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Abstract

This paper reflects and explores the grand narrative on work set by Adam Smith and Karl Marx during the early and later modernity. It tires to push forward the idea that Marx and Smith are one of the major influencers to the contemporary notion on work. It also tries to show the major differences and similarities between these two authors. Moreover, this paper seeks to point out the failures of idealism on work and tries to put forward critics of contemporary society. Maybe in this conduct idealism could be overcome in future and the world could be built on material, actual, needs, not on ideology.
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1. Introduction

Work is the source of our wealth and well being in our society. This is a claim that probably most of the people reading this paper can agree upon. However, my attempt is to show the reader that this contemporary notion on work is contradictory and by far a socially built historical conviction. It is idealised and thus separated from its actual meaning, that work is the foundation for our societal wealth. To understand the contemporary it is crucial to dig into the historical discussion on work, for the current ideas on work have not always been the prevailing ones.

The contemporary notion on work, however, is not the only one and has been criticised in the academic discussion by now almost for two centuries, notably by Marxist standpoint, and moreover, has become relevant again in the concurrent time of the crisis of finance capitalism.

To see where the modern concept of work comes about I study the notions of Adam Smith and Karl Marx that are notably the greatest authorities in the discussion on work. Not only because their authorship has launched various convictions on libertarianism and Marxism and neoliberalism and have therefore impacted the academic discussion that followed their own time, but more crucially, because in the core of the ideas of Smith and Marx lies the liberation of individual human potentiality, i.e. the liberation of work from the prevailing societal conditions. For Smith the liberation of the worker comes about in the specialisation of the workers individual abilities and for Marx in the class consciousness of the proletarian, that becomes the potentiality of revolution and therefore the potentiality for the workers to grasp their individual abilities to produce the society.

In the academic tradition Adam Smith and Karl Marx are set into the opposing sides on the conversation over work. I think this perception is very narrow one and actually think that both, Smith and Marx, were revolutionary thinkers of their own time. Therefore in my opinion they are both as well critics of their own time and in my paper I approach the discussion on work accordingly.

The critical though of Smith and Marx is that they see the opulence of societies coming from the human ability to organise work, not from the hierarchy, that only despises work instead of cherishing it. Smith and Marx clearly share the understanding of production and work as a human ability and labour as a character of humanity, the existence of ourselves as human beings and our abilities for sharing understanding.

Marx and Smith are crucial to study today, while discussing work, for in their thinking we can find patterns to contemporary ideas. Marx is still relevant while discussing work for he is the classic of class analyses. In other words, as long as there is class society Marx is relevant point of reference to it.
My paper is a historical research from a class perspective and the focus of the discussion is the grand narrative on work set by bourgeois ideology, i.e. Adam Smith, and its critics, Karl Marx. I will present the core of the thinking of Adam Smith and Karl Marx on work and also try to develop further the understanding of their notions on work in contrast to those of prevailing ones, i.e. libertarian and Marxist notions, that have treated Marx and Smith from a narrow perspective. (Solomon in Singer 1997, 355, 356; Cleaver 2000, 23-76)
2. Class struggle as an academic research tool

My study is definitely not a neutral one. It takes a stand. This is the standpoint of seeing that the present discussion on work is mainly forged by libertarian and Marxist ideology, and that this line of thought ought to be challenged and changed in order to reach more humane understanding of work, which is the source of wealth in our society. Parallel my paper is a Marxian paper. Many of the sources used in my discussion are Marxist. Most prominent is Harry Cleaver and his book 'Reading Capital Politically' that I constantly refer to in my explanatory and discussion over Marx (Cleaver 2000, 23-162). With his work, where he caries out the idea that Marx has written the capital to be a tool for the proletarian (Cleaver 2000, 23-31), on the class struggle against the bourgeois has deeply inspired my own thinking.

In my opinion this does not lessen the academic quality of my work, nor does it mean that the result of my research is biased. Quite the contrary, I think my paper strengthens the academic quality. For honesty is more important for the academic in research than objectivity.

As objectivity is set to be a goal for academic discussion it rather hides the authors own opinion than erases it. Interpretation becomes ever more crucial in social and humanistic sciences. To arise discussion on truth and to question it is an academic virtue, to claim that it is possible to reach it is scientific banality and totalitarianism in the fields of social and humanistic sciences. Scientific neutrality is actually the way of keeping the academic discussion in the hands of those in centre of the academic discussion (Bourdieu 1990, 344). Therefore taking a clear stand is actually challenging the current line of thought. This is something that Pierre Bourdieu (1999, 12) calls the "scholarship with commitment".

Therefore I see that my commitment is to share the academic struggle with Cleaver and other academics that try to push forward ideas where one of the major function of social sciences ought to be prompting the class struggle, like Cleaver and Marx does, as an attempt to serve workers to become more class conscious and take control over their own production.

It is proper to show that Marx actually follows Smith in his line of thought. They both share the comprehension that work lies in the foundation of our societies, and challenge the more primitive conceptions where hierarchy, may it be aristocratic or more developed, determines the societal distribution of wealth. Marx and Smith show reluctance towards the conservative aristocratic ideas on work where work is despised. Presenting their ideas they have deeply affected the changing concepts of work in our societies.(Harisalo &Miettinen 1997, 28-29; Pålsson-Syll 1998, 96)

As Marx's writings my paper is a political tool, i.e. it tries to put forward ideas that the current line of thought on work should be challenged. As Marx criticised Smith and other classical
economists, I criticise the current ideas of finance capitalism. Not only does it attempt to criticise the prevailing notions on work and helps on thinking differently, but also aims to give courage to take action.

In this manner to find answers to my questions I have to research and find out the prevailing historical discussion on work set by Marx and Smith, which is basically the ideas they have on work. The problem is how Smith and Marx are set against each other on the traditional discussion on work, namely by libertarian and Marxist traditions although both Smith and Marx are clearly for more humane and prosperous life of the workers, i.e. they share a common goal. Liberation of work and individuality is the development where Marx and Smith see the better society, Marx in communism and Smith in the specialisation of workers individuality and self interest. For both of them the worker should hold the means to define one's own work.

For this reason my paper has an importance for the academy, for it actually shows, as Marx and Smith are products of their own time, their goal is the same, the liberation of work. This is contrary to the traditional historical discussion between Marx and Smith. Still my work is not unique. For example it can be seen in Sennett's analyses, where he notes, that Marx himself sees the similarities between his own and Smith's thinking on the humane conditions for workers as a necessary development for more advanced society (Sennett 1998 35-40).

Against this background I therefore will try to investigate the similarities and differences between Marx and Smith in their view on work. I also try to understand how they looked upon work as a societal and civilizing human activity.

My paper is divided into two parts. The first part is divided to two explanatory parts where I will first present the theoretical concepts of Adam Smith and after that, those of Karl Marx. The second part is a analytical part where I will first sum up the theoretical concepts of Marx and Smith and do some comparison between their thinking. I will show that both authors are deeply rooted into their own historical time and concepts. After the summing up I will go deeper into the discussion between the Marxian and Smithian idealism and try to point out the class perspective that dominates Marx's writing in comparison to Smith's ideas.
PART I

3. Adam Smith and the bourgeois ideology

All the objects of human reason or enquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, relations of ideas, and matters of fact. Of the first kind are the sciences of geometry, algebra, and arithmetic, and in short, every affirmation which is either intuitively or demonstratively certain....

