

HARDT & NEGRI, *COMMONWEALTH*

Preface: The Becoming-Prince of the Multitude

Lays out the overall argument of the book

An ethics of democratic political action against Empire. Becoming-prince = learning the art of self-rule and inventing democratic forms of social organization that last. The multitude producing its own subjectivity immanently. Must draw on the commonwealth already being produced. Poverty (not so much a state of deprivation but of *potentia*) and love (connecting with other poor in common) will be key concepts. Emphasis is on the fact that the multitude is potential power that must decide for itself to become-Prince and govern itself.

Strange (p. xii): love needs to conquer existing ruling powers before it can build a new commonwealth.

Part 1: Republic (and the Multitude of the Poor)

1.1 Republic of Property

Establishes the enemy

State of exception not a good model for sovereignty, it is now immanent. Rule of law and of property are now immanent. Or rather the transcendental plane of power, between immanence and transcendence. Property as an *a priori*, as anterior to society (as in Locke), installed as the governing logic and *raison d'être* of the republic. We must critique it immanently, release the *potentia* (constituent power) of living labor toward democracy. We need the desires for refusal and violence, but they must be educated, trained, and transformed toward resistance and force in order to immanently construct an organized alternative. Kant ("What is Enlightenment?") is along these lines: we must emerge from a state of immaturity to think for ourselves—*sapere aude*, dare to know. Hardt & Negri also want us to know how to dare [##this is good, that we must grow up, that we must train and discipline ourselves so that we know how to manage our affairs. Not only *dare* to do democracy, but to *know how to do it well.*]

Against the "theorists of social democracy": Habermas, Giddens, Rawls, Beck, Held, Stiglitz, T. Friedman...this is the major Kant that defends the structures of law and property.

Great quote from John Adams (p. 10) admitting that liberal democracy is intended to defend property.

1.2 Productive Bodies

Sets out their argument for a focus on bodies and their *potentia*.

Marx's early work: critique of property, living labor as source of value, but alienated. Tronti and Castoriadis presented as first to grasp the importance of the potential of bodies, of immanent struggle. Method: investigate the concrete struggles of laboring bodies. E.g. from salary demands to social demands. For Hardt & Negri this means coming to terms with the switch to immaterial labor.

Bergson and Gentile: vitalists attacked the critical tradition, Kantian liberalism, and transcendental epistemologies. Phenomenology is more promising for Hardt & Negri. It emphasizes experience, rejects the transcendental. Heidegger does this negatively, *not* in a way that reconstructs being through human productive capacities. His idea of letting go, of disengagement. Husserl is better: constructs subjectivity as a relation with the other. Merleau-Ponty: being with others opens the door to understanding the construction of the common from below. Foucault understands that the critique of property must engage an understanding of the body, which is the constitutive component of the world, but which always resists that world, and that resistance produces subjectivity. This is the minor Kant.

Find in fundamentalism something we can use (i.e. an obsession with bodies and what they can produce). Any time an apparatus is obsessed with limiting something, recognize that as an affirmation of that something's *potentia*. Deploy differently that power that the apparatus is trying to capture. Deploy it to transform subjectivity toward liberation (e.g. Fanon). Concentrate on the body in order to restore the full productivity of bodies across all domains of life so that they may freely use their power immanently. [## We still don't know what a body can do].

1.3 The Multitude of the Poor

Sets out their argument for the poor as key subject of the struggle.

Poor: all those who participate in social production. The multitude of the poor is plural, open, inclusive, powerful. It is important not to limit it to the propertyless, the destitute, the excluded. [a sense here of Agamben: *qualunque*, the whomever, the party of whatever persons. English 17th C: fear of the multitude, desire to contain it and its power to remake the social

order. Hobbes does so by arguing that the naked multitude is chaos, and it needs to subordinate itself by contract to a common power. Boyle and the infinitely recombinant nature of bodies as mixed multitudes. Spinoza: nature is composed of encounters of elementary particles. Joyful encounters increase a body's power [to affect other bodies], sad encounters decrease this. The multitude for Spinoza is the only possible subject of democracy. Gratian: by divine law all things are common. The multitude of the poor is the primary threat to property. The party of the poor in a Ranciorean sense is those who have no part in the management of the common. A formation of *all* those inserted in the mechanisms of social production. Heidegger, Schmitt, also sought to contain the poor. Hardt & Negri want to investigate (rather than contain) the ontological power of the poor to intervene and change the world. Hobbes is the great villain here, but Machiavelli is the hero: he lays out the fundamental alternative path that poses the poor as not just the leftovers from primitive accumulation, but also a force of resistance that recognized itself as exploited within a regime of property that still bears the marks of the common. The multitude must move from indignation to creating disorder to rebellion through its power to produce and to rebel. Spinoza carries Machiavelli forward, highlighting the body and its power to produce the common through love. The common power of the multitude aimed toward the production of the common is the primary force for democracy. Marx again: labor is not only stripped bare, destitute (deprivation), it is also the source of all value (potential). Today wage labor and the poor are equally part of the multitude, and at the heart of capitalist production and of revolutionary transformation.

