Wealth Begins with Human Need: Machines Can't "Read," or Remediating Marx's *Capital*, Volume 1

Johannah Rodgers

This project began, as many of my projects do, at the invitation of Jill Magi. In this instance, asked to engage with The Tamiment Library/Wagner Labor Archive, my response began with some very simple but, I feel, pressing questions related not only to this project, but to several other creative and academic projects that I am involved with as a writer and as a teacher of writing in an educational system that is becoming increasingly industrialized: what does it mean to be able to write? what does it mean to be able to read? To respond to these questions, one must choose a perspective to answer them from.

Education is currently—or perhaps always has been--big business. As such, it only makes sense that an industrial model would emerge. In an era in which certain humans may very well be becoming--or have already become--commodities, one can only point to or point out this fact and ask questions about humans and machines, their relationships, and the potential consequences of these relationships. Karl Marx is not the only author to have considered these relationships. However, he did so in ways that, I believe, remain pertinent and relevant. As part of a project having to do with how texts function and how humans and machines interact with these texts, I combine human and machine reading in a remediation of the first chapter of the first German edition of Marx's *Capital*, Volume 1.

What follows is a textual compilation that includes work by me, Karl Marx, the translator Albert Dragstadt, the electronic compiler Steve Palmer, the editors of the website Marxists.org, librarians and other staff members at the Tamiment Library, the Library Committee at the Reference Center for Marxist Studies, and the authors, designers, and printers of several pamphlets related to labor education projects and housed in the Wagner Labor Archive. The following text was read aloud and accompanied by a projection of a short video, which can be accessed via this link: https://vimeo.com/123200344.

Wealth Begins With Human Need*

Johannah Rodgers, Karl Marx, Albert Dragstadt, Steve Palmer, The Tamiment Library/Wagner Labor Archive

Wealth begins with human need.

The science of commodities may be in the form of society. One kind of relationship is expressed in bootblacking, soap, gold, wheat and iron. A geometrical example, its visible figure Is labour. Segments of time, like hour, day, might seem to change yarn into cloth, but

After propitious weather, impropitious weather. In a small volume of space, Jacob doubts that Diggings discovered in wild conditions can be The coat. From this viewpoint, the coat is not a coat.

Incarnations lurk in the deployments of useful labour. Where a need for material wealth is, labour is the precondition of Existence. Different instances lurk inside the coat. What is more, now we recall 10 yards of linen, 20 yards of linen, Objective expressions of the same person.

Today, trousers make tomorrow shifting friction.

A banker plays a big role. The simple human being is merely quantitative. Various proportions of linen are human.

If one coat x, then two coats 2x.

But now assume that this contrary motion expresses purposeful activity.

In extensions of time, fruitfulness lurking must be value. A specific quantum, relative constant, sterility.

Growing flax in place of sheep now influences our power of abstraction. Linen makes its earthly appearance, swats different flies. By equating both things it reveals itself as meaning.

In its mundane reality (coat) is composed exclusively of labor. In reality this crystal is very murky. A web of flax turns into chimera. But labour counts as coat since it is woolen comfort, buttoned up essence, An equivalent. The jumping off point of all difficulties.

Similarly cannot express concrete labour insofar as fashion considers The mystery. As far as the coat is concerned, the coat is doing the coat, however modest it may be. On the one hand, being is an equivalent Just as the coat was. In the expression "linen was equated," the linen relates itself to Consequently.

Coffee = tea = iron = wheat = labour.

Is as if alongside

Lions, tigers, rabbits and all other actual animals. Just as linen was Completely indifferent to hence, now counts as labor, expressions of values Counting only quantitatively.

A possessor is indifferent to human needs. At the same time, Evanescent, the coat holds, coffee follows tea and is socially valid. Imagine actually, reciprocally, in linen.

Fashion precisely is the reason why they did not become family, which is wha all human "socialness" must be.

Just as, lurking, they obtain in a contradictory, exclusive kind of As, if. Illusion strengthens itself as metamorphosed by the fact that Twenty yards of linen = one coat = etcetera.

But each of these equations reflexively, obviously, specifically, Conceptually, is a sensual thing.

The table remains wood. The mystical character is human brain, nerve, Muscle, organ of perception or labour. Labour. Labour.

Labour. Necessity compels the totality.

The shipwreck begins. Books are required.

All relationships contained therein were one part.

