

Marxism, theory, and literature

Convenor: Jamie Baxendine (jwb40@cam.ac.uk)

Introduction : This course will focus on Karl Marx's critical and philosophical writings and on the subsequent history of Marxist theory. We'll start off by looking carefully at the first chapter of *Capital*, which is on the nature of commodities; then we'll look at Marx's early critique of Hegel; then his notes on method from 1857-9; and in the following seminars we'll discuss critical case studies, reading later critics and theorists along with passages from Marx that cast light on them.

I have preferred this philological approach, based on the careful reading of a selection of texts, to a more general conspectus of 'Marxism', or an introductory run-through of a selection of Marxian concepts, for several reasons. Firstly, Marxism is a *materialist* philosophy: this itself is a highly contested term, but one sense that it must have is that Marxism is a philosophy inseparably related to its material conditions, rather than one that claims to offer a timeless and abstract set of notions that can be applied freely to any objects, in any circumstances whatsoever. Marx himself is scathing about any theory which regards itself as able to float free from the realities of practice: 'The question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but a practical question. Man must *prove* the truth – i.e. the reality and power, the *this-sidedness* of his thinking in practice.' So we will get closer to an understanding of Marxism through critical attention to its particular instantiations – as real practices, not just as objects of contemplation. Secondly, Marxism has proven highly changeable, both developing over time and controversial within itself at any given moment: Marxist theory is united neither by a single common object of study, nor a stable set of shared methods or assumptions, so it wouldn't really be possible to track the history of a single 'Marxism' (this is why one of the most comprehensive attempts to get to grips with the intellectual history of the movement has a plural rather than a singular title: *Main Currents of Marxism*). An abstract account of the history of a movement risks casting a spurious uniformity over debates, dialogues, and oppositions as various as those between the analytical Marxist G A Cohen and the dialecticians he denounced as 'bullshit Marxism'; or between the older Lukacs and those members of the Frankfurt School he accused of taking up residence in the 'Grand Hotel Abyss' (or, with even greater hostility, between the older Lukacs and his younger self); or between Rosa Luxemburg and the Bolsheviks; between Marxism-Leninism and 'Western Marxism'; and so on. Thirdly, the history of Marxism has been importantly affected by the long unavailability of several of Marx's most important works. Kautsky, Plekhanov, Bernstein, Lenin, and many others all lived and developed their thought without ever encountering Marx's *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* of 1844-7, *Critique of Hegel's Doctrine of the State*, or *The German Ideology*. These were discovered and published by David Riazanov for the first time in the USSR in 1932, and later publicised and discussed in detail by Lukacs and Althusser (and others); but these texts emerged into a world where 'Marxism' had already taken shape in their absence. Without them, the reception of Marx's thought has been influenced much more strongly by the deterministic, scientific conceptions that Engels expressed at Marx's funeral -- 'Marx discovered the law of development of human history' – and much less by the critical, philosophical work, fixated on the patient dismantling of Hegelian idealism, that preoccupied Marx long before *Capital* and remained arguably central to his thought throughout his life. While it may go too far to say, as a later commentator has, that 'Marxism is the interrelated set of misinterpretations that have been given concerning Marx', those remnants of economic and social determinism that still disfigure Marxist and non-Marxist critical work today are often (whether

knowingly or not) evidence of this important accident of his reception. Reading later interpreters together with Marx's own words will help us see not only continuities but differences: Marx himself is a crucial resource for responding critically to Marxism.

Lastly, Marx was a reader and a critic (and scholar and playwright) as well as a philosopher, economist, and revolutionary. His work is saturated with allusions to Shakespeare, Aeschylus, Balzac, Goethe, Schiller, Defoe, Shelley, Heine, Homer, Cervantes, Pushkin, Dickens, the Bible, the Brothers Grimm, folk songs, popular theatre, and much more. His work tends to proceed not through the outright statement of facts, but through patient critical attention to concepts and phenomena, in an effort to turn them inside out – to reveal the social experience hidden by and in them. We'll be looking carefully at Marx's own critical practices, and the practices of some of his best later readers, in the hope of becoming better readers and critics ourselves.