De Corpore 1: Biopolitics as Event

Foucault broods about power controlling us, but he also has a minor strain in his work that is getting at our power to produce. Hardt & Negri call the former biopower [##pouvoir] and the latter biopolitics [##puissance], “the power of life to resist and determine an alternative production of subjectivity.” Agamben’s use of Foucault lacks this power to create an alternative. Badiou’s event is in Foucault too. The event is an act of freedom when the creative power of biopolitics emerges to disrupt biopower. A new production of subjectivity. Intimation that events need not only emerge, that we can strive to bring them about.

Part 2: Modernity (and the Landscapes of Altermodernity)

2.1 Antimodernity as Resistance

##Don't focus on the power of modernity to control, focus on the power of its subjects to resist.

Modernity is always two: domination and resistance. Antimodernity is *internal to* modernity, not a force outside it. Both are changed through the relation. Altepétl, Iroquois. Slavery and racism are internal to capitalism. The ideological move of biopower is to erase resistance (Haitian Revolution), make it seem like biopower is all there is. So methodologically we must pay attention to resistance, “investigate the forces of antimodernity.” Haitian slaves: not absolutely subjugated, never *homo sacer*, but actively resisting. WEB DuBois: US slaves are protagonists, playing a determining role in their own emancipation. Free subjects always have the power to resist; that resistance is internal to domination, and it drives history. There are internal mechanisms of domination installed in the dominated; docile subjects *are* produced by biopower. But they are never total, subjects are never entirely passive, incapable, and voiceless (Spivak), though that is what the dominant ideology teaches. Resistance is always operating. In fact, it is prior to power. Power can only be exercised over free subjects (Foucault). Their freedom is prior to domination. Their resistance is not born *after* power is imposed, it is merely the ongoing free activity [##D&G would say desire] that continues to churn, to actively create according to its own will, as is its nature, even if domination is trying to control it.

2.2 Ambivalences of Modernity

Look for the antimodern forces of freedom.

Marxist tradition guilty of a modernism that reinforces existing hierarchies (linear, irreversible capitalism). This fails to recognize class struggle as constitutive of history, or capital as a relation with labor, or the resistance of labor. But it also has an anti-modern strain (Luxemburg, Lenin, Mao, Marx) that focuses better on revolt, on the non-linear nature of history, on the existing forms of antimodernity (i.e. social expressions of the common) that already exist. Socialist states did not do the latter well. We must create a new humanity, rediscover the movements from the base that have the capacity to autonomously construct a new consciousness. Among the 'monsters' of antimodernity there are good (expanding the freedom of the subordinated) and bad (reactionary—freeing the sovereign). Pace Horkheimer and Adorno, antimodernity is not locked in dialectic struggle with modernity, it is its own animal that desires and operates diagonally to modernity, inventing new rationalities, alternatives, and forms of liberation. An antimodernity that is autonomous from modernity, that desires freedom in a way that biopower can't contain. This antimodernity, again, resides in the common. Two positive tasks for an antimodernity analysis: distinguish between good and bad antimodernity, and recognize how antimodernity exceeds modernity and creates new alternatives.

2.3 Altermodernity

We must go beyond antimodernity to altermodernity which does not just resist modernity but constructs alternatives.

Liberation movements must achieve autonomy, construct alternatives. A revolutionary becoming; the creation of a new humanity. Resisting modernity not by going back to the premodern traditions, but by becoming something new. Socialism was antimodernity; communism is altermodernity.

Multiplicitous struggles (class, gender, race) can move autonomously but in parallel-cooperation. Post-fordism has made the working class more multiplicitous and we must work with this rather than try to reunify the class. The multitude-form is differentiated struggles that coordinates common actions in horizontal structures. This form is not a magic key, it is not simple to do, but it does pose the problem of what is required of us now. It must draw from existing practices of the common to create alternative social relations, new alternative forms of life.

