



**UNIVERSITY OF SALAMANCA
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY**

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: PROPOSALS

PAPER P/05/E 97-PB94/1382

ECONOMIC NETWORKS AND MODES OF PRODUCTION

Mariano F. Enguita

Paper presented to the XIV WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY
Montreal (July 27-August 1 1998)

Research Committee 02: ECONOMIC SOCIOLOGY: PRECEDENT AND PROSPECT
Session 6: Economic sociology: precedent and prospect
(Friday July 29, 9:00-12:00)

ABSTRACT

This paper is an attempt to define a broader field for economy than the one suggested by economics. Four kinds of economic networks: households, organizations, states and markets, the former two being sites for production and produce appropriation and the later for its circulation (allocation or exchange), combine among themselves resulting in six modes of production: domestic, hacendary (*oikos*, estate), tributary, bureaucratic, mercantile and capitalist. These modes add specific dynamics to the consistency of relations already present in networks. Their threefold dimension: production, appropriation and circulation, makes room for different and superposed alignments of interests, regarding both inside and outside, with their corresponding conflicts. This approach radically brings into question any monistic vision of social dynamics supported by its identification with one mode of production dominated by one main conflict, such as Marxism. But it also tries to recover the idea that economy cannot be reduced to market plus non economic surroundings.

This paper is inscribed in a broader study on social or, if one prefers, economic inequality. In a previous article (Enguita, 1993) I argued in favour of the need to approach the analysis of economic relations by simultaneously tackling all relations which can be considered as such, and not only those which occur within the context of monetary economy, much less those which do so through the market. This basis is necessary to fully understand the different forms of inequality: in the production and distribution of goods and services (exploitation), in the struggle for access to resources or factors (discrimination) and in the initial endowment of these (inheritance), as well as the different nature of the social aggregates distinguishable around them (social classes and categories). This paper represents a necessary link between the economic networks, on the one hand, and the exploitation of the social classes, on the other hand: modes of production and distribution.¹

If we define economy as the process of production and distribution of resources in order to satisfy needs ("the use of scarce resources for alternative ends", the economists say), we must consider, together with the market and the firms (hereafter the organizations), the state (or the political community in general, so as not to limit ourselves to its modern form) and the home (or the domestic community in general, so as not to confuse it with its sedentary, family and nuclear form). We then find four large types of networks: homes, states, organizations and markets, under which almost all the economic activity of society can be subsumed. Two of them, homes and states, are what Tönnies would have called community forms, whereas the other two, markets and organizations, are eminently associative. At the same time, two of them, homes and organizations, are essentially, for our purposes, the scene of cooperative production and of the appropriation of what is produced, whereas the other two, states and organizations, are, as such, the scene of a different stage of distribution: the circulation towards others of what has previously been appropriated and possessed by someone. Table 1 summarises the crossing of these two simple dichotomous distinctions.

¹ At the same time, it represents a thorough revision of the ideas set out in another paper I published a few years ago on the same subject (Enguita: 1989). I maintain what was essential in both that paper and this one: the idea that every society is a combination of various modes of production which coexist instead of succeeding each other, as the greater part of Marxism sustained, but I now consider more basic modes and base their delimitation on other coordinates, specifically the economic networks.

Table 1
Economic Networks

		Type of economic relations	
		Production and appropriation	Acquisition
Type of social relations	Community	HOMES (domestic communities)	STATES (political communities)
	Associative	ORGANIZATIONS (public or private, specific or diffuse)	MARKETS (including barter and donation)

The economic networks not only coexist and combine, but, on doing so, they give rise to new phenomena, partly explainable by the networks themselves, but which are not merely due to their presence: modes of production. In general, modes of production are somewhat more than the economic networks (and also, let us suggest, somewhat less, or quite a bit less, than the societies or, to use Marxian jargon, than the “social formations”). In the first place this is because, as has already been pointed out, they evoke a dynamic image of process that we do not need to take into account when referring to the economic networks. Secondly, and above all, this is because a mode of production typically comprises the existence of two or more economic networks. By passing from the concept of economic network to that of mode of production, my aim is to introduce a dynamic view of both the economic process and social inequalities.

The difference between the home and the domestic mode of production can serve as an example. In order to define the concept of home it suffices to indicate that it is a group of people (including a group formed by one person) who pool their resources with a view to satisfying their needs. To go on to the concept of domestic mode of production we should add something else: the tendency to seek a balance between the degree of well-being and the level of effort. If, within the home, we define generation (age) groups and gender (sex) groups, for example adults and minors and men and women, going from the concept of network (home) to that of mode (domestic) will not lead us to a different definition of the groups in structural terms, **for which we do not need it at all**, but it does lead us to a better understanding of the dynamics, since it will, for example, enable us to understand the possibility of “self-exploitation” of domestic workers in general and women in particular. Similarly, we can understand the market simply as a collection of people willing to buy and sell, owners of goods, or of money and goods, in the style of those typical pictures of country markets in which one can guess what each person is going to do before they do it. We can then divide those present, once again in structural terms, into buyers and sellers, lenders and borrowers, etc., but if we

wish to go beyond mere taxonomy in understanding the inequalities generated we must take into account the dynamics of competition, cornering the market, monopoly, etc. However, by then we will have passed, albeit without realizing it, from the market to the mercantile mode of production.

Here I am only going to point out in a very elementary way the characteristics and dynamics of modes of production and their foundation in the economic networks dealt with above. Specifically, it will be argued that there are six modes of production: domestic, estate, tributary, mercantile, bureaucratic and capitalist, based on diverse combinations of the networks mentioned - homes, states, organizations and markets. However, I shall first indicate what seem to me to be the minimum requirements for being able to point out the existence of a mode of production and try to distinguish this concept and its implications from those usually associated with more orthodox Marxist tradition. Let us begin with the latter.

Marx coined the concept of "mode of production" to designate the set of social relations of the productive process, the "structure" or the social "base", and argue its priority over other spheres in the analysis of the social structure and dynamics.² Although occasionally he spoke of other modes of production - early communist, Asian, slave, feudal or mercantile - his analysis centred almost exclusively on the capitalist mode of production, due to the conviction that this was going to absorb the whole of society or, more exactly, of production. Moreover, Marx - implicitly and sometimes explicitly - fostered the idea of a succession of modes of production, of the substitution of one by another, in the sequence announced before - except for the simultaneousness in different parts of the world of the slave or feudal and Asian modes - which would culminate in socialism and communism.³ This representation was fascinating to post-Marx Marxism, since it simplified both synchronic analysis - each society defined by a single mode of production - and diachronic analysis - history represented and foreseeable as a succession of them - but for this very reason it became one of its most counter-productive defects when analysing real societies.⁴

Indeed, Marx used all the arguments within his reach to minimize what could be considered as other modes of production present together with the capitalist mode. He thought

² [...] In the social production of their existence, men enter into relations that are fixed, necessary, independent of their will; these production relations correspond to a certain degree of development of their material productive forces. The set of these production relations constitutes the economic structure of society, the true base on which a legal and political superstructure is raised and to which certain social forms of conscience correspond. The mode of production of material life conditions the process of social, political and intellectual life in general. (Marx, 1859a:37)

³ In broad lines, the Asian, ancient, feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production can be defined as the progressive ages of the economic forms of society. The bourgeois production relations are the last antagonistic form of the social production process. (Marx, 1859b: 9). The early communist and communist or modern socialist modes could clearly be added to these.

