

HANDBOOK OF THE INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY OF PRODUCTION

HANDBOOKS OF RESEARCH ON INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

Series Editors: Matthew Watson, *Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK* and Benjamin J. Cohen, *Louis G. Lancaster Professor of International Political Economy, University of California, Santa Barbara, USA*

This highly original *Handbook* series offers a unique appraisal of the state-of-the-art of research in International Political Economy (IPE). Consisting of original contributions by leading authorities, *Handbooks* in the series provide comprehensive overviews of the very latest research within key areas of IPE. Taking a thematic approach, emphasis is placed on both expanding current debate and indicating the likely research agenda for the future. Each *Handbook* forms a prestigious and high quality work of lasting significance. The *Handbooks* will encompass arguments from both the British and American schools of IPE to give a comprehensive overview of the debates and research positions in each key area of interest, as well as offering a space for those who feel that their work fits neither designation easily. Taking a genuinely international approach these *Handbooks* are designed to inform as well as to contribute to current debates.

Titles in the series include:

Handbook of the International Political Economy of Governance
Edited by Anthony Payne and Nicola Phillips

Handbook of the International Political Economy of Monetary Relations
Edited by Thomas Oatley and W. Kindred Winecoff

Handbook of the International Political Economy of Trade
Edited by David A. Deese

Handbook of the International Political Economy of Production
Edited by Kees van der Pijl

Handbook of the International Political Economy of Production

Edited by

Kees van der Pijl

Professor Emeritus, University of Sussex, UK

HANDBOOKS OF RESEARCH ON INTERNATIONAL
POLITICAL ECONOMY

 **Edward Elgar**
PUBLISHING

Cheltenham, UK • Northampton, MA, USA

© Kees van der Pijl 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical or photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by
Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
The Lypiatts
15 Lansdown Road
Cheltenham
Glos GL50 2JA
UK

Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
William Pratt House
9 Dewey Court
Northampton
Massachusetts 01060
USA

A catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014950765

This book is available electronically in the **Elgaronline**
Social and Political Science subject collection
DOI 10.4337/9781783470211



ISBN 978 1 78347 020 4 (cased)
ISBN 978 1 78347 021 1 (eBook)

Typeset by Servis Filmsetting Ltd, Stockport, Cheshire
Printed and bound in Great Britain by T.J. International Ltd, Padstow

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	viii
<i>List of tables</i>	ix
<i>List of contributors</i>	x
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xx
<i>Introduction: the world of production and political economy</i> Kees van der Pijl	xxiii

PART I RESTRUCTURING THE GLOBAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

Introduction to Part I	3
1 Labour, war and world politics: contemporary dynamics in world-historical perspective <i>Beverly J. Silver</i>	6
2 Rethinking production, finance and hegemonic decline in IPE <i>Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin</i>	23
3 Innovation policies and the competition state: the case of nanotechnology <i>Joscha Wullweber</i>	43
4 The political economy of global labour arbitrage <i>Raúl Delgado Wise and David T. Martin</i>	59
5 Apple's iPad City: subcontracting exploitation to China <i>Jenny Chan, Pun Ngai and Mark Selden</i>	76
6 The grapes of wrath: social upgrading and class struggles in global value chains <i>Benjamin Selwyn</i>	98
7 Global outsourcing and socialization of labour: the case of Nike <i>Jeroen Merk</i>	115
8 Standardizing services: transnational authority and market power <i>Jean-Christophe Graz</i>	132

vi	<i>Handbook of the international political economy of production</i>	
9	Encumbered behemoth: Wal-Mart, differential accumulation and international retail restructuring <i>Joseph Baines</i>	149
10	Beyond the 'BRICS': new patterns of development cooperation in the Trans-Eurasian Corridor <i>Yury Gromyko</i>	167

PART II LABOUR AND THE POLITICS OF WORK

	Introduction to Part II	189
11	Look back in hope? Reassessing Fordism today <i>Radhika Desai</i>	192
12	Paternalism, Taylorism, socialism: the Battle for Production in the Chilean textile industry 1930–1973 <i>Adam Fishwick</i>	211
13	<i>Trasformismo</i> and the defeat of the Left in Italy <i>Davide Bradanini</i>	229
14	Flexibilization of labour in the European Union <i>Otto Holman</i>	247
15	Globalization and Japanese-style management: image and changing reality <i>Ryoji Ihara</i>	264
16	Work, power and the urban poor <i>Jeffrey Harrod</i>	279
17	Unfreedom and workers' power: ever-present possibilities <i>Siobhán McGrath and Kendra Strauss</i>	299
18	The race to the bottom halted? Passive revolution and workers' resistance in China <i>Youngseok Jang and Kevin Gray</i>	318
19	Bargaining in the global commodity chain: the Asia Floor Wage Alliance <i>Anannya Bhattacharjee and Ashim Roy</i>	334
20	Twilight of the machinocrats: creative industries, design and the future of human labour <i>Alan Freeman</i>	352

Appendix to Part II: transnational networks of radical labour research <i>Örsan Şenalp and Mehmet Gürsan Şenalp</i>	376
PART III PRODUCTION, REPRODUCTION, NATURE	
Introduction to Part III	391
21 Tracking bodies, the ‘Quantified Self’, and the corporeal turn <i>Phoebe Moore</i>	394
22 Production in everyday life: poetics and prosaics <i>Matt Davies</i>	409
23 Automobility: culture, (re-)production and sustainability <i>Matthew Paterson</i>	426
24 Risk capitalism, crisis of socialization and loss of civilization <i>Werner Seppmann</i>	442
25 Servicing the world: women, transnational migration and sex work in a neoliberal era <i>Christine B.N. Chin</i>	458
26 Molecular biotechnologies: insights on production through the lens of reproduction <i>Miriam Boyer</i>	473
27 Alternatives to agribusiness: agro-ecology and the peasant principle <i>Sylvia Kay</i>	490
28 Strategies of a Green Economy, contours of a Green Capitalism <i>Ulrich Brand and Markus Wissen</i>	508
<i>Conclusion: emergent predatory logics</i> Saskia Sassen	524
<i>Bibliography</i>	542
<i>Index</i>	649

Figures

1.1	World labour unrest, 1870–1996	8
5.1	Foxconn's locations in Greater China	83
5.2	Foxconn employees and revenues, 1996–2013	84
5.3	Distribution of value for the iPad	87
9.1	The differential capitalization and differential net profit of Wal-Mart	152
9.2	The differential cost-cutting of Wal-Mart	156
9.3	Wal-Mart's would-be retail empire 2012	160
9.4	Wal-Mart's store count in the US and abroad	161
10.1	Energy, information and transport at the basis of a development corridor	173
10.2	Railway ring around the Sea of Japan	181
19.1	Poorest households' expenditure on food	346
20.1	Share of employment in services, 1948–2007	362
20.2	Share of employment in US services, 1946–2013	363
20.3	Demand for leisure and service products by UK families, 1976–2008	364
20.4	Annual growth rate of major categories of family expenditure, UK, 1976–2008	365
20.5	Revenue from recorded and live music in the UK, 1997–2010	371
21.1	Chris Dancy's Google calendar log of daily activities	405

Tables

I.1	Cadre, productive workers and workers in circulation activities in the economically active population, selected countries, 2008	xxxiii
3.1	Most important NNI R&D institutions and networks	54
4.1	Labour cost differentials	61
5.1	Apple's revenues by product segments, 2010–12	86
8.1	Exports and imports of goods and services, 1990–2012	133
8.2	Share (%) of developing/developed/transition economies of services exports, 1990–2012	134
8.3	Estimated world inward FDI flows, by sector and industry, 1990–92 and 2009–11	135
14.1	Unemployment, youth unemployment and labour costs in the original six EEC states and the Southern European eurozone states and Ireland, 2008 and 2011	262
19.1	Asia Floor Wage in local currency on the basis of PPP, 2012–13	347
20.1	Creative intensity of the creative industries, DCMS 2011 definition	356
20.2	Demand for creative products	366
C.1	US home foreclosures, 2006–10	537
C.2	Rate of sub-prime lending by ethnic group in New York City, 2002–06	538

Contributors

Joseph BAINES is a PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at York University, Toronto. His research focuses on the impacts that the business operations of the major agricultural commodity traders have on global food security. He has presented some of his findings in an article entitled 'Food price inflation as redistribution: Towards a new analysis of corporate power in the world food system', published in *New Political Economy*. He has also published in the *Review of Capital as Power* and he was a 2013 winner of the Association for Institutional Thought Student Scholars Award.