Course structure: 6 x 1.5 hour seminars in Michaelmas term

Seminar preparation: Each week you should read the core reading carefully and in detail, and come to the seminar prepared to discuss it – the seminars will offer a chance to debate and develop your ideas, but also to answer any questions and to clarify any difficulties that you might have had with the readings. In light of this it would be useful if you were to prepare, each week, a short response to your reading: even if it is just a list of points and questions, it will help you to organise your thoughts.

Course administration: This will mostly be done through the course's Moodle site, where I'll try and supply the core reading in the form of PDFs. The suggested reading will be available in the Cambridge library system; if it proves difficult to track down, I'll find another way of getting you a copy.

Essays: If it would be useful, please feel free to speak with me as you develop your chosen topic. This course leaves it very open as to how you approach your essay: you could write on Marx (from a philosophical, political, historical, or other standpoint); you could develop some aspect of his thought and apply it to some other area of theory or literature that interests you; you could choose to focus on any of the later interpreters, or on any feature of the later history of Marxism that we have omitted to look at this term. I hope that this course models a great diversity of potential responses, and that you feel free to develop beyond them as you see fit.

Supervision: If you want to write a coursework on this topic, please come for a 30 minute supervision to discuss it (email me to set this up). I can't discuss essay drafts, but can comment on an outline, or a plan, or an opening section of up to 750 words.

Seminar I: Fundamentals of capitalism, according to Marx: commodities and value

Core reading: *Capital Volume I*, chapter 1, 'The Commodity'

Marx struggled for a long time with the problem of where to begin *Capital*; in the end he started with a discussion of the commodity, and this is where we will begin too. Capitalism is the system in which the *commodity* is the general form of all products – including, crucially, labour-power itself. Chapter 1 of *Capital* explores the nature of commodities and the process by which the commodity form has attained its universal domination – and, importantly, it does so by critically developing the immanent logic of capitalism's own processes.

This week I'd like you to think both about the specifics of Marx's argument – try to grasp the details of the double character of commodities, the double character of labour, the nature of value, and the social character of exchange – and his methodology. *Capital* is not just a positive study, it's a *critique*: it is not just occupied with explaining what there is, and how it works, but with examining how things got that way in the first place, and the unacknowledged grounds upon which they rest. This means that it cannot proceed by opposing capitalist society to some other, better one – as Marx says, to carry out a moral condemnation of usury teaches you nothing about usury – but rather by confronting capital's self-presentations with its actualities: the free and equal process of exchange by which we meet each other in the marketplace to swap goods of equal value is, in fact, pre-formed by the class relations that it conceals: by hidden monopolies over the means of production. How does Marx show this? What are its causes, processes, and consequences?

Suggested further reading:

David Harvey, *A Companion to Marx's Capital* (2010), 'Introduction' and chapter 1, 'Commodities and Exchange' – written as an introductory guide for people trying to read *Capital* straight through, so it sticks usefully close to the text; be careful of Harvey's misreadings and simplifications

Ernest Mandel, *Introduction to Marxism* (1979), chapter 4, 'Mode of Production' and chapter 5, 'The Capitalist Economy' – really an introduction to Trotskyism, but there's useful introductory material here, aimed at extending Marxist claims to embrace the 20th-century world economy
-- 'Introduction' to Karl Marx, *Capital Volume I*, trans. Ben Fowkes (1976) – very helpful general summary

Ellen Meiksins Wood, *The Origin of Capitalism: A Longer View* (2017), chapter 4, 'Commerce or Capitalism?' and chapter 5, 'The Agrarian Origin of Capitalism' – classic historical study of the emergence of capitalism; see also Michael Perelman's *The Invention of Capitalism* for a more detailed account

György Lukács, 'Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat' in *History and Class Consciousness* (1923, tr. 2000) – central to Marx's argument is the contention that labour-power, 'in the eyes of the worker himself, takes on the form of a commodity which is his property'; Lukács offers an extremely influential theoretical generalisation of the consequences of this argument for human consciousness; see also Max Weber's 'The Conditions of Maximum Formal Rationality of Capital Accounting' in *Economy and Society* for a detailed, non-Marxist sociological account of how this process takes place

Hans-Georg Backhaus, 'On the dialectics of the value form' (1980) – an important defence of Marx's work on value

Diane Elson (ed.), *Value: The Representation of Labour in Capitalism* (1979) – detailed and intelligent attempt to retrieve the political and philosophical content of the labour theory of value from various misrepresentations it has been subjected to