Hypermodernity (Beck, Habermas) is reformist, postmodernity (Lyotard, Rorty, Baudrillard, Vattimo) is defeatist, altermodernity is creates radical new subjectivities and new forms of life out of existing practices. It can have some values (which are arrived at per the method in the next section), like *common-against-property, democracy, autonomy, horizontality, liberation*. They propose three lines of investigation: minor thought (absolute democracy against sovereignty), minor workers' struggles for self-determination [# e.g. Hungary], and colonial/racial struggles for self-determination. The role of the intellectual is to critique and propose alternatives alongside others in a common struggle. Together they produce a new truth...

De Homine 1: Biopolitical Reason

Neither absolute truth nor only-particular truths, but a common truth built together from already-existing sensibilities. Spinoza: common notions, or Wittgenstein: agreement in forms of life. These are consistencies that people form together out of the floating meaning that they encounter. Critique the enlightenment idea of universal reason, but don't throw out reason, forge a new one out of already-existing knowledges. Destabilize truth and then produce a new consistency from below [# this is very D&G, esp. *WiP*, though they are not mentioned]. It is not a discovery of a transcendental being-with, but the construction of a common [# a becoming-common]. Becoming is prior to being: all being is formed up out of a ceaseless becoming. Any body is a dispositif, something that has been made out of flux, an assemblage of affects, of forms of life. The project is to set about actively forming new assemblages, new truths, new subjectivities—a new common—out of existing practices.

This project would put rationality at the service of life, technology at the service of ecology, and wealth at the service of the common. A common project, all of us together, guided by the values above.

They agree with Latour, that the world is fluxy and hard to grasp, but they insist that we can form a robust fabric of common experience.

Part 3: Capital (and the Struggles over Common Wealth)

3.1 Metamorphoses of the Composition of Capital

Today value is increasingly produced autonomously by labor in the form of common, immaterial products. Capital is largely exterior to this value production and must expropriate it as rent.

The leading/hegemonic results of production are now immaterial: social relations, codes, information, knowledge, affects, and forms of life. These products increasingly take common forms, are easily shared and difficult to enclose as private property. Capital is finding a way to capture our selves and our activities as rent (e.g. browsing data). Production now produces subjects and common social relations. This offers potential for the autonomous production of new subjectivities H&N have been seeking. We should always watch for the emergence of this autonomy. Three major trends in the technical composition of labor in contemporary capitalism: immaterial production, feminization (care, affects), migration.

Increasingly capital controls value by expropriating the common that is produced: dispossession by enclosing the first common: formerly common property (a new round of primitive accumulation), but it is also working to expropriate the second common: the ongoing production of new commons (e.g. ideas, affects, knowledges, etc.). This second common is not a common of scarcity but of abundance. How capital appropriates this second form is the key. In the industrial factory, capital used to coordinate cooperation. Now, cooperation is increasingly coordinated immanently, by labor without capital. That is, labor is increasingly autonomous. [## Look for this autonomy wherever it exists.] Capital then expropriates that coordination, that value that is produced externally to capital. Rentiers/financiers not industrialists/manufacturing.

History is moved by a back-and-forth between labor's invention of forms of autonomy and capital's restructuring its operation to contain it. Increasingly today capital's attempts to expropriate and control immaterial production only diminish its productivity. Biopolitical production produces the common, and then it *draws on* that common as a resource to produce more

value (e.g. scientific inquiry or # free code). Capital encloses and expropriates that common, and so handicaps the productivity of the process. It limits open access, free time, and free movement and exchange, all of which are essential for today's immaterial productivity.

3.2 Class Struggle from Crisis to Exodus

We must *leave* capitalism, and take our biopolitical production with us to build a new world.

Contemporary biopolitical production is increasingly producing the common autonomously. Place our bets on that horse. The struggle must be one of exodus. Taking our capacity to produce the common with us and creating an alternative world (social relations, forms of life). To do this, understand the common as it is being produced today, and develop that [# lodge yourself on a stratum...<http://pathtothepossible.wordpress.com/2013/09/04/lodge-yourself-on-a-stratum-or-for-exodus/>]. They say the *metropolis* is a key site of this common. They are vague on how: cultural circuits, intellectual practices, affective networks, social institutions. Though the real estate example is OK: value produced by a property's accessibility to common resources, not its internal material characteristics. Finance too is a common wealth that has been expropriated into money and captured by banks. The rising importance of finance in capitalism is a reflection of the increasing importance of biopolitical production of the common: it is capital's scrambling attempt to expropriate increasing common production as rent.