...Propositions of this kind are discoverable by the mere operation of thought, without dependence on what is anywhere existent in the universe. Though there never were a circle or triangle in nature, the truths demonstrated by Euclid would for ever retain their certainty and evidence.

...Matters of fact, which are the second objects of human reason, are not ascertained in the same manner; nor is our evidence of their truth, however great, of a like nature with the foregoing.... ....We should in vain, therefore, attempt to demonstrate its falsehood. Were it demonstratively false, it would imply a contradiction, and could never be distinctly conceived by the mind.

-David Hume-

3.1 The formation of Smithian ideology

What becomes crucial in understanding Adam Smith on his contribution to the notion of work, is that his seminal work, Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations, or the Wealth of Nations as it is more commonly referred to, is mainly two things and has to be discussed accordingly. First an analytical argument against the economic tradition before Adam Smith, where the monarchist bureaucracy has still the control over the markets and where Smith is an active figure discussing the epoch of the time where he lived. Second the historical approach where Adam Smith and the Wealth of Nations is discussed in a historical context of a particular time that contributes ideas to the following generations.

The analytical argumentation of Smith himself and the historical contribution that interpretation of the Wealth of Nations has had, shows how deep is the impact that Adam Smith has had to our contemporary understanding on the concept of work, and how the reasoning behind each and everyone's thought is the logical outcome of the prevailing society. As Smith is clearly a critical voice of his own time so is Marx a critic of the epoch that becomes after Smith, that times
ideas on work being accordingly stimulated by Smith's ideas.

Smith himself is clearly antagonistic towards the set of political system of his time. This shows in his notion of the work that public servants bring to the society;

*The sovereign, for example, with all the officers both of justice and war serve under him, the whole army and navy, are unproductive labourers. They are servants of the public, are maintained by a part of the annual produce of the industry of other people. Their service, how honourable, how useful, or how necessary soever, produces nothing for which an equal quantity of service can afterwards be produced.* (Smith 1999: 430,431)

Smith sees that all men are basically alike and there is no divine order or hierarchy for men. They are brought to the world with same abilities, therefore it is their own duty to make best out of it, i.e. to develop one's skills for example by educating one self (Smith 1999, 120,121).

This clearly shows that Adam Smith is the child of enlightenment. The first copy of the Wealth of Nations was published the very year first modern revolutions took place, i.e. the North American one. So, when published, its ideas were not yet contested in the turmoil of revolutionary change. Therefore, rather as being inspired by revolution, the Wealth of Nations is the inspiration for the revolutionaries that probably read the book and contemplated it. Later its ideas were implemented into newly founded republics all over the world. In this way Smith is a critic of current political sphere of 18th century, probably as one of the triggering forces of bourgeois revolutions.

Adam Smith's conception of individuality is set against the monarchist idea, the society of sovereign or absolute power, that only regulates human beings instead of enabling their full potential and abilities. Smith's thought can be seen effected by multiplicity and combination of enlightenment philosophers and by Protestant Christianity. The ones above championing the individuality of thought independent from the monarch or church. The latter preaching of the individuality of salvation in Christianity, that could be achieved only with good deeds and that is important to each individual, by hard work on the secular life.

These factors stay behind when the Smithan ideology or idealism comes about. Society is naturally given, or with more comprehensible terms, a free network where nothing is already fixed and the traditions can be challenged and altered.

In my opinion Smith is under heavy influence of various philosophers. I can see a clear cut from the ideas of David Hume and Martin Luther. The spirit of enlightenment becomes relevant the individual becomes the presentation of god and human abilities of individual. This is a heritage of the humanistic hermeneutics. Human is created by god and thus made natural and perfect. The
relations between these divine individualities, human beings, are not hierarchical, but set by men themselves. So whatever the human is determined to do becomes the reflection of his own abilities. All men are basically equal as long as they work for the whole and god.

3.2 Smith on division of labour

In the book, The Wealth of Nations, Adam Smith begins his discussion with the theme of self-regulating market with the division of labour. What does division of labour mean to Adam Smith and why does he begin with this specific subject?

As the individual freedom of every human being becomes idealised in Adam Smith's theories, so is the case in here as well. He approaches the question of the division of labour from the perspective of what he calls specialisation. Therefore it is best to begin with the development or causes that in Smith's opinion resulted in this 'specialisation'. This is the process where the individuality becomes significant.

In Smith's opinion accumulation or development of capital/market can be understood by, what he calls 'the self need and interest' (Smith 1999, 119). This means that basically the market is founded on individual needs and interaction of the individual needs of human being. He pictures the formation of markets in following manner;

'Give me that which I want, and you shall have this which you want, is the meaning of every such offer; and it is in this manner that we obtain from one another the far greater part of those good offices which we stand in need of. It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages.' (Smith 1999, 118,119)

Smith also derives this process of self-interest that leads to exchange and market, essentially a human gesture, i.e. a character that makes us different from animals. This gesture is the ability to communicate and understand other people's needs than those personal. The whole of society becomes organised around communication.

In order to grasp this Smithian notion or idealism of individual freedom as clearly a human character it is very crucial to understand the ability to communication in its core. The ability to understand one's own individuality can be seen in other individualities around. Thus the markets are made for the culmination of individual freedom, the societal space where each individual can
be one's own lord. Homo mercantius becomes the grand achievement of human civilisation, thus;

'In almost every other race of animals each individual, when it is grown up to maturity, is entirely independent, and in its natural state has occasion for the assistance of no other living creature. But man has almost constant occasion for the help of his brethren.... .... He will be more likely to prevail if he can interest their self-love in his favour, and show them that it is for their own advantage to do for him what he requires from.' (Smith 1999, 118)

All humanity becomes determined by work, for it is the realisation of our individual abilities that we bring to the society in order to manage ourselves. The personal function and goal of each societal human being, for Smith, is to produce commodities in order to exchange these commodities to the commodities of other individuals, that are masters of their own work as well.

This work becomes determined by our abilities that we have ourselves or that we can develop further with education (Smith 1999, 120). I go deeper into this question in the next part where I will discuss the development of Smithian specialisation and its relation to the self-interest of each individual on the market.

3.3 Smith on division of labour and specialisation

As the individuality is the dominant character of work done by men in The Wealth of Nations, and the self-interest of every individual, the form where these self-interests meet, there is also a system where this self-interest can be truly put forward or idealised. Adam Smith sees this in the formulating and developing industries that has created multiplicity of work and raise the growth of the productivity of all the nations. This tool for raising the productivity of newly coming industries and labour, during the 18th century, is something what Smith calls the specialisation or the division of labour.

