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Class is arguably the single most crucial concept on which human life turns in the modern world, yet it is at the same time one of the most ill-defined, in the sense of being a free, ungrounded production. The social character of capitalism, however, is not the product of some unexamined experience, but is the product of the very dynamics of capitalist production itself. Capitalism is a process of continuous transformation of the social relations that underlie and determine the production of goods and services. The fundamental dimension of human life, yet the geographic element in the social sciences, has been left out of the way in which social theory and spatial theory have been developed. The term 'class' comes from the Latin word 'classis', which means 'a body or group of people united by common interests, affinities or activities'. Class is a necessary condition for the process of social reproduction, and is a necessary condition for the process of social change. The concept of class is thus a necessary condition for the process of social reproduction, and is a necessary condition for the process of social change. The concept of class is thus a necessary condition for the process of social reproduction, and is a necessary condition for the process of social change.
The problem of class begins with the failure to perceive class within the world. There have been various attempts by Marx; therefore to apparent contradiction, the French structuralists, and other Marxist-oriented authors, have sought to bring in a different perspective from this.

Class is not defined solely by economic factors, such as wealth or income, but also by social and cultural aspects. These include factors such as education, occupation, and lifestyle, which collectively determine an individual's class position within society.

One answer to this is to posit that class is a form of consciousness, which is formed in the context of the economic base. This consciousness is then able to act as a force in its own right, shaping the development of society and the economy.

Class is a concept that can be difficult to grasp, as it encompasses a wide range of factors that influence an individual's position in society. However, understanding class is essential for understanding the dynamics of society and the economy.

Second, class operates in a stratified social world, in which many people are organized into a hierarchical structure. This structure is maintained through various mechanisms, such as education, media, and economic systems.

In conclusion, class is a complex and multifaceted concept that plays a crucial role in shaping society and the economy. Understanding class is essential for analyzing social and economic phenomena, and for developing strategies to address social inequality.
Chapter 1: Division of Labour and Employment in Space

1. Class, power and production

We must start by saying something about the substance of class as a particular kind of structuring relation. While some have defined the term "class" as the division of people into two or more groups whose members have different interests or positions in society, others have argued that class is defined by the power that individuals or groups have to make decisions within a given social context. Marx himself defined class as the distinguishing characteristic of human history in all its dimensions. The Marxian model of class is based on the idea that individuals or groups are defined by their position in the social hierarchy, which is determined by their access to resources and power. This model is often used to explain the dynamics of class conflict and the struggle for social change.

II. Class, power and production

In this section, we will explore the relationship between class and production, and how it relates to power. We will examine the ways in which class and production intersect, and how they affect the distribution of power and resources. We will also consider the role of the state in regulating production and the dynamics of class conflict.

1.1 The class formation

Class formation is also a creative process, where the actions of individuals and groups combine to create new social relations. In the context of production, class formation involves the creation of new productive relationships and the organization of labor. The creation of new classes involves the emergence of new social relations and the transformation of existing ones.

1.2 Creative activity

The creative activity of individuals and groups is bound up with social practices and the production of new relationships. The creative activity of individuals and groups is an expression of their own desires and needs, and it is also shaped by the social context in which they operate.

1.3 The class formation

The class formation process is a complex and dynamic one, involving the interaction of individuals and groups at different levels of society. The process of class formation is not simply a matter of individuals or groups acting independently, but rather involves the interplay of various social forces and the creation of new social relations.

1.4 Creative activity

The creative activity of individuals and groups is bound up with social practices and the production of new relationships. The creative activity of individuals and groups is an expression of their own desires and needs, and it is also shaped by the social context in which they operate.

1.5 The class formation

The class formation process is a complex and dynamic one, involving the interaction of individuals and groups at different levels of society. The process of class formation is not simply a matter of individuals or groups acting independently, but rather involves the interplay of various social forces and the creation of new social relations.
displace the class of merchants on whom they were dependent. The critical step may then be the displacement of merchant capitalists as the dominant class. This is achieved through the accumulation of capital, the achievement of monopoly and the control of industrial markets. At the same time, the state intervenes to promote the accumulation of capital, through measures such as the Civil War in the US. It is the state of things that corresponds to this sequence of events.

