

The community reproduction of life

Thinking of social trans-formation in the present¹

Raquel Gutiérrez / Huáscar Salazar Lohman^Ω

Summary

We approach with a critical eye the question “Is social transformation possible?” and maintain that the starting point for an answer lies in the set of specific collective and/or community activities that aim at guaranteeing the material and symbolic reproduction of social life. We argue that transformation does not, only nor mainly, have to do with sketching out an abstract future horizon; it is rather about a systematic flow of actions of resistance and struggle in the present, which defends and expands the specific possibilities for the reproduction of life as a whole, be it human or non-human. This is the starting point for our analysis of the tensions and contradictions that exist between said possibilities for the reproduction of life and the structuring logic of capital in its continuous cycles of accumulation. From this standpoint, we look into the popular-communitarian aspects of certain theoretical difficulties that emerged during recent struggles in Latin America. More specifically, **the obstacles for the social deployment of concrete labour beyond the mediation of value and in the polymorphic forms of collective political decision-making.**

Keywords: social transformation, production of the commons, concrete labour, use value, popular-communitarian struggles.

1. We consider the question “is social transformation possible?” to be imprecise and somewhat sterile. Even more so when the question is projected towards the future. Sterile because it parts from a specific conception of a world that is given, that has been established and is, therefore, motionless, configured, finished. The analysis chooses, to put it synthetically, to attend the totality of domination in the present. Those who attempt to confront such a totality are overwhelmed by this perspective, rather than encouraged. If we assume this starting point, all we are left with is a conception of the future as *possibilis*, that is, as a counterfact of what

¹ Many of the ideas presented in this text are part of discussions conducted at the permanent research seminar “Entramados Comunitarios y Formas de lo Político” [“Community Weavings and Forms of the Political”], which takes place at the department of postgraduate studies in sociology of the Instituto de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico (ICSYH-BUAP).

^Ω Raquel Gutiérrez is a Mexican mathematician and research professor at the department of postgraduate studies in sociology of the ICSYH-BUAP. Huáscar Salazar Lohman is a Bolivian economist and doctoral student at the CEDES-BUAP. They both participate in the permanent research seminar “Entramados Comunitarios y Formas de lo Político” [“Community Weavings and Forms of the Political”] at the department of postgraduate studies in sociology of the ICSYH-BUAP.

we have today. This turns social transformation into an imaginary negation of the present, a negation desired by many but not by all. When approached like this, the issue of transformation has often led to the creation of teleological counterfactual conditionals or sophisticated *ad hoc* justifications; encouraging nothing but reflection on what we *should* be doing and are not doing in the present, or the justification of what has been done, pointing towards what we *should* construct and have not constructed in the present. Once we find ourselves in this perspective of an *imaginary negation* of the present -which can otherwise be mediated by good intentions and a lot of creativity- we can give an affirmative answer to the question; however, we will almost certainly be trapped within this designed preconception. If that is not the myth of socialist revolution, what is? In the words of Bolivar Echevarria “The myth of revolution is precisely the one that tells of the existence of a moment of absolute creation or recreation, when human beings tear every thing down and create it anew. When all the forms of sociality are destroyed and other new ones are built from nothing” (Echeverría, 1998: 68). Furthermore, says the author, this myth is constructed on the basis of capitalist modernity's own imaginaries.

In order to pose more useful questions on social transformation, we must conceive the term beyond its typical dictionary definition, which describes it as: “to convert one thing into another through a given process”. The prefix “trans” etymologically refers to a 'beyond’ or “on the other side”; therefore, to *trans-form* refers to a *capacity to produce form beyond or against and beyond what is given*. Thus, social trans-formation turns into the deployment of the human capacity to produce and reproduce collective forms of inhabiting the world other than those of domination, exploitation and plunder. If social trans-formation is conceived like this, our concern is no longer focused on totality: the fundamental issue is not the conversion of one social order that we perceive as a totality into another social order that we also conceive as a totality, judging *a priori* that the latter is better than the former.

When we abandon the point of view of totality, new questions arise: how do we collectively deploy the specifically human capacity of social trans-formation? Which categories, notions and ideas can prove fertile and which ones get in the way of our reflection? How do we produce social trans-formation every day? How do we conserve the conditions for the deployment of social trans-formation? How do we persevere in the trans-forming activity? The answers to these questions are not logical deductions that part from specific principles; they will rather depend on a theoretical strategy that will allow us to account for the “practical scope” of everyday struggles, as well as for the “horizons of desire” (Gutiérrez, 2013; 2014) of men and women who, day in day out, trans-form and insist on trans-forming their concrete and located social reality.

2. The existence and persistence of social structures that reproduce life in a non-capitalist or not fully capitalist way has been one of the main discussion topics in 20th-century Marxism. The production of a critical discourse based on a linear conception of history led to an epistemic legality that tends to show history as a succession of phases. Thus, beyond the specificities of each society, the passage from one phase to another could be explained “objectively”, as if following a predetermined script. So, in capitalism, anything

that was not truly or formally subsumed to capital was considered “precapitalist” and it was all about explaining how the laws of history would inevitably lead to the conversion of said concrete practices of production of social wealth -which sometimes configured societies- into abstract, i.e. modern and capitalist, relations in some moment of history. Another deduction of the same debate wondered if this “precapitalism” was a historical necessity of capital itself. Also, a very revealing conclusion of these discussions is that “the existence of the peasantry within the capitalist mode of production is revealed to us as the *result* of the reproduction needs of this mode of production”(Bartra, 1979: 65). So, everything was considered to be *determined* by the needs of capitalism, the most advanced mode of production in terms of phase succession.

In contrast with the above mentioned, we are interested in formulating a series of interpretative arguments so as to understand the non-capitalist, the not fully capitalist and the potentially anticapitalist *as a present transformation*; that is, as a way to shape social life from a different standpoint than that of capital and its political and state form of regulating life. For that, we turn to the notion of the *communitarian*, which we basically understand as a form of establishing and organizing social relations of sharing as *compartencia** (Martínez Luna, 2014), and cooperation. Shared and coordinated links and doings, not devoid of tensions, that tend to generate dynamic equilibria and aim at the reproduction of social life. In this context, a collectivity assumes the autonomous, self-determined and self-regulated capacity of deciding on issues relating to the material and symbolic production that is necessary to guarantee the continuity of biological and social life through time.²

Therefore, the community as *a form of reproduction of social life* is not only the negation of existing domination, it is not only non-capitalist and non-state; it is that and, at the same time, so much more. **The communitarian is not determined *ex ante* by domination, it does not exist only due to capital, nor does it part from capital, not even in terms of negation.**³ To think of all forms of reproduction of social life in terms of their antagonistic relation derived from capital can lead us to the epistemic pitfalls of the previously mentioned Marxist debates. In one case, capitalist society produces the precapitalist because it needs it; in the other, the non-capitalist emerges only as the antithesis of capitalist society, as a production that is undesired but apparently necessary for capital. This conceptual weaving leaves no room for a broad constellation of practices and efforts that are asserted in the reproduction of social life through the generation and regeneration

* *Tr.N.* The term “compartencia” has been coined by anthropologist Jaime Martínez Luna to describe the reproduction and sharing of knowledge generated within communities amongst equals.

