

University of Groningen

Precarity/Coloniality

Van Milders, Lucas

Published in:
Theory and Event

DOI:
[10.1353/tae.2021.0059](https://doi.org/10.1353/tae.2021.0059)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2021

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Van Milders, L. (2021). Precarity/Coloniality. *Theory and Event*, 24(4), 1068-1089.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/tae.2021.0059>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



PROJECT MUSE®

Precarity/Coloniality

Lucas Van Milders

Theory & Event, Volume 24, Number 4, October 2021, pp. 1068-1089 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/tae.2021.0059>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/819569>

Precarity/Coloniality

Lucas Van Milders

Abstract This paper explores the intricate relationship between precarity and coloniality. It argues that discussions and experiences of precarity—defined as the increased vulnerability to exploitative working and living conditions—are historically steeped in colonial and racial violence. It stages a critique of the recently-emerged scholarship on the future of work that tends to both trivialize the experience of precarity as the deprivation of futurity, and ignore the racialized dynamics through which these experiences are distributed. Through a meditation on the anti-work politics of *Autonomia* and the armed struggles of the *Zapatistas*, the argument concludes that it is only by reconnecting the resistances to precarity to the project of decolonization as one against dehumanization that discussions of precarity will find their resonance, strength, and efficacy.

Introduction

On 26 May 2019, 22-year-old Malian migrant Mamoudou Gassama climbed four storeys on the exterior of a Parisian apartment block in just 30 seconds to save a child hanging from a balcony. Quickly dubbed “the Spider-Man of Paris,” Gassama was soon thereafter invited to meet French President Emmanuel Macron who issued him fast-track access to French citizenship in September and encouraged him to take up an internship at the Parisian fire service in December. Blinded by Macron’s Caesarean intervention to grant citizenship and employment outside of the normal channels of procedural bureaucracy, one could almost forget that his immigration policies are marked by violent crack-downs and detention of migrants, most of whom come, like Gassama, from former French colonies like Mali. In 2018 Macron also introduced a number of economic reforms (such as his controversial slashing of the wealth tax and the introduction of the equally unpopular carbon tax) that contributed to the emergence of the *Gilets Jaunes* protests, which have been declaring to French elites for more than three years that the planet will not be saved on the backs of the poor. Like many protests however, Macron’s unpopular policies have worked as a catalyst for resistance that is about more than merely a tax on carbon emissions. In

a recent documentary, protesters clarify the true meaning of the *Gilets Jaunes*: the breaking through of the precarity that has been unleashed upon them after decades of economic austerity and political destitution.¹ The message is clear: *nous en avons marre!*²

The point here is not to exploit the toxic reactionary trope of anti-immigration scapegoating that is persistently nurtured by public pundits and politicians whenever the economic demands of the *Gilets Jaunes* are discussed. It is indeed Macron's pandering to the neo-fascist politics of *Front National's* Marine Le Pen that has contributed to the normalization of such apologism. Although Macron quickly co-opted Gassama's heroics in order to distribute highly problematic discourses about the so-called "good immigrant" as well as arbitrarily conditioning and privileging both citizenship and employment, Gassama's backstory reveals a much less conformable reality. As a teenager, Gassama crossed Burkina Faso and Niger before entering Libya through the Sahara desert, which took the lives of many others traveling with him. It was especially in Libya—plagued and pillaged after the French-led NATO Intervention of 2011—where Gassama faced the horrific violence of immigration: "Libya is very difficult for Black African people. They beat you, they put you in jail, they kill some people, and they put some people in slavery too. There is a lot of racism there."³ Although Gassama has been wary of criticizing a *président des très riches* who has executively granted him citizenship and access to employment while systematically precaritizing or deporting others like him, his experience is nonetheless emblematic of the discourses around post-colonial migration and citizenship, and also employment and precarity.

Exploring and diffusing the intricate relation between conditions of coloniality and precarity will be the aim of this article. Yet before this aim is fleshed out more clearly, a little more needs to be said about both concepts individually. Although there is a diverse range in academic circles wherein precarity has been discussed, a general consensus seems to exist around the precarious working and living conditions that have proliferated globally under neoliberal capitalism. More so, it is indeed the ostensible demise of stable and fixed forms of employment in the global north as well as the rise of modern forms of bonded labor in the sweatshops of the global south that has nurtured the idea that more and more people are now living to work as opposed to working to live. In this context, precarity often comes to mind to describe the vulnerability to increased exploitation. The connotations with feudal serfdom that have emerged in said context have not only rekindled interest in and awareness of the parasitic dependency that capitalism historically has had to slavery but also whether, as McKenzie Wark wonders, capital is in fact dead and this is something worse.⁴ In his account of the proliferation of "bullshit jobs," David

Graeber has argued that contemporary forms of employment are no longer just metaphorically feudal, as wealth and position are distributed not on economic but on political grounds.⁵ In other words, there seems to be an intuitive sequence through which discussions about work and precarity end up in contexts of feudalism, slavery, and therefore coloniality. The latter term is to be differentiated from colonialism as the “long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism, but that define culture, labor, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations.”⁶ Precarity is therefore not merely a recent phenomenon but one that is partially rooted within the vestiges of coloniality.

