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1 [Randglossen zu Adolph Wagners „Lehrbuch der politischen Ökonomie“ (Zweite Auflage), Band I, 1897]


English text and page numbers from Karl Marx/Frederick Engels—Collected Works, International Publishers, New York, Volume 24, copyright Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1989; however the translation has been adjusted by Hans G. Ehrbar. [Car75] contains a much bet-
ter translation than MECW and a commentary, and the text below leans more and more on Carver’s translation.

Wagner’s book is apparently [Wag79], although the page numbers are not identical. An expensive facsimile edition [Wag91] is presently in print. Other interesting literature [Hue89], [Gio03], [Hus79], [Bac97]. A brief summary in [RM75, p. 320].

Manuscript completed after January 1881

First published, in Russian, in the Marx-Engels Archives, Book V, Moscow, Leningrad, 1930

Printed according to the manuscript

Another translation was published in Spring, 1972 in the journal Theoretical Practice, which was introduced by a lengthy essay by Athar Hussain, which is apparently reprinted in [Hus79].

The first paragraph starts with “1.”, but there seems to be no corresponding “2.”

531:1 1. Mr. Wagner’s conception, the “socio-legal conception” (p. 2). 355:1 1. Herrn Wagners Auffassung, die „sozialrechtliche Auffassung“ (p. 2).

Carver, p. 164, writes: “According to Marx, Wagner had inverted the real relationship between economic activities and social, legal relations; in Wagner’s work the latter were
treated as a presupposition of the former, whereas Marx had been arguing exactly the reverse since at least 1845–6.” See [mecw24]553:4–554:1.

Thereby finds himself “in accord with Rodbertus, Lange and Schäffle” (p. 2). For the “main points of the foundation” he refers to Rodbertus and Schäffle.

Marx starts out with an example where this socio-legal point of view is blatantly wrong: Mr. Wagner says even of piracy as “unlawful acquisition” by entire peoples that it is only robbery if “a true jus gentium is presumed to obtain” (p. 18, Note 3).

According to Wagner, it is not possible to say that piracy is robbery by just looking at it. It is only robbery if one presupposes an international law which defines it as robbery.

531:2 His research is primarily devoted to the “conditions of economic life in a community” and he “determines from them the
sphere of the economic freedom of the individual” (p. 2).

According to Wagner, these conditions are conceptual conditions, since according to him people first conceptualize and then act:

531:3 “The ‘drive to satisfy one’s needs’”

... “does not function, and is not meant to function, as a pure force of nature; rather it stands, like any human drive, under the guidance of reason and conscience. Every act resulting from it is therefore an answerable one, and is always governed by a moral judgement, though this is admittedly” (!) “itself subject to historical change” (p. 9).

If the moral judgment is subject to historical change, this is an argument against Wagner’s thesis that this moral judgment is primary, rather than being derived from the organization of production. Marx added an exclamation point because Wagner himself admits this weakness in his argument.

One possible argument why piracy may not be considered robbery would be that it is
considered productive labor, like fishing. This is perhaps why Marx discusses Wagner’s concept of labor now. Wagner does not distinguish between concrete and abstract labor:

531:4 As for “Labor” (p. 9, § 2), Mr. Wagner does not distinguish between the concrete character of each kind of labor and the expenditure of labor power common to all these concrete types of labor (pp. 9, 10).

355:4 Unter „Arbeit“ (p. 9, § 2) unterscheidet der Herr Wagner nicht zwischen dem konkreten Charakter jeder Arbeit und der allen diesen konkreten Arbeitsarten gemeinschaftlichen Verausgabung von Arbeitskraft (p. 9, 10).

Then Marx brings a quote documenting that Wagner has a very broad conception of labor:

531:5 “Even the mere management of wealth for the purpose of procuring revenue always necessitates activities which belong to the concept of labor, and likewise the employment of the income thus acquired for the satisfaction of needs” (p. 10, Note 6).

355:5 „Selbst die bloße Verwaltung des Vermögens zum Zweck des Rentenbezugs nötigt stets zu Tätigkeiten, welche unter den Begriff Arbeit gehören, und ebenso die Verwendung des erzielten Einkommens zur Bedürfnisbefriedigung“ (p. 10, N. 6).

If Wagner’s concept of labor is so broad that even consumption is considered labor, then piracy could be considered labor too.
After this discussion of Wagner’s concept of labor, Marx also discusses several other concepts which play a role in Wagner’s socio-legal approach.

Wagner’s definition of economic goods is based on use-value plus a “natural monopoly.” Marx immediately remarks on the absurdity of calling the location in a city to be a natural monopoly:

531:6 According to Wagner the historico-legal are the “social categories” (Note 6, p. 13).

531:7/o “In particular natural monopolies of location have the effect, especially in urban” (!he calls the location in the City of London a natural monopoly!) “conditions, then under the influence of the climate for the agricultural production of entire countries, further, natural monopolies of the specific fertility of the land, e.g. with especially good vineyards, and indeed even between different peoples, e.g. in the sale of tropical products to


355:7/o „Namentlich bewirken Naturmonopol der Lage, so besonders in städtischen” (!Naturmonopol die Lage in der City von London!) „Verhältnissen, dann unter dem Einfluß des Klimas für die Agrarproduktion ganzer Länder, ferner Naturmonopole der spezifischen Bodenergiebigkeit, z.B. bei besonders guten Weinbergen, und zwar auch zwischen verschiedenen Völkern, z.B. beim Absatz tropischer Produkte nach Ländern der gemäßig-


countries of the temperate zone.” “One example are the export duties on products of a kind of natural monopoly, which are imposed in some countries (Southern Europe, tropical countries) on the safe assumption that they will be passed on to the foreign consumers” (Note 11, p. 15). In deducing export duties in the Southern countries from this, Mr. Wagner shows that he knows nothing of the “history” of these duties} “that goods at least partially free in nature become purely economic ones, sold as a matter of business to the highest bidder” (p. 15).

From this Wagner’s definition of the market:

532:1 The sphere of regular exchange (sale) of goods is their market (p. 21).

532:2 Among economic goods: “Relations to
persons and things (res incorporales), whose material completeness is based on an abstraction: a) from absolutely free commerce: the cases of customers, firms, etc., when advantageous relations with other people, which have been formed through human activity, may be granted and acquired for payment; b) due to certain legal limitations of commerce: exclusive manufacturing rights, real equities, privileges, monopolies, patents, etc.” (pp. 22, 23).

Now Wagner’s definition of services:

532:3–4 Mr. Wagner subsumes “services” under “economic goods” (p. 23, Note 2 and p. 28). His real motive in doing so is his desire to portray Privy Councillor Wagner as a “productive worker”; for, he says


356:3 Herr Wagner subsumiert die „Dienste“ unter die „wirtschaftlichen Güter“ (p. 23, N. 2 u. p. 28). Was ihm eigentlich dabei unterliegt, ist seine Sucht, den Geheimrat Wagner als „produktiven Arbeiter“
The answer is prejudicial to an assessment of all of those classes which professionally perform personal services, such as servants, the members of the liberal professions, and hence also of the state. Only if services are reckoned in with economic goods, are the aforementioned classes productive in the economic sense” (p. 24).

532:5 The following is highly characteristic of the way of thinking of Wagner and company:

Wagner’s treatment of services gives us insights into his scientific method: economic goods must be defined in such a way that services fall under this definition.

532:6 Rau had observed: it depends on the “definition of assets and also of economic goods” whether “services also be-

356:4 Folgendes sehr charakteristisch für die Denkmanier von W[agner] und Konsorten:

356:5 Rau hatte bemerkt: es hänge von der „Definition des Vermögens und ebenso der wirtschaftlichen Güter“ ab, ob „die
long to them or not.” Whereupon Wagner states: “such a definition” of “assets” must be “undertaken which includes services among economic goods” (p. 28).

Dienste auch dazu gehören oder nicht“. Darauf Wagner: es müsse „eine solche Definition“ vom „Vermögen“—„vorgenommen werden, welche die Dienste in die wirtschaftlichen Güter einschließt“ (p. 28).

⇑ But this is not the “decisive” reason for the definition of economic goods. ⇩ Rather, the decisive reason is that humans need not only material goods.

532:7–8 “The decisive reason” is, however, “that the means of satisfaction cannot possibly consist solely of material goods, because needs are not only related to the latter, but also to personal services (in particular those of the state, such as legal protection, etc.)” (p. 28).

356:6 „Entscheidender Grund“ aber sei, „daß die Befriedigungsmittel eben unmöglich nur in Sachgütern bestehen können, weil die Bedürfnisse sich nicht bloß auf solche, sondern auf persönliche Dienste (namentlich auch des Staats, wie Rechtsschutz etc.) beziehen“ (p. 28).

⇑ The round parentheses are Wagner’s. But Marx’s selective excerpting picked out again a case where Wagner’s definitions lead him to make absurd statements, such as that protection by the state is a human need.

So far services. Now the concept of an asset, although this word was already used in
It is wrong to translate it with “wealth.”

Marx brings two quotes which he numbers 1. and 2.

1. purely economic ... “the supply of economic goods available at a given time as the real stock for the satisfaction of needs” is “assets as such,” “parts of the total or people’s or national assets.”

2. “As an historico-legal concept ... the stock of economic goods in the possession or Property of an entity,” “possession of assets” (p. 32). The latter is an “historico-legal relative concept of property. Property conveys only certain powers of disposal and certain powers of exclusion vis-à-vis others. The extent of these powers varies” {i.e. historically} (p. 34). “All assets in the second sense is indi-
**vidual assets**, the assets of a physical or a legal entity” (l.c.).

Now Public Assets:

533:2–3 Public assets,

“in particular the assets of compulsory communal economies, thus especially the assets of states, regions and communities. This assets is designated for public use (such as roads, rivers, etc.) and ownership thereof is assigned to the state etc., as the legal representative of the public (nation, local population, etc.) or it is actual state and communal assets, namely, administrative assets, which also goes to make possible the fulfilment of public services, or financial assets, employed by the state to acquire revenues as the means for the fulfilment of its services” (p. 35).

Vermögen im zweiten Sinn ist *Einzelvermögen*, Vermögen einer physischen oder juristischen Person“ (l.c.).

357:4 Öffentliches Vermögen,

„insbesondere das Vermögen der Zwangsge- meinwirtschaften, also namentlich das Staats-, Kreis-, Gemeindevermögen. Dieses Vermögen [ist] zur allgemeinen Benutzung bestimmmt (wie Wege, Flüsse etc.) und dem Staat usw. … Eigentum daran als dem rechtlichen Ver- treter der Gesamtheit (Volk, Ortseinwohnerschaft usw.) zugeschrieben oder es ist eigentli- ches Staats- und Gemeindevermögen, nämlich Verwaltungsvermögen, das zur Herstellung der Staatsleistungen mit dient, und Finanzvermögen, das vom Staat zur Erwerbung von Einkünften, als den Mitteln für die Herstel-
Now Capital:

533:4 Capital, capitale, is a translation of κεφάλαιον signifying the claim in respect of a sum of money, as opposed to the interest (τόχος). In the Middle Ages there emerged capitale, caput pecuniae for the main thing, the essential, the original (p. 37). In German the word Hauptgeld was used (p. 37).

533:5 “Capital, source of earnings, stock of goods bearing interest: a supply of mobile means of acquisition.” As opposed to: “stock for use: a quantity of mobile consumable wares put together in any respect at all” (p. 38, Note 2).

Downward Fixed and circulating capital: Marx only gives page references, without copying the
533:6 Circulating and standing capital (p. 38, 2(a) and 2(b)).

Now the concept of value:

533:7 Value. According to Mr. Wagner, Marx’s theory of value is the cornerstone of his socialist system” (p. 45). Since I have never established a “socialist system,” this is a fantasy of Wagner, Schäffle e tutti quanti.

533:8–9 Further: according to which Marx “finds the common social substance of exchange-value, the only value he is here concerned with, in labor, the magnitude of exchange-value in the socially necessary labor time,” etc. [p. 45].

357:7 Umlaufendes und stehendes Kapital (p. 38, 2 (a) und 2 (b)).


357:9 Ferner: wonach Marx „findet die gemeinsame gesellschaftliche Substanz des von ihm allein hier gemeinten Tauschwerts in der Arbeit, das Größenmaß des Tauschwerts in der gesellschaftlich notwendigen Arbeitszeit“ etc.
Although Wagner’s above formulation seems very close to Marx’s own in *Value, Price and Profit*, Marx takes exception to it:

Marx says, "Nowhere do I speak of “the common social substance of exchange-value”; I rather say that the exchange-values (exchange-value, without at least two of them, does not exist) represent something common to them, which is “quite independent of their use-values” (i.e. here their natural form), namely “value.”"

Marx’s phrase “the exchange-values represent something common to them” is apparently an abbreviation for “the exchange-values of the commodities represent something common to them,” i.e., the “them” refers to the commodities whose exchange-values he is talking about. I.e., the exchange-values themselves do not have a common social substance, they are merely the indicators, the representations of the fact that the commodities have a common social substance.

Why does Marx say here that exchange-value, without at least two of them, does not exist?
Because for $A$ to be exchangeable against $B$, $A$ and $B$ must be two different commodities. Marx alludes to this also in [mecw24]551:1/o.

“Quite independent of their use-values” might be a reference to 128:4 in *Capital* (the same paragraph from which he is about the reproduce a passage in his next paragraph here).

Now he brings the quote from the second edition of *Capital* which shows what he really said:

This is what I write: “Therefore, the common substance, that manifests itself in the exchange-relation or exchange-value of commodities, is *their value*. The progress of our investigation will lead us back to exchange-value as the necessary mode of expression or form of appearance of value. For the present, however, we have to consider value *independently of this form*” (p. 13).

This is a quote from *Capital*, which in the fourth edition is 128:4. In the next sentence,
Marx strengthens his denial: not only does he not say that the common social substance of exchange-value is *labor* but his whole theoretical development shows that exchange-value cannot be reduced to anything:

534:1 Thus I do not say “the common social substance of exchange-value” is “labor,” and as I deal with the *form of value*, i.e. the development of exchange-value, at some length in a separate section, it would be curious if I were to reduce this “form” to a “common social substance,” labor.

