Marx’s critique of capitalism

1. **Alienation**
   - Separation of things which ought not to be separated
   - Domination of the producer by her product

2. **Exploitation**
   - Unreciprocated flow that is …
     - EITHER a) … normatively fundamentally
       (consisting in fraud, force, maldistribution, or being treated as a means)
     - OR b) … normatively derivatively
       (because primacy lies with maldistribution, or domination)
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Freedom

Freedom as a ‘triadic’ relation (McCallum):

\[ x \text{ is (not) free from } y \text{ to (not) do/become } z \]
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‘[Liberty is the] state in which a man is not subject to coercion by the arbitrary will of another ... [Freedom has] meant always the possibility of a person’s acting according to his own decisions and plans, in contrast to the position of one who was irrevocably subject to the will of another, who by arbitrary decision could coerce him to act or not to act in specific ways.’

– Hayek, *The Constitution of Liberty*, ch. 1
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Republican domination

‘someone has dominating power over another, someone dominates or subjugates another, to the extent that
1. they have the capacity to interfere
2. on an arbitrary basis
3. in certain choices that the other is in a position to make.’

– Pettit, Republicanism, p. 52
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Negative/republican liberty

‘[Liberty is the] state in which a man is not subject to coercion by the arbitrary will of another ... [Freedom has] meant always the possibility of a person’s acting according to his own decisions and plans, in contrast to the position of one who was irrevocably subject to the will of another, who by arbitrary decision could coerce him to act or not to act in specific ways. ...’
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Negative/Republican liberty

‘[Liberty is the] state in which a man is not subject to coercion by the arbitrary will of another ...

... [Freedom has] meant always the possibility of a person’s acting according to his own decisions and plans, in contrast to the position of one who was irrevocably subject to the will of another, who by arbitrary decision could coerce him to act or not to act in specific ways. ...’

– Hayek, The Constitution of Liberty, ch. 1
Freedom – negative/republican

**Freedom in general**
1. \(x\), a subject
   
is free from

2. \(y\), a constraint
   
to do

3. \(z\), some action

**Neg./Rep. liberty**
1. \(x\), an individual
   
is free from

2. \(y\), coercive interference by, or personal dependence on the arbitrary will of, specific persons
   
to do

3. \(z\), certain specific acts that would otherwise be possible
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‘The confusion of liberty as power with liberty in its original meaning inevitably leads to the identification of liberty with wealth ... Yet, though freedom and wealth are both good things ... they still remain different. Whether or not I am my own master ... and whether the possibilities from which I must choose are many or few are two entirely different questions. The courtier living in the lap of luxury but at the beck and call of his prince may be much less free than a poor peasant or artisan’

– Hayek, *The Constitution of Liberty*, ch. 1
Poverty

1. Unfreedom = coercion/personal dependence, $\neq$ lack of power

2. Poverty = lack of power, $\neq$ coercion/personal dependence

$\therefore$ 3. Poverty $\neq$ unfreedom
Poverty

‘The only way you won’t be prevented from getting and using things that cost money in our society – which is to say: most things – is by offering money for them. ... [T]o lack money is to be liable to interference ... [T]he point of money is to extinguish interference: that is its defining function’

– Cohen, ‘Freedom and Money’, pp. 177-78
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Capitalist power in the marketplace

‘The individual provider of employment cannot normally exercise coercion ... So long as he can remove only one opportunity among many to earn a living ... he cannot coerce, though he may cause pain.’

– Hayek, *The Constitution of Liberty*, ch. 9
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‘It cannot be denied that the rule of law produces economic inequality – all that can be claimed for it is that this inequality is not designed to affect particular people in a particular way.’

– Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 59
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Pre-capitalist power

Slave master
- Decisive power held by specific master and wielded over other specific slave

Feudal lord
- Decisive power held by specific lord and wielded over other specific serf

Capitalist
- ... ???
Capitalist power in the marketplace

1. Unfreedom = (liability to) coercion

2. Coercion = decisive power held by specific persons and wielded over other specific persons

3. Capitalist power ≠ coercive power (because ≠ decisive power held by specific persons …)

∴ 4. Capitalist power ≠ unfreedom
‘private property, like any system of rights, pretty well is a particular way of distributing freedom and unfreedom. It is necessarily associated with the liberty of private owners to do as they wish with what they own, but it no less necessarily withdraws liberty from those who do not own it. To think of capitalism as a realm of freedom is to overlook half of its nature.’

