

Aspects of a global theory of regulation

SABAH ALNASSERI ¹

INDEX

PREVIOUS ACCUMULATION, ARTICULATION AND REGULATION	1
PREVIOUS ACCUMULATION	3
MODE OF PRODUCTION, SOCIAL FORMATIONS, IMPERIALISTIC CHAIN AND WORLD SYSTEM.	7
THE ARTICULATION OF DIFFERENT MODES OF PRODUCTION.....	13
THE REGULATION OF THE ARTICULATION RELATION	16
LITERATURE	19

PREVIOUS ACCUMULATION, ARTICULATION AND REGULATION

1. In this contribution I will undertake the attempt, to seize theoretically more exactly the status of the terms “previous accumulation“ and “articulation“. Because in the regulation theory these objects are hardly worked on, why —so the basic thesis— the theory has not only difficulties with the analysis of peripheral social formations, but also with questions of the periodisation of the capitalist mode of production (see for this the problematic of Postfordism, Candeias/Deppe 2001). In a methodical sense is the articulation between different —capitalistic and vov—capitalistic— modes and forms of Production central, whereby it is important that this relationship not as functional, but it is to be determined as an internal contradiction. The theoretically fundamental question is here the following: “In the historical reality of capitalism designates the capitalist relation of production the dominating, but not the exclusive mode of societalization. It always is, but in historically changing way, *combined* with other relations of production and forms of societalization [...]. A more exact analysis would show that the commodity exchange characterized,

¹. Sabah Alnasseri

capitalist relation of societalization without the others [...] *kann not exist at all.*" (Hirsch 1990: 33, emphasized and translated². SA). On which theoretical basis it is now possible to determine this interrelation more exactly?.

2. I would like to follow for this first the Marxian consideration that the so-called "previous accumulation" does not represent a historical residue category, but theoretically one of the forming moments of the capital, to be determined historically as "force relation". "The accumulation represents only as sequential process, which in the previous accumulation appears as a special historical process, as developing process of the capital and as transition from one mode of production to the other." (Marx 1968: 268, Translation. SA). As capital always to be determined historical—concretely, so the term previous accumulation will be understood as one moment of "developing— and transition processes", as well as a "ongoing" Process. The previous accumulation will be therefore theoretically crucial for the determination of the articulation of different modes of production. Generally it is regarded that the articulation does not mean a symmetrical relation, but as dominance of the capitalist on non—capitalist modes of production. In a second step the articulation of modes and forms of production (AMP/F) will be determined as an institutional form in the sense of the regulation theory. In the sense of concretizing this means thirdly that the political—spatial compression, the concrete form of the AMP/F qua dominance, constitutes a social formation and at the same time globally a "imperialist chain" (Poulantzas) and/or always historically concrete forms of the capitalist world system (Wallerstein). In order to unfold this argumentation, I will proceed as follows: First I will try to determine following Marx, Althusser and Balibar the theoretical status of the term previous accumulation more precisely (1). Subsequently, I will go into the concepts of the mode production and social formation, which developed further following on the Marxian theory, as well as global on the "imperialist chain" and the "world system": The three categories social formation, imperialist chain and world system designate the historical—concrete "place" (Poulantzas) of the articulation of different modes of production (2). Thereafter I will try to characterize more precisely the relation of articulation between capitalist and non—capitalist modes of production (3), in order to finally introduce it analytically as an institutional form in the sense of the regulation theory (4). Regarding the status of the Marx argumentation I follow Louis Althusser and Étienne Balibar: The economic writings of Marx can according to them be understood as the epitome of the construction of the capitalist mode of production in its "ideellen Durchschnitt" (Marx). This means two different things: Methodically remains the "mode of representation", particularly in capital throughout abstract (see Schwarz 1974). It is the "movement form" of the terms/categories, i.e. their interior— exterior exposition. Therefore the Marx method, ascending from the abstract to the concrete, means to remain in the term, to determine it diversely, to enrich it by its conditions of existence (see Althusser/Balibar 1972: 256). The representation bei Marx means thus one the historical development opposite unfolding of the term. At the same time historical—concrete conditions float forwards the abstract categories. This means that the formers are not

² - All quotations are translated by the author, except the quotations of Marx remain in original (german). Exception is here the first quotation of Marx (p. 1) and due to shortage of time, those of Althusser/Balibar (p.3f).

analyzed empirically, but that they find their status as historical “places“ in the theoretical representation (see Marx 1974: 22f., 364f. and 391f.). It concerns a genetic De— and a progressive re—construction of the capital relationship: Because the unit is contradictory, the different elements (worker, means of production, food etc.) kann be dissolved into their so—called “urspruengliche Einheit“ and build up again. With “urspruenglicher Einheit“ is meant the total connection of possession and property, which are characterized as the “primitiv communism“ and/or the asiatic common property as the social “Urform“ (see MEW 13: 21. Fn. 1). What stands in the “Ursprung“ or the “Stamm“ is capital as community. The different forms of the separation/connection represent periodisation formeln of capital self, not pre—historic origins and their straight—line self development. Serfdom, slavery, Fronarbeit etc. have together with the wage labour that they represent all historical forms of the surplus work as forced labour, i.e. they are not pre—capitalist, but visible faces of the wage labour. “Es ist dasselbe, als arbeite er [Lohnarbeiter] 3 Tage in der Woche für sich und 3 Tage in der Woche umsonst für den Kapitalisten. Aber ‚dies ist nicht sichtbar‘. Mehrarbeit und notwendige Arbeit verschwimmen ineinander. Anders mit der Fronarbeit [...]“ (MEW 23: 251. Emphasized. SA). Differently expressed: The wage labour can assume other, distorted faces in the articulation with other forms of the forced labour. As soon as non—capitalist modes of production are integrated into the world market, “wird den barbarischen Gräueln der Sklaverei, Leibeigenschaft usw. der zivilisierte Gräuel der Überarbeit aufgepfropft [...]. Es galt nicht mehr, eine gewisse Masse nützlicher Produkte aus ihm [dem Sklaven in den südlichen Staaten Amerikas, SA] herauszuschlagen. Es galt nun der Produktion des Mehrwerts selbst. Ähnlich mit der Fronarbeit, z.B. in den Donaufürstentümern.“ (ibid.: 250). Since on the other hand the Marxian method understand itself as criticism of the classical and vulgar political economy and qua this immanent criticism it developed the Marxian term of the economy, is the argument along and the “puring“ of the “dullness“ (Marx) in that theory an methodical—analytic requirement. These impurities, turbidity and constant confusions in the classical political economy are connected with questions of the articulation of different modes of production, on which still I come to speak.