One has to understand, that by division of labour, Smith does not mean some peculiar hierarchy. It is more an organisation of the 'individualities' of each human being that is entering into the division of labour, in order to get bigger share from the whole societal production. As Smith pictures the developed division of labour on the very first pages of the Wealth of nations in a pin factory. Here Smith discusses the benefits of each craftsman, that before the development of the division of labour, had to do all the phases of pin production and manufacture themselves before, when the development of the division of labour was still poor. As well workman without education was much for no use in the production process. But as the work phases are brought to
the utmost simplicity and organised cleverly even an uneducated worker can yield great numbers to the whole of the production. (Smith 1999, 109,110)

Therefore the Smithian 'subdivision to the simplicity of operation' or division of labour is not just an acceleration in the production of quantities and qualities, it is also liberation from the society where the more complex production was done only by educated privileged craftsmen. The liberation of individuality forms the liberal society. (Smith 1999, 110)

In Smith's opinion the separation of the simplicity of labour is carried furthest in the industrialised societies. This is logical as the industrial societies produce more, which is the natural outcome of more subdivided labour that yields more production than labour which is not as subdivided to the simplicity of tasks. Thus industrious societies are not necessarily societies with large population. This can be comprehended more simply when Smith compares the productive powers of agricultural production to manufacture or industrial production. He concludes that as the agricultural production is not as effectively subdivided to the simplicity of work as the manufacture work is, although it has greater number of population (during Smith's own time) in its use, it is unable to compete with the manufacture production that might have a smaller number of workers but give a high production volume. This is all just because of the form of the division of labour. (Smith 1999, 111,112)

3.4 Smith; man, machine and work

In Wealth of Nations Smith argues why this special form of subdividing the work in to its simplicity is the form of production and division of labour, where the whole quantity of work increases in comparison to other production modes. Smith names three actors that increase the quantity of output of work.

First is the 'dexterity' or ability of the worker. In order to yield more to the whole of production the whole potential or dexterity of the worker has to be put in work. Smith sees that it can be achieved when the work is reduced to the simplest operation, this means that the worker becomes highly professionalised in the task she/he is carrying out. (Smith 1999, 112)

Second is the division of labour. This means that all the highly professionalised workers do their part of work in contribution to the work of the whole of the workers. (Smith 1999, 113)

Third actor is the machine. What the machine does is that it increases in great numbers the production of one man. This means that one man does the work of many. (Smith 1999, 114)

So what actually Smith argues is not only that the highly professionalised or simplified labour is much more productive in the manufacture, but because of this production mode the each man becomes master of one's own work. Moreover man takes control of the machine that frees
him from the slavery of the societal structure of Smith's time, where craftsmen were still privileged in comparison to common people.

Smith's notion on each human being is not fixed or conservative on the contrary in his own words; 'The difference of natural talents in different men is, in reality, much less than we are aware of; and the very different genius which appears to distinguish men of different professions, when grown up to maturity, is not upon many occasion so much the cause as the effect of the division of labour.' (Smith 1999, 120)

Thus the machine becomes the ultimatum of liberal production and industrialised society, where each worker has enough potential to support oneself and expand one's abilities and even educate oneself. (Smith 1999, 120)

The labour's liberation has positive effects into the creation of more developed machinery as well. For the innovation of more complex and intelligent machinery becomes from the labour's interest of liberating itself from the hard work and diminish the labour time that the worker has to himself put into the production. (Smith 1999, 115)

Thus the machine as a part of the manufacture and simplified division of labour or high professionalism, in the Smithian notion liberates workers from the prevailing societal conditions and puts the tools of liberation, the development of machinery, into workers own hands.

3.5 The Smithian value of labour, the idealisation of commodity

Smith sees that the real value of all the commodities produced for the market can be only measured in comparison to other commodities, i.e. with exchange-value. Although the exchange-value of all the commodities are produced by labour, for all the commodities are products of labour, it is the realisation of labour that can be more conveniently put in comparison, the realisation being the commodity. Thus it is more plausible to compare the commodities, the products of labour, with each other than labour itself. (Smith 1999, 133,134)

The value of labour itself for Smith is measured by the harshness or quality of the labour in comparison to other labour. As he points out; 'There may be more labour in hour's hard work than in two hours' easy business; or in an hour's application to a trade which it cost ten years' labour to learn, than in a month's industry at an ordinary and obvious employment.' (Smith 1999, 134)

So the commodity, product of the labour itself, becomes something that is more convenient to exchange to other commodities, for labour in itself is an abstract notion and commodity a palable object that everyone can understand. As the commodities value is determined by understanding and knowledge of human comprehension, money becomes a mean for all the exchange of the commodities, because money is convenient and comprehensible. One does not
have to determine values of commodities with each other, when there is one fixed measure. (Smith 1999, 135)

But the real value of all the commodities can always reduced to labour, for its value never deteriorates. For Smith the labour is the commodities real or natural price, i.e. the real measure, and money the nominal price. Thus natural price is something that puts all the price of the commodity, the value of labour, together for the market (Smith 1999, 157) and the market price and its shifts comes from the minds of the buyers willing to pay (or unwillingness to pay) the natural price or more or less the value of the commodity, that is set by the interest of the people, i.e. all the buyers (Smith 1999, 159, 160). (Smith 1999, 136)

What is important to understand is that Smith sees the idea of the value and commodity from the perspective of the buyer, and as all the workers are equally producers they naturally, in Smith's opinion, enter the markets from the interest of producer as well as the buyer. This is important because Smith sees the real value of labour always determined by food crops. This means that although the actual price of wages for labour might be low if the worker has more value in comparison to the value of food crops it is actually 'dearer' for the employer to hire their work. This Smith points out while presenting how labour, being the accurate measure for all the values, is more interested in the value of corn than silver.

"From century to century, corn is a better measure than silver, because, from century to century, equal quantities of corn will command the same quantity of labour more nearly than equal quantities of silver. From year to year, on the contrary, silver is a better measure than corn, because equal quantities of it will more nearly command the same quantity of labour." (Smith 1999, 140)

Although Smith agrees upon the fact that labour is the actual value of all the commodities he sees that the effort that employer puts into the production by giving the stock or capital into the production thus taking the risk of losing the value that is in the capital, must be compensated with profit for the capitalists, or owners of the stock. (Smith 1999, 151)

The workers wages in Smith's opinion forms somewhat according to the market situation and the negotiation power of the workers in comparison to the employer. He sees that it is only natural or 'the set of work', that worker strives to have more wages when the employer is not willing to yield to it. The later usually having the upper hand is always more likely to succeed in his wish, when considering the wages of labour. However the wages cannot in any circumstances go beneath the level that the worker needs for sustaining himself and his family; (Smith 1999, 169, 170) 'Mr Cantillon seems, upon his account, to suppose that the lowest species of common labourers mist everywhere earn at least the double their own maintenance, in order that one with
another they may be enabled to bring up two children; the labour of the wife, on account of her necessary attendance on the children, being supposed no more than sufficient to provide herself.' (Smith 1999, 170, 171)

Smith proceeds accordingly, he propagates against the existing society of his time and argues for the liberal state, because in his opinion the liberal state encourages people to work, while the rationalist mentality of the monarchist state demarcated work by strict law and order and cannot liberate the whole potentiality and opulence of the work. (Smith 1999, 184)

3.6 Smith on productivity that is the contradiction of unproductiveness

One of the most disputed ideas of work that effect directly our society today is the discussion Adam Smith puts into productivity, or unproductive and productive work. In order to comprehend what is productive work for Smith it is crucial to study its counter part, i.e. unproductive work.

