but also political and ideological relations. For Poulantzas that means that the term of the global capitalist mode of production must be not only be founded on accumulation-theory, but also on state-theory. In the absence of a global state, similar to the national state, however, one cannot speak of the global capitalist mode of production, since the national state not only, in Lenin’s sense, represents an adequate form of the development of capitalism, but also because alone it can guarantee the reproduction of relations of power in the social

formation split into classes. On the subject of Althusser I would like to insert a short digression, because his determination of the imperialistic chain provides Poulantzas with important arguments.

11. Regarding Maos' distinctions between main- and sub-contradiction, main- and sub-side of the contradiction, antagonistic and not-antagonistic contradictions as well as on the law of the heterogeneity of the development of the contradictions (see *ibid.*: 57f., Fn. 6; 137f. and 146f.) Althusser (1968) illustrates the term of the contradiction on the basis of Lenin's metaphor of the "weakest link" of the imperialistic chain (see *ibid.*: 57f.).¹³ In essence it points out that the contradiction is not to think of its "conditions of existence" in a detached way (see *ibid.*: 65), i.e. the fact that it forms a contradictory unit with these, that it is to be determined only into and by this unit (see *ibid.*: 62): It is in principle "overdetermined" (*ibid.*: 65f.). Related to the term of the mode of production this means that it does not exist in pure form, but that it always represents a specifically articulated, contradictory unit, which is to be determined only in a concrete space, i.e. the social formation. How are global relations of power now to be determined? —Relations of power are inherent in the structure of the complex given whole. "Power is not a simple unimportant fact, it is in itself a *substantial* fact for the complexity. Therefore the complexity includes the power as a substantial force : It is signed into its structure." (*ibid.*: 147). With it however the elements of the unit itself are not constructed in an arbitrary and "plural" manner; this unity articulates itself by the relation of dominance (*ibid.*: 148). Meanwhile the unit cannot be determined outside its contradictions and relations of inequality. Formulated differently: "Every contradiction, each substantial *Gliederung* of the structure and the general relation of *Gliederung* in the structure with dominance form likewise many conditions of existence of the complex whole self." (*ibid.*: 151,

¹³ - Meant here Russia at that time as the "exceptional situation", which made, after Lenin, the revolution possible. Althusser shows in the course of his demonstration that this not an exception, but the rule, i.e. that the "Anhaeuftung", Shift and condensation of the contradictions up to an explosive junction, a "whole of the rupture" is the rule (*ibid.*: 68-71) and that the "pure" contradiction never exists as such and penetrates expressively to the surface, but that it always "overdetermined" (s.above).

Empha. SA). This applies also to the relationship of the main- and sub-contradictions equally, i.e. one is not to think outside or independently from the other (see *ibid.*). The linkage between this abstract relationship of the overdetermination and the concrete analysis of the concrete situation is constituted by the term of the "conditions". Althusser determines according to Marx, Lenin, Mao etc. that everything depends on the "conditions", the "circumstances". The term of the conditions is not to be understood as an empirical term, but in a more theoretical light, because it is justified "in the nature of the object self": "the always- already given complex whole" (*ibid.*: 153). The mediating "Glied" is missing in this linkage, in as much as the forms of the "conditions of existence" change historically, which means that they must be conceptionally produced, so that the concrete situation can be analyzed, otherwise it becomes difficult, "to understand the concrete variations and circulations of a structured complexity, e.g. of a social formation", because these variations and circulations are not "accidentally", produced "through outside conditions" at a firm structured whole, its categories and its firm order [...], but are to be understood as respective concrete restructurings" (*ibid.*: 156f.).¹⁴ The movement of the contradiction is characterized by displacement and compression processes, which, however, run unevenly. This heterogeneity is not an exception, but "a previous law" (*ibid.*: 158f.), an "interior unevenness", which the "exterior" justified and not vice versa, also in the relationship between and under the social formations (see *ibid.*: 159f.). In this sense, the imperialistic chain would not be a system, still another lining up of social formations, but a relation of power, whose concrete form depends on the condition/forms of existence of the over-determined and uneven developments of the contradictions. Here the political moment and the question of the class struggle as an engine of history want to avoid the autocentrism of a system and/or a structure. The political struggle is as "the actual compression, the strategic junction [...], in which the complex whole is reflected (economics, politics

¹⁴ - This is carried out in the regulation theory by the mediating concept of the institutional form.

and ideology).” (ibid.: 164). Since, however, the strategic place of the confrontation, of the struggles, varies depending upon displacement of dominance and compression of the contradictions, this means identifying the strategic place for political practice (resistance, intervention into the political economic conjuncture etc.), in the dominant form of existence of the contradiction (displacement, compression or global restructuring) for the “splitting of the existing whole” (ibid.: 158). This power-critical and strategic perspective of the political inserts the background for the state theory of Poulantzas’ and the construction of the imperialistic chain. Therefore because it concerns the radical change of the existent order, the concrete-complex term of the social formation takes a central position in the analysis of the concrete situation. An abstract, global capitalist mode of production would not only be methodically inconceivable, but politically represents an incomprehensible absurdity. This contradictory unit can be globally waived in a regulation-theoretically enriched world system theory.

