

THE AMBIVALENCE OF DISPOSABLE TIME: THE SOURCE AND REMEDY OF THE NATIONAL DIFFICULTIES AT TWO HUNDRED

TOM WALKER

Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada

Published in 1821, *The Source and Remedy of the National Difficulties* was an important influence on Marx's analysis of 'disposable time' in a section of his *Grundrisse* notebooks known as the 'fragment on machines.' That analysis has inspired rethinking of Marx's mature work by authors ranging from Raniero Panzieri, Antonio Negri, and Paolo Virno to Moishe Postone, yet those re-evaluations do not account for the contribution of the 1821 pamphlet. This article examines the neglect of the pamphlet and offers suggestions about what could be gained by attention to this foundational text.

JEL Classification: B23; B31; B51

I. INTRODUCTION

Year 2021 marks the bicentennial of publication of the 'little known' pamphlet Karl Marx supposedly 'saved from falling into oblivion,' according to Friedrich Engels (Engels, 1893, p. 13). Although the pamphlet has indeed not been completely forgotten, *The Source and Remedy of the National Difficulties, deduced from principles of political economy*, has certainly 'not received the attention it deserves if one accepts Marx's [and Engels's] claims on its behalf,' as Giancarlo de Vivo (2019, p. 61) has remarked. Hopefully, republication (Dilke, 1821) and Professor de Vivo's very informative article will help to remedy the neglect.

What makes inattention to Dilke's *Source and Remedy* even more mystifying is that it played a prominent role in a selection from the *Grundrisse*, widely referred to as the 'fragment on machines', which inspired a great deal of intellectual excitement and controversy over the last half century. An Italian translation, *frammento sulle macchine*, appeared in the journal *Quaderni Rossi* in 1964 (Marx, 1964) and inspired intense debate challenging 'orthodox' or 'traditional' interpretations of Marx's work. An English translation of the fragment appeared in 1972 (Marx, 1972) in the journal *Economy and Society* as 'Notes on Machines' a year before publication of the full translation of the *Grundrisse*.

It should hardly be surprising that scant attention was paid to *The Source and Remedy* in the early debates. The pamphlet was published anonymously, although it was almost certainly written by Charles Wentworth Dilke, publisher of *The Athenæum*, a leading 19th century literary journal.¹ Before 1981, there were few copies available in libraries worldwide, de Vivo could only locate nine copies and no translations (2019, p. 61). Microfilm copies of the pamphlet, as part of the Goldsmiths'-Kress Library of Economic Literature, did not become available until 1981. Even then, the price tag for all three segments of the microfilm library was around \$200,000 in 1978 dollars (Whitten 1978, p. 1005)—equivalent to over \$700,000 in today's dollars.

Where the neglect makes less sense, though—and is easier to document—is in more recent scholarship that highlights the fragment on machines. Electronic copies of *The Source and Remedy* have been available on the Internet since at least 2004.² But discussion of Marx's fragment on machines and its contribution to contemporary theory continue to ignore the pamphlet entirely or, at best, cite passages quoted by Marx. I could find no published articles and only one book (Lapides, 2008) that made direct reference to the pamphlet's text.³

A search of Google Scholar for 'fragment on machines' and 'disposable time'—the key concept from *The Source and Remedy* featured in the *Grundrisse*—found 66 articles. Only three of those also contained the phrase, 'source and remedy'. Those three articles cited Marx's quotation from the pamphlet but did not elaborate with direct reference to the text of the pamphlet itself. Further searches were conducted in several anthologies, Web of Science Citation Indexes, JSTOR, EBSCO, and full-text databases of journals such as *Historical Materialism*, *Antipode*, *Rethinking Marxism*, *Economy and Society* and *Science and Society*. With one exception, the few references I could find to the text Engels had hailed as 'the farthest outpost of an entire literature which in the twenties turned the Ricardian theory of value and surplus value against capitalist production in the interest of the proletariat' (Engels, 1893, p. 13) were second-hand.