Smith thinks that all work that does not add value, and thus yield profit to someone, is unproductive, because in this work there is no production of commodity that could be sold on the market (Smith 1999, 430). Thus productive work is the opposite of this, i.e. something that yields directly profit from the commodity produced and sold on market. He pictures unproductive and productive work in following manner;

*Thus the labour of a manufacturer adds, generally, to the value of the materials which he works upon, that of his own maintenance, and of his master's profit. The labour of a menial servant, on the contrary, adds to the value of nothing* (Smith 1999, 430)

Following in Smith's opinion, as seen above, the function of public sphere is next to nothing in the use of the production of value for society. He sees; that as the productive work is the only source for sustaining the society as all the work is 'maintained by land' (Smith 1999, 431). As the work civil servants do does not employ directly the work and yield to the production and exchange on the market, it is unproductive.

The only work that creates wealth, in Smith's opinion, is the productive work and this work maintains all other kinds of work (Smith 1999, 432). And the one that employs this productive work is the stock or the capital; *'The rent of land and the profits of stock are everywhere, therefore, the principal sources from which unproductive hands derive their substance.'* (Smith 1999, 433).

Thus the countries, nations or economies that succeed in producing high output of productive work are more opulent than other ones (Smith 1999, 434, 435). Smith thinks that these nations, because
of their high output in productive work, are able to sustain greater number of unproductive work as well and enjoy the outcome of this in form of culture and theatre etc. (Smith 1999, 432,435).

The leading perception of Smith is, that the societal development or the 'historical shift' is closely related with the productive work. 'We are more industrious than our forefathers; because in the present times the funds destined for the maintenance of industry, are much greater in proportion to those which are likely to be employed in the maintenance of idleness.' (Smith 1999, 435).

Moreover, it is not sufficient for the capital accumulation, or the growth of stock, to merely create more industrious or productive work; it needs developed stock exchange and banking system, where capital must be set into circulation, i.e. lending and investments. This is founded on the surplus of stock or capital, i.e. the parsimony or the savings in the common language. From these saving of capital the money can be given as loan. Which eventually makes more money to the stock (Smith 1999, 437).

What Smith basically tries to say with his perception of productive and/or unproductive work is, that productive work enables the accumulation of capital thus the growing of wealth. The state, whether a liberal one, enables productive and industrious work that adds to capital in the form of surplus that employs more work in the form of investments from the already existing capital.
4. Marx and value theory

*It is my hope that in spite of all difficulties, particularly the lack of arms, we shall nevertheless win. It may be that we shall all perish in this struggle, but you, my son, must be strong. Think of our ideals, be ready to fight without weakness, be ready to sacrifice yourself to the end in behalf of our cause....*

*Lean to work and to understand political questions. You, must also be strong physically. Study theory, which will enable you to understand all that is going on from the Marxist standpoint. Be kind to your comrades. Never for a moment doubt that communism is the only ideal to which it is worth devoting one's whole life.*

-Dolores Ibárruri-

4.1 Marx's ideological bases

Karl Marx is for sure one of the most disputed thinkers in the history of the mankind. Not just because his philosophy has inspired numerous revolutionaries and upheavals in the wide world, but also because his philosophical writings has been highly disputed from various perspectives.

Political interpretation of Marx has resulted in movements that have forged the history of our societies and as well created ever more colourful debates inside the political movements and the academic field. Major dispute of political Marxists is without no doubt split of the left, or workers movement, in the beginning of the 20th century to moderate socialists and communists.

On the epistemic community Marx has been source for various and opposing interpretation. For academics on the fields of economics, sociology and political science, even psychology Marx is constantly brought back into contemporary discussion in the sphere of each of the disciplines. This has to be, because Marx's major work is on interest that is central for all of these scientific tradition, i.e. the function of the society; not whatever society, but capitalism or gently expressed market economy. Therefore Marx remains to be in the core of whatever discussion, as long as it is on capitalism. Put simply, Marx criticises the current society we live in.

In the longer historical turn there is nothing revolutionary in the manner Marx criticises his contemporary society. Actually criticism of contemporary society has been more the practice than scarcity of scientific thought through out the history.

As I have already discussed the economic ideas on work of Adam Smith in this following part I will present the thoughts of Karl Marx, that are related to economic thinking, but has more broader, a societal aspect, when discussing economics.
Now it is crucial to understand the principal objective of my paper, for it is a historical one, although it discusses constantly economic theory. In understanding Marx this becomes even more pivotal, for criticism of the historical and theoretical discussion is the target for Marx. His economic structuralism is merely a result of his method where he endeavours to show the failures of idealistic structuring of the human societies.

(Marx 1845, A Critique of German Ideology: online)

Therefore the criticism of the classical economy of Marx is not criticism of the economy. It is direct attack against the idealism of economists before him. It is no surprise that the classical economy is constantly referred as political economy, because it is economics with ideology, i.e. economy that does not follow the material bases of the society.

This idealist criticism follows the same line as the earlier production of Marx, where he argues against the Hegelian set of the 'divine' national state (nation being the final good society for human beings in Hegel's ideology). Marx's critique goes through the whole history of ideas and idealism, where the superb ideas have always been ruling the society and human beings.

All of these societies have had political structures and all of them have exceeded the materialistic foundation of all the societies, i.e. their dependence to labour. However, idealism has this far enslaved people. The historical idealisms are, feudalism, monarchism and republicanism. And the more contemporary forms of idealisms parliamentarianism and the nationalistic and liberal ideologies.

Accordingly idea, for example the Roman Empire finished to exist because the following idea of Christian church was so much stronger. New idealism emerged that could combine and hold the power in the time where the peasants had become too powerful for the, not that ideologically strongly state, Roman Empire.

In following manner as the production methods and technology have developed and changed forms, the workers have become ever more powerful and opulent. Therefore, new idealisms had to be developed for the controlling of populations.

So Marx's main critique against the economic ideology is a critique against the prevailing production method. In Marxian perception our society is directed by economic idealism that assists on controlling the societal relations for the economic or liberal idealism, that sees liberty and equality where there is actually non.

The capital and Marx's value theory thus examines thoroughly the material realism behind the production of the society, which real production force is the labour. Therefore it is important to enter Marx's economic principles in order to understand the role of work for him and how it challenges the prevailing concepts of bourgeois ideology.

One must not forget that work and the worker is the central theme for Marx in his writings. It is the workers that he wrote for; to help them overcome their struggles. Of course the society
today has developed from Marx's time, but the discussion he has launched is still relevant. We just have to find the parts that mach to contemporary ideas on work.