Two questions emerge from this. The first concerns the potential yet predictable pitfall of appropriating and indeed whitewashing a term that directly refers to the politics of racialization, subjugation, and dehumanization in order to provide more insight into a condition that has largely been discussed within the context of the working classes of former colonizers. Precarity has indeed received increased attention because its distribution has come to affect the once-privileged subject of both capitalist production and colonial extraction: the middle-class, white male. Trivializing coloniality in order to dramatize the plight of the latter would indeed achieve nothing other than reproducing colonial and racial violence. However, in the articulation of precarity as the foreclosure of the future and indeed the subjugation of life to (forced) labor, precarity has become a fertile platform for debating both the reverberations of colonialism and slavery as well as the normalization of precarious forms of living and working.

The second question concerns the reasons why there is no discussion of this complicated nexus within the recent surge of critical interest in the future of work. The answer to this question is twofold. On the one hand, as is common within academic research, concepts that emerge within political activism and social movements tend to filter down to political research in cycles that are typically longer than the validity and usage of said concepts. In other words, although this does not directly explain the lack of attention for the precarity/coloniality nexus, academics have taken up interest in precarity around the same time that activists seem to have stopped referring to it altogether. Yet this is not without consequence. A key contention of this article will be that the recent proliferation of publications on work tend to overlook how conditions of precarity are characterized by an intricate and complicated relationship with coloniality. Indeed, in their broad-sweeping overviews of a post-capitalist future without work, precarity is merely understood as involving precarious conditions of labor—thereby overlooking the much broader conditions of existence that omit any vision of or projection into the future as such. Although the respective authors by no means present a future without work as the

panacea of all societal ills, their arguments are nonetheless centralized around a demand that would alleviate much of the suffering caused by a system that captures people in a life-long cycle of exploitative labor. Additionally, their tendency to discuss the latter in the insulated context of Western society contributes to what Gurminder K. Bhambra has aptly referred to as methodological whiteness: “a way of reflecting on the world that fails to acknowledge the role played by race in the very structuring of that world, and of the ways in which knowledge is constructed and legitimated within it.”⁷ It is therefore precisely the negligence of discussing colonial and racial violence in labor exploitation and the destitution of life that deprives discussions on the future of work of their efficacy and, ultimately, relevance.

Argumentatively, this paper advances a two-pronged case. Firstly, it argues that, despite their merit and importance, discussions around the future of work are impeded by their negligence or dismissal of the prevailing conditions of precarity as they are produced through neoliberal modes of governmentality. Precarity is thereby tentatively defined as the increased vulnerability to exploitative living and working conditions as well as a more fundamental state of insecurity in social, psychological, and economic terms. What is fundamentally lacking in this state is the capacity to adopt a vision or conception of the future that is no longer conditioned by precarious labor relations. In other words, the problem with recent demands to invent a future without work is that they tend to presuppose a projection towards the future that has been, in actuality, fundamentally thwarted through decades of neoliberal governmentality and the subsequent atomization and precaritization of life. However, whereas most of these discussions would not deny that the future is indeed over,⁸ it is their tendency to address this through predominantly state-based policies that highlights the effects of ignoring the precarity/coloniality nexus. Secondly, whereas discussions of precarity under neoliberalism have been made elsewhere, the present argument will contend that the ultra-exploitative and dehumanizing effects of precarity ought to be rightfully understood within, through and against a global matrix of coloniality – i.e.; colonial violence. It is indeed part of the aforementioned methodological whiteness of contemporary discussions of precarity that the co-constitutive relations of capitalist imperialism and racialized colonialism have been silenced and erased. The foreclosure of the future that characterizes precaritization needs to be uprooted from persistent tropes about the so-called white working class that have succeeded in whitewashing precarity from colonial and racial violence. If the aforementioned arguments are to be successful in reinvigorating progressive politics on the future of work as a platform for improving living and working conditions on a global scale, they must come to terms with two notions: on the one hand, the increased

precaritization that has not only decomposed the working class as a collective subject but also prevented projection towards the future by fragmenting society into a site of atomized individuality and stringent competition ; on the other hand, the Eurocentric understanding of precarity that has detached it from the broader structures of coloniality and race. This also involves, as mentioned above, dispensing with state-based methods of inventing a future. To move beyond this dystopian conjuncture of hopelessness, the argument will take inspiration from various autonomous movements—specifically the Italian *Operaismo* of the 1960s and the Zapatista uprising of the 1990s—and argue that autonomy is a crucial safeguard against the precarity/coloniality nexus in general as well as an essential catalyst for heralding a post-capitalist future without work in particular.