PREVIOUS ACCUMULATION

3. Important is with the determination of the Marx representation method by Althusser the status of the term “urspruengliche Akkumulation“. The 24. Chapter in the first volume of capital is to be understood not as an historical—empirical outline over the actual developing history of the capitalist mode of production, but as “Illustration“ of the Marxian term of the previous accumulation as expropriation and commodification. Marx determines the previous accumulation as one of the three forming moments of capital (see Marx 1974: 225f.), that is why it cannot be a residual, historically overhauled moment, but is always inherent the production and reproduction of capital. This, on the basis of the english case illustrated history is in as much of importance as for the determination of the term of the previous accumulation, not only “pure“ economic relations are constitutiv, but also political and ideological—cultural conditions of existence. Exactly the abstraction of the latters of the determination of the economic tempts theoretical “Tauschungen“ und adventurous constructions, which can now be briefly illustrated on the basis the problematic of the

“non—or extra—economic“, because they are for the detection of the term of the previous accumulation of importance.

4. The “non—economic” represents for the classical as well as vulgar political economist a pre—capitalist moment: on the basis of cultural, legal—political or violent conditions nominal laid claim on the capitalistically produced surplus value, i.e. the rent. These, just like the interest, seem to be not directly involved into the working process, but appear as a condition and prerequisite of the work. This conception fastens itself all the more, as on the one hand those forms (interest, rent) exist historically before the industrial capital (see Marx 1968: 460f.). On the other hand on this level of circulation the results of the production process than appear as if they were self—centered and independent phenomena from the production process, which are then noticed as outside of the production process and condition of the same and represented theoretically (ibid.: 497f.). This “Truebheit“ (Marx) in the theory is methodically conditioned (see ibid.: 472f.; MEW 25: 637f.). I.e. what as pre—capitalist economics appears, represents nothing than the capitalist surplus value in its articulated form with non—capitalist relations, which cloud their purity in the theory (see MEW 25: 795f.). Following Marx, selfdom, slave economy, house economy etc. is neither historical, nor logically pre—capitalist, but under the rule of capital, articulated modes of production, which are to be understood in the representation as “Andeutungen“ in the term of capital. These modes of production have just as illustrative character in the representation of Marx as English capitalism. “Die Vergleichung des Heißhungers nach Mehrarbeit in den Donaufürstentümern mit demselben Heißhunger in englischen Fabriken bietet ein besonderes Interesse, weil die Mehrarbeit in der Fronarbeit eine selbständige, sinnlich wahrnehmbare Form besitzt.“ (MEW 23: 250f.). And exactly this does Marx in the representation of the ground rent (MEW 25: 627f.)—in particular regarding the genesis of the capitalistic ground rent (see ibid.: 790f.). In this sense Balibar's distinctions appear to me importantly. He differentiates on the one hand between history as origin of „capitalism“ and a “pre—history“ as history of “capital“, i.e. between historical and abstract origin of the development: a history in the Feudalismus (another mode of production) and one of the different ways, the element formation of capital (Althusser/Balibar 1972: 372f.). On the other hand he differentiates between the time of the dynamics (i.e. theoretical time in the sense of tendencies of the structure contradictions) and the time of history and/or material time (ibid.: 403). Important it is with the fact first that we have to do it in capital and in the “sketches of the criticism of the political economy” with theoretical constructions. The representation may not be misunderstood empiricist: The space (England) is illustrative in the representation of Marx and the time represents no historical evolution, but dynamics, a movement of the terms and not those of real development. On the other hand know with these distinctions is to be excluded each form of the historical Determinismus (succession models of the modes of production) and any origin myths and causal nexus in the development. Thus history gets back its open character. These distinctions are besides for two different analytic reasons importantly. First of all: As example of a diachrone analysis (the time of the transition of a mode of production to the other, i.e. “eine Zeit, die bestimmt ist durch das Ersetzen und Transformieren der Produktionsverhältnisse...“, ibid.: 400), represents the previous accumulation, i.e. the theoretical (genealogische) reconstruction of the elements of the

capitalist mode of production (see *ibid.*). The “Übergang wird nicht auf der Ebene der Strukturen, sondern auf der Ebene der Elemente gedacht. Diese Form erklärt nicht nur, warum wir es hier nicht mit einer echten Geschichte im theoretischen Sinne zu tun haben“, but—and that is the second analytically important reason both for the analysis of “genesis—, transition and sequential processes“ and for those the concrete situation— “sie ist auch die Bedingung für die Entdeckung einer sehr wichtigen Tatsache: der relativen Unabhängigkeit der Formation verschiedener Elemente der kapitalistischen Struktur und der *Mannigfaltigkeit der geschichtlichen Wege* dieser Formation.“ (*ibid.*: 376). I.e. the elements have different sources, different processes, which do not dress inevitably or magnet—like, but is a relation of determination, in which the elements shift depending upon specific point and change their ranking, in which „marginale“ elements kann dominant, i.e. “ein und dasselbe Ensemble von Voraussetzungen entspricht mehreren Reihen historischer Bedingungen“ (*ibid.*: 379). This moment of the previous accumulation understands thus the capital in its emergence, its mode of existence and its be—coming. The Marx term of the previous accumulation is not the same term of the “previous accumulation“ by Adam Smith, i.e. in the sense of an allegedly pre—capitalist, past developing moment. The Marxian term does not designate a past, causally working moment, but to present—future moment: The previous accumulation is not before, but behind capital. The cause, the origin or the prototype have its place in the future. There is no capital on itself, which develops historically or theoretically at one time and first attempt and affects, which moved from there from itself, but capital is only to understand in its motion. The previous accumulation is the theoretical and historical act of the appropriation and the commodification. The term of capital is thus always determined non—capitalistically, the contradiction however is unevenly, asymmetrical and timely unequal: Exchange in relation to use value, utilization versus value—added process, relations of production versus productive forces, constant versus variable capital etc. The previous accumulation is thus the process of the creation and/or the class formation of property lots and private owners. Which historical and social conditions are however necessary, so that this process is reproduced/regulated, because neither the money is per se capital, nor is the property lots a free worker, but both have to be made as such? The value is enabled by the “Auflösung der alten Produktionsweisen befähigt[...] einerseits zu kaufen die objektiven Bedingungen der Arbeit, andererseits die ledigliche Arbeit selbst gegen Geld von freigewordenen Arbeitern einzutauschen“ (Marx 1974: 405f.). This is first the “historic field“, in order to set it however in motion, it requires more than the forced economic relations. Here first lies one of the crisis moments of the reproduction/regulation of the capital relation, just because the elements have “verschiedene, von einander unabhängige Ursprünge“ (Althusser/Balibar 1972: 377). The unit of both does not take place on itself. So that both meet and together—chain themselves to a subordinate position, it requires “de[s] systematischen Einsatz[es] einer außerökonomischen Gewalt (Recht, Politik, Militär)“ (*ibid.*: 379), i.e. only by force, power, violence, struggles is this relation created, reproduced and regulated. The question of the previous accumulation does not only refer to the „Mindestgröße der Wertsumme“ intended for the formation of capital (*ibid.*: 370), but it concerns the “formation of the capitalist social relations“ (*ibid.*: 371). Herein first gain the ideological term of the previous accumulation in importance, i.e. following Marx, the apologetic function of the myth,