Family, corporation, nation (# and state, party, and union) all generate the common and then corrupt it. There is good common, which increases our power to think and act together, and bad common, which diminishes that power (hierarchy, exclusions, restrictions, inequalities, privations. People are actively seeking the experience of the common, and they find it in the family, corporation, and nation, because these communities *do* generate the common, but in restricted, corrupted form. These apparatuses are resources for the exodus, storehouses of common wealth that we must reappropriate as we leave.

Throughout the chapter (and the book so far) D&G are present but rarely mentioned. Huh. (They do come up more explicitly in the following chapters...)

3.3 Kairos of the Multitude

Can the multitude organize immanently? If it can, will it do good?

Political organization of the multitude is needed. People have complained that 1) you need something transcendent to organize the multitude (Macherey,

Laclau, #Zizek), and 2) you can't know that the multitude will do good when it manages itself (Virno, Zizek, Badiou). For H&N the multitude is not spontaneous but the result of immanent political organizing. Both political society *and* in the state of nature. The common conceived as: produced by the activity of the multitude (rather than conceived as: a pre-existing resource). The production of subjectivity is key, *the* terrain of struggle. It is already going on, through the production of affects and social relations. It is already coordinating the economic production of the common wealth immanently, so it can coordinate collective decision-making too. The multitude is constantly becoming, but this becoming is not driven by a specific subject. The multitude can coordinate itself without either sovereignty *or* spontaneity. Are they ready? Pay attention to what they are already doing. But, H&N think, the question of the content of their agenda is a thornier one. They are rebellious, antisystemic, but are they liberatory? Can they choose the beneficial (i.e. common-augmenting) common and not the corrupt (i.e. common-diminishing) common? How will it organize itself and create its own durable institutions?

De Singularitate 1: Of Love Possessed

Love is the answer. The poor's love: social solidarity, social production, care for others, cooperation. Power of invention/production of the common, to produce a new social body, a new collective subjectivity. Heidegger thinks being is *a priori*, Spinoza thinks we create being through our activity. For Spinoza love is joy that increases our power to act, forming new, more powerful bodies. Love produces God = the common. Love is mostly corrupted in our everyday life. Love of the same, trying to make a whole out of many (corrupt) rather than love of the other (not corrupt). The common is necessarily composed of singularities. The goal is to promote the encounter of singularities in the common, which encounters are themselves creative of the common, of common subjectivities. The wasp and the orchid: we seek the production of subjectivity and the encounter of singularities that *become each other*, that compose new assemblages and new forms of the common. Increasing the number of connections we currently think is appropriate [#rhizome not tree].

Intermezzo: A Force to Combat Evil

Love produces everything, and so it produces evil too.

Humans are neither naturally good nor bad. They are becoming. We struggle both for our servitude and our liberation. Love comes first, and is corrupted into evil, which is an obstacle to love. We act on our drives, and we see whether our act augments the common or diminishes it, and then we can judge

the act as good or evil. Spinoza: we act on our striving/conatus, which grows into desire/cupiditas, which matures into love/amor. This is the path of training or self-improvement of human 'nature'. When evil arises, it is this training gone awry, and we must ask: how was love corrupted? Power of love: force to constitute the common, force to combat evil (exodus—evil is always secondary to love—we always have the power to overcome evil), force to make the multitude. It is important to create lasting and consolidated political institutions of the common. These are horizontal, constitutive, open. Love is a matter of learning, training, organizing,

Part 4: Empire Returns

4.1 Brief History of a Failed Coup D'Etat

##We were right, Empire is the deal now. The idea of US unilateral control was bound to fail.

US hegemony, either military (hard power) or economic (soft power), is crumbling. Distributed-networked system of global control: nation-states, corporations, NGOs, militias, global entities. Armed resistance to US invasions produces subjectivities among the invaded, but not among the invaders. The metropolis again: as factory for the production of subjectivities (of resistance in this case). Vague how.

4.2 After U.S. Hegemony

The emerging form is Empire: distributed, polyarchic network (even assemblage) of a limited number of global powers (nation-states, MNCs, ngos, etc) that collaborate and negotiate continually to create an immanent consensus that governs the world.

