

The Double Role of the Writer as Worker and Rentier

Maja Breznik

Peace Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia
maja.breznik@guest.arnes.si

The dismantling of the “aesthetic welfare state” and the latest cycle of economic globalization have driven culture into the “production” of new capitalism for a new cycle of capitalist expansion. The article examines the new socioeconomic position of writers torn between the role of workers and rentiers.

Keywords: publishing industry / globalization / book market / author / writer / wage relations / copyright

The community of writers, the *république des lettres*, is increasingly dependent on profit-seeking arrangements. In the latest stage of economic globalization, culture has been driven into the “production” of new capitalism for a new cycle of capitalist expansion. This has resulted in reshaping and strengthening the profit-driven production strategies in culture by increasing its productivity where appropriate. Publishing was one of the first cultural productions subjected to such new business innovations.

It is important to note here that extra-economic regulation (i.e., copyright protection) has increased the opportunity for the valorization of capital, thus securing investments in cultural industries. Copyright has created new provisions of protection that have augmented the monopolistic position of the right-holder, who is an investor or writer. Both the acceleration of productivity in the cultural industry and the old and new provisions of copyright protection have created new social and economic conditions for writers and artists. Various extensions of copyright regulation have offered new patterns of compensation for writers and artists, while further developing the technical division of labor:

[T]he technical composition of the cognitive labour force is very specific. It possesses the means of production, but is unable to put them to use because of juridical obstacles that force it to pass through the market and thus to submit to a ‘capitalist’ type of exploitation. The cognitive worker, being in possession of the means of production, is thus *separated from the social conditions of production*. This position is mystified by the ideology according to which a cognitive worker is her or his own entrepreneur, marketing her or his ‘social’ or ‘cultural’ capital.” (Močnik 232–33)

I analyze how writers and artists are integrated into cultural production in the Slovenian market economy as established since the 1990s. I believe that such a meticulous analysis, which might be tiresome at some points for the reader, can be useful for further studies of contemporary publishing. If it proceeds from the complex dynamics between the accommodation to and confrontation with institutional practices and legal norms, it may facilitate understanding the social position of writers, their motivations and self-perception, their aesthetic conceptions, and the social reflection of the arts.

The question of writers' position in the profit-driven publishing industry has become increasingly important since Slovenian independence and the "reconstruction" of capitalism. In the preceding period, the socialist "aesthetic welfare state" used to guarantee general access to culture and stable conditions for artists. Today, on the demand side the cultural rights of people are being transformed into consumers' rights, whereas on the supply side an increasing number of artists are becoming "entrepreneurial cultural workers"; that is, "sole service suppliers in the professional cultural field" (Ellmeier 4, 11). In Slovenia, about a quarter of all artists are self-employed,¹ whereas general national statistics reports about 10% of people self-employed among the entire working population (in the early 1980s they were less than 3%). The question of new "entrepreneurial cultural workers" is even more compelling if one takes into consideration Debra Hevenstone's study, in which she tests a hypothesis about a correlation between the "entrepreneurial spirit" and the extent of self-employment. Her conclusion is that "self-employment has been consistently shown to be positively correlated with a weak economy" (Hevenstone 319). It is high in Greece and in the new EU member states, all weak economies with higher unemployment, lower unemployment benefits, lower wages, and so on, but low in strong western European economies. Moreover, a Slovenian study of the working poor showed that self-employed persons are almost five times more exposed to the risk of poverty than other groups of employees (Leskošek et al. 80–81). As a consequence, former "independent" workers are becoming "dependent self-employed." This raises the question of the nature of this new dependency, which I examine by analyzing modes of artists' integration in the labor market, the division of labor, and compensation models together with possible causes of the "proletarianization" of this particular workforce.

Dependency is important in positioning workers in cultural industries, while also affecting their "success" in non-market social spheres. Interventions by the "aesthetic welfare state" have been reoriented towards the interests of cultural industry. Today, the wellbeing of capital owners

and the growth of profits seem to be the highest priority. “The aesthetic capitalist state,” as I call this type of state *maecenate*, uses state interventions to secure profits and the development of this particular economic sector through selective criteria for allocating funding that are not much different from those appreciated in market exchange. These criteria are the number of books printed and sold, the number of awards, and so on, also applicable to the “evaluation” of an individual artist. (For a sketch of the world-systems dimension of neoliberal cultural politics, see Habjan 194–95.)

