

Marx's Class Theory 2.0

Roberto Fineschi

Abstract: This paper proposes an updated version of Marx’s theory of class. First, it criticizes the traditional interpretation of the subsumption of the labor process under capital as a historic reconstruction of 19th century’s British capitalism. Second, it tries to outline an articulated definition of history that interprets Marx’s theory of capital - and the subsumption section in particular - as a logical development of forms instantiated in historical figures. Finally, from these premises, it claims a functional/logical concept of class in late “crepuscular” capitalism still based on Marx’s theory, both at the Western and global level.

Keywords: class struggle, historical materialism, dialectics, Marxism, crepuscular capitalism.

Premises. Marx as a political thinker and marxism(s)

Karl Marx is a political thinker. After more than a century of “philosophy of praxis” this sentence is not surprising. However, what are the strong points of his thought that allow us to develop a theory of political historical action? This is related to the complex question of the relationship between Marx and Marxism on which I can spend just a few words. What is Marxism? Or it would be better to say Marxisms, plural, because of the proliferation of several positions that hardly can be reduced to the same foundation, except for the reference to the name Marx.¹ In general, one could define Marxism as a movement that tries to apply his theory with political goals that mainly consist in going beyond the capitalist mode of production and creating a Communist Society. To what extent the different historical attempts to do it are connected with Marx’s own theory?

Marx has realized just a little of his extended project; his original six book plan was left unfinished.² Just the first book on *Capital* was mostly completed and a little of the second on wage labor and the third on rent, that became part of it. In spite of these limits, on their basis I think that we can outline a consistent draft of a general theory of the capitalist mode of production as a historically determined phase of human reproduction in nature. This theory is presented in a series of manuscripts written in the periods 1857-1883 and in the several editions of *Capital* vol. 1 published by Marx himself.³

.....
1 See an outlook in *Storia del Marxismo Einaudi* (Hobsbawm 1978-82), or other classic contributions by Favilli 1996 and Corradi 2005 in regards to the Italian experience.

2 Marx’s plan included books on capital, wage work, rent, state, international trade, and world market. See Marx 1859, p. 99) and the letter to Lassalle February 22nd 1858 (Marx and Engels 1973, p. 550 ff.).

3 Several materials are now finally available in the new critical edition of Marx’s and Engels’ works, the *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe*. For an outline see Bellofiore and Fineschi 2009.

A relevant aspect regards the level of abstraction of this theory: in my understanding, it is very high. This means that the laws that it describes are at an *epochal* level, and don't need to have any empirical *immediate* correspondence in facts. Hence, they can't be applied to contingencies as such. In order to have theories that might be concretely and politically used we need further developments. *Capital* is a manual neither of politics nor revolution; it is about the principles on whose base these further developments are possible. So, whatever Marxism can't be identical to or a direct application of Marx's general theory of the capitalist mode of production: there are mediations to more concrete levels of abstractions that Marx himself did not articulate in his time and that, moreover, are different from time to time. Marx and Marxism are connected, but they don't coincide⁴.

If Marx did not have enough time to elaborate a coherent political doctrine on the basis of his general theory of capitalism, this does not mean that he was not politically engaged during his lifetime or did not have political goals; also in the period he was working on *Capital*, he was personally involved in apical positions in the International workers association. In *Capital* vol. 1, Marx tried his best to contextualize his abstract theory, and find a connection with the transformation of reality - in particular in the section on labor subsumption under capital, where he wrote the famous sentence about the expropriation of the expropriators.⁵ His writings on the *Paris Commune* or *The critique of the Gotha's program*, etc. show how Marx investigated the issue of a possible future society and its organization. The question is whether these works can be organically integrated within his theory of capital; if we consider his methodology connected with the descent from abstract to concrete, it seems difficult to take them as organic parts. The gap between the general theory of capital and its possible application was not properly fulfilled by Marx himself; however, since he wanted to take political positions, he himself skipped mediations and operated at a more concrete level of abstraction with categories that belonged to a higher one. He made two steps: *(i)* in the doctrine of the production of surplus-value in *Capital*, he demonstrated that exploitation of the working class takes place, and capital and wage labor are the two extremes of the essential relation of the capitalism mode of production; *(ii)* since in that specific historical moment, the general figure of workers in England - the most advanced capitalist country - was the factory working class, Marx identified with it the subject he needed to address the issue of the organization of a political movement. Marx's attempt was legitimate as long as we take into account these two conditions; but is also limited by those.