II. THE AMBIVALENCE OF DISPOSABLE TIME

Why should this matter? Marx thought enough of *The Source and Remedy*'s 'important advance on Ricardo' (Marx, 1861–63, p. 238) to expend almost as many words in the *Grundrisse* and *Theories of Surplus Value* combined citing and discussing the pamphlet

¹ Additional evidence for Dilke's authorship is indicated in a 1952 letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* by literary biographer, Joanna Richardson (1952, p. 565), who referred to a copy found in a collection of Dilke papers as 'noted as the work of Charles Wentworth Dilke.' The comment immediately follows mention of a journal in which Charles Brown had 'penciled in the names of the chief contributors.' Richardson's *The everlasting spell: a study of Keats and his friends* (1963) contains four chapters on Dilke.

² A pdf copy of the pamphlet, <http://www.worklessparty.org/timework/source%20and%20remedy.pdf> was posted on or before 1 March 2004. Subsequent transcriptions have been available at Marxists Internet Archive since at least 6 January 2010.

³ Lapides's book contains extensive quotation *The Source and Remedy* in the context of discussion of 'Radical and Early Socialist Critics of Political Economy'. He does not delve into the pamphlet's influence on Marx's thought about wealth as disposable time or the recent literature focusing on the fragment from the *Grundrisse*.

as its author had used in its composition. What was it about the pamphlet that Marx thought was so important? Did Marx's citations and summary of the pamphlet overlook anything significant? Was the *Source and Remedy's* argument a 'precursor' to Marx's mature analysis or might Dilke's argument stand on its own as an alternative to Marx's interpretation of it? Might not a *dialogue* between Marx's argument and Dilke's be more illuminating than the sum of the separate texts?

By this point in the article, one might expect to see a precis of the fragment on machines or an overview of the controversy about its interpretations. Instead, for reasons that should become clear subsequently, I offer Frederick Harry Pitts's (2018) slightly sarcastic synopsis of Paul Mason's 'postcapitalist' reframing of Antonio Negri's *post-operaismo*⁴:

In the Fragment, Marx presents a future scenario today evangelized as a statement of unfolding fact. The use of machines and knowledge in production expands. Production revolves more around knowledge than physical effort. Machines liberate humans from labour, and the role of direct labour-time in life shrinks to a minimum. Free time proliferates. The divorce of labour-time from exchange value sparks capitalist crisis. But this technological leap brings about the possibility of a social development on a massive scale. Freed from physical subordination to the means of production, workers grow intellectually and cooperatively. This freely generated 'general intellect' reinserts itself, uncoerced, into production as fixed capital. The worker is incorporated only at a distance, rather than as a constituent part of the capital relation. The potential for an incipient communism arises (p. 325).

Three years after *Quaderni Rossi* published Marx's *frammento sulle macchine*, Julia Kristeva's essay, 'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue, le roman' was published in the French journal *Critique*. In that essay Kristeva introduced the term 'intertextuality'. Intertextuality refers to an insight Kristeva attributed to Mikhail Bakhtin, that 'any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another' (Kristeva 1967, p. 37). Marx's fragment undeniably absorbed and transformed Dilke's homage to disposable time. According to Kristeva, words acquire a new meaning through reuse while retaining the old one, '[t]he result is a word with two significations: it becomes *ambivalent*' (p. 43). Earlier in her essay, Kristeva had explained '[t]he term "ambivalence" implies the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history; for the writer, they are one and the same' (p. 39).

In Dilke's *Source and Remedy*, the passage about disposable time being real wealth serves as a hinge between the abstract analysis of the natural limits of capital accumulation and a concrete discussion of why, in practice, accumulation has never reached those hypothetical limits. The idyll that Dilke explicitly referred to in a footnote as

⁴ The nomenclature of *operaismo* (translated as 'workerist'), *post-operaismo* (or *neo-operaismo*) refers to theoretical distinctions that are beyond the scope of this article. For discussions of those distinctions, see Tomba and Bellofiore (2013) and Boffo (2014). A few of the more prominent authors associated with the operaist or postoperaist currents are Raniero Panzieri, Mario Tronti, Antonio Negri and Paolo Virno.