– Cohen, ‘Capitalism, Freedom and the Proletariat’
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Capitalist power in the workplace

1. **Unemployment** is intolerable

2. **Employers:**
   - (2a) arbitrary firing (“fire at will”)
   - (2b) arbitrary employment (abuse, alter, worsen conditions)

3. **Employees:**
   - (3a) experience dependence upon employers because of (1) + (2a)
   - (3b) adopt strategies of deference in order to avoid (2a) + (2b)
   - (3c) acquiesce with (2b) in order to avoid (2a)
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‘an interference restricts my freedom to do x only if I lack the means to overcome that interference, and, therefore, the ability to do x despite that interference. If I have that ability, if I am able to overcome the interference, then I am free to do [x] even in the face of the interference. So interference is insufficient for lack of freedom. An appropriate inability is also required.’

– Cohen, ‘Freedom and Money’
Antifreedom

1. **Interference → resistance**
   - “A can (successfully) interfere with B” implies “B cannot (successfully) resist A’s interference”

2. **Unfreedom** presence of interference
   - Interference by some specific agent, A = constraint on any given action by B

3. **Antifreedom** impairment of resistance
   - General social processes that impair precisely those actions/processes that develop B’s power to resist interference
Marxist theory of domination

B suffers from domination when –

1. some A possesses some degree of power to interfere with B

2. B experiences systematic impairment of the development or maintenance of her power reliably to resist both the interference in (1) and the impairment in (2)
B suffers from domination when –

1. some A possesses some degree of power to interfere with B

2. B experiences systematic impairment of the development or maintenance of her power reliably to resist both the interference in (1) and the impairment in (2)
B suffers from domination when –

1. some A possesses some degree of power to interfere with B

2. B experiences systematic impairment of the development or maintenance of her power reliably to resist both the interference in (1) and the impairment in (2)
Marxist versus negative/republican

1. Marxist v. negative
   - Impairment (\(\therefore\) domination) without coercive interference

2. Marxist v. republican
   - Impairment (\(\therefore\) domination) without arbitrary interference or personal dependence
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Marxist analysis of domination in capitalism

Exploitation
- B can say “No” to any specific exploitative wage offer
  - BUT can’t say “No” to them all; must eventually say “Yes” to some offer

Expropriation
- No specific A has arbitrary power to say “No” to B’s accessing property in general
  - BUT B’s proletarianisation is an aggregate effect of each A’s refusal

Collective action
- Bs’ (collective) power to resist is impaired by working conditions
  - e.g. competition between labourers undermines solidaristic action
  - e.g. intensity of labour undermines action
Marxist analysis of domination in capitalism

**Exploitation**
- B can say “No” to any specific exploitative wage offer
- BUT can’t say “No” to them all; must eventually say “Yes” to some offer

**Expropriation**
- No specific A has arbitrary power to say “No” to B’s accessing property in general
- BUT B’s proletarianisation is an aggregate effect of each A’s refusal
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'It is not enough that [workers] are compelled to sell themselves voluntarily. The advance of capitalist production develops a working class which by education, tradition and habit looks upon the requirements of that mode of production as self-evident natural laws. The organisation of the capitalist process of production ... breaks down all resistance. ... The silent compulsion of economic relations sets the seal on the domination of the capitalist over the worker. Direct extra-economic force is still of course used, but only in exceptional cases. In the ordinary run of things, the worker can be left to the "natural laws of production", i.e. it is possible to rely on his dependence on capital, which springs from the conditions of production themselves, and is guaranteed in perpetuity by them.'

– Capital, vol. 1, ch. 28, p. 899
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Looking ahead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Chapters in <em>Capital</em></th>
<th>Pages in Penguin edn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 2: History</td>
<td>Part 8 (chs. 26-33)</td>
<td>873-943 (= 70pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3: Ideology</td>
<td>Chs. 1-2</td>
<td>125-188 (= 63pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4: Alienation</td>
<td>Chs. 3-7</td>
<td>188-307 (= 119pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5: Exploitation</td>
<td>Chs. 8-12</td>
<td>307-429 (= 122pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6: Domination</td>
<td>Chs. 13-15</td>
<td>429-643 (= 214pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7: Liberalism</td>
<td>Chs. 16-24</td>
<td>643-762 (= 119pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8: Feminism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summing-up

**DIAGNOSIS** – what is (capitalist) domination?

1. Libertarianism
   - Specific agent, A, has **coercive power to interfere** over agent B

2. Republicanism
   - Specific A has an **arbitrary power to interfere** with B

3. Marxism
   - B has **impaired power to resist** interference by some (member of) A

**Q**: how is the producer “dominated” by her inanimate product?

**A**: insofar as the “product” empowers non–producers, and forms a social structure that impairs producer’s own powers of resistance
Summing-up

REMEDIY – how do we overcome (capitalist) domination?

1. Libertarianism/Republicanism: disempower employers
   - Eliminate personal dependence + arbitrary power (e.g. fire at will)

2. Marxism: empower workers
   - Restructure (= communalise) power over productive assets

**NOT**: (only) reduce power of “employers”

**RATHER**: (also) abolish structure of “capital” (≠ “capitalists”)