New unilateral hegemon (China)? No. Back to multilateralism (Kissinger)? No. Non-sovereign, immanent coordination of Empire. This is not democracy. It is hierarchical and oligarchical, even if it has many poles and is immanent, emergent. It is global: capital has subsumed everything. But it is not without division: new within-capitalism divisions mark the system. Reappearance of old forms, like accumulation through dispossession. China does have a particular role: stable state-centered capitalist machine (#with a whole hell of a lot of people).

4.3 Genealogy of Rebellion

Remember: Empire can only rest on the foundation of resistance. We must

keep our attention on the struggles for freedom. These must reappropriate time and space (of the metropolis), and they must figure out how to stabilize, organize, institutionalize the power of the multitude.

Spinoza: indignation is the basis for rebellion and resistance. H&N will not focus on the institutional forms resistance is taking, but on the base indignation. Is it possible for this base indignation, this self-organized resistance, to form up into an organized, lasting, stable strategy?

Rebellion/revolt/*jacqueries* is more than just local, because it keeps recurring; it is a recurrent force in life, it is a drive for liberation [#very Rancière here]. The organization can take the form of informal networks. There can be urban and rural revolt. They can be a revolt against economic exploitation narrowly, or something broader, against the entire form of social life. The central problem, Lenin says, and they agree, is to make insurrection lasting, organized, and stable. Of course the old socialist course of action is dead. The sovereign target of resistance is: the complex of exploitation, hierarchy, possessive individualism (Hobbes *and* Locke). Foucault: local struggles are key, but there is a sense in which they can be generalized or make widespread change. Revolt is the way the multitude acts to change the world.

The factory is no longer the primary site of production, all of the social territory is, the metropolis is. Exodus is leaving not just from wage work, but from society as a whole. The metropolis should be a key site of this leaving. The qualities of the metropolis (traditionally) are communication, unexpected encounters, access to the common, social difference, production of collective forms of life. Work time and free time are interwoven now, just as work space and free space are. Capital's power is immanent to all life. Because capitalism has no outside, resistance/revolution is already here, all around us, creating free space and time in the body of the current society.

Labor is flexible, the world is being informalized, *banlieu*-ized. These marginalized, the poor, can reappropriate time and space (of the metropolis). We have to find a way to create productive subjectivities to accumulate force. It is not a question of facilitating moments of revolt, but of identifying the bases of the accumulation of power [#interesting suggestion]. It is not enough to reappropriate time and space; that's not yet an organizational program. The agents of metropolitan uprisings are to biopower as industrial working class was to industrial capitalism. They must reappropriate its wealth and destroy its hierarchies. We must construct a global public space and also institutions to consolidate the power of the multitude. Before we can know what these might be like, we need to construct a theory of political institutions.

De Corpore 2: Metropolis

Industrial working class : factory :: multitude : metropolis

The metropolis is where the multitude produces the common wealth (languages, affects, knowledges...). Three central activities: production, encounter, rebellion. The biopolitical metropolis and the common mutually produce each other. This production is increasingly autonomous from capital, etc. Production is not contained in the factory, but occurs all over the city. The metropolis is where the common is produced through the aleatory encounter of singularities. And the metropolis (both its good and its bad) is becoming a planetary condition. [#The absence of HL has now become *very* troubling (and Andrea Cavalletti).] Of course the geography of the intensity of the common is uneven. The elements of the common-metropolis that produce joy (vis Spinoza—increase a body's ability to affect the world) are good and those that produce sadness (hierarchy, inequality, division) are bad. Think of African cities: we must continue to pay attention to the way these cities actually work, the way the poor create informal networks of production (shelter, food, social life, communication, exchange, etc.) in order to survive. Demonstrate what the poor can do.

But this latent power is not enough, it must be organized in order to ensure systematically that joyful common encounters predominate. Learning is key; training ourselves to promote joy and withdraw from sadness. In the biopolitical metropolis capital cannot organize joyful encounters (as it did in industrial capitalism?). Only the poor can. Spate of urban uprisings against the bad common provides energy, energy that must be channeled, that the poor must learn to direct into free and peaceful self-management of the metropolis.

Part 5: Beyond Capital?

5.1 Terms of Economic Transition

None of the systems of control (unilateralism, multilateralism, neoliberalism, socialism, social democracy) are adequate to be a stable system of control in the biopolitical world because they cannot bring about the biopolitical production of wealth. We are in an interregnum.

Fordist factory model is inadequate to the biopolitical regime. The transition to this regime was set in motion by the workers struggles against Fordism. Neoliberalism cannot organize wealth production (like Fordism did). In Fordism, knowledge that guided how to produce wealth was in the hands of capital. It is not now. Mass intellectuality holds the knowledge. The

knowledge needed to coordinate the production of wealth has been taken back in to the body of the multitude.

