**Our volition is the structure of our will and it is binding—it is the only way we can feel anything like emotions, form relations or use reason to make decisions and generate intentions.**

**Our will is dependent on our interactions with the people around us, which explains why the subject can be fluid and stable at the same time. I am different now than I was 10 years ago, but if I did something messed up we shouldn’t immediately forget about it.**

**Motivation determines what our conceptions of goodness are what leads us to take actions in support of it—we respond to things differently depending on how they affect our will. We cannot strictly abide by external rules because they disregard individuality and contextual circumstances, but still need an objective set of rules for people to remain ethical.**

**The only solution is a concept of alienation: a criterion concerned with how someone is able to exercise their volition, not what they will. Alienation is the obstruction of ones will and their relations with the world.**

**Since everyone is presumed equal, everyone has an obligation to establish conditions of non-alienation, including the state. Thus: the standard is resisting alienation**

**Independently prefer:**

**1. Performativity—every argument assumes creative productivity i.e. that you are able to pursue an end and that this is done consciously. Thus embracing the standard is a prior question to the very nature of debate since we cannot make any arguments without it.**

**2. Moral accountability requires non-alienation. If you are alienated from your ends there is no way you can be morally responsible for what you do because it wasn’t you rationally willing and doing it. Thus the only way to identify moral responsibility is to not be alienated. This means the AC is key to actualize any other ethic.**

**Impact Calc: The standard is not consequentialist—it’s not concerned with the effects of removing subsidies on fossil fuels or the alternatives that would replace them. It’s only concerned with the procedures of subsidies.**

**Capitalism is alienating because the laborer is distanced from the act or working, it turns a life into becoming means rather than an end. Jaeggi 16** Rachel Jaeggi; et al. *Alienation*; Columbia University Press, 2016; Rahel Jaeggi is Professor for Practical Philosophy with Emphasis on Social Philosophy and Political Philosophy at the Humboldt University of Berlin – brackets for gendered language

**We can identify two dimensions of the deficit in the relation to self and world that Marx theorizes as alienation: first, the inability meaningfully to identify with what one does and with those with whom one does it; second, the inability to exert control over what one does**—that is, the inability to be, individually or collectively, the subject of one’s actions. **Alienation from the object—from the product of one’s own activity—means at once loss of control and dispos- session: the alienated worker** (as the seller of her labor power) **no longer has at her [their] disposal what she herself [they] has produced; it does not belong to her**. Her product is exchanged on a market she does not control and under conditions she does not control**. Alienation also means that the object must appear to her as fragmented: laboring under conditions of specialization and the division of labor, the worker has no relation to the product of her [their] work as a whole.** As someone who is involved in one of the many specialized acts that make up the production of Adam Smith’s famous pin, she has no relation to the pin as a finished product, as small as the pin might be**. Put differently, the product of her [their] specific labor—her specific contribution to the production of the pin—does not fit for her into a meaningful whole, a unity with significance**. The same pairing of powerlessness and loss of meaning (or impoverish- ment) marks the worker’s alienation from her own activity**. Alienated labor is, on the one hand, unfree activity, labor in which and into which one is forced**. In her labor the alienated worker is not the master of what she does. Standing under foreign command, her labor is determined by an other, or heteronomous. “If he relates to his own activity as to an unfree activity, then he relates to it as an activity performed in the service, under the domination, the coercion, and the yoke of another human being.”**5 And, being powerless, the worker can neither comprehend nor control the process as a whole of which she is a part but that remains untransparent to her. At the same time, alienated labor is also characterized by—as a counterpart to the product’s fragmentation—the fragmentation and impoverishment of laboring activity**. Thus Marx also regards as alienated the dullness and limited character of the labor itself, “which make the human being into as abstract a being as possible, a lathe, etc., and transforms her into a spiritual and physical monstrosity” (as he says in his “Comments on James Mill**”). Alienation from others, from the world of social relations of cooperation, also reflects these two dimensions: in alienated labor the worker has no control over what she, together with others, does. And in alienated labor others are for her, one could say, “structurally indifferent**.”6 It is interesting and of great importance for his theory that Marx denounces not only the instrumentalization of the worker by the owner of her labor power but also the instrumental relation to herself that the worker acquires through it. From Marx’s perspective, the instrumental relation that the worker develops (or is forced to develop) to herself and to her labor under condi- tions of alienation also appears problematic—or, more forcefully, “inhuman.” What is alienating about alienated labor is that it has no intrinsic purpose, that it is not (at least also) performed for its own sake. **Activities performed in an alienated way are understood by those who carry them out not as ends but only as means. In the same way, one regards the capacities one acquires from or brings to the activity—and therefore also oneself—as means rather than ends. In other words, one does not identify with what one does. Instrumental- ization, in turn, intensifies into utter meaninglessness: When Marx says that under conditions of alienation life itself becomes a means** (“life itself appears only as a means to life”)7—**what should be an end takes on the character of a means—he is describing a completely meaningless event, or, as one could say, the structure of meaninglessness itself.**