.....
4 On the complex issue of the level of abstraction of Marx's theory of capital, see Fineschi 2013.

5 Marx 1991, pp.684-685

I think that his theory is suitable for larger application, if we distinguish between *logical* “forms” and *historical* “figures” in the framework of his theory of political subjectivity. This essay is dedicated to this distinction, and to show how it allows to outline a more advanced definition of class and class struggle that provides us with a more sophisticated theory that may still be used for the analysis and transformation of contemporary dynamics.

1. Defining “historical” (*res gestae* and *historia rerum gestarum*)

The soundness of Marx’s theory of classes and, in particular, the traditional interpretation of the factory working class as privileged political subject need to be investigated in depth in particular in the fourth section of *Capital* vol. 1, which deals with the subsumption of the labor process under capital; there Marx investigates the transformations of the labor process in the capitalist mode of production as a moment in the exposition of the production of relative surplus-value. We need in particular to focus on two points:

1. What is the meaning of “historical” in regards to the capitalist mode of production. In my opinion Marx does not refer to events that occurred in England in the second half of the 19th century (the second Industrial revolution). Marx uses this period as a historical example of a *conceptual* argument. At this latest level, “historical” has an *ontological* meaning: it is not the description or inclusion of facts that took place in a certain moment, but a theoretical framework where a dialectical, “formal” development takes place; human reproduction happens in a way that implies structural passages and transformations; internal, logical phases. This is their “history”, a totality articulated in phases that come in a succession one out of the other. *Logically determined temporal moments of a totality.*

2. A distinction between these two meanings of history (a factual one vs. a logical one) allows us to distinguish between “forms” and “figures” as integrated categories through which we can identify historical subjects.

On the one hand, historical can refer to the narrative of events of the past (*historia rerum gestarum*); under this regard, *Capital* is historical inasmuch as it describes the situation of the factory working class in 19th century’s England. In this case “historical” simply means transitory; it is not about *capital’s time*, but *capital in time*. If *Capital* is a *description* of how production worked in that period, it is just useless for today,

since empirically that world does not exist anymore in those terms. My conviction is that Marx's intention is different. He refers to the logic of how events happen: it is not about the narrative of how they happened, but the logic of their happening (*res gestae*). In *Capital* there are many historical descriptions of facts, but this is not their actual "temporality". The theory of the capitalist mode of production is a structured model that has an internal proper dynamic, which is logically determined by laws. These laws imply changes, passages through stages. The model is temporal because it has a starting point (which is exogenous), a development due to its own laws (that posits that presupposed starting point as its own result), and a breaking point after which it stops developing but gets blocked by the same laws that permitted that development. This is its "end", in the sense that from that moment on those same laws that made it proceed, now block it. This is its own internal time, capital's time, defined in a purely logical way.⁶

We have a theoretical model where production, based on value and its self-valorization, expands to the world; a development of a material content in its specific historical form. But content and form are not separated; content exists through its specific forms that are *its own* way of existence; therefore, content changes through *its* forms and is always "formed content" (*Forminhalt*); it is a process. At a certain point the process stops running smoothly because the formed content has reached a stage that potentially implies a new content-form dialectic, but is still stuck in the old form. Those laws of the capitalist mode of production that allowed a development of the productive forces, now block it: they are used only to the extent that permits capital valorization. At some point, within capitalism, productive capacity becomes overcapacity.⁷ Overproduction crisis is the form through which this contradiction manifests itself. Laws are "historical" in as much as have an internal development that brings them to surpass themselves (the Hegelian *Aufhebung*).⁸

We can hence outline three different meanings of "history" or "historical":

1. Historical as a temporally determined logic of the capitalist mode of production (res gestae). The capitalist mode of production has

.....
6 Antonio Labriola put emphasis that under the term "history" we can distinguish two different meanings (Labriola 1977, p. 320 ff.). A distinction that was already in Hegel, but with a different connotation (Hegel 1995b, p. 83).

7 In a few words: this is due, on the one hand, to the process being based on the exploitation of living labor (something without which the exploitation process could not happen), and, on the other, to the trend to expel living labor out of the labor process.