‘Utopian speculations’ (Dilke, 1821, p. 34) also set up a contrast to Dilke’s imagined ‘last paragraph’ of a future historian who laments the moral degradation of a society in which ‘the splendour of luxurious enjoyment in a few excited a worthless, and debasing, and selfish emulation in all.’ Dilke’s future historian sounded uncannily like Thorstein Veblen (1899).⁵

By contrast, Marx’s repetition of disposable time raises an agitational banner. Instead of something that *would have already happened* if the accumulation of capital had been confined to its inherent limits, as Dilke maintained, Marx viewed disposable time as both an element of the explosive contradiction of capitalist accumulation and the prize of emancipation from capitalism. Dilke’s pamphlet contained a single mention of disposable time. Marx’s *Grundrisse* dwelt on the phrase. The original German edition repeated it seven times in *English* alone. *Theorien über den Mehrwert* (*Theories of Surplus Value*) added another six.

III. DISPOSABLE TIME, LABOUR, AND SOCIAL DOMINATION

In his reinterpretation of Marx’s critical theory, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination* (Postone, 1993), Moishe Postone placed the issue of disposable time at the ‘essential core’ of Marx’s analysis in *Capital* and of capitalism’s possible overcoming, arguing that in the *Grundrisse*, Marx, ‘characterizes a possible postcapitalist society in terms of the category of “disposable” time . . .’ (p. 375). Postone did not refer to Dilke’s *Source and Remedy* in his book nor in his earlier article, ‘Necessity, Labor, and Time: A Reinterpretation of the Marxian Critique of Capitalism’ (Postone, 1978). I have not found any reference by Postone to the 1821 pamphlet.

Postone criticized what he termed ‘traditional Marxism’ for assuming that private ownership of the means of production and the market are the sources of class domination and exploitation. In Postone’s account, such analyses treat class domination as something extrinsic superimposed on industrial production, which presumably could be rectified by expropriating the means of production and redistributing the value produced therein. Postone opposed this traditional formulation with an analysis that treats both labour and value as historically specific categories that are unique to capitalism. According to Postone, Marx viewed social domination as ‘grounded in the value form of wealth itself’ and therefore ‘based on the unique character of labor in capitalist society’, rather than as a function of private property and the ownership of the means of production (1993, p. 30). In Postone’s interpretation, ‘private property is not the social cause but the consequence of alienated labor’ (p. 31). Furthermore, labour is not the transhistorical source of wealth in all societies but is the impersonal

⁵ Pecuniary emulation is the central motif of Veblen’s *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, where he pointed out its inherent generation of conspicuous waste: ‘In an industrial community this propensity for emulation expresses itself in pecuniary emulation; and this, so far as regards the Western civilized communities of the present, is virtually equivalent to saying that it expresses itself in some form of conspicuous waste. The need of conspicuous waste, therefore, stands ready to absorb any increase in the community’s industrial efficiency or output of goods, after the most elementary physical wants have been provided for’ (p. 85).

and abstract social form unique to capitalism, which structures capital's 'dynamic trajectory and its form of production' (p. 6).

Although both Postone and neo-operaist⁶ authors such as Negri and Virno anchored their respective analyses in the *Grundrisse* and referred conspicuously to passages from the fragment on machines, Postone viewed the *Grundrisse* as a 'key' for reading *Capital* while post-workerists interpreted it as pointing 'beyond' *Capital*. Ironically, while presuming to go 'beyond *Capital*', the post-workerists end up repeating features that Postone criticized as characteristic of so-called traditional Marxism. Rather than viewing Marx's categories such as *exchange value*, *surplus value*, and *fetishism* as *socially constituting practice* under capitalism as Postone does, the neo-operaists, in his view, treat these categories as a sort of veneer concealing an underlying reality of use-value, as had Georg Lukács (Postone and Brennan, 2009, 327–328). Crucially, then, no matter how profound the contradictions, labour and value constituted by labour are not surpassed under capitalism by 'general intellect'. They continue to be forms of practice and not mere appearance. If those categories seem to be obsolete now it is because seeming obsolescence was always an inherent part of their dynamic.