4.2 Marx on commodity

Looking somewhat closer into the monetary expression of value, or what comes to the same, the conversion of value into price, you will find that it is a process by which you give to the values of all commodities an independent and homogeneous form, or by which you express them as quantities of equal social labour. (Marx 1865, Value, Price and Profit: online)

To Marx, in capitalism everything appears as commodities, for commodity is the measure of all the wealth in capitalism. This means that even social relations appear as commodities. In following manner labour and therefore work appears merely as a commodity to a capitalist and the worker, because it has a price, i.e. it can be bought and sold, like whatever else commodities. The whole capitalism for Marx is an aggregation of all possible commodities, i.e. the commodity-form, as Marx accordingly argues in his pamphlet Value, Price and Profit; In fact, in speaking of the value, the value in exchange of a commodity, we mean the proportional quantities in which it exchanges with all other commodities. (ibid), and; Looking somewhat closer into the monetary expression of value, or what comes to the same, the conversion of value into price, you will find that it is a process by which you give to the values of all commodities an independent and homogeneous form, or by which you express them as quantities of equal social labour. (ibid)

Because labour is merely a commodity for capital, it forces workers to sell or exchange its labour power to gain access to the world of commodities that capital owns and regulates. Thus labour becomes also the power that creates and sustains capitalism, the world where the commodity or exchange is the measure of all the wealth. So in a way labour helps capitalism on imposing the commodity-form on itself, where it has to give its labour to capitalism in order to access commodities to sustain itself (thus creating the circumstances for class struggle.). (Cleaver 2000, 81-94)

Capitalism gains the commodity-form through controlling all forms of social wealth, thus having social control of all the commodity production and all commodity relations that are social relations as well. This is because of the imposition of the commodity-form. Part of this social control is the work itself, where workers alienate themselves from the production. They are set aside from the production, where they become rather nurturers of a machine than workers mending the machine. They alienate themselves from work because they cannot anymore see the whole process of work. It might be that they do not even touch the products during the production procedure done by machines, they merely maintenance the machine that does the work instead. As
workers cannot understand that it is actually the workers themselves actually producing the commodity, they become unaware of the real value of their labour, which is put in the process of producing all commodities. (Marx 1986, 168-175)

Thus the wealth of capital is the commodity-form or a power relation where everything is related as commodities, for example the relation between the machine and worker is purely set by the commodity-form, as both the machine and the labour is bought by capitalists as use-value for its production, that it exchanges to other commodities and thus those things (labour and the machine) appear as commodities for capital as well. (Marx 1986, 168-175)

However, in capitalism the true value of commodity is still produced by the labour not by the capitalist. So the reason why capitalist uses the social control is not merely to make people work, for in Marx opinion it is something that is natural to people anyway. More it is the way capitalism forces people to work for it, without compensation, to produce commodities to capitalism without money. Basically this means that capitalist never gives the whole value of the work to the worker, merely a small part of it and steals the rest. This part capitalist steals from the worker the economists call surplus or profit. (Cleaver 2000, 81-94)

4.3 Marx on use-value and exchange-value that has always a class perspective

As noted already above the labour-power, in the commodity production society, i.e. the capitalism, appears in a commodity-form. It means that labour-power has the form of exchange-value and it can be exchanged to whatever else commodities, like all the other things that are produced for/in the society. However, labour-power has a broader or 'two-folded' character under capitalism. This is mainly because under capitalism all the value gets its value or it is measured by the ability of being exchangeable. However, the working class needs to sustain itself in order to yield its labour-power to the society, which can be exchanged further. Marx says: He sells his labouring power in order to maintain it, apart from its natural wear and tear, but not to destroy it. (Marx 1865, Value, Price and Profit: online)

For workers themselves, the labour-power is an exchange-value, 'the capital' it can change for other value, namely money. It uses this value to by the commodities it needs for sustaining itself, to get the commodities that are use-value for the workers. For capitalist labour-power is mainly an use-value, a need it has to full fill to maintain itself, to put the workers in labour, and simultaneously it is the power that produces everything in the society. (Cleaver 2000, 97-105)

So the price the workers get from the capitalists is not more than the amount it needs for to yield its labour-power to the capitalists; the value of labouring power is determined by the value of the necessaries required to produce, develop, maintain, and perpetuate the labouring power. (Marx 1865, Value, Price and Profit: online)
1865, *Value, Price and Profit: online*)

To get the use-value, namely, nutrition and other absolute necessities, workers have to give their labour, the exchange-value to capital. They have to do it because capitalists own all the commodities that are necessary for working class. Put simply, capitalist forces workers to do labour for itself for the price of use-value the workers need for themselves to live their lives as the labour-power. The capitalist succeed in forcing the workers to do labour for capital itself, because they hold all the commodities that workers need in their hands, the capitalists decide the prices of all the other commodities and therefore can determine the actual price of the labour as well. (Cleaver 2000, 97-105)

The use-value and exchange-value appears contradictory to capitalists and the workers. What is use-value for workers is exchange-value for capitalists. Therefore use-value and exchange-value has always something that Marx calls the class perspective, which is always contradictory in comparison to the perspective of use-value/exchange-value of the opposite class. This is why the class struggle takes the form of the struggle over the working day. (Cleaver 2000, 97-105)

The struggle over the working day is a struggle over quantities. Basically this means how much use-value workers will get from their exchange-value, and how much exchange value the capitalist will yield for the use-value it needs. So the struggle is of the length and price of the working day, how much money workers will get from how many hours of work to capitalist. It is crucial to comprehend that the question of contradictory perspectives of use-value/exchange-value is always a class perspective. This means that capitalist is against the worker and other way around as a whole class in the concurrence for the commodity. (Cleaver 2000, 97-105)

4.4 Marx and the production of labour as an ability of working class

The class relation and interests of the working class and the capitalist class comes about in use-values and exchange-values. For Marx the contradictory perspectives of working class and the capitalist class or the bourgeois in use-value and exchange-value, reveals the true essence of the commodity-form; the exchange in capitalism where all relations are given existence in the form of commodities.

Marx thinks that the ability to produce is strictly a characteristic of the working class. This ability Marx calls the useful-labour. By the ability to produce Marx means that the useful-labour is the quality of all the work done in the whole world by the workers (for Marx there is no unproductive work expect the work done by the capitalists, which is basically stealing from the workers). The way Marx measures this quality of all possible work is the actual labour time, the
whole time of all the possible work done. It is good to conceive that by all possible work Marx means all the work, most of that work being unpaid, mainly house work and so forth. (Cleaver 2000, 105-110).

The quality (useful-labour) and quantity (actual labour time) are attributes and measures of use-value, the production of the whole society with or without capitalism. Now, the labour is mainly interested in qualitative things or useful-labour that is required for its reproduction and upkeep. This is because the useful-labour is needed for producing all the use-value for workers needs. Capitalists (notice the class contradictory again!) on the contrary are interested mainly on the actual labour time, the quantitative things of how much use-value (actual labour time) it gets with the exchange-value it holds. The actual labour time capitalists employs in the exchange process for its own use, is not only the value it contributes to the labour (money). The actual labour time is the all work done in the society despite of the capitalist production (for example the house work). Its qualitative side is the useful-labour, the existence of the working class for itself as production power. (Cleaver 2000, 105-110).

