

Fatima Suleman ~ Affordability And Equitable Access To (Bio)Therapeutics For Public Health



Prof. Fatima Suleman

On 16 May Prof. Fatima Suleman gave her inaugural lecture as the new Professor to the Prince Claus Chair in Development and Equity at Utrecht University, entitled: *Affordability and equitable access to (bio)therapeutics for public health*. Prof. Suleman works at the University of Kwazulu Natal in South Africa and connects the theme of development and equity with accessibility of medicine, pharmacy and health economics. Read the highly interesting text of the [inaugural lecture](#) or [watch the video](#) of the livestream!

Henk A. Becker ~ Inleiding bij Generaties van geluksvogels en

pechvogels



Het woord 'generatie' komen wij vrijwel dagelijks tegen. In de kranten, op de televisie, in boeken en films. In de meeste gevallen begrijpen wij meteen, dat het om 'tijdgenoten' gaat. Soms echter is niet meteen duidelijk waar het woord 'generatie' voor staat. In dat geval hebben wij met een 'wezelwoord' te maken. Dan lijkt het alsof een wezel in het geniep de betekenis uit het woord heeft weggezogen. Het boek biedt handvatten om dan toch de ontglipte betekenis te kunnen achterhalen.

Zodra het verschijnsel is herkend, komen tal van maatschappelijke knelpunten in gedachten. Denk aan

de vraag, welke gevolgen de komende sterke krimp van de bevolking zal hebben en wie de kosten hiervan zal moeten betalen. Immers in 2010 bereikt in Nederland en vele andere Europese landen het eerste cohort van de babyboom de leeftijd van 65 jaar. In al deze landen gaan achtereenvolgens twintig of meer cohorten van babyboomers het arbeidsbestel verlaten.

Voor sociologen en andere maatschappijwetenschappers gaat het om een omvangrijk onderzoeksgebied. Er is een patroon van generaties ontstaan. Sociologen gaan na, met welke bedreigingen de leden geconfronteerd worden en welke kansen zij hebben. Ook wordt onderzocht welke 'stille reserves' in de samenleving kunnen worden aangeboord om het lot van pechvogels te verbeteren en geluksvogels de mogelijkheid te bieden hun gunstige positie te behouden of verder te verbeteren.

Een goed voorbeeld van een geluksvogel is iemand, die op het juiste ogenblik en in de juiste leeftijd op de juiste plek zit. Veranderingen in de samenleving dwingen telkens weer tot nieuw onderzoek. Redenen genoeg om het onderwerp 'generaties' in een overzichtspublicatie aan de orde te stellen. De hoofdpunten uit dit boek zijn reeds in wetenschappelijke tijdschriften gepubliceerd.

Hoofdlijnen

Om te beginnen gaat het om een korte karakterisering van het verschijnsel generatie.

Daarna komt het patroon van generaties aan bod, dat in Nederland en de meeste

andere lidstaten van de Europese Unie is ontstaan. Vervolgens wordt geanalyseerd hoe het staat met de solidariteit tussen de generaties. Deze informatie wordt geconfronteerd met 'Europe 2020', de opvolger van de Lissabon Strategie. De nieuwe strategie is door de Europese Commissie gelanceerd om de houdbaarheid (in 'Europese' termen de sustainability) van de Europese Unie tussen 2010 en 2020 te garanderen. Om de gestelde doelen te bereiken acht de Europese Commissie enkele grootscheepse ontwikkelingsprogramma's noodzakelijk.

In dit kader is besloten om 2012 uit te roepen tot 'The European Year of Active Ageing and Intergenerational Solidarity'. In het boek wordt bezien op welke punten 'Europe 2020' valt te ondersteunen vanuit het patroon van generaties met zijn vele stille reserves. Deze stille reserves schuilen vooral in de patronen van specifieke generaties en van deze specifieke generaties worden in het boek enkele nader geanalyseerd. Actief ouder worden en het beleid in de nota 'Europe 2020' spelen op lange termijn, met het jaar 2030 als een omslagpunt in verband met het begin van de uittrekking van de babybust cohorten uit het arbeidsbestel.