Postone's analysis emphasized the non-identity of real wealth and value—the latter of which, under capitalism, is a self-mediating form of wealth measured by the expenditure of labour time. In a section toward the end of *Time, Labor and Social Domination* with the heading, 'The development of the social division of time', Postone repeated the passage from the *Grundrisse* that he had quoted at the beginning of the book:

Capital itself is the moving contradiction [in] that it presses to reduce labour time to a minimum, while it posits labour time, on the other side, as sole measure and source of wealth. Hence it diminishes labour time in the necessary form so as to increase it in the superfluous form; hence posits the superfluous in growing measure as a condition—question of life or death—for the necessary. (Postone, pp. 373–4)

In Postone's interpretation, *superfluous* labour time signifies the difference between the amount of labour required by capital to continue its trajectory of accumulation and the amount of labour that would be required to produce the material wealth needed for maintenance of 'society generally and each of its members' (Marx, 1857–58, p. 708). Opposed to this *superfluous labour time*—which expresses 'the historical nonnecessity of a previous historical necessity' (Postone, 1993, p. 376)—Postone postulated the category of *disposable time* as the positive foil to the negativity of superfluous labour time. Postone was not simply referring to disposable time as a term employed by Marx but described it as an analytical category with a status corresponding to the category of superfluous labour time and ultimately referring to the fundamental categories of labour and value.

⁶ Postone uses the term *neo-operaist* instead of *post-operaist*.

The passage from the *Grundrisse* that Postone quoted *twice*, came at beginning of a paragraph that concluded with a loosely translated⁷ quotation from *The Source and Remedy*:

Forces of production and social relations—two different sides of the development of the social individual—appear to capital as mere means, and are merely means for it to produce on its limited foundation. In fact, however, they are the material conditions to blow this foundation sky-high. ‘Truly wealthy a nation, when the working day is 6 rather than 12 hours. Wealth is not command over surplus labour time’ (real wealth), ‘but rather, *disposable time* outside that needed in direct production, *for every individual* and the whole society. (*The Source and Remedy* &c. 1821, p. 6)’ (Marx, 1857–58, p. 706).

Despite its strategic prominence at the conclusion of a paragraph the beginning of which he had quoted twice, Postone did not acknowledge it in his discussion of disposable time.

In his recent, *This Life: Secular Faith and Spiritual Freedom*, Martin Hägglund (2020) also presented a sustained discussion of the central importance of Marx’s category of disposable time. He called attention to the fact that in the *Grundrisse* Marx had used the English ‘disposable time’ instead of the German *verfügbare Zeit*. This is not entirely accurate, as Marx did use *verfügbare Zeit* in his loose translation of the passage he attributed to ‘*The Source and Remedy* etc.’ but then used ‘disposable time’ repeatedly in a passage several paragraphs later that also includes several other English phrases. Immediately following that paragraph is another quotation from the pamphlet. Attention to the translation highlights the fact that ‘disposable’ has the sense of ‘available,’ as in *disposable income*, rather than as time that can be conveniently thrown away. Hägglund’s renaming the concept as ‘socially available free time’ is consistent with both Marx’s and Dilke’s examples of what disposable time might entail in practice.

One puzzling feature of Hägglund’s book is that although he lauds Postone as having ‘come closest to the right analysis of the question of value in Marx’ he criticizes him for advocating ‘the *abolition* of value rather than a *revaluation* of value’ (p. 406, note 37). This is odd because although Hägglund discusses both Postone and disposable time at length, he does not acknowledge that disposable time was central to Postone’s analysis. Postone did not advocate the ‘revaluation of value’ because he treated value as a dynamic feature of capitalism *per se*. Instead, he opposed *wealth* to value, as had Marx. Unlike value, wealth contains no compulsory dynamic of expansion. It exists as an end in itself rather than as a means to an end. ‘The contrast between value and “real wealth” is one between a form of wealth based on “labour time and on the amount of labour employed” and one that does not depend on immediate labour time’ (Postone, 2008, p. 124).