1. The development of industry, as the capital form, is not the same as the development of productive forces. The productive forces develop spontaneously, without the intervention of the state. The state only intervenes to promote the accumulation of capital, which is the result of the development of industry.
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The division of labour is a concept in economics and sociology that describes the specialization of individuals in particular tasks or jobs, typically within a factory or industrial setting. It is often contrasted with the generalization of work, where individuals perform a variety of tasks.

The division of labour has been a subject of study and debate for centuries. Adam Smith, in his 1776 work "The Wealth of Nations," is often credited with formalizing the concept. Smith argued that division of labour increased productivity and efficiency, as workers became more skilled at performing a single task.

However, the division of labour can also lead to negative consequences, such as de-skilling of workers, reduced job satisfaction, and increased risks of job loss or displacement.

In modern economic theories, the division of labour is often discussed in the context of globalization and the outsourcing of manufacturing and service jobs to low-wage countries.

The study of the division of labour is important for understanding the dynamics of the workplace and the broader economy. It helps in analyzing the impact of technological advancements, changes in market conditions, and shifts in the global economy on the nature of work and employment.
The practical meaning of the division of labour is to make the workers so independent and to reduce the mutual co-operation between them as little as possible.

The social division of labour is produced by the social organization of society, and is therefore a product of class relations.

The division of labour is not a natural phenomenon, but a product of class relations. It is a product of the social organization of society, and is therefore a product of class relations.
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must be marshaled in order to comprehend the complexity of the social
power. The answer is they cannot. The problem, then, is to catch the
dynamics of class without eliminating the distinctive
drift of labor. The conflict surrounding the debate over class can be
sorted out once a general understanding of the role of class in society is
achieved. In order to achieve this understanding, one must begin by
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that the organisation of labour (division of labour), as only a semi-technical system, is steeped in class. The converse, however, is also true – but less widely acknowledged. As the division of labour has been expanded, elaborated, subdivided and reorganised, it has given rise to new dimensions of human activity – new jobs, new processes, new knowledge, new workplaces, new companies, etc. – and, consequently, new sources of power. These become, in turn, sites and tools of class struggle. Capital must try to secure to itself a prevailing position vis-à-vis the most important components of the economy if it is to operate effectively. Capitalist class power, like capital, must be extended in order to be reproduced.

It bega the question to assert that class is superior to division of labour or that class power is fully encompassed by control over labour, physical means of production and money. Carchedi has gone the farthest in recognising the advancing front and multidimensionality of class power, by grappling with what he calls the 'functions' of 'global capital' and 'collective labour'. Unfortunately, he, too, appears to put class on ice at a certain point. The modern credit system, for example, is of fundamental importance to the operation of capital, giving rise to new groups of financiers, new kinds of monetary instruments and new institutions, such as the Federal Reserve Bank, which must be incorporated into the capitalist class and its practices. Because the relationship to pre-existing capital and capitalists is so clear in this case, the transition happens rather automatically. But the situation is different with, say, the modern medical complex, professional sports or the engineering profession, which have been brought within the constellation of capital more or less imperfectly.

Precisely because the question of class integration is still partly or largely open for many people and positions in the division of labour, the various issues raised by the 'professional-managerial class' are a lively subject of debate.35 If we try to jam them into a rigid set of predetermined-class boxes, they do not fit. We would do much better, as Wright suggests, to recognise the ambiguities and contradictions of many positions in relation to class, while stressing the ongoing fact of class power in society. But even this is not enough. A changing division of labour cannot be fully encompassed, in Wright's fashion, by judicious combinations of existing dimensions of class. The dimensions must themselves be extended in theory as they are in practice to deal with new problems of reproducing power and accumulating capital. Since both are imperfect and fraught with difficulties, and change is persistent under capitalism, class formation is necessarily partial, class structuring incomplete. The openness of history must be faced straight on. But it cannot be faced without a powerful conception of the division of labour. Without the inevitable tensions between division of labour and class, the difficulties of class analysis appear to rest entirely with the overburdened and inadequate category of class, and the vindication of Marx's approach to history is impossible.