The Future Doesn't Work

In recent years, work and its future has become a prominent topic in academic and policy circles alike. Although the recent proliferation of academic publications and media attention around issues such as automation and basic income make it appear as if this discussion is a novelty, debates on the conditions of work, as well as its dogmatic fetishization in political ideologies and policies, have been around for a long time. Indeed, the discussion of work or labor is a long-running one in political theory that goes back at least as far as the dawn of the Industrial Age, or even Aristotle's *Politics*.⁹ What might be taken to be the impetus for the increased attention is the ambiguous fact that a world without work seems to be closer and yet further away than ever before. Closer, as technological developments are forecasted to make an increasing number of jobs obsolete within the next couple of decades; with numbers indicating that 30% of tasks in 60% of occupations could be automated in the near future.¹⁰ A recent study has estimated that as much as 47% of all jobs will be obsolete by 2034.¹¹ But a future without work seems also further away. As capitalism has expanded its grasp on a global scale throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, it has also created a global reservoir of labor that is available on tap to perform work under harsh, ultra-exploitative and dehumanizing conditions.¹² It is indeed through these conditions that colonial and racial violence resonates in labor precarity—but more on that later. The point for now is that, as can be expected, debates on the future of work are increasingly politicized. Who exactly will reap the benefits of a world without work? Who has the right to be idle? And who has the capacity to demand a liberation from work? And what will this future look like? Will it be a future where global surplus populations will be increasingly exposed to neocolonial living and working conditions that will facilitate the blissful whiteness of a global

bourgeois elite? Or will it truly be a liberation from work that echoes the demands of many decolonial and indigenous movements around the world in their question for social, economic, and ecological justice? A key assertion of this article is that these discussions remain stultified as they are insulated from a broader analysis of coloniality and race that have historically and contemporarily subjected those belonging to the above-mentioned global reservoir of labor to direct forms of colonial and racial violence.

Specifically, the discussion of the liberation from work has spearheaded a number of publications that view the liberation from work as an essential step in the development of a post-capitalist counter-hegemony. There are many entries in this canon.¹³ One of them, however, has instantly morphed into the seminal manifestation of what such a project could look like: Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams's *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work*. Although excellent discussions on the book can be found elsewhere, it is nonetheless important to reiterate the impetus that sparks the book's main argument: the entrenchment of leftist politics in a state of hopeless resistance without substantial demands. Arguing that what the authors refer to as "folk politics" is unlikely to summon a transition towards a post-capitalist future, the demand for a liberation from work is presented as a platform that could alleviate some of the fragmentation of leftist arguments and movements. Specifically, the authors codify this demand in relation to four pillars: a shortening of the workweek, a universal basic income, full automation, and a delegitimizing of the work ethic or dogma.¹⁴ The problem with folk politics—which the authors argue draws upon a tradition of theories that includes anarchism, communism, libertarianism, and autonomism—is that it does not just refrain from raising demands, but that it often regards this refusal as one of its strengths. This fetishization of horizontalism, which eschews all forms of hierarchy and exclusion, is epitomized by the Occupy movements. Although these movements were successful at politicizing multiple sections of the society that regarded it as a platform to express their indignation to economic injustice, the authors argue that the movement quickly ran out of steam due to its lack of concrete demands and emphasis on direct democracy within an autonomous community. Another aspect of folk politics is localism that, as the name suggests, contends that the local should simply be preferred over the global. As such, it does not constitute an intrinsically leftist or anti-capitalist issue, but rather a "small is beautiful" mantra that transcends many political cleavages. Although directing action towards the local—by building local economies, for instance—can provide people with a direct experience of alternatives, it ultimately suffers from the same impediment as horizontalism, as it fails to take into account the extent to which globalized capitalism has, despite its complexity and crisis-

prone nature, remained hegemonic as a socio-economic system.¹⁵ Put differently, it is very unlikely that folk-politic maneuvers will fundamentally alter the operation of the capitalist order. What is therefore needed, the authors conclude, is a post-capitalist project structured around a set of demands that does not refrain from invoking hierarchy and enlisting state structures when necessary, and that is capable of offering a counter-hegemonic narrative that can dethrone the neoliberal orthodoxy and reinvigorate leftist politics once again.