8 On this see Mazzone 1987. I have dealt with the logical dynamic of capital in Fineschi 2021. For a distinction between "historicism" and "historicity", see Diaz 1956 and Luporini 1974.

an immanent *logical temporality*, determined by the development of the dialectic of value and use-value; it has a starting point and an end which do not coincide with the events of whatever past, present or future factual capitalism. It is historical because it has an internal time; it corresponds to its internal logic of self-surpassment. In order to conceptualize “real” dynamics, we need to move forward and reach a much more concrete level of abstraction, which includes capitalisms (plural) and specific configurations, determined in space and time. I call this *Logic 1*. If such a model has a beginning and an end, in its starting moment it finds conditions that are not posited by itself and that qualitatively don’t correspond to its proper functioning. This is overcome by the development of the system itself on the basis of its own laws. It is then not about describing the events of this process, but explaining the logic of this adequation, where exogenous presuppositions are posited as endogenous elements by the system itself. I call *logic 2* this *process of adequation*, which is a specific moment of logic 1.

2. History as an interconnection of logical temporalities, where the current one is a chapter of a broader, still logical process (res gestae). If we accept that the capitalist mode of production has a starting point and an end, it is implied that there is a “before” and an “after”, other phases in which the labor process takes place in different forms. The presuppositions of the capitalist mode of production resulted as an output from those forms; similarly the capitalist mode of production creates outputs as possible inputs of a future society. This does not require automatic passages, but just potentiality. The present capitalist mode of production posits itself because of its own logic as a ring in a chain, a moment of a more general history of human reproduction in nature. The investigation of these other models of other “historical” periods is still *logical*, theoretical in the same way the theory of the capitalist mode of production is.

3. History in the sense of historiography (historia rerum gestarum). All these categories outline a concept of temporality that allows further investigations in the empirical field, and classification and periodization of facts from the past on the basis of a conceptual framework; once I know what the capitalist mode of production is, I can move to historiographical analysis. This is the history of historians.

We can finally argue the following:

- Marx’s theory of capital investigates the logic 1 and 2 of the capitalist mode of production.
- This makes the capitalist mode of production a moment in the broader history of human reproduction.
- Marx’s theory is not a mere description of the 19th century’s British capitalism; historical descriptions in his theory are empirical examples of logical laws.⁹

If we talk about the capitalist mode of production as a determined *historical* phase of human reproduction in nature, we mean a *logical temporality*. The relationship between theoretical model and reality is mediated: in order to descend to lower levels of abstractions, where we can talk of “capitalisms” (the Italian, French, 19th or 20th century’s one), more theoretical passages are necessary; they as such can’t mechanically be deduced from the general concept of capital; just at that lower level we can deal with political issues that can’t be properly investigated without considering more concrete configurations, and even contingencies.

2. Subsumption of the labor process under capital

These theoretical assumptions clear the field from those interpretations that reduce the “historical” character of capital to a generalization of historical facts that happened in the 19th century.¹⁰ The point is instead: what are the form-determinations (*Formbestimmungen*) within this framework? In particular in the subsumption of the labor process under capital?

The subsumption of labor under capital has been mainly studied isolating the fourth section of *Capital* vol. 1 from the more general logical framework in which it is placed. In my opinion, this is a relevant flaw, since it is a moment of a general theory. The first consequence of such an extrapolation is to consider the chapters on “cooperation”, “manufacture” and “industry” just as descriptions or narrative of the Industrial revolution’s capitalism, or the 19th century’s British one.¹¹ To some extent Marx encouraged such a reading, because he inserted

.....
9 The role of factual elements - “history” - in the theoretical development of a capital theory has been the subject of an intense debate that is not possible to recall here. For a survey see Fineschi 2009a and 2009b.

10 Here we hear the echo of Engels’ historicist understanding of Marx’s logical methodology. See Fineschi 2008, ch. 1.2.

11 On the one hand, this would represent nothing but the continuation of the chronological succession begun in the first three books, interpreted as “simple commodity production”.

lots of historical examples and contextualizations probably thinking this would clarify his argument. Paradoxically, this hid the theoretical framework those descriptions were examples of. We need hence to take into account both the theoretical complexity and the different phases of elaboration of that part in the different drafts since 1857.