which comes to the expression through a perpetuating of the economic categories of capitalism (s. *ibid.*: 372). I.e. by projecting capitalist relations of production on “the past“ and by stating that” der spätere Kapitalist habe sich, sein Anfangskapital, bevor es die Form von Löhnen und Produktionsmitteln angenommen habe, vom Produkt seiner Arbeit gespart, verschafft sie [die klassische Ökonomie] den Gesetzen des Äquivalententauschs und dem auf legalisierter Verfügungsgewalt über die Gesamtheit der Produktionsfaktoren beruhenden Eigentum am Produkt eine rückwirkende Geltung.“ (*ibid.*: 371). Since however neither “die Vergangenheit“ passed nor the “Rueckwirkung“ lies back, but both always represent present relations (see *ibid.*: 373), the private owner is constructed as a self—creating individual, who „durch seine Sparsamkeit die Möglichkeit geschaffen hat, sich das Produkt aus der Mehrarbeit anderer unbegrenzt anzueignen.“ (*ibid.*: 372). This is however only the one side of the previous accumulation and/or the making of the relation of capital, i.e. the bourgeois myth of the “Kapitalbildung durch die Eigenbewegung einer privaten, potentiell bereits kapitalistischen Produktion und die Selbsterzeugung des Kapitals.“ (*ibid.*: 371). How produces and reproduces however the bourgeois/civil society the class of the private owners, “where do the capitalists previously come from?“ (Marx). This question can be treated only in relation to the Marxian term of the previous accumulation. The “sogenannte ursprüngliche Akkumulation ist also nichts als der historische Scheidungsprozeß von Produzent und Produktionsmittel. Er erscheint als ursprünglich, weil er die Vorgeschichte des Kapitals und der ihm entsprechenden Produktionsweise bildet.“ (MEW 23: 742). The “pre—history“ is not only to be understood here in the sense of other modes of production, thus the organic interrelation between “capital and its appropriate mode of production“, but also as criticism at that apologetical function: the attempt of the bourgeois/civil society to reproduce the relation of capital —seperation and commodification— on extended ladder, i.e. to create the “prerequisites“ of the implementation of this relation under the given “historical condistions“ (see *ibid.*: 375). In this sense the question of the AMP/F is of importance, thus the “verschiedenen Produktionsweisen als ein geschichtliches *Sondieren* der Wege“, on which carries out „die Trennung des Arbeiters von den Produktionsmitteln und die Bildung von Kapital als frei verfügbare Wertsumme“ (*ibid.*). Here we can say that to each historical formation belongs a certain form of the previous accumulation, which functions as condition of existence of the reproduction/regulation of capitalist realtions of production. It is in the same time anact of „expropriation/commodification“ of worker, knowledge, skill, means of production etc., which appear then as potential productive force of capital. So seen the analysis of the previous accumulation and the articulation of different modes of production can help to identify the elements, those which develop and/or be made/set free on the “historical Feld“, the given terrain and which shifts in the transition and could be consolidated to a possible formation (see *ibid.*). The previous accumulation meant therefore the permanent produced separation of the producers from means of production and their conversion into wage and non—wage worker, which cause and supplement themselves however mutually (*ibid.*, see also Marx 1968: 267) and at the same time the commodification of social (and) nature relations. Herein thus two different things is to be emphasized: On the one hand the modes of appropriation always are accompanied with force (as „economic potency“); on the other hand the previous accumulation —Separation/reintegration in the working process and

commodification— can function as a distinction criterion of the periodisation (transition of a mode of production to the other). There are several ways of transition. The diversity of the ways, the “relative independence and historical difference of the developing processes of the capital bring Marx with the word ‚vorfinden‘ to the expression: the constitution of the structure is a ‚Fund““ (ibid.: to 380, see also Marx 1974: 375f.). To that extent now the questions of the regulation theory are concerned with the historical “Fundsachen“ (Lipietz) and/or with the once found and reproduced capitalist relations of production, the theory introduced two historical—spatial like socio—economic breaks, which have a lasting effect negatively in the present situation: indeed once the periodisation of the capitalist social formation since the “spezifischen capitalistic PW“ (real Subsumtion, Marx) or the large—scale industry and thus the predominant autocentring of metropolitaner economy; and the other one time the abstraction of the AMP/F. These two deficits can be in as much waived with the help of the terms of the imperialistic chain and the world system as in these concepts both the formal Subsumtion and the articulation of the specific capitalist with non—capitalist modes of production are brought up for discussion. In this context the analysis of the previous accumulation and the articulation of different modes of production seems to me of strategic importance both for the respective social formations and global.

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

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

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

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

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

8. Poulantzas (1975), which makes the productive distinction between possession and property and between economic and legal property in the tradition of Althusser (see ibid.: 19f., to latter Althusser/Balibar 1972: 237f., Fn. 12), specifies: Ideological and political relations go constitutiv into the determination of the relations of production as relations of property (see also Lefebvre 1974: 34f.), because the expropriation/separation of the direct producers must be always reproduced (see Poulantzas 1975: 21). In other words: “The production and exploitation process is at the same time the reproduction process of the political and ideological relations of power/subordination.“ (ibid.). The mode of production is thus a abstract—general term, but in these abstractness it is complexly determined, i.e. economically, politically and ideologically (see ibid.: 22). The “modes of production exist and reproduces themselves only in historically determined social formations: France, Germany, England etc.“ (ibid.). Further: “The principle of the *Gliederung* of the practice forms exists in the ‚construction‘ or in the ‚mechanism‘ its reciprocal effect [structural causality after Althusser], where the social formation proves itself as out different levels (‚instances‘, ‚formes of practice‘) existing whole. Marx names three of such levels: economic basis, legal and political supra structure and forms of social consciousness.“ (Althusser/Balibar 1972: 272). This pattern is a first approximation to the epistemological question, raised by Balibar „how do different practice forms *structure* among themselves, which are expression of a division of labor, and how does their *structuring* change with a mutation (‚Einschnitt‘) of the formes of practice?“ (ibid.: 275, Fn. 5). In this context er problematize the term of the social formation: “The term ‚Gesellschaftsformation‘ can be so, as Marx uses it, both an empirical term [...] and an abstract term“ (ibid.: 276, Fn. 6), i.e. the term may not be seized as fixed object, but always as concretely determining one. In order determine the term of the social formation, which covers several modes of production, it would be necessary, “to analyze thies modes of production [...] only on the laws of their *juxtaposition* ^{3/4}*existence* and their hierarchy“ (ibid.: 277, Hvh. SA). That is, that in economic regard the different moments of the labor— and reproduction process (production, circulation, distribution and consumption) are to be determined as articulation of various (not only capitalist) relations of production under the dominance of a certain relation of production —in the capitalist mode of production this is the wage/commodity relation. This *confusion* leads according to him to the problem of the “mix—up of the sozial