**The only hope is to reclaim our power is committing ourselves to the communist horizon as an organizing principle for collectivity. Any individual act of resistance will be coopted because one person's power is not enough to overturn violence. Commitment to a universal principle of communism becomes a way of combatting alienation through authentic politics. Dean 16**

[Jodi, Prof. of Political Science @ Hobart and William Smith, Crowds and Party, pp. 153-154. Dean received her B.A. in History from [Princeton University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Princeton_University) in 1984. She received her MA, MPhil, and PhD from [Columbia University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Columbia_University) in 1992. Before joining the Department of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, she taught at the [University of Texas at San Antonio](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Texas_at_San_Antonio). She has held visiting research appointments at the Institute for the Human Sciences in Vienna, [McGill University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/McGill_University) in Montreal, and [Cardiff University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cardiff_University) in Wales.]

How do and can we imagine political change underthe conditions of communicative capitalism? Is political change just aggregated personal transformation, communism as viral outbreak or meme-effect, #fullcommunism? Do we think that “autonomous zones of freedom and equality will emerge like so many mushrooms out of the dregs left behind in capital flight and the shrinking of state social provisioning? Or do we optimistically look to democracy, expecting (all evidence to the contrary) that communism, or even upgraded social democracy, will arise out of electoral politics? All these **fantasies imagine that political change can come about without political struggle.** **Each pushes away the fact of antagonism, division, and class struggle as if late neoliberalism were not already characterized by extreme inequality, violence, and exploitation, as if the ruling class did not already use military force**, police force, legal force, and illegal force **to maintain its position.** Politics is a struggle over power. **Capital uses every resource—state, non-state, interstate—to advance its position. A Left that refuses to organize itself in recognition of this fact will never be able to combat it.** “In communicative capitalism, **individual acts of resistance**, subversion, cultural production, and opinion expression, no matter how courageous, **are easily absorbed into the circulatory content of global personal media networks**. Alone, they don’t amplify; they can’t endure. **They are easily forgotten** as new content rushes into and through our feeds. We indulge in fantasies of the freedom of our expression, our critical edge and wit, disavowing the way such individuated freedom is the form of collective incapacity. Against states and alliances wielded in the service of capital as a class, diverse and separate struggles are so many isolated resistances, refusals to undertake the political work of pulling together in organized, strategic, long-term struggle. The constant churn of demands on our awareness disperses our efforts and attention. What **the Left should** **be** doing is **coordinating**, consolidating, and linking **its efforts so that they can amplify each other**. We don’t need multiple, different campaigns. **We need an organized struggle against capitalism capable of operating along multiple issues in diverse locations**. “Crowds push back. From the perspective of the party, we see them as the insistent people. Fidelity to the insistence of the egalitarian discharge demands that **we build the infrastructure capable of maintaining the gap of their desire. The more powerful the affective infrastructure we create, the more we will feel its force, interiorizing the perspective of the many into the ego-ideal that affirms our practices and activities and pushes us to do more than we think we can.** Radical pluralists and participatory democrats sometimes imply that there can be a left politics without judgment, condemnation, exclusion, and discipline.

**Capitalism needs to expand in order to sustain itself – this marks the arrival of capitalism into space creating new forms of exploitation and alienation.**

**Shammas 19** “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space” Dr. Victor Lund Shammas is Associate Professor of Sociology at the Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of Agder, Norway. His research interests include comparative penology, political economy, critical theory, ethnographic methods, and theology.<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9>