⁷ In the English translation of the *Grundrisse*, Marx’s laconic German translation of this passage is *retranslated* back into English. This was a conscious choice of the translator, to show what were, for Marx, ‘the vital point of the writer’s thought.’

IV. DISPOSABLE TIME AS VOCATION

Dilke's exaltation of disposable time had deep roots in the writings of William Godwin.⁸ His 'fine statement' (Marx, 1861–63, p. 256) that 'there is no means of adding to the wealth of a nation but by adding to the facilities of living... it [wealth] is disposable time, and nothing more' (Dilke, 1821, p. 34) amplified Godwin's affirmation, in *The Enquirer* that 'genuine wealth of man is leisure, when it meets with a disposition to improve it. All other riches are of petty and inconsiderable value' (Godwin, 1797, p. 149). Godwin concluded his appraisal of leisure as wealth with a question, 'Is there not a state of society practicable, in which leisure shall be made the inheritance of every one of its members?' In *The Source and Remedy*, Dilke (p. 35) inverted Godwin's question from future to past tense to ask, 'Why then is it that no existing society, nor society that ever had existence, has arrived at this point of time, considering that in all times, and in all societies, excepting only the very barbarous, a few years would naturally have led to it?'

Godwin's comments about leisure were not incidental asides. The first essay in Part II of Godwin's *The Enquirer*, 'Of Riches and Poverty,' (Godwin, 1797) dwelt on the cultural benefits of leisure and the disadvantage to the poor of a lack of leisure. The second essay, 'Of avarice and profusion', contended that human subsistence requires relatively few commodities and therefore much less labour than currently expended so that if the work were divided equally there would be ample leisure time for all. The consequence of that change would be that 'hours which are not required for the production of the necessaries of life, may be devoted to the cultivation of the understanding, the enlarging our stock of knowledge, the refining our taste, and thus opening to us new and more exquisite sources of enjoyment' (p. 156).⁹

Godwin's fifth essay, 'Of trades and professions' offers a tantalizing clue to the origin of his elevation of leisure. Godwin introduced his theme by pointing to parents' anxiety about choosing their child's future occupation:

... there cannot be a question of greater importance, than that which every anxious parent asks concerning his child, which the child, if endowed with foresight and an

⁸ See de Vivo's (2019, pp. 66–7) discussion of Godwin's influence on Dilke. In one of his last letters to his grandson, Dilke recalled the powerful impression that reading Godwin had on him at his grandson's age and its role in making him 'a self-responsible moral man' (Richardson, 1963, p. 150). Two further brief mentions of Godwin by Engels and Marx are notable: According Engels (1844, p. 240): 'The two great practical philosophers of latest date, Bentham and Godwin, are, especially the latter, almost exclusively the property of the proletariat... The proletariat has formed upon this basis a literature, which consists chiefly of journals and pamphlets, and is far in advance of the whole bourgeois literature in intrinsic worth. On this point more later.' Engels did not return to the point.

In a posthumously published notebook, Marx (1845–46, p. 204) wrote, 'The theory of exploitation owes its further development in England to Godwin, and especially to Bentham... Godwin's *Political Justice* was written during the terror...'

⁹ Volume II, Book 8 of Godwin's *An Enquiry Concerning Political justice and its Influence on Morals and Happiness*, 'Of Property' also deals extensively with leisure, asserting the maxim that '[t]he object in the present state of society is to multiply labour, in another state it will be to simplify it' (Godwin, 1793, p. 355) followed by a calculation that half-an-hour a day of labour should suffice for the sustenance of a population if every member performed their share of the necessary work (p. 356).

active mind, asks perhaps with still greater anxiety and a nicer perception, what is the calling or profession to which his future life shall be destined? (p. 192).

It was not Godwin's intention to alleviate that anxiety. Instead, his accounts of the depravity of the careers of the merchant, the lawyer, the physician, the preacher, the soldier, and the sailor were calculated to dispel any illusions one might still harbour about those callings' 'splendour and value in the eye of God' (Calvin, 1535, p. 35).