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

9. Poulantzas therefore determines the social formation as an ever specific articulation of several modes (and forms) of production (see Poulantzas 1975: 22). In a social formation a certain production way dominates the others and pushes latter their stamp open. The articulation of this dominance relationship implies „komplexe effects of dissolution preservation on other modes— and forms of production“ and“ assigned this social formations its Charakter“ (ibid.).

10. For the purpose of the historical—concrete determination of the capitalist social formation Poulantzas avails himself now the term of the “imperialistic chain“. The imperialistic chain therefore reflects itself in each chain link (in the sense of a social formation) in special form, which depends again on the dominance of the capitalist mode of production over other modes of production in the respective social formations. “In fact testifies the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production in its double tendency that this can only exist, by subjecting the other modes— and forms of production and appropriate itself their elements (worker, means of production). In its reproduction generate the straight linkage of the capitalist mode of production with the other modes— and forms of production in social formations the unequal development.“ (ibid., Empha. SA). Which differentiates the imperialistic stage from previous is that the dependent social formations are no more “external“ bound to the metropolises: They become from now on “internally“ controlld (ibid.: 40), as the dominance of the capitalist mode of production intersperses itself also in these social formations: *“The mode of production of the metropolises reproduces itself in specific form in the inside of the controlled and dependent formations themselves.* This does not prevent that unevenly and contrary to what in the metropolises before itself goes, the retaining effects can keep here the upper hand over the solvent, in the double tendency, which the capitalist mode of production imposes upon the internal rule of to the other modes— and forms of production of these formations. Beyond that this phase is characterized by the fact that this, from the capitalist mode of production induced reproduction crucially interferes within these formations on the range of its state apparatuses and its ideological forms.“ (ibid.: 43). This periodisation of the concrete formations is directed against the abstract representation, in which the modes of production appear as subjects. The social formation appears in the imperialism theories of the 70's (see ibid.: 45f.) as “spatial order“ of the the moments of the process of the mode of production as such: “The class struggle is thereby expelled from it.“ (ibid.: 45). Poulantzas proceeds neither from an abstract, global mode of production, nor he understands relations of power as result of simply added units. He determines it as „imperialistische Kette“: *“The imperialistic chain is nothing but the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production in the social formations under certain economic, political and ideological conditions, and the members of this chain —social formations— constitute the place of the existence of this process.“* (ibid.: 46).

11. This not systemic, but construction understood as contradictory unit seems to be created on two methodical assumptions: on the one hand Althusser's ‚overdetermination‘ and on the other hand the primacy of the national space, the state with Poulantzas. The latter is in as much consistent as like represented to the term of the mode of production belong

constitutiv not only economic, but also political and ideological conditions. For Poulantzas that means that the term of the global capitalist mode of production must be not only accumulation—theoretically founded, but also state—theoretically. In the absence of a global state, similar to the national state, however one can not speak of the global capitalist mode of production, since the national state not only, in the Lenin's sense, represents adequate form of the development of capitalism, but also because alone it can guarantee the reproduction of relations of power in the social formation split into classes. To Althusser I would like to insert a short excursion, because his determination of the imperialistic chain provides Poulantzas important arguments.

12. Althusser (1968) illustrates regarding Maos distinctions between main— and sub—contradiction, main— and sub—side of the contradiction, antagonistic and not—antagonistic contradictions as well as on the law of the heterogeneity of the development of the contradictions (see *ibid.*: 57f., Fn. 6; 137f. and 146f.) the term of the contradiction on the basis the Lenin's metaphor of the “weakest link“ of the imperialistic chain (see *ibid.*: 57f.). Into the *Essenz* it goes with the fact pointing out that the contradiction is not to think detached of its “conditions of existence“ (see *ibid.*: 65), i.e. the fact that it forms a contradictory unit with these, that it is to be determined only into and by this unit (see *ibid.*: 62): It is in its principle “overdetermined“ (*ibid.*: 65f.). Related to the term of the mode of production this means the fact that it does not exist in pure form but that it always represent a specifically articulated, contradictory unit, which is to be determined only in a concrete space, i.e. the social formation. How are global relations of power now to be determined?—Relations of power are inherent the structure of the complex given whole. “Power is not a simple, unimportant fact, it is in itself a *substantial* fact for the complexity. Therefore the complexity includes the power as for itself substantially: It is signed into its structure.“ (*ibid.*: 147). With it however the elements of the unit itself are not constructed arbitrary and “plural“, this unity articulates itself by the relation of dominance (*ibid.*: 148). Meanwhile the unit cannot be determined outside of its contradictions and relations of inequality. Differently formulates: “Every contradiction, each substantial *Gliederung* of the structure and the general relation of *Gliederung* in the structure with dominance form likewise many conditions of existence of the complex whole self.“ (*ibid.*: 151, *Empha. SA*). This applies also to the relationship of the main— and sub—contradictions equally, i.e. one is not to think outside or independently from the other (see *ibid.*). The linkage between this abstract relationship of the overdetermination and the concrete analysis of the concrete situation is constituted by the term of the „conditions“. Althusser determines following Marx, Lenin, Mao etc. that everything depends on the “conditions“, the “circumstances“. The term of the conditions is to be understood to that extent not as empirical term, but as more theoretical, because it is justified „in the nature of the object self“: “the always— already given complex whole“ (*ibid.*: 153). The mediating „Gliederung“ is missing to this linkage, in as much as the forms of the „conditions of existence“ change historically, which means that they must be conceptionally produced, so that the concrete situation can be analyzed, otherwise it becomes difficult, “to understand the concrete variations and circulations of a structured complexity, e.g. of a social formation“, because these variations and circulations are not „akzidentiell“, produced “through outside “conditions“ at a firm structured whole, its categories and its firm order [...], but are to