Although this argument is not without merit, its ultimate dismissal of a rather essentialized and reified conception of folk politics in favor of less anti-systemic politics and more state-based methods is in the end a form of methodological whiteness that fails to acknowledge lasting contribution that these politics – which are indeed often steeped in decolonial, feminist, and indigenous types of knowledge – have made.¹⁶ Following Gurminder K. Bhambra, methodological whiteness “fails to recognize the dominance of ‘whiteness’ as anything other than the standard state of affairs and treats a limited perspective – that deriving from white experience – as a universal perspective.”¹⁷ This is not to say that Srnicek and Williams do not criticize the subversive universalism of Eurocentrism and its relation to the so-called dark side of European modernity (i.e., the *history* of colonial dominion, indigenous genocide, slave trade, and colonial extraction) or that they do not recognize some the positive effects of folk politics.¹⁸ Yet the fundamental problem with their discussion of folk politics – which they argue has produced critiques that are “largely accurate” – is that it tends to enshrine these contributions as *historical* tactics that have either accommodated existing power structures that have corrupted the new left, or have remained marginal and therefore unable to transform society more broadly.¹⁹ Although this is not the same as directly whitewashing the colonial and racial violence that continues to structure the majority of working and living conditions in the non-western world – dismissing decolonial, feminist, and indigenous politics simply because they “aren’t winning”²⁰ is deeply problematic, for it contributes to the normalization of a discussion of Eurocentrism that fails or omits to account for its epistemological racism or indeed methodological whiteness. Without being firmly rooted in an engagement with coloniality, the discussion of folk politics – which as a term is itself deeply colonial²¹ – leaves the argument as a whole fatally impeded from discussing the extent to which conditions of coloniality continue to structure global flows of labor as well as the waves of resistance against them. Indeed, the entire project seems to be premised on the goal of reinvigorating white western leftism. It is for these reasons that Srnicek and Williams regard folk politics as a welcome yet never sufficient step in overcoming the capitalist order. Their frequent reference to anti- and decolonial movements thereby fits within a typical

Eurocentric narrative of referencing decolonial, feminist, and indigenous interventions into the operations of coloniality yet ultimately dismissing them for not heralding the monumental rupture of the capitalist order. Of specific importance for the present argument is the fact that their account of a future-oriented politics is one that does not shy away of making tactical use of state power, as theirs is indeed a project on the hegemony of neoliberal capitalism as opposed to dismantling the state as a fundamentally colonial institution that enables and maintains distributions of racial violence.²² On a theoretical level, their argument is all but explicitly aimed at John Holloway's *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*. Yet Holloway's argument is by no means a naive, folk-political celebration of horizontalism and localism. Changing the world without taking power entails starting from a more profound analysis of global capitalism and its effects on both the construction of the subject and the composition of class power. More than mere hyper-individuality, capitalism – through its emergence from colonial slavery and exploitation – has reconstituted the subject in a fundamentally dehumanized form. Indeed, colonial capitalism was fundamentally a project of turning people into things. The subject is not just atomized and violently separated from its entanglement in the social world but also stripped of its dignity and capacity to flourish and live with dignity as a human being. Holloway therefore argues that a struggle that only frames itself as a positive one in terms of explicit demands negates the dehumanized conditions that determine the lives of a global surplus population:

To treat the subject as positive is attractive but it is inevitably a fiction. In the world that dehumanizes us, the only way in which we can exist as humans is negatively, by struggling against our dehumanization. To understand the subject as positively autonomous (rather than potentially autonomous) is rather like a prisoner in a cell imagining that she is already free: an attractive and stimulating idea, but a fiction, a fiction which leads on to other fictions, to the construction of a whole fictional world.²³