Biopolitical production belongs to the common. Capitalism appropriates/alienates/privatizes the wealth produced, but it thereby corrupts and gets in the way of the common (social autonomy and cultural creativity) that is the engine of production. Same with the socialist state.

So what is involved, economically, in the social production of social wealth? Social fabric, understanding, trust, norms, languages, habits, sympathy. Communism has been so degenerated as a word that it now means an authoritarian government. We should not abandon the term, though, but fight for it. What would an institution and government of the common (i.e. communism) be like? The opportunity is there because the current interregnum is so chaotic and unsure of itself. The plebs, the poor, the multitude must assert its freedom, but also then organize it. How is it doing so today?

5.2 What Remains of Capitalism

The increasing production of two opposed subjectivities: autonomous bio-labor and rent-expropriating capital.

See the economy from the perspective of the common, the locus of freedom and innovation that is essential for biopolitical production. Private property is an externality to the common. See economic growth in terms of the accumulation of the common, the increase in our collective power to think/feel/relate/love. How much (good) common is there, how accessible is it, how autonomous and connected is biopolitical labor? The produced common is not scarce, it puts bios to work without consuming it. Reiteration: capital depends on biopolitical labor, but vice versa is less and less true. Labor has direct access to the means to organize itself. Capital expropriates the value labor produces, which decreases productivity. It uses war and finance as means of control. The latter is more effective, but it still is external to production. The struggles are: the common (free activity) against work, the common (unpaid labor) against the wage, and the common (democratic management of production) against capital. Biopolitical labor is spilling out over the walls that capital has erected to contain it. Increasingly autonomous labor and increasingly command-y capital (rather than labor as variable capital, part of the body of capital). Precarious labor that does all sorts of informal (i.e. outside capitalism) activities that are nevertheless productive. Perhaps it is possible for the poor to reappropriate money.

5.3 Pre-shocks along the Fault Lines

Classic Marxist line: capital will wither because it is not in the best position to develop the forces of production, the multitude is.

Capital has lost its capacity to invent the new. The multitude has that now. The products of Apple and Microsoft are mostly the result of a vast common of code writers. Thus capital is not the best entity to develop the productive forces, and so it will die and give way to an entity that can better develop those forces (i.e. the multitude). Property fetters production and innovation. It is not so much that property is immoral, it is that property is not productive. Capital is already producing its own gravediggers; the question is when it will cross the threshold and yield to the more productive regime of autonomous biopolitical production. To expand the productive forces by taking advantage of the generative power of the common, what is needed is: a social freedom to self-organize cooperation, equality that enables cooperation and communication across difference, democratic practice in making decisions (not representation, which unifies the people and stifles encounter across difference). How will democratic decisions be made? We'll get to that.

What the common productive forces need: physical infrastructure (water, electric, food), social/intellectual infrastructure (education in language, science, codes, social relations), information/communications infrastructure (open codes, open ideas), freedom of movement (to create encounters), freedom of time, freedom from work/wages, the power and know-how to create the autonomous social institutions of self-rule. There is not a plan of degeneration and then rebirth, but rather one of developing existing capacities of the multitude so as to reach the threshold beyond which capital withers away.

De Homine 2: Cross the Threshold!

We need a new theory of value: it exists when the cooperative activity overflows the constraints of the republic of property, and its measure must be determined by the democratic process.

Immaterial value (like reputation) makes standard measures of value inadequate. Marx's abstract labor reminds us that there is a global social labor-power that produces everything, and that development of that common power is what drives economic growth. It is the general productive force in the economy that is harnessed in various ways. Cooperation and the common make labor productive, and they grow as the productive forces develop. Biopolitical value is grounded on the common of cooperation. An accumulated but still unexpressed power. Spinoza: when two unite their strength, they

have more power to transform the world. Minor tradition in philosophy of value as the expression of life: Augustine, Avicenna, Duns Scotus, Nicholas of Cusa, Spinoza, Nietzsche, Deleuze...love as a will to power, i.e. the production of common subjectivities. Value is when the common creative powers of life exceed the bounds placed on them by constituted power. [#Ranciere's "politics"]. Political positions: labor-power against exploitation, singularity against identity [#HL's "right to difference"], the common against the republic of property. Recapture economics, not the reductive measure of profit, but the expansive measure of the *oikos*, of the common cooperative creative activity, organized democratically. We need a radical democratic structure to organize this production.