No longer terra nullius**, space is now the new terra firma of capitalistkind**: its naturalized terroir, its next necessary terrain. The logic of capitalism dictates that **capital should seek to expand outwards into the vastness of space**, a point recognized by a recent ethnography of NewSpace actors (Valentine, [2016](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR66), p. 1050). The operations **of capitalistkind serve to resolve a series of (potential) crises of capitalism, revolving around the slow, steady decline of spatial fixes** (see e.g., Harvey, [1985](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR21), p. 51–66) as they come crashing up against the quickly vanishing blank spaces remaining on earthly maps and declining (terrestrial) opportunities for profitable investment of surplus capital (Dickens and Ormrod, [2007a](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR12), p. 49–78). **A ‘spatial fix' involves the geographic modulation of capital accumulation, consisting in the outward expansion of capital onto new geographic terrains, or into new spaces, with the aim of filling a gap in the home terrains of capital.** Jessop ([2006](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR34), p. 149) notes that **spatial fixes may involve a number of strategies,** including **the creation of new markets within the capitalist world, engaging in trade with non-capitalist economies, and exporting surplus capital to undeveloped or underdeveloped regions**. The first two address the problem of insufficient demand and the latter option creates a productive (or valorizing) outlet for excess capital. **Capitalism must regularly** discover, develop, and **appropriate such new spaces** because of its inherent **tendency to generate surplus capital**, i.e., capital bereft of profitable purpose. In Harvey’s ([2006](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR23), p. xviii) terms, **a spatial fix revolves around ‘geographical expansions and restructuring…as a temporary solution to crises understood…in terms of the overaccumulation of capita**l'. It is a ***temporary* solution because these newly appropriated spaces will in turn become exhausted of profitable potential and are likely to produce their own stocks of surplus capital**; while ‘capital surpluses that otherwise stood to be devalued, could be absorbed through geographical expansions and spatio-temporal displacements' (Harvey, [2006](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR23), p. xviii), this outwards drive of capitalism is inherently limitless: there is no end point or final destination for capitalism. Instead, capitalism must continuously propel itself onwards in search of pristine sites of renewed capital accumulation. In this way, Harvey writes, society constantly ‘creates fresh productive powers elsewhere to absorb its overaccumulated capital' (Harvey, [1981](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR24), p. 8). Historically, **spatial fixes have played an important role in conserving the capitalist system**. As Jessop ([2006](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR34), p. 149) points out, ‘The export of surplus money capital, surplus commodities, and/or surplus labour-power outside the space(s) where they originate enabled capital to avoid, at least for a period, the threat of devaluation'. But these new spaces for capital are not necessarily limited to physical terrains, as with colonial expansion in the nineteenth century; as Greene and Joseph ([2015](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR19)) note, various digital spaces, such as the Internet, can also be considered as spatial fixes: the Web absorbs overaccumulated capital, heightens consumption of virtual and physical goods, and makes inexpensive, flexible sources of labor available to employers. Greene and Joseph offer the example of online high-speed frequency trading as a digital spatial fix that furthers the ‘annihilation of space by time' first noted by Marx in his *Grundrisse* (see Marx, [1973](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR40), p. 524). Outer space serves at least two purposes in this regard. In the short-to medium-term, it allows for the export of surplus capital into emerging industries, such as satellite imaging and communication. These are significant sites of capital accumulation: global revenues in the worldwide satellite market in 2016 amounted to $260 billion (SIA, [2017](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR55), p. 4). **Clearly, much of this activity is taking place ‘on the ground'; it is occurring in the ‘terrestrial economy'. But all that capital would have to find some other meaningful or productive outlet were it not for the expansion of capital *into* space**. Second, outer space serves as an arena of technological innovation, which feeds back into the terrestrial economy, helping to avert crisis by pushing capital out of technological stagnation and innovation shortfalls. In short, **outer space** serves as a spatial fix. It **swallows up surplus capital, promising to deliver valuable resources, technological innovations, and communication services to capitalists back on Earth.** This places outer space on the same level as traditional colonization, analyzed in Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right*, which **Hegel thought of as a product of the ‘inner dialectic of civil society', which drives the market to ‘push beyond its own limits and seek markets, and so its necessary means of subsistence, in other lands which are either deficient in the goods it has overproduced, or else generally backward in creative industry, etc**.' (Hegel, [2008](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR26), p. 222). In this regard, **SpaceX and related ventures are not so very different from maritime colonialists and the trader-exploiters of the British East India Company.** But there is something new at stake. As the Silicon Valley entrepreneur Peter Diamandis has gleefully noted: ‘There are twenty-trillion-dollar checks up there, waiting to be cashed!' (Seaney and Glendenning, [2016](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR54)). Capitalistkind consists in the naturalization of capitalist consciousness and practice, the (false) universalization of a particular mode of political economy as inherent to the human condition, followed by the projection of this naturalized universality into space—capitalist humanity as a Fukuyamite ‘end of history', the end-point of (earthly) historical unfolding, but the starting point of humanity’s first serious advances in space.

**Thus, we start by affirming that the appropriation of outer space is unjust. This is the starting point of our utopia – even if it is imperfect, all we need to prove if it is a possible starting point to be able to begin anticapitalism.**

**The next step is an affirmative ballot – a material act of resistance that negates our current flow of doing and the means of production by direct refusal. The “no” is the critical starting point for revolution against capitalist society.**

**Holloway, 02** [John Holloway, Marxist-oriented sociologist and philosopher, 2002, Pluto Press, “Change the World without Taking Power The Meaning of Revolution Today”, pg. 125-129 // RM]