Seminar 2: Marx's critique of Hegel

Core reading: i. 'A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right. Introduction', *Early Writings* pp.243-257

ii. 'Critique of Hegel's Doctrine of the State (§261-313)' (up to §275), *Early Writings* pp.57-75

iii. Lucio Colletti, 'Introduction' to Marx's *Early Writings* (trans. by Rodney Livingstone and Gregor Benton, 1974)

The decade after Hegel's death saw a fierce debate over his intellectual legacy, divided between (as Engels later put it) those who adhered to Hegel's *method*, and those who adhered to his *system*. Marx's sympathies initially lay with the 'left' or 'Young' Hegelians, for whom Hegel's philosophy represented a radical method whose effects had been compromised by the philosopher's own personal capitulation to Prussian state power. For this group, which included Ludwig Feuerbach, Bruno Bauer, and David Strauss, Hegel's argument about the nature of historical progress as a form of the progressive self-realisation of reason was at once true *and*, at the same time, plainly in conflict with the empirical unfreedom of their actual political and religious life.

Marx himself was a fierce critic of the dialectic's 'mystificatory' character, but he acknowledged at the same time its 'rational core' and the fact that 'the mystification which dialectic suffers in Hegel's hands by no means prevents him from being the first to present its general form of working in a conscious and comprehensive manner'; and he was at least as fierce a critic of the Young Hegelians, whose 'materialist' attacks on Hegel he attacked as reproducing Hegel's idealism without its incipient rationality. The two texts presented here – an extract from *Critique of Hegel's Doctrine of the State* and *Contribution to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* -- date from 1843-4, a period when Marx was settling accounts both with Hegel and his radical critics.

This week I'd like us to focus more closely on the nature of *critique*, and on Marx's styles of reading and argument: how does Marx surpass the 'materialist' critique to which Hegel was subjected? What is the relationship between the *concrete* and the *abstract* in Marx's analyses? How does Marx think about the relationship between mystification and society? And what sort of line can be drawn between these critiques and the critique of commodity form we looked at in *Capital*?

Suggested further reading:

G W F Hegel, *Elements of the Philosophy of Right* (ed. Allen W Wood, trans. H B Nisbet (1991)) – Marx's commentary is on paragraphs 261-313 (pp.283-351 in this edition)

Ludwig Feuerbach, *The Fiery Brook* (trans. by Zawar Hanfi (1972)) – see *Towards a critique of Hegel's Philosophy* and the sections of *The Essence of Christianity* excerpted here

Friedrich Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy* (1886, trans. 1946)

Gillian Rose, *Hegel Contra Sociology* (1995) – profound and difficult attempt to preserve Hegel's philosophy; for Rose, the 'speculative' character of Hegel's propositions renders Marx's critique of the subject/predicate inversion in Hegel unworkable

Michel Henry, *Marx: A Philosophy of Human Reality* (trans. Kathleen McLaughlin (1983)) – exceptionally ambitious and rigorous attempt to rethink the whole of Marxism along the lines laid down by the 1840s work

David McLellan, *Marx Before Marxism* (1970) – the clearest and simplest introduction to Marx's early life

Louis Althusser, 'On the young Marx' in *For Marx* (trans. Ben Brewster, 1969) – influential attempt to separate the 'mature' Marx from the Marx of the 1840s and ground the 'science' of historical materialism in a radical break from philosophy

Seminar 3: Marx's Notes on Method

Core reading: i. Karl Marx, , 'Introduction' to *Grundrisse* (1857-61; published 1953)

ii. Stuart Hall, 'Marx's Notes on Method: A "Reading" of the "1857 Introduction"', *Cultural Studies* 17.2 (2003), 113-149

Grundrisse ['Foundation'] is a set of notebooks dating from 1857-8, written by Marx during a course of study and self-clarification in which he attempted to sum up the previous 15 years of his research in political economy. The body of the work consists of two large studies, 'On Money', and 'On Capital', along with the 'Introduction' and some smaller fragments. The 'Introduction' contains some of Marx's most sustained reflections on economic and critical methodology. Marx had considered calling the work *Critique of the Economic Categories*: both of these movements, the establishment of what is *foundational* for a given economic system and the dismantling of the apparent naturalness of the concepts that structure bourgeois political economy, are explored here.