In the context of Godwin's strict Calvinist upbringing and theological training, his lapsed faith—and, nevertheless—his lifelong, self-professed 'vocation as a missionary,'¹⁰ it would not be unreasonable to suspect Godwin's attention to leisure sketched a secularizing, modernizing, revolutionizing immanent critique of the 'particular calling' component of Calvin's doctrine of grace.¹¹

Godwin confirmed such a reformulation was indeed his intention in *Thoughts on Man*, published 34 years after initial publication of *The Enquirer*, in which he 'attempted to give a defined and permanent form' (Godwin, 1831, p. iii) to the thoughts that had occurred to him since publication of the earlier work. In *Thoughts on Man*, Godwin sought to establish the proposition that, 'every human creature is endowed with talents, which, if rightly directed, would shew him to be apt, adroit, intelligent and acute, in the walk for which his organisation especially fitted him.' Lest there be any doubt about what he was getting at, Godwin repeated that formulation, almost verbatim, at least five times throughout the book (1831, pp. 25, 36, 53, 66, 456).

In essay IX, 'Of leisure,' Godwin significantly bifurcated the notion of occupation:

The river of human life is divided into two streams; occupation and leisure—or, to express the thing more accurately, that occupation, which is prescribed, and may be called the business of life, and that occupation, which arises contingently, and not so much of absolute and set purpose, not being prescribed: such being the more exact description of these two divisions of human life, inasmuch as the latter is often not less earnest and intent in its pursuits than the former. (p. 164)

Leisure, in Godwin's view, is thus a *calling* no less than one's trade or profession. Furthermore, Godwin emphasized the claims of leisure for self-improvement with the observation, 'that schoolboys learn as much, perhaps more, of beneficial knowledge in their hours of play, as in their hours of study'. Thus leisure, for Godwin—Dilke's disposable time—was indispensable for the improvement of the individual and consequently of the individual's private judgment. Godwin's notorious 'perfectibility' could plausibly be translated as 'salvation', post-Enlightenment.

¹⁰ William Hazlitt (1825, p. 56) described Godwin as a 'metaphysician grafted on the Dissenting Minister'. As Stafford (1980, p. 292) stated, 'The Calvinist doctrine of the calling can be discerned just below the surface of *Political Justice*'.

¹¹ Godwin's secularization of Calvin's doctrine of the calling can be contrasted with the sort of secular accommodation inherent in the proverbial Puritan work ethic and culminating in Benjamin Franklin's 'time is money' axiom. See Michaelsen (1953, p. 330, note 47).

In one of the few recent articles that mention *The Source and Remedy*, Jacob Blumenfeld (2014) suggested that Marx's fascination with disposable time was linked to his interpretation of the last chapter of Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* and 'turns on a very specific meaning of the "abolition of time" that Hegel describes in the very last paragraphs' (p. 113). Artemy Magun (2010) briefly mentioned *The Source and Remedy* and its authorship by Dilke in a discussion of Marx's theory of time that explored the theological and especially the eschatological elements of Marx's categories of disposable time, surplus labour, and alienation. Magun cautioned that Marx's purpose and that of subsequent thinkers such as Walter Benjamin was not to 'retheologize' time but to 'understand rationally the crucial elements of the religious world-view that have been ignored by modern science, but which nevertheless are highly relevant to orientation in the contemporary world' (p. 108).

Ben Trott (2018) has argued that the fragment on machines might best be understood as a type of science fiction, 'as social commentary and criticism exploring the social relations caught up with techno-scientific developments that were evidently already *imaginable*... even if they did remain (just) beyond the realm of the scientifically *possible*' (p. 1108). *The Source and Remedy* also has a passage that could best be understood as science fiction, albeit dystopian science fiction:

Oh, if I dared venture to anticipate the last paragraph of the historian that generations hence shall trace the character of this age and country, it should run thus—'The increase of trade and commerce opened a boundless extent to luxury:—the splendour of luxurious enjoyment in a few excited a worthless, and debasing, and selfish emulation in all:—The attainment of wealth became the ultimate purpose of life:—the selfishness of nature was pampered up by trickery and art:—pride and ambition were made subservient to this vicious purpose:—their appetite was corrupted in their infancy, that it might leave its natural and wholesome nutriment, to feed on the garbage of Change Alley:—instead of the quiet, the enjoyment, the happiness, and the moral energy of the people, they read in their horn-book of nothing but the wealth, the commerce, the manufactures, the revenue, and the pecuniary resources of the country; the extent of its navy and the muster-roll of its hireling army:—in honour of this beastly Belial they made a sacrifice of the high energies of their nature:—they hailed his progress with hosannahs, though on his right hand sat Despotism, and on his left Misery:—they made a welcome sacrifice to him of their virtues and their liberties:—to satisfy his cravings they forewent their natural desires:—honour and truth were offered up on his altars:—and the consummation of their hopes was characterised by misery and ignorance; the dissolution of all social virtue and common sympathy among individuals; and by a disunited, feeble, despotic, and despised government!' (Dilke, 1821, p. 42)

This fictional last paragraph of a future historian was not in Dilke's passage about disposable time. It appears during his inquiry into 'why society never has arrived at this enviable situation, this real national prosperity, although so immediately within its grasp' (p. 35). By that point in his inquiry, it had become easier for Dilke to imagine the end of social virtue than to imagine the end of capitalism.

V. CONCLUSION

Why read *The Source and Remedy*? First, for its literary quality. The pamphlet is elegantly written, especially the first half, before Dilke's composition becomes bogged down in a catalogue of grievance.¹² Second, to illuminate the arguments that Marx drew from the pamphlet and elaborated upon. If the *Grundrisse*—and especially the fragment on machines—offers either a key to understanding Marx's mature thought or a text pointing beyond *Capital*, then certainly a source that deeply influenced Marx in that work is worth investigating. The *ambivalence* of Marx's category of disposable time and the stark contrast between the Utopia of Harry Pitts's parody of 'fragment evangelism' and the dystopia of the last paragraph of a future historian are just two examples of how convening a dialogue between the two texts could illuminate both and thereby deepen their respective analyses of capitalism and critiques of political economy. Godwin's influence on Dilke and Godwin's explicitly post-theological intentions further expands that possibilities of such dialogue. Finally, the standpoints of Marx, Dilke, and Godwin are dissimilar enough to enable a pedagogical objective: ' "To educate the image-making medium within us, raising it to a stereoscopic and dimensional seeing into the depths of historical shadows" ' (Benjamin, 1999, p. 458).

REFERENCES

- BENJAMIN W. (1999) *The Arcades Project*. Belnap Press, Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- BLUMENFELD J. (2014) The abolition of time in Hegel's "absolute knowing" (and its relevance for Marx). *Ideal. Stud.* 43: 111–119.
- BOFFO M. (2014) Book review: S. Bologna, *Ceti medi senza futuro?* S. Bologna & D. Banfi, *Vita da freelance*. C. Formenti, *Felici e sfruttati*. *Historic. Mater.* 22: 425–476.
- CALVIN, J. (1535) *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Vol. 2. Trans Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1846.
- de Vivo G. (2019) Marx's Pamphletist: Charles Wentworth Dilke and his tract on *The Source and Remedy of the National Difficulties* (1821). *Contrib. Political Econ.* 38: 59–73.
- DILKE C.W. (1821) *The Source and Remedy of the National Difficulties, Deduced from Principles of Political Economy in a Letter to Lord John Russell* Vol 38. Rodwell and Martin. Reprinted in *Contributions to Political Economy*, 2019, London, pp. 31–58.
- ENGELS F. (1844, 1892) *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Swan and Sonnenschein & Co, London.
- ENGELS F. (1893, 1971) *Preface to Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* Vol 2. Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- GODWIN W. (1793) *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness* Vol 2. Luke White, Dublin.
- GODWIN W. (1797, 1823) *The Enquirer. Reflections on Education, Manners, and Literature. In a Series of Essays. A New Edition*. John Anderson, London.