If crisis expresses the extreme dis-articulation of social relations, **then revolution must be understood as the intensification of crisis.** This implies a rejection of two distinct understandings of crisis. Firstly, it rejects the traditional concept of the crisis as an opportunity for revolution. This is a concept shared by Marxists of many different perspectives. The argument is that when the big crisis of capitalism comes, this will be the moment in which revolution becomes possible: economic crisis will lead to an intensification of class struggle, and this, if guided by effective revolutionary organisation, can lead to revolution. This approach understands crisis as economic crisis, as something distinct from class struggle, rather than as being itself class struggle, a turning point in class struggle, the point at which the mutual repulsion of capital and anti-labour (humanity) obliges capital to restructure its command or lose control. Secondly, this approach rejects the view that the crisis of capital can be equated with its restructuring. This view sees crisis as being functional for capital, a ‘creative destruction’ (to use Schumpeter’s phrase) which destroys inefficient capitals and imposes discipline on the workers. The crisis of one economic model or paradigm of rule leads automatically, in this view, to the establishment of a new one. The argument here is that a crisis is essentially open. Crisis may indeed lead to a restructuring of capital and to the establishment of a new pattern of rule, but it may not. To identify crisis with restructuring is to close the possibility of the world, to rule out the definitive rupture of capital. To identify crisis with restructuring is also to be blind to the whole world of struggle that capital’s transition from its crisis to its restructuring has always involved. Crisis is, rather, the falling apart of the social relations of capitalism. It can never be assumed in advance that capital will succeed in recomposing them. Crisis involves a salto mortale for capital, with no guarantee of a safe landing. Our struggle is against capital’s restructuring, our struggle is to intensify the disintegration of capitalism. II The moving force of crisis is the drive for freedom, the reciprocal flight of capital of capital and anti-labour, the mutual repulsion of capital and humanity. The first moment of revolution is **purely negative.** On the side of capital, the drive for freedom involves the spewing out of nauseating workers, the insatiable pursuit of the alchemist’s dream of making money from money, the endlessly restless violence of credit and debt. On the side of anti-capital, flight is in the first place negative, the refusal of domination, the destruction and sabotage of the instruments of domination (machinery, for instance), a running away from domination, nomadism, exodus, desertion. People have a million ways of saying No. The driving force is not so much insubordination, the overt and militant refusal of capital, as **nonsubordination**, the less perceptible and more confused **reluctance to conform.** Often the No is expressed so personally (dying one’s hair green, committing suicide, going mad) that it appears to be incapable of having any political resonance. Often the No is violent or barbaric (vandalism, hooliganism, terrorism): the depradations of capitalism are so intense that they provoke a **scream** against, a No which is almost completely devoid of emancipatory potential, a No so bare that it merely reproduces that which is screamed against. The current development of capitalism is so terroristic that it provokes a terroristic response, so anti-human that it provokes an equally antihuman response, which, although quite comprehensible, merely **reproduces the relations of power which it seeks to destroy**. And yet **that is the starting point**: not the considered rejection of capitalism as a mode of organisation, not the militant construction of alternatives to capitalism. They come later (or may do). **The starting point is the scream, the dangerous, often barbaric No.** III Capitalism’s survival depends on recapturing those in flight. Workers must work and produce value. Capital must exploit them. Without that, there would be no capitalism. Without that, capital as a whole would be left in the same position as the unhappy Mr. Peel: ‘Mr Peel… took with him from England to Swan River, West Australia, means of subsistence and of production to the amount of £50,000. Mr Peel had the foresight to bring with him, besides, 3000 persons of the working-class, men, women and children. Once arrived at his destination, "Mr. Peel was left without a servant to make his bed or fetch his water from the river." Unhappy Mr. Peel who provided for everything except the export of English modes of production to Swan River!" (Marx 1965, p. 766) Mr Peel ceased to be a capitalist (and his money ceased to be capital) simply because the workers fled. In the West Australia of that period, there did not exist the conditions to force them to sell their labour power to capital. Because there was land available, the workers were not separated from the means of doing. Mr Peel’s export of capital turned out to be a flight into emptiness. His incapacity to reunite himself with labour meant that he ceased to rule. The recapture of the workers in flight depends on the double nature of the workers’ freedom. They are free not only to sell their labour power, but also free of access to the means of doing. The answer to Mr. Peel’s problem, in West Australia as elsewhere, is to separate the workers from the means of doing by enclosure. People must be deprived of their freedom to do what they like: freedom is gradually enclosed, hemmed in. This is achieved by the establishment of **property,** the appropriation of the land and other means of living and doing, so that in the end the people have no option but to choose freely to be exploited by Mr. Peel and his like. Property is the means by which freedom is reconciled with domination. Enclosure is the form of compulsion compatible with freedom. You can live wherever you like, provided of course that it is not the property of others; you can do whatever you like, provided of course that it does not involve using the property of others. If you have no access to the means of doing, because all of it is the property of others, then of course you are free to go and offer to sell your labour power to them in order to survive. That does not mean that the owners of the means of doing are obliged to buy your labour power, because of course they have the freedom to use their property as they wish. Property restricts the flight of those without property, but it does nothing at all to restrict the flight of those who own property. Quite possibly, when the workers (or their descendants) eventually returned cap in hand to Mr. Peel (or his descendants) to ask him for a job, they found that he had already invested his money in another part of the world where he would have less problem in converting it into capital. The basic formula for the **recapture** of those in flight from labour is **property**. Those who do not want to labour are entirely free to do as they like, but since the means of doing are enclosed by property, those who do not wish to labour are likely to starve unless they change their attitude and sell their labour power (their and only property) to the owners of the means of doing, thus returning to the labour from which they have fled. Hemmed in, they can try to escape by stealing, but risk being hemmed in even more by the operation of the judicial system. In some countries, they can try to escape by turning to the system of social security or public assistance, which, by and large, keeps people from starving to death on the streets, but, more and more, these systems are designed to return those in flight to the labour market. They can try to escape by borrowing, but few lenders will lend their money to those who are not using their labour