But another part must be the manner of this division,

Comparable only in such a case to labour, transparently comes the puzzling. Objectified husks concealed unconsciously instinctive in their brain. The mystery lurking under the apparent motions.

The producers lie, which veils the insanity.

But if coat, boot, etcetera, then the social appears in exactly this insane Form. Historically determined, social relationships, persons, appear as Objects to one another.

The umbilicus-labour-can only disappear as fog.

So if commodities could speak, they would say: "Now just listen, 'Riches are the attributes of man; value is the attribute of commodities"; now is an immediate contradiction.

* This text is compiled from text taken from an English translation by Albert Dragstedt of the first chapter of the

first German edition of Karl Marx's Capital.

Source: Albert Dragstedt, Value: Studies By Karl Marx, New Park Publications, London, 1976, pp. 7-40.

Transcribed: by Steve Palmer.

Accessed: by Johannah Rodgers on January 20, 2015 https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867c1/commodity.htm

Wealth

begins

with human need.

commodities

form of society

The science of

may be in the

0ne

kind relationship of

is expressed in bootblacking, soap, gold

wheat and

iron.

A geometrical example,

its visible figure

labour:

Segments of time,

like hour, day,
 might seem

to change into cloth.

yarn

but

After propitious weather impropitious weather.

In a small volume of space, Jacob doubts that

diggings

discovered

in wild conditions

can be

the coat.

From

this viewpoint

A coat

is not a coat.

Incarnations,

in the deployments of useful labour.

Where a

need for

material wealth is

labour is the precondition of existence.

Different instances lurk inside the coat.

What is

more,

we

recall

10 yards of linen, 20 yards of linen

objective expressions of

the very same person.

trousers

Today make tomorrow

shifting friction.

A banker the

plays a big role simple human being

is merely quantitative.

Various proportions

of

linen

are

human.

x 2x assume that If one coat then two coats . But now

this

contrary motion

expresses purposeful activity.

Ιn

extensions of time

fruitfulness

lurking

value.

A specific quantum, relative

constant,

sterility. Growing flax place

in

of

sheep now:

influence[s]

our power of abstraction.

Linen makes its earthly appearance,

swats different flies. By equating

both things

it

itself

as

meaning.

In its mundane reality
 (coat)

is

composed exclusively of

labour;

In reality this crystal is very murky

A web of flax turns into a chimera. But

labour counts as

Since it is

coat

woollen comfort buttoned-up essence

an Equivalent.

The jumping-off point of all difficulties

Similarly

cannot express

concrete labour

insofar as

fashion

considers

the mystery

As far as the coat is concerned,

the coat doing it to the coat, however modest it be.

On the one hand,

being

is

just as the coat was.

In the expression

linen was equated

the linen relates itself

Consequently.

to

```
Coffee

= "
tea

= "
iron

= "
wheat
```

labour

is as if alongside lions, tigers, rabbits, and all other actual animals

Just as linen

was completely

indifferent

to

hence

now counts as

labour

expressions of values

counting only quantitatively.

a

possessor,
is

indifferent

to

human needs

at the same time

evanescent,

the coat holds coffee follows

tea

And is

socially valid

Imagine

Actually,

reciprocally

in linen.

Fashion

precisely

is the

reason why

they did not become

family

which is what

all human

'socialness' must be.

Just as

lurking they

obtain in a contradictory exclusive kind of

as if.

illusion strengthens itself

as

metamorphosed
 by the fact that

20 yards of linen = one coat

= etc.
But each of these equations
reflexively,

obviously,

specifically

conceptually

is a sensual thing.

The table remains wood.

The mystical character

human brain, nerve, muscle, organ of perception,

or

labour.

Labour.

Labour.

Labour.

Necessity compels

the

totality.

The shipwreck begins. Books

are

required.

All

relationships

contained

therein

were

One part.

But

another part

must be

The manner of this division.

Comparable

only

in such a case

to labour, Transparently

comes the puzzling

objectified

husks.

Concealed,

unconsciously

instinctive

in their brain

the mystery lurking under the apparent motions.

The producers lie

which veils

the insanity. But if

coat, boots, etc.

then the social appears in exactly this insane form.

Historically

determined,

social relationships,

persons,

appear as objects to one another.

The umbilicus

labour

can only disappear

as

fog.

deceived by

Economists

style

can no more

contain

Fetishism

So if commodities could speak, they would say:

Now just listen

'Riches are the attribute of man; value is the attribute of commodities;

now

is an

immediate contradiction.