Forms of labor process subsumed under capital

The notion of labor process and that of production in general do not coincide with the capitalist form of labor process or production. We find at least two different levels of abstraction:

1. Labor process in general as such does not represent any concrete form of production (ch. 7 of *Capital* vol. 1; ch. 5 in the German edition); it shows the abstract elements that are common to every form of production; therefore, it does not permit distinguishing any of them.

2. A mode of production specifies the determined modalities in which those abstract elements of the labor process combine, and permits conceptualizing particular forms of production.

Given that, the question is: what specific, historic determinations does the labor process assume in the capitalist mode of production? *Capital's* chapters on subsumption answer this question.

Production of surplus-value is the logical condition of existence of the capitalist mode of production: the surplus of time over the labor time necessary for labor-power to be reproduced; a part that is appropriated by capital. Labor day is then split into two parts: the necessary labor time, and surplus-labor. If this second part is increased without changing the given social conditions of production, it is called *production of absolute surplus-value*; if instead production conditions are changed so that the necessary part of the labor day is reduced thanks to an intensified labor productivity, it is called *production of relative surplus-value*. Actually, the former can define the process of production in its “static” moment, the latter in its “dynamic” one: both co-exist in different stages of the same social valorization process. If we study the transformation of the labor process in the production of relative surplus-value, we find relevant points for an updated class theory.

The first form we encounter is *cooperation*. A first important moment is that the finalism of the process gets doubled: on the one hand the goal of the global action, the collective plan under which individuals are subsumed, and on the other the one of each individual worker; the first directs and regulates the second. This cooperative “organism”

transcends the individual limits and so increases labor productivity. There is a positive side: the capitalist mode of production is that stage in the history of human reproduction when sociality is not just external to the production process (interaction of independent producers), but also internal (interaction of producers subsumed to reach a common general goal); sociality becomes a constitutive part of the human reproduction in the same act of producing. This second form existed also in other historical periods, but was linked to specific productions or sectors, while now becomes the essence itself of it, since capital competition imposes that to all producers. Cooperation is the first step of a logical and historical transformation, which creates humanity as a matter of fact and not just as intellectual abstraction. It is the universalization of individual work and vice versa Marx had talked about already since the *Grundrisse*.¹² If cooperation does not necessarily change work modalities, capital arranges all those changes necessary to improve it toward a much more productive, integrated process.

Manufacture is the first specific capitalist form of production; it first requires cooperation, and then generalizes it, since it breaks down the activity into parts: individual workers are not able anymore to realize the entire product, but just a piece of it; hence, a structural interdependence with others is now technically set, and this modifies the form of production.¹³ Thanks to the manufacturer division of labor, *being-part* becomes an essential quality of labor-power.¹⁴ Labor expenditure is logically now possible only in combination. If, on the one hand, we now have sociality as a structural dimension of human reproduction, on the other this appears as a capital's form of existence and domination.¹⁵ However, this specific form is not adequate to the requirements of the concept of capital, yet: the individual skills of the partial-worker are still necessary; they are a product of capital, but still inadequate to its full functioning and represent at the same time the progress and the limit of manufacture,¹⁶ because a hierarchy of different skills contrasts the objective needs for capital valorization.¹⁷ Therefore, a technical contradiction emerges inside manufacture itself,¹⁸ labor needs to evolve toward a purely formal activity opposed to capital, and therefore

.....
12 Marx 1976-81, p.187

13 Marx 1976-82, vol. I, p. 253; Marx 1991, p.304

14 Ibid., vol I, p.253

15 Ibid., p. 292; 1991, p. 325 f.

16 Ibid., 1976-82, p. 2021

17 Marx 1991, p.315

18 Ibid., p.332.

manufacture constitutes a (logically) transitory phase to a higher level that might overcome these limits.¹⁹

The factory system is the most adequate capitalist mode of production, which implies a further re-determination of the labor process: transforming means of production into a machine system determines an inversion of the still subjective character of manufacture into an objective organization of production,²⁰ where the worker becomes not just part, but an appendix.²¹ Work conditions use workers. At the same time, mastering science and its application to technological development becomes a crucial factor in the organization of the productive system, and valorization of capital. The social power of the general intellect appears however under the form of capital as one of its instruments.

It follows that the specific capitalist forms of production - the concrete forms that the labor process assumes - are characterized by: 1) internal cooperative nature, 2) the individual worker as being-part, 3) finally its being-appendix (toward their possible complete substitution through machines as long as their activity becomes more and more formalistic). These are the determinations of form (*Formbestimmungen*)²² of the labor process once it is subsumed under capital²³.