Anannya BHATTACHARJEE is the president of the Garment and Allied Workers Union (GAWU) in North India and Executive Council Member of the New Trade Union Initiative (NTUI). She is the International Coordinator of Asia Floor Wage Alliance. She has helped build grassroots labour-related collaboration between North America, Europe and Asia. Before, Ms Bhattacharjee was an activist based in the US in the women's, migrants' and the workers' rights movements. She was a Charles Revson Fellow at Columbia University and Activist-in-Residence at the Asian Pacific American Studies Program and Institute at New York University. She is the co-editor of *Policing the National Body* (2002).

Miriam BOYER received a joint PhD in sociology and political science in 2013 from Columbia University and the Free University of Berlin. Her dissertation develops a novel framework for studying living processes as part of nature–society relations by capturing the materiality of nature through the use of spatiotemporal categories. Areas of research include the history of science and technology, agriculture, theories of nature and interdisciplinary methods between the social and the natural sciences.

Davide BRADANINI holds a PhD in 'Political systems and institutional change' from IMT Lucca, where he defended a thesis on 'Common sense and national emergency: neoliberal hegemony in 1990s Italy'. His research interests in the field of International Political Economy are in the areas of European integration, Italian history and political economy and neo-Gramscian and Marxist theory.

Ulrich BRAND is Professor of International Politics at the University of Vienna. His interests are in critical state and governance studies, regula-

tion and hegemony theory, political ecology, international resource and environmental politics; his regional focus is Latin America. He was member of the Expert Commission on 'Growth, Well-Being and Quality of Life' of the German Bundestag. His work in English has been published in journals such as *Antipode*, *Austrian Journal of Development Studies*, *Austrian Journal of Political Science*, *Globalizations*, *Innovation* and *Review of International Political Economy*. He recently co-edited books on Regulation theory, Political Ecology and Latin America.

Jenny CHAN joined the School of Interdisciplinary Area Studies at the University of Oxford in September 2014. She was Chief Coordinator of SACOM (Students and Scholars Against Corporate Misbehaviour) between 2006 and 2009. Educated at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and the University of Hong Kong, she went on to pursue her doctorate in sociology and labour studies as a Reid Research Scholar at the University of London. In finishing her PhD thesis (June 2014) she was assisted by a grant from the Great Britain–China Educational Trust. Her articles have appeared in *Current Sociology*, *Global Labour Journal*, *Modern China*, *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, *New Labor Forum*, *Labor Notes*, *New Internationalist* and *New Technology, Work and Employment*.

Christine B.N. CHIN is Professor in the School of International Service, American University. Her research and teaching interests are in the political economy of transnational migration, South-East Asian studies and intercultural relations. Dr Chin's most recent book is *Cosmopolitan Sex Workers: Women and Migration in a Global City*. She is also the author of *In Service and Servitude: Foreign Female Domestic Workers and the Malaysian 'Modernity' Project*, as well as *Cruising in the Global Economy: Profits, Pleasure and Work at Sea*. Dr Chin has published in international academic journals such as *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *Third World Quarterly* and *New Political Economy*. Her current research project examines human insecurities and immigrant communities in the Global North.

Matt DAVIES is Senior Lecturer in IPE at Newcastle University, UK. His research interests range from work as an issue for IPE, to the critique of everyday life in international relations, to popular culture and world politics. He is the author of *International Political Economy and Mass Communication in Chile* and co-editor (with Magnus Ryner) of *Poverty and the Production of World Politics*. His articles have appeared in *Global Society*, *International Political Sociology* and *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* and other journals. His current research focuses on a critique of

the notion of precarity and an extended study of the concept of everyday life in IPE.

Raúl DELGADO WISE is professor and former director (2002–12) of the Doctoral Program in Development Studies at the Autonomous University of Zacatecas, Mexico. He is general coordinator of the UNESCO Chair on Migration, Development and Human Rights; member of the advisory board of the UNESCO–MOST committee in Mexico; president and founder of the International Network on Migration and Development, and co-Director of the Critical Development Studies Network. Professor Delgado Wise has published or edited 22 books, and written more than 150 essays, including book chapters and refereed articles. He has been a guest lecturer in more than 30 countries on all five continents.

Radhika DESAI is Professor at the Department of Political Studies, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada. She is the author of *Geopolitical Economy: After US Hegemony, Globalization and Empire* (2013), *Slouching Towards Ayodhya: From Congress to Hindutva in Indian Politics* (2nd rev edn, 2004) and *Intellectuals and Socialism: 'Social Democrats' and the Labour Party* (1994, a *New Statesman and Society* Book of the Month) and editor of *Revitalizing Marxist Theory for Today's Capitalism* (2010) and *Developmental and Cultural Nationalisms* (2009). She co-edits the *Future of Capitalism* book series with Alan Freeman.

Adam FISHWICK completed an ESRC-funded PhD at the University of Sussex in 2014. He holds an MA in Global Political Economy and an MSc in Comparative and Cross-Cultural Research Methods. He published articles in *Capital & Class* and *Peripherie* and has co-authored two introductory books on economics. In the course of his PhD research he spent six months conducting archival and field research on workplace conflict and industrial development in Argentina and Chile. He has taught at the University of Sussex and worked for its Centre for Global Political Economy and as an intern at the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam.

Alan FREEMAN is a former economist at the Greater London Authority, where he wrote *Creativity, London's Core Business* and was lead author for *London: A Cultural Audit* and *The Living Wage: Towards a Fairer London*. He is a Visiting Professor at London Metropolitan University and lives in Winnipeg, Canada. With Radhika Desai, he co-edits the *Future of World Capitalism* book series and with Andrew Kliman he founded the International Working Group on Value Theory (IWGVT), and co-edits the new critical pluralist journal *Critique of Political Economy*. He currently serves on the Board of the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra.

Sam GINDIN spent most of his working life (1974–2000) on the staff of the Canadian Auto Workers – now UNIFOR – where he was Research Director and later Assistant to the President. He was subsequently (2000–10) the Packer Chair in Social Justice in the Political Science Department at York, where he is now an Adjunct Professor. He has written extensively on labour issues and in 2010 he co-authored, with Leo Panitch and Greg Albo, *In and Out of Crisis*. Most recently he and Panitch co-authored *The Making of Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of American Empire* (2012, Deutscher Memorial Prize, Davidson Prize).

Kevin GRAY is Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Sussex, UK. He is the author of *Korean Workers and Neoliberal Globalization* (2008), *Labour and Development in East Asia: Social Forces and Passive Revolution* (forthcoming 2014), as well as co-editor (with Barry Gills) of *People Power in an Era of Global Crisis: Rebellion, Resistance and Liberation* (2012), and (with Craig N. Murphy) *Rising Powers and the Future of Global Governance* (2013). He is also the Assistant Editor of the journal *Globalizations* and co-editor of the *Rethinking Globalization* book series.

Jean-Christophe GRAZ is Professor of International Relations at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques et Internationales of the University of Lausanne, Switzerland, and co-founder of the *Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur l'International (CRII)*. For the last 15 years his research field has been on regulation issues in international political economy and the interplay of transnational and private patterns and agents of change in globalization. His latest book is titled *Services sans Frontières: Mondialisation, Normalisation et Régulation de l'économie des Services* (2013).

Yury GROMYKO is a director of the consultancy and research company Shiffers Institute of Advanced Studies, based in Moscow. He holds a degree in psychology and is a Professor at Moscow State University and a visiting professor at Tamkang University in Taipei, Taiwan. His research interests lie in the sphere of international political economy, innovation politics and international cooperation in Eurasia. He has been one of the initiators of the international cooperation network 'Trans-Eurasian Belt of *Razvitie*' which embraces researchers, politicians and businesspeople from the European Union (Italy, Germany, France), Asia (Japan, China) and Russia.