12. According to Wallerstein (1989, Wallerstein/Hopkins 1979), historical capitalism as a world system is to be understood economically as a process and a tendency of the commodification on a worldwide scale; politically and ideologically it is characterized by a hierarchical state system and a bourgeoisie/civil “culture imperialism” and/or a “Weltbild” (Wallerstein 1989: 73, 71). The economic struggles for production and appropriation of the global surplus value are always over-determined by national, “ethnic” and/or ethnic, racist and gender-specific struggles and conflict axes. The extent of the commodification and proletarianization —and this justifies the household as the central analytic unit in the theory— mediates on the basis of the grade of commodification of the reproduction of the labor force: The different forms of the reproduction of the labor force represent to this extent a central moment of exploitation and thus the profit maximization, when structurally as well as strategically pure wage labor contradicts and/or runs contrary to the extended reproduction of capital. Meanwhile the relation of articulation between the capitalist and the non-capitalist modes of production represents an immanent contradiction in the system. Wallerstein seizes the accumulation process on a

world wide scale as a movement, which tends here from the peripheries into the centers and promotes the accumulation and the extended reproduction. It is hierarchical on the basis of an extended social differentiation of labor articulated process, i.e. by different modes and forms of production and reproduction constituted process: “This hierarchization of the space in the structure of the production process led to an increasingly larger polarization between the centers and the peripheral zones of the world economy, not only in terms of the distribution criteria (level of the real income, quality of life), but —importantly— the locations of the capital accumulation.” The value transfer constitutes the relationship of the “centrality and peripherality“. The concentration of the capital in the centers contributed not only to the further accumulation and extended reproduction, but was accompanied and/or forced by the formation of powerful central states: Here “the so-called historical wage levels, those in the different zones of the world system so dramatically diverge” —and thus in the long run at the expense of the peripheries. Class compromises form and institutionalizes (ibid.: 25-27). This process meanwhile never runs purely economically, but is always non-economically mediated. Here the meaning of the state system is to be seen as a mutual constitution process, in that not only the so-called state sovereignty appears as “myth” but also the formal equality of the states. “The modern state was never a completely autonomous political unit. States developed and formed as parts of a ‘Staatsensystems.’ This is structured hierarchially according to strong and weak states, by which the former imposes all other “restrictions” (ibid.: 48). According to Gramsci (1991ff.: 784f.), this relationship, the downward global power gradient and the inter-states hierarchy can be explained by the fact that the strong national states are not only independently, but also “internationally autonomous” in as much as the expansive moment of their constitution accents their national exclusivity considerably. For the national states in the periphery, i.e. for the historically retarded process of the national state formation after ent-colonialization, there can be no talk of it, since here it concerned only, “patching together any state unity” (ibid.), i.e. around the political, economic, cultural territorial development of the area

colonialized before. To this extent the peripheral states are internationally constituted, but not internationally autonomous, being in a globally pre-structured space: International dependence causes a national carving up and vice versa. However, this does not prevent the use of strategic options for oneself and/or “to pull use of the equilibrium of the international forces” (ibid.). The political fractioning is meanwhile immanent for this system (see Hirsch 1993), so that a „transformation of the world economy in a “Weltreich” (Wallerstein 1989: 49) or into a “Weltstaat” runs counter structurally, i.e. due to the competition around the appropriation of surplus value globally produced (see Hirsch 1993: 201). If necessary, stability phases of this historical system become preserved by the “relative dominance” or “hegemony” of a strong state (Wallerstein 1989: 49f.). Historical capitalism as world system is meanwhile characterized by long-term “systemic accumulation cycles” coupled to a hegemonic power (Arrighi/Moore 2001: 43f.). Likewise because the dynamics of the accumulation are qualitatively different on a worldwide scale to that within the national state (ibid.: 43), that is why the state system represents the analytic unit. As “regime of accumulation in worldwide scale” is now defined “those strategies and structures” , whereby the “hegemonic actors of the restructuring of the capitalist world economy have promoted, organized and steered” (ibid.: 45). This world-wide accumulation regime implies particularly in terms of its finance, credit and debt forms in the sense of Marx “one of the sources of the previous accumulation” (MEW 23: 783f., see. Arrighi/Moore 2001: 48f.). The term accumulation regime is understood here in the sense of a certain configuration of the institutional form of regulation on a worldwide scale. This means that it is not to proceed as individual states, but always as a “block” from political as well as economic actors, those who set the material expansion in movement (see. ibid.: 46f.). Similarly to the ideal-typical constructions of extensive and intensive accumulation regime in the regulation theory Arrighi/Moore speaks of “extensive” and “intensive” regimes of accumulation on a worldwide scale: Extensive is used here in the sense of a “cosmopolit-imperial”, i.e. expansive regimes and intensive in the sense of a “corporativ-national”, thus to consolidation and recess of the expansion tending regimes. “The