Because the capitalist becomes interested in the quantity of labour, so becomes the worker as well. It is forced to fight for lesser work under the capitalist, in order to have more actual labour time, or free time, for itself. In the same manner the capitalist becomes interested in the qualitative aspect or the useful-labour. By trying to get even larger control over all of the work, as pictured already above, and by imposing division of labour in the forms of any other than waged work. (Cleaver 2000, 105-110).

In the struggle over the working day the working class challenges capital in both, the quantitative and qualitative perspectives. In quantitative perspective by trying to hold as much as possible free time for itself and in qualitative perspective by questioning the formation of the surplus-value, i.e. the means for capitalist societal control over the useful-labour, the ability for the workers to control and organise work.

4.5 Marx on value that is product of labour directly under capitalism and separation to qualitative and quantitative aspects

Like the use-value Marx divides exchange-value to quantitative measure and qualitative substance. So the exchange-value of different quantity appears as a value of some common quality. This common quality of exchange-value Marx calls the abstract labour. Abstract labour is whatever human labour, through which the commodity emerges, and thus gains its quality of something, to be measured with the quantity. It determines the quantity by being the human labour put into the quantity, i.e. time.
In Marx opinion in commodity-form, i.e. the rule of commodities, all the commodities and thus all the societal relations are determined by value, which is not the use-value, that comes about from commodities ability of being exchanged and thus have an exchange-value. This ability of being exchangeable is the quality that the abstract labour produces. It means that the value of the commodity is a value, as long as it is produced by abstract labour. Commodities emerge only as products of human labour in capitalism.

As abstract labour simply means the ability to produce commodities for the capitalists and give the qualitative substance to labour that produces value to commodities, it also gives the value its form of exchange-value. This means that the ability to produce can be compared with other abilities to produce, exchange-value with exchange-value and thus commodities with commodities. Comparing products of abstract labour with other products of abstract labour determines the exchange-value. In this manner work has only meaning to the capitalist when it produces value, i.e. it can be exchanged.(Cleaver 2000, 110-117)

The quantity of abstract labour is measured with time or duration in the similar way as the useful-labour is measured from the abstract labour time. The duration which abstract labour puts into production is the whole time that working class gives to capital production, which is not necessarily work that the workers get paid for. This quantity of labour time in abstract labour Marx calls the socially necessary labour time or just necessary labour (time). Marx says;

-What is the common social substance of all commodities? It is labour. To produce a commodity a certain amount of labour must be bestowed upon it, or worked up in it. -And I say not only labour, but social labour. (Marx 1865, Value, Price and Profit: online)

Marx sees that the necessary labour determines the value of the commodity. This means that the time workers put into capitalist production of value or exchange-value, the commodity, is the time necessary for producing the abstract labour; the 'quality'.

The value of exchangeable commodities in capitalism thus comes directly from the time put into production. Thus measuring of the 'quality' of work is to idealise production. Actually the production of commodities in capitalism is not interested in the quality of the product but only from the time that workers yield to capitalist production. To put quality on the common measure of necessary labour, is to give meanings to the commodity that do not exist. Thus the value of the commodity is formed in the socially necessary labour time, which is the labour under the capitalist social control. The value of the commodity cannot be measured with useful-labour that is the whole labour of workers as class, because it is work that is not directly under the capitalist control. (Cleaver 2000, 117-126)
In Value, Price and Profit Marx explains the value of the commodity with socially necessary labour;

...the labour lasts, in measuring the labour by the hour, the day, etc. Of course, to apply this measure, all sorts of labour are reduced to average or simple labour as their unit. We arrive, therefore, at this conclusion. A commodity has a value, because it is a crystallization of social labour. The greatness of its value, or its relative value, depends upon the greater or less amount of that social substance contained in it; that is to say, on the relative mass of labour necessary for its production. The relative values of commodities are, therefore, determined by the respective quantities or amounts of labour, worked up, realized, fixed in them. The correlative quantities of commodities which can be produced in the same time of labour are equal. Or the value of one commodity is to the value of another commodity as the quantity of labour fixed in the one is to the quantity of labour fixed in the other.(Marx 1865, Value, Price and Profit: online)

The way useful labour and abstract labour appears is the two-folded character of the work. On the one hand labour is the ability to sustain human life on the planet; the useful-labour. However, this human ability to work is the same character of labour that capitalist puts under its control, and uses it on giving qualities to its own value production mechanism; the abstract labour, that whoever (worker) can perform under capitalism.(Cleaver 2000, 127-134)

4.6 Class struggle and division of labour as controlling methods for capitalists

The injustice that Marx sees in the capitalist production is the capitalist take over of the labour-power. By his deep probing research Marx tries to show how capitalist pays workers only part from the production of value, which is actually completely done by the workers. Capitalist pays only the amount of use-value to workers that they need for sustaining themselves, thus keeping the whole of value for itself. This part bourgeois economists, like Adam Smith, calls the profit and Marx the surplus value, meaning the part of value produced by workers that capitalists steal from the workers. In the pamphlet of Marx Value, Price and Profit he argues in following manner;

...
labour realized in them. If you cannot explain profit upon this supposition, you cannot explain it at all. This seems paradox and contrary to every-day observation. It is also paradox that the earth moves round the sun, and that water consists of two highly inflammable gases. Scientific truth is always paradox, if judged by every-day experience, which catches only the delusive appearance of things. (Marx 1865, Value, Price and Profit: online)

and

The rate of surplus value, all other circumstances remaining the same, will depend on the proportion between that part of the working day necessary to reproduce the value of the labouring power and the surplus time or surplus labour performed for the capitalist. It will, therefore, depend on the ratio in which the working day is prolonged over and above that extent, by working which the working man would only reproduce the value of his labouring power, or replace his wages. (ibid)

Capitalists impose workers to this control, by trying to cut down the real price of their work (Cleaver 2000, 127-134). To conduct these cut downs on the real price of work they put inflation on prices. The real use-value workers get from the work diminishes (Cleaver 2000, 127-134). Capital also tries to impose reduction on the necessary labour time, i.e. the real production of value that is a creation of labour. They try to do it by mechanising the production. Basically this means building of more and more complex machinery for production (Cleaver 2000, 105-110). In Marx opinion this is the huge contradiction of capital, for it tries to mechanise the production of value by cutting down the labour, which is simultaneously the source for its wealth in production the imposition of the commodity-form. Marx sees that the high development of machinery system will naturally end up in the overthrow of capitalism. If machinery develops enough, capital looses its purpose of imposing and controlling labour; the access to the world of commodities and surplus-value. (Marx 1986, 168-179)

However, in Marx opinion capitalists try to find other ways of imposing the commodity-form. Mainly this means that capitalists seeks to find new ways for employing this 'extra' time to retain the qualitative control of the society, i.e. to keep the production of surplus-value or value in its own hands by socially binding the working class (Cleaver 2000, 105-110).