Jeffrey HARROD is a writer and essayist and supervises research at the University of Amsterdam. He graduated in international law at UCL London and holds a PhD from the University of Geneva. His

publications and online material relevant here are *Power, Production and the Unprotected Worker* (1987); 'The global poor and global politics: Neo-materialism and the sources of political action' in Davis and Ryner (2006); the 16-lecture online course 'Global political economy: How the world works'; and essays on 'Global Weirism: Or why the centre cannot hold' and 'Corporatism: The 21st century political economic system', at www.jeffreyharrod.eu.

Otto HOLMAN is Reader in International Relations and European Politics in the Department of Political Science and a member of the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research at the University of Amsterdam. He has been a visiting professor at the University of Lausanne since 2009. His research focuses on EU enlargement, transnational governance in the EU and the role of transnational business, and on patterns of uneven development within the EU and its member states. His most recent project deals with the multidimensionality of crisis and core-periphery dynamics inside the EU and in its external relations.

Ryoji IHARA holds a PhD in Sociology from Hitotsubashi University. He is currently working as Associate Professor in the Faculty of Regional Studies at Gifu University in Japan. His books include *Toyota's Assembly Line: A View from the Factory Floor* (2007) and *Power, Politics and Culture in the Workplace: A Comparative Study of the Shop Floor at Toyota and Nissan* (in Japanese, forthcoming). His research interests are in Japanese-style management and workers' culture on the shop floor in the context of the global economy.

Youngseok JANG is Professor of Chinese Studies at Sungkonghoe University, South Korea. He is author of *Chinese Labour Relations in an Age of Globalization* (in Korean, 2007), and *Changes in the Contemporary Chinese Labour System and Transformations in the Functions of Trade Unions* (in Chinese, 2004). He is also co-author, with Seung-Wook Baek, of *Chinese Workers and the Politics of Memory: The Memories of the Cultural Revolution* (in Korean, 2007).

Sylvia KAY is a researcher at the Transnational Institute (TNI). She is part of TNI's Agrarian Justice team, working on issues related to land and resource rights, food politics and agricultural investment. She holds a BA in International Relations and Sociology from the University of Sussex and an MSc in Global Politics from the London School of Economics and Political Science. She currently lives in The Hague, the Netherlands.

David T. MARTIN is a PhD candidate in the Doctorate of Development Studies at the Autonomous University of Zacatecas in Mexico. Prior to his

return to academia, he served as researcher for United for a Fair Economy and the Center for Migrant Rights, where he researched issues of inequality and migration. In 2011, he earned a Master's degree in International Development Studies from Saint Mary's University in Halifax, Nova Scotia for a thesis he wrote on US hegemonic decline in Latin America. His current research interests include global capitalist crisis, financialization, international migration and the commodities boom in Latin America.

Siobhán McGRATH is a lecturer in Human Geography at Durham University. She completed her PhD at the University of Manchester's Institute of Development Policy and Management. She is interested in work, labour and employment, particularly forced / unfree labour; degrading, precarious and unregulated work; and labour within Global Production Networks. She is part of a research project on addressing demand for trafficking, funded by the European Commission. She is also interested in Brazil's role as a rising power in the context of South–South globalization and development. She is on the Associate Board of *Work, Employment and Society* and the International Advisory Board of *Antipode*.

Jeroen MERK is David Davies of Llandinam Fellow at the London School of Economics where he works on a project 're-inventing corporate accountability after the Rana Plaza collapse'. His research interests lie at the crossroads of international relations, political economy, social movements and the governance institutions of global industrial relations. Since 2003, he has been a research and policy coordinator at the International Secretariat of the Clean Clothes Campaign, a labour rights NGO with branches in 15 European countries and an extended network of partners in production countries.

Phoebe MOORE is Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Middlesex, London. Her research covers international employment relations, education and training policy, and the use of technology in workspaces and on working bodies. She is the author of *Globalisation and Labour Struggle in Asia* (2012) and *The International Political Economy of Work and Employability* (2010). She is on the Editorial Boards for *Capital and Class*, *Globalizations* and the *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*. She served as Convenor for the International Political Economy Group (IPEG) of the British International Studies Association (BISA) 2011–14 and is an elected BISA Trustee.

Leo PANITCH is Canada Research Chair in Comparative Political Economy and Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science at York University. For the past 25 years he has been the co-editor of the

internationally renowned annual volume, *The Socialist Register*. His most recent books are *The Making of Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of American Empire* (with Sam Gindin, 2012, Deutscher Memorial Prize, Davidson Prize), *In and Out of Crisis: The Global Financial Meltdown and Left Alternatives* with Greg Albo and Sam Gindin, (2010) and *American Empire and the Political Economy of Global Finance* (ed., with Martijn Konings, 2008).

Matthew PATERSON is Professor of Political Science at the University of Ottawa. His research focuses on the political economy of global environmental change. His publications include *Global Warming and Global Politics* (1996), *Understanding Global Environmental Politics: Domination, Accumulation, Resistance* (2000), *Automobile Politics: Ecology and Cultural Political Economy* (2007), and most recently *Climate Capitalism: Global Warming and the Transformation of the Global Economy* (with Peter Newell, 2010). He is currently focused on the political economy and cultural politics of climate change.

PUN Ngai is Professor in the Department of Applied Social Sciences at Hong Kong Polytechnic University. She is the author of *Made in China: Women Factory Workers in a Global Workplace* (2005), which received the C.W. Mills Award and was translated into French, German, Italian, Polish and Chinese. Her articles have appeared in *Modern China*, *China Journal*, *China Quarterly*, *Global Labour Journal*, *Work, Employment and Society*, *Cultural Anthropology*, *Feminist Economics*, *Current Sociology*, and *Third World Quarterly*. She also co-authored three books in Chinese on construction workers, Foxconn workers and Chinese social economy.

Ashim ROY is founding General Secretary and currently Vice President of the New Trade Union Initiative, a left democratic, non-partisan national federation of independent trade unions. From the time of the anti-Emergency movement in the 1970s (when the then-Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, tried to impose a police state in India) Roy has been a leader in the trade union movement nationally. He is also president of the Garment and Textile Workers Union in the state of Karnataka, president of several manufacturing unions in Gujarat, and member of the International Steering Committee of the Asia Floor Wage Alliance.

Saskia SASSEN is the Robert S. Lynd Professor of Sociology and Co-Chair, The Committee on Global Thought, Columbia University. Her recent books are *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages* (2008), *A Sociology of Globalization* (2007), and *Cities in a World Economy* (4th rev. edn, 2012). Among older books is *The Global City* (1991/2001). Her books are translated into over 20 languages.

Her latest book is *Expulsions: When Complexity Produces Elementary Brutalities* (2014). She is the recipient of diverse awards, most recently the Principe de Asturias 2013 Prize in the Social Sciences.

Mark SELDEN is Senior Research Associate in the East Asia Program at Cornell University, Coordinator of *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, and Professor Emeritus of History and Sociology at Binghamton University. His books include *China in Revolution: The Yanan Way Revisited*, *The Political Economy of Chinese Development*, *Chinese Village, Socialist State* (with Edward Friedman and Paul Pickowicz), *Chinese Society: Change, Conflict and Resistance* (with Elizabeth Perry), *The Resurgence of East Asia: 500, 150 and 50 Year Perspectives* (with Giovanni Arrighi and Takeshi Hamashita). He is the editor of two book series.

Benjamin SELWYN is Senior Lecturer in International Relations and Development Studies in the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex, UK. He is the author of *The Global Development Crisis* (2014), and *Workers, State and Development in Brazil: Powers of Labour, Chains of Value* (2012) and has published articles in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, *Open Democracy*, and *Global Labour Column*. He sits on the editorial board of *Development Studies Research: An Open Access Journal* and on the international advisory board of the *Journal of Agrarian Change*.

Mehmet Gürsan ŞENALP holds a PhD in economics from Gazi University. He works in the field of international political economy with a focus on transnational economic and political relations, social class formations and struggles. Along with a book in Turkish titled *Transnational Capitalist Class Formation in Turkey: The Koç Holding Case* (2012), he has published articles in academic, political and literary journals on the transnationalization of capitalism and capitalist classes, global governance, institutional economics and the political economy of Turkey. He is currently working as an assistant professor in the Department of Economics at Atılım University, Ankara.