The socialization of writers’ “products” is thus progressively more dependent on market regulation. For this reason, this analysis of a particular working group, “authors” or “writers,” from the perspective of labor relations may facilitate understanding the positioning of writers in contemporary society. To this end, I analyze the labor process in book publishing as generating certain labor relations with various professionals. I develop an abstract model of free-market publishing irrespective of any concrete publishing programs, putting aside for a moment all kinds of publishing that depart from this abstract model (e.g., subsidized publishing or academic journal publishing).

Means of production in book publishing

An examination of the entire labor process (book production) from the point of view of its results (books) shows that three kinds of means of production are being used: 1) the instruments of labor, 2) the subject of labor, and 3) labor as productive labor. I proceed from the easiest to the more difficult points, starting with the instruments.

Instruments

By instruments in book production, I mean computers for writers, editors, or designers, but also printing machines, means of transport for distributing books, and so on. My first observation would be that increasingly less human labor is needed to produce a book as the modes of its distribution become faster. One can easily provide statistical evidence by looking at the cost structure of a book and the progressive decrease of costs of book manufacturing throughout the twentieth century.

The instruments are the materialization of past labor needed for creating and manufacturing them. At the same time, instruments are the result of multiform innovative contributions from all humankind, the fruits of gen-

eral scientific development. For this reason, past labor is also called “dead labor” or “general intellect” and is viewed as a joint property of humankind. However, it may collide with the “contradiction between the development of productive forces and the relations of production; namely, the regime of private property” (Cohen 69). Today the internet is the best example of such a contradiction: technological means make it possible for all texts from all over the world to become available to anyone, but the private appropriation of the technological means impedes this large project of cultural democratization. In such a situation, the “dead labor” is a *voluntary gift* to the one that has the means to explore its potentials for economic use. Therefore, examinations of technological progress demand more precaution than certain philosophers have shown: technological progress itself does not necessitate any radical social change without a change in the relations of production.

Labor

My second point is labor. Needless to say, writers do not write books, but manuscripts (see Chartier 9).² Many different professions participate in the transformation of a writer’s manuscript into a book: editors, designers, proofreaders, printers, booksellers, and so on. The labor of all these people is important for the production of a book; their working skills are rare and highly specialized, but they are nevertheless replaceable. In the context of the publishing industry, they take the position of wage workers not very different from employees in other sectors.

What about writers and their labor? The purpose of the kinds of labor I have described so far is to change a manuscript into a commodity, whereas the writer’s pursuit cannot be simply described in these terms. The manuscript comes into the publishing labor process as a semi-finished product that has the function of “raw material” or “semi-finished products” in the publishing process. With this assessment I come to the third point: the subject of labor.

The subject of labor

The subject of labor in publishing, or labor’s raw material, is the manuscript that the writer submits to the publisher. It is therefore a subject of past labor from a previous labor process.

This conclusion is more important than one might imagine. It marks the point at which the writer joins the publishing process as commodity

production after completing the manuscript. The manuscript itself was created under circumstances that (with no offence to the artist) could be described as artisanal, by which I wish to emphasize that it differs from commodity production. As such, it cannot be compared with standardized commodity production according to the principles of scientific management; similarly, the work of the writer can hardly be measured by the usual standards of commodity production. What is the value of the manuscript that the writer has written in a certain period of time? How much material (paper, ink, electricity, etc.) is consumed while working? Can the work be compared to somebody else's work?

However, one must be careful with conclusions here. All of these questions signal that the writer's labor cannot be directly subsumed under commodity production, but can nevertheless be turned into a general time-labor form of value (see Figure 1). The writer's efforts might be estimated in financial terms according to the current price of the labor force in a particular space and time. Socialism, for example, developed a system of fixed fees obligatory for publishers in order to provide writers with payments that were comparable to the wages of workers of similar qualifications. In sum, manuscript writing is artisanal and different from commodity production, but they both meet at the particular moment of the writer's submission of the manuscript to the publisher.