development of historical capitalism as a world system was based on the formation of increasingly powerful blocks cosmopolit imperial (or corporativ national) economic and government organizations, which were in addition able to expand or to widen the functional and spatial range of the capitalist world system.” (ibid.: 53)

III. THE ARTICULATION OF DIFFERENT MODES OF PRODUCTION

13. If there is no way back behind the capitalist mode of production and/or if the capitalist mode of production represents a historical break, then there are no pre or outside-capitalist modes of production, but only non-capitalistic. If the latter are not capitalism outwardly and if they arrange their rhythm, their speed and their form of the change according to the dominant form of the capitalist mode of production, then they can be understood only as the capitalist mode of production inherent contradictions. In other words, they are neither fixed capitalist quantum, nor can the non-capitalist modes be derived apriori: The forms of the ap- and expropriation, the de- and re-commodification of social and nature relations (worker, means of reproduction, raw materials, knowledge, means of production etc.) not only assume historical-concrete forms, but they are always subjected to the dissolutions, preservation and new creation processes, those that stand against the outward appearance, the fixed nature and the unchangeability of social relations. Marx thus does not analyze pre-capitalist modes of production, as explained, but contradictions and “dullness” in the economic categories of the bourgeoisie mode of production: These so-called pre-capitalist modes of production represent nothing more than constructions in the term of the capitalist mode of production.

14. What is now to be understood by the articulation of different modes of production? – One can first criticize Althusser (see Althusser/Balibar 1972: 265) in that he seems to set the non-capitalist “rest” and the “relics” as empirical phenomena in relation to a more purely capitalist mode of production.¹⁵

¹⁵ - A “real rest” is missing from the abstract model of the two classes in capital. “For Marx can examine the specific

This pure capitalist mode of production does not exist, because the relations and the categories, which express it are “dull”. The “purity” of the abstract capitalist mode of production thus expresses its dominance, not its exclusiveness: Various relations of production and different social relations do not first articulate themselves at the level of social formation, but at the abstract level they are already articulated as “Andeutungen” (Marx). Balibar’s determination of articulation in relation to dominance is only meaningful if he refers to the epoch of the capital. Then his argument to determine the non-capitalist mode as contradictions, as “dullness” in terms of the capitalist mode of self production, would have a more concrete sense, and not as historical, pre-capitalist modes of production. “Es wäre also untubar und falsch, die ökonomischen Kategorien in der Folge aufeinanderfolgen zu lassen, in der sie historisch die bestimmenden waren. Vielmehr ist ihre Reihenfolge bestimmt durch die Beziehung, die sie in der modernen bürgerlichen Gesellschaft aufeinander haben, und die genau das umgekehrte von dem ist, was als ihre naturgemäße erscheint oder der Reihe der historischen Entwicklung entspricht. Es handelt sich nicht um das Verhältnis, das die ökonomischen Verhältnisse in der Aufeinanderfolge verschiedener Gesellschaftsformen historisch annehmen. Noch weniger um ihre Reihenfolge ‚in der Idee‘ (Proudhon) [...]. Sondern um ihre Gliederung innerhalb der modernen bürgerlichen Gesellschaft.” (Marx 1974: 28). The articulation should not be understood as elimination of other modes of production, but —also and particularly if one argues more concretely and more complexly— as their new creation and reproduction. The relationship between the dominant mode and the other modes of production is an internal, not external relation. Thus

difference of the capitalist mode of production only on the condition that he examines the other modes of production at the same time: not only each individual mode of production as type of a special form of the whole (connection), but also the relations between different modes of productions during their developing process. The impurity of English capitalism is a real object, that Marx in ‘Capital’ does not examine, but which is quite relevant for the Marxist theory: nevertheless this impurity represents directly what we want to designate provisionally as ‘relics’ in the lap of the capitalist mode of production dominating in England: “Forms more subordinated, but of capitalism not yet eliminated [sic!] modes of production.” (Althusser/Balibar 1972: 265).