⁴ As Harris has pointed out (1983: 234), Marxian theory (É) is not a theory of capitalist social formations. (É) It provides us with a theory of the capitalist mode of production, but it does not offer us a sociology of capitalism.

that mercantile production was a vestige of the past, destined to disappear owing to the incessant accumulation and concentration of capital as an effect of competition.⁵ Domestic production did not even merit this, since he saw it devastated by the market and capitalism, a mere souvenir of past times.⁶ With respect to bureaucratic production, in the perspective of Marx and Engels the state, even if it faithfully served economic interests, was not an economic institution but a political one: "in the last instance, a group of armed men",⁷ an abstraction of civilian society,⁸ or "purely and simply, the board of directors which governs the collective interests of the middle class".⁹ This monotone nature of production, or this exhaustive condition of modes of production which, at least in the long run, equated every society with one only mode of production, fitted historical materialism perfectly. With each society reduced to a single mode of production, an attempt could be made to identify the dynamics of its self-destruction and its being superseded by another more progressive form in the logic of an abstract and unpolluted model, not contaminated by the disagreeable diversity of the real world. Although Marx really only theorized this destructive logic ("dialectic") for the capitalist mode of production, conceived in a Hegelian key as brilliant as it was mystic, Marxism behaved as if this proved its existence, *mutatis mutandis*, for all modes of production (but see, as proof that this was not so, the endless controversy on the transition of feudalism to capitalism or on the causes of the crisis of the ancient world).

On the contrary, what is maintained here is that diverse modes of production can and do coexist in the same society, and not casually or temporarily (as remains of the past or seeds of the future), but in a regular and stable way, although it does not have to be eternal. One of the advantages of this view is that, from the point of view of the analysis of inequalities, of their causes and remedies, not only are the internal dynamics of this or that mode of production important but also their relative weight in society in general and whether or not they belong to each social group in particular. In more conventional sociological terms, not only each scale of stratification or each source of inequality is important, but also its relative weight and extension, mutual relations, etc. The capitalist mode of production, for example, with its division between owners and non-owners of the means of production, is very important, but becomes somewhat less so when the bureaucratic mode of production (commonly

⁵ The emergence of many capitalists - writes Marx - is only possible through a multilateral accumulation, since capital, in general, only emerges through accumulation, and multilateral accumulation is necessarily transformed into unilateral accumulation. The accumulation, which under the dominion of private ownership is *concentration of capital* in a few hands, is a necessary consequence when the capitals are left to follow their natural course. (Marx, 1844a: 74-75).

⁶ (É) Big industry had dissolved, together with the economic fundament of the traditional family and the labour corresponding to it, even old family ties. (Marx, 1867: I/2, 595) (É) The manufacturing system (É) took charge of undermining the last vestige of the common interests, the family community of goods, which is now (É) in process of liquidation. (Engels, 1843: 124)

⁷ Engels, 1884

⁸ Marx, 1844b, 1843

⁹ Marx and Engels, 1848: 74

known as Welfare State), which makes all citizens approximately equal with regard to access to certain resources and opportunities, reduces its social space (even those most reluctant to accept this argument will be ready to admit it in the opposite sense, especially in times of privatization such as today).

Therefore, according to what has been said, it is natural that the concept of mode of production used here is, so to speak, of "low intensity" in relation to what is properly Marxian. In the first place because it does not entail any idea of explosive and unsurmountable internal contradiction. The mere image of various modes of production coexisting implies that the more recent have appeared without any need to bury the oldest, which, consequently, would not have shown themselves to be very "dialectic". Moreover, the acceptance of simultaneousness destroys the idea of succession and, therefore, that of the necessary destruction of one social form to give way to another. All this does not mean that there cannot or should not be any change, evolution and even revolution, or that there are no fissures, opposition, contradictions and conflicts, but purely and simply that, whether they exist or not, they are not deduced from where it was expected.

Modes of production other than those proposed here could perhaps be considered. In fact, to the typical list (early communist, slave, feudal, Asian, mercantile, capitalist, socialist), which really consists of transmuting the major social forms into abstract models of modes of production, historical sociology and political theory - especially, but not only, Marxist - have added an additional list of candidates: patriarchal, nomad, state capitalist, communist (as distinct from socialist), cooperativist... Moreover, a multiplicity of modes or submodes, based on the real or imaginary variants of the main modes could also be postulated: for example, distinguishing between patriarchal and egalitarian, or extensive and nuclear, domestic mode, or between pure and trade-union mercantile mode, between free and regulated capitalist mode, between centralist and self-managing collectivism, between corporative and liberal welfare, etc., but we cannot grasp the usefulness of this, that is, of branding each of the possible versions of the basic modes and modes of production. The option taken here consists, on the one hand, of highlighting as modes of production those which arise from the basic combinations among the economic networks, and can thus be clearly characterised and delimited based on these same economic networks; on the other hand, they must offer a certain internal consistency and dynamics of their own, in the sense that regularities in their functioning can be pointed out and, from them, a logic of development deduced; finally, they should have a certain significance, which fundamentally means dimensions worthy of consideration - fortunately, as can be immediately understood, it is not necessary to go into disquisitions as to how much significance or what dimensions, or as to possible differences between their quantitative and qualitative significance, since the modes of production that will be considered could pass any reasonable test of minimums.

Modes of Production as Combinations of Networks

The classification we shall make of modes of production and distribution is based on a single criterion: the presence in them of the different economic networks. We start from the fact that one of them is always present: homes, whether directly as such or through one of their members, and then we shall consider the results according to whether organizations, states or markets are added. Nevertheless we must begin by recalling an elementary difference between homes and organizations, on the one hand, and states and markets on the other. Homes and organizations are agents of production and also settings for distribution, inasmuch as and only inasmuch as it must be decided to whom what is produced belongs. Logically they are also the setting for the distribution of what is obtained in other networks of distribution (of the price obtained in the market or of the transfer received from the state). States and markets, on their part, are networks of distribution, and only intervene in production indirectly, insofar as they put the producing agents (homes and organizations) in contact, or insofar as the state itself sets up productive organizations. Table 2 shows this schematically. In the vertical dimension we have homes and organizations (or, in this second case, the homes plus the organizations, if one prefers). In the horizontal dimension three possibilities are distinguished: that there is no mechanism for distribution between the productive units - thus implying that they are self-sufficient - , that the state is the intermediary, or that the market is.