Omdat generaties veelvuldig in het secundair en hoger onderwijs aan de orde komen, met name doordat studenten er werkstukken over maken, worden in het methodisch deel voorbeelden van generationele analyses en 'serious gaming' gepresenteerd.

Het Europese Jaar van Actief Ouder Worden roept tal van vragen op, vooral over de te organiseren activiteiten. Op deze en soortgelijke vragen wordt in een bonus hoofdstuk met 'Vaak Gestelde Vragen' ingegaan. Dit systeem van frequently asked questions zal periodiek worden bijgewerkt, vooral om recente ontwikkelingen te behandelen.

Het boek vertoont een indeling, die veel gelijkenis vertoont met de opzet van het eraan ten grondslag liggende meerjarige onderzoeksprogramma. Het gaat om een samenspel van kwalitatieve verkenningen, kwantitatieve onderzoeksprojecten en kwalitatieve interpretaties.

Voor wie bestemd?

Het boek richt zich in de eerste plaats tot een algemeen lezerspubliek. De levensloop van elk der betrokkenen is in het geding. Ten tweede richt het boek zich tot beroepsbeoefenaren, die in hun werk met generatieverschillen te maken hebben. Denk aan leraren, die telkens nieuwe generaties onderwijs moeten geven. In de derde plaats zijn beleidsmakers te noemen, die vanuit hun organisatie op generaties moeten inspelen. Ten vierde gaat het om wetenschappers. Zij

komen generaties in hun eigen discipline tegen, onder andere bij de instroom van jonge vakgenoten.

Ook zijn er heel wat wetenschappers, die resultaten van generatieonderzoek in hun eigen onderzoek willen verwerken. Denk aan generatieverschillen tussen patiënten. Tenslotte is het boek bestemd voor al degenen die zich op de hoogte willen stellen van de 'state of the art' in de generatiesociologie alsmede de empirische sociologie meer in het algemeen.

Over het boek

Het boek is zo geschreven, dat de hoofdstukken ook afzonderlijk te lezen zijn. In verband met het afzonderlijk kunnen lezen van hoofdstukken komen hier en daar herhalingen voor.

Het hoofdstuk over *Generaties en Meertaligheid* en het eraan ten grondslag liggende onderzoek vormen een gezamenlijke activiteit van mij en Zoltán Lippényi. Mijn jonge collega is precies vijftig jaar jonger dan ik en daarom gaat het hier om een duidelijk voorbeeld van intergenerationele samenwerking.

In bonushoofdstuk 15 zijn enkele handvatten voor het lezen van het boek opgenomen.

Ook bevat dit hoofdstuk onder meer aanwijzingen voor het toepassen van 'serious gaming'.

Bij het schrijven en voor publicatie gereedmaken van dit boek heb ik van vele kanten steun ontvangen. Gaarne dank ik Lies van Rijssen en Zoltán Lippényi voor hun commentaren en hun assistentie bij het samenstellen van dit boek. Ook dank ik Rob Ackerstaff, Johanna Becker, Gijs Dekkers, Jan van Hooff, Kees de Jager, Jan Stolp, Ferdinand Verhulst, Sander Vlot, Thymo Vlot en René Vos, die elk op hun eigen wijze al meedenkend een belangrijke inbreng hebben geleverd.

Met dank wordt melding gemaakt van de financiële steun van de stichting 'Doorns Belang' voor de vertaling van het boek in het Engels

Illusions And Dangers In Trump's "America First" Policy: An Interview With Economist Robert Pollin



Robert Pollin ~ Photo: UMass Amherst

Donald Trump will probably go down in history as having pulled the biggest political con job in US electoral politics. With no coherent ideology but lies and false promises, he managed to win the support of millions of white working-class people whose lives have been shattered by globalization and stagnant wages. In an exclusive interview for Truthout, Robert Pollin, professor of economics and co-director of the Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, puts into context Trump's stance on globalization and his "America first" stance.