modes of production become understandable as relations of power, which can be reconstructed from the developed term of capital and which point to the forms of movement according to (tendentious) laws of the dominant capitalist mode of production. The articulation is an internal relation of contradiction, not functional, not at all a relation a priori. Meanwhile the dominant mode of production of the epoch can take different forms, in more concrete terms depending upon specific conditions: The “Urform” the surplus value takes different derived forms; it is thus, value-theoretically expressed, the surplus labor, and this is “allgemeine Kritik des Gesamtsystems der ökonomischen Kategorien“ (Marx 1968, III: 250).

15. We reconstruct: Why can't Marx analyze the capitalist mode of production without non-capitalist modes and forms of production (NCMP/F)? “Auch bei der theoretischen Methode [...] muß das Subjekt, die Gesellschaft, als Voraussetzung stets der Vorstellung vorschweben“ (Marx 1974: 22), and this bourgeoisie society (illustrates on the basis of English capitalism) „ist die entwickeltste und mannigfaltigste historische Organisation der Produktion. Die Kategorien, die ihre Verhältnisse ausdrücken, das Verständnis ihrer Gliederung, gewähren daher zugleich Einsicht in die Gliederung und die Produktionsverhältnisse aller untergegangenen Gesellschaftsformen, mit deren Trümmern und Elementen sie sich aufgebaut, von denen teils noch unüberwundene Reste sich in ihr fortschleppen, bloße Andeutungen sich zu ausgebildeten Bedeutungen entwickelt haben etc.“ (Marx, *ibid.*: 25f.; as well as *ibid.*: 364f.). The neglect of this complexity and the overlaps in these various relations of production cause the “dullness” in the theory. In the analysis it is more natural for example to begin with the first production form, agriculture. “Aber nichts wäre falscher. In allen Gesellschaftsformen ist es eine bestimmte Produktion, die allen übrigen, und deren Verhältnisse daher auch allen übrigen, Rang und Einfluß anweist.” (*ibid.*: 27). This relation of articulation, which implies the dominance/subordination relation and the tendencies, is not only to be understood at a certain level or in a certain space, but generally. We thus have different relations of power, in which the capital relation is dominant. This is the first

determination of the articulation between stages of the capitalist mode of production (manufacture, factory, large-scale industry etc..) and other non-capitalist modes of production: Articulation qua dominance. In order to grasp this relation now as an internal, contradictory relation, an “external” determination, on the circulation level is not enough, because this usually leads to a functional determination of the relation. This means meanwhile that capital should be understood as commodified movement and one of and commodification. To the term tendency however belongs the counter-tendency, which always implies the reverse direction: De-commodification. Here one can see the dominance, violence and hierarchy of relations, thus in the “Keimzelle” of the bourgeoisie relations of power: the commodity. This is however not identical, but is grasped as contradictory. Others, no-capitalist MP/F must always be determined concretely, since they neither precede nor are they to be derived from the capitalist mode of production, but always articulate themselves with it, depending upon the dominant form of the capitalist mode of production: without dominance no articulation. The dominance relation justifies the articulation and does not let it appear arbitrary and voluntary. Which dominant form of the capitalist mode of production and which NCMP/F develop, are conserved or dissolved, cannot be determined and derived priori. This is the question of the analysis of the concrete situation, i.e. the determination of the dominant form and the articulation. A comparison with the other modes of production does not only serve to specify historically which capitalist mode of production in the sense of a criticism at the naturalism of the political economy (Althusser among other). It is also the question of the contradictions and the unequal timeliness in the development, i.e. articulation —evenly because this is the rule— and transitions to be pointed out. If we regard the different constructions of the modes of production by Marx not as the term of the capitalist mode of production apriori or externally, but understand them as the capital term as hierarchically articulated, unevenly determined (Althusser) contradiction formation, those in the periodization (manufacture, factory, large-scale industry etc..) are always articulated under a certain dominant form, then this means that these modes of production are

not to be understood in the historical-evolutionary sense, thus as pre-capitalist modes of production, which develop stage-like to capitalism or stagnate for all eternity, but always as specifically articulated contradictions.