Table 2

Networks and Modes

	Distribution / Social Division of Labour		
Production	None	State	Market
Home	DOMESTIC MP	TRIBUTARY MP	MERCANTILE MP
Organization	ESTATE MP	BUREAUCRATIC MP	CAPITALIST MP

The most elementary mode of production is, logically, domestic (DMP), formed exclusively by more or less self-sufficient homes. It comprises the set of activities that individuals perform to directly satisfy their own needs or those of other members of their homes.¹⁰ It has been the predominant form of production throughout the whole of the prehistory of

¹⁰ The existence and specificity of the DMP have been pointed out on several fronts, with this or some other name: in the study of primitive societies, from Morgan and his *Communist life*, which served as a major basis for Marx and Engels (particularly Engels, 1884), to the more recent study by Sahlins (1974) and his *Economic theory of the Stone Age* or *Chayanov's rule*; in the analysis of the logic of peasant economies, especially in Chayanov (1924) and his theory on peasant economic organization, but also in other authors, such as Meillassoux (1975) and, to some extent, the whole school of the Fernand Braudel Center with its insistence on homes; finally, in numerous feminist analyses of domestic labour, for example, Harrison (1973) or Gardiner (1973), or Delphy (1976).

mankind and the greater part of history: from the primitive horde to the self-sufficient peasant units which still persist throughout the non-industrialized world. Obviously it has been losing ground and will lose still more (but not much more) versus more advanced forms of production, but even today, in a country such as Spain, the total hours devoted to domestic labour seem to be appreciably higher than those dedicated to all kinds of paid labour.

A higher degree of complexity and sociality in production takes us to the estate mode of production (EMP), a name which is probably the most unfamiliar to the reader.¹¹ It arises when the organization is added to the home, as a way to obtain results which require labour on a larger scale, or the use of means of production outside the reach of an individual or a domestic group, as a form of systematic extraction of surplus labour from some homes by another or, what is most acceptable, as both at the same time. The economic unit in question, the estate, continues to be, like the home, unitary and self-sufficient, self-contained, although it may have occasional relations with the outside (with other estates, and where appropriate, with the state or with the market); labour thus, at all events, acquires greater internal specialisation. The relations inside it can be of cooperation between equals or of submission to a master, or even of slavery (slavery of former times can be included here). Feudal estates or Roman estates based on slave labour can be considered to fit in here, either totally or partially. Traces of this mode of production can no longer be found in industrial democracies, but they can be found, in a far from negligible way, in rural areas of the Third World, particularly in Latin America.

If, instead of the organization, what is added to the home is the state, as a distributive network that does not alter production as such, the tributary mode of production (TMP) emerges. Production still depends essentially on the homes, while the state mainly concerns itself with taking a bit here and giving a bit there, with a good part getting lost on the way. As the state produces little or nothing but redistributes an important part of what is produced by the homes, it makes good sense to speak of a tributary mode of production (or rather of distribution, but let us not cross our bridges before we come to them, since we shall go into this in detail later), since its economic activity consists above all in extracting resources from the homes, whether in labour, in kind, in money or in any combination of the three, for consumption by the dominant group itself or for transferring it to other homes. Historically both "eastern despotism" and feudalism are included here; in this respect these are only differentiated by the extent of their territory or by the degree of centralisation of power and, therefore,

¹¹ There are also important precedents in considering the EMP. In the first place, Weber (1922: I, 311), when he referred to the *oikos* as the great domestic estate, directed authoritatively, of a prince, lord of the manor, patrician, whose ultimate motive does not lie in the *capitalist acquisition of money*, but in the *natural and organized covering of the lord's needs*. For this purpose he could make use of all the means to a very great extent, without neglecting outside exchange. What is decisive is that for him the main informant is *use of heritage* and not *valuation of capital*. Of course, Weber does not speak, nor ever would have, of a *mode of production*, but describes an economic sector with a specific internal economic logic, which is what it is about.

of the tributary extraction of surplus.¹² Nowadays, the public budget easily accounts for between one and two thirds of the national income, which goes far beyond what is implied by the direct intervention of the state in production and reveals its additional purely redistributive role.

If, instead of the state, the market is added to the homes, as a mechanism of distribution we then find the mercantile mode of production (MMP), which consists of direct production for the market carried out by independent producers (who are generally the owners of the means of production they use, though even this is not necessary).¹³ It arises when a major part of the product of the domestic units is no longer consumed by the units themselves, and a major part of their needs of consumption is no longer directly covered by the product of their labour. The MMP and the TMP are alternative forms of development of the external or social division of labour, since what both do is create a relation between estate domestic units which thus cease to be self-sufficient. The MMP has probably never existed in a pure and isolated state, except episodically in the frontier areas of the massive colonisation of new lands (those which in the nascent United States, for example, were called "territories", in contrast to "states"). Their sphere today is that of small production (craftsmen, professionals, farmers and independent traders, without employees). Although their relative weight has not ceased to decrease, in the long term, throughout the whole process of industrialisation, they continue to be a considerable proportion of the labour force and it even seems that they have experienced some recovery during recent times. In Spain, for example, they now make up between a sixth and a seventh of the working population, a fifth if the so-called "family allowances" are added, and probably somewhat more if informal economy could be adequately computed.

The bureaucratic mode of production (BMP) emerges when the state, already present as a political organization of the community and as head of the TMP, goes on to organize relevant areas of production at a supradomestic level; or, if preferred, when it moves from limi-

¹² This has been specially pointed out by authors such as S. Amin, to whom, I believe, we owe the first known use of the expression "tributary M.P.", although this author shares with other Marxists the monopolistic view of the modes of production, that is, their identification with the whole of society. According to Amin (1973: 11), this mode adds to the persistence of the village community a social and political apparatus of exploitation of it under the form of extraction of tax; this tributary mode of production is the most common form characterising the (pre)capitalist class formations; we shall distinguish: a) its early forms, and b) its developed forms, such as the "feudal" mode of production, in which the village community loses the eminent ownership of the soil to the benefit of the lords, and subsists as a community of families.

¹³ Few people have dealt with the mercantile mode of production, undoubtedly due to that perverse combination of the stigma of being a mode to be extinguished and of being branded by Marx (1867: I/1,214) as the "Eden of human rights". Nevertheless, it has been dealt with by those who, as has already been indicated, studied the market, that is, those who have studied the peasantry, such as Chevalier (1983), and some analytical neo-Marxists, such as Roemer (1982,1988), specifically those who have overcome the prejudice that it was a pure relation between free, equal individuals exchanging equivalent values. Insofar as it shares this prejudice, pure classical economic theory can be considered a major speculative construct on the MMP.

ting itself to distribution to concerning itself with the production of wealth.¹⁴ The differential element with respect to the tributary mode is the irruption of the organization. Consequently, we can consider it already present in the seigneurial and despotic forms, inasmuch as these pass from the pure extraction of tributes to the undertaking of public work or, in general, any form of production. Coexisting with other forms of production it is found as the public sector in the countries called in a simplifying way capitalist, and it represents an important part of total production: in Spain almost a fifth of the working population. In the so-called socialist countries it came to represent the greater part of extradomestic production, scarcely leaving room for the market of consumer goods, and in some cases it was almost the whole (for example, during the Great Cultural Revolution in China).