C.J. Polychroniou and Marcus Rolle: Resistance to globalization was the preeminent policy theme in Trump's election campaign, as he not only attacked immigration and promised to build a wall on the US-Mexican border, but rallied against existing trade agreements, including the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and promised to withdraw the US from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade deal, a promise he carried out immediately upon entering the White House. Given that the US remains the world's only true superpower and that multilateral trade agreements constitute an integral component of the global neoliberal economy, where, firstly, does resistance to globalization locate

Donald Trump on the politico-ideological spectrum and, secondly, what is, in your view, his ultimate vision for the United States?

Robert Pollin: Donald Trump is difficult, if not impossible, to locate with respect to the global neoliberal project; first of all because all evidence thus far supports the conclusion that he has no real convictions at all, other than self-promotion. It's true that he campaigned on a strong nationalist agenda that diverged in many ways from neoliberalism — i.e. from a program of free trade, unregulated financial markets and freedom for multinational corporations to operate as they please. That program did speak to the experiences of the US white working class, which, as even former Federal Reserve Chair Alan Greenspan recognized in the 1990s, had become “traumatized” by the forces of neoliberal globalization. It is unclear how forcefully Trump intends to diverge from neoliberalism in practice, despite his rhetorical appeals to his base within the US white working class. To me, relative to understanding Donald Trump's “ultimate vision,” I think it is much more important for progressives to become much clearer in defining our own vision on globalization. Specifically, in my view, what is most important is establishing a clear distinction between neoliberal globalization and globalization in any form at all.

Neoliberal globalization is all about creating freedom for private capital and financial speculation, which in turn has created an unprecedented global “reserve army of labor,” to use Marx's brilliant turn of phrase. The global reserve army of labor has indeed pitted US workers against workers in China, India, Kenya, Mexico, Guatemala — you name it. This has weakened workers' bargaining power in the US, which in turn is the most basic factor driving wage stagnation in the United States for the past 40 years, even as US average labor productivity has more than doubled over this period. But we should be able to envision an alternative framework in which the US and other countries are open to trade and immigration within a context of a commitment to full employment and a strong social welfare state. Within a full employment economy with strong social protections, an open trading system will not produce a global reserve army of labor to anything close to the extent we have experienced over the past 40 years. This is the key point.

What has been NAFTA's impact on US workers, and what was wrong with the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal?

It is first important to recognize that NAFTA and the TPP were not simply about “free trade” between the US and Mexico. Much less advertised but at least equally significant was that these were deals that gave freedom of movement and strengthened property rights to multinational corporations and financial institutions. With respect to trade, per se, between Mexico and the US, the basic impact of NAFTA has been, again, to expand the reserve army of labor — i.e. pitting US workers against Mexican workers. This is by no means an abstract matter. What I am talking about are situations in which, say, autoworkers in the US try to bargain for a raise. But the plant owners’ response to a demand for increased wages is, effectively: *“You don’t like what you are getting paid? Fine, we will move across the border to Mexico, where wages are one-quarter of what you make, or less. Good-bye and good luck.”* That has been a credible threat to workers for a long time. NAFTA only made it still more credible.

As part of his “America first” agenda, Trump has vowed to bring back manufacturing jobs by imposing high tariffs on certain imports (for example, he plans to do so on imports of Canadian softwood lumber) and has stressed that all jobs must be first offered to Americans before they can be offered to foreign nationals. How realistic are such policy postures, and what could be the consequences if every other country opted to adopt similar approaches?

I don’t think Trump will end up following through on such threats, even while he will likely keep up the rhetoric to appeal to his base. For example, he has already backed off on his threat to declare China a currency manipulator. Of course, in practice, China is no less of a “currency manipulator” than it was six months ago. What has changed is that, with Trump now in office, he is hearing from his top economic advisers — Gary Cohn and Steven Mnuchin, both veterans of Goldman Sachs — that trying to bully China is more likely to hurt US capitalists as well as have dangerous consequences for US military interests. In general, I do not think imposing high tariffs is either realistic or desirable, and I don’t think Trump has any serious intention to follow through on such threats.