power as property to be sold on the market, and even if they do succeed in borrowing, the debt collectors will soon come knocking. In some cases, those in flight set up their own businesses or even form co-operatives, but, in the relatively few cases where these survive, they do so by subordinating themselves to the discipline of the market, by integrating themselves into forms of behaviour from which they have fled. The system of property is like a maze with no exit: all paths of flight lead to recapture. In time, the walls of the maze penetrate the person trapped within. The external limitations become internal definitions, self-definitions, identification, the assumption of roles, the adoption of categories which take the existence of the walls so much for granted that they become invisible. But never entirely. Capital is not hemmed in in the same way. On the contrary, property is its passport to movement. Property can be converted into money, and money can be moved with ease. The curtailing of the flight of capital comes through periodic crisis as mediated through the movement of the market, through the relative attraction of different investment opportunities. It is above all crisis, and the changing in market patterns through which the threat manifests itself, that forces capital, in flight from non-subordinate labour, to confront that labour and face up to **its task of exploiting**. The confrontation with labour is a confrontation with anti-labour, with labour in flight from labour. The confrontation involves the ever more intensive exploitation of those workers who have chosen freely to be exploited and the ever more profound enclosure of all the means of living and doing that, if left unenclosed, might stimulate the flight and non-subordination of the workers. Hence the twin drives of contemporary capitalism: the intensification of labour through the introduction of new technologies and new working practices, and the simultaneous extension of property to enclose more and more areas (genes, software, land). The more capital is repelled by people, the more it is forced to refashion people in its own image. The more frenetically capital flees from nonsubordination (globalisation, in other words), the more violently it has to subordinate.Capital becomes more and more repulsive. More and more, it drives us to flee. But flight seems hopeless, unless it is more than flight. **The scream of refusal must also be a reaffirmation of doing, an emancipation of power-to.** IV To break from capital, it is not enough to flee. It not enough to scream. Negativity, our refusal of capital, is the crucial starting point, theoretically and politically. But mere refusal is easily recaptured by capital, simply because it comes up against capital’s control of the means of production, means of doing, means of living. For the scream to grow in strength, there must be a recuperation of doing, a development of power-to. That implies **a re-taking of the means of doing.** Power-to is already implicit in the scream. Flight is rarely mere flight, the No is rarely mere No. At very least, the scream is ecstatic: in its refusal of that which exists, it projects some idea of what might exist in its place. Struggles are rarely mere struggles-against. The experience of shared struggle already involves the development of relations between people that are different in quality from the social relations of capitalism. There is much evidence that for people involved in strikes or similar struggles, the most important outcome of the struggles is often not the realisation of the immediate demands, but the development of a community of struggle, a collective doing characterised by its opposition to capitalist forms of social relations. Barbarism is not as merely negative as the classic dichotomy between socialism and barbarism suggests. Struggle implies the reaffirmation of social doing, the recuperation of power-to. But the recuperation of power-to or the reaffirmation of doing is still limited by capital’s monopoly of the means of doing. The means of doing must be re-appropriated. But what does that mean? **The appropriation** by the working class **of the means of production** has always been a **central** element of programmes **for a transition** to communism. In the mainstream communist tradition, this has been understood as the appropriation by the state of the largest factories, as state ownership of at least the ‘commanding heights’ of the economy. In the practice of the Soviet Union and other ‘communist’ countries, this did little to transform doing itself or to make doing the responsibility of the doers themselves. The term ‘means of production’ has generally been avoided here precisely because it conjures up images that are difficult to dissociate from this tradition. The problem remains, however: if the means of doing are controlled by capital, then any flight from capital comes up against the need to survive, the need to do in a world in which we do not control the means of doing. As long as the means of doing are in the hands of capital, then doing will be ruptured and turned against itself. The expropriators must indeed be expropriated. To think in terms of property is, however, still to pose the problem in fetishised terms. Property is a noun which is used to describe and conceal an active process of separating. The substance of capitalist rule is not an established relationship between a person and a thing (property), but rather **an active process of separating us from the means of doing**. The fact that this separating is continuously repeated does not, for us, convert a verb into a noun. The fact that it becomes a habitual separating does not in any sense make it normal, any more than the habitual beating by a man of his wife makes that normal or converts the verb of beating into a noun, or an established fact. To think of property as a noun, as a thing, is to **accept the terms of domination**. Nor can we start from the means of production, for the distinction between production and doing is itself a result of the separation; nor even from the means of doing, for the very separation of means of doing from doing is a result of the rupture of doing. The problem is not that the means of production are the property of capitalists; or rather, to say that the means of production are the property of the capitalists is merely a euphemism which conceals the fact that capital actively breaks our doing every day, takes our done from us, breaks the social flow of doing which is the pre-condition of our doing. **Our struggle, then, is not the struggle to make ours the property of the means of production, but to dissolve both property and means of production**: to recover or, better, create the conscious and confident sociality of the flow of doing. Capital rules by fetishising, by alienating the done from the doing and the doer and saying ‘this done is a thing and it is mine’. Expropriating the expropriator cannot then be seen as a re-seizure of a thing, but rather as the dissolution of the thing-ness of the done, its (re)integration into the social flow of doing. Capital is the movement of separating, of fetishising, the movement of denying movement. Revolution is the movement against separating, against fetishising, against the denial of movement. Capital is the denial of the social flow of doing, communism is the social movement of doing against its own denial. Under capitalism, doing exists in the mode of being denied. Doing exists as things done, as established forms of social relations, as capital, money, state, the nightmarish perversions of past doing. Dead labour rules over living doing and perverts it into the grotesque form of living labour. This is an explosive contradiction in terms: living implies openness, creativity, while labour implies closure, pre-definition. Communism is the movement of this contradiction, the movement of living against labour. Communism is the movement of that which exists in the mode of being denied.