Although Holloway falls short in explicitly framing this negative struggle as one against the distribution of colonial and racial violence that has shaped and maintained the western world, his engagement and experiences with the Zapatista movement in Chiapas have profoundly affected and readjusted his Marxist focus on capitalism and class struggle. I will return to this in the last section of this paper. It will suffice to emphasize at this point that Holloway's emphasis on autonomy – quickly sidelined by Srnicek and Williams – is not only necessary in fighting for a post-capitalist order, but also essential to facilitating the very waging of such a struggle in the first place. In

other words, the difference between a refusal of work steeped in state-based methods and politics, and a negative struggle for autonomy waged from a vantage point that acknowledges and engages colonial and racial violence, is that the latter does not fail to capture the way human subjects are inhibited from raising demands by their own entanglement in a system of dehumanization. In other words, what seems to undermine the demand for a future without work is the fact that there is no political subject capable of raising this demand in the first place. Indeed, the distribution of colonial violence, which has relegated racialized others to the realm of negated humanity, is what characterizes the living and working conditions that have gradually enmeshed global surplus populations into stratifications of precarity. What is lacking in these recent calls for a future without work is therefore not merely an acknowledgement that precarity omits any sense of future orientation (or indeed the notion of futurity itself) but also the awareness of decolonial, feminist, and indigenous scholarship that has highlighted and exposed the distribution of colonial and racialized violence within and through contemporary relations of labor exploitation. Untangling this nexus will be the focus of the next section.

White Precarity

In most discussions on work—and specifically on the conditions under which the majority of people have come to sell their labor for a wage—the notion of precarity has become something of a standard term of reference. Precarious workers are seen as those who do not receive the social and legal rights that are ostensibly associated with Fordist and welfarist forms of employment. This often entails unstable and ultra-exploited employment (e.g., the Deliveroo model of zero-hours contracts, workforce casualization, and freelancing in the gig economy) and dangerous working conditions (e.g., the Amazon model of inhumanly rationed breaks and shifts and meticulous measurement of workforce efficiency). It is often also accompanied by active obstructions to unionization. According to Guy Standing, there is now an entire class—called the precariat—that is typically comprised of women, minorities, and migrant workers but has become a growing category under the impetus of globalization and, I will argue, the logic of colonial and racial subjugation that structures precarity.²⁴ The latter is by no means meant to suggest that precarity can be singularly reduced to coloniality. Precarity in the twenty-first century is to be regarded as a process—called precaritization—through which increasing strata of the world population are subjected to economic insecurity.²⁵ As precarity is marked by the absence of a stable and “decent” forms of employment, it is typically seen as the product of dissolving the working class. Precarious laborers are no longer “tied”

to their employer (as they can be let go at any point) or even their skill (as they are not provided with the opportunity to develop one). It is hard to provide exact data on the number of people engaged in precarious labor yet, in many countries, nearly a quarter of the population tends to belong to the precariat.²⁶

Still, even though the precariat mostly comprises women, migrants, and minorities, the increase of labor insecurity has also affected what was once the privileged subject of industrialization: the prototypical white, male worker. It is indeed due to the effects that precaritization has had on the so-called white worker that discussions on precarity have become the bread and butter of academic and indeed bourgeois discussions on labor conditions and class (de)composition.²⁷ It is also through its fetishization of the white middle class as the primary victim of precaritization that the latter is subsequently treated as a novelty. Historically this is arguably false as precaritization has indeed a double structure of aiming towards exceptional groups as well as the population at large.²⁸ Firstly, precarity – as an explicit concept of socio-economic struggle – emerged at the end of the 1990s during the anti-globalization protests in Seattle and Genova. More than merely criticizing the deteriorating working conditions, the focus of protests like the EuroMayDay and movements like *Euro Mayday Parade* in Italy and *Precarias a la Deriva* in Spain was also on the lack of affordable housing, increased government by debt, and the rolling back of the welfare state.²⁹ Spreading itself throughout Europe, these protests quickly tackled questions on the position of migrant workers as well as the gendered nature of precaritization. From a theoretical angle, they can be understood as fueled by nostalgia and anger towards the disappearance of Fordism, a highly industrialized mode of production that was capable of ensuring careers and stable forms of employment. However, if one takes a historical overview, Fordism is to be seen as the exception.³⁰ Under capitalism, precarity has always been the norm. This can be unpacked more clearly following Sandro Mezzandrea's reading of Marx's distinction between living labor and labor power, whereby living labor is the capturing, appropriating, and subsuming of the common social knowledge and effects of the worker into a commodity that the latter can "sell" whilst not being totally separated from it, i.e. labor power.³¹ Precarity, as the capturing of living labor into labor power, is therefore capital's rule rather than its exception. Or as Franco Barchiesi writes:

The illusions of stability and decent work abetted by pre-neoliberal workplace-based productivity and welfarist full employment policies are really a parenthesis superseded by capital's turn (encouraged by financialization and the dematerialization of the sites of speculative gains) toward the colonization of life.³²

In other words, discussions of precarity-as-norm ought not to be treated as a novelty since this exceptionalizes the plight of the white, male middle-class over the much longer-running (ultra-) exploitation of racialized, classed, and gendered others. And this brings us to the second reason for not singularly treating precarity as a novelty. As the notions of capture and colonization of life themselves indicate, precarity is merely a recent moniker used to analyze and problematize conditions of being that—whilst by no means being identical due to precaritization dual structure—are more fundamentally known as those of coloniality.