358:2 Ich sage also nicht, die „gemeinsame gesellschaftliche Substanz des Tauschwerts“ sei die „Arbeit“; und da ich weitläufig in besonderem Abschnitt die *Wertform*, d.h. die Entwicklung des Tauschwerts, behandele, so wäre es sonderbar, diese „Form“ auf „gemeinsame gesellschaftliche Substanz“, die Arbeit, zu reduzieren.

The separate section is section 3 in chapter One of *Capital*. This section shows that the form of value *develops*, i.e., has its own dynamic. This means it cannot be reduced to its substance. (If it were reducible to the substance, i.e., if it were a mere shadow of the substance, then this shadow would not be able develop, would not have a history of its own. All the movement of the shadow would come from the substance itself.) The thing that can be reduced to a common social substance are the commodities as values. The commodities
have exchange-value because they can be reduced to a common substance, but the exchange-
value itself cannot be reduced to a common substance. A little later, in [mecw24]536:3–5,
Marx gives examples of exchange-values which are not based on value (but on fraud, as in
the case of adulteration of goods, or on speculative bubbles). Also in the section about the
fetish-like character of the commodity in Capital, p. 164:1, Marx implies that the content of
exchange-value is a social interaction (i.e., it is not abstract labor).

The next sentence emphasizes that Marx’s subject is much more concrete than Wagner’s
subject:

Mr. Wagner also forgets that neither “value” nor “exchange-value” are the subjects for
me, but the commodity.

Marx means here that neither value nor exchange-value are the subjects of his invest-
igation. Marx does not investigate a concept but a concrete thing, the commodity. This does
not deny the result of this investigation, according to with value is an “automatic subject,”
as Marx says in Capital, 255:1.

Further:  

“This” (Marxian) “theory is, however, “Diese“ (Marxsche) „Theorie ist aber
not so much a general theory of value as a *theory of cost* related to Ricardo.” (loc. cit.).

In response to the above paragraph, Marx first distances himself from Ricardo.

534:4 Mr. Wagner could have familiarised himself with the difference between me and Ricardo both from *Capital* and from Sieber’s work (if he knew Russian). Ricardo did indeed concern himself with labor solely as a *measure of the magnitude of value*, and was therefore unable to find any link between his theory of value and the nature of money.

But the lack of a “general theory of value” which Wagner meant as a critique of Marx, is indeed an important aspect of Marx’s theory:

534:5/o When Mr. Wagner says that it is not a “general theory of value,” he is quite right in his own sense, since he means by

358:5 Herr Wagner hätte sowohl aus dem „Kapital“, wie aus *Siebers Schrift* (wenn er russisch wüßte) die Differenz zwischen mir und Ricardo kennenlernen [können], der sich in der Tat mit der Arbeit nur als *Maß der Wertgröße* beschäftigte und deswegen keinen Zusammenhang zwischen seiner Werttheorie und dem Wesen des Geldes fand.

358:6/o Wenn der Herr Wagner sagt, das sei „keine allgemeine Werttheorie“, so hat er in seinem Sinn ganz recht, da er un-
a general theory of value the phantasizing over the word “value,” which enables him to adhere to the traditional German professorial confusion between “use-value” and “value,” since both have the word “value” in common.

To Wagner’s assertion that Marx’s theory of value is a theory of costs, Marx has a twofold response: (1) it is true in so far as Marx’s theory of value is a theory of labor cost, but (2) it is false if one tries to define the value of the good to be the sum of the values of all the ingredients (including labor-power) which must be bought in order to produce the good.

But when he goes on to say that it is a “theory of cost,” then either it amounts to a tautology: commodities, as values, only represent something social, labor, and as far as the magnitude of value of a commodity is determined, according to me, by the quantity of the labor-time contained, etc., in it.

Wenn er aber ferner sagt, das sei eine „Kostenlehre“, so läuft das entweder auf eine Tautologie heraus: die Waren, soweit sie Werte, nur etwas Gesellschaftliches, Arbeit darstellen, und soweit nämlich die Wertgröße einer Ware nach mir durch die Größe der in ihr enthaltenen etc. Arbeits-
in other words the normal amount of labor which the production of an article costs, etc.; and Mr. Wagner proves the contrary by declaring that this, etc., theory of value is not the “general” one, because it does not correspond with Mr. Wagner’s view of the “general theory of value.” Or else he says something incorrect: Ricardo (following Smith) lumps value and production costs together; I have already expressly pointed out in A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy as well as in the notes in Capital that values and production prices (which merely express in money the costs of production) do not coincide. Why not? That I have not told Mr. Wagner.
Wagner criticizes Marx for arbitrarily singling out labor costs:

Furthermore, I “proceed arbitrarily” when I attribute these costs solely to what is termed labor output in the narrowest sense of the term. That always presupposes proof which is hitherto lacking, namely that the production process is possible entirely without the mediation of the activity of private capitalists in amassing and employing capital” (p. 45).

One does not have to go into the future here: production that was non-capitalist but that was nevertheless social production existed in the past. Marx makes this point by saying: Wagner should have proved that the numerous communities that existed before the appearance of private capitalists did not have social production.

Quite the reverse: instead of foisting such future proofs on me, Mr. Wagner first ought to have proved that a social production process, not to mention the produc-
tion process in general, *did not exist* in the very numerous communities which *existed before the appearance of Private capitalists* (the Old Indian community, the South Slav family community, etc.). Besides, Wagner could only say: the exploitation of the working class by the capitalist class, in short, the character of capitalist production as depicted by Marx, is correct, but he is mistaken in regarding this economy as transitory, while Aristotle, on the contrary, was mistaken in *not* regarding the *slave economy* as transitory.

Wagner argues: as long as capitalists are necessary for production, their profits are well-deserved.

535:4 “As long as such proof has *not* been fur-
After making fun of Wagner’s formulation Marx clarifies that the capitalist is not a robber because (a) he forces the worker to create the product before he takes it from him, and (b) potentially full value is paid for all commodities he buys and sells.

What a “subtraction from the worker” is, subtraction of his skin, etc., is not evident. At any rate, in my presentation even, “profit on capital” is in actual fact not “a subtraction from, or robbery of, the worker.” On the contrary, I depict the capitalist as the necessary functionary of capitalist production and demonstrate at great length how, in the capitalist economy, “profit on capital is also in fact the clubfoot or ass’s ear reveals itself here” “‘constitutive’ element of value, not as in the socialist view, simply a subtraction from, or ‘robbery’ of, the worker” (pp. 45, 46).
length that he not only “subtracts” or “robs” but enforces the production of surplus value, thus first helping to create what is to be subtracted; what is more, I demonstrate in detail that even if only equivalents were exchanged in the exchange of commodities, the capitalist—as soon as he pays the worker the real value of his labor-power—would have every right, i.e. such right as corresponds to this mode of production, to surplus-value.

⇓ All this can be done even while “arbitrarily” singling out labor costs:

But all this does not make “profit on capital” the “constitutive” element of value but only proves that the value which is not “constituted” by the labor of the capitalist contains a portion which he can appropriate “legally,”
i.e. without infringing the law correspond-
ing to the exchange of commodities.

According to Wagner, value has two elements, one coming from the costs, and one from demand. This is similar to neoclassical price as the intersection of demand and supply curves. Marx says here that Wagner (1) confuses value and use-value and (2) confuses the mechanisms determining value with the mechanisms adjusting supply to demand.

536:1–2 “That theory is unduly preoccu-
pied with this single value-determining el-
ment” {1. Tautology. The theory is false
because Wagner has a “general theory of
value” which does not agree with it; his
“value” is thus determined by “use-value,”
as is actually proved by the professorial
salary; 2. Mr. Wagner substitutes for value
the “marketprice” at a given time, or the
commodity-price diverging from it, which

360:1 „Jene Theorie berücksichtigt zu
einseitig nur dieses eine wertbestimmende
Moment“ {1. Tautologie. Die Theorie ist
falsch, weil Wagner eine „allgemeine Wert-
theorie“ hat, die nicht damit stimmt, sein
„Wert“ daher durch den „Gebrauchswert“
bestimmt wird, wie das namentlich die Pro-
fessoralbezahlung beweist; 2. Herr Wagner
schiebt dem Wert den jedesmaligen „Markt-
preis“ oder von ihm abweichenden Waren-
is something very different from value}, “[it considers] the costs, not the other, usefulness, utility, the demand element” {i.e. it does not lump together “value” and use-value, which is, after all, such a desirable thing for a born Confusius like Wagner}. preis unter, was etwas sehr vom Wert Verschiedenes ist}, „die Kosten, nicht das andere, die Brauchbarkeit, den Nutzen, das Bedarfsmoment“ {d.h. sie wirft „Wert“ und Gebrauchswert nicht zusammen, was doch so wünschenswert für geborenen Konfusius wie Wagner}. 

In the next paragraph Marx is again very keen on distinguishing the formation of exchange-value (which happens on the surface) from the formation of value (in production). His own procedure has been to abstract from these surface elements by the assumption that prices coincide with values, although this assumption is factually false. (But Marx says it is a scientific necessity.)

536:3–5 “Not only does it not correspond to the formation of exchange-value in present-day commerce”

{he means price formation, which does not affect the determination of value in any way:}

360:2 „Sie entspricht nicht nur nicht der Tauschwertbildung im heutigen Verkehr“

{er meint die Preisbildung, die absolut nichts an der Wertbestimmung ändert: im}
moreover, the *formation of exchange-value* CERTAINLY does *take place in presentday commerce*, as any speculator, adulterater of goods, etc., knows, and this has nothing in common with *value formation*, but has a keen eye for formed values; what is more, in, e.g., the determination of the *value of labor power* I proceed from the assumption that it is really paid at its full value, which is *in fact not the case*. Mr. Schäffle is of the opinion in *Capitalismus*, etc., that that is “magnanimous” or some such thing. He simply means a scientifically necessary procedure,

“but neither, as Schäffle excellently and *indeed conclusively* (!) “demonstrates in the Quintessenz and especially in the Socialer

„sondern auch, wie Schäffle in der ‚Quintessenz‘ und besonders im ‚Socialen Körper‘ vortrefflich und *wohlablschließend* (!) nach-
Körper, does it correspond to conditions as they are bound to take shape in the Marxian hypothetical social state.”

536:6 {I.e., the social state, which Mr. Schäffle was courteous enough to “shape” for me, is transformed into “the Marxian” (not the “social state” foisted on to Marx in Schäffle’s hypothesis).

536:7 “This may be strikingly demonstrated with the example of grain and such like, whose exchange-value would—owing to the influence of fluctuating harvests when demand is fairly constant—of necessity have to be regulated in some other way than simply according to costs even in a system of ‘social taxes’” [p. 45].

536:8/o {So many words, so much nonsense. First, I have nowhere spoken of “so-

360:3 {Also der Sozialstaat, den Herr Schäffle so artig war, für mich zu „gestalten“, verwandelt sich in „den Marxschen“ (nicht den in Schäffles Hypothese dem Marx untergeschobnen „Sozialstaat“).

360:4 „Schlagend läßt sich das namentlich am Beispiel des Getreides u. dgl. nachweisen, dessen Tauschwert wegen des Einflusses der wechselnden Ernten bei ziemlich gleichen Bedarf notwendig auch in einem System von „Sozialtaxen“ anders als bloß nach den Kosten reguliert werden müßte.“

360:5/o {So viel Worte, so viel Blödsinn. Erstens habe ich nirgendwo von „Sozialta-
cial taxes,” and in my investigation of value I have dealt with bourgeois relations, not with the application of this theory of value to a “social state” not even constructed by me but by Mr. Schäffle for me.

Second, if the price of grain rises after a bad harvest, then its value rises, for one thing, because a given amount of labor is contained in a smaller product; for another thing, its selling price rises by much more still. What has this to do with my theory of value? The more the grain is sold over its value, the more other commodities, whether in their natural form or in money form, will be sold under their value by exactly the same amount, even if their own xen“ gesprochen und bei der Untersuchung über den Wert mit bürgerlichen Verhältnissen zu tun, nicht aber mit Anwendung dieser Werttheorie auf den nicht einmal durch mich, sondern durch Herrn Schäffle für mich konstruierten „Sozialstaat“.

Zweitens: wenn bei Mißernte der Kornpreis steigt, so steigt erstens ihr Wert, weil eine gegebene Arbeitsmasse in weniger Produkt realisiert ist; zweitens steigt noch viel mehr ihr Verkaufspreis. Was hat dies mit meiner Theorie des Werts zu schaffen? Grade um so mehr das Korn über seinen Wert verkauft wird, grade so viel werden andre Waren, sei es in Naturalform oder in Geldform, unter ihrem Wert verkauft, und zwar selbst, wenn ihr eigner Geldpreis nicht fällt.
money price does not fall. The total value remains the same, even if the expression of this total value in its entirety were to increase in money, in other words, if the sum total of “exchange-value” according to Mr. Wagner were to rise. This is the case if we assume that the drop in price of the total of the other commodities does not cover the over-value price (excess price) of the grain. But in this case, the exchange-value of money has fallen pro tanto beneath its value; the total value of all commodities does not only remain the same, but even remains the same expressed in money, if money is included among the commodities. Further: the rise in price of grain beyond the increase in its value determined by the

A bad harvest will in any case be smaller in the “social state” than it is with present-day profiteering in grain. But then the “social state” will organise production from the outset in such a way that the annual supply of grain is only minimally dependent on changes in the weather. The volume of production including supply and consumption will be rationally regulated. Finally, supposing Schäffle’s fantasies about it come true, what is the “social tax” meant to prove for or against my theory of value? Just as little as the coercive measures taken during a food shortage on a ship or in a fortress or during the French Revolution, etc., which pay no regard to value; and how terrible for the “social state” to infringe the laws of value of the Kornwuchern. Dann aber wird der „Sozialstaat“ von vornherein die Produktion so einrichten, daß die jährliche Getreidezufuhr nur ganz minimal vom Witterungswechsel abhängt, der Umfang der Produktion—die Zufuhr und die Gebrauchsseite darin—wird rationell reguliert. Endlich, was soll die „Sozialtaxe“, gesetzt, Schäffles Phantasien darüber würden realisiert, für oder gegen meine Theorie des Wertes beweisen? So-wenig als die bei Lebensmittelmangel auf Schiff oder in Festung oder während der französischen Revolution etc. getroffenen Zwangsmaßregeln, die sich nicht um den Wert kümmern; und das Schreckliche für den „Sozialstaat“, die Wertgesetze des „kapitalistischen (bürgerlichen) Staats“ zu ver-
1 Randglossen zu Adolph Wagner

“capitalist (bourgeois) state,” hence, too, the theory of value! Nothing but infantile rot!