The capitalist mode of production (CMP) is defined by the configuration of capital and labour as commodities, and the purchasing of the latter (as labour force, or work time) by the former. In terms of economic networks this means that the organization joins the market (and the homes), without any intervention of the state being theoretically necessary other than that corresponding to its role of guarantor of social order. It is thus distinguished from the MMP and the TMP by the presence of the organization, and from the EMP and the BMP by the presence of the market. It is, undoubtedly, the broadest and most forceful sector in western economies, in which it represents the greater part of extradomestic labour and of monetary wealth and in which, above all, it plays a dominant role which goes far beyond its mere numerical importance (which, in Spain, reaches three fifths of the working population, by adding those employed in the private sector and the employers).¹⁵

Production and Distribution

It is necessary to recall once again that modes of production are distinguished through two dimensions: production and distribution. It not only matters what is produced and how, but also for whom it is produced. What separates the DMP, the TMP and the MMP is the form

¹⁴ The productive, as well as distributive, nature of the eastern empires was pointed out by Marx, when speaking of the Asian MP, and later on by Wittfogel (1957), with the 'eastern despotism' model. The nature of the East European, or 'socialist', countries has logically attracted a great deal of attention from opponents to their regimes, who have tried to find a comprehensive explanation for their existence, often resorting to expressions such as 'bureaucratic mode of production', 'bureaucratic collectivist', 'degenerate workers' state', etc. The analyses by Trotsky (1939), Rizzi (1939), Burnham (1941), Djilas (1957), Kuron and Modzelewsky (1976), Konrad and Szelenyi (1979), Castoriadis (1975) or Bahro (1979) are particularly interesting. Finally, some scholars on the subject, such as O'Connor (1973) or Gough (1979), and analysts of collective action such as Olson (1965) or March and Simon (1958) have tried to find a specific logic, either autonomous or subsidiary, to the public sector in dominantly capitalist economies.

¹⁵ It is questionable whether employers with a very small number of workers should be considered as capitalists, but it would also be questionable whether they should be considered as lower middle class without further specifications. In a later chapter we shall precisely go into a more detailed delimitation of the classes.

of distribution - domestic self-sufficiency, the state or the market - not the form of production strictly speaking - which is always the home. The same could be said of the EMP, the BMP and the CMP, once again separated, and in the same terms, by the form of distribution, but with a common basis in production: the organization. Moreover, what separates the DMP from the EMP, the same as that which distinguishes the TMP from the BMP, or that which differentiates the MMP from the CMP, is the form of production - always, for each pair mentioned, respectively, the home and the organization - not the form of distribution, which is common to each of them - none or self-sufficiency for the former, the state for the next ones, the market for the last two.

As forms of production, each mode is at the same time a technical form of labour and a social form of cooperation (including non-cooperation, in individual production, that is domestic production, within the domestic, tributary and mercantile modes).¹⁶ On the one hand, as a relation between the processes of labour, it can consist of the autonomy of each one with respect to the others or in their coordination, that is, of independent processes of labour or of cooperative contributions to a process. On the other hand, as a relation between people it can take three main forms: dependence, power, and need. Dependence is what I call the diffuse relation, at the same time authoritarian and with solidarity, proper to the family structure and the seigneurial forms. I refer to power as the capacity to directly determine the activity of another, even against his will, generally with the possibility of violence as a last resort. Finally, I consider need to be the situation in which one of the parties is forced into the relationship by circumstances, but this relationship could be avoided, although at a high cost, and in any case an act of will must intervene. These two types of functional links and three types of personal links are combined in modes of production already mentioned as Table 3 indicates.

¹⁶ If we accumulate this subdivision between technical process and cooperation, within production, together with the division between production and distribution, we can find a correspondence between these three relations and the forms of instrumental, strategic and communicative action pointed out by Habermas (1976: 133) when he said that what is decisive is, furthermore, the sociological aspect of the transformation of material in agreement with the ends and according to the *rules of instrumental action*. (É) *The rules of strategic action* according to which cooperation is produced, are a necessary component part of the labour process. (É) The delivery of finished products thus requires rules of interaction which can be detached from the concrete situations and established with a lasting nature as recognized standards or as *rules of communicative action* on the level of linguistic understanding.

Table 3

Personal and Functional Links

		Functional links	
		Autonomy	Coordination
Personal links	Dependence	DMP	EMP
	Power	TMP	BMP
	Need	MMP	CMP

The difference which separates the modes of production mentioned into two halves throughout the dimension of production, those which are based on the home and those based on the organization, has a far-reaching consequence for all of them. In the three modes that are based on production in the home, whether for subsistence (DMP), for the state (TMP), for the market (MMP) or, of course, for any combination of them, the worker always maintains a high degree of control over the object, the process and the rhythm of his labour. However, in the three that are based on production by organizations, whether for themselves (DMP), for the state (BMP), for the market (CMP) or for any mixture of these, the worker loses autonomy in his labour to be subjected to the authority of the organization and to those who occupy positions of authority in it. It is also extremely likely, although not inevitable, that he may find himself immersed in a growing internal division of labour, and, in the last analysis, in the division of the tasks which the process can be broken down into.

The term "distribution", however, contains a reality which is not less but rather more complex. By distribution one should understand the way in which the product is distributed both among the different productive units, which is the most conventional way of doing it and which we have been using up to now - when speaking of homes and organizations as merely productive and only of the states and markets as distributive - and within each productive unit. We can consider these two as the internal and external distribution of the product, from the point of view of the unit that serves as a setting for the productive process, or, to use more exact terminology, as the appropriation and acquisition of the product, respectively. I have chosen these two terms because I think they express, at least approximately, a basic difference: in the first case it is a matter of taking possession of something that exists in principle, as *res nullius*, which does not yet belong to anybody; in the second case, it is a matter of obtaining something that previously belonged to someone, who yields it so that the other may obtain it. In this sense, appropriation is a unilateral act in the face of its object (although it may require the voluntary or compulsory acquiescence of the others, particularly that of the other participants in production); acquisition, on the other hand, is always at least a bilateral act, in which the goods obtained cease to belong to the other party (although it also requires, no less than appropriation, the voluntary or compulsory acquiescence of the others, third parties who abstain from intervening and accept the result). Acquisition is such, for each resource involved in that distributive moment, from the point of view of one of the parties involved; from the

perspective of the other it is alienation, and from an outside, external or overall perspective it could be described as circulation (movement of the resources among the economic units).

When the productive unit is an individual, (for these purposes not involved in other relations), production and appropriation coincide, or perhaps we should say that there is no place for appropriation as a different moment. But this would hardly be the case of Robinson Crusoe on his island before the arrival of Friday, one might say the case of an individual producing for himself in a subsistence economy, a home but not a family, or that of an individual producing by himself for the market under the same circumstances or with a clear separation between domestic and mercantile production. When production is a cooperative process, as occurs in homes (formed by more than one active individual) and organizations and in the mixed form which is the estate, there is no direct relation between the final product, if it is one, or each part or unit of the product, if it is multiple, and each part or unit of the productive activity. Remember that we are speaking of producing in common, in a coordinated and cooperative way, and simply together, in parallel or in juxtaposition. The production process consists precisely of obtaining a new and different result (the product) from elements of a given origin (the factors), hence there is no possible direct equivalence between the former and the latter. Equivalence is always indirect and, ultimately, conventional: the "marginal productivity" of each factor, the contribution in labour, the hierarchic position of the participants... Whatever the criterion adopted (we could also say the *theory of value*, but only as a normative theory of justice), we are faced with an act of appropriation, that is, of distribution of the product among the participants in the productive process in proportions which are not unquestionably deduced from this, but rather through the mediation of conventional criteria.