2 We attempted a positive reformulation of the communitarian on the basis of previous proposals by Gutiérrez (2014), expanded and enriched by the ideas of Federici (2004), Navarro (2012) and Linsalata (2014).

3 This assertion reflects an ongoing and unfinished discussion with critical Marxism and other forms of reflection and argumentation from negative dialectics. The core of the disagreement is that we consider life, human and non-human, to contain a positive drive towards its own self-reproduction. This drive can be considered as a negative force that systematically confronts death. However, to argue from this standpoint makes our reasoning even more complex; therefore, for the time being, we prefer to use the positive formulation.

of specific links that guarantee and expand the possibilities of collective -and therefore individual- existence, in the sense that they produce a social plot that can always renovate and regenerate itself.

Such disjointed and complex networks of social relations –that we usually call the community weavings-- become clearly visible and intelligible in indigenous peasant communities, especially in moments of struggle or celebration. However, they are also present outside this context, in urban life for example, in all the much more ephemeral and volatile relations, creations and practices that allow or facilitate the reproduction of life and are not mediated by capital.⁴ Therefore, we understand community weavings as the constellation of social relations of *compartencia* -never harmonious or idyllic, but rather filled with tensions and contradictions- operating in time in a coordinated or cooperative form that is more or less stable. Their multiple goals are always specific and different in the sense that they are renovated, and tend to fulfill or expand the fulfillment of the basic needs of social, and therefore individual, existence. Having said that, this *form of social relations* is clearly strengthened when social antagonism is intensified and actions of struggle that defy, contain and push back capitalist relations are deployed. Therefore, the communitarian is an interpretative tool that can take us deeper into the analytical lacuna that Bolivar Echevarria encounters in Marxism and which comes from Marx himself: the determinations of the process of capitalist accumulation are studied, but the studies do not refer to the other side, that is, to the “natural form” of the reproduction of life that focuses on “use value”.⁵

Of course, this does not mean that the community lives on in a separate bubble, in an idyllic world devoid of capital. These varied forms of reproducing life are constantly under siege by capital, and many of the relations that are generated and regenerated, as well as a lot of the concrete social wealth that is created on the basis of these relations, are subordinated and functionalized by capital; also, many are mediated by the state form of politics. Therefore, all the determinations that we use to understand the communitarian must be understood and explained in specific contexts so as to understand how they are resolved –or not-- within the framework of globalized capital, though always in a contradictory and ambiguous way. However, it is important to stress that the heterogeneous and multiform trans-formation that emerges from community weavings implies their capacity to reproduce social life, disrupting, deforming or reshaping domination in a way that allows for this reproduction through time; in doing so, they oppose capital. That is why the communitarian is by definition antagonistic towards capital, even if its production is not defined by it.

4 A distinction must be made between a community practice that is subsequently functionalized by capital and one that is created for capital to begin with. The first type can refer to efforts to reproduce life beyond capital, or even against it, where capital manages to appropriate the human energy deployed through different mechanisms of exploitation and plunder. As long as they exist, there will always be something more. A material and/or social product is produced or regenerated that is not *for capital* and that, in one way or another, will fulfill its goal of reproducing life.

5 We believe [...] that Marx's main contribution to a critical understanding of modernity is somewhat asymmetrical or one-sided. His comprehensive and penetrating research on the process of accumulation of capitalist value –one of the two sides of the contradictory behaviour of modern society-- was not counterbalanced by similar research on the other side of this behaviour, “use value” and its reproduction. So, in this sense, we justify our work as a contribution to the reconstruction of the conception of a “natural form” of things as “use values”. This conception is implicit in the “critique of political economy”; without clarification, the latter is left incomplete and, in many ways, enigmatic” (Echeverría, 1998 [1984]).

3. In line with a Marxist reading, Tapia (2012) argues that the two defining moments of social reality are the productive and the political. To this we would add that the link between the two is a *sense of the world* or multiple fragmented and contradictory meanings of reality – what anthropologists could define as culture. We human beings need to satisfy material and immaterial needs and that is why we produce social wealth: *use values*. At the same time, we create a set of relations for the administration of collective life. We administrate in order to produce (amongst other goals) and we produce in order to administrate (amongst other aspirations). And thus we *reproduce* as species, as collective beings and as separate individuals. Production is part of human reproduction and not viceversa. The administration of the social or political life is part of human reproduction and not viceversa. And production and administration are social. Therefore, if we assume the *process of the reproduction of existence*⁶ as the starting point of the analysis, they are one. Social reproduction is *truly* an indivisible process, even if it is cruelly and violently separated from modern thought, from the thinking that emerges when capital production is placed at the centre of the analysis (Federici, 2004).

This bond that we are accustomed to separates production from politics and pushes reproduction towards a dark and subordinated place of production, as a horizon and as practice. In capitalism, the different processes of reproduction of existence are subordinated to the production of capital, appearing as ensembles of fragmented, secondary activities without a meaning of their own. Also politics, in this case state politics - apparently the only locus for the realization of collective administration- is placed above society and claims to be looking out for the “common good”, relegating social reproduction to the private sphere. In other words, capital produces appearances: social wealth appears under the form of an accumulation of commodities while concrete wealth, which nurtures the everyday reproduction of social life, is not only rendered invisible; the activities that generate it are conceptualized as opaque sets of secondary affairs. After all, capital is a social relation that de-forms the social reproduction that is based on use value, violently replacing the collective capacity to decide on production with decision-making that emerges from private property.⁷ Capital takes control of the social relations that reproduce life and privately appropriates them, turning them into a mechanism of valuation. Therefore, in the words of Bolívar Echevarría, the reproduction of life within capitalism is possible only if it is “betrayed in its essence”, because it can only be attained when it takes place within the terms established by the valuation of capital. But for that reason precisely, *capital cannot be*

6 So, we define at least two starting points for reflection on transformation: the one that sets capital production at its core, in order to guarantee its accumulation or criticize it; and the one that focuses on the reproduction of existence, material and significant, human and non-human.

7 On this point, see *The Origins of the Black Act* by E.P. Thompson (1990).

*conceived without the reproduction of life, even if that is not its goal.*⁸ From this standpoint it becomes clear that our reproduction in capitalism as species, as collectivities and as individuals is an unbalanced reproduction of life, because one side is deprived of material and symbolic wealth, as well as of the capacity to collectively decide, while the other side privately accumulates this wealth and all privileges in collective decision-making.⁹

Capital –and its heterogeneous processes of production-- abstract the use values that make up social wealth in order to tie them down to commercial relations; only this way can value be valued in never-ending spirals. On its part, the reproduction of life, be it human or non-human, or the polymorphic processes of the community reproduction of existence are based on the care and production of an enormous multiplicity of ties and use values that guarantee the satisfaction of a broad variety of human needs. The production and administration of this concrete wealth is not divided to begin with. There are many different ways of attaining their balance. Thus, the political is not necessarily an autonomized activity of reproduction.