Part 6: Revolution

6.1 Revolutionary Parallelism

The goal of revolution is to move from identity-property-sovereignty-emancipation-being to singularity-common-revolution-freedom-becoming.

Identity is property in Locke's sense: we are sovereign over our own bodies and selves. Identity politics must be engaged, but in a revolutionary way: 1) revealing the way identities of race, gender, etc. institute hierarchy and domination, 2) struggling for freedom from that domination, and 3) self-abolishing identity in favor of singularity.

If we just do the first, we will become "wedded to injury"--ressentiment. We need to also recognize our own powers, and use them to liberate ourselves. *Emancipation* tries to make conditions better for existing identities, *liberation* aims at self-transformation of those identities into singularities that are becoming-other. Emancipating the worker involves recognizing his existence and making procedures for ameliorating his life in capitalism. Liberating the worker means moving to a life of free activity beyond capitalism. You are not a worker, you are a free actor. You are not gay, you are an extremely complex desirer who is constantly becoming other. Abolishing identity does not mean we are all the same, far from it, it means the singularities that are now captured within reductive identities will be liberated and free to proliferate. The creation of a new humanity [#a D&Gesque humanity that is a radically more multiplicitous self than we currently recognize, a self with some consistency, yes, but radically less than we are currently prepared to admit]. All three tasks must occur simultaneously. A singularity is necessarily embedded in relations with other singularities (assemblages), but is also itself multiple, and also always becoming. Let go of your self as you know it, in order to become a new human. It will not be easy. We are attached to the identities we have been given by

the regimes of power.

Connections among the various projects are parallelisms: translations without reductions, articulation in a common project without forcing them into unity. Something like a swarm. Zizek thinks class is more important, but no basis of struggle is qualitatively different from or more important than any other. There are infinite axes of struggles for liberation. Parallel coordination is possible, but it does not happen on its own. We need a clear logic of encounter and articulation, of democratic organization that does not fix events into bureaucracy, but makes them repeatable, durable, that creates lasting political bodies. [#this last desire of theirs betrays the desire for the liberation of singularities to become-other, I think. Don't like it.]

6.2 *Insurrectional Intersections*

The overall thrust is that insurrection must be consolidated in new forms of institution and government, forms that are open to change, that arise from within the multitude itself rather than from above it.

Representation is one way to consolidate popular insurrection into a government. Insurrectionary people become “the people.” When the singularities insurrect they often do not cohere, they disagree. [#After p. 350 I began to get physically disturbed.] The task of democratic decision-making is to provide a structure in which the conflicts inside the multitude can be resolved [#I do *not* like that word]. Intersections (the term they favor) are not the same thing as alliances/coalitions. The latter bring together fixed identities (emancipation). The former networks together singularities that are always becoming (liberation). Ranciere's politics, they seem to say, needs to become a *partage* of the common. [#ugh.] Democratic decision-making “determines” and “sustains” this process of articulation/composition. Hardt & Negri do not mean revolution in the old sense. No vanguard, sovereignty. But there is still an organizational process that establishes routines for revolutionary decision-making. However, this process must come from *within* the multitude (immanently), not from above it (transcendent). [#But does it *always remain* within it? Their emphasis on rejecting a sovereign seems to say that it does, but how do we do all this institutionalizing and consolidating and also make sure the institution never becomes transcendent/sovereign?]

The current economic era gives the multitude good training for all this: it is increasingly normal for the multitude to horizontally organize cooperation and common effort. They must build on this initial condition to consciously construct “a new type of power,” to manage the common and nurture autonomy, creation, communication, cooperation, and to effect the institutional development of those things. Insurrection must be sustained and consolidated

in an institutional process. Not a state apparatus. A different sort of institution, one based on social conflict, not social contract. To the extent conflict is the basis of an institution, it can be a democratic institution. Consolidate insurrection without negating its force of rupture, but extending it [#sounds like a contradiction, cake and eat it too]. Institutionalize a new set of collective habits and practices. The institution is: open to discord; continually transformed; maximizes joy [#for whom though? People, or the institution itself?] It provides some *consistency* in interaction and behavior, some form of life, some forming up of chaotic life, but never to the point of fixity or identity [#cf Deleuze and Guattari in *WiP?*]. These institutions form a constituent rather than a constituted power, established interactions that are continually open to evolution. [#They could have done a whole consideration of norms vs. laws here, which is needed, but not offered]. These institutions would prohibit (ward off) the re-emergence of a sovereign power. Insurrection becomes revolution once it forms an institutional process, a form of government that is common [#Virno's non-State republic may be a better option, better defended against the dangers of ossification]. Consolidating and reinforcing the achievements of insurrection in institutional form. In a new form of *government* [#might as well offer up Dean and Zizek's party-that-is-totally-different-than-the-old-party bullshit].