16. Thus Poulantzas first determines the articulation of the capitalist mode of production in and between the spaces abstractly in the sense of the double tendency of this mode of production: “its reproduction within a social formation, in that it ‘holds foot’ and establishes its rule, and their expansion beyond this formation, whereby both aspects of this tendency work at the same time. The capitalist mode of production can [...] only exist, by extending its relations of production and in this way eliminating its borders.” (Poulantzas 1975: 39). Reproductive and functional seem to be the determination of the articulation by Poulantzas, correcting nevertheless in the same breath this determination, because the “dissolution- and preservation processes” are about class struggles (ibid.).¹⁶ This characterization of the articulation is important in that it understands the relationship as contradictory and full of conflict. It turns against a functional understanding because this refers to concrete strategies of the exploitation of individual capitals and not to relations of production. The articulation relation, specified as dependent upon the form of dominance, supplies Poulantzas with the means to periodize the global relations of dependency and subordination (see ibid.: 39f.),

¹⁶ - Poulantzas characterizes all this work (1975) by contradictions: On the one hand, he remains arrested by the Balibar reproduction problem and on the other hand, however, he partly supplies brilliant arguments and innovative concepts for the analysis of the concrete situation. The first case is even clearer in his work of 1968. Wolpe (1980) here to: He reduces the AMP (Poulantzas 1974) to the political instance state (see ibid.:10). This results from the fact that he uses a restrictive term for the mode of production, whose unit can be only ensured qua state. This leads in the concept of the social formation to a “juxtaposition” of the modes of productions, whose collectivity is adjusted by the state, so that beyond the state no mechanisms of the articulation are supplied. The social formation derived problem-free or from the pure capitalist mode of production. This means that the concept of the articulation does not develop analytically, but is put on as substitute symbol or filler of empty places, in that the traces and effects of other MP/F are simply missing (see ibid.: 10f.). This is an interesting point, in particular if it concerns the condensation of balances of power, i.e. with the question of the determination of the peripheral state and its forms/regimes.

whereby the articulation also refers to stages and phases of the capitalist mode of production (see *ibid.*: 41).

17. This representation meanwhile excludes the coexistence of two parallel historical times (modern vs. tradition etc.), for two different reasons: firstly because the non-capitalist modes of production develop during capitalism, i.e. their specification can only be understood in the context of the global capitalist mode of production; and secondly because they are dominated by the historical-concrete forms of the capitalist mode of production, i.e. that they are over-determined by the dominant form at the respective level of the mode of development and the social formation. Thus the dominance of the capitalist mode of production is not only to be seen at the level of the world market, but also internally at the level of the social formation, but it acquires, qua articulation, always different forms.¹⁷ This uneven- and unequal- development does not refer to different historical times, but is to be understood synchronously, but with different, diachronous rhythms and speeds. The dominant form of the development determines this structure of time, i.e. it carries itself out *as* a certain time and in certain space, not *in* or *with* the time. This point is central for the problematic of the articulation of space and time sequences of the development. The articulation of different modes of production does not mean a “parallelogramm” of relations. It always means a concrete configuration under the dominance of a

¹⁷ - These forms do not usually assume e.g. in the periphery not necessarily, the metropolitan-bourgeois character. The “hybridity” of the modes of production arises due to certain articulation forms. The dominance of the capitalist mode of production concretely always takes specific forms here according to the level of development of the social formations, i.e. the relations of classes/struggles (and not only those of the classes). On the other hand, the capitalization of the periphery take/takes qua direct or indirect colonialization depending upon form and type of the different faces of colonialism, not only regarding the dominant economic forms (trade -, commodity or financial capital), but also on the dominant, colonial classes and their specific conditions (Spanish, French, English, Russian etc.), those put on partially their own “Bild” (Marx), i.e. their own exploitation conditions on the periphery, then assume qua the articulation with respective internal exploitation conditions “hybride” forms (patriarchal, nomadic, neofeudal, slavery etc., see Stavenhagen 1981). This also concerns the latecomers in the center, e.g. the French Feudalismus in England, English capitalism into Ireland or Germany in the Vorfordismus or American capitalism in the Fordism.

certain form, differently expressed, a mode of production as a formation. The Marx determination of the contradictory unit and/or the statement of Balibars that with Marx the term of the social formation is to be found abstractly as concretely, implying that social formation is only to be determined on the basis of a concrete configuration (the articulation of different modes of production).