537:1–2 The same Wagner graciously quotes from Rau:

“In order to avoid misunderstandings, it is necessary to establish what is meant by value pure and simple, and it is in conformity with German usage to choose use-value for this purpose” (p. 46).

Wagner begins with the concept of value and derives from this use-value and exchange-value. Marx looks carefully where Wagner ends up in this derivation, and this careful look also clarifies Marx’s own approach which is in important ways different from Wagner’s.

537:3 Derivation of the concept of value (p. 46 ff.)

537:4/o It is from the value-concept that use-value and exchange-value are supposed to be derived d’abord by Mr. Wagner, not as

letzen, also auch die Werttheorie! Nichts als kindischer Kohl!};

361:1–2 Derselbe Wagner zitiert wohlgefällig aus Rau:

„Um Mißverständnisse zu vermeiden, ist es nötig, festzusetzen, was unter Wert schlechthin gemeint sei, und es ist dem deutschen Sprachgebrauch angemessen, hierzu den Gebrauchswert zu wählen“ (p. 46).

361:3 Ableitung des Wertbegriffs (p. 46 sqq.).

361:4/o Aus dem Wertbegriff soll d’abord der Gebrauchswert und der Tauschwert von Herrn Wagner abgeleitet werden, nicht wie
with me from a concretum, the commodity, and it is interesting to follow this scholasticism in its latest “Foundation.”

“Foundation” is in quotes because this is the title of Part One of Wagner’s work. With his remark that it is interesting to pursue Wagner’s scholasticism, Marx begins a thorough criticism of the individual steps in Wagner’s derivation of use-value and exchange-value from the concept of value. Marx brings now a seven-line quote from Wagner and then spends five pages, until [mecw24]543:3, to discuss it.

538:1 “It is a natural striving of man to arrive at a clear awareness and understanding of the relationship which inner and outer goods bear to his needs. This is done through the appreciation (valuation) by which value is attributed to goods or things of the outside world and this value is measured” (p. 46), and he says, p. 12: “All means of satisfying one’s needs are called goods.”

362:1 „Es ist ein natürliches Bestreben des Menschen, sich das Verhältnis, in welchem die innern und äußern Güter zu seinen Bedürfnissen stehen, zum deutlichen Bewußtsein und Verständnis zu bringen. Dies geschieht durch die Schätzung (Wertschätzung), wodurch den Gütern, beziehungsweise den Dingen der Außenwelt Wert beigelegt und derselbe gemessen wird“ (p. 46), and it heißt p. 12: „Alle Mittel...“
These two quotes are in [Wag91, § 33 on p. 37–38 and § 5 on p. 6]. Wagner is developing here a utility theory of value. He tries to derive economics from an anthropology explaining human behavior by a hierarchy of selfish and altruistic motives, see [Wag91, § 4 on p. 5–6]. In a later book [Wag92, p. 15] Wagner says that economics is applied psychology. His approach is summarized in [Gio03, pp. 166/7].

Thus, if in the first sentence we replace the word “goods” with its Wagnerian conceptual content, then the first sentence of the passage quoted becomes:

Wagner defines “goods” as “means of satisfying people’s needs.” This is indirectly indicated in [mecw24]532:7–8, and Marx’s last quote on [mecw24]538:1 gives the page number.

“It is a natural striving of ‘man’ to arrive at a clear awareness and understanding of the relationship which ‘the inner and outer means of satisfying his needs’ bear to

„Es ist ein natürliches Bestreben des ‚Menschen, sich das Verhältnis, in welchem die inneren und äußeren‘ Mittel zur Befriedigung seiner Bedürfnisse „zu seinen

zur Befriedigung der Bedürfnisse heißen Güter.“
his needs.” We may simplify this sentence somewhat by dropping “the inner means,” etc., as Mr. Wagner himself does instantly, in the very next sentence, by means of the word “or.”

Bedürfnissen stehen, zum deutlichen Bewußtsein und Verständnis zu bringen“. Wir können diesen Satz etwas vereinfachen, indem wir „die inneren Mittel“ etc. fallenlassen, wie Herr Wagner im unmittelbar folgenden Satz dies sofort „beziehungsweise“ tut.

After this final simplification the sentence to be discussed reads:

“It is a natural striving of ‘man’ to arrive at a clear awareness and understanding of the relationship which ‘the outer means of satisfying his needs’ bear to his needs.”

Now it is time to discuss the sentence itself. Wagner begins with “the human.” How is this meant? Marx discusses three possibilities: the category “human,” an isolated human confronting nature, or a human who is already in some social context.

538:4 “Man”? If the category “man” is meant here, then he has “no” needs at all; 362:4 „Der“ Mensch? Ist hier die Kategorie „Mensch“ gemeint, so hat er überhaupt
if isolated man confronting nature, then this human must be considered a nongregarious animal; if a human is meant who already exists in some kind of society—and this is what Mr. Wagner implies, since his “man” does have a language, even though he lacks a university education—then as a starting-point the specific character of this social man must be presented, i.e. the specific character of the community in which he lives, since in that case production, i.e. the process by which he makes his living, already has some kind of social character.

⇑ The first and second possibility are ruled out, therefore only the third remains. But it is inadmissible to begin with humans that live in a social connection without first telling us
something about the social connection in which these humans live.

Second point of criticism: the relationship with natural things, which humans, according to Wagner, try to become aware of and which they try to understand, is not a theoretical relationship in which they “stand,” but it is a relationship established by their practical activity.

538:5 But for a professorial schoolmaster the relations between men and nature are a priori not practical, that is, relations rooted in action, but theoretical, and two relations of this kind are packed up together in the first sentence.

362:5 Aber bei einem Professoralschulmeister sind die Verhältnisse der Menschen zur Natur von vornherein nicht praktische, also durch die Tat begründete Verhältnisse, sondern theoretische, und 2 Verhältnisse dieser Sorte sind gleich in dem ersten Satz ineinandergeschachtelt.

The two interlocked relations are (1) humans stand in a relation to nature, and (2) humans make themselves aware of this relationship in which they stand. For now Marx only talks about the first of the two.

538:6/o First: since the “outer means of satisfying his needs” or outer goods be-
come transformed into "things of the outside world" in the next sentence, the first interlocked relation assumes the following form:

\[
\downarrow
\]

Here is therefore the simplified version of Wagner’s first claim, immediately followed by Marx’s objections:

man finds himself in relation to the things of the outside world as means of satisfying his needs. But men do not by any means begin by “finding themselves in this theoretical relationship to the things of the outside world.” They begin, like every animal, by eating, drinking, etc., that is not by “finding themselves” in a relationship, but actively behaving, availing themselves of certain things of the outside world by action, and thus satisfying their needs. (They start,
then, with production.)

(Sie beginnen also mit der Produktion.)

↑ “Vor allen andern unterscheiden:” I (H.E.) strongly suspect that it should be “von allen andern unterscheiden,” although MEW says “vor.”

↓ After having corrected the character of this first relationship, Marx says something about the process in which people become conscious of this relationship. After they have learned to distinguish the useful things from all other outside things, they incorporate a name for these things into their language. (This “theoretical” act comes after their practical activity.)

By the repetition of this process the capacity of these things to “satisfy their needs” becomes imprinted on their brains; men, like animals, also learn “theoretically” to distinguish the outer things which serve to satisfy their needs from all other. At a certain stage of evolution, after their needs, and the activities by which they are satisfied, have, in the meanwhile, increased and further developed, they will linguistically christen entire
classes of these things which they distinguished by experience from the rest of the outside world.

More details why they need words to talk to each other about these things: because when they appropriate these things they do not do this alone but in co-operation with others, and there may also be conflicts with others over these things.

This is bound to occur, as in the production process—i.e. the process of appropriating these things—they are continually engaged in active contact amongst themselves and with these things, and will soon also have to struggle against others for these things. But this linguistic label purely and simply expresses as a mental image what repeated activity has turned into experience, namely that certain outer things serve to satisfy the

mehr und weiterentwickelt haben, werden sie auch bei der ganzen Klasse diese erfahrungsmäßig von der übrigen Außenwelt unterschiedenen Dinge sprachlich taufen.

More details why they need words to talk to each other about these things: because when they appropriate these things they do not do this alone but in co-operation with others, and there may also be conflicts with others over these things.

This is bound to occur, as in the production process—i.e. the process of appropriating these things—they are continually engaged in active contact amongst themselves and with these things, and will soon also have to struggle against others for these things. But this linguistic label purely and simply expresses as a mental image what repeated activity has turned into experience, namely that certain outer things serve to satisfy the

Dies tritt notwendig ein, da sie im Produktionsprozeß—i.e. Aneignungsprozeß dieser Dinge—fortdauernd in einem werktätigen Umgang unter sich und mit diesen Dingew stehe und bald auch im Kampf mit andern um diese Dinge zu ringen haben. Aber diese sprachliche Bezeichnung drückt durchaus nur aus als Vorstellung, was wiederholte Betätigung zur Erfahrung gemacht hat, nämlich daß den in einem gewissen gesell-
needs of human beings already living in certain social context (this an essential prerequisite because they have language).

⇑ “Wiederholte Betätigung:” MEW says “Bestätigung,” but I consider this a typo or deciphering error. The next sentence ⇓ has “wiederholte Tätigkeit,” which supports my hypothesis that it should be Betätigung:

⇓ Therefore they do not first categorize things and then act, but they act first, and the mental conception is a reflection of this activity.

Human beings only give a special (generic) name to these things because they already know that they serve to satisfy their needs, because they seek to acquire them by more or less frequently repeated activity, and therefore also to keep them in their possession; they call them “goods” or something
else which expresses the fact that they use these things in practice, that these things are useful to them, and they give the thing this character of utility as if it possessed it, although it would hardly occur to a sheep that one of its “useful” qualities is that it can be eaten by human beings.

↑ At the end Marx remarks on it that this usefulness is attributed to the thing itself, although it does not belong to the thing itself but is something relative.

↓ Now Wagner’s error is that he thinks that this has something to do with “value.” It is a misnomer that Wagner calls this process of identifying use-values and finding a word for them “attributing value.”

Thus: human beings actually started by appropriating certain things of the outside world as means of satisfying their own needs, etc. etc.; later they reached a point
where they also denoted them linguistically as what they are for them in their practical experience, namely as means of satisfying their needs, as things which “satisfy” them.

Marx has given here an explanation why humans develop a special name (“good,” “article,” “use-value”) for those things of the outside world which are useful for them. Wagner mistakes this social act as the origin of the concept of value.

Now, if one terms the fact that human beings not only treat such things practically, as means of satisfying their needs, but also designate them in their thoughts, and further also in their language, as things which “satisfy” their needs, and hence themselves {as long as the need of man is not satisfied he is at variance with his needs and thus with himself}; if one terms this, “accord-
ing to German linguistic usage,” “attributing value” to them, then one has proved that the general concept “value” stems from the behaviour of human beings towards the things found in the outside world which satisfy their needs, and consequently that this is the generic concept of “value,” and that all other kinds of value, such as the chemical value [valency] of the elements, are no more than variations of it.

\[\uparrow\] Wagner thinks he has discovered the concept of value, but what he really did was to rediscover the concept of use-value and to call it “value.”

\[\downarrow\] The next paragraph tries to make a link to Marx’s first criticism, that Wagner begins with humans in general. But this paragraph was crossed out in the manuscript:

540:7 [Deleted in the manuscript:] “In the case of Mr. Wagner, however, this ‘deduc-

364:6 [In der Handschrift gestrichen:] Bei Herrn Wagner wird diese „Deduktion“
tion’ becomes even more splendid, since he deals with ‘man’ not with ‘men’. This very simple deduction is expressed by Mr. Wagner like this: “It is a emphnatural striving of man” (read: of the German economics professor), “the relationship” whereby things of the outside world are not only means of satisfying human needs, but are acknowledged linguistically as such, and therefore also serve . . .”

540:1 It is “the natural striving” of a German economics professor to derive the economic category “value” from a “concept,” and this he achieves by simply renaming what is vulgo called “use-value” in political economy as “value” pure and simple, “according to German linguistic usage.” And aber noch schöner, weil er es mit „dem“ Menschen, nicht mit „den“ Menschen zu tun hat. Diese sehr einfache „Deduktion“ drückt Herr Wagner so aus: „Es ist ein natürlicheres Streben des Menschen“ (lies: des deutschen Ökonomieprofessors), „das Verhältnis“, wonach Dinge der Außenwelt als Befriedigungsmittel menschlicher Bedürfnisse nicht nur sind, sondern als solche sprachlich anerkannt sind und daher auch dienen.

364:1 Es ist „das natürliche Bestreben“ eines deutschen Ökonomieprofessors, die ökonomische Kategorie „Wert“ aus einem „Begriff“ abzuleiten, und das erreicht er dadurch, daß, was in der politischen Ökonomie vulgo „Gebrauchswert“ heißt, „nach deutschem Sprachgebrauch“ in „Wert“ schlech
as soon as “value” pure and simple has been found, it serves in turn to derive “use-value” from “value pure and simple.” To do this, one merely has to re-place the “use” fragment, which one dropped earlier, in front of “value” pure and simple.

540:2 In fact it is Rau (see p. 88) who tells us plainly that it “is necessary” (for the German professorial schoolmasters) “to lay down what is meant by value pure and simple,” naively adding: “and it is in accordance with German linguistic usage to select use-value to this end.” {In chemistry the chemical valency of an element is the number at which one of its atoms is able to combine with the atoms of other elements.