Yet before this can be analyzed more substantially, a little more needs to be said about what precarity-as-norm entails. The recent proliferation of academic interest in precarity has explored the topic mostly from a sociological and empirical angle as there are many subjects whose working and living conditions can currently be defined as precarious, with arguably considerable differences in terms of these being steeped in racial and colonial violence. A UK graduate student driving for Deliveroo is not precarious in the same way as a Bangladeshi garment worker working fourteen to sixteen hours a day, seven days a week for \$25 a month. Yet apart from this, precarity has also been understood from a different angle, involving the existential state of social destitution, political disenfranchisement, and economic exclusion. What is an intrinsic characteristic of precarity is then its creation of the precaritized subject, “defined by short-termism, which could evolve into a mass incapacity to think long term, induced by the low probability of personal progress or building a career.”³³ In other words, the precaritized mind is one marked by the absence of futurity or future projection that is not conditioned by labor relations: “The precariat knows there is no shadow of the future, as there is no future in what they are doing.”³⁴ The causes for this are manifold yet a substantial one is the protracted experiences of alienating and precarious labor as well as financial and existential anxiety that has thwarted all possibilities to live a meaningful life and/or consider the possibility of this emerging in the future. Precarity has no future untethered by the machinations of neoliberal capitalism. Although Srnicek and Williams themselves acknowledge the way workers’ lives are riddled with “increasingly precarious situations and increasingly precarious inclinations,”³⁵ it is apparent that an explicit engagement with these conditions of a future untethered by neoliberal capitalism would pose immediate limitations to a project that seeks to invent such a future where there is none. Precarity is not in itself without futurity, yet the latter is inevitably contingent on the prescriptions of neoliberal or indeed precarity capitalism.³⁶ The point is therefore that precisely because precarity is ingrained in the way that capital produces subjects, there can be no future that is not somehow tainted with precarity.

Yet there is more. The reason why precarity cancels the future is due to the fact that it is indeed not a novelty but, pertaining to the subjectivity that it forms, a development within the historical trajectory of colonial and racial exploitation and dehumanization. In order to unpack this, it is useful to briefly discuss the distinction between precariousness and precarity.³⁷ Following Judith Butler, the former refers to the general state of insecurity that defines human and non-human life. It simply concerns the idea that lives and bodies are precarious and vulnerable things, something that has typically sparked a general fear of the potential threat that the broader, material environment constitutes to human life. It is characterized by the obstacles to physical survival and constitutes a shared condition that makes human bodies dependent on social and political infrastructures. This is where precarity comes in. Precarity is the effect of the social and political apparatuses that seek to compensate for precariousness by distributing its effects unequally; this is directly related to relations of domination. Butler writes: "precisely because each body finds itself potentially threatened by others who are, by definition, precarious as well, forms of domination follow."³⁸ As precariousness is presented as reinforcing regimes of anxiety towards others, social and political relations of domination are implemented in order to protect certain bodies and lives from the harm that other bodies and lives can inflict. So precarity is the hierarchized difference in insecurity that arises from the segmentation and categorization of shared precariousness.³⁹ It is therefore the result of the social and political relations that seek to distribute protection against precariousness at the expense of others. Hierarchy and domination therefore play a vital role in producing precarity. For Butler, what ultimately sanctions precarity is that which distinguishes between lives as grievable or ungrievable: "Forms of racism instituted and active at the level of perception tend to produce iconic versions of populations who are minutely grievable, and others whose loss is no loss, and who remain ungrievable."⁴⁰ Although this discussion is amplified elsewhere as bearing a colonial mark, the racialized distribution of precarity is never brought into connection with coloniality.⁴¹ By the latter, I refer to colonial "culture, labor, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations."⁴² Butler indeed refers to the Islamophobic nature of distributed precarity yet this is not the same as retracing the (colonial) dynamics of racialization that are not the effect but the cause such a distribution.