One of the most primitive forms capitalists use for imposing more work on working class is the division of labour. Division of labour means, that the working class is divided in to parts, where it is harder for it to realise its own role in the commodity production as the source of all societal wealth. Capitalist conduct this division of labour with societal control over work. Basically this means it strengthens the heterogeneity of the working class with social differences among people; like ethnicity, age, sex, income, and so forth, i.e. mainly racism and sexism. For
example, the reason women were left in home and children put into school during the development of capitalism. (Cleaver 2000, 110-117)

Workers counter these actions by striving to get more value (money), and to do less work for capital. This far capitalist have always turned the workers strength to its own strength, to its power to produce even more commodities and have even firmer grip of whole of the society. Marx sees that as long as workers work under capitalism they make it just stronger. In order to shut it down they have to become aware of the society around them and take control over the production. This can only occur by uniting working class into a struggle over the power in the society, which is in the hands of the bourgeois (Engels & Marx, The Communist Manifesto: online).
PART II

5. Intermediate;

5.1 The critique of the political economy

The critique of political economy is the critical attack of Marx against the prevailing conceptions on economy in his own time. It was directed towards the idealisation of markets, which was dominated with ideas of having superior abilities. It is a literally directed towards the publication of Malthus; The Political Economy (Malthus 1989) and is the reason Marx calls the economist before him and in his own time political economists, for in Marx opinion their ideas on economy are idealised and politicised. For Marx this means that the Smithian interpretation of economy does not have materialistic bases. Instead of grasping the true function of economy, the commodity-form, they see the production of value more like a mystical process, where the commodity achieves its value magically from the hand of the worker, where it actually gains it only by being use-value for someone and thus product of useful-labour.

Now, I am not directly interested in the discussion on economy. As shown above both Marx and Smith put work into the central position. They agree that economy has its productive bases on work.

For Marx Smith is definitely ‘the one’ classical economist, that Marx criticizes constantly. This gives more value to Smith in the present discussion around Smith and Marx. They are both actively referred in the academic tradition. Therefore, it is good to research this relation; how does the ideas of the critique of the political economy function in discussion of work today.

5.2 Smith the ideologist of enlightenment

In Smithan perspective the abilities of individual worker becomes the central source in the production of wealth. Accordingly the division of labour is determined by the individual abilities, i.e. education and the skill level of the worker. Smith takes the individual abilities into the specialisation of work, where machines gives new abilities to the worker to become the lord of his own production without the old highly developed qualities in education. Marx has completely the opposite view of the 'Smithian' specialisation, which I will contemplate further.

Commodity for Smith is the convenience to see the result of work. In his opinion work itself has an abstract character that become amendable and easily conceivable in the form of
commodities. Commodity is the realisation of labour. The value the commodity has is the value of the labour and the profit, the stockholder or capitalist, puts into it, with investments and capital (money: machines and work). This happens through the personal abilities of the workers, which determines the wages as well. Holding the stock or capital is a personal ability as well.

Smithian idea on productivity is probably one of the most dominant conceptions of work today. Basically Smith has determined the waged work under capitalist production of commodities the only source of societal wealth. Thus all work left outside the direct transition of labour to commodity is unproductive. It is a common sense thought where all the work that remains abstract, i.e. cannot put in to a form of commodity, cannot be measured in value, and therefore are not product of the individual abilities of the worker. This perception is widely recognised in all the political tradition from left, to centre and right.

5.3 Marx the ideological rationalist of modernity

In Smithian perspective the production is determined by commodity and the individual ability of the worker. Marx shows that this is not the case in reality. He thinks that the commodity gets its real value from the ability of being produced by the working class as a whole. Specialisation or division of labour is not the coming of individuality. On the contrary, it is a creation of hierarchy among the workers, where machines determine the speed of work. However, machines do not determine the value of the product, because the production process is a result of the working class labour. Without workers there would be no value production at all. Therefore it is absurd to measure the productivity/unproductiveness of work. Value is produced by the workers ability to labour in general. Specialisation is the form the production in more developed society, where workers are set aside from the machine and therefore the production. Specialisation is not the fulfillment of individuality of personalities in the production process. In capitalism machine becomes the individuality of workers. (Marx 1986, 168,175; Cleaver 81-94)

Marx criticise Smith directly on the production of riches in labour. Although Smith sees that all wealth is produced by labour, Marx argues it to be insufficient, for Smith sees the labour as a multitude, i.e. he does not differentiate the labour in detail (Marx 1986, 53). Marx does so by showing that labour has a two-folded character. It is work under capitalism and work to reproduce the working class itself. In Marx opinion, the capitalist constantly seek to find new ways of putting this labour under capitalist control.

The commodity for Marx is the idealistic imposition of work in the capitalist society. All the wealth in capitalism is measured in commodities and not by labour that is the actual base of all the value. This occurs in the form of commodity fetishism, where the commodity gets mythical
abilities in the production. The value is put in to the commodity by the magic touch of the worker, instead of the materialist needs that the workers have to retain in order to keep on the production (Cleaver 2000, 81-94).

5.4 Humanity as the goal of idealism

The main differences in the bourgeois economics of Smith and Marx's critique of the political economy, is in the way they see how the formation of wealth comes about. As Smith emphasises the role of commodities in the production he takes stand for the ones in the control of commodity production. In the market economy or capitalism it is naturally the capitalists. However, it is unawareness to accuse Smith for taking sides for the capitalists against the workers. Both Smith and Marx has been heavily miss-interpreted.

A good example is the fact that The Wealth of Nations that is commonly published misses the part of Moral Sentiments, where Smith discusses more deeply the role of the workers and criticises the inhuman labouring conditions of workers (Sennett 1998, 38,40). For example Smith thinks that routine deadens the spirit of work, and thus kills the individuality and the real work. Smith thinks that routine becomes 'self-destructive' (Sennett 1998, 35, 37). Smith sees that in order to 'develop one's character as a worker, one has to break out of routine' (Sennett 1998, 38).

However, the Smithian conception on the Moral Sentiments are not widely known and therefore do not enter the contemporary discussion on work. Smith comes particularly crucial as the father for the neo-liberal thought. I will go deeper into this in my final analyses. Next I will show how the discussion of the work appears in our society.
6. Analyses

6.1 The development of ideas on the organisation of labour

As I have shown Marx and Smith have many things in common on their ideas on work. They both agree that work is the source of all the wealth in our societies. Moreover, both of them see that effectiveness is natural goal for organisation of work. This is to say, the more organised work is, the more value it will yield. However, Smith and Marx disagree on who organises the work. The previous reasons that organisation of labour is naturally conducted by the people that employ the work for their own interest, the latter that the organisation of work is outcome workers ability to organise and reorganise their work for to give them more material, that is needed by the workers for personal and societal production and reproduction.

Now Smith and Marx lived in time where work was seen quite differently from the perspective of today. To understand this, one must see that their work is deeply critical towards the elite of their own time. Smith in particular criticises the unproductive nobility. His attack against the unproductive work must be seen as a critique of the monarchist societies where work was despised and not seen as the source of wealth (Smith 1999, 431-433). Smith's work is criticism of the monarchist society that does not leave space for the natural composition of work.

