

## THE SUBJECT OF PRODUCTION IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

*Petros Papapetropoulos*

Assistant Professor, Technological Educational Institute of Patras, Greece

---

### Abstract:

Capitalism is the social production that takes place in private economic units and the contradiction between social and private is resolved by private exchange of goods. Capital, over all, is the manifestation of a social relationship, the disobedience of which manifests itself through the continuous mobility under two aspects: functional transformations, and spatial movements.

With the State, exceeded, the articulation of the productive relationship in every point of the economically defined space can interpret the shift from past macroeconomic equilibrium of the national area to the pulse of the open beam free world goods which corresponds to a direct productive meeting between the capital and labor.

Developments in both credit and productive field equivalent to an autonomous operation of capitalist relations prepared by the internationalization of the State, and create flexible boundaries that allow potential labor participation in profits.

The modern social Meta – organization, selects money as a reflection of the relationship developed in each field of the production of value. As it relativizes the space, this field extends beyond the limits of traditional production relations that are articulated within the place.

---

**Key Words:** Capital, labor, money, value, Meta – national

### Introduction

This text examines the behavior of the subjects of production in the context of the globalization of capitalism. The aim is to demonstrate that the system as a whole relativizes the space and the exceeding of the State highlights new independent reproductive mechanisms. The interesting thing is to see the affirmative clues towards a world where adoptive behaviors, former institutional, are attending as a term of the new productive relationship in the Ecumenical field.

### General characteristics, developments in the organization of production

Capitalism is the social production that takes place in private economic units and the contradiction between social and private is resolved by private exchange of goods: the spending (built-in) work for their production is certified and socially assessed; the owner of the product achieves a claim to an equivalent part of social work in another unit that is produced within the social division of labor.

This "recognition" is done through institutions and mainly through the institution of money, the universal equivalent of which each producer assesses the part of social work that holds or claim against the exchange.

The decisions of economic units are taking place in a field of accumulation and reproduction that the systematic distribution and redistribution of the productive result of each time, is done by social coordination of the conditions of production and of final consumption (appropriate allocations between total supply and total demand).

### The relativity of the space

To the economically acting the following degree of freedom is "awarded", followed by their alienation of the means of production, as aptly put by Hegel, (teste, Ferreira-Ege, 1998, pp. 586-587): the subject may sell to another a particular product of physical and mental skills and potential actions or even their hiring for a limited time because it is this restriction that develops an external relationship, outside the unity and universality of each subject of production. This encapsulates the differentiation of capitalism than earlier systems, which exchanged the man as a productive unit, and not his work, and there was no formal marketing freedom of Worker.

But with the release of labor occurs and the liberation of the capital from this job, the static, almost unchanged nature of a relationship that could be structured in capitalism's previous formations.

At the same time, the capital, over all, is the manifestation of a social relationship, disobedience of which manifests itself through the continuous mobility under two aspects:

a. Functional Transformations of productive capital, in commodity capital, in financial capital.

b. Spatial movements in the search of the means of its self-expansion.

Consequently, the importance of space is becoming relativized. The capital moves with increasing ease and is associated with labor with typical production functions for each period (Marx K. *Capital*, [Greek translation] 1978 Vol.2, Ch. I, II, III).

The absolute relativity of space is manifested in the money form of capital (Holloway J. 1990, 1992.).

In an imaginative figure, a Baechler's continuum (Baechler J. 1995, p. 77), on one pole it is integrated producer and consumer in the same person (consumes only what it produces and only produces what it consumes). On the other pole that represents an absolute market, everyone consumes what has been produced exclusively from others (from the most complex products to the most simple services), and produces exclusively for others (absolute specialization and Division of work extended to the absolute end of).

In the never-ending process of the historical succession, as markets expand, the Division becomes deepening and the transactions become more impersonal, the mutual trust must be institutionalized in a peculiar way: each institutional past behavior tends to become "second nature" of the subject of production and consumption. Under this perspective, the market society dissolves the traditional community, and at a higher abstractive level flows toward the universal market society without external relations that stimulated the economic behavior.

#### **National and Meta - national paradigm (Universal, Meta - state schematic form)**

On the domestic (national) pattern, institutional mechanisms had been created so as balances maintained when excessive savings occurred, the total demand amounted with labor's responsibility or the excessive consumption of capitalists caused risks of imbalance.

Things go in a further self-regulated financial status: direct contact between labor and capital can be effectively interpreted only if the epistemological field moves in the relationship between values, General and indeterminable exchange value from the perspective of capital and General and indeterminable use value from the side of work.

With the State, exceeded, the Commodity contract relationship can be potentially articulated at each point of space by reducing losses and the gaps between production and consumption of goods. It is this dematerialization manifested in increasing financial flows and the virtual capital, which are an expression of the developed networks, through which the funds are allocated to its productive use.

And as it is not a dilettante copy of transition, a single metathesis of earlier relationships between capital and labor that matured in the national arena, the relationship is now imposed by its own new terms, the institutional and organizational arrangements.

The "freedom" of the State, the Keynesian space policy, to produce money (through the guarantee of the operation in the movement of money), to strengthen, through market signals and traffic, production in necessary areas within the framework of national, has been limited.

