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Chapter 1 – the Postmodern Economy

Today the question of economic engagement is post-modernized. This means that it is no longer a matter of discovering and developing new markets. All of the markets have been discovered and exploited. The final frontier of economic engagement is on information and intellectual production.

Hardt and Negri 2000 (Michael and Antonio, *Empire* pgs. 271-272)

A third hypothesis, which may be seen as complementary to the second, is that **today capital continues to accumulate through subsumption in a cycle of expanded reproduction, but that increasingly it subsumes not the noncapitalist environment but its own capitalist terrain**—that is, **that the subsumption is no longer *formal* but *real***

The resolution is a question that has already been answered. Hardt and Negri indicate that there is no longer a separate political sphere in which decisions are made, but rather that the economic sphere determines questions of social policy and activism. This means that a true switch-side debate is an impossibility in status conceptions of the resolution.

Hardt and Negri 2000 (Michael and Antonio, *Empire* pgs. 307-308)

The contemporary phase is in fact not adequately characterized by the victory of capitalist corporations over the state. **Although transnational corporations and global networks of production and circulation have undermined the powers of nation-states, state functions and constitutional elements have effectively been displaced to other levels and domains**.

And this is because Empire determines the real questions of economics and sovereignty. Empire is a form of sovereignty consolidated by hegemonic governments, international corporations, and organizations representing the people.

Ansaldi 2001, (Saverio, “The Multitude in Empire: Biopolitical Alternatives” in *Rethinking Marxism* vol. 13 no. 3-4 page 137)

Therein lies the response of imperial and biopolitical capital**. The control over biopower exerted by the immaterial work of the multitude finds its point of application in the infinite ramifications of real subsumption**.

The nature of the new means of production and exploitation require a new central command. The centers of financial trade are the new overseers in the factory that is informational production. This means that it’s not about the USFG, but rather about New York, London and Tokyo and how the decision made in these sites of market management allow for exploitation of communicative networks.

Hardt and Negri 2000 (Michael and Antonio, *Empire* pg. 297)

**The decentralization and global dispersal of productive processes and sites, which is characteristic of the postmodernization or informatization of the economy, provokes a corresponding centralization of the control over production. The centrifugal movement of production is balanced by the centripetal trend of command**

The impact of this ongoing means of exploitation is domination. Those whose production-value is managed and exploited – face a life of brutal violence, starvation, and poverty.

O’Neill 2002 (John, “Empire versus Empire: A Post-Communist Manifesto” in *Theory Culture Society* vol. 19 Page 199-200)

The prospect of Empire is underwritten by the US dollar, trusting in the one-eyed god that watches from the great pyramid overlooking the New Age of Global Order – Novus Ordo Seculorum. It is a ﬁnancial, corporate and military order faced by the G8, GATT, WTO, World Bank, IMF, all towering over the UN, Church, media and NGOs that are charged with representing the interests of the world’s people. Yet, as much as Empire strives for constitutional status, it becomes the very site (non-place) of its own contestation abroad as a sovereign political and economic order whose macro-spectacle of consumptive desire is simultaneously shot through with anxiety and fear among its micro-subjects unsure of its centre, as we remarked earlier.

Chapter 2 – Multitude

As a means of controlling production and generating wealth from information networks, Empire must maintain and compartmentalize instances of identities and producers. This means that Empire is in a constant decline as our capability as producers always outpaces our ability to be contained. However, the desire to maintain control over network production is what fractures universal resistance to capitalism.

Hardt and Negri 2000 (Michael and Antonio, *Empire* pgs. 391-392)

**Such examples of corruption could be multiplied ad infinitum, but at the base of all these forms of corruption there is an operation of ontological nullification that is defined and exercised as the destruction of the singular essence of the multitude. The multitude must be unified or segmented into different unities: this is how the multitude has to be corrupted**.

This means neither a reactionary resistance to exploitative production, nor a restructuring of capitalism, but simply an allowing the excess of communication to collapse the system.

Bowring 2004 (Finn, “From the Mass Worker to the Multitude: A Theoretical Contextualization of Hardt and Negri’s Empire” *in Capital and Class* no. 83 Summer 2004 pgs. 101-132)

**If Empire can be superseded neither by the reappropriation of productive forces, nor by the defence of regional autonomy and the assertion of distinctive cultural identities, what mode of resistance is most appropriate to the new global configuration of capital**? Though Hardt and Negri are as vague on this question as they are on any subject they address in their work that requires the identification of agents, acts and effects, one political response they do seem to favour is conveyed by the notion of 'exodus'.

Whereas **in the disciplinary era sabotage was the fundamental notion of resistance, in the era of imperial control it may be desertion**. Whereas being-against in modernity often meant a direct and/or dialectical opposition of forces, in postmodernity being -against might well be most effective in an oblique or diagonal stance. Battles against the Empire might be won through subtraction and defection.

This corrosive capability of our labor-power is good.

Our advocacy is that you use this round as an opportunity to align yourself with the Multitude.

This means that we do not seek to use our labor power to answer questions that have already been answered. Instead you should endorse abandoning the productive system of post-modern capitalism and allow for a truly democratic form of communication. This is the only way to solve for the harms of capitalism that exist today.

Hardt and Negri 2004 (Michael and Antonio, *Multitude* page 217-219)

To grasp fully the novelty of the multitude's network form of organization it helps to contrast it with the dominant organizational forms of our recent past. In the latter part of the twentieth century, protest movements and revolts followed two primary models. The first and more traditional form of organization is based on the identity of the struggle, and its unity is organized under central leadership, such as the party. There might be other axes of conflict important to those in the movement on the basis, for example, of minority status, but these must be subordinated in the name of unity to the primary struggle.

Our role of the ballot is summarized by Ani DiFranco, who once said, “Every tool is a weapon if you hold it right.”

Affirming our reappropriation of communication is a form of self-organization within the multitude. The real revolutionary event waits only on the construction of a powerful organization, which is formed by constantly renewing the cooperative productivity by aligning yourself, via the ballot, with the affirmative.

Hardt & Negri 2000

(Michael & Negri. Empire. Harvard University Press. pg 411.)

Certainly, there must be a moment when reappropriation and self-organization reach a threshold and configure a real event. This is when sthe political is really affirmed—when the genesis is complete and self-valorization, the cooperative convergence of subjects, and the proletarian management of production become a constituent power. This is the point when the modern republic ceases to exist and the postmodern posse arises. This is the founding moment of an earthly city that is strong and distinct from any divine city.

The affirmative solves because it is an affirmation of the capability of intellectual labor to provide a means of social relations outside of the exploitative structures of Empire.

Ansaldi 2001, (Saverio, “The Multitude in Empire: Biopolitical Alternatives” in *Rethinking Marxism* vol. 13 no. 3-4 page 137)

The imperial political model thus does not only imply a redefinition of sovereignty and its modalities of application; it also brings up to date profound and irreversible changes in the modes of production. And it is there where we locate the question of biopolitics. In effect, **we have seen that imperial sovereignty crosses, in an immanent manner, all the subjectivities onto which it exercises its action. It is thus an eminently bioproductive sovereignty.**