Smith sets his ideas against the absolutist ideology. He becomes the pillar of the bourgeois ideology, as he puts individuality of work into the centre of the whole production. In Smithian perspective the specialisation of work results in the liberation of workers individuality and abilities. (Smith 1999, 112, 120)

Quite similarly Marx accuses the ruling classes of the society on his own time. Moreover, he also criticises the Smithian and other bourgeois ideology of being idealistic (Marx 1986, 53). Idealistic in the same manner as the absolutist and monarchists were for Smith, not being able to see the formulation of wealth in our society in a proper way, but in the idealised one.

I argue that Marx's and Smith's ideology not only criticised the perception of work in their own time, but also influenced by their criticism the formulation of the common ideas on work today. Smith and Marx both saw the development of organising the work as the development of understanding the organisation of working time put into the working process and more developed division of labour, both of them being natural outcomes of the development of societies where each and every one's life is depended on others labour (Smith 1999, 109-111,119) and individual interest. Bourgeois being the ones taking the control over the society where the production is no longer primitive, but complex, dictates its own ideology into the society, and thus take the control over the whole production of all the wealth.

In capitalism, Marx says, the natural organisation of work, which he calls the useful labour,
is put under capitalist control as social labour. This is the labour time that workers give to the capitalists, which is basically all the work they contribute for themselves and the capitalist society. (Cleaver 2000, 127,134).

6.2 Destruction of work, the control over work by Smithian commodity idealism

In Marx opinion Smith's perception on work and organisation of work is idealistic, because Smith sees the commodity (money) as an adequate form to measure wealth. However this is the case only in the bourgeois society, where the ability to organise and picture work is an abstraction, its crystallisation being in the material commodity. The commodity becomes idealisation and omnipotence of understanding the societal opulence and function.

It is the understanding of the bourgeois society that needs commodities to picture the wealth, which actually is the labour put into the society by all of the humanity, the working class. This is because work is a human ability and also the everyday action where we become human, on creating work and organising it (Marx 1986, 175). It is natural for us to work and organise it, otherwise we could not sustain our lives.

To organise work we do not actually need a superficial structures of capitalist organisation of work that only abuses the natural organisation of the proletarian work. Thus the bourgeois perception of work's value, being crystallised in the commodity, is idealisation of work out from the material circumstances of organising the work, that Marx calls the actual (labour time) and useful labour, thus the use-value.

As the commodity is set above all the other value in Smithian theory, and therefore in the contemporary capitalism, that is put into work with bourgeois ideology of Smith, it takes control over the whole production, i.e. the organisation of work. Basically this means that workers have to give their ability to work and organise work to capitalism in exchange for commodity, commodity that is ironically seen as the crystallisation of value in capitalism. This Marx calls the commodity fetishism. In bourgeois ideology commodity becomes something more than it actually is, an idealisation.

The way workers are forced to give their labour to capitalists Marx calls the alienation. Alienation is a process where workers become alienated from work; that is to say that workers cannot anymore understand the production of commodities, and therefore become part of the machine working instead of the workers. Marx says that work takes the form of maintaining the machine and machine does all the work for the workers, worker steps aside from the production. Thus the process of production becomes an inhuman one. The workers work and the organisation of their work is destroyed in the commodity-form, the rule of commodities. (Marx 1986, 175)
It is ironical that Smith in contrary saw the machine as the liberator of the potentiality of human work and individuality. He saw that the machine would bring even more specialisation of work that would mean a bigger say on work for the worker mending the machine with or without professionalism.

The history, however, tells another story. Marx's research on workers struggle for better life and their living conditions, was obviously done in a political context, but remain still significant as an empirical study. The conditions where workers lost the ability to take control over their own production in a slave alike form was the reality in the western societies not too long ago. Moreover, it is good to remember that the sweat shops, where bad working conditions do exist are plenty in Europe and some of the commodity production in the contemporary world is done in even worst conditions that Marx ever could imagine.

6.3 Class struggle as a possibility for change in the society

As Marx has shown, in capitalism the commodity-form means always the opposite things for the working class and the bourgeois class, it has always a class perspective. When something is a use-value for the workers it is exchange-value for the bourgeois and capitalists, i.e. capitalists make profit out of workers needs. Accordingly the exchange-value for the workers, namely their labour power, is a use-value for the capitalists, which they employ by forcing the commodity-form. In this case it means that in order to get use-value, which is workers basic needs, the worker has to give its labour power to the capitalists.

The alienation or destruction of work becomes the capitalist mean to keep labour power loyal to its own needs. The Smithian or bourgeois ideology thus becomes the justification for implementing the commodity-form. Capitalists do this with alienating workers from their work and thus destroying the organisation of work by bourgeois ideology. Deforming organisation of work to hierarchical system where division of labour is abused as a mean to put workers in hierarchies under capitalism. Basically this means discrimination by gender/sex (chauvinism), ethnic background (racism), wages (incorporated societal hierarchies) and age.

The way workers can change the system, where they are alienated from the work, and take control of their own production, in Marxian ideas can only become a reality through the working class self-awareness. Self-awareness means that working class has to understand that it is the source of all the wealth in the society, and its ability as class keeps the whole world going on.
7. Conclusion

Now what I have noted pivotal in understanding Marx and Smith, is their historical understanding of the concept of work in their own time and the critics they pronounced about those notions. They both are champions of the idea that the wealth of our society is made in work, not in societal hierarchy. In this manner they have both affected the contemporary discussion of work. For the common notion on work today, appreciates the workers labour as the source of the wealth in contemporary society. This also makes Smith's and Marx's analyses on work pivotal for contemporary academic discussion, as they both are on the bases of our concurrent notion, may those be false or correct, on work.

This also shows that Smith’s and Marx's thinking is more than contradictory in comparison to each others theories. They are more ideological products of their own time, where they both are the critics of the society they lived in. Major contradiction in Smith's and Marx's is in their perceptions on the individuality of the worker, and the formation of the value that comes from the work. Smith sees the production as individual commerce and ability of each individual potentiality. Marx, quite the contrary, sees the individuality of worker determined by the class relation, as long as there is capitalism. Value formulation, for Smith, comprehends the abstraction of labour through the facility of the commodity that has the value automatically in the form commodity is produced, to be consumed. Marx sees this as the commodity fetishism. For him, all the commodities are products of labour, and they have their value in the labour, not the other way round, i.e. in the commodity.

I have shown that the formulation of wealth in capitalist society is built on reorganising the organic or natural organisation of the working class to produce labour for itself. Namely this means destroying the workers ability to understand one's own production. Smith thinks that the process that Marx calls the alienation will actually end in the liberation of labour power. This process of specialisation will yield control of the production, work, to workers themselves. This shows that capitalism is not depended on ideology. Ideology is only analyses of the society. Capitalism functions in multiplicity of societies. Not only liberal democracy. In fact to function properly capitalism does not needed liberal democracy more than any other societal solutions.

I have also shown that Smith and Marx share the understanding that labour is a human social ability to produce. And all the wealth in the society is put together by this ability to labour. Moreover, this labour is a character of the working class that sets itself against the bourgeois class on its ability to produce wealth. On these topics Marx and Smith are traditionally set against each other, but as Sennett's discoveries show, this contradiction is overrated and Marx and Smith should be seen more as vivid analysers of their own contemporary society in their own epoch.
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