be understood as respective concrete restructurations“ (ibid.: 156f.). The movement of the contradiction is characterized by displacement and compression processes, which run however unevenly. This heterogeneity is not an exception, but “ein previous law“ (ibid.: 158f.), a “interior unevenness“, 2 which the “exterior“ justified and not in reverse, also in the relationship between and under the social formations (see ibid.: 2159f.). The imperialistic chain would be in this sense neither a system, still another lining up of social formations, but a relation of power, whose concrete form depends on the condition/forms of existence of the over—determined and uneven developments of the contradictions. Here the political moment and the question of the class struggle step out as engine of history, want to avoid the autocentrism of a system and/or a structure. The political struggle is as “the actual compression, the strategic junction [...], in that reflects itself the complex whole (economics, politics and ideology).“ (ibid.: 164). Since however the strategic place of the confrontation, of the struggles, varies depending upon displacement of dominance and compression of the contradictions, this means to identify the strategic place for political practice (resistance, intervention into the political economic conjuncture etc.), in the dominant form of existence of the contradiction (displacement, compression or global restructuring) for the “splitting of the existing whole“ (ibid.: 158). This power—critical and strategic perspective of the political places the background for the state theory of Poulantzas‘ and the construction of the imperialistic chain. Therefore, i.e. because it concerns the radical change of the existent order, the concrete—complex term of the social formation takes a central place in the analysis of the concrete situation. An abstract, global capitalist mode of production would not only be methodically inconceivable, but represents politically an incomprehensible absurdity. This contradictory unit can be global sketchily waived, in a regulation—theoretically enriched world system theory.

13. The historical capitalism as world system is to be understood economically after Wallerstein (1989, Wallerstein/Hopkins 1979) as a process and a tendency of the commodification on a worldwide scale, political and ideological is it characterized by a hierarchical state system and a bourgeoisie/civil “cultur imperialism“ and/or a „Weltbild“ (Wallerstein 1989: 73, 71). The economic struggles for production and appropriation of the global surplus value are always over—determined by national, “ethnic“ and/or ethnifize, racist and gender—specific struggles and conflict axes. The extent of the commodification and proletarianisation leaves itself to —and this justifies the household as the central analytic unit in the theory— mediate on the basis the grad of commodification of the reproduction of the labour force: The different forms of the reproduction of the labour force represent to that extent a central moment of the exploitation and thus the profit maximization, when structurally like strategically pure wage labour contradicts and/or contrary—runs the extended reproduction of capital. Meanwhile the relation of articulation between the capitalist and the non—capitalist modes of production represents an immanent contradiction in the system. Wallerstein seizes the accumulation process on a worldwide scale as a movement, which tends here from the peripheries into the centers and promotes the accumulation and the extended reproduction. It is hierarchical, on the basis of a extended social differentiation of labor“ articulated process, i.e. by different modes and forms of production and reproduction constituted process: “This hierarchisation of the space in the structure of the production process led to a ever larger polarization between the

centers and the peripheral zones of the world economy, not only regarding the distribution criteria (level of the real income, quality of life), but —still important— in the locations of the capital accumulation.“ The value transfer constitutes the relationship of the “centrality and peripherality“. The concentration of the capital in the centers contributed not only to the further accumulation and extended reproduction, but was accompanied and/or forced the formation of powerful central states: Here could be “the so—called historical wage levels, those in the different zones of the world system so dramatically diverget“ —and thus in the long run on the expense of the peripheries— Class compromises form and institutionalize (ibid.: 25—27). This process runs off meanwhile never purely economically, but is always non—economically mediated. Here the meaning of the state system is to be seen as a mutual constitution process, in that not only the so—called state sovereignty appears as “myth“ but also the formal equality of the states. “The modern state was never a completely autonomous political unit. States developed and formed as parts of a Staatensystems.“ This is structured after strong and weak states hierarchical, by which the former impose all other “restrictions“ (ib id.: 48). Following Gramsci (1991ff.: 784f.) this relation, thus the global power downward gradient and the inter—states hierarchy, can be explained by the fact that the strong national states are not only independently, but also „internationally autonomus“ in as much as the expansive moment of its constitution accents considerably their national exclusivity. For the national states in the periphery, i.e. for the historically retarded process of the national state formation after the ent—colocalisation, can be no speech of it, since it concerned here only, “to patch together just any state unity“ (ibid.), i.e. around the political, economic, cultural like territorial development of the area colonialisied before. To that extent the peripheral states are international constituted, however not internationally autonomously, but are in a globally pre—structured space: International dependence causes a national carving up and in reverse. This does not prevent however, to use the strategic options for oneself and/or “to pulls use of the equilibrium of the international forces“ (ibid.). The political fractioning is meanwhile this system immanent (see Hirsch 1993), so that a “transformation of the world economy in a Weltreich“ (Wallerstein 1989: 49) or into a “Weltstaat“ runs counter structurally, i.e. due to the competition around the appropriation of surplus value globally produced (see Hirsch 1993: 201). If necessary stability phases of this historical system become by the “relative dominanc“ or “hegemony“ of a strong state preserved (Wallerstein 1989: 49f.). Historical capitalism as world system is characterized meanwhile by long—term “systemic accumulation cycles“ coupled to a hegemonial power (Arrighi/Moore 2001: 43f.). Evenly because the dynamics of the accumulation are qualitatively different on a worldwide scale of that one within the national state (ibid.: 43), represent the state system the analytic unit. As “regime of accumulation in worldwide scale“ are now „those strategies and structures“ defined, whereby the “hegemonial actors of the restructuring the capitalist world economy have promoted, organize and steered“ (ibid.:45). This world—wide accumulation regime implies particularly into its finance—, credit and debt forms in the sense of Marx “one of the sources of the previous accumulation“ (MEW 23: 783f., see. Arrighi/Moore 2001: 48f.). The term of the accumulation regime is understood here in the sense of a certain configuration of the institutional form of regulation on a worldwide scale. This means that it is not to proceed of individual states, but always of a “block“ from political as economic

actors, those sets the material expansion in course (see. *ibid.*: 46f.). Similarly to the ideal—typical constructions of extensive and intensive accumulation regime in the regulation theory Arrighi/Moore speak of “extensiv“ and “intensiv“ regimes of accumulation on a worldwide scale: Extensive is here in the sense of a “cosmopolit—imperial“, i.e. expansive regimes and intensive in the sense of a “corporativ—national“, thus to consolidation and recess of the expansion tending regimes. “The development of historical capitalism as world system was based on the formation of always more powerful blocks cosmopolit imperial (or corporativ national) economic and government organizations, which were in addition able to expand or to widen the functional and spatial range of the capitalist world system.“ (*ibid.*: 53)