IV. THE REGULATION OF THE ARTICULATION RELATION.

18. In connection with this determination of the previous accumulation, I would now like to determine and represent in a schematic and analytical form the articulation relation between the capitalist and non-capitalist modes of production as an institutional and/or structural form in the sense of the regulation theory. Methodically the first three should be emphasized: Firstly, and in the sense of the regulation theory the concepts must be developed on the basis of concrete (historical like spatial) analyses and not a set model.¹⁸ Secondly, over the close (Fordistic) understanding of regulation the concepts of accumulation regime, mode of regulation etc. can neither be determined without the international and/or global moment on the one hand, or without the articulation relation of modes of production on the other hand (see Hirsch 2001: 173f.). These relations are not external concepts, ingredients, which were added into the analysis afterwards. Thirdly, colonial and imperialistic relations must be included particularly in the analysis of peripheral social formations. They are neither empirically negligible nor historically residual. These relations of power represent on the one hand analytic criteria of the periodization of the development of the capitalist world system. The speech of world markets, international division of labor, state system etc. would on the other hand be worthless, if they did not express and/or analytically concretize these relations, i.e. their consequences and after-effects. This justifies all the differentia

¹⁸ - This is the main deficiency in the analysis of peripheral regulation that the methodically most important regulation-theoretical premise, according to which the contradictory articulation of social conditions and their concrete compression are represented as object of the regulation process and the subject of the theoretical analysis, is suppressed here.

specifics of the unevenness of the development in the centers as well as in the peripheries.¹⁹ This relation is neither spatially nor temporally fixed, but always takes a concrete form. In its global, capitalist context it continues to exist, however. The term of the “previous accumulation”, how it was here developed according to Marx, Althusser/Balibar and others, I would like to determine as a spatial-like political economic *boundary relation*, which (historically as well as theoretically) mediates the tendentious articulation relation of the capitalist with non-capitalist modes of production. Since, however, the term determines the articulation relation only from the side of the dominant capitalist mode of production tendentious, in order to be able to analyze the relationship as a contradictory unit, methodically as well as analytically the dominated modes of production must be analyzed at the same time. The non-capitalist modes of productions constitute what Marx calls the “auswaertige Departement” and/or the “erweiterte Ausbeutungsfeld” and the extended “Exploitationsgrad” of capital (MEW 23: 417. 485f.). Herein one can locate the cheap, formal and informal, by visible and “unsichtbare Faeden” (ibid.: 485f.) regulated work set free from capital in motion. By this distribution of the work outside of and on the border of the bourgeoisie right sphere (women -, children -, slaves -, forced labor etc..) the labor power, exploited on the basis of free wage labor, is devalued, i.e. beside the formal, contract-legal labor the question here is of revolutionizing the formal “Vermittlung of the Kapitalverhaeltnisses” (ibid.: 417), whereby even the “Schein” of the freedom of contract formally exposes the same owner (see ibid.: 419). It is meanwhile in this “polarized space” (Perroux) where one always starts out from the relation “centrality-peripherality” (Wallerstein). This

¹⁹ - I quote Balibar here again, because he formulated this fundamental relationship so elegantly: “The event of meeting these societies with the ‘western’ societies in the transition to capitalism (in the course of conquests, colonialization or different forms of trade relations) obviously belongs to the diachrony and not to the dynamics of these societies, because it causes an abrupt or gradual transformation of its mode of production. This event in their history develops in the time of their diachrony, without striking down in the time of their dynamics – a border line, that makes clear the conceptual difference of the two times and the necessity to think their articulation.” (Althusser/Balibar 1972: 404f.).

contradiction, which is justified in the capital relation and its expansion urge, is thus “previous” and has to be always seized in its reciprocal effect and in its free forms as well as in its forms of force. The latter represents a condition of existence of the reproduction/regulation of the capital relation in this extended sense. This boundary relation can be analyzed concretely at different levels (within the social formations and between them) and in different forms (see to the illustration MEW 23: Cape. 13, 23, 24). In the imperialism theories²⁰ different, economic, political, ideological, spatial etc. Mechanisms of the articulation of this relation were worked out, particularly in its forced form: Migration, unequal exchange, colonization, force, plundering, robbery, monopolizing and patenting of means of production/reproduction/knowledge among other things. These relations rarely appear in their pure form, but are always over-determined ethnically, nationally, gender-specifically, generation-specifically, culturally, religiously etc. This boundary relation in its abstract form as previous accumulation, in its institutional form as articulation of different modes of production and in its concrete, over-determined forms should be clarified schematically. This pattern stressed, as an auxiliary construction, no more than a strongly condensed illustration. The fact that it is incomplete, fragile and appears strongly simplistic is taken for granted. Scheme 1(a, b, C) refers both to relations within and between the social formations.