**Capitalism has infiltrated the debate space means uniqueness flips our way for a predictable model—education planes are crucial to resistance of capitalism**

**Robinson 16** (Global Capitalism and the Restructuring of Education: The Transnational Capitalist Class' Quest to Suppress Critical Thinking Author(s): William I. Robinson Source: Social Justice , 2016, Vol. 43, No. 3 (145) (2016), pp. 1-24 Published by: Social Justice/Global Options Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26405720)//RM

IN RECENT DECADES WORLD CAPITALISM HAS BEEN UNDERGOING A process of globalization, or profound restructuring and expansion. What type of human capital does the emerging global capitalist system require in order for it to function (which is to say, in order for capital accumulation to overcome the technical and political impediments to its continuous expansion)? For one, it needs a cadre of organic intellectuals who are to do the overall thinking and strategizing for the system, as well as a small army of technocrats and administrators who are to resolve problems of system maintenance and development. At the same time, this system needs a very large army, indeed, of people who will supply nothing but their labor, and who are not disposed or equipped to think critically and reflexively about their existence or that of a system sustained on great inequalities and ever more repressive and ubiquitous social control. Finally, it needs a mass of humanity as surplus labor—let us say a few billion people or so—who can serve as a reserve supply of manual and other forms of low-skilled and flexible labor in agriculture, industry, and services; who can be carefully controlled at all times; and who can be discarded when no longer needed. What kind of an educational system would be able to deliver such a mass of humanity endowed with, or lacking in, the sets of skills, knowledge, and mental faculties needed to meet these requirements? Certainly, it would need a core of elite centers of education where the organic intellectuals who administer the system and engage in its ongoing design would study and train. Below it would be a tier of educational institutions producing every sort of vocational and technocratic referred to as "symbolic analysts" ers—that is, people trained in as engineers, computer programmers, change for their services and comfortable lifestyles. Then "precariatized" and thrown basic numeracy and literacy and whose potential for critical threat to the capitalist order. This tier in the educational system would be quite restricted in its pedagogical dual function of supplying the necessary to produce servile critical thinking that could punitive social control. In that the transnational elite The Trifurcation of Humanity The 1 Percent, the 20 Percent, On the eve of the 2015 annual Switzerland, an event attended business, political, and cultural at that, one must be invited), port on global inequality, aptly More" (Oxfam 2015b). The report observed that the wealthiest 1 percent of humanity owned 48 percent in 2009, and that under more than 50 percent of the global wealth by 2016. The obscenity of such concentrations when seen in the context the world's richest 80 billionaires increased from $1.3 trillion of $600 billion in just four The wealth of these 80 billionaires by the bottom half of the world's half of humanity saw its wealth period. In other words, the of billions of dollars from the poorest half of humanity to the richest 80 people on the planet. If such inequality was already "simply staggering," in the words of the report (Oxfam 2015a), it is noteworthy that this polarization of wealth between the bottom half of humanity and the richest 80 people on earth—all but seven of whom are men—actually accelerated since the 2008 financial collapse, so it would seem that the crisis has made the rich many times richer and the poor many times poorer. It is similarly worth noting that the world s top billionaires and the one percent are concentrated in the financial and insurance sector (Warren Buffett and Michael Bloomberg lead the way, followed by the likes of George Soros, a Saudi prince, several Russian oligarchs, and a Brazilian and a Colombian businessman). A major portion of these richest are also concentrated in the pharmaceutical and health care sectors, and here Indian and Chinese billionaires lead the way, together with ones from Turkey, Russia, Switzerland, and elsewhere. And such immense concentrations of wealth translate in manifold ways into political influence: according to Oxfam, the financial and pharmaceutical sectors spent in recent years close to one billion dollars lobbying in the United States alone. The Occupy Wall Street movement of2011-2012 brought to worldwide attention the concentration of the world's wealth in the hands of the one percent with its famous rallying cry, "We are the 99 percent!" However, an equally if not more significant division of the world's population with regard to political and sociological analysis is between that better off—if not necessarily outright wealthy—20 percent of humanity whose basic material needs are met, who enjoy the fruits of the global cornucopia, and who are generally blessed with conditions of security and stability, and the bottom 80 percent of the world's population who face escalating poverty, deprivation, insecurity, and precariousness.The Oxfam report noted that the richest 20 percent of humanity owned 94.5 percent of the world's wealth in 2014, whereas the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just 5.5 percent of that wealth. In simplified terms, the world faces a trifurcated structure of the 1 percent, the 20 percent, and the 80 percent. The global elite has taken note of these extreme inequalities, as evidenced by the inordinate attention received by Thomas Piketty's 2014 study, Capital in the Twenty-First Century, and it is concerned that such polarization may undermine growth and lead to instability and even to rebellion. But there is little or no discussion among the one percent about any fundamental redistribution of wealth and power downward; instead, the elite has turned to expanding the mechanisms of ideological and cultural hegemony as well as repression. Both and constructed in and through industries, and political and to be seduced by the promise and entertainment, backed dissatisfaction lead to rebellion. So what type of a worldwide the global ruling class, presumably a trifurcation of humanity? for elites and power relations ing needs with regard to economy of global capitalism and open-ended evolution Global Capitalism as Epochal Capitalism experiences major obstacles emerge to ongoing named "structural" or "restructuring" structured in order to overcome invest profitably dry up, the capital, typically through adjustment programs imposed measures, free-trade agreements, violence (Greece's struggle Fund-private banking complex US wars of intervention construction of prison-industrial Both forms of violence have opportunities for capitalist The structural crises of capitalism, involve social upheavals, political cultural change. The last global financial collapse 1970s. The year 1968 was of Martin Luther King in Black and Chicano liberation anti-war movements, and massacre of students took great campesino, worker, and students upheavals across the country. Further away, 1968 saw the Prague Spring, the uprising of students