We consider that the communitarian –or, to a certain extent, the “communitarian-popular”¹⁰-- allows us to reveal the reproduction of life as the nucleus that shapes social relations, beyond ethnic differences that could exist between different cultural moulds. In the social relations that emerge from community weavings, what we understand as politics and the economy¹¹ are clearly components destined to guarantee the reproduction of life and, therefore, of the same network of relations that make up the weaving. “The production and consumption of the transformations of nature turns out to be, simultaneously and above all, a ratification and modification of the concrete figure of sociality. They are two processes in one: in the reproduction of the human being, the physical reproduction of the integrity of the community body of the

8 If there is a “trademark” for capital, it is its constitution -as a social relation- as a systematic negation of the community reproduction of life; at the same time, this is the precondition for its existence.

9 For a more detailed analysis of the issue of the plunder of the political, see Mina Navarro (2012): *Luchas por lo común [Struggles for the Commons]*

10 Generally speaking, the analysis of the communitarian uses as a starting point or as paradigmatic examples the sets of practices that are developed in rural environments and are immediately linked to food production. However, we can also find practices driven by a reformulated community logic in an urban context and even in spaces that have been rendered transnational. Hence the notion of “communitarian-popular”, more inclusive and flexible for thinking mostly about contexts of reproduction that are profoundly permeated by capital. On this, see (Linsalata, 2014; Gago, 2014).

11 In this document, when we talk about the economy in the community sense, we are not referring to its definition by modern economic science, but to the ancient and etymological sense of the term that was clearly differentiated by Aristotle. In his *Politics*, Aristotle understands *oikonomia* as the household administration, which can be understood as administration and production for reproduction. What we perceive as economy in modern times, linked to the accumulation of wealth or money, is *chrematistics*.

subject is fulfilled only to the extent that it is the reproduction of the political form (*polis*) of the community (*koinonía*). It is a dual and always contradictory process, in the sense that its 'political' stratum necessarily implies an exaggeration (*hybris*), a forcing of the very legality of its physical stratum" (Echeverría, 1998 [1984]: 167). The production of material wealth that evolves around community relations is always "forced" by community politics, for it is the community weaving that will define its scopes and meanings in terms of collective reproduction. Therefore, we assert that the productive process –relaunched within a community weaving-- is not an exclusively material and/or physical process, it is rather fundamentally social. A very interesting example of all this are the transnational networks for the reproduction and expansion of social life that are produced by Bolivian immigrants in Buenos Aires. They combine the textile workshop, the fair or the market and the organization of everyday life in the towns and celebrations in a way that is at the same time ambiguous and promiscuous, but always in struggle against what is imposed as norm and destiny (Gago, 2014).

Keeping this in mind, we will present certain notions that allow us to go deeper into issues relating to the production and social administration of the communitarian, that is, the reproduction of life in its community *form*. Our analysis differentiates the economy and politics as separate but never divided moments of reproduction; we wish to show that both spheres are part of the same process of social reproduction, which is contradictory, enclosed and confronted with chrematistics; that is, with the processes of capital accumulation that are usually described as "economic".

4. We will now present certain reflections on the tensions and antagonisms that emerge between the countless efforts to guarantee the possibility of the reproduction of life in the community and the systematic processes of capital production. For that, we critically recover classic formulations of Marxism while trying to answer a specific question: why is it so difficult to think of the social nature of concrete labour?

When we human beings produce the necessary goods to guarantee the continuity of our life cycle, we do it socially. That is, we appropriate a body of knowledge produced collectively throughout history and certain *means of existence* -some of which are means of production (Dangelis, 2012)- that in most cases have also been produced by other human beings. On the basis of this knowledge and these goods we produce other goods –and other relations-- which we can use to satisfy our needs or to produce once again; i.e. they have a *use value*. However, generally speaking, we also produce for others in the context of what is understood as the social division of labour. We need the goods that result from the labour of others and the others need the goods that result from our individual labour. So, beyond our own labour in its concrete sense -which we can still consider as the use of physical and mental energy for the attainment of a specific goal- the capacity to work socially is one of the most fantastic practices that characterize our species. Not only do we do things, we also generate *mechanisms and codes* so that these things can be enjoyed by others and in turn we enjoy the

usufruct of other people's labour. These mechanisms and codes are not constituted through material goods but rather from social relations. According to Bolívar Echevarría, they are part of the semiotic dimension of culture as well as, might we add, of its practical dimension. Human relations are generated and regenerated socially through interaction, always collectively, between men and women and the “natural world” of which they are part. Hence the eminently practical and not only structural dimension of these relations, which is also significative and semiotic as it produces relationships and meanings and not only “things”, goods or products.

In *Capital*, Marx describes with colossal clarity how capital accumulation is produced precisely on the basis of social labour which, being social, cannot self-reproduce autonomously any more: it is through the private appropriation of the labour of some people by others. In other words, exploitation. Along this line, Marx explains that in capitalism these goods turn into commodities. He describes and analyzes processes through which social labour is rendered private, parting from relations of production that are mediated by the private legal ownership of the means of production and of specific relations of force -generally linked to the monopolization of the “right to kill”- that lead to exploitation. Here we have a first reduction by Marx that has been systematically criticized by Federici: Marx moves along the lines of classical political economy in that he considers that the free worker exists in his/her own right -after the period of primitive accumulation that, once described, is relegated to the past. The *reproductive process in capital* is understood only as a process of consumption and not any more as a true process of production of human beings as well as of everyday relations that guarantee the reproduction of human and non-human life.¹²

Now then, following the previous argument, we maintain that the capitalist relations of production fetishize social activity in presenting its products and creations under the form of the commodity, in the sense that the exchange between said commodities is based on exchange value. In other words, the terms of the exchange of a good that has been socially produced but privately appropriated are determined on the basis of the socially necessary labour time for its production: this good is exchanged with other goods that correspond to an equivalent socially necessary labour time. The exchange process is in turn mediated by a general equivalent, money. This way of producing and exchanging allows for the appropriation of surplus value, guarantees the private control of surplus and promotes the recreation of the entire process of exploitation that we are already familiarized with. What we want to stress through the previous claims is that exchange under the rule of capital is socially conducted from the dictatorship of exchange value, measured in a *specific type* of socially necessary labour time. What interests capital is not the usefulness of the product but its capacity to be exchanged, to contain a universal value that can be accumulated; this value seems to spring from the product

12 A line of reflection that we will not explore in this work but that opens up from here is that of the terms and conditions of the “multiple exploitation” of reproductive processes, paraphrasing Navarro and his notion of “multiple plunder”: the exploitation of labour by capital that occurs in the course of the production of capital is not the only exploitation that occurs under capital. For the exploitation of “free” labour by capital to occur, it must hook up with another specifically capitalist set of actions that exploit the totality of the reproductive activities that allow for the existence of this “free” labour.

itself, but it is the result of a physical and mental effort involved in the creation of all products. This is what Marx calls *abstract labour*.