Subsumption, logical and historical temporality

Subsumption is a logical model of adequation. As we saw above, this implies a specific logical meaning of “historical”, of the specific temporality of capital: Marx needed to explain from a *theoretical and not merely descriptive point of view*, capital’s internal time. If, in order to be historical, the capitalist mode of production has a logical beginning, development, and conclusion, the subsumption theory is part of this explanation. In its ideal starting moment, capital finds conditions that were not posited by itself, that do not correspond to the way it works; hence there is a phase of adequation with specific characteristics, which I tried to summarize above. This is necessary because of the logic of the concept of capital, and does not need to correspond to empirical facts, but explain the theory of its historical transformation. Only on the basis

.....
19 Marx 1976-82, p. 2018

20 Marx 1991, p. 346 ff.

21 Marx 1991, p. 378 ff.; 1976-82, p. 2015 ff.

22 ‘Form determination’ refers to logical categories of a theoretical framework. ‘Formalistic’ refers on the contrary to inessential aspects that don’t affect form determinations.

23 In the preparatory works to *Capital*, we don’t have as many historical examples as in the published work. There Marx mainly focused on the logical laws of movement of the system; only later he looked for confirmation in empirical data. .

of such a theory, empirical facts can be reconnected to a general model and so explained. This corresponds to what I called above *logic 2*.

Once capital has gone beyond this adequation phase and properly works, those forms of its dynamics appear as moments that can be present or not in different stages at a lower level of abstraction; this basically depends on the valorization needs of capital, which can imply “returns”, once more variables and circumstances are included. These aspects are to be dealt with in the theory of cycle and crisis, which is not a point at this level of abstraction; therefore, it would be mistaken to mechanically apply this formulation to those lower levels.

3. For a definition of the “class” concept. Forms and figures

We can now finally come to a logical and not empirical definition of class by distinguishing between forms and figures.²⁴ I consider the specific “forms”, that is logical categories, that define the new characteristics of the labor activity within the labor process of the capitalist mode of production the following: 1) structural cooperation of workers, 2) being-part of each individual worker, 3) being-appendix of them, toward the potential substitution of living labor by machines as long as their activity becomes more and more formalistic. Cooperation, manufacture and industry are instead historical “figures” of those theoretical forms, that is historical factual configurations in which those forms appeared for the first time or significantly.

Forms and figures are not identical: if they were, if a determined figure disappeared, also the respective form would. This would have two critical consequences: current capitalism would be something different than Marx’s; factory workers would be the only possible historical subject. If instead we distinguish between forms and figures, what matters is forms and their logic; therefore, the eventual disappearance of factory workers would not necessarily imply the disappearance of cooperative work, partial character of labor or transformation of workers into an appendix, all subsumed under the valorization process of capital; those forms can exist in other different figures, whose logic is still the one dictated by those forms. The new historical content is the creation of a “collective worker”,²⁵ which is the structured, integrated global worker, which comes to existence thanks to the capitalist mode of production, and constitutes the “material content” of

.....
24 In his *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Hegel shows the different phenomenal “figures” (*Gestalten*) through which consciousness makes experience and becomes aware of itself, and finally reaches the stage of Absolute knowledge; while in its *Science of logic* and *Encyclopedie*, he exposes the systematic “forms” phenomenally represented by those figures from the standpoint of Absolute knowledge. I think that it is useful to use this distinction also for Marx, although the terminological application by him is not rigorous.

25 Marx 1991, p.456.

a possible, future, “social form”. This collective worker does not coincide with the factory worker in capitalism, which, again, is just a figure of that.

In Marxian terms, the determination of the class concept is then *functional*: it depends on the specific role and modalities through which subjects realize their production and reproduction. This objective determination is established independently from their consciousness (they can subjectively be convinced of the opposite of what they do if hegemonically subjugated). The phenomenal perception of their objective action takes place at the superstructural level through historical figures. Understanding these figures as manifestations of respective forms is not always easy: it is more simple in determined phases (industrial system, factory worker), less in others (automation, computerization, etc.). Always, but in particular when the perception is not easy, the functional definition of class (based on the role in social reproduction) gets confused with a sociological classification based on income level, living standard, etc. In the latter, aggregation is not based on functions but on phenomenal data, and a class becomes a summation of empirically identified individuals.²⁶