THE ARTICULATION OF DIFFERENT MODES OF PRODUCTION

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

15. What is to be understood now by the articulation of different modes of production? —One can first Althusser (see Althusser/Balibar 1972: 265) criticize, that he seems to set the non—capitalist “rest“ and the “relics“ as empirical phenomena in relation to more purely capitalist mode of production. This pure capitalist mode of production does not exist, because the relations and the categories, which express it, are “dull“. The “purity“ of the abstract capitalist mode of production expresses thus their dominance, not their excludingness: Not first on the level of the social formation articulate themselves various relations of production and different social relations, but on the abstract level they already are articulated as “Andeutungen“ (Marx). Balibars determination of the articulation as relation of dominance is meaningful only if she refers to the epoch of the capital. Then his argument, to determine the non—capitalist mode as contradictions, as “dullness“ in the term of the capitalist mode of production self, would have a more concrete sense, and not as historical, pre—capitalist modes of production.” Es wäre also untubar und falsch, die ökonomischen Kategorien in der Folge aufeinanderfolgen zu lassen, in der sie historisch die bestimmenden waren. Vielmehr ist ihre Reihenfolge bestimmt durch die Beziehung, die sie

in der modernen bürgerlichen Gesellschaft aufeinander haben, und die genau das umgekehrte von dem ist, was als ihre naturgemäße erscheint oder der Reihe der historischen Entwicklung entspricht. Es handelt sich nicht um das Verhältnis, das die ökonomischen Verhältnisse in der Aufeinanderfolge verschiedener Gesellschaftsformen historisch annehmen. Noch weniger um ihre Reihenfolge ‚in der Idee‘ (Proudhon) [...]. Sondern um ihre Gliederung innerhalb der modernen bürgerlichen Gesellschaft.“ (Marx 1974: 28). The articulation may not be understood the moreover as elimination of other modes of production, but —also and in particular if one argues more concretely and more complex— as their new creation and reproduction. Because the relationship between the dominant mode and the other modes of production is an internal, not external relation. Thus modes of production become understandable as relations of power, which can be reconstructed from the developed term of the capital and on the movement forms of those, which point to the, according to (tendentious) laws of the dominant capitalist mode of production. The articulation is an internal relation of contradiction, not functional, not at all a relation a priori. Meanwhile the dominant mode of production of the epoch can take different forms, more concrete depending upon specific conditions: The “Urform“ the surplus value takes different, derived forms; it is thus, value—theoretically expressed, the surplus labor, and this is “allgemeine Kritik des Gesamtsystems der ökonomischen Kategorien“ (Marx 1968, III: 250).

16. We reconstruct: Why can't Marx analyze the capitalist mode of production without non—capitalist modes and forms of production (NCMP/F)? “Auch bei der theoretischen Methode [...] muß das Subjekt, die Gesellschaft, als Voraussetzung stets der Vorstellung vorschweben“ (Marx 1974: 22), and this bourgeoisie society (illustrates on the basis of english capitalism) "ist die entwickeltste und mannigfaltigste historische Organisation der Produktion. Die Kategorien, die ihre Verhältnisse ausdrücken, das Verständnis ihrer Gliederung, gewähren daher zugleich Einsicht in die Gliederung und die Produktionsverhältnisse aller untergegangenen Gesellschaftsformen, mit deren Trümmern und Elementen sie sich aufgebaut, von denen teils noch unüberwundene Reste sich in ihr fortschleppen, bloße Andeutungen sich zu ausgebildeten Bedeutungen entwickelt haben etc.“(Marx, *ibid.*: 25f.; as well as *ibid.*: 364f.). The neglect of this complexity and the overlaps in these various relations of production causes the “dullness“ in the theory. In the analysis it is more natural for example to begin with the first production form, agriculture.” Aber nichts wäre falscher. In allen Gesellschaftsformen ist es eine bestimmte Produktion, die allen übrigen, und deren Verhältnisse daher auch allen übrigen, Rang und Einfluß anweist.“ (*ibid.*: 27). This relation of articulation, which implies the dominance/subordination relation and the tendencies, is not only to understand on a certain level or in a certain space but generally. We have thus different relations of power, in which the capital relation is dominant. That is the first determination of the articulation between stages of the capitalist mode of production (manufacture, factory, large—scale industry etc.) and other non—capitalist modes of production: Articulation qua dominance. In order to grasp this relation now as internal, contradictory relation, a „external“ determination, on the circulation level is not enough, because this usually leads to a functional determination of the relation. This means meanwhile that capital must be understood as commodified and commodified movement. It appropriate ‘outside’ of its „development stage“ lying

NCMP/F and commodify them tendentially. To the term tendency however belongs that one of the counter—tendency, which always implies the reverse direction:

De—commodification. Herein is to see the dominance, the violence and the hierarchy of relations, thus in the „Keimzelle“ of the bourgeoisie relations of power: the commodity. This is however not identical, but is grasped contradictory. Others, non—capitalist MP/F must be determined always concretely, since neither they precede nor are they to be derived of the capitalist mode of production, but always articulate themselves with it depending upon the dominant form of the capitalist mode of production: without dominance no articulation. The dominance relation justifies the articulation and does not let it appear arbitrary and voluntaristic. Which dominant form of the capitalist mode of production and which NCMP/F develop, are conserved or dissolved, cannot be determined and derived priori. This is the question of the analysis of the concrete situation, i.e. the determination of the dominant form and the articulation. The comparison with the other modes of production does not serve thus only to specify historically which capitalist mode of production in the sense of a criticism at the naturalism of the political economy (Althusser among other). It is also the question of the contradictions and the unequal timeliness in the development, i.e. articulation—evenly because this is the rule—and transitions to be pointed out. If we regard the different constructions of the modes of production by Marx not as the term of the capitalist mode of production a priori or externally, but to understand them as the capital term as hierarchically articulated, unevenly determined (Althusser) contradiction formation, those in the periodisation (manufacture, factory, large—scale industry etc..) are always articulated under certain dominant form, then this means, that these modes of production are not to be understood in the historical—evolutionary sense, thus as pre—capitalist modes of production, which develop stage—like to capitalism or stagnates however for all eternity, but always as specifically articulated contradictions.