We can now isolate one fundamental site of the construction of lived experience and the formation of class: the encounter between capital and labour in the workplaces thrown up by the evolving capitalist division of labour. We will find that even if one goes where class relations ought to be the simplest and most readily apparent, one must deal with the problem of structural levels, human agency and the need to analyse capitalism as it evolves in its full complexity, as part of settling the question of class.

V Where labour and capital meet: the employment relation

In every workplace of the capitalist economy, labour and capital come together in order to carry out a concrete work project. Each workplace thus combines the detailed division of labour and class in one project in the social division of labour. This intersection of classes in production is necessary for the reproduction of both capital and labour; that is, for the creation of surplus value and for securing the means of existence, respectively.36 Work and the division of labour necessary to carry it out does more than secure the exchange and exploitation of labour (power), however; the concrete activity of work is an essential part of the experience and formation of class.37 The junction of capital and labour in the workplace is thus more than the sum of division of labour and class; it generates a certain life of its own – 'relative autonomy' – as a structured sub-system in its own right. We therefore require a new category to deal with it; the employment relation.

The employment relation is structured by the following elements: First, every workplace has a production process with a definite 'performance structure' that is strongly determined by the practical, technical problems of the project. While it is essential to recognise the technical component of work organisation, I do not want to introduce it as a strictly exogenous variable, lacking a social and
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On the one hand, the reward demands of the labour force depend on the degree of organisational and social service, and the nature of the work involved. The economic outcome is measured largely by the balance between two poles: the degree of organisational and social service, and the nature of the work involved. The reward demands of the labour force are measured largely by the balance between two poles: the degree of organisational and social service, and the nature of the work involved.
their input and output linkages and labour demands will be different.

Second, workers require a certain fixed for their reproduction.
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broadly defined, and the institution and social relations, which are

sufficiently discussed in this book. Without

reproduction are not directly discussed here. The different

the employment relation and hence the social relations of the

order than reproduction is concerned. There is an additional
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In this chapter we shall discuss the role of capital and

involves the reproduction of labour capital. To

must be carefully considered, for it is the key to understanding

mental processes. This is the essence of the classical Marxian
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together with the laws of reproduction of capital, in order to

the same capital. The demand for labour is determined by

profit. Capitalists require the ability to purchase labour power

production and capital accumulation. The necessary

in the reproduction process. This is the basis of the capitalist

The role of capital and the reproduction of labour.

equipment.
term performance. Many working-class communities come to be based on such stable employment, on which long-term financial commitments for houses, etc. are made and to which successive generations will return. On the other hand, many industries are characterised by an in-built variability in employment, as in the seasonality of nineteenth-century shoemaking in Lynn, Massachusetts, the war-spending swings of modern jet production or the persistently high turnover of workers in electronics assembly. Associated with such industries one finds workforces and working-class communities with a high degree of adaptation to the unstable conditions of employment, whether through finding counter-seasonal work in other sectors, moving from job to job and place to place within the same industry, temporarily returning to housework, moving on, or recruiting a whole workforce as needed. Of course, 'successful adaptation' in such situations can mean acceptance of lower living standards or of profound instability in familial and personal life. One should not, therefore, always associate the regularity of employment practices with stability in a literal sense.

Whatever the degree of personal or market stability involved, every employment relation rests on some degree of regularised practices in time and space. But every employment relation inevitably becomes subject to destabilisation, erosion and either termination or reconstruction in a new form. The sources of destabilisation are, broadly, those originating with changes in the external circumstances of capital, such as macroeconomic cycles, inter-firm competition, or product markets, those originating with labour outside the workplace, such as dwindling supplies from the locale, growing militancy in the community, or changing nationality of immigrants; and, finally, those deriving from the contradictions of the employment relation itself, such as the exchange leverage of skilled workers, high turnover because of oppressive control systems, or rigidity of habitual practices in the face of an ongoing need to introduce new technology to remain competitive. There is, therefore, an inevitable tendency in the nature of capitalism and employment for employment relations to have to be dissolved and reconstituted is the course of industrial evolution.