The latter approach, criticising earlier studies that used apparently disinterested (but really socially mediated) anthropologies or theories of human nature to secure in advance the conditions that will legitimate their projects – Rousseau's 'natural man'; Smith's isolated worker; the 'Crusoe-figures' of the 18th-century economists – has had a crucial influence on the discipline of cultural studies. The most important interpreter of the 'Introduction' was the late Stuart Hall; the article of his that we'll be looking at this week, 'Marx's Notes on Method', is a revised version of a longer paper, *A 'Reading' of Marx's 1857 Introduction to the Grundrisse*, presented to the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at Birmingham University in Nov.-Dec. 1973. Hall's reading is both a model of clear, thorough exposition and a critical interpretation in its own right: he picks out and develops the logic of Marx's comments on abstract and concrete critical categories, transhistorical and culturally mediated practices, and production and consumption in ways that he would go on to develop in his own work on cultural codes and hegemony (see in particular his brilliant study of the political creation of moral panics, *Policing the Crisis*, where ideas from *Grundrisse* and *The German Ideology* are extended to provide a way thinking about crime and responses to crime). Think carefully about Marx's argument, with Hall as a guide; but think about Hall's work, too, and the points of overlap and conflict between Marx's approach and the approaches of a nascent cultural criticism.

Suggested further reading:

Martin Nicolaus, 'The Unknown Marx', *New Left Review* 1/48 (March-April 1968) – extremely useful contextualisation of *Grundrisse* within a larger narrative of Marx's intellectual development towards *Capital*
-- 'Introduction' to *Grundrisse* (1973)

T W Adorno, "'Static" and "Dynamic" as Sociological Categories', (trans. H Kaal) *Diogenes* 9 (33) (1961) 28-49 – brilliant critique of the use of concepts in social theory; the remarks on the impossibility of an 'impartial' sociologist, and the methodological issues arising from this, are particularly consequential for cultural criticism

Stuart Hall *et al.*, *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order* (1978)
-- 'Cultural studies: two paradigms', *Media, Culture, and Society* 2 (1980) 57-72

Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks* (trans. J A Buttigieg and A Callari (1992)) – Gramsci is a key influence on Hall and others; like many of the critics we've looked at, his project involved generalising aspects of Marx out to parts of culture that Marx paid little attention to, often in ways that Marx might not have recognised

Simon Choat, *Marx's Grundrisse* (2016) – a perhaps over-simplified reader's guide

Antonio Negri, *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse* (trans. Harry Cleaver *et al.* (1991)) – important, violent, eccentric attempt to disentangle Marx from economics-centred readings and represent him as concerned chiefly with the revolutionary clash between proletarian and capitalist subjectivities

Seminar 4: Base, superstructure, ideology (i)

- Core reading:** i. Walter Benjamin, 'The Paris of the Second Empire in Baudelaire' (1938), in *The Writer of Modern Life* (trans. Harry Zohn, edited by Michael Jennings (2006)) pp.46-133
ii. Walter Benjamin, N16-N17 in *The Arcades Project* (trans. Eiland and Mclaughlin (1999)) pp.482-5
iii. T W Adorno and Walter Benjamin, 'Presentation III' (Adorno's letters to Benjamin and Benjamin's reply) in Adorno, Benjamin, Bloch, Brecht, Lukács, *Aesthetics and Politics* (trans. Harry Zohn (2007)), pp.110-141
iv. Giorgio Agamben, 'The Prince and the Frog: The Question of Method in Adorno and Benjamin', in *Infancy and History* (trans. Liz Heron (2007)), pp.117-138

In the 1859 'Preface' to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx wrote that 'it is not the consciousness of men that determines [*bestimmt*] their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness.' In Seminar ii we saw how the critique of religion, of the state, and of political economy followed from this. This week and next, we'll be thinking about exactly what it means for social existence to *determine* consciousness: is the relationship *causal*, or *dialectical*, or are they in fact *identical*, or something else?—what mediates the relationship between the two levels (if 'levels' is the right term at all)? What are the consequences of that determination for the practice of critique? Most fundamentally of all, what kind of 'experience' is Marx referring to?