and workers in Paris, the height of the Cultural Revolution in China, the Tet Offensive in Vietnam (which marked the beginning of the first major defeat for US imperialism), and the spread of anti-colonial and armed liberation movements throughout Africa and Latin America. All this reflected a crisis of hegemony for the system—a crisis in its political and cultural domination. Then came the economic dimension. By 1973 the US government had to abandon the gold standard; the recently formed Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) imposed its oil embargo, which sent shock waves through the world economy; and stagflation (stagnation plus inflation) set in everywhere. This was, in a nutshell, a severe structural crisis of twentieth-century nation-state capitalism. By the early 1970s a pre-revolutionary situation was percolating in many countries and regions. The popular classes were able to resist attempts by the dominant groups to shift the burden of the 1970s crises on to their shoulders. As the crisis intensified, these dominant groups sought ways to liberate themselves from the social democratic, redistributive forms of class compromise of the previous decades. Analytically speaking, capital sought to free itself of any reciprocal responsibility to labor, and capitalist states sought to shed themselves of the social welfare systems that were established in previous decades. Elites in the rich countries also sought ways to integrate emergent Third World elites into the system (see, e.g., Prashad 2008, Robin son 1996) .These dominant groups launched a neoliberal counter-revolution: an attempt to roll back the social welfare state, to resubordinate labor, and to reconstitute their global hegemony through a newfound transnational mobility of capital and a transformation of the inter-state system. The model of "savage" global capitalism that took hold in the late twentieth century involved a new relation between capital and labor based on the deregulation, informalization, deunionization, and flexibilization of labor, as more and more workers swelled the ranks of the "precariat"—a proletariate existing in permanently precarious conditions.4 Free-trade agreements and neoliberal policies have played a key role in the subordination of labor worldwide and in the creation of this global flexible labor market. The new model of global capitalism has also involved a renewed round of extensive and intensive expansion of the system. In the late twentieth century, the former socialist countries and the revolutionary states of the Third World were integrated into the world market. But even more than extensive expansion, the system has undergone intensive expansion involving commodification of spheres exchange value, such as social health, and education, so and of unloading of surplus The capitalist system has and transformation since the Americas. On the heels the reorganization of political class agents and technologies, expansion through imperialist of humanity and of the and historical materialist educational system, are connected economy (that is, in the material existence), and experience the changing nature of therefore, has impressed that comprise society. The mercantile era spanned tenth centuries, and it lowed by an epoch of classical first industrial revolution, ruling class, and the consolidation system as the political form symbolic date of 1789, the Competitive capitalism gave national monopolies and which organized themselves in a new round of imperialist world markets, resources, mass social struggles around around a new social structure accumulation involving a norms, and political structures tion (McDonough et al. But the Fordist-Keynesian II—with its mechanisms the market, and class compromise—in the 1970s. Emergent "going global," giving way to the current epoch of global capitalism. One key distinctive feature of the global epoch of world capitalism is that the system has all but exhausted its possibilities for extensive expansion, as the whole world has been brought into the orbit of capital, so that globalization now involves an intensive expansion that is reaching depths not seen in previous epochs. The life-world itself, to use Habermas's (1985) phrase, becomes colonized by capital, and the educational system is an institution that facilitates the colonization of the life-world. Transnational Capital and the Transnational State Global capitalism involves a rearticulation of social power relations around the world. This new epoch is characterized above all by the rise of fully transnational capital and the integration of every country and region into a new globalized system of production, finances, and services. We have seen a sequence in the rise of the global economy. Production was the first to transnationalize, starting in the late 1970s, as epitomized by the consolidation of the global assembly line (a delocalized process of manufacturing across multiple countries) and the spread of maquiladoras and zonas francas based on the super-exploitation of cheap, often young female, workers located in countries of the Global South or border communities. Next to transnationalize, in the twentieth and early twenty-first century, were national banking and financial systems, following the deregulation of financial markets in most countries around the world and the creation of countless new financial instruments or tradable forms of finance. There is no longer such a thing as a national financial system. Given its fungible nature and its virtually complete digitalization, money moves almost without friction through the financial circuits of the global economy and therefore plays a key integrative function. Transnational finance capital has become the hegemonic fraction of capital on a world scale; it determines the circuits of capital and it has subordinated productive capital—not to mention governments, political systems, social institutions, and households. More recent is the transnationalization of services. At this time, in fact, the major thrust of free-trade negotiations such as the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP), the Trans Adantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), and most ominously, the Trade in Services Agreement (TISA), is to remove remaining national regulation and of transnational capital from nation state and the working social consideration; and But transnational capital or TCC, has emerged as capitalist classes began to the process accelerated in the 1970s crisis, capitals from numerous mechanisms that through foreign direct and boards of directors, transnational of outsourcing, subcontracting, establishment of tens of thousands inter-alia, Robinson 2004,2014).the giant global or transnational global economy. The TCC is grounded in emergent rather than national. There the TCC has become the global scale, and at its apex when they are still local found that in order to survive or another into the emergent services. Power in most countries has gravitated away from local and national fractions of the elite transnationally oriented Transnational fractions have taken state power, through the takeover of political platforms, backed transnationally oriented the political control and their heightened material capitalist globalization, integrating of accumulation as well as as the World Trade Organization) neoliberal states have opened corporate plunder of resources,