To further unpack the colonial dimension of precarity, it is relevant to revisit the discussion of biopolitics in the context of neoliberal governmentality, as it is within this context that contemporary discussions on precarity have unfolded. Governmentality, Michel Foucault argued, refers to a conduct of government that seeks to govern the population

with a focus on its longevity, health, and the way it conducts itself.⁴³ Put differently, it is a conduct of governmentality aimed at securitizing precariousness and thus producing precarity. Biopolitical governmentality reconstitutes human corporality as abstracted capital that can be sold as labor power and therefore needs to be adequately invested for a wage that in turn can be used to treat the existential contingency that is precariousness. As the hierarchization of difference through segmentation, categorization, and domination is essential to the production of precarity, it goes without saying that precarity can also be understood as a process of othering that typically takes place along racialized, classed, and gendered lines. Domination allows for the insulation of people who protect themselves from existential precariousness, while distributing precarity to all those considered to be less worthy.⁴⁴ To illustrate this, it is only necessary to highlight neoliberalism's trope of the self-governing subject, which sees its mode of protection typically informed by bourgeois notions of property, masculinist conceptions of independence, and white/Western entitlement to privilege.⁴⁵

What is of relevance for the present argument is that biopolitical governmentality has predominantly produced precarity through the racialized body and the modern/colonial structure of equating of humanity to whiteness.⁴⁶ Although Foucault understood racism as a technology of biopolitics, his was indeed a theorization of racism-without-colonialism: "more an unfortunate cultural artefact than a global system of appropriation fundamental to the conditions of possibility for the liberal way of war and biopolitical security assemblages."⁴⁷ It is indeed the notion of coloniality that allows us to understand the flipside of biopolitics to be, in the terms of Achille Mbembe, necropolitics: "the capacity to define who matters and who does not, who is *disposable* and who is not."⁴⁸ The Eurocentric understanding of the neoliberal *homo economicus* as a self-disciplining subject has effectively disposed of the primary mode of constituting labor power: the colonial capture of living labor, which in its more rudimentary form led to the enslavement of those who were not considered to be *homo* at all.⁴⁹ Colonial precarity is literally a matter of life and death or, following Franco Barchiesi, "the laceration, which Marxian analysis has in fact not sutured, pulling apart White workers as living subjects and Black slaves as socially dead but sentient objects."⁵⁰

What we can conclude from all this is that—despite the methodological whiteness of most discussions of precarity—governmentalities that produce it have in both historical but also contemporary terms always been structured by colonial and racial violence that shore up distributions of humanity among racialized lines. Not only is the Black body the object that validates white subjectivity and indeed humanity-as-such, but it also poses the limits of equating precarity to colonial Blackness. The stripping away of humanity, subjecthood, culture, and

other victims of epistemicide constitutes an ontological lack that can never be recollected or transcended as it concerns not merely stolen time but the absence of time as such.⁵¹ This Fanonian reminder about the colonial distribution of Blackness as non-existence continues to shape and maintain coloniality-as-precarity today in contexts of racial segregation and neo-apartheid. Hardly anything illustrates this better than Palestine as a late colonial zone of necropolitics, since it shows how Israel's settler-colonial violence is indeed the relegation of existential vulnerabilities/precarities across spatialized and indeed racialized lines.⁵² Crucially however, while precaritization as a tool for colonial governmentality might indeed operate as a regime of passivizing and distributing precarity, it also engenders new forms of activity and resistance that harness the potential for engaging the colonial and racial violence of precarity without relapsing into state-based methods of refusing work.

Oh, Hi Marx

As the colonial distribution of Blackness constitutes a clear limit to which the notion of precarity can accommodate the distribution of colonial and racial violence, any attempt at unifying the white and Black experiences of precarity will remain potentially flawed if not outright destructive due its methodological whiteness. In fact, it is precisely the capture of the Black body as living labor without subjecthood that has insulated the white working class as a racial category.⁵³ Indeed, the violence and suffering that configures the Black slave and the broader dynamics of coloniality will need to be foregrounded in any analysis that is serious about engendering resistance and activism against precarity. This will depend on how such a project will engage the challenge that Black subjectivity poses to white subjectivity. Barchiesi writes:

Whites, not having been defined through paradigmatic violence and having been spared absolute dereliction, have the option of reclaiming collective political subjectivity, a universalized "We" infused with capacity and relationality, as they make their existence consonant with an image of life as a purely positive and affirmative force.⁵⁴

Colonial violence haunts any project that seeks to tackle precarity-as-norm under capitalism. The latter have taken on many forms and shapes. Historically however, the *Operaismo* or workerist movement of Italy in the '60s as well as its reverberations within Autonomist Marxism have become a cornerstone within the left's political imagination.⁵⁵ This has also nurtured a continued interest in autonomy as

a political project of different sorts: ranging from social movements in Latin America to theoretical treatments of (political) ontology and indeed work.⁵⁶ Within the latter, the notion of autonomy has typically followed Cornelius Castoriadis's discussion of the Greek polis as a city of *auto* (self) *nomos* (rule). Etymologically speaking, autonomy is juxtaposed to heteronomy wherein rule or hierarchy is imposed externally, as opposed to being the result of a decision-making process known as direct democracy. Although there is much variation on what autonomy implies in more concrete terms, this paper will follow Bernard Stiegler's conception that understands it as always consisting of a relational or dialogical element.⁵⁷ What is important to note in the context of the present argument is that autonomy has a collective fabric; something that is diametrically opposed to precarity as an existential experience. In short, I cannot be autonomous without the environment in which I live and the people within it also having a similar degree of autonomy.