364:2 Ist in der Tat Rau (siehe p. 88), der uns schlicht sagt, daß es „nötig ist“ (für die deutschen Professoralschulmeister) „festzusetzen, was unter Wert schlechthin gemeint sei“, und der naiv hinzusetzt: „und es ist dem deutschen Sprachgebrauch gemäß, hierzu—den Gebrauchswert zu wählen. {In der Chemie heißt chemischer Wert eines Elements die Anzahl, worin eins seiner Atome sich mit Atomen anderer Elemente verbinden
But the combining weight of the atoms is also called “equivalency,” the equal value of different elements, etc., etc. Therefore one must first define the concept “value pure and simple,” etc., etc.\}

540:3 If man relates to things as “means of satisfying his needs,” then he relates to them as “goods,” according to Wagner. He grants them the attribute of being “goods”; the content of this operation is in no way altered by the fact that Mr. Wagner renames this “attributing value.” His own lazy consciousness immediately arrives at “an understanding” in the following sentence:

540:4 “This is done through the appreciation (valuation) by which value is attributed to..."

364:3 Bezieht sich der Mensch auf Dinge als „Befriedigungsmittel seiner Bedürfnisse“, so bezieht er sich auf sie als „Güter“, teste Wagner. Er legt ihnen das Attribut „Gut“ bei; der Inhalt dieser Operation wird in keiner Art dadurch verändert, daß Herr Wagner dies umtauf in „Wert beilegen“. Sein eigenes faules Bewußtsein kommt sofort „zum Verständnis“ in dem nächstfolgenden Satz:

364:4 „Dies geschieht durch die Schätzung (Wertschätzung), wodurch den Gütern, bezie-
goods or things of the outside world and this value is measured” [p. 46].

540:5–541:1 We shall waste no words on the fact that Mr. Wagner derives value from valuation (he himself adds “valuation” in brackets after the word appreciation in order to arrive “at a clear awareness and understanding” of the matter). “Man” has the “natural striving” to do this, to “appreciate” goods as “values,” and thus permits Mr. Wagner to derive the promised achievement of the “concept of value in general.” Not for nothing does Wagner smuggle in with the word “goods” the phrase “or the things of the outside world.” His starting point was that man “relates” to the “things of the outside world,” which are means of satisfying

hungsweise den Dingen der Außenwelt Wert beigelegt und derselbe gemessen wird.“

his needs, as to “goods.” So he appreciates these things by the very fact that he relates to them as “goods.” And we have already had an earlier “paraphrase” for this appreciation, to the effect that, e.g.:

“As a needy being, man is in constant contact with the outside world surrounding him and acknowledges that therein lie many of the conditions for his life and well-being” (p. 8).

541:2 This, however, means no more than that he “appreciates the things of the outside world” insofar as they satisfy his “needy being,” being means of satisfying his needs and therefore, as we have already heard, re-

53
lates to them as “goods.”

541:3/o Now it is possible, particularly if one feels the “natural” professorial “striving” to derive the concept of value in general, to do this: to give “the things of the outside world” the attribute of “goods” and dub it “attributing value” to them. One might also have said: Since man relates to the things of the outside world which satisfy his needs as to “goods,” he “prizes” them, thus attributing “price” to them, and thus the derivation of the concept “price pure and simple” by “man’s” own methods is supplied ready cut to the German professor. Everything that the professor is unable to do himself, he makes “man” do; but this man is himself nothing more than the

hörten, sich zu ihnen als „Gütern“ verhält.

365:3/o Nun kann man, namentlich, wenn man das „natürliche“ Professoral-„Bestreben“ fühlt, den Begriff des Werts im allgemeinen abzuleiten, dies: „den Dingen der Außenwelt“ das Attribut „Güter“ beilegen, auch benamen, ihnen „Wert beilegen“. Man hätte auch sagen können: Indem der Mensch sich zu den seine Bedürfnisse befriedigenden Dingen der Außenwelt als „Gütern“ verhält, „preist“ er sie, legt ihnen also „Preis“ bei, und damit wäre denn die Ableitung des Begriffs des „Preises schlechthin“ durch die Verfahrensart „des“ Menschen dem Professor germanicus ready cut geliefert. Alles, was der Professor selbst nicht tun kann, läßt er „den“ Menschen tun,
professorial man who claims to have understood the world once he has arranged it under abstract headings. But in so far as “attributing value” to the things of the outside world is simply another way of phrasing the expression of giving them the attribute of “goods,” this is far from being the same, as Wagner wishes to make out, as attributing “value” to the “goods” themselves as a designation distinct from their “being goods.” It is simply substituting the word “value” for the word “goods.” {As we have seen, the word “price” could also be substituted. Even the word “treasure” could be substituted; since “man” labels certain “things of the outside world” “goods,” he “treasures” them, and therefore relates to them as to a der aber in der Tat selbst wieder nichts ist, als der Professoralmensch, der die Welt begriffen zu haben meint, wenn er sie unter abstrakten Rubriken rangiert. Sofern aber den Dingenden Außenwelt „Wert beilegen“ hier nur eine andere Redensart ist für den Ausdruck, ihnen das Attribut „Güter“ beilegen, so ist damit beileibe nicht, wie das Wagner erschleichen will, den „Gütern“ selbst „Wert“ beigelegt als eine von ihrem „Gutsein“ verschiedene Bestimmung. Es ist nur dem Wort „Gut“ das Wort „Wert“ untergeschoben. {Es könnte, wie wir sehen, auch das Wort „Preis“ untergeschoben werden. Es könnte auch das Wort „Schatz“ untergeschoben werden; denn indem „der“ Mensch gewisse „Dinge der Außenwelt“ zu „Gü-
“treasure.” Thus it can be seen how the three economic categories value, price and treasure could be conjured up by Mr. Wagner at a stroke out of “man’s natural striving” to provide the professor with his bone-headed system of concepts (fancies).} But Mr. Wagner has the dim instinct to step out of his labyrinth of tautology and worm his way into a “further something” or a “something further.” Hence the phrase: “by which value is attributed to goods or things of the outside world, etc.” Since the labelling of “things of the outside world” as goods, i.e., the distinguishing and fixing of these (in the mind) as means of satisfying human needs, is also dubbed by Mr. Wagner “attributing value to things,” he can no more call this tern “stempelt, „schätzte“ er sie und verhält sich daher zu ihnen als einem „Schatz“. Man sieht daher, wie die 3 ökonomischen Kategorien Wert, Preis, Schatz von Herrn Wagner auf einen Schlag aus „dem natürlichen Streben des Menschen“, dem Professor seine vernagelte Begriffs(Vorstellungs)welt zu liefern, hervorgezaubert werden konnten.} Aber Herr Wagner hat den dunklen Trieb, seinem Labyrinth von Tautologie zu entschlüpfen und ein „weiteres etwas“ oder „etwas weiteres“ zu erschleichen. Daher die Phrase; „wodurch den Gütern, beziehungsweise den Dingen der Außenwelt Wert beigelegt etc. wird“. Da Herr Wagner das Stempeln von „Dingen der Außenwelt“ zu Gütern, d.h. das Auszeichnen und Fixieren
attributing value to “the goods” themselves than he could talk about attributing value to the “value” of the things of the outside world. But the salto mortale is performed with the words “attributing value to goods or the things of the outside world.” Wagner should have said: the dubbing of certain things of the outside world “goods” may also be called “attributing value” to these things and this is the Wagnerian derivation of the “concept of value” pure and simple or in general. The content is not altered by this change of linguistic expression. It is still only the distinguishing or fixing in the mind of the things of the outside world which are means of satisfying human needs; in fact, simply the perception and acknowledg-
edgement of certain things of the outside world as means of satisfying the needs of “man” (who as such, however, is actually suffering from a “need of concepts”).

542:1 But Mr. Wagner wishes to make us, or himself, believe that instead of giving two names to the same content he has progressed from the designation “goods” to a further developed designation “value,” distinct from the first, and he does this simply by substituting the word “goods” for “things of the outside world,” a process which is fur-

366:1/o Aber Herr Wagner will uns oder sich selbst weismachen, daß er, statt 2 Namen den selben Gehalt zu geben, vielmehr von der Bestimmung „Gut“ zu einer davon unterschiedenen, weiterentwickelten Bestimmung „Wert“ fortgeschritten ist, und dies geschieht einfach dadurch, daß er „Dingen der Außenwelt“ „beziehungsweise“ das
ther “obscured” by the fact that he rather substitutes the “things of the outside world” for “the goods.” His own confusion thus achieves the certain effect of confusing his readers. He might also have reversed this splendid “derivation” as follows. By differentiating the things of the outside world, which are means of satisfying his needs, as such means of satisfaction, from the other things of the outside world, and therefore according them special distinction, he pays tribute to them, attributes value to them, or gives them the attribute of “value.” This can also be expressed by saying that he grants them the attribute of “goods” as a characteristic, or respects or values them as “goods.” Thereby the concept “goods” is attributed by the termal beilegt oder sie als “Gut” achtet oder
to the “values” or to the things of the outside world. And thus the concept of “goods” in general is “derived” from the concept of “value.” All derivations of this kind are simply concerned with diverting attention from a problem which one is not capable of solving.

542:2 But in the same breath Mr. Wagner proceeds in all haste from the “value” of goods to the “measurement” of this value.

543:1 The content would remain exactly the same if the word “value” had not been smuggled in at all. It might be said: By dubbing certain things of the outside world which, etc., as “goods,” man will eventu-


367:2 Der Inhalt bleibt absolut derselbe, wäre das Wort Wert überhaupt nicht hineingeschmuggelt worden. Es könnte gesagt werden: Indem der Mensch gewisse Dinge der Außenwelt, die etc. zu „Gütern“
ally come to compare these “goods” with one another, and according to the hierarchy of his needs will arrange them in a certain order, i.e. if one likes to call it so, “measure” them. Wagner may not speak at all of the development of the real measure of these goods here, i.e. of the development of their measure of quantity, as this would remind the reader too sharply how little what is otherwise meant by “measure of value” is dealt with here.

543:2 {That the distinguishing of (reference to) things of the outside world which are means of satisfying human needs as “goods” may be dubbed “attributing value to these things”—this Wagner was able to stempelt, wird er nach und nach diese „Güter“ untereinander vergleichen und, entsprechend der Hierarchie seiner Bedürfnisse, in eine gewisse Rangordnung bringen, d.h. wenn man es so nennen will, sie „messen“. Von der Entwicklung der wirklichen Maße dieser Güter, i.e. der Entwicklung ihrer Größenmaße, darf Wagner hier beileibe nicht sprechen, da dies den Leser zu lebhaft daran erinnern würde, wie wenig es sich hier um das handelt, was sonst unter „Wertmessen“ verstanden wird.

367:3 {Daß das Auszeichnen von (Hinweisen auf) Dingen der Außenwelt, die Befriedigungsmittel menschlicher Bedürfnisse sind, als „Güter“ auch benamst werden kann: diesen Dingen „Wert beilegen“, konn-
prove not only by means of “German linguistic usage,” as Rau did, but also: there is the Latin word \textit{dignitas} = dignity, merit, rank, etc., which when applied to things also means “value”; \textit{dignitas} is derived from \textit{dignus}, and this from \textit{dic}, \textit{point out}, show, auszeichnen, zeigen; \textit{dignus} thus means “POINTED OUT”; hence, too, \textit{digitus}, the finger with which one points out a thing, refers to it; Greek \textit{δείκνυμι}, \textit{δάχτυλος} (finger); Gothic: \textit{ga-tecta} (dico); German: \textit{zeigen}; and we could arrive at a lot more “derivations” bearing in mind that \textit{δείκνυμι} or \textit{δείκνυω} (sichtbar machen, zum Vorschein bringen, hinweisen) (to make visible, to bring to light, \textit{to refer to}) has the same basic stem as \textit{δεχομαι}—that is \textit{δέχ} (to
543:3 What a lot of banality, tautological confusion, hairsplitting and underhand manoeuvring Mr. Wagner manages to pack into not quite 7 lines.

This is the end of Marx’s critique of Wagner’s passage in [mecw24]538:1.

543:4 No wonder that after this feat, the obscure man (vir obscurus) continues with great self-assurance:

543:5 “The much disputed concept of value, still obscured by many investigations frequently of merely apparent depth, resolves itself” (indeed) {rather “involves,” i.e. convolutes itself} “if, as has been done hitherto” {namely by Wagner}, “we take the needs and the economic nature of man as our starting-point and on arriving at the concept of goods—tie it up with the concept of value” (p. 46).

367:4 So viel Banalität, tautologischer Wirrwarr, Wortklauberei, Erschlichungsmanöver bringt Herr Wagner in nicht ganz 7 Zeilen fertig.

367:5 Kein Wunder, daß dieser Dunkelmann (vir obscurus) nach diesem Kunststück mit großem Selbstgefühl fortfährt:

Here we have the concept juggling, whose supposed development according to the *vir obscurus* boils down to “tying up,” and to a certain extent “tying on.”

Begriffswirtschaft instead of the economics of production.

Further derivation of the concept of value:

Subjective and objective value. Subjective and, in the most general sense, the value of goods = importance which “is attributed to the goods on account of their usefulness ... not a quality of the things in themselves, even if it objectively presupposes the usefulness of a thing” {thus presupposing “objective” value}. In the objective sense one also understands by “value” and “values” the value-possessing goods, in

Man hat hier die *Begriffswirtschaft*, deren angebliche *Entwicklung* beim *vir obscurus* herausläuft auf das „Anknüpfen“ und gewissermaßen aufs „Aufknüpfen“.

Weitere Ableitung des Wertbegriffs:

Subjektiver und objektiver Wert. Subjektiv und im allgemeinsten Sinn der Wert des Gutes = Bedeutung, die „dem Gute wegen ... seiner Nützlichkeit“ beigeglegt wird ... keine Eigenschaft der Dinge an sich, wenn er auch objektiv die Nützlichkeit eines Dinges zur Voraussetzung hat“ {also den „objektiven“ Wert zur Voraussetzung hat} „... Im *objektiven* Sinn versteht man unter ‚Wert‘, ‚Werten‘ dann auch die
which (!) good and value, goods and values become essentially “identical concepts” (pp. 46, 47).