²⁰ - “In so far ‘previous accumulation refers to accumulation on the basis of production with non-capitalist relations of production, capitalist production and accumulation must not precede it, but can very probably go with it at the same time.” (Frank 1979: 70, see also Meillassoux 1976, Marini 1981; in the context of the post-colonial mode of production, see Hauck 1996: 143f.). Franc calls the accumulation which is based on the basis of non-capitalist production primary accumulation and asks the question about the meaning of non-capitalist relations of production for the capitalist mode of production. It is here important that non-capitalist relations of production are recreated and are precisely not residual (see ibid.: 71ff.). In this sense this process represents for Meillassoux (1976: 113-115) an “immanent” mechanism of the reproduction of the capital and one of the means of the perpetuation of the “previous accumulation”.

V. SUMMARY AND VIEWPOINT.

19. I would first like to summarize the realizations of this thesis; then I will dare a *realistic* view. Firstly, the previous accumulation represents the term of the force relation, which theoretically justifies the articulation of the capitalist with non-capitalist modes of productions. Secondly, with articulation the movement form of contradictory units (mode of production, mode of development, social formation etc.) is implied. As the latter are not to seize abstractly, but are always to determine concretely and since their units are always constituted by a dominant or hegemonic relation, there can be neither abstract nor arbitrary articulation. Thirdly, the articulation of the modes of production is to be seized for its part as a structural and/or institutional form, with those belonging organically for the constitution of an accumulation regime or a mode of regulation. Fourth, there is no pure capitalism, but different historical formations. Fifth, the economic transformation is not a purely economic question, but depends on the balances of forces, on the respective interests, the contradictions and condensation in the state —i.e. the national state plays a central role in the development. Sixth, the “infinite different combinations” are, if one considers the “thousand threads” and “hybrid forms” (Lenin) of wage labor, of central importance for the various concrete development strategies. The “relics” should not be understood either as historical residuals or as pure capitalism contradicting phenomena and/or as “dullness in the theory” (Marx), but as structural characteristics of the capitalist social formation. Seventh, the question of the articulation of different modes of production not only excludes historical determinism (phase models), but the existence of non-capitalist modes of production can be constitutive for the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production although the former are not per se organized in a commodity form. It can thus be assumed that under the reproduced and recreated non-capitalist mode of productions there is a coexistence of democratic-organized, collective production forms and/or elements of collective modes of production (socialist, communitary, communist etc.). Finally I would like to allude to which fields of (global)

changes my remarks could play a role: in the attempt of the so-called “human sciences” (bio- and gene technologies), one can identify by the commodification of social nature relations a new thrust of through-capitalization; in the attempt of the so-called “new-economies” (I&k technologies) to create by means of start ups, risk capital, shareholder value, business start up etc. a new layer from private properties, to fabricate by means of flexibilization of the global labor process new forms of children -, women -, house -, slave and forced labor, which would be subsummaized formally or really under capital, as well as by a global, violent contest of conflicts on the part of strong states to perfect the arms- and safety industries and thus to inaugurate a new accumulation thrust etc.. Here the previous accumulation on a worldwide scale (Amin) presents itself in new form and thus the attempt of the reproduction/regulation of capitalist relations of power. This form of the previous accumulation marked by excessive force is typical for crisis and transitional phases and/or not hegemonic phases (Arrighi/Moore, Hirsch), both in the individual social formations and globally.

20. In the openness of the situation (crisis and transitional phase) and with the assumption of the coexistence of alternative modes of production, in the course of struggles and clashes preventive strategies and future drafts are meanwhile possible and perhaps more probable than ever. “This analysis is neither optimistic nor pessimistic, in so far that I cannot predict whether the result will be better or worse. It is however realistic, since it tries to energize a discussion over the kinds of structures which could move us in such a direction. Therefore, as it is said in East Africa, *harambee* [let us begin]!” (Wallerstein 2002: 103).

Literature

Alnasseri, Sabah/Brand, Ulrich/Sablowski, Thomas/winter, Jens (2001): Space, regulation and Periodisation of capitalism, in: Albritton, Robert/Itoh, Makoto/Westra, Richard/Zeuge, Alan (ed.) 2001: Phases of capitalist development, N.Y., 163-179
Althusser, Louis (1968): Für Marx, Frankfurt/M.; Franz. 1965.