Figure 1: The labor process in book publishing

Means of production	Instruments	"Dead labor"
	Subject of labor	"Subject of past labor"
Productive labor	Labor	"Wage labor"

The expansion of market mechanisms into the arts

The conclusions so far have approached the question of art's subordination to market mechanisms. The question of the expansion of market mechanisms into social spheres that are not subsumed under the market economy is not a recent one. Already in the 1960s, Mario Tronti (49), a member of the Italian *operaisti*, wrote: "The real process of proletarianization is presented as a formal process of the third sector's growth." Tronti's line of argumentation is that, in order to augment the surplus value and thus the profits, the capitalist must diminish the value of the labor force and constantly improve the labor process, as well as generalize and expand the capitalist mode of social production. In the end, Tronti says, all forms of

labor must become industrial labor, and all social relations must swiftly change into relations of production in the third sector, until the entire society becomes a factory. Hence, Tronti draws equals signs between factory, society, and state (*fabbrica = società = stato*).

However, society as a whole is not automatically becoming a factory because the capitalist mode of production cannot automatically subsume all spheres of social production by, for example, separating the labor force from the means of production or by subtilizing the division of labor. The way that a particular social production (e.g., artistic production) becomes incorporated into a capitalist mode of production may have no impact on its particular mode of production. It may remain almost the same as before, like the process of writing a manuscript, at least so long as there are no machines for producing novels and poems. The incorporation of various forms of production into the market economy does not imply that they will automatically be industrialized: some may be industrialized and others (e.g., writing a manuscript) may remain artisanal.

From this perspective, the arguments about the independence of labor from management control or about the embodiment of a utopian (socialist) future in the present knowledge-based societies as found in the theories of “cognitive capitalism” and of “immaterial work” seem simplified and exaggerated (see Vercellone; Virno). According to my findings so far, analyses of “knowledge-driven production” must be carried out with great precaution. The “knowledge industry” was incorporated into the market economy without achieving a reversal of the usual relations of production in commodity production. On the contrary, mass commodity production has been expanded to “knowledge industries” such as publishing and even the university. As a result, these two sectors were converted into large-scale production lines, similar to those in Ford’s factories, to produce books or knowledge as market commodities for mass consumption (see Schiffrin, *The Business*; Krašovec). Only work that could not be directly subsumed under commodity production, such as artistic or research work proper, was left behind as artisanal. It was incorporated, instead, by the monetary dependence in the circulation process, which I examine in the following sections.

Conclusive remarks on production

As noted above, the writer provides a manuscript, which enters into the production chain as a semi-finished product or as raw material of the publisher. Editors, proofreaders, and designers then change this manu-

script into a market commodity. At this moment the writer might receive some remuneration for the time spent writing a manuscript, and for the materials (e.g., computer, ink, paper) and goods consumed during writing. He can thus receive a kind of “wage” from the publisher, but this is not the only reward to which the writer has access. He may receive more as the finished book enters the sphere of circulation.

Circulation

The circulation of cultural goods such as books is regulated by restrictions of copyright protections. Legal protection of intellectual property rights has extended normal property rights for physical objects (land, real estate, etc.) to “intellectual creations” (books, paintings, etc.). The right-holder thus gains a monopoly position in the market and, particularly, the right to control and monetarize the use of protected works. In certain situations, the right-holder can hence charge for certain uses of the protected commodity even after it has been sold to a buyer. Copyright is an old companion to the publishing industry, but the tensions between publishers and writers have increased with the recent concentration of publishing and distribution (Schiffrin, *Le contrôle*; Epstein; Rouet; Breznik et al., *Knjižna*). This has led to greater dependency of writers on publishers and, as one might say, to the “proletarianization of cultural workers” on both sides of the Atlantic.