544:1–2 After taking what is usually termed “use-value” and dubbing it “value in general” and then the “concept of value” pure and simple, Wagner can surely not fail to recall that the “value” “derived” (!) “in this way” (well, well!) is “use-value.” After dubbing “use-value” the “concept of value” in general, or “value pure and simple,” he discovers, on second thought, that he has simply been drivelling on about “use-value,” and has thus “derived” it, drivelling and deriving now being for him “essentially” identical mental operations. But at this juncture we discover how subjective the hitherto “ob-

jective” confusion of ideas of the aforesaid Mr. Wagner really is. For he reveals a secret to us. Rodbertus had written a letter to him which may be read in the Tübingen Zeitschrift of 1878, in which he, Rodbertus, expounds why there is “only one kind of value”: use-value.

“I” (Wagner) “have come to support this view, the importance of which I have already emphasized in the first edition” [p. 48].

544:3–5 Of what Rodbertus says, Wagner says:

“This is quite correct and necessitates an alteration of the usual illogical ‘division’ of ‘value’ into use-value and exchange-value, which I

368:6–7 Von [dem,] was Rodbertus sagt, sagt Wagner:

„Das ist vollkommen richtig und nötigt zu einer Änderung der üblichen unlogischen ‘Ein teilung’ des ‘Werts’ in Gebrauchswert und
had still undertaken in § 3 [in Wagner § 35] of the first edition” (p. 48, Note 4).

and the same Wagner places me (p. 49, Note) amongst those according to whom “use-value” should be entirely “removed” “from the science.”

↓ In response to Wagner’s claim that Marx wanted to remove use-value entirely from the science of economics, Marx gives an important commentary about his own derivation. The first paragraph following here (“to begin with”) gives a few remarks about Marx’s starting point, and the next [mecw24]545:1 (“secondly”) introduces a longer discussion about use-value:

544:6/o All this is “drivel.” To begin with, I do not proceed from “concepts,” hence neither from the “concept of value,” and am therefore in no way concerned to “divide” it.

368:8/o Alles das sind „Faseleien“.
De prime abord gehe ich nicht aus von „Begriffen“, also auch nicht vom „Wertbegriff“, und habe diesen daher auch in keiner Weise „einzuteilen“. 
Marx’s starting point is therefore not the concept of value, which then would have to be divided into use-value and exchange-value. What I proceed from is the simplest social form in which the product of labor presents itself in contemporary society, and this is the “commodity.” This I analyze, initially in the form in which it appears. Here I find that on the one hand in its natural form it is a thing for use, alias a use-value; on the other hand, a bearer of exchange-value, and from this point of view it is itself “an exchange-value.”

“Theory of Value”

⇑“From this point of view it is itself ‘an exchange-value’” means: if the commodity is looked at as carrier of exchange-value, it is itself called “an exchange-value.”

Further analysis of the latter shows me that exchange-value is merely a “form of appearance,” an independent mode of representa-
tion of the value contained in the commodity, and then I proceed to analyze the latter. I therefore state explicitly, p. 36, 2nd ed.: “When, at the beginning of this chapter, we said, in common parlance, that a commodity is both a use-value and an exchange-value, we were, strictly speaking, wrong. A commodity is a use-value or object of utility, and a ‘value’. It represents itself as this twofold thing that it is, as soon as its value assumes its own form of appearance distinct from the natural form of the commodity—the form of exchange-value,” etc.

↑ In the fourth edition of *Capital*, this passage is 152:1. ↓ The next passage is perhaps Marx’s clearest explanation why his starting point is the commodity and not value:

Thus I do not divide value into use-value and exchange-value as opposites into which des in der Ware enthaltenen Werts ist, und dann gehe ich an die Analyse des letzteren. Es heißt daher ausdrücklich, p. 36, 2. Ausg.: „Wenn es im Eingang dieses Kapitels in der gang und gäben Manier hieß: Die Ware ist Gebrauchswert und Tauschwert, so war dies, genau gesprochen, falsch. Die Ware ist Gebrauchswert oder Gebrauchsgegenstand und ‚Wert‘. Sie stellt sich dar als dies Doppelte was sie ist, sobald ihr Wert eine eigne, von ihrer Naturalform verschiedene Erscheinungsform besitzt, die des Tauschwerts“ etc.
The abstraction “value” splits up, but the concrete social form of the product of labor, the “commodity,” is on the one hand, use-value and on the other, “value,” not exchange value, since the mere form of appearance is not its own content.

The form of appearance is exchange-value, and its content is value.

545:1 Second: only a vir obscurus who has not understood a word of Capital can conclude: Because Marx in a note in the first edition of Capital rejects all the German professorial twaddle about “use-value” in general, and refers readers who want to know something about real use-values to “manuals dealing with merchandise”—for this reason use-value plays no part in his work. Naturally it does not play the part of

its opposite, of “value,” which has nothing in common with it, except that “value” occurs in the term “use-value.” He might just as well have said that “exchange-value” is discarded by me because it is only the form of appearance of value, and not “value” itself, since for me the “value” of a commodity is neither its use-value nor its exchange value.

The above-mentioned remark seems to refer to footnote * in Contribution, 270:1, rather than to a footnote in the first edition of Capital.

545:2/o When one comes to analyze the “commodity”—the simplest concrete element of economics—one must exclude all relations which have nothing to do with the particular object of the analysis. Therefore I have said in a few lines what there is to
say about the commodity in so far as it is a use-value, but on the other hand I have emphasized the *characteristic form* in which use-value—the product of labor—appears here, that is: “A thing can be useful, and the product of human labor, without being a commodity. Whoever [directly] satisfies his needs with the produce of his own labor, creates, indeed, use-values but not commodities. In order to produce commodities, he must not only produce use-values, but use-values for others, social use-values” (p. 15). {This the root of Rodbertus’ “social use-value.”} Consequently use-value—as the use-value of a “commodity” itself possesses a specific historical character. In primitive communities in which, e.g., Gebrauchswert, zu sagen ist, habe ich daher in wenigen Zeilen gesagt, anderseits aber die *charakteristische Form* hervorgehoben, in der hier der Gebrauchswert—das Arbeitsprodukt—erscheint; nämlich: „Ein Ding kann nützlich und Produkt menschlicher Arbeit sein, ohne Ware zu sein. Wer durch sein Produkt sein eignes Bedürfnis befriedigt, schafft zwar Gebrauchswert, aber nicht Ware. Um Ware zu produzieren, muß er nicht nur Gebrauchswert produzieren, sondern Gebrauchswert für andre, gesellschaftlichen Gebrauchswert“ (p. 15). {Dies die Wurzel des Rodbertusschen „gesellschaftlichen Gebrauchswerts“.} Damit besitzt der Gebrauchswert—als Gebrauchswert der „Ware“—selbst einen historisch-
means of livelihood are produced communally and distributed amongst the members of the community, the common product directly satisfies the vital needs of each community member, of each producer; the social character of the product, of the use-value, here lies in its (common) communal character. {Mr. Rodbertus on the other hand transforms the “social use-value” of the commodity into “social use-value” pure and simple, and is hence talking nonsense.}

546:1 As may be seen from the above, it would be sheer nonsense, in an analysis of the commodity—since it presents itself

spezifischen Charakter. Im primitiven Gemeinwesen, worin z.B. die Lebensmittel gemeinschaftlich produziert und verteilt werden unter den Gemeindegenossen, befriedigt das gemeinsame Produkt direkt die Lebensbedürfnisse jedes Gemeindegenossen, jedes Produzenten, der gesellschaftliche Charakter des Produkts, des Gebrauchswerts, liegt hier in seinem (gemeinsamen) gemeinschaftlichen Charakter. {Herr Rodbertus dahingegen verwandelt den „gesellschaftlichen Gebrauchswert“ der Ware in den „gesellschaftlichen Gebrauchswert“ schlechthin, faselt daher.}

370:1 Es wäre also, wie aus dem obigen hervorgeht, reine Faselei, bei Analyse der Ware—welch sie sich einerseits als Ge-
on the one hand as a use-value or goods, on the other hand as value”—to “tie up” at this juncture all sorts of banal reflexions about use-values or goods which do not enter into the world of commodities, such as “state goods,” “communal goods,” etc. as Wagner and the German professor IN GENERAL does, or about goods like “health,” etc. Where the state is itself a capitalist producer, as in the exploitation of mines, forests, etc., its product is a “commodity” and hence possesses the specific character of every other commodity.

546:2 On the other hand the vir obscurus has overlooked the fact that even in my analysis of the commodity I do not come to a halt with its dual way of presenting itself, brauchswert oder Gut, anderseits als „Wert“ darstellt—nun bei dieser Gelegenheit allerlei banale Reflexionen über Gebrauchs-werte oder Güter „anzuknüpfen“, die nicht in den Bereich der Warenwelt fallen, wie „Staatsgüter“, „Gemeindegüter“ etc., wie es Wagner und der deutsche Professor in general tut, oder über das Gut „Gesundheit“ etc. Wo der Staat selbst kapitalistischer Produzent, wie bei Exploitation von Minen, Waldungen etc., ist sein Produkt „Ware“ und besitzt daher den spezifischen Charakter jeder andern Ware.

370:2/o Andrerseits hat der vir obscurus übersehen, daß schon in der Analyse der Ware bei mir nicht stehengeblieben wird bei der Doppelweise, worin sie sich darstellt, son-
but immediately proceed to show that in this duality of the commodity there presents itself the dual character of the labor whose product it is: of useful labor, i.e. the concrete modes of the labors which create use-values, and of abstract labor, of labor as expenditure of labor power, regardless of the “useful” way in which it is expended (on which the presentation of the production process later depends);

The end of this impossibly long sentence has a nice summary of the role of use-value in Marx’s theory:

that in the development of the value form of the commodity, in the final instance its money form, and thus of money, the value of a commodity presents itself in the use-

daß in der Entwicklung der Wertform der Ware, in letzter Instanz ihrer Geldform, also des Geldes, der Wert einer Ware sich darstellt im Gebrauchswert der andern, d.h.
value of the other commodity, i.e. in its natural form; that surplus-value itself is derived from a “specific” use-value of labor power belonging to it exclusively, etc., etc., that, in other words, for me use-value plays an important part quite different from its part in economics hitherto, but nota bene it still only comes under consideration when such a consideration stems from the analysis with regard to economic formations, not from arguing hither and thither about the concepts or words “use-value” and “value.”

Marx’s hiatus between value and use-value therefore does not mean he ignores use-value.

546:3/o For this reason when analyzing the commodity I do not immediately drag in the Naturalform der andern Ware; daß der Mehrwert selbst abgeleitet wird aus einem „spezifischen“ und ihr exklusive zukommenden Gebrauchswert der Arbeitskraft etc. etc., daß also bei mir der Gebrauchswert eine ganz anders wichtige Rolle spielt als in der bisherigen Ökonomie, daß er aber notabene immer nur in Betracht kommt, wo solche Betrachtung aus der Analyse gegebner ökonomischer Gestaltungen entspringt, nicht aus Hin- und Herräsonieren über die Begriffe oder Worte „Gebrauchswert“ und „Wert“.

371:1 Deswegen werden bei Analyse der Ware auch nicht bei Gelegenheit ihres „Ge-
definitions of “capital,” not even when dealing with the “use-value” of the commodity. Such definitions are bound to be sheer nonsense as long as we have advanced no further than the analysis of the elements of the commodity.

547:1–4 What annoys (shocks) Mr. Wagner about my presentation, though, is that I will not do him the favour of complying with the patriotic German professorial “striving” for confusing use-value with value. Although German society is very much post festum, it has nevertheless gradually emerged from the feudal subsistence economy, or at least its predominance, into capitalist society, but the professors are still standing with one foot in the old muck—

brauchswerts“ sofort Definitionen des „Kapitals“ angeknüpft, die ja reiner Unsinn sein müssen, solange wir erst bei Analyse der Elemente der Ware stehn.

371:2–3 Was Herrn Wagner aber bei meiner Darstellung ennuyiert (schockiert), ist, daß ich ihm nicht den Gefallen tue, dem deutsch-vaterländischen Professoral- „Bestreben“ zu folgen, und Gebrauchswert und Wert zu konfundieren. Obgleich die deutsche Gesellschaft sehr post festum, ist sie doch nach und nach aus der feudalalen Naturalwirtschaft, oder wenigstens deren Vorwiegen, zur kapitalistischen Wirtschaft gelangt, aber die Professoren stehn mit ei-
naturally enough. From being the serfs of landowners they have turned into the serfs of the state, vulgo the government. Therefore our vir obscurus too, who has not even noticed that my analytic method, which does not proceed from man but from a given economic period of society, has nothing in common with the German-professorial association-of-concepts method ("words are excellent for fighting with, with words a system may be built"), therefore he says:

"In harmony with the view of Rodbertus and also of Schäffle I place the use-value character of all value in the fore, and emphasize the assessment of use-value all the more, since the

nem Fuß immer noch im alten Dreck, was natürlich. Aus Leibeignen von Gutsbesitzern haben sie sich in Leibeigne des Staats, vulgo Regierung, verwandelt. Daher sagt auch unser vir obscurus, der nicht einmal bemerkt hat, daß meine analytische Methode, die nicht von dem Menschen, sondern der ökonomisch gegebenen Gesellschaftsperiode ausgeht, mit der professoraldeutschen Begriffsanknüpfungs-Methode nichts gemein hat ("mit Worten läßt sich trefflich streiten, mit Worten ein System bereiten"), deswegen sagt er:

„Ich stelle im Einklang mit der Rodbertuschen und auch mit der Schäffleschen Auffassung den Gebrauchswert-Charakter alles Werts [voran] und hebe die Gebrauchswert-
assessment of exchange-value is simply not applicable to many of the most important economic goods,”

Schätzung um so mehr hervor, weil die Tauschwert-
Schätzung auf viele der wichtigsten wirtschaftlichen Güter schlechterdings gar nicht anwendbar ist“

“post festum” might be a reference to 168:1/o in conjunction with what Marx wrote in 95:2/o.