In the capitalist mode of production, the two functional poles of the production relationship are not capital and factory workers, as it was interpreted for a long time, but capital and wage work: the productive forces are labor and means of production; they get polarized on the one hand as wage-workers (labor-power - labor *in potentia*) and capitalists (bearer of means of production) on the other. The core relationship of each mode of production is defined by the specific form through which these elements get combined, a specific connection of dead and living labor: wage workers and capitalists are these specific forms in the capitalist mode of production. None of the two poles can be conceived without the other. Overcoming capitalism implies then not destroying capital, but moving to a different configuration of that connection. Marx calls “capital” both the connection as a whole (the capitalist mode of production) and one of the two poles of that connection (capitalist as bearer of means of production); flattening to the same level these two different meanings can lead to serious theoretical and political mistakes. Capital is not even just capitalists’ decision making; the range of their possible choices is limited within the possibilities of the reproduction of the capitalist system, whose general trends are beyond their control. The same on the workers side: no subjective action can be successful if they don’t take into account the general trends of the system as such.

Understanding factory workers as figures does not mean that they are not forms: in that specific historical configuration, that figure was the most matching concrete instantiation of the capitalist form of movement;

.....
26 The second meaning corresponds to the most common English use such as “upper class”, “middle class”, etc. Other languages have different words for those concepts; in Italian f.i. we have “ceto” and “classe”; in German “Gesellschaftsschichte” and “Klasse”; in French “rang” or “extraction” and “classe”. In common use, they get frequently mixed.

the point is to go beyond just figures and see how other figures are more matching instantiations of those forms in other configurations.

Definitions

Let's now expand the picture and try a more general systematization; the formal elements to functionally identify the wage-worker class are the following (class definition 1):

1. *Exchanging labor-power with capital*, receiving a salary. This can take place in the most different, irregular forms of salary, from the traditional ones to the hidden contemporary variants of piecework, alleged freelance work, etc.

2. *Valorizing capital*. One's labor expenditure is part of a process that, in the intention of capitalists, valorizes anticipated capital. Capital valorization means not only producing value and surplus-value, but also participating in all those passages that are *as necessary* as production so that actual valorization might take place, that is including circulation, sell, promotion, etc. If produced commodities are not sold, there is no capital valorization.

3. *Labor process takes place in the above-mentioned forms*: cooperative work, partial worker, appendix worker, with doubled finalism: individual and global, where the global one is posited by capitalists. The more formalistic the living labor, the easier its replacement with a machine if this increases capital valorization. Here is the core contradiction of the capitalist mode of production: on the one hand it is based on exploitation of living labor, on the other expels living labor out of the labor process.

In current "crepuscular" capitalism,²⁷ the long run dynamics of capitalist production has created a tendential growth in the technical composition of capital²⁸, that is the ratio between machines and living labor has dramatically increased. Less and less workers are necessary in the production of single units of product. Good, stable employment becomes more and more difficult in the difficult valorization process of over-productive capital. As a consequence, the elastic character of unemployment gets more and more rigid, and re-hiring workers fired because of automation becomes

.....
27 For an outline of this concept see Fineschi 2022.

28 Setting aside the question of organic composition, which is the relationship between technical and value composition. Tangentially, it is to highlight that in the traditional debate on the tendential fall of rate of profit the focus has mostly been only on value composition.

extremely difficult. A growing mass of unemployed is a systematic effect of crepuscular capitalism. We need to consider this in a broader definition of class and class conflict. We can outline three categories that expand the previous framework (class definition 2):

1. Workers that are active in the actual capitalistic production as defined before (in class definition 1).
2. A growing mass of potential workers within the advanced capitalist system that can't find a job; they live by their wits or of the crumbs from the table (inclusive of State assistance shaped in different forms). However, they are not outside the system, since their exclusion is a structural moment of it. Because they are excluded from any collective productive praxis, they don't perceive themselves as class, but just as individuals, as allegedly autonomous atoms; individualist ideologies will easily have a grasp on them. This opens the broader chapter of ideology and self-consciousness.
3. A third relevant level includes that huge mass of people that live in parts of the world that have not been completely subsumed under capitalist production; their system is still part of global capitalist reproduction, since they - either as colonies, or half-colonies, or for commercial trades - are a moment of it, but not in the Western form, that is without having experienced the social transformations and "progress" that took place there. To most of them, the Western world and capital are just imperialism and violence, they have not seen any progress in this relationship. The crucial point however is that they will never experience any progress, since crepuscular capitalism is not in the condition to expand further its production, because of structural overproduction of commodities and capital. In spite of that, they are still a variable of the system, inasmuch as their reproduction, even if not in the Western form, is entangled in the global capitalist one. However, their self-perception and transformation perspectives would be very different from those of the first two groups, affected by pre-modern (or even anti-modern) features and ideologies.