The discussion between Walter Benjamin and T W Adorno about Benjamin's critical practice deals centrally with these questions, and is one of the 20th century's most important documents of Marxist aesthetics. Benjamin had been working on Baudelaire for most of his academic life; as he revised his project and attempted to situate his thoughts on literature within his broader studies of Paris and the history of capitalism in *The Arcades Project*, rifts began to open up between him and the members of the Institute for Social Research, his friend Adorno chief among them. The extracts I've given above will give you a detailed way into this critical exchange: the first extract is Benjamin's first extended attempt to develop a connection between the *Arcades* material and Baudelaire; the second, from the notes for *The Arcades Project*, shows Benjamin's reading in the idiosyncratic, undogmatic 'Western' Marxist Karl Korsch, and in particular his attention to Korsch's effort to reformulate the base-superstructure relationship; the third is the letters between Benjamin and Adorno, outlining their developing disagreements; and the fourth is the later (non-Marxist) philosopher Giorgio Agamben's brilliant attempt to counter Adorno's objections and save Benjamin's theory of history.

Suggested further reading:

Michael Rosen, 'Critical Theory' in *On Voluntary Servitude: False Consciousness and the Theory of Ideology* (1996), pp.223-257 – clear, carefully analytical attack on 'ideology critique': an immensely informative book

Gillian Rose, *The Melancholy Science: An Introduction to the Thought of Theodor W. Adorno* (1978) – the best introduction to Adorno and a major work in its own right

Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism; or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (1991) – influential but muddled

Karl Korsch, *Marxism and Philosophy* (1923, trans. Fred Halliday (1970)) – neglected study of ideology

Friedrich Engels, letter to Joseph Bloch Sept 21-2 1890; letter to Mehring July 14 1893, in *Marx and Engels on Literature and Art* (1976) pp. 57, 64-9 – clear, programmatic statements on 'determination in the last instance'

Core reading: i. Karl Marx, 'Preface' and Chapter 1, 'Feuerbach' in *The German Ideology* (1845-6, published in a revised edition in English in 1976)

-- ii. Louis Althusser, 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation' in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (trans. Ben Brewster (1971)) pp.121-176

The German Ideology, which contains some of Marx's most far-reaching and revolutionary remarks about the history of society and the nature of human praxis, has a complicated history. When it was first retrieved from the archives of the German Social-Democratic Party in the 1930s, it was taken to be a crucial piece of evidence regarding the development of Marx's thought out of an early, 'humanist' phase, centred on a theory of human nature and sharing features with Feuerbach's critical inversion of Hegelian philosophy, to a mature, 'scientific' phase, centred on dialectical materialism and revolutionary communism. That development was taken by the text's discoverer and editor, David Riazanov, along with most of his contemporaries, to have involved a 'farewell to philosophy': in that respect, the rejection or criticism of a philosophical work like *The German Ideology* is a founding gesture of 'Marxism' itself.

In actual fact, Marx does not seem to have thought about his texts of the early 1840s in quite those terms. While he didn't make much effort to get his work from that period published, in his 1858-9 'Preface' to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, he did describe his efforts then -- the critique of idealism of Hegel and the materialism of Feuerbach -- as 'settling accounts with our former philosophical conscience' for the purpose of 'self-clarification'. The extent to which that self-clarification remained important for him, and therefore the extent to which even a work like *Capital* retains a 'philosophical' character, is a nice question. The most rigorous and influential attempt to argue for an epistemic break in Marx's development comes in the work of the French structuralist philosopher and communist Louis Althusser. The essay of his that we'll be looking at this week concerns issues that we discussed in the last seminar, but the differences are as important as the similarities, both between Althusser and the Frankfurt School critics we were discussing, and between Althusser and Marx. What effects does Althusser's conception of his project as 'scientific' have on the content of his theory? How do Althusser and Marx differ in their conceptions of the distinction between 'ideology' and 'science'? Are there broader political consequences to the extreme stylistic differences between *The German Ideology* (parodic, 'literary') and 'Ideological State Apparatuses' (technical, general)? Lastly: Althusser had particular objections to the first chapter of *Capital*, and, in his introduction to a reading edition of that work, advised readers to skip the material on fetishism altogether. What role does the absence of that kind of analysis play in his arguments about ideology here?