- 30/01/03 Althusser, Louis (1987):
Machiavelli, Montsequieu, Rousseau.
Argument, Hamburg.
- Althusser, Louis/Balibar, Etienne (1972):
Das Kapital Lesen (DKL). Reinbeck; Franz.
1968.
- Arrighi, Giovanni/Moore, J. W. (2001):
Kapitalismus in welthistorischer Sicht,
Argument, N. 239, 43-58.
- Candeias, Mario/Deppe, Frank (Hg., 2001): Ein
neuer Kapitalismus? VSA Hamburg.
- Frank, André Gunder (1979): Über die
sogenannte ursprüngliche Akkumulation,
in: Senghaas, D. (Hg.), Kapitalistische
Weltökonomie, 68-103.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1991ff.): Gefängnishefte,
Argument Hamburg.
- Hauck, Gerhard (1996): Evolution,
Entwicklung, Unterentwicklung.
Gesellschaftstheoretische Abhandlungen,
Frankfurt/M.
- Hindes, Barry/Hirst, Paul (1981):
Vorkapitalistische Produktionsweisen
(VKPW), Frankfurt/M.; Engl. 1975.
- Hirsch, Joachim (1993): Internationale
Regulation. Bedingungen von Dominanz,
Abhängigkeit und Entwicklung im globalen
Kapitalismus, in: Das Argument, N. 198,
195-221, Hamburg.
- Hirsch, Joachim (2001): Postfordismus:
Dimensionen einer neuen kapitalistischen
Formation, in: ders./Jessop,
Bob/Poulantzas, Nicos (Hg.): Die Zukunft
des Staates, VSA Hamburg.
- Hirsch, Joachim (1990): Kapitalismus ohne
Alternative? Hamburg.
- Hopkins, T. K./Wallerstein, I. (1979):
Grundzüge der Entwicklung des modernen
Weltsystems. Entwurf für ein
Forschungsvorhaben, in: Senghaas, D.
(Hg.), Kapitalistische Weltökonomie.
Kontroversen über ihren Ursprung und ihre
Entwicklungsdynamik, Frankfurt/M.
- Jessop, Bob (1989): Regulation Theories in
Retrospect and Prospect. Amsterdam,
Manuskript.
- Jessop, Bob (1990): State Theory.
Pennsylvania.
- Lefebvre, Henri (1974): Die Zukunft des
Kapitalismus. Die Reproduktion der
Produktionsverhältnisse, München.
- Lipietz, Alan (1992): Vom Althusserismus
zur „Theorie der Regulation“, in:
Demirovic, Alex/ Krebs, Hans-
Peter/Sablowski, Thomas (Hg.), Hegemonie
und Staat, Münster.
- Lipietz, Alan (1998): Nach dem Ende des
„Goldenen Zeitalters“, Argument
Hamburg/Berlin.
- Marini, Ruy M. (1981): Die Dialektik der
Abhängigkeit, in: Senghaas, D., Peripherer
Kapitalismus...
- Marx, Karl (1974): Grundrisse der Kritik
der politischen Ökonomie, Dietz Verlag
Berlin.
- Marx, Karl (1968): Theorien über den
Mehrwert. Band I und III. Frankfurt/M.
- MEW – Marx-Engels-Werke
- Meillassoux, Claude (1976): „Die wilden
Früchte der Frau“. Über häusliche Produktion
und kapitalistische Wirtschaft, Frankfurt/Main.
- Poulantzas, Nicos (1975): Klassen im
Kapitalismus – heute. Westberlin.
- Poulantzas, Nicos (1974): Politische Macht
und gesellschaftliche Klassen, Frankfurt/M.
- Schwarz, Winfried (1974): Das „Kapital im
allgemeinen“ und die „Konkurrenz“ im
ökonomischen Werk von Karl Marx. Zu
Rosdolskys Fehlinterpretation der

Gliederung des <Kapitals>, in :
Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen
Theorie I, Frankfurt/M.

Senghaas, Dieter (Hg., 1981): Peripherer
Kapitalismus. Analysen über Abhängigkeit
und Unterentwicklung, Frankfurt/M.

Stavenhagen, R. (1981): Agrarische
Strukturen und Unterentwicklung in Afrika
und Lateinamerika, in: Senghaas, D. (Hg.),
Peripherer Kapitalismus...8

Wallerstein, Immanuel (1989): Der historische
Kapitalismus, Argument Berlin.

Wallerstein, Immanuel (2002): Utopisik.
Historische Alternativen des 21. Jahrhunderts,
Wien.

Wittfogel, Karl A. (1962): Die orientalische
Despotie. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung
totaler Macht. Köln; Engl. 1957.

Wolpe, Harold (Hg., 1980): The articulation of
modes of production, London.