In capitalism, abstract labour is the condition for the conversion of labour into social labour. The reduction of concrete labour to a scale of value that is measured in socially necessary labour time and the corresponding process of fetishization of the commodity allow for the generation of equivalents in order to access other goods. All this is administered privately, consolidating the specifically capitalist form of the private appropriation of surplus value. Importantly, we must always keep in mind that the time with which abstract labour is measured is not a “natural” time. It is linear, empty and homogeneous time (Benjamin) which, as a plague, parasitizes and obstructs the multiple reproductive processes that are filled with varied rhythms and discontinuous and alternated cycles.

We agree with Holloway when he expresses that, in capitalism, “there is an abstraction from the very act of producing: all that matters is the quantity of value produced.” (Holloway, 2014: 215). What interests capital is abstract labour, so that it can access the general equivalent, money, and thus generate a process of amplified accumulation. The goal is not use value. So, in capitalist society, the organization of the reproduction of social life is not an end in itself, but rather a set of operations aimed at accelerating the creation and circulation of exchange value. Exchange value cannot exist without use value, but the latter is subordinated to the dictatorship of the former. This is particularly clear in the processes of food production of peasants or indigenous communities as well as in the autonomous processes of production that focus on the use value of products and on the relations that are created and consolidated from it.

Therefore, abstract labour becomes the specifically capitalist *form* through which social labour presents itself to us. It is the corruption of social labour that turns into labour-for-capital and disguises the reproduction of life as a component of commodity production. In capitalism, “progress” or “development” have to do with the vertiginous acceleration of commodity production. If, at the end of the day, we manage to reproduce our own life cycle, great for us! However, it will not necessarily occur.

So, what is the particular difference between the community reproduction of life and the one set up by capital? With no intention of reducing all differences to this, we believe a central aspect is the social *form* that concrete –and individual-- labour assumes in community societies. If the form adopted by social labour under capitalism is that of abstract labour, concrete labour is stripped of its social capacity. Use value is only the thing itself, its materiality; the *goal* of concrete labour, from the platform of abstract labour, is only the creation of *that* material thing. What is produced for a specific reason is stripped *ex ante* of the capacity to be labour-for-others. It is amputated, the deployment of its social character is made difficult.

Therefore, in capitalism, the capacity of use value to turn into social wealth is a characteristic only of abstract labour: the materiality produced by the workers does not belong to them, in the sense that they cannot conceive it -or can conceive it only in a “limited”, “enclosed” and “mediated” way- as a product also for others, that is, as social labour beyond exchange value. The capacity of concrete social relations that are centered in the material reproduction of social life to collectively produce a meaning will be crushed. Their

semiotic capacity will be amputated as long as this tremendously broad sphere of social life is defined by capital on the basis of the determinations of exchange value. In the words of Marx, “It is therefore the physical body of the commodity itself, for instance iron, corn, a diamond, which is the use-value or useful thing”, “We use the abbreviated expression “useful labour” [concrete labour] for labour whose utility is represented by the use-value of its product, or by the fact that its product is a use-value”, “Not an atom of matter enters into the objectivity of commodities as values [as socially necessary labour time]; in this it is direct opposite of the coarsely sensuous objectivity of commodities as physical objects”. ” (Marx, 1990 [1867]: 126, 132, 138).

Here we have reached a crucial point of the contemporary discussion: the tyranny of money. Beyond the practical fact of this tyranny, the issue is not linked to the “means” of circulation, but rather to the *lack of a measure* with which to think of the concrete exchange of use values beyond capital. Importantly, use values that are not only or even mainly things but, above all, social ties and relations that are established beyond contractual figures. That is, we are faced with the problem that, in order to think -and deploy the *social character of concrete labour* as struggle against the tyranny of abstract labour that is imposed as the only measure for exchange and social wealth- it is necessary to conceive new forms of measurement which will bring new meanings to the concrete exchange of use values and, generally speaking, to the always asymmetrical processes of the reproduction of life. So, how can concrete labour be labour for others too? Only if it is deployed within a community weaving that organizes and measures its exchanges and obligations in a way other than that of the tyranny of abstract labour.

Having said that, in the reproduction of the social life of communities¹³ and indigenous societies -and also in the collective and autonomous efforts to create goods and ties against and beyond capital- what we understand as concrete labour in capitalism contains a double purpose: that of the thing itself, which is its use value, and that of being labour-for-others. The enjoyment of the product of this labour is both at the same time. Thus, the function of abstract labour as a vehicle that turns concrete -individual- labour into social labour makes no sense; therefore, within the community weaving, the analytical differentiation between concrete and abstract labour makes no sense either. *Community labour*¹⁴--as we shall call it for the sake of exhibition-- is not

13 There were difficulties in the argumentation of the reproduction of community life: firstly, it was necessary to unveil certain characteristics of the reproduction of life under capital in order to, subsequently, counterpose the communitarian. The totalizing vocation of capital is egocentric, in the sense that it forces us to deduce any analysis of social reality from its own terms. This is important and must be taken into account, for it is part of the difficulty of the “Copernican inversion” in the comprehension of the social issue that we are set to attain.

14 Another approach to the same problematic is by following the line of the “production of the commons”, that is, by attending to the characteristics of the collective activities that are deployed in order to produce some type of wealth that is commonly shared. “Community labour” is another way of referring to

assaulted by the separation that the process of valuation exerts upon the worker and the product of his/her labour. Following Bolívar Echevarría, we could say that it is labour in its “natural form”. Community labour produces *community goods*, which also transcend the differentiation between use value and exchange value that constitutes the *commodity*. They aim at the satisfaction of biological and cultural needs through individual and collective consumption –materiality itself. At the same time, these *community goods* also have the purpose of satisfying the needs of others on the basis of the same plot of meaning they generate –the semiotic dimension of culture-- and are therefore “objects” equipped with meaning beyond exchange value.¹⁵

Therefore, we can talk of a system of circulation and flow of community goods where the products of labour - the goods- can be exchanged on the basis of *mechanisms and codes* that are established by the community itself. These *mechanisms and codes* -the semiotic dimension of culture that also challenges the dominant symbolic order- are produced and interiorized in each one of the repeated community and individual labour processes as an immanent part of their goal. So, it follows that this system of circulation and flow of community goods not only allows for the normal and eminently material reproduction of the members of the community, it also generates and reasserts its mechanisms of inclusion and reproduces -through reiterating- the sociability of the latter; it produces a symbolic order that gives meaning to the exuberant forms of reciprocity in community life.