The State does not distribute funds to prospective incomers. This operation shrinks because the same signals "produced" through the state freedom undermined it; as the operation and the nature of money in production and circulation were ignored.

The crisis of the modern State and the "anti-providence revolution" are associated with this exactly ineluctable transcendence of the role of money as capital. Money as capital to be reproduced is suffocated within the framework of the national area.

With the universal spread of capital relationship, of the production and reproduction system, the value that must be tapped because it just exists (capital, money as capital), recourse to special value of utilization (the power of live work) more easily: this is the meaning of universalization.

The work meets most directly itself, its alter ego in the enduring agony to be actualized in a continuing way. All this is done under the new conditions of capital relationship and a new relativity that came with it.

The Ecumenical society of individuals with its new features and its contributors develops as the Adventure follows a lasting to the quest for profitability. The withdrawn State -its removal of direct productive field and "anti-providence revolution"- (Skidelsky R. 1997) partially purify the landscape from the burdens imposed by it (of the ways formation and distribution of value and surplus value were occurred). Sovereignty being eroded, State activity fits organically into a system which is also held at new synapses.

### **The new productive relationship**

The new productive relationship is not anymore the correlation with public policies that guide the development of business investment activities. It is mainly and decisively the very effective self-organization of the firm through productive, financial and communications networks that develop and enable the relations of control and power to determine in what ways the funding, materials and labor contributions are distributed and enter the productive chain.

The venture capitalist and the modern administration are entities which form an autonomous system within a system without rules (Habermas j. teste Coutrot Th. 1998, p. 130).

The articulation of the productive relationship in every point of the economically defined space can interpret the shift from past macroeconomic equilibrium of the national area (investment-consumption relationship, national fiscal and monetary policy, national production function etc.) to the pulse of the open beam free world goods which corresponds to a direct productive meeting between the capital and labor (Cohen E. 1998).

We do not have any more a closed economic system modeled on the "national" past, in order to calculate the GNP financial contributions each coefficient in the generation of income and the creation of wealth. In our opinion, the thought of capitalist production relationship adequately analyzed only through inductive switch in the root system of the mode of production values, through returning to the heart of production values, which is the term for the calculation of the shares in the production output.

### **The modern subject as a producer and consumer**

Developments in both credit and productive field equivalent to an autonomous operation of capitalist relations, prepared by the internationalization of the State, and create flexible boundaries that allow potential labor participation in profits. But it is Labor's participation as "holder" and potential income proprietor. The participative cracks in the system allow growing social property alienated phenomena within the strict framework of the capitalist system, reproduced in an enlarged consensual basis. The possibility of this participation, however, only occurs when an Act doesn't exits of capital, when breeding "respects" the conditions of reproduction of the capitalist system. Labor that owns asset titles that allude to the possession of the means of production, works with capital reproductive terms: not accounting the odds as disposable income for consumption-which will disrupt the overall reproduction of the system-but as a capital that must be constantly in the process of exploitation enters. It is sui generis "capitalist" work mode; otherwise it will not reproduce the system. Treats whatever goodwill comes into its possession as a basis of the reproduction of capital.

### **Conclusion**

The path travelled we saw that the State as an institution of collective consciousness, is removed from the scene and a new mechanism for closer productive communication, emerges, accompanied by the ever cultivated trend for generalized investment behavior of the productive subjects.

The subject grows on the cross-flows of production and circulation which reproduce individually. These are "flows" and patterns of reproduction and evolution of world standards which allow for the realization the modern productive and consuming subject.

The realization of the subject in both, the productive and the consuming field, is taking place in a Meta -space of sharing of its ability to produce in the continuity.

The mediation is carried out by the money through which tends to run any kind of relationship and exchange the result of each individual and collective activity of the subject. Money, whose character is not a mere reflection of the values generated in production but becomes a flexible

autonomous institution ever that now represents a complex Web flows and potential utilization of any present or possible future value. Only within this money (attention: money as capital), the present is represented and the future is mirrored.

The modern social Meta – organization, selects money as a reflection of the relationship developed in each field of the production of value. As it relativizes the space, this field is extending beyond the limits of traditional production relations articulated within the place. Tends to include any activity through which the subject proves its existence.

Money disclaims a single, mere character of the measurement mean of value and becomes the draining channel as each entity endowed with value (as holder of the ability to produce), works now as owner of capital to be invested.

### **References:**

- Baechler J. (1995), *Le capitalisme 1.Les origines, 2. L'économie capitaliste*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Coen E. (1998), Mondialisation et souveraineté économique, *le débat*, p. 21-32.
- Coutrot TH. (1998), *L'entreprise néo-libérale, nouvelle utopie capitaliste?* Paris, la découverte.
- Ferreira R.D.S. - EGE R. (1998), Le temps et la conception du capital chez Marx, *Revue d'économie politique*, 108, 4, p. 581-595.
- Holloway J. (1990), Global Capital and the National State, *Capital & Class*, 52, p. 23-49.
- (1992), Capital Moves, *Capital & Class*, 57, p. 137-144.
- Marx K. (1978), *Capital*, [Greek translation], Vol. I, II & III, μετ. Μαυρομμάτης Π. Αθήνα, Σύγχρονη Εποχή.
- Skidelsky R. (1997), L'Etat sans la providence, *le débat*, 95, p. 106-115.