A more realistic policy framework would work from the existing “Buy America” program that has been in place for decades in the area of federal government procurement, but that has been only weakly enforced in practice. Under Buy America, federally-funded procurement contracts in manufacturing — such as building railcars for municipal public transportation systems — are supposed to give preferences to US manufacturers. That is a reasonable framework both at

the level of federal as well as state and local government policy that most other countries already follow as well, as one important element of a broader set of industrial policies in support of US manufacturing and jobs.

The issue of immigration continues to divide public opinion in the United States, as it does elsewhere around the Western world, insofar as its impact to the economy and society is concerned. Is there any evidence that the inflows of foreign labor reduce jobs or Americans' wages?

The best evidence of which I am aware comes from the UC Berkeley economist David Card, who [finds](#) that the impact of immigrants in the US labor force has little, if any, impact on wages of US native-born workers at the lower end of the job market. Card reached this conclusion by comparing conditions in the low-wage labor market in US cities that have a very high proportion of immigrants, such as Miami, New York and Los Angeles, with cities, such as Philadelphia or Atlanta, in which the immigrant population is much smaller proportionally. I myself, along with [Assistant Research Professor at the Political Economy Research Institute] Jeannette Wicks-Lim [replicated](#) Card's findings over the years of the Great Recession. Our conclusion was the same as Card's — the mere presence of a high proportion of immigrants in a given local labor market did not negatively impact wages of native-born workers. This is because immigrants in cities, such as Miami and New York, are also people who buy things and set up their own businesses in these cities. They are, therefore, expanding the markets and jobs in these cities, as well as supplying more people to these local labor markets.

What about undocumented immigration? There are some studies indicating that undocumented immigration depresses wages of unskilled American workers.

The same general result applies to both legal and [undocumented] immigrants. Immigrants do take jobs in the low-wage labor market. But they also expand demand by their own purchases, and they also create their own businesses in some cases. That said, there are specific areas of the economy in which the share of immigrant workers is very high — agricultural farm work is perhaps the best example. In this case, you do get more of a reserve army of labor effect, in which the overall wage bargaining dynamic hurts workers against their employers. But we need to be careful not to generalize from the specific case of farmworkers to the general case of all immigrant workers operating in all areas of the US

economy.

Looking at the first 100 days of the Trump administration, an “America first” policy begins to look like a military-first policy aimed towards global hegemony. If the Trump presidency is ushering in a new era of militarism, doesn’t this fit with Trump’s unilateral trade approach?

“America first” as a foreign policy is nothing new, of course. US global military dominance has been the established program for generations. But this is fully consistent with the point that neoliberal economic policy is clearly the preferred framework for big capital in the US, since it is the program that enables multinational corporations and financial institutions to operate most profitably throughout the world. As such, US militarism has been operating on behalf of an open economic system, supportive of US capital. I don’t think that is going to change in a fundamental way under Trump. Overall, again, I think that Trump’s global economic policies will be characterized mostly by incoherence, with heavy doses of “America first” rhetoric. Within such incoherence, it is again most important, in my view, that progressives go much further in advancing a policy approach that is open to global trade and investment, but as part of a broader framework in which full employment and a strong social welfare state are the foundations, in the US and elsewhere.

What am I talking about more specifically? At present, the US is officially at full employment, according to the Federal Reserve. But this is with about 23 million people either unemployed, underemployed or having dropped out of the labor force during the Great Recession but not returning since. The federal government needs to directly expand job creation through spending on 1) building a zero emissions green economy; 2) traditional infrastructure, especially public transportation; and 3) education. This can be financed in large part through the so-called Robin Hood Tax — i.e. taxing Wall Street transactions, which can generate in the range of \$300 billion per year. This would mean moving money out of Wall Street and into vital areas of social spending, which can also be sources of new job creation. It can also be financed by the Federal Reserve directly purchasing bonds floated by states and municipalities to support public spending on the green economy, infrastructure and education. In addition, we need to move out of our existing disastrously inequitable and wasteful health care system, and replace it with something like “Medicare for All.” That would provide decent health care provision for everyone, while still reducing the overall

economy's spending on health care by about 20 percent. There is a model bill of just such a measure being debated now in California.