17. Thus Poulantzas determines the articulation of the capitalist mode of production in and between the spaces first abstractly in the sense of the double tendency of this mode of production: „its reproduction within a social formation, in that it ‚hold foot‘ and establish its rule, and their expansion beyond this formation, whereby both aspects of this tendency work at the same time. The capitalist mode of production can [...] only exist, by extending its relations of production and in this way eliminate its borders.“ (Poulantzas 1975: 39). Reproductive and functional seems to be the determination of the articulation by Poulantzas, corrects nevertheless in the same breath this determination, because the “dissolution— and preservation processes“ are about class struggles (ibid.). This characterisation of the articulation is in as much important as it understands the relationship contradictory and conflictful. It turns against a functional understanding, because this refers to concrete strategies of the exploitation of individual capitals and not to relations of production. The articulation relation, specified depending upon dominance form, supplies Poulantzas the means to periodise the global relations of dependency and subordination (see ibid.: 39f.), whereby the articulation refers also to stages and phases of these stages of the capitalist mode of production (see ibid.: 41).

18. This representation closes out meanwhile the coexistence of two parallel historical times (modern vs. tradition etc..), for two different reasons: first of all because the non—capitalist modes of productions develop during capitalism, i.e. their specification can

only be understood in the context of the global capitalist mode of production; and secondly because they are dominated by the historical—concrete forms of the capitalist mode of production, i.e. that they are over—determined by the dominant form on the respective level of the mode of development and the social formation. Thus the dominance of the capitalist mode of production is not only to be seen on the level of the world market but also internally on the level of the social formation however it acquires qua articulation always different forms. This uneven— and unequal— development refers not to different historical times, but is to be understood synchronously, however with different, diachronen rhythms and speeds. The dominant form of the development determines this structure of the time, i.e. it carries out itself *as* a certain time and in certain space, not *in* or *with* the time. This point is central for the problematic of the articulation of space and time sequences of the development. The articulation of different modes of production does not mean meanwhile a „parallelogramm“ of relations. It means always a concrete configuration under the dominance of a certain form, differently expressed, a mode of production as a formation. The Marx determination of the contradictory unit and/or the statement Balibars that with Marx the term of the social formation is to be found abstractly as concretely, means that only on the basis of a concrete configuration (the articulation of different modes of production) is the social formation to be determined.

THE REGULATION OF THE ARTICULATION RELATION

19. I would like now, tying to this determination of the previous accumulation, to determine and afterwards schematically represent analytically the articulation relation between the capitalist and non—capitalist modes of production as an institutional and/or structural form in the sense of the regulation theory. Methodically as analytic first three is to be emphasized: First of all and in the sense of the regulation theory the concepts must be developed on the basis of concrete (historical like spatial) analyses and not set modelful. Secondly, over the close (Fordistic) understanding of regulation the concepts accumulation regime, mode of regulation etc. can neither be determined without the international and/or global moment on the one hand, still without the articulation relation of modes of production on the other hand (see Hirsch 2001: 173 f.). These relations are the concepts not external, as it were into the analysis afterwards added *Ingredienzen*. Thirdly, colonialistic and imperialistic relations must be included particularly into the analysis of peripheral social formations. They are neither empirically negligible nor historical *Residuale*. These relations of power represent on the one hand analytic criteria of the periodisation of the development of the capitalist world system. The speech of world market, international division of labor, state system etc. would be on the other hand worthless, if they not express and/or analytically concretize these relations, i.e. their consequences and aftereffects would obtain. This justifies at all the *differentia specifica* of the unevenness of the development in the centers as in the peripheries. This relation is neither spatially nor temporally fixed, but takes always concrete forms. In its global, capitalist context it remains existing however. The term of the „previous accumulation“, how it was here developed following Marx, Althusser/Balibar and others, I would like to determine as a spatial like politico economic *boundary relation*, which (historically as theoretical) mediate the

tendentious articulation relation of the capitalist with non—capitalist modes of production. Since the term determines however the articulation relation only from the side of the dominant capitalist mode of production tendentious, in order to be able to analyze the relationship as a contradictory unit, methodically like analytically the dominated modes of production must being analyzed at the same time. The non—capitalist modes of productions constitute what Marx calls the “auswaertige Departement“ and/or the “erweiterte Ausbeutungsfeld“ and the extended “Exploitationsgrad“ of capital (MEW 23: 417. 485f.). Herein is to locate the cheap, formal and informal, by visible and “unsichtbare Faeden“ (ibid.: 485f.) regulated and from capital in motion set free work. By this scatter of the work outside of and on the border of the bourgeoisie right sphere (women—, children—, slaves—, forced labour etc..) the labour power, exploited on the basis of the free wage labour, is devalued, i.e. beside the formal, contract—legal labour is here the question of revolutionizing the formal „Vermittlung of the Kapitalverhaeltnisses“ (ibid.: 417), whereby even the “Schein“ of the freedom of contract formally same owner exposes (see ibid.: 419). It is meanwhile in this „polarised space“ (Perroux) to go out always of the relation “centrality—peripherality“ (Wallerstein). This contradiction, which is justified in the capital relation and its expansion urge, is thus “previous“ to always seize in its reciprocal effect and in its free like force forms. The latter represents a condition of existence of the reproduction/regulation of the capital relation in this extended sense. This boundary relation can be analyzed concretely on different levels (within the social formations and between them) and in different forms (see to the illustration MEW 23: Cape. 13, 23, 24). In the imperialism theories different, economic, political, ideological, spatial etc. Mechanisms of the articulation of this relation had been worked out, particularly in its forced form: Migration, unequal exchange, colonization, force, plundering, robbery, monopolizing and patenting of means of production/reproduction/knowledge among other things. These relations appear rarely in their pure form, but always over—determine ethnical, national, gender—specifically, generation—specifically, culturally, religiously etc. This boundary relation in its abstract form as previous accumulation, in its institutional form as articulation of different modes of production and in its concrete, over—determined forms is to be clarified schematically. This pattern stressed, won as an auxiliary construction, no more than a strongly condensed illustration that to date realizations. The fact that it is incomplete, fragile and works strongly simplifying understands itself automatically. Scheme 1(a, b, C) refers both to conditions within and between the social formations.