The specific mechanisms and codes that organize the circulation and flow of community goods repeatedly define different ways of exchanging goods on the basis of the establishment of notions of comparability, not equivalence. These notions of comparability can be founded on the comparison of labour times to be exchanged (such as the *mano-vuelta* and the *ayni**). However, it must be made clear that community labour is not subordinated to the abstract determination of measurable periods of abstract labour, neither to exchange value, but to the possibility of reproducing community life. “In *communal forms*, labour time not only is not an abstract quality of the activity of individuals, for it is dependent on ritual and symbolic forms, it actually does not exist either as a social substance of wealth or a form of exchangeability. At most it is a *material requisite that underlies the meaning and purpose of the activity of the individuals*” (García, 1995: 267, italics

this same heterogeneous and polymorphic set of activities. (Gutiérrez 2014a and Linsalata 2014 broadly address the notion of “production of the commons”.)

15 An eloquent example of this class of “community goods” are the *castillos* [castles] of fireworks present in community festivities. They are complex structures made only to be burnt during the festivity. We thank Jaime Martínez Luna for insisting on this example during a talk on the social reproduction of life and social transformation [Coloquio sobre Reproducción Social de la Vida y Transformación Social] Puebla, September 8 and 9, 2014.

* *Tr.N* A *mestizo* term used to refer to reciprocity in indigenous communities. It is part of the Central American philosophy of labour as a means of communication, a means of life. In South America it is known as *minga* or *ayni*. (source http://issuu.com/cenco_uacm/docs/encarte_lafama)

in original). The *ayni* or *mano-vuelta*, for example, can be presented as an exchange of individual labours on the basis of an estimated quantification of a specific labour time: a day's work for a day's work. However, the deeper significance of this exchange is mediated by the meaning of the community goods that will be produced, starting from the strengthening of ties between those who engage in the exchange. It is on the basis of these exchanges that give a social character to concrete labour that the social bond is regenerated and recreated, in a different though equivalent way each time, between those who share a community weaving and, at the same time, "belong" to it. The organization and enjoyment of the festivity, the set of behaviours that grant prestige, the ratification of ties through practices of *compradrazgo*,* etc., as well as the ties and commitments crystallized in moments of struggle; these are all relations filled with a symbolism that, above all, tends to reproduce and conserve the social bonds in the community.¹⁶ It is this way of reproducing life that will organize -and perhaps determine- a system of flow of community goods and of exchange of concrete labour. Depending on the specific cultural network that is set up and reproduced through these exchanges, there will exist within it a specific logic, a guide of rationality that will allow for a set of *calculations and strategies* for individual performance within the weaving (Gago, 2014).

To sum up: the very possibility of community labour -or of collective activities for the production of the commons- comes about through a dynamic process that administrates and organizes the reproduction of community life. The system of circulation and flow of community goods cannot appear "out of thin air", as

* *Tr.N.* The word *compradrazgo* refers to the relationship existing between a godparent or godparents and the godchild and its parents. However, in the Andes -and Latin America-- this relationship exceeds the religious bond created and is perceived as an element of a framework of reciprocity.

16 Another more complex example is that of the *chuqu* or *minka*, deployed when large quantities of labour are required, generally for sowing or harvesting in only one day. The member of the commune that is carrying out this activity calls to others to help out in his/her farm and labour for the entire day. When the day is over, the member must offer food and the drink *chicha* in abundance. All those who work receive a significant portion of food and drink to share with family members or friends, who might or might not have worked. The activity ends in a small celebration. It is interesting to note that this form of community labour aims at reproducing a social bond, apart from carrying out the concrete labour. The sharing at the end of the labour process is part of the meaning of community labour and this is what it means to socially share in the context of the established relationship: one cannot pay for this labour and enjoy the use values outside this socialization. In this sense, there is no direct exchange of comparable labours. However, there is an indirect exchange; whenever considered necessary, another commoner will be able to call a *chuqu*; those who have received the labour of others in the past will now have to participate and offer their own labour to another member of the commune. This is one example amongst many, depending on the place and the activity; and we must not forget the practices deployed in struggles. They are all relations filled with a symbolism that, above all, tends to reproduce the social ties of the community. And it is this way of reproducing life that will determine the system of flow of community goods.

the network of commercial trade claims to have done. Commercial trade is based on the abstract exchange of equivalents that conceals the process of destruction of the capacity to produce concrete wealth that always precedes the beginning of commercial circulation. Neither does this system of circulation and flow of community goods consist in a series of rules that are established once and for all, as certain positivist ethnographers argue, and even less so does it depend on the altruism of the members of the community. The system of exchange and flow of community goods is based, above all, on the capacity to collectively decide on what is to be exchanged and on the very terms of the exchange. Once again in the words of Bolívar Echevarría, it creates the conditions for the “politicity” of the reproductive process, including different systems of circulation and flow of goods that configure a network of material and symbolic exchanges.¹⁷

5. In order to account for the politicity of the multiple processes of collective labour that configure community reproduction, we should remember with Foucault that “all social relations are power relations’ to the extent that ‘all social relations are none other than the deployment of certain capacities, according to the specific needs of some people regarding other people which, in order to be fulfilled, must manage, regulate, neutralize, affect or highlight the capacities and needs of others; that is, ‘other people’s behaviours’” (Gutiérrez, 2001: 59). Here we must clarify something important: not all power relations are relations of domination. There are many social and collective mechanisms that allow for the *generation of equilibria* on the basis of existing social asymmetries. If these mechanisms are in operation, relations of power between different people will be harmonious, they will be reconfigured time and again and they will evolve around ever renovated equilibria. On the contrary, when certain power relations become crystallized, rigid and fixed, they lead to ties that are not only asymmetrical, but also strongly hierarchical; relations in which one pole conditions other people’s behaviours and those who gather around the other pole “accept being directed”. This crystallization and fixing is the source of a relation of domination that is generally expressed in law, in which the capacity to decide on issues affecting both poles of the relationship is concentrated and placed in only one of the poles. “In the community form of politics, social sovereignty is not delegated, but rather directly exercised. It is not based on a contract that surrenders (and mortgages) individual will; the mechanisms for

17 Obviously, this type of community exchange networks, of old or new breed, is systematically enclosed and stalked by capital. One of the pending tasks which in this text we simply draw out, is that of going deeper into the notion of the comparability that guides these exchanges. As we mentioned previously, they point towards a renovated concept of “measurement” which does not keep to the numeric –merely quantitative-- identity that allows for the possibility to enumerate and compare, but rather explores qualitative comparability. This is one of the intellectual possibilities opened up in the threshold of modernity, as can be seen in the work of the so-called “medieval scholars” (Álvarez J.L., 2012). Measurement and comparability are notions that can boost a renovated reflection on dynamic systems of exchange that evolve around balance and not around the systematic lack thereof, as occurs in capital’s chrematistics.

dealing with a common affair are constructed on the basis of agreements between specific subjects that share activities and destinies” (Gutiérrez, 2001: 70); even so, these subjects are different and display different capacities.