Finally, the US needs to practice industrial policies to support a manufacturing revival. This would include guaranteeing public sector purchases of US manufactured products, low-cost financing for innovative US manufacturers and the development of regional support systems for manufacturing firms in various areas of the country. The German economy is a good model on this point — they are a manufacturing and export powerhouse, even though their average manufacturing wages are about 30 percent higher than in the US. With this combination of Green New Deal, social infrastructure and industrial policies pushing the economy toward true full employment — i.e. anybody who is willing and able to work can get a decent job — the US could still manage to purchase a good share of imports from all over the world, especially low-income economies that can gain great benefits from being able to sell their products in the US market. Any negative impacts from such import purchases will be greatly diminished because the reserve army of labor in the US will have been itself greatly diminished by policies of full employment and a strong welfare state guaranteeing the well-being of US workers and their families.

Copyright, Truthout. May not be reprinted without [permission](#).

ASC ~ Education For Life. Akiiki Babyesiza ~ Introduction



On the occasion of the [international conference 'Education for Life in Africa'](#), organized by the Netherlands Association for Africa Studies in The Hague on 19 and 20 May 2017, the ASCL Library has compiled a web dossier on this theme. The conference is dedicated to Goal 4 of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): '[Ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning](#)'.

The web dossier contains recent titles from our [Library catalogue](#) (from 2013 onwards), divided into six thematic sections. Each title links to the corresponding record in the [online catalogue](#), which provides abstracts and full-text links (when available). The dossier also contains a number of relevant websites. African textbooks present in our Library (for example, on history and on religion), have not been included in this web dossier. They can be searched in our [catalogue](#) using the keyword [textbooks \(form\)](#) combined with a keyword such as '[history](#)', '[Islam](#)' or '[Christianity](#)'.

The dossier is introduced by [Dr Akiiki Babyesiza](#), an expert in higher education, specializing in Sub-Saharan Africa. Dr Babyesiza has been working for CHE Consult (Berlin), a consulting company in the field of strategic higher education management, since May 2017.

Introduction

Africa is the youngest continent, with half of its population under the age of 15. An inclusive and equitable education sector from pre-primary to higher education that can offer opportunities for this rising young population is at the core of the targets of Sustainable Development Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning.

In recent decades, the multilateral initiative Education for All and the education related goals of the Millennium Development Goals have led to substantial changes in the field of education in Africa. Yet, the goal of universal primary education has not been achieved and a high proportion of the world's out-of-school children are African. While access to primary, secondary and higher education has increased, many other challenges persist with respect to equity and quality. Some of the challenges are connected to how and what children learn at school. One important aspect is the language of instruction, which is usually not the pupils' mother tongue. Often, the lack of educational success is connected to a lack of proficiency in the language of instruction. Another issue is the role of pedagogy and whether students learn to apply knowledge or just to repeat it. This is, of course, also connected to the quality of the education and training of teachers. Moreover, inequities remain between rural and urban areas with respect to the distribution of schools, particularly secondary schools and higher education institutions. And there are inequities with regard to gender, ethnicity, disability and refugee status.


These challenges are exacerbated in situations of war and violent conflict, where educational institutions can worsen as well as mitigate conflict. Students can be marginalized by language, teaching content and the politicization of teaching staff. At the same time, educational institutions that offer peace and civic education for students and accelerated learning programmes for former child soldiers can have a positive impact in post-conflict situations.

Whether in times of war or in times of peace, there is need for a more holistic view of education – from pre-primary education to higher education and technical vocational education and training. The higher education sector, for example, has long suffered from neglect due to the strong focus on primary education in international development debates. Due to the social rates of return theory adopted by the World Bank, higher education institutions in Africa were perceived as an unnecessary luxury. These days, politicians and development actors have embraced the interconnectedness of the different educational sectors. Teachers are taught at higher education institutions, so there cannot be successful primary and secondary schools without quality tertiary education. While the number of higher education students in Sub-Saharan Africa doubled between 2000 and 2010, the rate of youth enrolled in higher education is only around 6% (26% is the global average). Furthermore, many scholars, practitioners and politicians believe that the development of a knowledge economy/society, with higher education institutions at its centre, is key to local and global sustainable development.