To keep these three souls into the same body and have it fight for a possible different organization of production and reproduction is the multifaceted and complex task we have to deal with. However, this re-configuration of the class concept provides an instrument that at least allows to pave a theoretical way toward class reorganization in a broader sense (class definition 2) on the basis of Marx's theory of capital.

- Backhaus, Hans Georg, *Dialektik der Wertform: Untersuchungen zur Marxschen Ökonomiekritik*, Freiburg: Ça ira.
- Badaloni, Nicola 1971, *Per il comunismo. Questioni di teoria*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Bellofiore, Riccardo and Fineschi, Roberto 2009 (eds.), *Re-reading Marx. New perspective after the critical edition*, Basigstoke, Palgrave.
- Cazzaniga, Gian Mario 1981, *Funzione e conflitto. Forme e classi nella teoria marxiana dello sviluppo*, Naples: Liguori.
- Corradi, Cristina 2005, *Storia dei marxismi in Italia*, Roma: Manifestolibri.
- Diaz, Furio 1956, *Storicismi e storicità*, Florence: Parenti.
- Favilli, Paolo 1996, *Storia del marxismo italiano. Dalle origini alla grande guerra*, Milan: Angeli.
- Fineschi, Roberto 2008, *Un nuovo Marx. Filologia e interpretazione dopo la nuova edizione storico-critica (MEGA²)*, Roma: Carocci.
- 2009a, 'Dialectic of the Commodity and Its Exposition: The German Debate in the 1970s – A Personal Survey', in Bellofiore and Fineschi 2009, p. 50-70.
- 2009b, "'Capital in general" and "Competition", in the Making of Capital: The German Debate', *Science & Society*, 2009/1: 54-76.
- 2013, 'The Four Levels of Abstraction of Marx's Concept of "Capital"', Bellofiore R., Starosta G., Thomas P. (eds.), *In Marx's Laboratory. Critical Interpretations of the 'Grundrisse'*, Boston-Leiden-Tokyo: Brill.
- 2021, *La logica del capitale. Ripartire da Marx*, Naples, Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici.
- 2022, 'Violence and Crepuscular Capitalism Structural Dynamics and Superstructural Forms of the General Law of Capitalist Accumulation', Fusaro L. and Alcalá Sandoval L.J. (eds.), *The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation in Latin America and Beyond Actuality and Pertinence*, Lanham MD: Lexington Books, p. 41-53.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 1995a, *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundrisse*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- 1995b, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- 1996a, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- 1996b *Wissenschaft der Logik*, vol. I, t. I, Die objektive Logik: Erstes Buch; vol. II, t. I, Die objektive Logik: Zweites Buch; t. II, Die subjektive Logik, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- 1998, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1978-82) (ed.), *Storia del marxismo*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Labriola, Antonio 1977, *Saggi Sul Materialismo Storico*, Roma: Editori Riuniti.
- Luporini, Cesare 1974, *Dialettica e materialismo*, Roma: Editori Riuniti.
- Marx, Karl 1859, *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, Berlin: Duncker.
- 1976-81, 'Ökonomische Manuskripte, 1857/58', *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe*, Vol. II/2, Berlin: Dietz.
- 1976-82, 'Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie', *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe*, Vol. II/3, Berlin: Dietz.
- 1991, 'Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie, Erster Band, Hamburg 1867', *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe*, Vol. II/5, Berlin: Dietz.
- Karl, Marx and Engels, Friedrich 1973, 'Briefe. Januar 1881 bis März 1883', *Werke*, Berlin: Dietz.
- Mazzone, Alessandro 1981, *Questioni di teoria dell'ideologia*, Messina: La libra.
- (1987), 'La temporalità specifica del modo di produzione capitalistico', *Marx ei Suoi Critici*, Urbino: Quattro Venti.