This neoliberalization of higher education converts the university worldwide into the domain of the elite and of that 20 percent of global society who have the resources to finance their education and to train for taking commanding roles in global society. At the same time, it heightens the ideological role that education plays in inculcating dull minds with respect for authority, obedience, and a craving for petty consumption and fantasy—that is, the banal culture of global capitalism and its dehumanizing values. Neoliberal restructuring, and most importantly privatization, opens up educational systems to transnational capital, both as a new space for accumulation and as brain trusts for capital *itself. Transnational capital has invaded the university and the educational system in every sense, from converting education into a for-profit activity to commissioning and appropriating research* (often publicly funded) while simultaneously generating a major new source of financial speculation through students loans (Soederberg 2015).

A critical part of the construction of any counter-hegemonic project will take place in schools and university campuses around the world. Through out the Americas, my own focal point of scholar-activism, teachers have led the struggle against neoliberal educational reform, the privatization of education, the defunding and closure of schools, the deunionization of the profession, and the state repression of students. They have stood alongside the remarkable student mobilizations in Mexico, Chile, Brazil, the United States, and elsewhere. There is a need to infuse student struggles and worker uprisings with a radical global political economy theory and analysis that can contribute to the practices of global social justice and emancipatory struggles—that is, to a Gramscian philosophy of praxis.