Örsan ŞENALP is a transnational social justice and labour activist, political economist and Internet specialist. Previously he worked as a trade union expert and took an active role in international trade union–NGO alliances as part of both the global water justice movement and European convergence processes like the Joint Social Conference, Alter-Summit, and Firenze 10+10. Since 2010 he has been managing a Social Network Unionism blog project and actively took part in the 15M, Occupy and Gezi uprisings. In May 2013, he organized the Networked Labour seminar in Amsterdam and since then he has coordinated the networkedlabour.net website and social network.

Werner SEPPMANN studied social science and philosophy and worked for many years with Leo Kofler. His recent book publications include *Subjekt und System: Der lange Schatten des Objektivismus* (2011); *Die Verleugnete Klasse: Zur Arbeiterklasse heute* (2011); *Dialektik der Entzivilisierung: Krise, Irrationalismus und Gewalt* (2012); *Marxismus und Philosophie* (2012); *Ästhetik der Unterwerfung: Das Beispiel Documenta* (editor, 2013); *Kapitalismuskritik und Sozialismuskonzeption: In welcher Gesellschaft leben wir?* (2013); *Marx Kontrovers: Aktuelle Tendenzen der Marxismus-Diskussion* (editor, 2014), and (with Erich Hahn und Thomas Metscher) *Marxismus und Ideologie* (2014). Dr Seppmann is currently president of the Marx-Engels-Stiftung, Wuppertal, where he directs the *Klassenanalyse@BRD* project.

Beverly J. SILVER is Professor of Sociology and Director of the Arrighi Center for Global Studies at the Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, USA). She has written widely on the historical dynamics of global capitalism. Her best known book, *Forces of Labor: Workers' Movements and Globalization since 1870*, has been translated into eleven languages and won several major awards including the Distinguished Publication Award of the American Sociological Association. She worked closely with the late Giovanni Arrighi, co-authoring numerous publications including *Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System*, 'Workers North and South' and 'The end of the long twentieth century'.

Kendra STRAUSS is a feminist economic and labour geographer and Assistant Professor of Labour Studies at Simon Fraser University. Her research interests include labour market change, pension reform, and new and evolving forms of unfreedom in contemporary labour markets. Prior to returning to Canada, she was an Urban Studies Postdoctoral Research Associate at the University of Glasgow, and University Lecturer in the Department of Geography at the University of Cambridge. Dr Strauss has published in the fields of geography, labour law and labour studies; her books include *Saving for Retirement* with Gordon L. Clark and Janelle Knox-Hayes (2012) and *Temporary Work, Agencies and Unfree Labour* (co-edited with Judy Fudge, 2014).

Kees VAN DER PIJL is Professor Emeritus in the School of Global Studies and Fellow of the Centre for Global Political Economy, University of Sussex. He studied law and political science in Leiden and taught International Relations at the University of Amsterdam where he also obtained his doctorate in 1983. His publications include *The Making of an Atlantic Ruling Class* (1984, new edn 2012), *Transnational Classes and International Relations* (1998), *Global Rivalries from the Cold War to Iraq*

(2006) and a trilogy, *Modes of Foreign Relations and Political Economy* (vol. I, *Nomads, Empires, States*, 2007, Deutscher Memorial Prize 2008; II, *The Foreign Encounter in Myth and Religion*, 2010, and III, *The Discipline of Western Supremacy*, 2014). Upon his return to the Netherlands in 2012 he was elected president of the Dutch Anti-Fascist Resistance, an offshoot of the wartime Communist underground and a member organization of the European *Fédération Internationale des Résistants*.

Markus WISSEN is Professor of Social Sciences at the Department of Business and Economics of the Berlin School of Economics and Law. He works on society–nature relations and the socio-ecological transformation of production and consumption patterns. Besides books and book chapters he has published articles in *Review of International Political Economy*, *Globalizations*, *Austrian Journal of Political Science*, *PROKLA* and other journals. In 2011 he and Ulrich Brand edited a special issue of *Antipode. A Radical Journal of Geography* on the internationalization of the state.

Joscha WULLWEBER is Assistant Professor in the Political Science Department, University of Kassel. He holds a PhD in political science, an MA in global political economy and an MSc in biology. His research interests concentrate on theories of IPE and IR; the global political economy of finance, critical security studies, and politics of R&D, technology and innovation. His recent publications include *Post-Positivist Political Theory*, in Michael T. Gibbons, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Political Thought* (2014); and ‘Global politics and empty signifiers: The political construction of high-technology’, *Critical Policy Studies* (2014).

Acknowledgements

In the composition of this collection I profited from the assistance of many colleagues, none more so than Magnus Ryner of King's College London, whose wise judgement helped me focus the project and draw up a first line-up of possible chapter titles and contributors. We would have edited this volume together had not his many current commitments been in the way.

Others who helped getting the project on the rails, identified potential authors, and/or made important suggestions include Alexander Kovriga, Jan Nederveen Pieterse, Marcel van der Linden, Christoph Scherrer, Masao Watanabe, Peter Waterman and Frido Wenten. Of the contributors, Ulrich Brand and Jeroen Merk played crucial roles in helping to get others on board.

All contributions have either been specially written for this collection or reworked from previous papers. An earlier version of Beverly Silver's chapter was presented at the International Conference of Labour and Social History, Linz, Austria, 11–14 September 2003 (Unfried et al., 2004). Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin's contribution draws on various chapters of their recent book *The Making of Global Capitalism* (Panitch and Gindin, 2012). Jean-Christophe Graz's contribution takes further the argument in his chapter in a collection by Joerges and Falke (Graz, 2011). Davide Bradanini's chapter includes material from an article in *Global Labour Journal* (Bradanini, 2014). Jeffrey Harrod's chapter contains material from his contribution to a volume edited by Ryner and Davies (Harrod, 2007). Matthew Paterson's chapter includes a section from his *Understanding Global Environmental Politics* (Paterson, 2000), with licence granted by Palgrave Macmillan. Sylvia Kay's chapter includes sections from a working paper published by the Transnational Institute (Kay, 2012).

One topic I wanted to include in the collection is the production of waste, one of the most striking consequences of how linear production violates the circularities of nature. Barbara Harriss-White and Sarah Hodges, whose commitments prevented them from contributing themselves, helped me in the search for a contributor but in the end the search was fruitless in spite of their assistance.

Finally I want to thank the series editors, Benjamin Cohen and Matthew Watson, for the confidence expressed in the invitation to edit this

Acknowledgements xxi

collection, and the publishers, Edward Elgar, for their support throughout the undertaking, and Yvonne Smith for the careful copy-editing.

Kees van der Pijl
Amsterdam, 3 October 2014



Introduction: the world of production and political economy

Kees van der Pijl

This volume provides a comprehensive overview of research, key concepts and debates on the international political economy (IPE) of production. It adopts an expansive approach to the topic, encompassing research that would not immediately be recognized by conventional definitions of the research area. Only thus can it cover key aspects of production as the transformation and exploitation of nature, the most fundamental and universal of human practices. This understanding of production necessarily includes the exploitation of the natural substratum of humanity itself. Marx formulated what remains the *locus classicus* of this when he characterizes the process of production in *Capital*, volume I, as

a process between man [*Mensch*] and nature, a process in which man mediates, regulates and controls his metabolism with nature by his own action. He confronts the substance of nature [*Naturstoff*] as one of its own forces, setting in motion arms and legs, head and hands, the natural forces of his body, in order to appropriate what nature yields in a form useful for his own life. Whilst influencing and changing external nature in this movement, he simultaneously changes his own (*MEW* 23: 192).

Now if production is a ‘unifying characteristic’ of historical human existence (Harrod 1997: 108–9), the question arises why this is not evident in the social sciences today. In this introductory chapter I answer this question, first, by looking at the key mutations in the combination of mental and manual work, with special reference to the concept of the socialization of labour. Secondly, I briefly investigate how social science originated in the quest for controlling the labour process and the working class. Yet labour paradoxically disappeared again as a unifying concern once the disciplinary organization of the social sciences took shape in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. I then address the issue that runs through the first two parts of the collection, the geographical and social bifurcation between mental and manual labour and the possibility of their coming together again. Finally, I briefly discuss those aspects of the anchorage of production in reproduction and nature that are not covered in detail in Part III.