{Was zwingt ihn zu Ausreden? also als Staatsdiener fühlt er sich verpflichtet, Gebrauchswert und Wert zu konfundieren!},

{what compels him to these subterfuges? so, as a civil servant, he feels obliged to confuse use-value and value!}

“neither to the state and its services, nor to other social economic relations” (p. 49, Note).

„so nicht auf den Staat und seine Leistungen noch auf andre gemeinwirtschaftliche Verhältnisse“ (p. 49, Note).

547:5/o {This reminds one of the old chemists before the science of chemistry: as cooking butter, which is simply called butter in everyday life (according to the Nordic custom), has a soft consistency, they

371:4/o {Es erinnert dies an die alten Chemiker vor der Wissenschaft der Chemie: weil Kochbutter, die im gewöhnlichen Leben Butter schlechthin (nach nordischer Sitte) heißt, einen weichen Be-
called chloride, butter of zinc, butter of antimony, etc. Butter juices, thus, to use the words of the vir obscurus, “firmly adhering to the butter character of all chlorides, zinc and antimony compounds.”} The whole rigmarole boils down to this: Because certain goods, especially the state (goods!) and its “services” {Particularly the services of its professors of political economy} are not “commodities,” the opposing characteristics contained in the “commodities” themselves {which also appear explicitly in the commodity form of the product of labor} must therefore be confused with one another! In the case of Wagner and Co. it is anyway hard to maintain that they have more to gain if their “services” are determined accord-
ing to their “use-value,” according to their tangible “content” [Gehalt], rather than according to their “salary” [Gehalt] (through a “social tax,” as Wagner expresses it [p. 45], i.e. are “assessed” according to their payment.

548:1 {The only thing which clearly lies at the bottom of the German stupidity is the fact that linguistically the words value [Wert] or worth [Würde] were first applied to the useful things themselves, which existed for a long time, even as “products of labor,” before becoming commodities. But this has as little to do with the scientific determination of the “value” of the commodity as the fact that the word salt was first used by the ancients for cooking salt, and conse-
1 Randglossen zu Adolph Wagner

quently sugar, etc. also figure as varieties of salt from Pliny onwards (INDEED, all colourless solids soluble in water and with a peculiar taste), and therefore the chemical category “salt” includes sugar, etc.

548:2 {As the commodity is bought by the purchaser not because it has value but because it is a “use-value,” and is used for definite purposes, it goes without saying that 1. use-values are “assessed,” i.e. their quality is investigated (just as their quantity is weighed, measured, etc.); 2. if different sorts of commodities can be substituted for one another for the same use, one or the other will be given preference, etc., etc.}

372:2 {Da die Ware vom Käufer gekauft wird, nicht weil sie Wert hat, sondern weil sie „Gebrauchswert“ ist und zu bestimmten Zwecken gebraucht wird, versteht es sich ganz von selbst, 1. daß die Gebrauchswerte „geschätzt“ werden, d.h. ihre Qualität untersucht wird (ganz wie ihre Quantität gemessen, gewogen etc. wird); 2. daß, wenn verschiedene Warensorten einander substituiert werden können für dieselbe Gebrauchsanwendung, dieser oder jener der Vorzug gegeben wird etc. etc.}

Zucker etc. seit Plinius als Salzarten figurieren {indeed alle farblosen festen Körper in Wasser löslich und mit eigentümlichem Geschmack}, deswegen die chemische Kategorie „Salz“ Zucker etc. in sich begreift.
548:3 In Gothic there is only one word for Wert and Würde: vairths, τιμή, \{τιμάω, assess, i.e. evaluate; to determine the price or value, to rate; metaphorically: to appreciate, esteem, honour, distinguish. Τιμή—assessment, hence: determination of value or price, evaluation, valuation. Then: estimation, honour, respect, place of honour, honorary post, etc., Rost’s Greek-German Dictionary.


548:4 Value, price (Schulze, Glossar) Gothic: vairths, adj., ἀξίος, ἰχάνος

372:4 Wert, Preis (Schulze, Glossar) gotisch: vairths, adj., ἀξίος, ἰχάνος

548:5 Old Norse: verdhr, worthy, verdh, value, price; Anglo-Saxon: veordh, vurdh;

372:5 altnordisch: verdhr, würdig, verdh, Wert, Preis; angelsächsisch: veordh, vurdh;
English: *worth*, adj. and noun, *value* and *dignity*

548:6 “Middle High German: *wert*, genitive *werdes*, adj. *dignus* and likewise *pfennincwert*, gen. *Werdes*, value, worth, splendour; *aestimatio*, commodity of definite value, e.g. *pfenwert*, *Pennyworth*; -werde: *meritum*, *aestimatio*, dignitas, precious character” (Ziemann: *Middle High German Dictionary*).

549:1 *Wert* and *Würde* [value and worth] are thus closely related in both etymology and meaning. What conceals the fact is the *inorganic* (incorrect) *inflexion* of *Wert* which has become customary in Modern High German: *Werth, Werthes* instead of *Werdes*, since Gothic *th* corresponds to High German *d*, not *th* = *t*, and this is indeed still


372:7/o *Wert* und *Würde* hängen also ganz zusammen, nach Etymologie und Bedeutung. Was die Sache verdeckt, ist die im Neu hochdeutsch gebräuchlich gewordene *unorganische* (falsche) *Flexionsweise* von *Wert*: Werth, Werthes statt Werdes, denn dem got[ischen] *th* entspricht hochdeutsch *d*, nicht *th* = *t*, und dies ist auch im Mittel-
the case in Middle High German (wert, gen. Werdes, loc. cit.). According to the rule in Middle High German, \( d \) at the end of a word became \( t \), giving \textit{wert} instead of \textit{werd}, but genitive \textit{Werdes}.

549:2 But all this has as much or as little to do with the economic category “value” as with the \textit{chemical valency of the chemical elements} (atomicity) or with the chemical equivalents or equal values (combining weights of the chemical elements).

549:3 Furthermore it should be noted that—even in this linguistic connection—if it follows automatically, as if by the nature of the thing, from the original identity of \textit{Würde} and \textit{Wert} that this word also referred

hochdeutsch so der Fall’ (\textit{wert}, gen. \textit{werdes}, daselbst). Nach mittelhochdeutscher Regel müßte \( d \) am Schluß des Worts \( t \) werden, also \textit{wert} statt \textit{werd}, aber genit. \textit{werdes}.


373:2 Ferner ist zu bemerken, daß selbst in dieser sprachlichen Beziehung—wenn aus der ursprünglichen Identität von \textit{Würde} und \textit{Wert} von selbst folgt, wie aus der Natur der Sache, daß dies Wort auch auf Sa-
to things, products of labor in their natural form—it was later directly applied unchanged to *prices*, i.e. value in its developed value-form, i.e. exchange-value, which has so little to do with the matter that the same word continued to be used for worth in general, for honorary offices, etc. Thus, linguistically speaking, there is no distinction here between use-value and value.

549:4 Let us now turn to the authority quoted by the *vir obscurus*, to *Rodbertus* {whose essay may be scrutinised in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift*}. The passage by Rodbertus cited by the *vir obscurus* is as follows:

549:5–6 From the *text on page 48*:

373:3 Kommen wir nun zum Gewährsmann des *vir obscurus*, zu *Rodbertus* {dessen Aufsatz in der *Tübinger Zeitschrift* anzu-sehn ist}. Was *vir obscurus* von Rodbertus zitiert, ist folgendes:

373:4–5 Im *Text der p. 48*:
“There is only one kind of value, and that is use-value. This is either individual use-value or social use-value. The former stands in a relation to the individual and his needs, quite regardless of any social organisation.”

549:7/o {This is sheer nonsense (cf. Capital, p. 171) where, however, it says that the labor-process, as a useful activity for the production of use-values, etc., is “equally common to all its” (human life’s) “forms of society” and “is independent of each of them.”} {First, it is not the word “use-value” which stands in relation to the individual, but concrete use-values, and which of these “stand in a relation” to him (for these people everything always “stands”; everything is a question of “standing”) is entirely de-
pendent on the level of the social production process, therefore also corresponding to “a social organisation.” But if Rodbertus only wishes to make the trivial statement that use-value which really stands in relation to an individual as an object of utility, relates to him as an individual use-value for him—then this is either a trivial tautology or it is incorrect, since not to mention such things as rice, maize, wheat or meat {which does not stand in any relation to a Hindu as food}, an individual’s need for the title of Professor or Privy Councillor or an order is possible only in quite a definite “social Organisation”}.

„ständisch“), hängt ganz von der Stufe des gesellschaftlichen Produktionsprozesses ab, entspricht also auch „einer sozialen Organisation“. Will Rodbertus aber nur das Triviale sagen, daß der Gebrauchswert, der wirklich als Gebrauchsgegenstand einem Individuum gegenübersteht, als individueller Gebrauchswert für es ihm gegenübersteht, so ist das eine triviale Tautologie oder aber falsch, da von solchen Dingen, wie Reis, Mais oder Weizen nicht zu sprechen oder Fleisch {das einem Hindu nicht als Nahrungsmittel gegenübersteht} nicht zu sprechen, einem Individuum das Bedürfnis eines Professor- oder Geheimrattitels oder eines Ordens nur in ganz bestimmter „sozialer Organisation“ möglich ist.
550:1–2 "The second is *use-value*, which a *social* organism consisting of many individual organisms (or individuals) has” (p. 48, text).

Lovely wording! Is it the “use-value” of the “social organism” which is meant here, or is it a use-value in the possession of a “social organism” (as e.g. land in primitive communities), or is it the definite “social” form of use-value in a *social organism*, as e.g. in places where commodity production predominates, the use-value which a producer supplies must be a “use-value for others” and in this sense a “social use-value”? This is nothing but hot air and will lead us nowhere.

374:1–2 „Der zweite ist der *Gebrauchswert* den ein aus vielen individuellen Organismen (bzw. Individuen) bestehender *sozialer Organismus* hat“ (p. 48, Text).

550:3–4 And so on to the second proposition of Wagner’s Faust:

“Exchange-Value is simply the historical mantle and appendage of the social use-value from a particular period of history. By taking an exchange-value as the logical opposite of use-value, one is placing an historical concept in logical contrast to a logical concept, which is logically not admissible” (p. 48, Note 4). “That is quite correct!” crows Wagner ibidem.

550:5/0 Who is the “one” who is committing this? That Rodbertus means me, we may take for granted, since according to R. Meyer, his famulus, he has written a “big, fat manuscript” against *Capital*.

374:3–4 Also zum andern Satz des Faustus des Wagner:

„Der Tauschwert ist nur der historische Um- und Anhang des sozialen Gebrauchswerts aus einer bestimmten Geschichtsperiode. Indem man dem Gebrauchswert einen Tauschwert als logischen Gegensatz gegenüberstellt, stellt man zu einem logischen Begriff einen historischen Begriff in logischen Gegensatz, was logisch nicht angeht“ (p. 48, Note 4). „Das ist“ jubelt ibidem Wagnerus, „das ist vollkommen richtig!“

Who is placing things in logical contrast? Mr. Rodbertus, for whom “use-value” and “exchange-value” are both by nature mere “concepts.” In fact in every price-list every individual sort of commodity undergoes this illogical process, distinguishing itself from the others as goods, use-value, as cotton, yarn, iron, grain, etc., and representing “goods” qualitatively different from the others toto coelo, but simultaneously representing its price as qualitatively the same but quantitavely different of the same essence. It presents itself in its natural form for him who uses it, and in value-form, which is quite different from it and “common” to all other commodities, i.e. as exchange-value.

The only “logical” contrast here is in Rodbertus and the German professorial schoolmasters related to him who proceed from the “concept” of value, not from the “social thing,” the commodity,” who get this concept to split up into itself (duplicate itself), and then argue about which of these two phantoms of the mind is the real Jacob!

551:1/o But what lurks in the gloomy background to these high-flown phrases is simply the immortal discovery that in all circumstances man must eat, drink, etc. {one cannot even continue: “clothe himself, or have a knife and fork or bed and dwelling,” as this is not the case in all circumstances};

Wertform sowie als Tauschwert. Es handelt sich hier um einen „logischen“ Gegensatz nur bei Rodbertus und den ihm verwandten deutschen Professoralschulmeistern, die vom „Begriff“ Wert, nicht von dem „sozialen Ding“, der „Ware“ ausgehen, und diesen Begriff sich in sich selbst spalten (verdoppeln) lassen, und sich dann darüber streiten, welche von beiden Hirngespinsten der wahre Jakob ist!

375:1/o Was aber im düstern Hintergrund der gespreizten Phrasen liegt, ist einfach die unsterbliche Entdeckung, daß der Mensch in allen Zuständen essen, trinken etc. muß {man kann nicht einmal fortfahren: sich kleiden oder Messer und Gabel oder Betten und Wohnungen haben, da dies nicht
in short, that in all circumstances he must find external things already available in nature to satisfy his needs and appropriate them or fashion them out of what nature provides; in this actual procedure of his he thus always relates practically to certain external things as “use-values,” i.e. he always treats them as objects for his use; hence according to Rodbertus use-value is a “logical” concept; thus, since man must also breathe, “breathing” is a “logical” concept, but not a “physiological” one at all. The entire shallowness of Rodbertus, however, emerges in his contrast between “logical” and “historical” concepts!

unter allen Zuständen der Fall}; kurz, daß er in allen Zuständen äußere Dinge zur Befriedigung seiner Bedürfnisse fertig in der Natur vorfinden und ihrer sich bemächtigen oder sich aus Naturvorgefundenem bereiten muß; in diesem seinen tatsächlichen Verfahren verhält er sich also faktisch stets zu gewissen äußeren Dingen als „Gebrauchswerten“, d.h. er behandelt sie stets als Gegenstände für seinen Gebrauch; daher ist der Gebrauchswert nach Rodbertus ein „logischer“ Begriff; also, da der Mensch auch atmen muß, so ist „Atem“ ein „logischer“ Begriff, aber beileibe nicht ein „physiologischer““ Begriff, aber beileibe nicht ein „physiologischer“. Die ganze Flachheit des Rodbertus’ tritt aber in seinem Gegensatz von „logischem“ und „historischem“ Begriff hervor!
**Question 1** Why is it an expression of shallowness to distinguish between “logical” and “historical” concepts?