SUMMARY AND VIEW

20. I would like to summarize first the realizations of this contribution thesisful; then I will dare a *realistic* view. First of all the previous accumulation represents the term of the force relation, which justifies the articulation of the capitalist with non—capitalist modes of productions theoretically. Secondly is meant with artuculation the movement form of contradictory units (mode of production, mode of development, social formation etc..) meant. Because the latter are not to seize abstractly, but are always to determine concretely and since their units are always constituted by a dominantes or hegemonial relation, there can be neither abstract nor arbitrary articulation. Thirdly, the articulation of the modes of

production is to be seized for their part as a structural and/or institutional form, those belongs organically for the constitution of an accumulation regime or a mode of regulation way. Fourth, there is no pure capitalism, but different, historical formations. Fifth, the economic transformation is not a purely economic question, but depends on the balances of forces, on the respective interests, the contradictions and condensation in the state – i.e. the national state plays a central role in the development. Sixth, the „unendlich different Kombinationen“ are, if one considers the „tausend Faeden“ and „Zwitterformen“ (Lenin) of the wage labour, of central importance for the various concrete development strategies. The Ueberreste“ should not be understood neither as historical residue nor as pure capitalism contradicting and/or as „dullness in the theory“ (Marx), but as structural characteristic of the capitalist social formation. Seventh, the question of the articulation of different modes of production does not only exclude historical determinism (phase models), but the existence of non—capitalist modes of production can be constitutive for the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production though, however the first are not per se organized in a commodity form, and to that extent can be assumed that under the reproduced and again—created non—capitalist mode of production of the coexistence of democratic—organized, collective production forms and/or elements of collective modes of production (socialist, communitary, communist etc..). Finally is to be suggested, on which fields of (global) changes my remarks could play a role: in the attempt of the so—called “human sciences“ (bio— and gene technologies), one can identify by the commodification of social nature relations a new thrust of through—capitalisation; in the attempt of the so—called “new—economies“ (I&k technologies) to create by means of start ups, risk capital, shareholder value, business startup etc. a new layer from private properties, to fabricate by means of flexibilisation of the global labour process new forms of children—, women—, house—, slave and forced labour, which would be subsumed formally or really under capital, as well as by global, violently contesting of conflicts on the part of strong states to perfect the arms— and safety industries and thus to inaugurate a new accumulation thrust etc.. Here the previous accumulation in worldwide scale (Amin) presents itself in new form and thus the attempt of the reproduction/regulation of capitalist relations of power. This form of the previous accumulation marked by excessive force is typical for crisis and transitional phases and/or not hegemonial phases (Arrighi/Moore, Hirsch), both in the individual social formations and global.

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

LITERATURE

Alnasser, Sabah/Brand, Ulrich/Sablowski, Thomas/winter, Jens (2001): Space, regulation and Periodisation of capitalism, in: Albritton, Robert/Itoh, Makoto/Westra, Richard/Zeuge, Alan (ed.) 2001: Phases of capitalist development, N.Y., 163-179.

Althusser, Louis (1968): Für Marx, Frankfurt/M.; Franz. 1965.

Althusser, Louis (1987): Machiavelli, Montsequeiu, Rousseau. Argument, Hamburg.

Althusser, Louis/Balibar, Etienne (1972): Das Kapital Lesen (DKL). Reinbeck; Franz. 1968.

Arrighi, Giovanni/Moore, J. W. (2001): Kapitalismus in welthistorischer Sicht, Argument, N. 239, 43-58.

Candeias, Mario/Deppe, Frank (Hg., 2001): Ein neuer Kapitalismus? VSA Hamburg.

Frank, André Gunder (1979): Über die sogenannte ursprüngliche Akkumulation, in: Senghaas, D. (Hg.), Kapitalistische Weltökonomie, 68-103.

Gramsci, Antonio (1991ff.): Gefängnishefte, Argument Hamburg.

Hauck, Gerhard (1996): Evolution, Entwicklung, Unterentwicklung. Gesellschaftstheoretische Abhandlungen, Frankfurt/M.

Hindes, Barry/Hirst, Paul (1981): Vorkapitalistische Produktionsweisen (VKPW), Frankfurt/M.; Engl. 1975.

Hirsch, Joachim (1993): Internationale Regulation. Bedingungen von Dominanz, Abhängigkeit und Entwicklung im globalen Kapitalismus, in: Das Argument, N. 198, 195-221, Hamburg.

Hirsch, Joachim (2001): Postfordismus: Dimensionen einer neuen kapitalistischen Formation, in: ders./Jessop, Bob/Poulantzas, Nicos (Hg.): Die Zukunft des Staates, VSA Hamburg.

Hirsch, Joachim (1990): Kapitalismus ohne Alternative? Hamburg.

Hopkins, T. K./Wallerstein, I. (1979): Grundzüge der Entwicklung des modernen Weltsystems. Entwurf für ein Forschungsvorhaben, in: Senghaas, D. (Hg.), Kapitalistische Weltökonomie. Kontroversen über ihren Ursprung und ihre Entwicklungsdynamik, Frankfurt/M.

Jessop, Bob (1989): Regulation Theories in Retrospect and Prospect. Amsterdam, Manuskript.

Jessop, Bob (1990): State Theory. Pennsylvania.

Lefebvre, Henri (1974): Die Zukunft des Kapitalismus. Die Reproduktion der Produktionsverhältnisse, München.

Lipietz, Alan (1992): Vom Althusserismus zur "Theorie der Regulation", in: Demirovic, Alex/ Krebs, Hans/Peter/Sablowski, Thomas (Hg.), Hegemonie und Staat, Münster.

Lipietz, Alan (1998): Nach dem Ende des "Goldenen Zeitalters", Argument Hamburg/Berlin.

- Marini, Ruy M. (1981): Die Dialektik der Abhängigkeit, in: Senghaas, D., Peripherer Kapitalismus...*
- Marx, Karl (1974): Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie, Dietz Verlag Berlin.*
- Marx, Karl (1968): Theorien über den Mehrwert. Band I und III. Frankfurt/M.*
- ME $\frac{3}{4}$ Marx $\frac{3}{4}$ Engels $\frac{3}{4}$ Werke*
- Meillassoux, Claude (1976): "Die wilden Früchte der Frau". Über häusliche Produktion und kapitalistische Wirtschaft, Frankfurt/Main.*
- Poulantzas, Nicos (1975): Klassen im Kapitalismus $\frac{3}{4}$ heute. Westberlin.*
- Poulantzas, Nicos (1974): Politische Macht und gesellschaftliche Klassen, Frankfurt/M.*
- Schwarz, Winfried (1974): Das "Kapital im allgemeinen" und die "Konkurrenz" im ökonomischen Werk von Karl Marx. Zu Rosdolskys Fehlinterpretation der Gliederung des <Kapitals>, in : Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen Theorie I, Frankfurt/M.*
- Senghaas, Dieter (Hg., 1981): Peripherer Kapitalismus. Analysen über Abhängigkeit und Unterentwicklung, Frankfurt/M.*
- Stavenhagen, R. (1981): Agrarische Strukturen und Unterentwicklung in Afrika und Lateinamerika, in: Senghaas, D. (Hg.), Peripherer Kapitalismus...8*
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1989): Der historische Kapitalismus, Argument Berlin.*
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (2002): Utopisik. Historische Alternativen des 21. Jahrhunderts, Wien.*
- Wittfogel, Karl A. (1962): Die orientalische Despotie. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung totaler Macht. Köln; Engl. 1957.*
- Wolpe, Harold (Hg., 1980): The articulation of modes of production, London.*