MENTAL AND MANUAL WORK

From a broad historical perspective, labour, or production, which we today recognize as a general category, began as the ability to make and use tools. This then guided the further evolution of the human mind and body, as captured in Marx's definition above. In all pre-modern societies, the actual process of (manual) work was separated from activities usually considered worthier, such as magical-religious tasks and contemplative activities, in other words, 'mental work'. Hence in most societies labour was associated with low social status, if not actually assigned to slaves. Manual work was further divided in the most elementary menial tasks like cleaning and food preparation, often the preserve of women; and skilled work that made it worthwhile to try and control access to its legitimate performance, as by the medieval guilds. These passed on the specific skills of their craft through a closed system of apprenticeships. One of the achievements of the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and D'Alembert, eventually codified by the French Revolution, was the divulgence of the secrets of the guilds.

Science early on developed separately from work. Like art, its magical and religious connotations kept it in the domain of contemplation as an activity for those not forced to work. Like mathematics for the natural world, systematic philosophy followed in the footsteps of art and religion in transcending the 'meso-cosmos' that our minds have organically developed in – thus exploring the macro- and micro-worlds that lie beyond our direct experience (Vollmer 2013: 147–50). In the Italian Renaissance an important step in applying such abstract projections back into the sphere of actual production happened when the builder of the dome of the cathedral of Florence, Brunelleschi, sought the advice of the city's leading mathematician, Toscanelli, to help him with problems his craft had no solution for (Sohn-Rethel 1970: 123). Galileo a century later took a step further into the macro-cosmos when he built his own telescope to verify Copernicus' hypothesis that the earth circles round the sun, widening the sphere of fruitful application of pure thought in doing so. But he also combined mental with manual work in a way that reversed the inherited hierarchy between the two (Meeus 1989: 48).

The genius of Galileo and contemporaries like Leonardo da Vinci was long interpreted in terms of 'universal humanity' (the late-nineteenth-century ideal of the *Übermensch* formulated out of unease over advancing mass society by Burkhardt and Nietzsche, cf. Deppe 1997: 11–13). However, universal humanity actually took a much less glorious road in achieving its miracles. Beginning in response to opportunities for wool exports to the Flanders manufactures, the enclosures of common lands in late-medieval England produced the mass of wage-dependent labourers

on which the emerging capitalist mode of production relied, as it still does today. The Humanist, Thomas More, in his *Utopia* famously characterized the early process as ‘sheep eating men’. English craft workers soon found themselves outpriced by the human surplus expelled from the villages and employed as unskilled day labourers. The craftsmen’s defeat in the struggles against machine production and the backlash against the French Revolution in England eventually led to what E.P. Thompson calls ‘a long counter-revolution’, covering the twenty-five years after 1795 (Thompson 1968: 888). In the early nineteenth century, English wages were pushed so low as to make hunger the main regulator of the labour market. As Karl Polanyi infers (1957: 117), ‘From the utilitarian point of view the task of the government was to increase want in order to make the physical sanction of hunger effective’. It entailed the degradation of humanity on which the Industrial Revolution was premised, a fate worse than slavery (see McGrath and Strauss, this volume, for these distinctions).

Capitalist industry produced miracles compared to which the boldest technical designs of Leonardo remain child’s play – on one condition: that the mass of humanity brought under the command of capital can be operated as a single force. This control passed a critical threshold in the closing decades of the nineteenth century with the so-called second industrial revolution. Capitalists involved in the new, integrated iron and steel, heavy chemicals, shipbuilding and other large engineering industries looked to ways of raising labour productivity by intensifying work whilst keeping a close watch on how life evolved in working class neighbourhoods.

This quest was most acute in the United States and Germany, which did not enjoy the advantage of income from large colonial empires as did Britain and France. Scientific management, associated with Frederick W. Taylor’s time-measurement experiments in the United States in the 1880s, devised a system of breaking down the worker’s job into separate movements which could be streamlined into a more fluid, ergonomic series and paid by piece-rates – assuming the worker’s core motivation was for higher pay. ‘Taylor was guided by the concept of energy, a nodal point in the positivism and bourgeois culture around the turn of the century,’ Vahrenkamp writes (1976: 15), ‘and this guided his attempt to find out “how many metric kilos a worker can possibly achieve in one day at the lowest cost”.’ Or in Gramsci’s words,

Taylor is in fact expressing with brutal cynicism the purpose of American society—developing in the worker to the highest degree automatic and mechanical attitudes, breaking up the old psycho-physical nexus of qualified professional work, which demands a certain active participation of intelligence, fantasy and initiative on the part of the worker, and reducing productive operations exclusively to the mechanical, physical aspect (Gramsci 1971: 302).

Today, as documented in this collection, a differentiation has evolved in the context of the global political economy between locations where this process is still in full swing, such as in Asia, and a concentration of control functions in the metropolises, or heartland, of the capitalist world economy. Here too a measure of ‘intelligence, fantasy and initiative’ has also been allowed back into the labour processes immediately adjacent to ‘tertiary’ activities concentrated there. In addition, to varying degrees and again with huge regional disparities, the evolution of labour processes continues to require ‘initiatives [that] have the purpose of preserving, outside of work, a certain psycho-physical equilibrium which prevents the physiological collapse of the worker, exhausted by the new method of production’ (Gramsci 1971: 303).

Mental and manual labour thus are connected into a complex but ultimately single grid again. The process is captured by the notion of *socialization of labour* (more accurately, ‘societization’); in the German original, *Vergesellschaftung*. Socialization of labour refers to the separation of tasks (mental/manual, and further sub-divisions) *and* their reconfiguration into a composite social labour process. Without the latter aspect, we are only looking at division of labour per se; with the control element added, there is actual socialization, the creation of mutual dependence and complementarity into a social bond, a *Gesellschaft*. In the Marxist tradition, the concept was anchored in the progress of production, and linked to the prospect of social transformation (e.g. Marx in *Capital*, I, *MEW* 23: 790, or Marx 1973: 832). The compensatory aspect of preserving an equilibrium outside of work that Gramsci refers to, on the other hand was theorized by Max Weber as *Vergemeinschaftung*, ‘communitization’. Weber sees it as a factor compounding every rational process of socialization with emotional, affective bonding (Weber 1976: 21).

The mechanization of the labour process, applying science to the sphere of production, is an instance of mental and manual labour coming together in a specific format favourable to controlling the workers. ‘Machinery is not neutral because the machine incorporates the dexterity and the skill of the individual worker who is henceforth deprived of [it] and subordinated. . . to the machine’, writes Palloix (1976: 53); ‘the separation of the mental from the manual part of work is materialised in the machines themselves’. The transformation of *homo faber* into *homo fabricatus*, by which Jürgen Habermas denotes the reversal of the relation between the producer and the tools into which the skills have been objectified (Habermas 1971: 82), hence is never a merely technical process, a matter of a subject-less artificial intelligence as in Stanley Kubrick’s masterpiece, *2001: A Space Odyssey* (when the computer, HAL, takes over the space mission after discovering that the two pilots doubt its judgement).

Socialization of labour, both by dividing tasks between living labourers and by mechanizing their jobs through the objectification of skills into machines or work organization, always remains a social relation, premised on authority guiding the ‘collective worker’. In capitalism, this guidance is provided by the discipline of capital over society and nature, which is passed on to each separate unit of functioning property by competition, both in the sphere of production and of reproduction. I have elsewhere (Van der Pijl 1998: chapter 5) argued that this comprehensive process of socialization engenders a social stratum, or cadre, of functionaries entrusted with planning and supervisory roles in both spheres.

This takes us to our second theme in this introduction, the connections between the changes in the labour process and the growth of the social sciences including IPE.

LABOUR DISCIPLINE AND DISCIPLINARY SOCIAL SCIENCE

Disciplinary social science has its origins in the surveillance of populations: to monitor public health, keep a check on working conditions, or for other reasons. In the course of the nineteenth century this surveillance specifically came to focus on industrial workers, both on the shop floors of large-scale heavy industry and in the working class residential areas of the big cities. The original surveillance infrastructure of populations emerged in response to the French Revolution. The Anglo-Irish parliamentarian and writer, Edmund Burke, warned in his *Reflections of 1790* (1934: 23, emphasis added) that ‘a state without the means of *some change* is without the means of its conservation’, and from 1815 onwards biannual reports to Parliament on the lower classes in England provided the information to make the necessary adjustments. This practice soon spread to the United States, notably in the state of Massachusetts (Derber 1967: 21).