¹² 'This Pamphlet, unfortunately, is utterly destitute of arrangement,' lamented a review in Leigh Hunt's *Examiner* shortly after publication, echoing Dilke's own exasperated disclaimer in *The Source and Remedy* that '[o]n reading the whole over with attention, I regret to find that it is not so consecutive, that the proofs do not follow the principles laid down so immediately as I could have wished. The reasoning is too desultory, too loose in its texture'. Hunt was a friend of Dilke's. Perhaps the seemingly harsh criticism of the pamphlet's composition was an insider's playful prank. Dilke—a fierce critic of 'literary puffery'—may even have been in on the joke.

- GODWIN W. (1831) *Thoughts on Man: His Nature, Productions and Discoveries Interspersed with Some Particulars Respecting the Author*. Effingham Wilson, London.
- HAZLITT W. (1825) *The Spirit of the Age*. Henry Colburn, London.
- HÄGGLUND M. (2020) *This Life: Secular Faith and Spiritual Freedom*. Anchor Books, New York.
- KRISTEVA J. (1967) Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue, le roman. as translated. In T MOI, ed, *Kristeva Reader*. Columbia University Press 1986, New York, pp. 35–61.
- LAPIDES K. (2008) *Marx's wage theory in historical perspective: its origins, development, and interpretation*. Wheatmark, Tucson.
- MAGUN A. (2010) Marx's theory of time and the present historical moment. *Rethink. Marxism* 22: 90–109.
- MARX K. (1845–46, 1973) In D McLELLAN, ed, *Karl Marx: Selected writings*. Oxford University Press, Oxford & New York.
- MARX K. (1857–58, 1973) *Grundrisse. Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*. Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- MARX K. (1861–63) *Theories of Surplus Value, Part 3*. Progress Publishers, Moscow, p. 1973.
- MARX K. (1964) Frammento sulle macchine. Trans. By Renato Solmi. *Quaderni Rossi* 4: 289–300. Accessed at: <http://www.bibliotecaginobianco.it/flip/QUR/004/04/index.html#288> 30 December 2020.
- MARX K. (1972) Notes on machines. *Economy Soc.* 1: 244–254.
- MICHAELSEN R.S. (1953) Changes in the puritan concept of calling or vocation. *N. Eng. Quarter.* 26: 315–336.
- PITTS F.H. (2018) Beyond the fragment: Postoperaismo, postcapitalism and Marx's 'Notes on machines', 45 years on. *Economy Soc.* 46: 324–345.
- POSTONE M., BRENNAN T. (2009) Labor and the logic of abstraction: An interview. *South Atlantic Quarter.* 108: 305–330.
- POSTONE M. (1978) Necessity, labor and time. *Soc. Res.* 45: 739–799.
- POSTONE M. (1993) *Time, Labor and Social Domination*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- POSTONE M. (2008) Rethinking Capital in light of the Grundrisse. In M MUSTRO, ed, *Karl Marx's Grundrisse: Foundations of the critique of political economy 150 years later*. Routledge, Abingdon and New York, pp. 120–137.
- RICHARDSON J. (1952) Some Dilke papers. *Times Literary Supplement*. 2639: 565.
- RICHARDSON J. (1963) *The Everlasting Spell: A Study of Keats and His Friends*. J. Cape, London, pp. 112–153.
- STAFFORD W. (1980) Dissenting religion translated into politics: Godwin's "political justice". *History Political Thought* 1: 279–299.
- TOMBA M., BELLOFIORE R. (2013) The 'Fragment on Machines' and the Grundrisse: The Workerist Reading in Question. In M Van der LINDEN, KH ROTH, eds, *Beyond Marx: theorising the global labour relations of the twenty-first century*. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands, pp. 345–367.
- TROTT B. (2018) The 'Fragment on Machines' as science fiction; or, reading the Grundrisse politically. *Cambridge J. Economics* 42: 1107–1122.
- VEBLEN T. (1899, 2017) *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Routledge, Abingdon & New York.
- WHITTEN D.O. (1978) Democracy returns to the library: The Goldsmiths'-Kress library of economic literature. *J. Economic Literature* 16: 1004–1006.