Access to education and enrolment: <http://www.ascleiden.nl/content/education-life> ~ scroll down a little for the web dossier.

**Ellen Klinkers ~ Op hoop van
vrijheid. Van slavensamenleving
naar Creoolse gemeenschap in**

Suriname, 1830-1880.



De afschaffing van de slavernij op 1 juli 1863 is het hoogtepunt in de Surinaamse geschiedenis. Bijna 33.000 mensen werden vrij. Wat gebeurde er met de samenlevingen die op de plantages waren ontstaan? Welke keuzes had en maakte de vrije bevolking na 1863? Hoe ontstond één Creoolse gemeenschap in Suriname uit al die plantagesamenlevingen? Die vragen staan centraal in de dissertatie waarop ik in 1997 aan de Universiteit Leiden promoveerde.


Echt vrije burgers werden de Creoolse plantagearbeiders pas tien jaar later op 1 juli 1873, toen het Staatstoezicht werd opgeheven. Tot die tijd waren zij nog aan de plantages gebonden. Wel mochten zij zelf beslissen waar ze werkten en kregen zij betaald voor hun werk. Die overgangperiode tussen slavernij en vrijheid beschermde de planter tegen een leegloop van zijn bedrijf.

In mijn boek bespreek ik de laatste decennia van de slavernij, het staatstoezicht en eerste jaren van volledige vrijheid. Ik maakte gebruik van de dagboeken van de Herrnhutters en van rechtszaken. Die documenten brachten mij zo dicht mogelijk bij de mensen die zelf nooit een stem kregen in de bronnen.

Op hoop van vrijheid is in 1997 verschenen. Het woord slaaf is nu omstreden, maar was toen gangbaar. Het boek is al lang niet meer leverbaar.

Het boek in PDF-formaat is hier te downloaden: <http://ellenklinkers.nl/op-hoop-van-vrijheid/>

Dismantling Domination: What We Can Learn About Freedom From Karl Marx



*Karl Marx (1818-1883) Ills.:
Ingrid Bouws*

Over the years, especially following the latest global financial crisis that erupted in late 2007, there has been a renewed interest in the work of Karl Marx. Indeed, Marx remains essential for understanding capitalism, but his political project continues to produce conflicting interpretations. What really motivated Marx to undertake a massive study of the laws of the capitalist mode of production? Was Marx interested in liberty, or merely in equality? And did Marx's vision of communism have any links to "actually existing socialism" (i.e., the socialist regimes of the former Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc)?

Marx's Inferno: The Political Theory of Capital, a recently published book by McGill University Professor William Clare Roberts, offers a rigorous and unique interpretation of Marx's political and philosophical project. The book reveals why Marx remains extremely relevant today to all those seeking to challenge capitalism's domination and violence — from its exploitation of labor power to the use of oppressive stage apparatuses as reflected in the exercise of police brutality. We spoke to William Clare Roberts about Marx's project and vision of

communism.

C.J. Polychroniou: In your recently published book Marx's Inferno, you contend that liberty, rather than equality, was Marx's primary politico-philosophical concern and, subsequently, claim that his work and discourse belong in the republican tradition of political thought. Can you elaborate a bit on these claims and tell us how they are derived from a particular reading of Marx's work?

William Clare Roberts: I would say it a bit differently. Marx is certainly concerned with equality. Everyone on the left is. The question is: equality of what? This is where freedom, or liberty, comes in. In my book, I argue that Marx shared the radical republican project of securing universal equal freedom. When we talk about equality on the left today, this is too often assumed to mean equality of material wealth or equality of treatment, such that economic equality is the goal in itself. For Marx, economic inequality was not the main problem. It was a consequence and a breeding ground of domination. This was Marx's prime concern.