In the English-speaking countries religion was initially seen as the best means of regimenting the workers outside of the factory. In Andrew Ure’s *Philosophy of Manufactures* of 1835, Thompson writes (1968: 395), ‘we find a complete anticipation of the . . . case for the function of religion as a work-discipline’. Ure saw in religious discipline a ‘moral machinery’, as important to the factory owner as his mechanical machinery. His fellow Utilitarian, Jeremy Bentham, by that time was beginning to think of alternatives to religion, which proved less and less effective in this respect. Bentham’s calculus of pleasure and pain offers a different method of control of worker behaviour. Hence Foucault’s claim (2004: 76) that ‘the

utilitarian philosophy has been the theoretical instrument which has supported the novelty of that period, the government of populations’.

The theory of the self-regulating market from the utilitarian perspective functioned as ‘a mechanism of rewards and punishments that would ensure effective order in social relations’ (Gammon 2008: 273), but the labour theory of value at its heart was becoming a potential liability. From Grotius and Locke to Smith and Ricardo this theory had served to legitimate property obtained through work (rather than by hereditary title). But what if the industrial workers would seize upon it as *their title* to a decent life? Hence from John Stuart Mill onwards, conceptions of political economy were being floated which played with the idea that wealth did not result from work, but from entrepreneurial initiative, or from property *per se*.

In the 1870s W. Stanley Jevons generalized this perspective into a different value theory altogether when he declared utility (‘marginal’, i.e., measured by the last unit added) as the source of value. After taking up the chair in Political Economy at the University of London in 1876, Jevons elaborated the axiom of self-interest into a deductive system. He also re-baptized the field ‘economics’, since ‘erroneous and practically mischievous’ ideas about political economy were circulating and were ‘becoming popular among the lower orders’ (quoted in Meek 1972: 88n, 90n). Thus labour was removed from the codex of understanding the economy at the same time that the field of ‘political economy’ was narrowed down to a psychology of choice modelled on entrepreneurial decisions – whether or not and where to invest (and ‘give work’), what to produce, and so on; and the same for investor decisions and also, consumer decisions. Everybody thus is made into the equivalent of an entrepreneur, the human ideal of bourgeois economics.

In the Restoration on the European continent, the focus on social control inspired the separation of another branch of social science, sociology. In France, Auguste Comte and Émile Durkheim, and in Germany, the *Kathedersozialisten* (‘socialists of the lectern’) of whom Max Weber was the most renowned exponent, reflected on how the world of work might be disciplined through more or less subtle forms of class compromise. This made sociology into what Therborn calls (1976: 225), ‘an investigative instead of a dogmatic guardian of the ideological community’. Thus after economics, a British field *par excellence*, a second field branched off from general political economy: sociology; although in Germany, it remained part of the *Staatswissenschaften* identified by Immanuel Wallerstein (2001: 192) as a ‘current of resistance’ to Anglophone liberalism.

In the United States the coming of monopoly capitalism with its scientific management of socialized labour, also resonated in the social

sciences. When Taylor was called before a Special Committee of the US House of Representatives in January 1912, he explained his methods as ‘a complete mental revolution’ both for the working man and for ‘those on the management’s side – the foreman, the superintendent, the owner of the business, the boards of directors’. ‘Without this complete mental revolution on both sides scientific management does not exist’ (Taylor 1947: 27). Such a revolution would of course not leave the structures of higher education outside its purview. This did not so much take the form of a research focus on work, but of a Taylorization of intellectual labour itself through the academic disciplines as we know them today.

It is often forgotten that, as Andrew Abbott reminds us (2001: 123), ‘the departmental structure appeared only in American universities’ and was adopted elsewhere only much later. Indeed from the 1880s on, higher education in the United States was subjected to repressive control as businessmen began to replace clergymen on university boards. A series of spectacular dismissals and academic freedom cases led to a situation in which ‘academic men in the social sciences found themselves under pressure to trim their sails ideologically’ (Hofstadter 1955: 155). In addition, Henry S. Pritchett, president of MIT, a railway director and president of the influential Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in 1909 commissioned Taylor to produce a blueprint for the scientific management of US universities. The report, by an associate of Taylor’s, advised that the ‘guild structure’ of academic life be broken up and a labour market created for academics, with competition fostering ‘greater research and teaching specialization by faculty as a condition for promoting more intensive mass production’ (Barrow 1990: 71–3). Intimidated by attacks on socialist or otherwise socially concerned scholars, the disciplines, organized in national associations to watch over the definition of their fields and control access to expert knowledge, retreated into their own domains, ‘shattered and torn from any holistic underpinning’ (Harrod 1997: 108).

Intellectually, Taylorism was translated into a positivist social science methodology that took its cue from the functional psychology of William James and his fellow Pragmatists, and from the animal experiments of the Russian, I.P. Pavlov. This behavioural perspective no longer assumed a substantive consciousness but focused on controlling reflexes and responses to stimuli (O’Neill 1968: 133). In actual labour studies it was soon to be contested by the Harvard psychologist, Elton Mayo, who became the founder of the ‘human relations’ school of industrial psychology on the basis of his experiments at the AT&T telephone plant in Hawthorne, Illinois. These experiments brought out that team spirit, not economic or ergonomic stimuli, was the most important factor in raising

productivity (Whyte 1963: 37). ‘The battle between the Taylorist and the Human Relations schools,’ Jeffrey Harrod writes, ‘essentially that between two schools of thought on how to enhance labour productivity’, would permeate all the social sciences including international studies. Actual labour studies also remained a separate discipline, a branch of sociology. Up to the early 1970s, this ‘had the potential for, and was moving in the direction of, *connecting workplace to world order*’ (Harrod 1997: 110, 112, emphasis added; Harrod, this volume).

However, if positivist Behaviouralism and interpretive approaches such as Constructivism today resonate across academia, this is no longer explicitly connected to the world of work. Economics has moved away from the world of production from the time of the Marginalist revolution; the discipline concerned with world order, International Relations (IR), had no interest in economics. Codified in the slipstream of Woodrow Wilson’s intervention in Europe at the close of World War I, (political) IR specifically served to sideline the remaining bastion of historical materialist critique, the theory of imperialism. With it, ‘IPE’ disappeared from the academic radar screen.

One effect of the crisis of the Cold War order from the late 1960s to the mid-1970s, was the shaking up of the different branches of academic orthodoxy. Economic wisdom was being challenged by the monetary crisis and stagflation in the capitalist West; the oil price hike, Vietnam and other neo-colonial wars upset the balance of forces between the West and the dominated periphery. Comparable shocks in the state-socialist world, from the Czechoslovak experiment with democratizing and/or liberalizing socialism to the Chinese cultural revolution, highlight that this was a transformation not just of the world order, but of the deeper productive and reproductive structures of society on a world scale.

The student and worker revolts of the period also entailed a resurgence of Marxist ideas, both within and outside academia. Within the mainstream, business economists like Raymond Vernon addressed the challenge to national state sovereignty posed by transnational corporations (TNCs) (Vernon 1973). This in turn generated a debate as to whether TNCs made the realist analytical model of IR (in which states alone are seen to be the essential actors) implausible, and whether the international system should not be understood in more ‘pluralist’ terms (Gilpin 1975). Relative outsiders like former financial journalist Susan Strange, then teaching at LSE, also called for the emancipation of IR from the realist frame of reference. The states of the West in Strange’s view (1972: 192) constitute an ‘alliance of the affluent’ waging a ‘class struggle’ against the Third World, only to find themselves locked in a simultaneous struggle with ‘an invisible adversary, the unruly market economy which somehow

they must subdue if they are not to risk social and political disruption'. In addition, this period saw the first, often dramatic calls for rethinking the human impact on the Earth's biosphere, such as the *Limits to Growth* report (Meadows et al. 1972).