Suggested further reading:

Louis Althusser, 'On the young Marx' in *For Marx* (trans. Ben Brewster, 1969) – you may have looked at this in a previous week, but it will be useful to remind yourself of exactly how Althusser thinks humanist Marxism developed into the science of historical materialism

Gillian Rose, 'The Antinomies of Sociological Reason', in *Hegel Contra Sociology* pp.1-50, particularly pp.39-42 – detailed argument for the impossibility of any kind of scientific social theory, including Althusser's

Daniel Brudney, *Marx's Attempt to Leave Philosophy* (1998)

Michel Henry, 'The Place of Ideology', in *Marx*, pp.160-189 – essential chapter; cf. the book's opening section

Nicos Poulantzas and Ralph Milliband, *The Problem of the Capitalist State* (1972)

Marjorie Levinson, 'Introduction' in *Rethinking Historicism* (1989) – consciously or not, aspects of Althusser's theory of ideology remain current in New Historicist (and post-) lit crit; here Levinson offers an intelligent attempt to reckon with Althusser directly; see also the work of Jerome McGann and Stephen Greenblatt

Seminar 6: Spectacle

Core reading: Guy Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle* (1967; trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (1995))

Debord's work is highly readable and, now that you have thorough grounding in commodity fetishism, reification, the relationship between capital and living labour, and the class structure of society, you'll need little introduction to the concepts in play. This book is prescient and radical, and develops Marx's thought towards a society that he didn't necessarily foresee – one structured not around production, but consumption – but nonetheless one that is thoroughly saturated with the fetishism of the commodity.

Suggested further reading:

Guy Debord, *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle* (trans. Malcolm Imrie (1998)) – extension of Debord's critique twenty years on

Giorgio Agamben, 'Marginal Notes on Comments on the Society of the Spectacle', in *Means Without End* (trans. Vincenzo Binetti and Cesare Casarino (2000)) – suggestive elaborations of various concepts and key terms from Debord

Last note

For reasons of space and thematic coherence it was necessary to omit a number of writers, texts, and concepts that could easily have found a place in this course, which has chiefly been given over to the elaboration of various texts by Marx himself and has therefore given short shrift to those areas that he did not focus on directly, or which would have required too much reading to work well in a seminar format. So here's an idiosyncratic, non-exhaustive list of major works and authors in whom you might be interested, who engaged directly with the work of Marx, and whose work would bear directly on, and illuminate, many of the people and problems we've discussed this term, but which were not mentioned here directly. Any one of them could have served as the basis for a week's seminar, if we had had enough time. In no particular order: Sebastiano Timpanaro, *On Materialism* and *The Freudian Slip*; Gillian Rose, *The Broken Middle: Out of Our Ancient Society*; György Lukács, *The Theory of the Novel* and *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*; T W Adorno, *Negative Dialectics* and *Minima Moralia*; Raymond Geuss, *Public Goods, Private Goods* and *Politics and the Imagination*; S S Prawer, *Karl Marx and World Literature*; Andre Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*; Michel Henry, *Barbarism* and *From Communism to Capitalism*; Angela Davis, *Women, Race and Class*; Jean-Claude Michéa, *The Realm of Lesser Evil*; The Invisible Committee, *The Coming Insurrection* and *For Our Friends*; Shulamith Firestone, *The Dialectic of Sex*; Alain Badiou, *Ethics*; John Berger, *Ways of Seeing*; Adolph Reed Jr., *Class Notes: Posing as Politics and Other Thoughts on the American Scene*; Wendy Brown, *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*; Rosa Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital*; Mark Fisher, *Capitalist Realism: Is there no alternative?*; Vivek Chibber, *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*; Jacques Rancière, *Staging the People: The Proletarian and his Double* and *Staging the People volume 2: The Intellectual and his People*; Cornelius Cardew, *Stockhausen Serves Imperialism*; Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*; Robert Kurz, *The Substance of Capital*; Mao Zedong, 'On Contradiction'; Raymond Williams, *Culture and Materialism*; Karen and Barbara Fields, *Racecraft*; Henri Lefebvre, *Critique of Everyday Life*; Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*; Moshe Postone, *Time, Labour, and Social Domination*; Margaret A. Rose, *Marx's Lost Aesthetic*; Huw Beynon, *Working for Ford*. And I didn't include *The Communist Manifesto*; I hope you can find a moment to read it on your own time.