At first glance, the exchange of books does not differ much from the exchange of other commodities. A book is offered on the market in much the same way as a car or any other commodity. When two contracted parties exchange a car, the buyer obtains absolute ownership over the object. Imagine, however, that the buyer of a book wishes to make a photocopy of the book for a friend that is also interested in the topic. The clerk at the copy shop will tell the buyer that, although he is allowed to make a copy of a small part of the book, making a copy of the entire book is prohibited. The clerk might even show the buyer the article in the copyright law that addresses reproduction for private purposes, or the copyright notice on the back cover of the book. The buyer might come up with the idea of establishing a public or private lending library, in which all the books he has bought would be available to everybody for borrowing. He would soon find out, however, that in Europe remunerations must be paid to the authorized organization for the public lending of books. He might then become angry and decide to hold a public reading from the purchased copy of the book, whose owner he definitely is, because in this way at least he

will inform people about its content. However, in this case too, the buyer will be approached by the collective organization of writers, which will ask him for another kind of remuneration that allows him to read from the book in public. The buyer may finally realize that, according to copyright law, he is excluded from an entire series of uses of the book he has already bought, and that if he wants to gain access to them he must pay additional remunerations to the writer or right-holder. Given the prohibitions stated in copyright law, he must pay the remuneration each time for each of these uses of the book he has already paid for once.

According to copyright law, only the writer, not other possible right-holders, is usually appointed to receive many of these kinds of remuneration. The writer may pass rights on to the publisher, but in some cases some rights are not transferable. Legal regulation therefore gives the writer rights to “secondary revenues” (such as remunerations for copying, lending in public libraries, adaptation into a film or a theater performance). The writer’s revenues are composed, one can conclude, of two kinds of revenues: 1) direct payment for work, which I have already described as “wage,” after the submission of a manuscript to a publisher, and 2) secondary revenues, which are a kind of rent, following publication of a book on the basis of work already accomplished and paid for and commodities already sold (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Writer’s revenues

1.	Direct payment for work	“Wage”
2.	Secondary revenues	“Rent”

The business partnership between the writer and publisher

The publisher, who of course knows about both types of revenue, is thinking: if the writer is justified in receiving not only a wage, but also rent revenues, then the relation between him and me is no longer a contract between the writer as a seller of labor or of his ability to write a manuscript and the publisher as a buyer of labor. If the publisher has ever felt obliged to provide, in the form of a wage or direct payment for the manuscript, a minimum required for the writer’s existential needs (or even for the writer’s social security or pension funds) as compensation for labor he bought, he is now completely liberated from this obligation. Their relation thus changes into a mutual business partnership for investment in a new commodity. This leads to a fantastic metamorphosis: the writer is transformed into an “entrepreneur,” and his labor into “capital.”

Figure 2 is of course a theoretical formalization that draws a clear line between the two sources of revenue, although in reality the situation is more complex. With royalties, for example, the figure may create uncertainties. Royalties are a sort of postponed “wage” that can be realized in the circulation process when, as I mentioned, the writer is justified in receiving “rent revenues.” If a writer receives royalties, he must participate with the publisher in the valorization of their common product in the market. Royalties therefore additionally reinforce the business relationship between the publisher and the writer.

Because the writer has a chance to receive rent revenues, the publisher considers to have the right to diminish his direct payment for a manuscript (or royalties as “postponed wage and one of the methods of decreasing direct payment to the writer). The writer, as a new entrepreneur, must collect the basic funds necessary for his subsistence by combining wage and rent revenues. What takes the form of rent revenues for the writer is actually to a great extent a monetary value that he needs for his basic living costs, and only what remains may eventually be the writer’s surplus. It suffices that the publisher anticipates rent revenues for the writer, even if the anticipation is not realistic, in order to build a relation with the writer as a business partner and to consider him a future rentier. As a member of the research group working on the project “The Management of Author’s and Related Rights in the Digital Environment” (see Breznik et al.),³ I helped conduct several interviews with Slovenian writers and translators. We assessed that only five percent of their revenues derive from “rent revenues” and that this type of revenue cannot replace the rapid decrease in direct payments on the part of the publisher. It is not difficult to conclude that this system leads to considerable pauperization of writers.

Monetary dependence of writers

Once upon a time, writers sought social recognition and sufficient reward for their work from private patrons, royal courts, and, lately, the aesthetic welfare state. Nowadays they are forced to look for these in the copyright regulation system.

As noted above, writers are free to organize production over which market relations have no control. However, social recognition and reward, valorization of their books on the market, and the sale of books on which the amount of copyright remuneration depends are accessible to writers only through publishers. Cultural production is thus subsumed under the capitalist economy through monetary dependence because market mecha-

nisms can provide some kind of subsistence to writers and it is through these mechanisms that the writer has access to his readership.