In community weavings with activities focused on guaranteeing the satisfaction of the needs for social reproduction or on expanding the possibilities for its satisfaction (note that we are not talking in any way, only or even mainly, of issues of “survival”) power relations are eminently harmonious and are realized through *agreements that oblige*. Belonging to a community weaving does not “grant rights”, it rather “obliges one to take charge” of one part of the decision-making. Furthermore, it is the fulfillment of agreements collectively discussed and decided upon that guarantees the belonging of each individual in the community fabric. The contrast between this form of the political and of politics and what we call “formal democracy” is absolute. The only right that formal democracy does not concede, given that it is based on delegation, is the right that is fundamental in the community weaving, although here it is expressed as an obligation. An obligation to accept responsibility for the needs that have to be satisfied, to deliberate with others on how to do it, to collectively take charge of the execution, etc. An obligation, therefore, to “collectively reach an agreement”, an obligation to generate a consensus as a condition for the possibility of reproduction. Thus, the way in which the agreements between the members of a community weaving are permanently established and reestablished, on the basis of the fabric's own frameworks of meaning that can always be adjusted, is the specific social practice that renders the solidification-crystallization of power relations impossible. It is a shared administration of what “can be done” -in terms of power-to, of what others and ourselves can do. Within this political framework no one monopolizes decision-making and the members do not delegate their capacity to collectively produce decisions. The members maintain the autonomy and sovereignty of, let's say, their “proportional quota of power”, though no one “has the power”, the capacity, if it is not deployed collectively through the community weaving. This is precisely the foundation of what Zibechi calls “dispersing power” (Zibechi, 2010). The specific and collective politicity that is generated in the community weaving is, therefore, also a specific dimension of the production of the commons that is based on a specific dimension of community labour: the “service” or labour for the commons. In quiché, the specific term used to refer to this type of eminently concrete community labour is *caxq'ol*.

In contrast, abstract labour is the vehicle for the monopolization of the capacity to decide on the processes of production. The abstraction of labour sets up a specific mechanism of power concentration based mostly on the control and configuration of vital time. The only way to privately appropriate the product of a process of social production is either coercion –slavery or the imposition of tributes are classic examples of this-- or the violent separation of the labour process into concrete and abstract labour. The workers are alienated from the product of their labour and its reproduction is left in hands of the value of their labour power; that is, abstract labour that is homogeneous and quantifiable in time. The solidification of power relations -domination- in capitalism allows for the monopolization of deciding on the production process and, therefore, the systematic and growing separation between abstract and concrete labour. This monopolization is the foundation of the state *form* of politics.

On the contrary, community labour is based on the collective production of –concrete-- meanings that organize the labour processes and the usufruct of the products of social labour. This immediately opens up a political dimension of the social, with the contradictions and tensions that are characteristic of social activity and where violence is also regulated and contained. This way there can be a collective production of meanings for the regulation of production as well as for the exchange of the products of social labour, through shared codes and mechanisms that are inherited and updated by the very community weaving that is reproduced. It thus becomes possible to document and reflect on the different practical strategies of community self-regulation, as they are oscillations and dynamic adjustments evolving around a certain equilibrium.

When community goods are produced within a social weave that is focused on the conservation and expansion of the possibilities for the reproduction of life, these community goods become a part of the social flow of relations and useful goods –the social flow of doing?-- that are exchanged and distributed between the members of the community fabric. Even when they are part of this social flow, community goods are not de-personified, as occurs with use values that turn into commodities. They remain the expression of concrete labours: labours with a name and a surname, a place of origin and a meaning of their own. The possibility to enjoy the usufruct of the goods of this flow -from within the reproductive framework- is determined by the participation of the labour put in by its members. And it is always the object of acute and difficult controversies that channel vague and contested balances which configure the specifically political sphere of the communitarian.¹⁸ That is, they grant the community weaving that is set on reproduction the capacity to self-regulate. Here we must stress that we are talking of processes of self-regulation of the individuals themselves and of their labours; in no way are we referring to the supposed self-regulation of the exchange of fetishized commodities that are independent from their concrete labour, as the promoters of the so-called “free market” argue.

One last insight on this issue: although the balances that are continuously updated in the specifically political sphere of the structure of community reproduction can occasionally contain exchanges based on equivalences,

18 “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” is, we believe, an incomplete Marxist phrase, for it assumes an axiological assumption from the different individuals in a communist world. The immediate question that one can ask is “what happens if people decide their abilities are null and their needs enormous”? This clearly unveils the weakness of the formulation. Surely, Marx did not conceive this issue in a simplistic manner, though many of his followers did. However, what we are arguing here is that the production of community goods and the usufruct of these goods is obviously possible only if there is a process of production of equilibria in time, on the basis of the social capacity to collectively reach political decisions, that is “agreements that oblige”. In the long run, they render possible the self-regulation of the weave that tests and deploys their specific forms of reproduction. Otherwise, this way of understanding the production of community goods allows us to dismiss the metaphysical and hardly fertile debate on if human beings are “naturally” good or bad, selfish or disinterested.

they are usually deployed in terms of comparing differences in order, precisely, to balance them. This means there can be similar and comparable usufructs on the basis of completely different labours, as is the case in the labour of old and young people. What is important here is to understand that this balance is founded on mutual agreements that are produced in common and are binding for all. Also, they are not fixed; that is, their terms are permanently redefined in repeated deliberations to guarantee the collective and individual reproduction of each of its members. Community labour is the condensation of these processes of repeated collective decision-making and therefore allows for the systematic modification and regeneration of the flow of exchange and distribution of goods that are in some way useful to others. These goods are full of diverse and multiple meanings that spring from the different common agreements; that is, from the collective capacity to self-regulate that renders unfeasible other *forms* of reproducing life that are focused on the accumulation of value.¹⁹

From this standpoint, the community process of reproduction is based on a tense and always demanding request for updating that dynamically combines eminently productive -economic- processes and political activity. There is no separation between these two spheres of social life. Furthermore, this perspective does not require an *ex ante* framework of values or norms: neither do the commoners do things in a certain way because they are “good” by nature, nor is social life idyllic and free of tensions. What is highlighted is the relevance of reflecting and supporting forms of organizing social life and guaranteeing the possibilities for its reproduction in terms that are completely different to those imposed by the dynamic of capital and its never-ending cycles of accumulation. Cycles filled with self-reinforcing spirals of wealth concentration based on the organizational axis of private property, backed by the abstract-metaphysical notion of the autonomous “individual”.