International Political Economy (IPE) by then had established itself as a subfield within IR. Its boundaries, as Katzenstein et al. write (1998: 645), 'have been set less by subject matter than by theoretical perspectives'; in other words, IPE presumes an acceptance of different philosophical frameworks. Yet work and production were still largely absent from this opening; in the first major attempt to absorb and contain the intellectual disarray within the IR discipline, the Harvard conference on transnational relations convened in 1970 by Robert O. Keohane and Joseph Nye (Keohane and Nye 1973: xi), the labour movement was only one 'case'. The Roman Catholic church, revolutionary movements, the Ford Foundation, and of course the TNC in its relation to the state system, were the others, all in an obvious effort, perhaps more by habit than intentionally, to generalize the phenomenon (of transnational relations) away from its most contentious forms.

Certainly the rediscovery of Gramsci's notes on Fordism and the work of writers like Robert Cox (the author of the labour paper in the Keohane and Nye collection) taking this forward into the realm of a revitalized IPE, has brought back production as an area of study, connected to the study of world order (Cox 1987; Gill 1993). Actual labour relations studies, now conceived as 'human resource management' and once again unrelated to the structure of the global political economy, on the other hand have been shifted into the domain of business schools in the context of the neoliberalism that took hold in the 1980s. Yet today as never before, the connection between work as the transformation of nature and the structures of power in the world, requires urgent examination.

TWO TRENDS IN GLOBAL PRODUCTION AND THE OUTLOOK OF LABOUR

The socialization of labour in the early twenty-first century covers the entire globe; the product or commodity chains approach is one way of capturing the process theoretically (Gereffi and Korzeniewicz 1994; Selwyn, this volume). This is not a straightforward 'globalization', but a transnational process in which productive capital is necessarily nested in different 'human resource complexes' (Harvey 2006: 399). Such complexes are held together by cumulative class compromises cemented by religion and education, and hence are difficult to change. States, among other

things, serve to demarcate one or more human resource complex(es) and through their trade and currency policies regulate their links with others; capital in turn seeks to exploit cost and regulation differentials between state jurisdictions. After several failed attempts to place TNCs under a system of controls (nationally, regionally or via various proposals to create a New International Economic Order under the United Nations), capital has recaptured the high ground. The NAFTA and EU common markets, to be merged in a projected and still contested Transatlantic Trade and Investment Pact (Bizzari and Burton 2013), are testimony to this.

The process of socialization of labour is thus modulated by human resource complexes fixated both in state territorialities (and in offshore enclaves through which host states commercialize their sovereignty, Palan 2003), and transnationally, across the world economy as a whole. As Charles Bettelheim puts it, the socialization of labour as a result evolves ‘through a structure of specific complexity, embracing the structure of each social formation and the world structure of the totality of social formations’ (Appendix I in Emmanuel 1972: 295, emphasis deleted). Or in Harvey’s words, ‘peoples possessed of the utmost diversity of historical experience, living in an incredible variety of physical circumstances, have been welded, . . . often through the exercise of ruthless brute force, into a complex unity under the international division of labour’ (Harvey 2006: 373; cf. 404 and Milios and Sotiropoulos 2009).

Capital exploits this transnational structure by combining activities parcelled out across different human resource complexes, and different circuits of capital (money and productive capital in particular) into historically specific structures of socialization. Thus the ‘working relationship’ between the United States and China combines production for export in China with a flow of funds that keeps the United States, which consumes much more than it can actually pay for itself, afloat – paradoxically allowing it to lay siege on China militarily, a process that must sooner or later force the Chinese leadership to reconsider its political and economic strategy. This it can do as long as it keeps in place the state prerogative that limits the free circulation of capital (Arrighi 2007; Fingleton 2008).

Whilst high-quality manual labour in sectors associated with the most advanced production technology remains ensconced in the West, the most prominent component of the workforce in this part of the world is the cadre (managers, engineers, professionals). They are directing labour processes *across* the ‘structures of specific complexity’: both the metropolitan structures of socialization and the product/commodity chains connecting distant manufacturing with developed markets. This has resulted in a world map of productive and other paid work that shows a functional differentiation between cadre functions and circulation activities (clerical,

Table I.1 *Cadre, productive workers and workers in circulation activities in the economically active population, selected countries, 2008*

	United States	Germany	France	Japan	Mexico	Indonesia
Total in thousands	154 287	41 875	27 983.5	63 850	43 866.7	102 552.8
Cadre*	35.1%	38.7%	37.8%	17.5%	18.4%	7.4%
Productive workers**	23.0%	21.9%	22.0%	35.1%	37.0%	52.8%
Circulation workers***	41.3%	22.1%	22.6%	46.2%	25.4%	21.7%

Notes:

Not counted: elementary occupations, unclassifiable, army, unemployed.

Definitions (not identical in different national statistics): * managers, professionals, technicians; ** agricultural, craft, industrial workers; *** clerical, sales & service workers.

Source: Calculated from ILO *Laborsta*. Economically active population, by occupation and status in employment.

sales, etc.) concentrated in the West as mental labour; whereas productive activity as manual labour has a much greater weight in Asia and Latin America, both developed and underdeveloped. Table I.1 illustrates this for selected countries (China is not included in the ILO data from which the table was compiled).

Of course the share of agriculture in a country like Indonesia is much larger and productivity levels are much lower. But the point is that the people *producing* things are relatively more numerous outside the West, with Japan already showing a quite different structure of the workforce (more comparable to Mexico than to the US and EU). Production is therefore integrated on a world scale, but because of the different jurisdictions across which it extends, it is both global and local, a condition sometimes labelled 'glocalization' (Ruigrok and Van Tulder 1995). The chapters in Part I of our collection, 'Restructuring the global political economy', document in depth the driving forces of this process and the different forms it takes, not just at the lower-end extremes of the product chains spanning the globe, but also in the service sector.

As a result of the ability of capital to diversify across the global structures of socialized labour, production in the core economies has tended to abandon the integrated assembly lines of Fordist mass production favourable to labour. Sometimes these have been replaced by 'craft communities' organized around regional nodes and with a particular ethnic identity

(Piore and Sabel 1984: 265–6). The development of quality circles in large production complexes likewise has worked to parcel out the structures of socialized labour into separate entities again (Hoogvelt and Yuasa 1994; Ihara, this volume). The deepening of the impoverishment of many Third World and former Soviet bloc societies in addition has set in motion what Saskia Sassen calls ‘a new phase of global migration and people trafficking’, processes which ‘used to be national or regional and today operate on global scales’ (Sassen 2010: 32–3, and this volume; Delgado Wise and Martin, this volume). However, the evacuation of the traditional large-scale factory, premised on historic defeats of the labour movements in the West and Japan (documented in Part II), also poses new challenges to capital. One consists of the possibility that the global socialization of labour may give rise to what Jeroen Merk calls the emergence of the collective worker in the product chain (Merk 2004, and this volume). This is a reference to Marx’s notion of a socialized workforce, ‘whose combined activity expresses itself materially and directly in a comprehensive product’ (Marx 1971: 226, emphasis deleted).

From the above it would seem that as far as production is concerned, the most urgent issue that will decide whether the destructive exploitation of society and nature by capital will be halted by something resembling such a collective worker, resides in combining the advancing labour movement in the periphery with the post-capitalist impulses animating the cadre in the West and Japan. Didn’t Marx theorize how the forces immanent in capitalist socialization were laying the foundations of what he called, in *Capital* vol. III, the ‘associated mode of production’ (*MEW* 25: 485–6), along these lines? On the one hand, he argues there, governments will find themselves compelled to take control of the financial world, which by its increasingly fraudulent operations jeopardizes ongoing production; on the other, the ‘collective worker’ is seen to become a reality also in the consciousness of the producers as the socialization of labour within and between units of production demands a rational, planned structure liberated from the competitive hunt for profit. Thus in the garment-exporting countries in South-East and South Asia and Central America, complex forms of struggle take place in which workers, with the support of Western-based NGOs such as the Clean Clothes Campaign, have secured alliances with consumers and enlightened management of the branded companies organizing the chains (Merk 2009: 606). In this way at least a section of the cadre in the West have acted to mitigate excessive exploitation across the product chain, suggesting possibilities to turn the ‘collective worker’ into a conscious social agent.

So on the one hand, we have ‘traditional strategies of labour to protect itself against exploitation, turning the global supply chain into a barrier

both for organizing and collective bargaining' (Merk 2009: 605–6). Contemporary labour struggles in China (Chan, Pun and Selden, and Jang and Gray, this volume) thus feed into wider strategies, of which the Asian Floor Wage campaign documented in the chapter by Anannya Bhattacharjee and Ashim Roy, would be an example. This trend of an increase in worker militancy and social conflict, which as Beverly Silver argues in her chapter, historically accompanies the world market movement of capital, is one component of the current evolution of class struggles on a world scale.