Writers feel inclined to adapt to publishers' expectations or market records, which certainly influence the decisions made in the writing process. However, the most negative social effect of generalized market-oriented publishing is that the culture cannot create a system of production and circulation that would be an alternative, and/or in opposition, to the market economy. Even special publishing programs, as the examples below (like scientific publishing or publicly financed publishing) show, are not isolated from market constraints, as they imitate some principles of market-oriented publishing. They meet accelerated profit-seeking pressures in publishing where supply and demand are otherwise publicly financed.

Academic e-journals

First, I illustrate the argument about monetary dependence with a specific type of publishing: academic journal publishing. On the list of the world's largest publishers in 2009, if one looks at their turnover, one finds among the top five no less than three publishers of academic journals (Reed Elsevier, Thomson Reuters, and Wolters Kluwer).⁴ They manage several hundred journals each. Their lucrative business model is based on voluntary and free-of-charge work on the part of writers that submit articles and on the part of their research colleagues that produce peer reviews. The articles present research work, predominantly funded by public subsidies, but writers must nevertheless turn over all rights related to the articles to the publishers. They, as the only right-holders, have a right to fix prices, to determine the accessibility terms for e-journals and selection criteria for journals or articles, and the use of methodologies for citation indexes and impact factors. This is why academic publishing corporations have control over writers: publications in journals with the highest impact factor and citation index rates are the main criteria in evaluating a particular researcher, and so university careers and research funding depend on them. Because it is also the terrain of international comparison and competition among national research communities, research funders also urge researchers to publish in journals with the highest impact factors. Funders thus entrust the sheep to the wolf, but they do not come off with a small loss either.

The same group of writers, peer-reviewers, and editors is also the target readership of these journals, which exceed the comprehension skills of most of the general public. Subscriptions are often too expensive for individuals: in 2007 the annual subscription to a chemistry journal cost

\$3,490, a physics journal \$3,103, an engineering journal \$1,919, and a geography journal \$1,086 (Cope and Kalantzis 23). University libraries subscribe to these journals for which national funders mostly pay excessive prices, particularly in comparison to restrictive access to articles that they have already financed once through research funding. The reason that they nevertheless bargain with publishers is the role of publishers in the evaluation of research. Publishers have created a “stock exchange” out of academic publishing with a system of quantification of items such as publications, citations, rejections of articles, and so on. This is a kind of quantitative valuation necessary for further monetarization of research. Quantitative estimations developed in this are used by writers in exchange for university positions, research funding, rewards, and prestige; the national funders use them as quantitative research funding criteria and as international score rates of national research competitiveness; and publishers sponge off public funds for education and research. The system seems to work and each agent has obligations and benefits. The role of publishers may seem superfluous, but the “monetary dependence” they have been able to build up out of academic publishing binds all the agents tightly together.

The fact that commercial publishing slows down the use of digital technology for further circulation of research, inhibiting epistemological advances in the representation of findings, seems to worry only a marginal groups of researchers (Cope and Kalantzis 13–61). Despite technological progress, scholarly publishing still imitates the print culture, uses PDF documents as a simple replacement for printed texts, and keeps peer-reviewing highly secret. It would be possible to create a new system of electronic publishing in which editors, writers, readers, and peer-reviewers could openly discuss research problems by means of new communication tools. Alternative models of publishing are so close at hand, and yet the bonds of monetary dependence quite successfully prevent attempts to change the existing publishing model.

The alignment of the state with the interests of commercial publishers

The second example is subsidized Slovenian publishing. The public system of subsidizing books and journals supports the publication of over 500 books and 148 journals a year. The subsidizing system helps many literary and science books/journals see the day of light; moreover, it protects writers and translators with a system of fixed fees so that they can survive and continue working. This is a remarkable system of public support for books and journals in contrast to profit-driven publishing.