Appropriation is based on different mechanisms according to its context, the setting of the cooperative production. If the setting is the home or the estate, the mechanism is relations of personal dependence, whether of kinship or of submission, that is, patriarchal or seigneurial. The fundamental difference between one and the other, for these purposes, is that relations of kinship are relations of dependence among persons (of women with respect to men, of minors with respect to adults), but they are usually accompanied by an affective dimension and actual living together which do not exist in relations of submission, and they are linked to a process of biological reproduction foreign to the latter. If the setting is the firm or agency, that is, the organization in a capitalist or bureaucratic context, the mechanism is relations of authority, which we consider to be different from those of dependence inasmuch as they are functional, segmentary and specialised, like the organization itself, and not diffuse and conspicuous. In the capitalist firm they are at the same time required and limited firstly by the exterior context, which means above all the range of alternative opportunities, but also, in the second place, by the inner context, that is, by the agreements and by the correlation of forces among the participants; in the public agencies they depend firstly on the inner context, that is, on consensus and the correlation of forces, but also on the outer context, that is the options (especially in capitalism) and the added force of the state (especially in collectivism).

When the economic unit is self-sufficient, in the sense that it produces what it consumes and consumes what it produces, as the home and the estate can be, distribution is reduced to appropriation, with no place for acquisition (or alienation, or circulation). However, if the economic units produce resources that they do not consume and consume others that they do not produce, then there must be some form of acquisition of what is produced by others and of alienation of what is going to be consumed by others, that is, circulation. Circulation can adopt the form of exchange, through the market, understanding here both the direct exchange of products, or barter, and their indirect exchange through money, or buying and selling, and of course all the possible variants of one or the other (bilateral or multilateral, immediate or at a term, etc.) It can adopt the form of allocation, through the treasury, one might say the state in purely distributive functions, when the latter, using its tax and budget mechanisms, takes resources from some units and transfers them to others, including itself or rather the individuals, homes and organizations associated with it. And it can take the form of donations, through informal networks of solidarity, when some economic units yield resources to others without the necessary compensation, although expectations of reciprocity may be based on it if the opposite situation occurs.¹⁷

This third form is, undoubtedly, less important in a society where distribution is clearly dominated by the market and the state, but this does not mean that it has been irrelevant before or even that it is irrelevant now. Thus, for example, in a generalised economy of subsistence, ritual gifts are frequent, donations between homes united by more or less lax relations of kinship, mutual support among neighbours, spontaneous aid in cases of emergency or need, etc. Really, it would be difficult to find, at any time in history and in any geographical context, strictly self-sufficient homes or estates. Self-sufficiency should be understood as a basic and predominant self-sufficiency, not total or absolute. Even today, together with the state and the market, we can find many forms of donations between relatives that go beyond the limits of the homes, mutual support among neighbours, companions and friends, help for all and sundry in case of need or emergency, etc. There may not be as many as one might expect or hope, but in any case sufficient so as not to consider these means of circulation as a negligible amount. What generally leads one to disregard them as a *quantité négligéable* is not the fact that they are really insignificant, but rather that they are either not quantifiable or it is difficult to quantify them.

And distribution does not end even here. If there is circulation, that is, if the individuals, the homes, or the organizations acquire resources, the appropriation of these acquired resources is still pending. In homes and organizations, resources obtained by donation in the networks of solidarity, prices and products in the market, and transfers received from the state will be the target of appropriation. This moment of distribution is not previously resolved,

¹⁷ To a certain extent, donations would correspond to *ÒreciprocityÓ*, whereas allocation through tributary mechanisms would correspond to *ÒcentricityÓ*, the ways of functioning of the economic system prior to the market pointed out by Polanyi (1944) together with estate economy. The other element, *ÒsymmetryÓ*, would be developed in the market itself.

since it is either a matter of resources that the economic unit acquires without compensation (as the result of a donation from another or of a unilateral transfer from the state), or a matter of resources that it obtains as compensation for handing over other resources that were not the object of appropriation (the non-consumed result of domestic labour, the “non-distributed benefits”, etc.). Consequently, in each economic unit, appropriation can be made of what is produced in the unit itself or what is acquired from outside, and just as there may be units which produce but do not acquire (self-sufficient), there may also be those which acquire but do not produce, although the majority in both combinations do both things at the same time. Sequentially, this appropriation of what is acquired must take place, quite probably, after appropriation (or non-appropriation) of what is produced in the economic unit itself and, undoubtedly, after acquisition of what is produced by other economic units (perhaps in exchange for what is produced but not appropriated by the unit itself), but the process is similar to that of appropriation of what is produced.

This breaking down into different partial processes of the overall process of distribution is given schematically in Table 4

Table 4

Forms of Distribution

DISTRIBUTION		MECHANISM
Appropriation	Patriarchal	Home
	Seigneurial	Estate
	Authoritarian	Organization
Acquisition	Allocation	State as Treasury
	Exchange	Market, barter
	Donarions	Networks of solidarity

The different modes of production can be, as such, the setting of both forms of distribution or of only one of them. The domestic and estate modes of production are the setting of processes of appropriation, but not of acquisition (circulation, alienation), since by definition they are self-sufficient. The mercantile and tributary modes of production are the setting for processes of acquisition, respectively through the market and the state, but not of appropriation (as “ideal types” or models, both would only relate individual producers and if they really relate homes, it is because they are articulated with the domestic mode of production, which typically underlies or accompanies all the others). Finally the bureaucratic and capitalist modes of production are the setting for both appropriation (of what is produced and what is acquired) and acquisition. This is summarized in Table 5.

Table 5

Modes of Production and Processes of Distribution

Current processes of distribution		
Appropriation only	Acquisition only	Appropriation and Acquisition
DMP, EMP	TMP, MMP	BMP, CMP

Ultimately this can all be reduced to an already-mentioned elementary difference. Appropriation exists wherever there is production through a complex social entity, which is something more than one individual; i.e., in homes and organizations, which are, together with the individuals (really one-person homes), the networks in which, strictly speaking, production carried out. Moreover, there is circulation or allocation in the networks which, in a restricted sense, are purely distributive, specifically the market and the state (the treasury). Consequently, although so as not to overload an already bulky terminology we shall continue to speak in general of modes of production without adding anything else, it should be remembered that it is a matter of modes of production and distribution or, to be exhaustive, modes of production, appropriation and acquisition (or circulation).

Inherent Conflicts

Each of these modes of production has its own inherent conflicts, either internal or external to the economic units themselves. For classical Marxism the CMP is the setting of the central conflict in current society, which could be contemplated indiscriminately as a conflict concerning production (of surplus labour) or concerning appropriation (of surplus value), although this distinction has been anything but irrelevant for the interpreters, as the unending, somewhat scholastic, discussion between orthodox Marxists and neo-Ricardians shows. As is well known, the MMP has been assumed to be the realm of equality, liberty and Bentham¹⁸ (a supposition, truly, in which Marxism paradoxically coincided in general terms with the "bourgeois economy"), a setting free from any real conflicts, whose only offence was concealment, by hiding behind the apparent equivalence of all the exchanges, including that of the labour force, the exploitation of the latter by capital.¹⁹ (As regards the DMP and the BMP, Marxism has not normally considered them as modes of production, but rather as non-economic superstructural spheres, the family as a structure of kinship, and the state as a political power, so that they could not be settings for the type of conflicts about exploitation that concentrated their interest. Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that some Marxist authors or

¹⁸ Marx (1867: I,1, 214).