Employment in space thus has two dimensions: allocative (cross-sectional) and temporal. The former refers to geographical matching of capitalist labour demands in each workplace to available labourforces. This sort of matching takes place regardless of whether capital moves to a pre-existing labour supply or labour migrates to sites of employment. Allocation is a relatively static conception of the problem, however, which takes us only one step away from conventional neo-classical theories of industrial location. Adding the temporal dimension of employment, the making and breaking of specific employment relations, makes the question of location not only one of where to go, but of when to go. Furthermore, the concept of where to go, or of 'matching' labour demands and labour supplies, takes on a more rich and subtle aspect. The qualities desired by an employer derive as much from the currently-lived experience of work as from prior skills, attitudes, and so forth. (And background characteristics derive strongly, in turn, from prior work experience.) Employers do not simply choose appropriate workers for a technically-given labour process, except in their dreams when a new plant is opened; most workers are recruited for and socialised into ongoing employment relations, often via connections with old workers. As a result, one can never be sure of the goodness of fit or the internal stability of the employment relation before the fact; it is an ongoing site of struggle.

The location process thus becomes a strategic part of the employment of labour by capital. Looking at it from a simplified perspective of a 'war of position' between the classes, we see that spatial manoeuvre is a fundamental tactic, especially of management, but also of labour. Yet that 'war' still operates under the restraints of the practical problems presented by production in different industries, or the division of labour, as well as the constraints of practical consciousness, which is something less than the 'rationalist' model of decision-making.

The result of the location process is, at any time, a mosaic of workplaces and associated communities. This mosaic is literally a spatial division of labour. That spatial division of labour is necessarily uneven in its development because of the differences among labour processes and the idiosyncratic element in workplace employment relations. And the mosaic shifts continually over time as industries evolve and labour relations are reconstituted, with the new overlying the old in a rich cross-cuts of industrial and class history.

As the sands of capitalist development shift and slide, so do the fortunes, actions and beliefs of the people trying to build on them. I am not concerned here with a critique of the social costs involved in this. Rather, I wish to point up the implications of this spatial flux of employment for the way people constitute themselves as classes and reproduce the class structure of capitalist societies, that is, to take a step beyond showing that the location of industry involves a spatial
better with the findings of geographers in the working class by historians and geographers. The problem is to account for such observable features as the mass of the working class. In this sense, the arguments of Marxist theories about the class struggle and the like. On closer inspection, however, asking whether, classes are "tragically" radical or "ideally" radical, that is, one can create fewer empirical generalizations of this kind. This is often not the case, at least in this kind of research:

Richard A. Walker

Conclusion: class formation as a geographic process

I have tried here to advance a diagnosis of class structures as a short step away from the first essay in this volume, not that I could bring to bear the employment relation through the personal activities, interactions and power struggles of people on the public domain in production, class consciousness and the reproduction of capital and labour, classes are necessarily constituted in and through the use of space. As a way of looking at things, it should be added, grew out of the practical experience of a research effort for a group of specific, radical, working people. At the same time, the construction of this model in no way entails rejection of any basic insights of the Marxist analysis, although each level of articulation is in some degree tied to the practical experience of a research effort for a group of specific, radical, working people.

The employment relation out of the class encounter within the division of labour, and the spatial division of labour. We mentioned earlier that Marxists are likely to be controversial. It appears, if anything, to introduce a strong element of class fragmentation within the thesis of the division of labour and the regional variation of employment groups, and the kind of circulation and knowledge that class relations—which are why we find that coal-miners are frequently the most class-conscious of workers.
The issue, then, is not whether or not classes are fragmented but whether the fragments of everyday life provide a basis for weaker or stronger formation of class-oriented institutions, practices and insights. Do people encounter the capital-labour relation in ways that emphasise or hide the class dimension of their existence? And do they encounter it in a manner that makes it possible to build more strongly class-oriented organisations, activities or policies, and hence to reproduce class structure in a progressively stronger fashion? Certain simple and habitual acts, such as going to work for profit-making firms, create the reality of class structure in the weak sense, but no move. The making of a coherent working class or a polarsied class society is a cumulative historical process which depends on both existing material sources of commonality and the creation of further resources from those at hand. Hence, crucial defeats of efforts to build up class organisation, class politics or class culture actually weaken the force of class structuration. This approach does not deny that class polarisation can take place very fast, given the right circumstances. But it suggests that, in human as in physical geography, it is often the slower, less dramatic processes of building up and tearing down that have the greatest effect in the long run.
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