However, is subsidized publishing really remote from profit-driven publishing? One might assume that state subsidies go where there is a lack of sufficient resources. Table 1 shows, to the contrary, that in Slovenia state subsidies are almost proportional to publishers' profits. Thanks to substantial profits, many publishers could easily finance books that they consider less profitable, but they nevertheless condition the publication of these books on state subsidies. The state, paying no attention to this contradiction, aligns with the interests of publishers and, as a result, defends their right to profit. Moreover, the state distributes subsidies to the publishers (see Table 1), paying no heed to the fact that the same publishers, by holding a monopoly in publishing as well as in distribution of books, inhibit production and circulation of non-commercial publishing programs that are the original objectives of public subsidizing. The position of the state is therefore ideological through the evident support of commercialization and the profit-seeking strategies in publishing despite all social consequences. Hence, state authorities also block potential attempts to constitute an independent publishing system on the basis of what Bourdieu (38–46) calls the “autonomous principle of hierarchization.”

Table 1: Ranking of Slovenian publishers in 2008

Publisher	Number of titles	Revenue (€)	Profit (€)	Subsidy (€)
Mladinska knjiga	552	52,118,547.00	4,787,490.00	502,298.41
Učila	308	4,484,087.00	1,021,101.00	13,000.00
Rokus	283	7,795,679.00	505,308.00	0.00
DZS	267	55,496,838.00	3,487,218.00	8,000.00
Modrijan	232	3,561,565.00	997,635.00	80,000.00
Družina	97	7,354,500.00	2,058,152.00	160,328.70
TZS	91	2,007,143.00	509,196.00	0.00
Mohorjeva	157	9,361,643.00	-8,645.00	95,724.05
Didakta	77	1,185,108.00	9,005.00	23,000.00
Študentska založba	70	–	–	427,225.34
Cankarjeva založba	60	661,703.00	19,225.00	162,744.12

Labor as capital

I have stated that the writer has the role of an entrepreneur (i.e., an owner of capital or capitalist) in business agreements with his stronger partner, the publisher. A devil's advocate may argue that I have simply imposed a false presentation of labor as "capital" as it is seen from the perspective of capitalists. Moreover, one may object that the hidden objective of this ideological mechanism of turning writers into entrepreneurs is to conceal the true nature of labor as the only producer of new value, and of the consequent extraction of value produced by the laborer as "surplus labor" (i.e., the labor performed in excess of the labor necessary to produce the means of the worker's livelihood, or "necessary labor"). However, it is important to stress that increasingly more people work in conditions in which they appear as business contractors (entrepreneurs) to those using their labor. This may not change the way how labor is included in capitalist production, but it dramatically changes the position of the worker on the labor market. Playing a double role of worker and an entrepreneur that mediates his own capacity to work as his only capital (Marx 482),⁵ he is excluded from any potential protection in the form of labor market regulations. This assessment is applicable to a group of workers – rentiers rentiers, despite the fictitious character of this status.

The examination of production and circulation has shown that the writer is torn between wage labor and (mostly illusionary) rentier privileges. The effect is that he can identify neither with wage workers nor with the capitalist class. For this reason, the writer is twice *déclassé* with respect to both the labor class and the capitalist class. He has no allies, so he easily succumbs to contradictory behavior. Torn between the interests of wage workers and the interests of the capitalist class, writers may have a significant role in the making of a new society, a new type of capitalist society that intends to subject all social relations to capitalist production.

NOTES

¹ See the Slovenian national report published in *Compendium/Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe*, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/slovenia.php?aid=429> (29 Feb. 2012).

² Here, Chartier (9) quotes Roger E. Stoddard: "Whatever they may do, authors do not write books. Books are not written at all. They are manufactured by scribes and other artisans, by mechanics and other engineers, and by printing presses and other machines."

³ For the research report on the project conducted between 2006 and 2008 at the Peace Institute, see http://www.mirovni-institut.si/Projekt/Detail/en/projekt/The-Management-of-Author-s-and-Related-Rights-in-the-Digital-Environment/kategorija/Cultural_policy.

⁴ The list of world's largest book publishers, published by Publishers Weekly, is accessible at: <http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/international/international-book-news/article/43564-global-publishing-rankings-2009.html>.

⁵ Marx writes: "The *self-employed laborer*, for example, is his own wage laborer, and his own means of production confront him in his own mind as capital. As his own capitalist, he employs himself as a wage laborer."