¹⁹ This circulation is a nebula behind which a whole world is hiding, the world of the nexuses of capital. (Marx, 1857: II, 153)

authors influenced by Marx have used the concept of mode of production to analyse these spheres. Finally, Marxism never referred to the TMP or the EMP, but it did refer to the feudal MP and to the Asian MP, which jointly covered the same area, and always did so pointing out the opposition between serfs and lords, masters and slaves.)

Here we are going to tackle the matter from a broader perspective. Since modes of production are, as has been said, modes of production and distribution, or more precisely, of production, appropriation and acquisition, each one of these types of relations is potentially, in the modes in which it is present, a source of conflict. However, not all the relations are present in all the modes, so we shall have to analyse them one by one to indicate which are present and which are not. In the mercantile and tributary modes, in which we suppose in principle that the economic unit is the individual (and if it is the home then it lies outside of the MMP and of the TMP, since it corresponds to the DMP articulated with them), **only distribution is present as such, or more precisely acquisition - whether as exchange or allocation, that is, through the market or the state.** The conflicts are always, therefore, outside the productive units, since they are situated in the relations between them. In the domestic and estate modes, on the other hand, where the home and the estate are settings of cooperative production, and therefore, at the same time, of production and appropriation, but also self-sufficient economic units, without a regular relation with the outside, acquisition is not present, neither as exchange nor as allocation (neither as market or as state). In this case, the conflicts, whether about production or appropriation, are always inside the productive units. Finally, in the bureaucratic or capitalist modes where the firm and the agency are in themselves settings for production and appropriation, and where they relate to **similar entities**, or to society as a whole through the networks of acquisition, respectively of allocation and exchange or, what amounts to the same, of the state and the market, the conflicts occur in the three spheres and consequently some are internal and others external from the point of view of the singular economic units. Table 6 gives these variants.

Table 6

Modes of Production as Settings for Conflict

	Type of conflict and relations affected			
	Internal conflicts		External conflicts	
	Production	Appropriation	Allocation	Exchange
DMP	+	+		
EMP	+	+		
TMP			+	
MMP				+
BMP	+	+	+	
CMP	+	+		+

It is easy to illustrate this. The units of the MMP come into conflict with each other about the prices. Those of the TMP do so with the treasury about taxes or among themselves about the individual taxes/transfers balance or, what amounts to the same thing, about the distribution of taxes among the taxpayers and the distribution of transfers among the beneficiaries. The units of the DMP, like those of the EMP, come into conflict about the division of labour and the workload (production) and about who the product belongs to (appropriation), although in each of these modes it is done differently since the sets of relations are clearly different. Finally, in the BMP and the CMP we find all the conflicts mentioned gathered together. It is notable that these modes of production have been able to be contemplated in such a unilateral way as to consider them the settings of a single conflict. Thus, for example, when Dahrendorf refers to the state as an association of domination marked by the division between administrators and administrated, what he is doing is focusing unilaterally on the external conflict proper to that mode of production (allocation), including a subsphere of it, the relation between the agencies and their public, without considering the relations between agencies (another part of allocation) or the relations inside them (production and appropriation). Similarly, when Marx affirmed that the division that crosses capitalist enterprise is the one that separates the employers from the employed, he was focusing on the internal conflict (production or appropriation) leaving aside the external one (exchange), and even then it is not always clear if he was referring to the former as a conflict proper to production, to appropriation or to both.

Two matters remain to be defined. The first is that donations do not appear among the relations of distribution considered as potentially conflictive, which is explained by their nature, in principle voluntary and incidental. If they should become regularised or ritualised to the point of being able to become the setting for conflict, it would mean that they had become a process of allocation. The second point is that we have only considered the DMP as

represented by the homes as settings for cooperative production, that is, formed by two or more individuals. However, a home can be purely individual, and then an interindividual conflict is not possible. It would, in this case, be an intraindividual conflict or, what amounts to the same, a conflict between the desire to minimize effort (production) and maximize enjoyment (consumption) on the part of one sole individual who would then have to decide on the balance most suited to him/her, the labour-consumption balance. This is the Chayanovian home par excellence: Chayanov generalised to any type of home what can only be predicted in the strict sense as logic of individual behaviour. When the home is formed by several individuals it can preserve this logic to a greater or lesser degree, according to whether it works in a more or less consensual way, or according to whether the person holding the authority assumes as more or less his/hers the interests of everyone equally, or to whether its members all act with more or less autonomy. However, it can also become a setting for conflicting interests, which will happen when there is disagreement on how to share the workload (production) or on how to distribute the product (appropriation).

Internal Dynamics

The dynamics of these modes of production, like their inherent conflicts, generally come from the relations of production and distribution that they have. Production, in general, entails an unwanted effort, at least after a certain point. Consequently, wherever the worker maintains control of his/her labour he/she will try to put into practice some kind of Chayanovian balance, that is, balance between labour and consumption, between effort and result.²⁰ This logic will prevail without restrictions in the DMP on a purely individual scale, that is, in homes formed by only one individual. In a general way, it can continue to prevail for homes as such as long as we do not take into account their internal divisions, that is, for the homes but not for the individuals. If Chayanov was able to generalise this formula for peasant homes, **and all the more so for a relatively mercantilistic economy**, and if Sahlins could do so for primitive peoples, without taking into account the enormous differences in the workload between men and women, it was precisely with this unconscious - and, we might say, androcentric - condition. However, if, as happens today and has happened practically always, the home comprehends a division of labour and the hierarchy between the sexes, and perhaps between the generations, then, as in all kinds of unequal and hierarchical cooperation in which one party exercises its power over the productive activity of the other, a contrast of interests may arise

²⁰ (É) The energy developed by the worker (É) is stimulated by the consumption needs of the family and, when these increase, the rate of exploitation of labour necessarily rises (É). On the other hand, the consumption of energy is inhibited by the fatigue of labour itself. The harder the labour, compared with the remuneration, the lower the level of welfare at which the family stops working, although it often has to make great efforts to reach even this low level. In other words, we can positively affirm that the degree of self-exploitation of the labour force is established by the ratio between the degree of satisfaction of needs and that of the weight of labour. (Chayanov, 1924:84)

and, to a greater or lesser degree, does arise. Thus, we can continue to characterise the home as an economic unit ready to reduce its workload or to exploit itself, but we should not forget that the party whose offer of labour has greater elasticity is women, with a large difference with respect to men. It is a commonplace, for example, that among the so-called "primitive peoples", as among the gypsies or Arabs, women bear a much greater workload than men. Even today, in western societies in which a typical couple combines the full-time paid labour of the man with the exclusive or basic responsibility of the woman in the domestic sphere, with or without the incorporation of the woman to paid labour, and with or without the man's collaboration in the housework, the probabilities of self-exploitation are almost always greater for the woman, who is the one who frequently takes on a "double working day"²¹ or unending housework. The probabilities of the balance leaning clearly towards leisure are also, although on fewer occasions, greater for women, as may occur in the case of the "middle-class housewife", in homes with a high income, or during the "empty-nest" period. To sum up, domestic economy is the privileged setting of Chayanovian balance, but with strong interference from the division of labour and the hierarchy of the sexes and, when appropriate, of the generations in it.