There is a second trend, concentrated much more, but not exclusively, in the metropolitan centres of the capitalist heartland. This concerns the possibilities created by new technologies. Not only do new technologies facilitate the operation of global product/commodity chains as integral, planned processes, but they also enable new forms of production which may altogether transcend the commodity form on which market transactions and private appropriation are premised. Just as information technology suspends the separation of publishers and readers characteristic of print media, it works to destabilize the 'ownership of the means of production' once 'information' is no longer held exclusively by capital as a knowledge monopoly, but will tend to be shared with employees (Boccaro 2008: 127, cf. 118).

The potentially greater autonomy of qualified professionals performing control functions as a managerial–technical cadre, has been responded to by 'knowledge management'. In this way capital seeks to re-establish discipline on mental labour by the 'identification, codification and application' of knowledge, in a 'quest to harness, monopolize and systematize' knowledge circulating and accumulating in a company (Chumer et al. 2000: xvi). Permanent auditing and self-assessment, as well as access to all communications including employees' emails, becomes mandatory to realize this (McInerney and LeFevre 2000: 15, cf. 11). Ultimately the aim is to gain hold of the socialized knowledge of these professionals so that it can be applied by less qualified personnel; for example doctors' diagnoses by nurses, professors' teaching by junior assistants, and so on. But even where the socialization of specialized knowledge into standardized packages (owned by the employer, like a Microsoft programme) succeeds, a complementary process is needed to keep knowledge workers under a market discipline. Regulatory standardization, as documented by Jean-Christophe Graz in Chapter 8, is one strategy; another is self-employment.

Self-employment has emerged as a major route towards creating market dependency but it also has brought to light profound contradictions. For unlike traditional factory workers, who are completely dispossessed of any means to make a living on their own, and whose labour therefore comes

under the heading of what Marx calls *real subsumption to capital*, self-employed knowledge workers operate at arm's length from this discipline, under the regime of 'formal subsumption', which is inherently incomplete and unstable (Marx 1971: 197–8). Indeed whilst the fluidity of capital movements in money form and its derivatives evokes the postmodern concept of a universally mobile, all-sided functional human being who has cut him/herself off entirely from any inner constraints in order to be able to exploit any market chance (Harvey 1990), for the self-employed professional (maybe for all professional cadres), the question arises as to why this universality should remain only at the disposal of capital and the market.

From this inner tension, Oskar Negt deduces (1997: 16) that we are actually living in the twilight zone between two economies. One is the seemingly immutable rule of capital, under which living labour power must be manipulated into serving the needs of the system; the other instead evokes a 'second economy', the contours of which become visible as the irrationality of the system becomes ever-more apparent in financial swindle and in human misery, war and ecological degradation. In this second economy, necessary labour is enlarged by forms of activity that realize our humanity more profoundly, rewarding social-ecological responsibility and creativity (Negt 1997: 29). This points to a fundamental departure which at this stage can only be discussed in terms of potential and promise. In our collection this is covered by Yury Gromyko in the concluding chapter of Part I and Alan Freeman's in Part II. The Appendix to Part II by Mehmet Gürsan Şenalp and Örsan Şenalp serves to document the growing cohorts of those qualified knowledge workers left behind by the crisis who have been drawn into activist networks.

PRODUCTION, REPRODUCTION, NATURE

The self-employed, qualified worker-turned-liberated subject that Negt sees emerging as market constraints weaken, meanwhile remains captive of a political economy in which the escape hatches are still largely shut. Often the market discipline of capital has already taken hold of the human subject, mentally and bodily. The 'quantified self' analysed by Phoebe Moore in this volume denotes a subject submitting to a regulation that is formally at arm's length, but which has internalized the rule of the market entirely in practice. Thus the exploited become administrators of their own exploitation, apparently oblivious of their ability to resist it. Indeed because of its confusingly flexible imposition of discipline, 'the new capitalism,' writes Richard Sennett, 'is an often illegible regime of power' (Sennett

1998: 10). This regime reaches deep into the personality, where it removes attitudes of dependency by substituting a precarious freedom. Yet

[t]he social bond arises most elementally from a sense of mutual dependence. All the shibboleths of the new order treat dependence as a shameful condition: the attack on rigid bureaucratic hierarchy is meant to free people structurally from dependence; risk-taking is meant to stimulate self-assertion rather than submission to what is given (Ibid.: 139).

In the process the underlying mental–physical bonds are jeopardized and along with it, the integrity of the individual personality. For the process of socialization is a constitutive factor of one’s ability to function in society. Whilst on the one hand, the extreme individualization and commodification of the self (as in sex work, cf. Chin, this volume) suspends honour and familial obligation, on the other it induces a general lowering of the level of civilization. For the ‘de-socialized’, affectively impoverished human subject, the neoliberal codex of behaviour ultimately leaves only two attitudes towards others: instrumentalization or elimination. Anomic, aggressive and destructive actions as a result become more widespread as the ‘tension between a reduced capacity to act socially and the need for an active participation in social life’ intensifies (Seppmann 2013c: 74, and this volume).

The exploitation of the human, social substratum by capital has all along been complemented by the exploitation of the soil. If we think of Marx’s definition of human labour as anchored in the metabolism with nature cited earlier, exploitation occurs once the reproductive capacity of the medium with which metabolism takes place, becomes strained by the unsustainable degree of appropriation from it. In this sense the human/social substratum and the remaining natural world are not different. Marx, who studied the contemporary advances in agricultural chemistry of Justus Liebig and others, actually developed a theory of *metabolic rift* to make sense of the exploitation of the soil. This refers to the removal, along with the products of the land, of the soil’s nutrients, leaving it bare and in need of artificial fertilizer, whilst in the cities, waste accumulates without regenerative, productive application. A socialist society would have to overcome this fatal separation of urban life without nature, and an impoverished, denuded hinterland from which food is to be procured nevertheless. Instead of the a-social existence under neoliberalism by the apparent suspension of social bonds, society for Marx was always the point of reference. ‘Freedom,’ he wrote in a rare reflection on the topic,

in this sphere can consist only in this, that socialized man, the associated producers, govern the human metabolism with nature in a rational way, bringing

it under their collective control. . . . accomplishing it with the least expenditure of energy in conditions most worthy and appropriate for their human nature (Marx in *Capital*, vol. III, as quoted in Bellamy Foster 2013: 7).

The large-scale acquisition of agricultural land for export monoculture by foreign buyers or lessees, notably in Africa, increases the ‘rift’ as crops are transported to far-away destinations by the corporations that invest in land abroad. The ensuing disruption of life on the land, discussed in the Conclusion to this volume by Saskia Sassen, is often aggravated by a second major aspect of the internationalization of agricultural production: the spread of genetically engineered plants.

Thus a country like India, whilst active abroad by investing (alongside German companies) in Ethiopia, is simultaneously targeted by US corporations like Monsanto. Monsanto has gained access for biotech products like genetically modified corn and cotton and hybrid seeds, with devastating consequences for the country’s landed population – and, still largely hidden, for all of us. Between 1997, when corporate seed control started in India, and 2010, 200 000 but probably more farmers according to Indian government figures committed suicide, as they could no longer pay debts incurred to buy seeds. Vandana Shiva, the renowned agricultural activist, speaks of ‘a negative economy, . . . an agriculture that costs more in production than the farmer can ever earn’; she singles out Monsanto’s biotech Bt cotton as the major cause of suicides (quoted in Louv 2013: 20–21).

Certainly there are also positive developments such as the recourse to peasants’ indigenous knowledge, or even entirely novel ways of organizing agriculture and overcoming metabolic rift (cf. Kay, this volume). Whether the various dislocating effects of the global reorganization of production under the auspices of capital will be brought under control remains to be seen. The present collection brings together insights on which such a reversal – towards a rational economic geography, the emancipation of labour, and the safeguarding of the biosphere without which human life cannot exist – will be premised. In the final analysis the fate of the Earth and its inhabitants will depend on the active engagement of those striving for a better society.