He grasps “value” (the economic value, in contrast to the use-value of the commodity) only in its form of appearance, in *exchange-value*, and since this only occurs when at least some part of the products of labor, the objects of utility, function as “*commodities*” this not, however, happening from the outset, but only at a certain period of social development, in other words, at a definite stage of historical development, then *exchange-value* is a “historical” concept. Now if Rodbertus—and I will point out later why he did not see it—had gone on to analyze the exchange-value of commodities—for it only exists where *commodity* occurs

Er faßt den „Wert“ (den ökonomischen, im Gegensatz zum Gebrauchswert der Ware) nur in seiner Erscheinungsform, dem *Tauschwert*, und da dieser nur auftritt, wo wenigstens irgendein Teil der Arbeitsprodukte, die Gebrauchsgegenstände, als „*Waren*“ funktionieren, dies aber nicht von Anfang an, sondern erst in einer gewissen gesellschaftlichen Entwicklungsperiode, also auf einer bestimmten Stufe historischer Entwicklung geschieht, so ist der *Tauschwert* ein „historischer“ Begriff. Hätte R[odbertus] nun—ich werde weiter unten sagen, warum er es nicht gesehen hat—weiter den Tauschwert der Waren analysiert—denn
in the plural, different sorts of commodities, then he would have found “value” behind this form of appearance. If he had further gone on to investigate value, he would have further found that here the thing, the “use-value,” amounts to a mere concretisation of human labor, as the expenditure of equal human labor-power, and therefore this content is presented as the concrete character of the thing, as a character appertaining essentially to the thing itself, although this objectivity does not appear in its natural form {which, however, necessitates a special form of value}. He would have found, then, that the “value” of the commodity merely expresses in a historically developed form something which also
dieser existiert bloß, wo Ware im Plural vorkommt, verschiedene Warensorten—, so fand er den „Wert“ hinter dieser Erscheinungsform. Hätte er weiter den Wert untersucht, so hätte er weiter gefunden, daß hierin das Ding, der „Gebrauchswert“, als bloße Vergegenständlichung menschlicher Arbeit, als Verausgabung gleicher menschlicher Arbeitskraft, gilt und daher dieser Inhalt als gegenständlicher Charakter der Sache dargestellt ist, als [Charakter], der ihr selbst sachlich zukommt, obgleich diese Gegenständlichkeit in ihrer Naturalform nicht erscheint {was aber eine besondere Wertform nötig macht}. Er würde also gefunden haben, daß der „Wert“ der Ware nur in einer historisch entwickelten Form aus-
exists in all other historical forms of society, albeit in a different form, namely the social character of labor, insofar as it exists as expenditure of “social” labor-power. If, then, “the value” of the commodity is merely a particular historical form of something which exists in all forms of society, the same must be true of the “social use-value,” as it characterises the “use-value” of the commodity. Mr. Rodbertus has the measure of the magnitude of value from Ricardo; but he himself has neither examined nor grasped the substance of value any more than Ricardo did; e.g. the “communal” character of the [labor process] in the primitive community as the common organism of the labor-powers belonging together, and hence
that of *their labor*, i.e. the expenditure of these powers.

Marx is looking here for the different social forms which the physiological fact that all labor is the expenditure of human labor-power takes in different social orders. That value is only a specific historical form of something that exists in all forms of society resonates with 164:1; Marx is looking here for a transhistorical content of the value determinations.

552:1 Further treatment of Wagner’s twaddle on this issue superfluous.

552:2 *Measure of the magnitude of value.* Mr. Wagner incorporates me here, but finds to his regret that I have “eliminated” the “labor involved in capital formation” (p. 58, Note 7.)

552:3 “In commerce regulated by social organs, the determination of tariff values or tariff prices must be carried out with due con-


376:3 „In einem durch Gesellschaftsorgane geregeltten Verkehr muß die Bestimmung der Taxwerte bzw. der Taxpreise unter an-
sideration to this *cost-element*” {his term for the quantum of labor expended in production, etc.}, “as used to happen in principle in the case of the former state and trade tariffs, and would again have to take effect under any *new tariff system*” {read “socialist”!}. “However, in free commerce the costs are *not* the *sole* basis for determining exchange-values and prices, and cannot be in *any conceivable social situation*. For regardless of costs, there must always occur *fluctuations in use-value and need*, whose influence on *exchange-value and prices* (both contract and tariff prices) then modifies the *influence of costs*, and is bound to do so,” etc. (pp. 58, 59). “The” {i.e. this!} “astute correction of the socialist doctrine of value … we owe to *Schäffle*” (!) who says in *Soz. Körper*, III, p. 278: “No matter what kind of social influence
over needs and production exists, there is no avoiding the fact that all needs always remain in equilibrium qualitatively and quantitatively with production. But if this is so, the social cost-value quotients cannot simultaneously be considered proportionally as social use-value quotients” (p. 59, Note 9).

552:4-5 That this merely amounts to the triviality of market-prices rising and falling above or below value and to the assumption that the theory of value developed by him for bourgeois society is predominant in the “Marxian social state” is shown by Wagner’s phrase:

376:4-5 Daß dies nur auf die Trivialität des Steigens und Fallens der Marktpreise über oder unter Wert und auf die Voraussetzung hinaufkommt, daß im „Marxschen Sozialstaat“ seine für die bürgerliche Gesellschaft entwickelte Werttheorie maßgebend ist—bezeugt die Phrase W[agner]s:
“They” (prices) “will occasionally deviate from them” [costs] to a lesser or greater extent, rising for goods whose use-value has become greater and falling for those whose use-value has become smaller. Only in the long run will costs continually assert themselves as the decisive regulator” etc. (p. 59).

552:6–553:0 Law. As for the fantasies of the vir obscursus about the economically creative influence of the law, one phrase will suffice, although he is forever dragging out the absurd point of view which it exemplifies:

“Individual enterprise has at its head, as the organ of its technical and economic activity . . ., a person as a legal and economic subject. Furthermore, this person is no purely economic


376:6–377:1 Recht. Für die Phantasie des vir obscursus über den wirtschaftlich schöpferischen Einfluß des Rechts genügt eine Phrase, obgleich er den darin enthaltenen absurden Gesichtspunkt wieder und wieder ausquetscht:

„Die Einzelwirtschaft hat an ihrer Spitze, als Organ der technischen und ökonomischen Tätigkeit in ihr . . ., eine Person als Rechts- und Wirtschaftssubjekt. Sie ist wieder keine rein
entity but at the same time dependent on the arrangement of the law. For the latter determines who is to count as a person, and consequently who can stand at the head of a business,” etc. (p. 65).

553:1 Communications and transport (pp. 75–76), p. 80 (Note).

553:2 From p. 82: where the “exchange in the (natural) constituents of the mass of goods” {of an economy, alias dubbed “exchange of goods” by Wagner, is declared to be Schäffle’s “social exchange of matter”—at least, one case of it; but I also used the word in the “natural” process of production for the exchange of matter between man and nature} has been borrowed from me, where exchange of matter first occurs in the analy-

wirtschaftliche Erscheinung, sondern zugleich von der Gestaltung des Rechts abhängig. Denn dieses bestimmt darüber, wer als Person gilt, und damit dann, wer an der Spitze einer Wirtschaft stehen kann“ etc. (p. 65).

377:2 Kommunikations- und Transportwesen (p. 75–76), p. 80 (Note).

sis of $C - M - C$ and interruptions in the exchange of form, later also termed interruptions in the exchange of matter.

553:3 What Mr. Wagner goes on to say about the "inner exchange" of the goods in one branch of production (in his case an "individual enterprise"), partly with reference to their "use-value," partly with reference to their "value," is also discussed by me in the analysis of the first phase of $C - M - C$, namely $C - M$, in the example of the linen-weaver (Capital, pp. 85, 86/87), where I conclude by saying: "Our owners of commodities therefore find out that the same division of labor that turns them into independent private producers, [also] makes the social process of production and their relations..."
lations within that process independent of them themselves, and that the seeming mutual independence of the individuals from one another is supplemented by a system of all-round material dependence” (Capital, p. 87).

This last quote is from 202:1/o.

553:4–554:1 Contracts for the commercial acquisition of goods. Here the vir obscurus places mine and his on their heads. For him the law is first, and then comes commerce; in reality it is the other way round: first there is commerce, and then a legal system develops out of it. In the analysis of the circulation of commodities I have demonstrated that in developed bartering the participants tacitly acknowledge

377:5–378:1 Die Verträge für die kehrsmäßige Erwerbung der Güter. Hier stellt Dunkelmann (vir obscurus) mein und sein auf den Kopf. Bei ihm ist erst das Recht da und dann der Verkehr; in der Wirklichkeit geht’s umgekehrt zu: erst ist Verkehr da, und dann entwickelt sich daraus eine Rechtsordnung. Ich habe bei der Analyse der Warenzirkulation dargestellt, daß beim entwickelten Tauschhandel die Aus-
one another as equal persons and owners of the respective goods to be exchanged by them; they already do that while offering their goods to each other and agreeing to trade with each other. This actual relation, which only arises through and in the exchange, is later given legal form in the contract, etc. but this form neither creates its content, the exchange, nor the relationship between the persons inherent in it, but vice versa.

Marx says this for instance in Capital, chapter Two, p. 178:1/o.

Wagner, on the other hand:

“This acquisition” {of goods through commerce}
“necessarily presupposes a definite legal system, on whose basis” (!) “commerce takes

Dagegen bei Wagner:

„Diese Erwerbung“ {der Güter durch den Verkehr} „setzt notwendig eine bestimmte Rechtsordnung voraus, auf Grund deren“ (!)
554:2 Credit Instead of giving the development of money as a means of payment, Wagner immediately turns the process of circulation, insofar as it occurs in such a form that the two equivalents do not confront each other as $C - M$ at the same time, into a "credit transaction" (p. 85 ff.), which is "tied up" with the fact that this is frequently linked with the payment of "interest"; it also serves to "inspire confidence" and thus to depict "confidence" as a basis for "credit."

378:2 Kredit. Statt die Entwicklung des Geldes als Zahlungsmittel zu geben, macht Wagner den Zirkulationsprozeß, soweit er sich in der Form vollzieht, daß die beiden Äquivalente sich nicht gleichzeitig in $W - G$ gegenüberstehn, sofort zum "Kreditgeschäft" (p. 85 sq.), wobei „angeknüpft“ wird, daß dies häufig mit „Zins“-Zahlung verbunden ist; dient auch dazu, das „Vertrauen geben“ und damit das „Vertrauen“ als eine Basis des „Kredits“ hinzustellen.

554:3 About Puchta’s etc., juridical conception of “wealth,” according to which debts, too, belong to it as negative components (p. 86, Note 8).

378:3 Über Puchtas etc. juristische Auffassung des „Vermögens“, wonach auch Schulden als negative Bestandteile dazu gehören (p. 86, N. 8).
Credit is “consumptive credit” or “productive credit” (p. 86). The former predominating chiefly on a lower level of culture, the latter on a “higher.”

As for the causes of debt {causes of pauperism: fluctuations in the harvest, war service, slave competition} in Ancient Rome (Jhering, 3rd ed., p. 234, II, 2. Geist des römischen Rechts).

According to Mr. Wagner, “consumptive credit” prevails on the “lower level” among “lower, distressed” and “higher, extravagant” classes. In fact, in England and America “consumptive credit” is generally prevalent with the development of the deposit-bank system!

proves to be an economic factor of the econ-
yomy based on private ownership of land and
movable capital and allowing free competi-
tion. It is tied up with the possession of
wealth, not with wealth as a purely economic
category,” and is therefore only a “historico-
legal category” (!) (p. 87).

554:8 Dependence of individual enter-
prise and wealth on the effects of the outside
world, especially the influence of the state of
the economy.

554:9 1. Changes in use-value: improve
in some cases with the passage of time, be-
ing the condition for certain processes in na-
ture (wine, cigars, violins, etc.).

554:10 “Deteriorate in the great majority

378:8 Abhängigkeit der Einzelwirtschaft
und des Vermögens von den Einwirkungen
der Außenwelt, bes[onders] dem Einfluß der
Konjunktur in der Volkswirtschaft.

378:9 1. Veränderungen im Gebrauchswert:
verbessern sich in einigen Fällen
durch Zeitverlauf, als Bedingung gewisser
Naturprozesse (Wein, Zigarren, Geigen
eetc.).

378:10 „Verschlechtern sich in der großen
of cases ... dissolve into their material constituents, coincidences of every kind.” Corresponds to “change” in exchange-value in the same direction, “increase in value” or “decrease in value” (pp. 96, 97). Vid. concerning the house-rent agreement in Berlin (p. 97, Note 2).

555:1 2. Changes in human knowledge of the properties of the goods: thereby “increasing wealth” in a positive case. {Use of coal for the smelting of iron in England around 1620, when the decline in forests was already threatening the existence of the ironworks; chemical discoveries, such as that of iodine (utilisation of iodine-bearing salt springs). Phosphorite as a fertiliser, anthracite as a heating agent. Substances for gas-lighting, photography. Discovery
of dyes and medicines. Gutta-percha, rubber. Vegetable ivory (from *Phytelephas macrocarpa*). Creosote. Paraffin-wax candles. The use of *asphalt, of pine-needles* (pine-needle wool), of the gases in the blast-furnace, coal-tar for the preparation of aniline, woollen rags, sawdust, etc., etc.} *In negative cases, a decrease in utility and therefore in value* (as following the discovery of trichinae in pork, poisons in dyes, plants, etc.) (pp. 97, 98). Discovery of *mining products* in the earth, of new useful properties of these products, discovery of a new application for them increases *fortune of the landowner* (p. 98).
3. Economic situation.