Where workers keep individual control, or even simply family control, of the process of production, but some distribution relations are superimposed with their own dynamics, the result is naturally mixed. This is what happens, in different ways, in the TMP and the MMP. As in the case of the DMP, the worker controls his/her labour, but now he/she does so subjected to certain constraints or impositions derived from the distribution relations: in the TMP because he/she has to pay tribute to the lord, to the royal or imperial official, or whoever, hence he/she has to produce some surplus beyond what is necessary to satisfy his/her needs and those of his/her home; in the MMP because he/she has to adapt to the characteristics of the product and to the prices dictated by the mechanisms of competition, on which he/she can have only limited influence.

Where, finally, production is organised cooperatively, as occurs in the EMP, the BMP or the CMP, the labour of the majority is subjected to the will of a minority, whether it be the lord, the bureaucrat or the capitalist, or their deputy. If the consumption or in general the access to resources, of any of these personages possessing power depends more on the labour of those subjected to them than on their own labour, they will try to use the power they have to increase the labour of those under their power. Wherever there is cooperative production there is also, as we have seen, a problem of appropriation. So, under any given conditions of production the appropriation of what is produced - once produced - can be considered a game of zero sum, in which everything that one party appropriates thus escapes the reach of the others. Consequently, this is part of the dynamics of all those modes of production in which the organization intervenes in one way or another, that is the EMP, the BMP and the CMP, and

²¹ As Young and Willmott (1973) pointed out some time ago, what often happens, and will happen until the heralded "symmetrical family" arrives, is that women come to have two jobs - one in the home and one outside - whereas men continue with one.

in a mitigated way, the DMP. The presence of the organization sets off the conditions of Chayanovian balance, because there is now no longer any opposition between labour and consumption, since some consume (or at least consume rather than work) and others work (or at least work rather than consume) and, above all, the consumption of those who hold authority depends mainly on the labour of others, rather than on their own. Those who fundamentally consume do not see the increase of the workload as a constraint for themselves, since this increase is suffered by others, and those who fundamentally work can no longer limit their effort on their own by accepting to relinquish part of their consumption, since they have lost control of their own labour (and, indirectly, of their own consumption).

When the networks of acquisition come into the picture, their internal logic is added to that of production and appropriation. Neither does the labour-consumption balance, when production is individual (or of the family unit without considering the individuals), depend any longer on the simple decision of the individual, nor do the individual doses of labour and consumption, when production is cooperative and appropriation individual, now depend merely on the ratio of forces in production and appropriation. In the former case, this is because the changing conditions of the environment alter the terms of balance, it being possible to demand less labour for the same consumption or offer more consumption for the same labour if the conditions become more favourable or more labour if they become unfavourable. In the latter case, it is because, although the proportions of appropriation may remain constant depending on the correlation of internal forces, under favourable conditions consumption can increase and/or the load decrease for all and under unfavourable conditions consumption will have to decrease and/or the general load increase, unless the change in the environment induces a change in the correlation of internal forces or the consumption or the labour of one of the parties reaches its lower or upper limits, or proves itself more inelastic. The conditions of the environment which we are referring to are, naturally, the buying prices of the factors and the selling prices of the products in the market and the balance between taxes handed over to the state and transfers received from it.

At this point it is interesting to note that the environment has a stimulating or dissuasive effect on production, but with different effectiveness. If the mode of acquisition or circulation is exchange - the market -, both the appropriation of the possible benefits, (that is, the consequences of the possible inefficiencies) and the covering of the possible losses will be individual, since the market is always a sum of bilateral relations between singular economic units. If the mode of acquisition or circulation is allocation - the state -, both the appropriation of benefits and the covering of losses will be shared, since the treasury or the budget is always a relationship of each economic unit with the set formed by all of them, not with one in particular. Consequently, both gains and losses are, respectively, a much more effective stimulating element or a much more effective dissuasive element in the market than in the state, that is, much more effective when the form of circulation is bilateral exchange than when it is collective allocation. This is true both when the market or state act as distribution relations between individuals or homes (MMP and TMP) and when they act as distribution relations

between organizations (CMP and BMP). Hence, at least in economic terms, fundamentally tributary societies (feudalism and despotism), have been basically **stagnant** societies, something which surely nobody would contradict, as have fundamentally bureaucratic societies (“real socialism”), which anyone not set on denying the evidence will accept, whereas the fundamentally mercantile societies (insofar as they have existed separately, as in frontier economy) and fundamentally capitalist societies have been essentially dynamic and have experienced an incomparably greater growth, although in all cases, those of growth and **stagnation**, at a very high social cost.²²

Finally, the greater or lesser external pressure of the acquisition relations redefines the characteristics of the internal relations of production and appropriation in the forms of cooperative production. The pressure of competition intensifies the struggle between employers and employed, or between directors and subordinates, for the intensity of production and the proportions of appropriation. Plainly speaking, the stronger the external competition the stronger the domination will tend to be, the more intense the exploitation and the more unequal the proportions in the internal distribution of the product. On the other hand, since the pressure of the allocation relations is less, it foments less internal domination and exploitation, and also less internal inequality. Hence the rhythm of labour, the possibilities of being dismissed or the **inequalities in income** between directors and subordinates were not as great in “socialist” firms as in capitalist firms, although this was offset by the fact that the workers were also much poorer.

However, **along these lines** that separate modes of production, production and distribution, also present is another world of options and thus possible conflicts: that of the relative space of each one. If we look at this now familiar table vertically, column by column, and use a little imagination, we can see in the first, EMP vs. DMP, lords and serfs in an age-old struggle, sometimes latent and sometimes harshly manifest, for the relative space of the estate and the home (of *corvée* and subsistence labour, for example); in the second, BMP vs. TMP, we can see the states of yesterday and today struggling to obtain and transfer resources through tributary mechanisms or produce them themselves (between public health service and agreements with the private sector, perhaps); in the third case, CMP vs. MMP, we have large capital devouring small producers, and the latter resisting come what may (e.g., large stores and small corner shops). But, despite the examples, it should not be forgotten that the struggles between homes and organizations do not occur exclusively within each distribution network, but in all of them and in all directions: schooling, for example, represents the shifting of the satisfaction of a need (no matter if it is a created need) from the DMP to the BMP or to the CMP, whereas small electric yoghurt-makers transfer the transformation of milk into yoghurt from the CMP to the DMP, etc. The organization substitutes the isolated individual or the

²² In purely economic terms, it can be said that the capitalist employer can ignore his workers, whereas the public employee can ignore his firm. The former has come to be partially compensated in capitalism by labour law; the latter was for a while confronted, in real socialism, by the repression of offences against production.

home because it is clearly superior for large-scale production, for the use of large means of production, etc., but along with the functional requirement of coordination it easily brings domination and exploitation of labour. The individual and the home subsist wherever the means of production maintain an accessible dimension, cooperation of labour is not necessary and/or large-scale production offers more dis-economies than economies, beginning with the organization costs themselves. This usually happens when the productive technologies are not very developed (for example in craft production) or, on the contrary, when their development drastically reduces the scale and cost of the means of production (for example, with the introduction of publishing programs in graphic arts), as well as when the very nature of the goods or service offered imposes its dispersal in space (for example, most repairs).