To figure out how in the sam hell to create institutions like this, we must study actually existing alternative institutions: Italian base committees, Zapatista juntas. Decision-making in cyber networks might be a model [#but they don't explore the many concrete instances that are in fact quite interesting. Here though I am more comfortable to the extent they say: we want to set out this lofty goal of insurrectionary institutions, and discover the extent to which they are possible and what they might look like *by examining practice.*].

6.3 Governing the Revolution

We need to create radically different institutions, governments, constitutions that are based solely on the constituent power of the multitude and only augment that power.

We people are not ready to take up democracy right now. There is a process of development/training needed. But that does not mean we need a sovereign (Lenin)...that would not train us in democracy. We must extend the insurrectionary event, create a revolutionary transition, an institutional process of revolutionary transformation that creates ample opportunity for us to practice democracy. Better democracy through more democracy. No vanguard, leadership, representation (they block democracy, which is the goal). But then what of disorder and ineffectiveness, of the insurrection fizzling out? We need to have order and guidance and consolidation, but achieve it without

leadership. Ground the solution in the capacities people already have, in the practices they are already enacting. Horizontal networks of cooperation in production, etc. Great (though latent) capacities for democracy are there.

Gramsci's passive (leaderless, immanent) revolution? Only if fused with his active (led by strong subject) one. The immanent production of a new subjectivity (the multitude) that can consolidate the capacities for democratic decision-making. [#Consolidate how, you ask? I don't know, how does an individual do it?] Revolution as active-and-passive, as insurrectional-and-institutional.

The use of force will be required, but not necessarily armed violence. In any consideration of tactics, we should consider the effects on the multitude (joy or sadness?) more than we should consider the effects on the powers that be. But also, strategically today, a disarmed multitude carrying out exodus is a more effective approach. Any strategy should bolster the common first, and secondarily diminish the republic of property. We are trying to produce a new humanity more than we are trying to kill the old one.

The ethic of the institutions: ward off corruption of the common and of the multitude. [#But of course they will quickly seek to preserve themselves, not the common or the multitude.] they cannot try to unify society or to ensure conformity. They must facilitate good common, keep access open, enable joyful encounters. It is a big transformation, leaving behind the old humanity and creating a new one. We will need institutions to help. They must establish, compose, and consolidate constituent power, establish collective habits and practices. We need governmental, constitutional, and juridical frameworks. But not the existing ones. [#They must be, essentially, constituted power that enables constituent power, not constrains it. Wtf?] This rule, this guidance would have to take place through radical, active, autonomous, democratic decision-making by the multitude as a whole. It would be a constitutional system in which the sources of law are constituent power. [#again, wtf?] It must have a will to institution and constitution [#this will must be immanent to the entire body of the multitude I assume].

We can subvert the distributed, non-sovereign structures of governance Empire is building. Maybe networked federalism without sovereignty?

[#blech—they are trying to infuse some consistency into the chaos of insurrection, I get it, but they should have used Deleuze and Guattari's consistency on the plane of immanence. What they do too obviously runs the risk of calling forth institutions and constitutions that are supposed to preserve constituent power, but of course quickly separate from the multitude and turn to preserving their own (constituted) power. H&N are not attentive enough to Bakunin.]

De Singularitate 2: Instituting Happiness

We can change (pace Macklemore), train ourselves to be more fully democratic.

We are at the beginning of history, of a process of educating and training ourselves to rule ourselves, so that we can increase our happiness. [#They use Jefferson to talk about happiness but not Aristotle...since happiness involves achieving our *telos*, what is our *telos*?] For H&N happiness is an active affect, common, a spur to desire, something we gain over the long term. Achieving it means expanding the social being, the common wealth. Spinoza: maximize our joy, our power to affect others. This power is almost infinitely expandable. And the increase of one's joy can increase others' joy—positive sum. For joy and against misery (sadness), which decreases our power to create and rule ourselves.

Planks: support of life against misery, equality against hierarchy, everyone become capable of self-rule (education), open access to the common wealth, facilitate felicitous encounters, remember and attend to our power, augment it, transform yourself into something beyond the identities you hold dear.

Fine