Influence of all of the external "conditions," which "essentially determine the production of goods for commerce, demand and sale" ... hence their "exchange-value," also that of "the individual finished goods" ... "entirely or mainly independently" of the "economic subject," "or proprietors" (p. 98). The economic situation becomes a "crucial factor" in the "system of free competition" (p. 99). Thus someone—"by means of the Principle of private property" gains "what he has not earned," and so someone else incurs a "forfeit," "economically unwarranted losses."

Concerning speculation (Note 10, p. 101).
In “an economy progressing in population and prosperity, the favourable chances … preponderate, albeit with occasional temporary and local setbacks and fluctuations, in the case of landed property, especially in the case of urban (city) property” (p. 102).

“Thus the economic situation directs profits into the hands of the landed proprietor” (p. 103). “These, like most other profits on value due to the state of the economy … are simply nothing but “gambling winnings,” to which correspond “gambling losses” (p. 103).
It must thus be "openly acknowledged: ... the economic situation of the individual or family" is "essentially another product of the economic situation" and this "necessarily undermines the significance of personal economic responsibility" (pp. [104,] 105).

If, therefore, "the present organisation of the economy and the legal basis for it" (!) "hence private ownership of ... land and capital" etc. is "for them mainly an immutable institution," then, after a good deal of prattle, there are no means "of combating ... the causes" {of the ensuing evils, such as stagnation in sales, crises, the dismissal of workers, wage-cuts, etc.}, "hence
not of the evil itself,” whereas Mr. Wagner imagines he is combatting the “symptoms,” the “consequences of the evil” by meeting “profits arising from the state of the economy” with “taxes”—the “losses,” “economically unwarranted,” the product of the state of the economy, by a “rational … system of insurance” (p. 105).

556:2 This, says the obscure man, is the result of considering the present mode of production and its “legal basis” as “immutable”; but his research, going more deeply than socialism, will get to grips with the “issue itself.” Nous verrons, won’t we?

556:3 Chief individual elements affecting


380:1 Dies, sagt Dunkelmann, ist das Resultat, wenn man die heutige Produktionsweise mit seiner „Rechtsbasis“ für „unabänderlich“ hält; sein tiefer als der Sozialismus gehendes Forschen wird aber der „Sache selbst“ zu Leib gehn. Nous verrons, wie?

380:2 Einzelne Hauptmomente, welche
1 Randglossen zu Adolph Wagner

the state of the economy.

556:4 1. Fluctuations in the harvest yields of staple foods under the influence of the weather and political conditions, such as disruptions in cultivation due to war. Producers and consumers affected by it (p. 106). {On grain merchants: Tooke, History of Prices; for Greece: Böckh, Staatshaushalt der Athener, I, 1, § 15; for Rome: Jhering, Geist, p. 238. Increased mortality among the lower strata of the population nowadays with every slight rise in prices, “certainly a proof how little the average wage of the mass of the working classes exceeds the amount absolutely essential for life” (p. 106, Note 19).} “Improvements in means of communication”

die Konjunktur bilden.

“at the same time,” he adds in Note 20, “the most important condition for a speculative grain trade able to level out prices”\}, changes in cultivation methods \{“crop rotation economy,” by means of “the cultivation of various products which are favoured or handicapped differently by varying weather conditions”\}; “hence smaller fluctuations in grain prices within shorter periods of time compared with “the Middle Ages and antiquity.” But fluctuations still very great even now (see Note 22, p. 107; FACTS ibid.).


of machines instead of manual labor.

557:1–3 3. Changes in the means of communication and transport, influencing the spatial movement of men and goods. Thereby in particular

... the value of land and the articles of low specific value affected; whole branches of production compelled to make a difficult transition to other working methods (p. 107).

{In addition Note 24, ib. The increase in land value in the vicinity of good communications, on account of the better sales of products made there; the facilitation of population concentration in towns, hence enormous rise in value of urban land and land-


380:5/o 3. Veränderungen in den Kommunikations- und Transportmitteln, welche die räumliche Bewegung der Menschen und Güter beeinflussen: Dadurch namentlich ...


{Dazu N. 24 ib. Steigerung des Bodenwerts in der Nähe der guten Kommunikationen, wegen bessern Absatzes der hier gewonnenen Erzeugnisse; Erleichterung von Bevölkerungsanhäufung in Städten, daher enormes Steigen des Werts städtischen Bo-
value in the vicinity of such places. Transport made easier from areas with hitherto low prices for grain and other agricultural and forestry raw materials, mining products to areas with higher prices; the result being a deterioration of the economic situation for all elements of the population with a more stable income in the former areas, and on the other hand the favouring of the producers and particularly the landowners in the same places. The easier transport (import!) of grain and other substances of low specific value has the reverse effect. Favours the consumers but prejudicial to the producers in the country of origin; necessitating a transition to other kinds of production, as in England from grain cultivation to stockrais-
ing in the forties, as a result of the competition from cheap East European corn in Germany. Difficult situation for German farmers (first) owing to the climate, then owing to the recent large wage increases, which they are not able to add on to the products as easily as the industrialists, and so on.}


557:5 5. Political changes in the sphere of national and international commerce (war, revolution, etc.); insofar as confidence and lack of confidence [become] more and more important with increasing division of labor, the extension of international etc., commerce, the role of the credit factor, the mon-

Jahren, infolge der Konkurrenz des billigen osteuropäischen Getreides in Deutschland. Schwierige Lage für die deutschen Landwirte (jetzt) wegen des Klimas, dann wegen der neuerlichen starken Lohnerhöhungen, die sie nicht so leicht wie die Industriellen auf die Produkte schlagen können usw.}


381:2 5. Politische Veränderungen im nationalen und internationalen Verkehrsgebiet (Krieg, Revolution etc.); sofern Vertrauen und Mißtrauen dadurch immer wichtiger bei steigender Arbeitsteilung, Ausbildung des internationalen etc. Verkehrs, Mitwirken des Kreditfaktors, ungeheuren Dimensionen
strous dimensions of modern warfare, etc. (p. 108).


557:7 7. Changes in the geographic distribution and overall economic situation of the whole population, such as migration from the country into the towns (pp. 108, 109).

557:8 8. Changes in the social and economic situation of individual strata of the population, such as through granting the freedom of coalition, etc. (p. 109). {The French 5 milliards, Note 29, ib.}

557:9/o  Costs in the individual enterprise. In the “value” producing “labor,” in moderner Kriegsführung etc. (p. 108).

381:3 6. Änderungen in Agrar-, Gewerbe- und Handelspolitik. (Beispiel: Reform der britischen Korngesetzgebung.)


381:5 8. Veränderung in der sozialen und ökonomischen Lage der einzelnen Bevölkerungsschichten, wie durch Gewährung von Koalitionsfreiheit etc. (p. 109). {Die französischen 5 Milliarden N. 29 ib.}

381:6/o Kosten in der Einzelwirtschaft. Unter der „Wert“ produzierenden „Arbeit“,
which all costs resolve themselves, “labor” in the proper broad sense, in particular, must also be included, whereby it “embraces everything which is necessary by way of purposeful human activities for the creation of revenues,” hence particularly “the intellectual labor of the leader and the activity whereby capital is created and employed,” “therefore” the “capital gain” financing this activity also belongs to the “constitutive elements of costs.” “This view stands in contradiction to the socialist theory of value and costs and critique of capital” (p. 111).

558:1–2 The obscure man falsely attributes to me the view that “the surplus-value produced by the workers alone re-

382:1 Dunkelmann schiebt mir unter, daß „der von den Arbeitern allein produzierte Mehrwert den kapitalistischen Un-
mains, *in an unwarranted manner*, in the hands of the capitalist entrepreneurs” (Note 3, p. 114). In fact I say the exact opposite: that the production of commodities must necessarily become “capitalist” production of commodities at a certain point, and that according to the *law of value* governing it, the “surplus-value” rightfully belongs to the capitalist and not the worker. Instead of engaging in such sophistry, the academic socialist character of the *vir obscurus* proves itself with the following banality, that the

> “Dem Kapitalisten gebührt” is here translated with “rightfully belongs to the capitalist.” A possible alternative translation might be: “it is properly owed to the capitalist.” This does not mean that it is created by the capitalist, only that (according to the law of value governing capitalist commodity production) he has ownership rights over it. I.e., the translation in [RM75, p. 320] “the surplus-value is due not to the working-man but to the capitalist” is
wrong! On the other hand, this source locates this quote on p. 375 in MEW 19, although in reality it is on p. 382, with nothing even remotely similar on p. 375. This must be a mistake with the page number.

“Uncompromising opponents of the socialists” “overlook the numerous actual cases of exploitative relations in which net profits are not properly” (!) “distributed, and the individual enterprise production costs of the companies are reduced far too much to the detriment of the workers (including the lenders of capital) and to the advantage of the employers” (l.c.).

558:3 National income in England and France (p. 120, χ–ϕ).

558:4 The annual gross income of a nation:

558:5 1. Sum total of goods newly produced that year. Domestic raw materials

382:2 Volkseinkommen in England und Frankreich (p. 120, χ–ϕ).

382:3 Der jährliche Rohertrag in einem Volk:

382:4 1. Gesamtheit der im Jahr neu erzeugten Güter. Die inländischen Rohstoff-
being included entirely according to their value; the articles manufactured out of these and out of foreign materials {to avoid a double assessment of raw products} at the amount of increase in value attained by manufacturing labor; raw materials and semimanufactured goods sold and transported in trade, at the amount of the increase in value effected thereby.

558:6 2. Import of money and commodities from abroad in the form of interest from the claims of the country arising from credit business, or from capital investments by home nationals abroad.

558:7 3. Freightage actually paid to domestic shipping companies by means of the import of foreign goods during the course of

fe vollständig ihrem Wert nach einzusetzen; die aus solchen und ausländischen Stoffen hergestellten Gegenstände {um Doppelansatz der Rohprodukte zu vermeiden} für den Betrag der durch die Gewerksarbeit erzielten Werterhöhung; die im Handel umgesetzten und transportierten Rohstoffe und Halbfabrikate für den Betrag der dadurch bewirkten Werterhöhung.


382:6 3. Mittelst Einfuhr ausländischer Güter reell bezahlter Frachterwerb der inländischen Reederei im auswärtigen Handel und
foreign trade and transit-trade.

558:8 4. Cash or commodities imported from abroad in the form of remittances to aliens staying in the country.

558:9 5. The import of nonrepayable gifts, such as permanent tributes to the country from abroad, or continuing immigration and consequent regular immigration wealth.

558:10 6. Value surplus from the import of commodities and money resulting from international trade {but then deduct, 2. export abroad}.

559:1 7. Sum value of revenue from useful wealth (as from dwellinghouses, etc.) (pp. 121, 122).

559:2 For the net income deduct, among

Zwischenverkehr.

382:7 4. Bares oder Waren vom Ausland eingeführt als Rimessen für die im Inland sich aufhaltenden Fremden.

382:8 5. Einfuhr aus unentgeltlichen Gaben, wie bei dauernden Tributen des Auslandes ans Inland, fortdauernder Einwanderung und daher regelmäßiges Einwanderungsvermögen.

382:9 6. Wertüberschuß der im internationalen Handel erfolgenden Waren- und Geldimporte, {aber dann abzuziehn, 1. die Ausfuhr ins Ausland}.


383:2 Für den Reinertrag abzuziehn u.a.
other things, the “export of goods in payment for the freightage of foreign shipping companies” (p. 123). {The matter is not so simple: the price of production (domestic) + freight = selling price. If the country exports its own commodities in its own ships, then the foreign country pays the freight charges, if the market price prevailing there, etc.}

559:3 “Besides permanent tributes, regular payments to foreign subjects abroad (bribes and retainers, as paid by Persia to Greeks, payments to foreign scholars under Louis XIV, St. Peter’s Money) must be taken into account” (p. 123, Note 9).

559:4 Why not the subsidies which the German princes regularly used to receive from France and England?

die „Güterausfuhr als Bezahlung für Frachterwerb fremder Reederei“ (p. 123). {Die Sache nicht so einfach: Produktionspreis (inländischer) + Fracht = Verkaufspreis. Führt das Inland seine eignen Waren auf seinen eignen Schiffen aus, so zahlt das Ausland die Frachtkosten, wenn der daselbst herrschende Marktpreis etc.}

383:3 „Neben dauernden Tributen sind regelmäßige Zahlungen an fremde Untertanen im Auslande (Bestechungsgehalte, wie seitens Persiens an Griechen, Besoldungen fremder Gelehrter unter Ludwig XIV., Peterspfennige zu rechnen“ (p. 123, N. 9).

383:4 Warum nicht die Subsidien, welche die deutschen Fürsten regelmäßig von Frankreich und England bezogen?
559:5 Vid. the naive sorts of income components of private individuals consisting of “services performed by state and church” (p. 125, Note 14).

559:6 Individual and national assessment of value.

559:7 The destruction of a part of a stock of goods in order to sell the rest at a higher price is called by Cournot, *Recherches sur les principes mathématiques de la théorie des richesses*, 1838, “une vérritable creation de richesse dans le sens commercial du mot” (p. 127, Note 3).

559:8 Cf. as regards the decline of private individuals’ consumption supplies, or, as Wagner terms it, of their “useful capital” in our cultural period, in Berlin in par-

383:5 Sieh die naiven Sorten Einkommensteile der Privaten, die aus „Staats- und Kirchenleistungen“ bestehn (p. 125, Note 14).

383:6 Einzelne und volkswirtschaftliche Wertschätzung.


383:8 Vergleich über die Abnahme der Konsumtionsvorräte der Privaten oder, wie Wagner es nennt, ihres „Nutzkapitals“, in unserer Kulturperiode, namentlich in Berlin,
ticular, p. 128, Note 5, p. 129, Notes 8 and 10; in addition, too little money or *working capital* proper in the production enterprise itself, p. 130 and ibid., Note 11.

559:9 *Comparatively greater importance of foreign trade* nowadays, p. 131, Note 13, p. 132, Note 3.
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