objective symbol of the money-form creates the racialized relations of colonialism. Conversely, Marx explains that, unlike colonial society and prior historical arrangements of production, the capitalist society acquires its unity through social relations defined by exchange due to the lack of perceptible interaction amongst these relations. Because the products of labor are immediately exchanged as commodities, their producers appear invisible throughout the production process and only encounter each other through the exchange of these products as expressed through the “universal equivalent” of the money-form. Through the assessment of all the commodities in terms of their relative exchange-values, instead of their use-values, the money-form reifies and “conceals the social character of private labour and the social relations between the individual workers, by making those relations appear as relations between material objects” [7]. Therefore, in Marx’s analysis of the capitalist society, members recognize themselves and their fellow relations not as human beings but through the money-form, itself a commodity fetishized with this function as a “matter of accident,” that they receive for their commodities [8].

In the theories of Marx and Fanon, both theorists argue that the societies that they analyze each represent “a world cut in two.” Marx argues that this is constituted by the conflict between the “compartments” of the capitalist and the worker, whereas the tension between the colonizer and colonized native replace this class struggle within Fanon's colonial context [9]. Because colonialism lacks the exchange relations of capitalism, Fanon’s analysis adapts Marx’s theory to colonialism by purporting that the colonial social relations assess value, not through the money-form, but instead through the whiteness of one’s skin. During the initial phases of expansion, the colonies serve to further the economic interests of capitalist society. Lacking the capitalist bourgeoisie “to create the conditions for the development of a large-scale proletariat, to mechanise agriculture” and employing the colonized as “forced labour,” the colony remains stagnant between its original structure of semi-feudalism and the parasitic colonizers’ disinterest in establishing the exchange processes of capitalism [10]. Fanon thus describes the colonies “as a source of raw material which, once turned into manufactured goods, could be distributed on the European market” [11]. While the workers’ positions as “someone who exchanges, posits exchange value, and maintains exchange value though exchange” integrates them into capitalist society, the institution of colonialism excludes the colonized natives from the cohesive exchange relations of capitalism and thus requires the universal equivalent of whiteness to integrate both the colonizers and the colonized into its exploitative social relations [12].

Without capitalism’s commodified exchange relations expressed through the money-form, the relationships within colonial society assume the form of skin color which preserves the exploitative distinction between the colonizers and the colonized. Whiteness serves as the embodiment of value and indicates “beauty and virtue, which have never been black” [13]. Fanon thus explains that “the cause is the consequence: You are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich” [14]. Whiteness appears to express the “use-values” of individuals’ characteristics, such as intelligence and