Let us make it clear once again: we are not arguing that this type of community social relations or the dynamic that regenerates them refer to a certain “state of purity”. We are rather driven by the desire to understand, as clearly as possible and with a certain degree of formality, certain forms of “doing” that are specifically human and are based on the satisfaction of vital necessities, drawing out community weavings that focus on the reproduction of life. In analyzing specific cases we can always run into situations where the coveted balances reproduce inequalities and hierarchies or, in other words, where tendencies towards the solidification of certain power relations exist. However, it is also true that these rigidities and crystallizations can be confronted from the community dynamic itself, that tends to be permanently updated, deploying self-

19 In another work, Gutiérrez argues on the need to understand the “capacity to self-regulate” as a “property of certain complex systems, of their dynamics”. Hence the particularly interesting conservation and self-transformation of complex systems in specific living systems on the basis of their capacity to self-regulate. Generally speaking, they conserve themselves, they reiterate the dynamic that distinguishes and characterizes them. That is, they exchange in the same way as they attained dynamic stability; but, at the same time, in case of an alteration in the conditions of exchange with the outside world, they also have the capacity to modify themselves in order to achieve new equilibria” (Gutiérrez, 2014b).

regulating processes that insist on a systematic dispersion of power. We understand this capacity to be an indicator of the vitality of the community weaving.

6. And, finally, one more question: how to understand the community dynamic within a globalized world of capital? If we are to think of the totalizing logic of capital that besieges and encloses the communitarian, we must account for the logic of the subsumption of community labour *from the community weaving itself as a whole*; that is, not from the individualised processes of subsumption of the process of immediate labour that capital imposes: a formal and real subsumption of the process of immediate labour. Indeed, capital appropriates community labour and turns it into surplus value to be added to the global mass of surplus value, generating a process of exploitation within the community. However, it does so without taking into account the properties of the means of production and even less so implementing a labour process that is specifically capitalist. In this sense, it is fertile to recover certain ideas from the work of Armando Bartra (1979); they are part of his effort to render comprehensible the specific characteristics of the process of exploitation of peasants, but we will use them for the argument that we have presented so far.

First of all, we must explain a form of exploitation where the labour process is not controlled by capital, nor do the means of production or final product of the labour process belong to it. So, how can a process of exploitation come about under these conditions? The answer is based on the *qualitative difference* -once again the issue of measurement!- that exists between the goods and use values produced by community labour and the commodities produced by capital. The former are determined by their usefulness and concrete meaning, while the latter by being bearers of surplus value. Those who *are part* of a community are interested in accessing use values that are not produced within the community, while capital is interested in surplus value. This qualitative difference between products of labour that appear undifferentiated in the labour market is what allows for these community goods to collapse into alien units of measurement: prices! That is, abstract quantities of value that cannot incorporate the average rate of profit and in certain cases can even be sold at prices that are below the costs of production because, in community production, the internal calculation is based on use value. “The condition of exploitation is fulfilled in the process of production. While production aims at reproduction and is carried out with means that have not acquired the free form of capital, the exploitation occurs in the market, where the peasant transfers his/her surplus through unequal exchange” (Bartra, 1979: 89).²⁰ This is the foundation of the “multiple” exploitation of the communitarian, though it also constitutes its possibility to exist confronted with capital in terms of material subsistence. In other words, if the community produces a great mass of goods that do not enter into the market of capital and maintain their community form of distribution, the community can continue to reproduce the conditions for its material life,

20 Bartra's text also refers to other forms of exploitation, not necessarily related to the sale of farming products but following the same logic.

even if that involves handing over a part of its surplus to capital, but never all of it.²¹ That is why community structures are hardly ever entirely dispossessed, contrary to what the vulgar discourse of the absolute dispossession of the worker sustains, concealing any type of wealth that is generated over and over again, almost always by women in the domestic, that is reproductive, sphere of the working class. They rather manage to collectively accumulate the material foundations that allow them to confront adverse situations, from natural disasters to long-lasting processes of struggle, where this small portion of concrete material wealth serves as a mattress that redirects human power destined for productive labour.

Therefore, it would be more convenient to talk of processes of *general subsumption*²² of community labour, in the sense that there have not been -or at least not entirely- any processes of formal or real subsumption of the processes of community life reproduction. That is, capital manages to price a heterogeneous set of labour processes that do not aim at reproducing surplus value, but it does so through besieging the forms of reproduction of social life and on the basis of mechanisms that “do not pertain” to its logic. The very existence of the community deforms the process of capitalist exploitation,²³ it does not eliminate it but it does condition it. It is due to this that we can also reflect upon processes of “multiple exploitation”, though, despite the siege, communities also continue to reproduce, but obviously not in an exclusive manner. They reproduce outside and against capital and, on the basis of their own processes of political self-regulation, they also

21 Obviously, this is not always possible. In many cases there are situations of *restricted reproduction* where processes of continuous impoverishment are generated, possibly rendering inviable the reproduction of the community at a specific moment.

22 Bartra develops the idea of the *general subsumption* of the labour of peasants to capital on the basis of the following explanation by Marx: “It is this that I refer to as the *formal subsumption of labour under capital*. It is the *general* form of every capitalist process of production; at the same time, however, it can be found as a *particular* form alongside the *specifically capitalist mode of production* in its developed form, because although the latter entails the former, the converse does not necessarily obtain”. (Marx, 1990 [1866]: 1019 Appendix: Results of the Immediate Process of Production). Formal subsumption involves an individualized subsumption to the production of capital, whereas general subsumption would entail the possibility of capital to subsume what is not capitalist; in this case, the communitarian.

23 In a sense, *general subsumption* can be understood as a process of domination that is to a certain extent administered from both poles of the relationship. In a sense, community weavings, though they might be forced -by the sieges, enclosures and plunders they are subjected to- to access commodities produced by capital, they also have a certain capacity to determine the conditions of their subsumption to capital, at least in two ways. On the one hand, on the basis of their own processes of collective self-administration and self-regulation, which limit capital in its effort to appropriate all energy produced by community labour. On the other hand, parting from themselves, they adopt and adapt certain commodities and knowledges that are relevant or useful to them.

produce and repeatedly adjust the mechanisms needed for their continuous reproduction as community weavings *despite* capital and in an everyday struggle against it.

7. Therefore, social transformation conceived through the community prism allows us to understand that capitalism is not total, despite its totalising logic; that different ways of reproducing life are currently being drawn out and deployed that are not -or not completely- ruled by capitalist relations; that these not fully capitalist forms are deployed over and over again as struggle, as a creative energy that in a way might overflow as a constellation of long-lasting resistances. In this sense, we understand that the varied and systematic collective efforts to guarantee the possibilities for the reproduction of life always imply struggle against capital and its political forms, confrontation and antagonism at different levels.