To be dominated is to be subject to the whims or caprice of others, to have no control over whether or not they interfere with you, your life, your actions, your body. Republicans, going back to the Roman republic, have recognized that this lack of control over how others treat you is, of itself, inimical to human flourishing. [According to their philosophy], whether or not the powerful actually hurt you is actually less important than the fact that they have the power to hurt you, and you can't control whether or not or how they use that power. It is in this space of uncertainty and fear that power does its work. So, for example, that an employer can fire a worker at will is usually enough to secure the worker's obedience, especially where the worker doesn't have many alternative sources of income. Likewise, that the police have the basically unchecked power to arrest, beat and harass people in many neighborhoods produces all manner of distortions in how people live, regardless of whether they have actually been beaten or harassed. To live free is to live without this fear or this need to watch out for the powerful. And this means being equally empowered.

Traditionally, republicans were concerned only to protect the freedom of a certain class of men within their own political community. In the 19th century, however, workers, women, escaped slaves — people who lived with domination — began to take over this republican theory of freedom and to insist that everyone should

enjoy equal freedom. I read Marx as part of this tradition.

Marx's major innovation in this tradition was to develop a theory of the capitalist economy as a system of domination. Radicals then — like many radicals today — assimilated capital to previous forms of power — military, feudal, or extortionary. They saw the capitalist simply as a monopolist, and the government as the enforcement squad of the monopolists. To Marx, this was insufficient as a critical diagnosis. The capitalists are, like the workers, dependent upon the market. They must act as they do or be replaced by other, more effective capitalists. Marx saw in this market dependence a new sort of all-round social domination. The livelihood of each depends upon the unpredictable and uncontrollable decisions of many others. This impersonal domination mediates and transforms the other forms of domination people experience.

One of the most interesting aspects of your book, at least for me, is the analysis of Marx's use and understanding of exploitation. Clearly, as you point out, Marx was concerned with the exploitation of labor power, not with exploitation as a general social category. What's the political significance of this, and what's your explanation for the general tendency among contemporary radical analyses on capitalism to shy away from the use of expressions like "surplus value" and "class struggle"?

This is a specific development of the previous point. Because the impersonal domination of the market mediates the other aspects of capitalist production, capitalist exploitation is quite unlike other forms of exploitation. As Marx puts it in *Capital*, capitalists did not invent the exploitation of surplus labor. But, in the past, those who enjoyed the fruits of other people's labor did so by means of extortion, theft and coercion. Exploitation was, therefore, a drain on production; it disincentivized production. Capitalist production, on the other hand, incentivizes labor and production like nothing else ever has. The exploitation of labor-power — Marx's technical phrase for capitalist exploitation — is so effective, in fact, that overwork is endemic to capitalist economies.

Marx thought that workers organizing to fight overwork was one of the most important and powerful levers for the development and transformation of capitalist production. The fight against overwork, and for higher wages, was, he argued, the basic spur that drove capitalists to introduce new production technologies. Industrialization and mechanization, in turn, provoke the

agglomeration of capitalist producers, increasing both the mass of workers and the concentration of capital. These fights also bring workers together, and give them political experience. All of this, Marx argued, prepared workers to win the battle someday, and to replace capitalist production entirely.

This understanding of the links between exploitation, class struggle, capitalist development and revolutionary politics has largely fallen out of favor among radicals. I am very interested in the history of this theory's decline, in part because I think the theory had more going for it than many of its critics — even very sympathetic critics — realize....

The criticisms of Marx's value theory ... have diverted attention from the basic observations that underlie Marx's account of capitalist exploitation. Unlike materials and technologies of production, which provide objectively predictable inputs to the production process, workers must be induced to work, and how much work they provide is a matter requiring constant management and government. Marx's attention to the workplace as a site of governance and induced activity is as relevant as ever.

The other major reason Marx's analysis has fallen out of favor is that the link between class struggle and revolutionary politics seemed to be broken. On the one hand, the industrial working class seemed to be integrated into capitalism by winning the franchise, winning higher wages through unionization, and winning social security in the form of the welfare state. On the other hand, the locus of radicalism and revolt seemed to be in the students, the peasants of the colonized world, and the oppressed peoples fighting for national liberation.