WORKS CITED

- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Breznik, Maja, et al. *Knjižna kultura*. Ljubljana: UMco, 2005.
- Breznik, Maja, et al. *Upravljanje avtorskih in sorodnih pravic v digitalnem okolju*. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut, 2008. Available at: http://www.uil-sipo.si/fileadmin/upload_folder/prispevki-mnenja/Raziskava_Upravljanje-ASP_2008.pdf (9 Feb 2012).
- Chartier, Roger. *The Order of Books*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Cohen, Daniel. *Trois leçons sur la société post-industrielle*. Paris: Seuil, 2006.
- Cope, Bill, and Mary Kalantzis. "Signs of Epistemic Disruption: Transformations in the Knowledge System of the Academic Journal." *The Future of the Academic Journal*. Ed. Bill Cope and Angus Phillips. Oxford: Chandos, 2009. 13–61.
- Ellmeier, Andrea. "Cultural Entrepreneurialism: On the Changing Relationship between the Arts, Culture, and Employment." *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* 9.1 (2003): 3–16.
- Epstein, Jason. *Book Business*. New York: Norton, 2002.
- Habjan, Jernej. "Who Chooses the One Who Chooses? On a Forced Choice of Shakespearean Epistemology and Textology." *Primerjalna književnost* 33.2 (2010): 193–202.
- Havenstone, Debra. "National Context and Atypical Employment." *International Sociology* 25.3 (2010): 315–47.
- Krašovec, Primož. "Realna subsumcija v hramu duha." *Univerza in neoliberalizem*. Ed. Katja Kolšek. Novo Mesto: Založba Goga [in press].
- Leskošek, Vesna, et al. *Vzroki in obseg pojave zaposlenih revnih*. Research report. Ljubljana: Faculty for Social Work, 2009.
- Marx, Karl. "Productive and Unproductive Labour." Marx, *Economic Works 1861–1864*. Accessible at: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1864/economic/ch02b.htm> (29 Feb. 2012).
- Močnik, Rastko. "Political Practices at the End of Capitalism." *Post-Fordism and Its Discontents*. Ed. Gal Kirn. Maastricht: Jan van Eyck Academie; Berlin: b_books, 2010, 221–52.
- Rouet, François. *Le livre*. Paris: La Documentation Française, 1999.
- Schiffrin, André. *Le contrôle de la parole*. Paris: La fabrique, 2005.
- Schiffrin, André. *The Business of Books*. London: Verso, 2000.
- Tronti, Mario. *Operai e capitale*. Rome: DeriveApprodi, 1962.
- Vercellone, Carlo. "From Formal Subsumption to General Intellect." *Historical erialism* 15.1 (2009): 13–36.
- Virno, Paolo. *A Grammar of the Multitude*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(c), 2003.

Dvojna vloga pisatelja kot delavca in rentnika

Ključne besede: založništvo / globalizacija / knjižni trg / avtor / pisatelj / mezdni odnosi / avtorske pravice

Razgradnja »estetske socialne države« in zadnji ciklus gospodarske globalizacije sta pripeljala tudi kulturo v »produkcijo« novega kapitalizma, zato da bi se zagnal nov svež ciklus kapitalistične ekspanzije. Ti procesi so spremenili družbeno-ekonomske okoliščine, v katerih ustvarjajo avtorji. Članek analizira vlogo avtorja z dveh vidikov življenja knjige, s stališča produkcije in cirkulacije knjige. Avtorica analizira nastajanje knjige s pomočjo konceptov produkcijska sredstva (delovno sredstvo in predmet dela) in produktivno delo. Iz tega ugotovi, da avtorjevo delo (rokopis) stopi v produkcijo knjige kot »predmet dela«, ki ga založnik spremeni v knjigo. Na tej ravni avtor sklepa z založnikom mezdni odnos. V sferi cirkulacije pa je avtor kot imetnik avtorskih pravic upravičen do del »profita« in zato se dogovor med založnikom in avtorjem za nazaj spremeni v »poslovni dogovor«, avtor pa v »podjetnika«. Avtor, kot lahko izpeljemo, je razpet med vlogo delavca in podjetnika, ki najpogosteje upravlja z edinim kapitalom, ki ga ima na voljo – s svojim delom.

Marec 2012