If we look horizontally, moving along each row, or along both at the same time, it is a question of which network each type of resource is distributed through: the self-sufficient units, the state or the market. This struggle must be considered independent from the previous one, since it intersects with it, and not only in our inexhaustible graphic representation, but above all in reality. The problem of the domestic, public or private nature of health coverage, for example, confronts en bloc the circuit of donations (homes which undertake care of the sick, relatives who help, neighbours who cooperate, etc.) with the state circuit (tributary and bureaucratic, i.e. for those who pay and those who give the service) and with that of the market (mercantile and capitalist, and there independent professionals and large private hospitals are aligned equally). In other words, networks of solidarity (DMP and traces of EMP, donation) vs. state (TMP and BMP, allocation) vs. market (MMP and CMP, circulation). Let it suffice to point out, in the first place, that, with equal characteristics and quality of the goods or services in question, any individual would prefer to receive them from the state rather than acquire them in the market, for which in exchange he/she would have to give up other resources or produce the goods and services in the domestic sphere, thus requiring labour, and he/she would prefer to acquire them in the market if he/she had sufficient resources to do so rather than produce them with his/her own effort, since the resources possessed can in principle be unlimited in relation to the needs, whereas the capacity of domestic production is in principle limited. Secondly, differences in quality may push the individual in any direction between the home, the state and the market, an impulse that could, where appropriate, either be added to that which comes from price differences or offset them, the latter by mitigating them, annulling them or surpassing them and thus imposing its direction. We shall not dwell on the consequent casuistry, which would be unending, but it must be remembered that many of its movements are quite familiar to us. Table 7 - where each horizontal entry (each row) represents the network that ceases to produce or in which a resource ceases to be acquired and each vertical entry (each column) represents the network in which it is then done or which then does so - gives the more common cases, with some typical denominations and other *ad hoc* denominations.

Table 7

Movements between Distribution Networks

		Network of destination		
		Home	Market	State
Network of origin	Home	-----	Commercialisation of what was domestic	Entitlement with personal rights
	Market	Domestication due to decrease of resources	-----	Socialisation, collectivisation
	State	Domestication due to disprovision	Privatization of previously public	-----

Once again, let it suffice to point out something specially important with regard to the analysis of inequalities: not only is the structure of a mode of production important and the position it occupies in it, but also the place of the mode of production with respect to others, with its corresponding relations and positions, and the possibilities of gaining access to the desired resources through one or the other. Inequality is, necessarily, a multidimensional phenomenon.

REFERENCES

- AMIN, S. (1973): *El desarrollo desigual. Ensayo sobre las formaciones sociales del capitalismo periférico*, Barcelona, Fontanella, 1975.
- BAHRO, R. (1977): *La alternativa. Contribución a la crítica del socialismo realmente existente*, Barcelona, Materiales, 1979.
- BURNHAM, J. (1941): *The managerial revolution*, N. York, John Day.
- CASTORIADIS, C. (1975): *L'institution imaginaire de la société*, París, Seuil.
- CHAYANOV, A.V. (1924): *La organización de la unidad económica campesina*, Buenos Aires, Nueva Visión, 1985.
- CHEVALIER, J.M. (1983): "There is nothing simple about simple commodity production", *The J. of Peasant Studies* X, 4.
- DELPHY, C. (1976): *The main enemy*, Londres, Women's Research and Resource Centre.
- DJILAS, M. (1957): *The new class. An analysis of the Communist system*, N. York, Praeger.
- ENGELS, F. (1843): *Esbozo de crítica de la Economía Política*, in MARX and RUGE (1843).
- ENGELS, F. (1884): *El origen de la familia, la propiedad privada y el Estado*, Madrid, Ayuso, 1977.
- ENGUITA, M.F. (1989): "Modos de producción en la sociedad actual", *Política y Sociedad* 4.
- ENGUITA, M.F. (1993): "Redes económicas y desigualdades sociales", *REIS* 64.
- GARDINER, J. (1973): "El trabajo doméstico de las mujeres", in HARRISON, SECCOMBE and GARDINER (1975).
- GOUGH, I. (1979): *Economía política del Estado del Bienestar*, Barcelona, Blume, 1982.
- HABERMAS, J. (1976): *La reconstrucción del materialismo histórico*, Madrid, Taurus, 1981.
- HARRIS, C.C. (1983): *Familia y sociedad industrial*, Barcelona, Península, 1986.

- HARRISON, J. (1973): "Economía política del trabajo doméstico", in HARRISON, SECCOMBE and GARDINER (1975).
- HARRISON, J., W. SECCOMBE and J. GARDINER (1975): *El ama de casa bajo el capitalismo*, Barcelona, Anagrama.
- KONRAD, G. and SZELENYI, I. (1979): *Los intelectuales y el poder*, Barcelona, Península, 1981.
- KURON, J. and MODZELEWSKY, K. (1966): *Carta abierta al Partido Obrero Unificado Polaco*, Madrid, Akal, 1976.
- MARCH, J.G. and SIMON, H.A. (1958): *Teoría de la organización*, Barcelona, Ariel, 1977, 3ª ed.
- MARX, K. (1843): *Critique of Hegel's Doctrine of the State*, in K. Marx, *Early Writings*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1975.
- MARX, K. (1844a): *Manuscritos: economía y filosofía*, Madrid, Alianza, 1977.
- MARX, K. (1844b): *La cuestión judía*, in MARX and RUGE (1843).
- MARX, K. (1857): *Elementos fundamentales para la crítica de la economía política, 1857-1858*, Madrid, Siglo XXI, 3 vols, 1972, 1976, 1976.
- MARX, K. (1859): *Contribución a la crítica de la economía política*, Madrid, Alberto Corazón, 1976.
- MARX, K. (1867): *El Capital* (1867 libro I, 1885 libro II, 1894 libro III), Madrid, Siglo XXI, 8 vols., 1975-1981.
- MARX, K. and ENGELS, F. (1848): *El Manifiesto Comunista*, Madrid, Ayuso, 1974.
- MARX, K. and RUGE, A., eds. (1843): *Los Anales Franco-Alemanes*, Barcelona, Martínez Roca, 1970.
- MEILLASSOUX, C. (1975): *Mujeres, graneros y capitales*, México, Siglo XXI, 1977
- O'CONNOR, J. (1973): *La crisis fiscal del Estado*, Barcelona, Península, 1982.
- OLSON, M. (1965): *The logic of collective action. Public goods and the theory of groups*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard UP.
- POLANYI, K. (1944): *The great transformation. The political and economic origins of our time*, Boston, Beacon, 1957.
- RIZZI, B. (1939): *La burocratización del mundo*, Barcelona, Península, 1980.
- ROEMER, J.E. (1982): *Teoría general de la explotación y de las clases*, Madrid, Siglo XXI, 1989.
- ROEMER, J.E. (1988): *Free to lose*, Cambridge, Harvard UP.
- WEBER, M (1922): *Economía y sociedad*, México, F.C.E., 2 vols., 1977¹⁺³.
- WITTFOGEL, K. (1957): *Le despotisme oriental*, París, Minuit, 1964.
- YOUNG, M. and WILLMOTT, P. (1973): *The symmetrical family*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.