But none of these developments actually undermine Marx's argument, which was that only those dependent upon wages for life — a class that far exceeds industrial workers — have an interest in universal emancipation. Anyone who is dominated or oppressed has an interest in the emancipation of their own group. But Marx thought that wages made people interdependent on one another and dependent upon technologically advanced production to such an extent that wage workers could only liberate themselves — even at a national level — by liberating everyone, everywhere. At a moment when left populism — be it that of Sanders or Corbyn or Mélançon — seems compelled to reinforce national frontiers, Marx's argument should be revisited.

Marx's critique of capitalist economy and society, you argue in your book, was influenced by the poetic imagery of Dante. Is this of political import, or simply of literary significance?

I am wary of too simple a distinction between the literary and the political. Marx rewrote Dante's *Inferno*, I argue, because Dante's moral imaginary was deeply ingrained in the vernacular of the workers' movement. The literary aspects of *Capital* — its structure, its metaphors, its images — are integral to its political mission: to reshape the theoretical and political language of the workers' movement. To us today, it may seem merely literary, but that is because the Christian-Aristotelian moral discourse is no longer part of our vernacular in the way it was in 19th-century Europe.

At the most fundamental level, I think Dante is crucial for Marx's political argument because the *Inferno* provides the basic categories of wrong that structure Marx's argument in *Capital*. Capitalist society is out of control, violent, fraudulent and treacherous. These are Dante's categories. Marx reconfigures and redefines them, fleshes them out with political economy, and transforms them into a critical social theory. You don't need Dante to understand that critical social theory once it is finished, but seeing the Dante in it helps reveal its genesis and structure.

Communism has gotten a bad rap as a result of the experience of "actually existing socialism": the socialist regimes of the former Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc. Did Marx have an actual vision of communism? And, if so, how does his ideal communist society relate to republicanism?

Marx's "vision of communism" is notoriously indefinite. I argue that there are good reasons for this. Marx is primarily a diagnostician of domination. He is impressed by the workers' unfreedom, and spent half his life trying to figure out how the institutions that created that unfreedom work. He was convinced that, if the workers knew how their unfreedom was sustained and reproduced, they would be able to figure out how to organize themselves to abolish it.

Part of this confidence, I am convinced, came from the fact that Marx took for granted that republican institutions — well-known in the realm of politics — could be extended to the realm of the economy without grave difficulties. He thought worker-run cooperative factories pointed the way. He thought workers should

elect their managers, and that decisions about production, organization and distribution should be subject to political debate. Revolutionary situations — like that of Paris in 1871 — saw the common people organizing themselves into networks of communal self-government. Marx took this as confirmation of his faith in the workers' ability to emancipate themselves and create a global framework of interdependent "social republics."

This emancipatory perspective certainly faded over the course of the 20th century. This was in part due to the harshness of war and the ravages of nationalism, not to mention the reactionary terrors that always stalked the ascension of socialists and communists to government. But it was also prepared by the fact that "rational administration" always vied with freedom as the goal of the socialist movement. From this perspective, it was the "out-of-control"-ness of capitalism that seemed most objectionable. Control and planning seemed more important, therefore, than the equal empowerment of everyone to resist the impositions of others. Command economies resulted in catastrophe.

Equally important, there are real and massive difficulties of logistics and institutional design that confront the effort to organize global cooperative production. The sheer scale of the project boggles the mind. It is very hard to cooperate, even when it is essential for our continued existence. We don't really know how to do it yet. You can affirm Marx's critical theory of the society ruled by capitalist production in every detail and then affirm that we do not yet know how to replace that society with something better. Rather than a vision of an ideal communist society, we might take from Marx what he offers: a compelling principle of freedom, by which we can evaluate our social and political situation, and a powerful theory of how the capitalist world disregards, endangers and tramples on that freedom. What we can do about it — that we have to supply for ourselves.

[Copyright, Truthout](#)