The way we see it, community struggles are not mainly or exclusively struggles of resistance. The transforming force of community struggles must be traced back in history; their dynamic is focused on guaranteeing the reproduction of life and in this sense they appear in everyday life as resistance. The great moments of community insurgency are the outcome of processes of articulation that can last decades, during which withdrawal and resistance tend to conserve and regenerate specific and, above all, concrete forms of *doing* and exchange. Therefore, men and women “in resistance” or whose capacity for struggle is in temporary retreat will exert themselves to reproduce and strengthen multiple weaves of social relations with a capacity to relaunch the production of the commons; that is, the capacity to self-produce a material foundation that habitates life beyond and against capital. Thus, we perceive the internal dynamic of struggle, resistance, basically as a moment of withdrawal of this capacity to struggle, an instance of introversion of the community weaving in struggle so that it can ensure its cohesion and guarantee its permanence in time.

Therefore, resistance as a moment of withdrawal of community struggle is a necessary condition for struggle to be deployed on and off as part of a never-ending cadence. There are times dedicated to the production and cultivation of a certain type of social ties, to the protection and expansion of the material wealth that is available for collective reproduction *beyond, against and beyond* capital. There are other times when these capacities are deployed, but almost never in a way that will endanger the reproduction of life itself. Our perspective, therefore, implies more than a simple qualitative difference between resistance and struggle. We rather perceive a scheduled and rhythmical deployment and withdrawal of the capacity for insubordination and struggle, both of which are focused on the conservation-transformation of the material conditions for the reproduction of social life, which at times manage to put in check -in directly opposing them- the deepest pillars and foundations of capital domination and its political forms.

Furthermore, in their repeated reproductive cycles, community weavings confront capital by establishing limits to its expansion. They collectively produce “capacities to veto” its plans and projects of expanded accumulation, de-organizing its rhythms of labour and, above all, conserving and regenerating concrete social ties and social relations oriented towards the reproduction of the trans-formed life in community terms. This

expresses a relentless struggle to evade and confront the formal and real subsumption of the varied community labour processes and, at the same time, veto the efforts of the state to expropriate the capacity of collective decision-making. In this sense, the *telos*, the horizon of desire that mediates community struggle, is the deployment of its own form of reproducing life, the expansion of its capacity of transformation. Along this line, social Revolution has nothing to do with transforming things once and for all on the basis of preconceived imaginaries; it rather turns into a *revolution through repeated distancing or recurring distortions*. In other words, we refer to a process in which what is important is *pathos* and not so much the moment in which everything turns into a different totality. Therefore, the *everyday social transformation that is deployed in struggles of different scales* involves the deployment of different forms of reproducing the communitarian, which do not only veto the totalising logic of capital, but rather enclose, little by little, from the other side of social antagonism, the social relations that are established by and for capital accumulation. An example of this are the successive waves of insurgence and protest that have been witnessed in Bolivia, Ecuador, Argentina, Mexico and many other parts of Latin America during the past fifteen years. We believe it is worth our while to continue to think from these deployed capacities and to reflect on the goals and desires that shone during the most energetic moments of struggle.

Puebla, México, septiembre de 2014.

Bibliografía

Álvarez, J.L., 2012 "El fenómeno de la caída de los cuerpos" in *Revista Mexicana de Física*, N° 58, pp. 36-40.

Bartra, Armando 1979 *La explotación del trabajo campesino por el capital* (México D.F.: Macehual).

De Angelis, Massimo 2012 "Marx y la acumulación primitiva: el carácter continuo de los 'cercamientos' capitalistas" en *Revista Theomai*, N° 26, noviembre, Buenos Aires. ["Marx and Primitive Accumulation: The Continuous Character of Capital's Enclosures, at <http://www.commoner.org.uk/02deangelis.pdf>]

Echeverría, Bolívar 1998 [1984] "El "valor de uso": ontología y semiótica" in Bolívar Echeverría *Valor de uso y utopía* (México: Siglo XXI), pp. 153-197.

Echeverría, Bolívar 1998 "Modernidad y revolución" in Bolívar Echeverría *Valor de uso y utopía* (México: Siglo XXI), pp. 61-76.

Federici, Silvia 2004 *Caliban and the Witch. Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. (New York: Autonomedia)

Gago, Verónica 2014 *La razón neoliberal. Economías barrocas y pragmática popular*, (Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón)

García, Álvaro 1995 *Forma valor y forma comunidad. Aproximación teórica-abstracta a los fundamentos civilizatorios que preceden el Ayllu Universal* (La Paz: Sin editorial).

Gutiérrez, Raquel 2001 "Forma comunal y forma liberal de la política: de la soberanía social a la irresponsabilidad civil" in Álvaro García; Raquel Gutiérrez; Raúl Prada and Luis Tapia *Pluriverso. Teoría política boliviana* (La Paz: Muela del Diablo/Comuna), pp. 55-73.

Gutiérrez, Raquel 2013 "Conocer las luchas y desde las luchas. Reflexiones sobre el despliegue polimorfo del antagonismo: entramados comunitarios y horizontes políticos" in *Acta Sociológica* (México: Centro de Estudios Sociológicos UNAM), N. 62, pp. 11-30.

- Gutiérrez, Raquel 2014 *The Rhythms of the Pachakuti. Indigenous Uprising and State* (London: Duke University Press).
- Gutiérrez, Raquel 2014a, *Horizonte comunitario-popular. Antagonismo y producción de lo común en América Latina* (Puebla, México, ICSyH-BUAP)
- Gutiérrez, Raquel 2014b “Sobre la autorregulación” in <<https://horizontescomunitarios.wordpress.com/>>.
- Holloway, John 2014: “Communiste”, in Shannon Brincat (ed), *Communism in the 21st Century* (Praeger, Santa Barbara/ Denver/ Oxford), Vol. 3, pp. 213-221
- Linsalata, Lucia 2014 “Cuando manda la asamblea. Lo comunitario-popular en Bolivia: una aproximación desde los sistemas comunitarios de agua en Cochabamba” *Doctoral Thesis in Latin-American Studies*, UNAM, México, DF.
- Martínez Luna, Jaime 2014 *Talk presented at the discussion on Material Reproduction of Life and Social Transformation [Reproducción material de la vida y transformación social]* that took place in the city of Puebla, Mexico, September 8 and 9.
- Martínez Luna, Jaime 2013, *Textos sobre el camino andado* (Oaxaca, México: CSEIIO-CAMPO), pp. 79-89
- Karl Marx, *Capital* Vol. 1, translated by Ben Fowkes, Penguin Books, London, 1990, p. 1019 (Appendix: Results of the Immediate Process of Production)
- Navarro, Mina 2012 "Luchas por lo común. Antagonismo social contra el renovado cercamiento y despojo capitalista de los bienes naturales en México" *Doctoral Thesis in Sociology*, BUAP, Puebla, Mexico.
- Tapia, Luis 2012 "Vivir por lo que nunca existió. Un programa de filosofía" in Luis Tapia *Politicidad. Ensayos filosóficos* (La Paz: Autodeterminación), pp. 97-105.
- Thompson, E.P. 1990 *Whigs and Hunters: The origins of the Black Act* (London: Penguin Books).
- Zibechi, Raúl 2010 *Dispersing Power: Social Movements as Anti-State Forces* (Edinburgh: AK Press).