Although this discussion does little justice to the rich theoretical treatment of autonomy, a more practice-oriented understanding of it can be derived from interrogating the historical manifestation of autonomous movements/communities. The best-known precursor of this was arguably post-WWII Italy's *Operaismo* or workerism. Centralized around a politics that is directly informed by the lives and struggles of the working class, the movement emerged gradually in Italy's industrious north when workers started to organize themselves around their own praxis as they had become dissatisfied with their unions as well as the Italian Communist Party. Forming the *Potere Operaio* ("workers' power")—which transformed into *Autonomia Operaia* ("workers' autonomy") or simply *Autonomia*, the movement of precarious workers quickly saw itself supported by housewives and students who gradually understood that their subordinated or exploited position in society was no longer addressed effectively by the state apparatus, the party system, or even the unions.⁵⁸ Preceding Holloway's emphasis on negativity, their strategy consisted of—apart from sabotage and wildcat strikes—a refusal to work; not as a preference for unemployment but a refusal "to be disciplined into the set of traits and characteristic 'behaviors' deemed to make a person 'employable.'"⁵⁹ In short, it was a resistance against neoliberal capitalism's biopolitical mode of subjectification. Yet the movement was not entirely negative in its orientation as it also explored prefigurative modes of self-organization. This had everything to do with the recalibrated attitude towards work itself. For Antonio Negri, *Autonomia* therein found a new encounter with Marx: "Marx insists on the abolition of work. Work which is liberated is liberation from work. The creativity of communist work has no relation with the capitalist organization of labor."⁶⁰ As such, *Autonomia* resisted the exploitation of labor and its subordination to capital by turning the abolition of work into a central commitment of the anti-capitalist

struggle. Or, as Mario Tronti argues: “The abolition of work by the working class and the violent destruction of capital are one and the same.”⁶¹

It is this refusal of work that has recently been picked up with the renewed interest in the hegemony of work and the productivity ethic.⁶² What the refusal to work entails is a restoration of the primacy of the subject and, as implied above, a capacity to resist the hyper-individualizing mode of subjectification under neoliberal capitalism. This precisely stems from its emphasis on the collective as a unit of analysis on the one hand and its restoration of autonomy as a project of self-government on the other.⁶³ Autonomy is not restrictively a negative project (i.e. a resistance against the exploitative and repressive dynamics of capital) but also a positive one that actively demands nothing less than the total liberation from work. The importance of refusing work therefore consists of the fact that, as Kathi Weeks argued, “work – not private property, the market, the factory, or the alienation of our creative capacities – is understood to be the primary basis of capitalist relations.”⁶⁴ Resisting work therefore constitutes one of the most fundamental ways of resisting capitalism itself. Srnicek and Williams’s dismissal of the so-called folk political celebration of negative struggle is therefore based on a rather crude understanding of what autonomy entails. As a negative struggle, resistance against the old is always accompanied by the invention of the new. Raising demands therefore starts from resistance against the imposition of the work ethic. More importantly, such efforts are to be seen as laboratories that do not favor less anti-systemic politics and more state-based methods. They are sites where different subjectivities and alternative futures are prefigured.⁶⁵

However, as should be clear by now, a return to autonomist politics in order to salvage precarity-as-norm is by no means an easy thing to do. This is not to say that such a project would not be without strengths.⁶⁶ Indeed, autonomists have been quite successful at accounting for the ways in which people become part of a global, precarious proletariat through cycles of technological innovation as well as the global market’s need for dependent, informal, and even bonded labor.⁶⁷ Understanding precarity-as-norm under capitalism, Autonomist Marxists such as George Caffentzis and Silvia Federici have also exposed the ways in which capital is existentially dependent on precarious laborers as well as the gendered and racialized ways in which this is systematically distributed.⁶⁸ In other words, Autonomist Marxists seek to abandon the narrow focus on class as the only determining element of precarity by looking at other forms of subordination and exploitation; they “mapped a scenario in which the spiraling enlargement of the capitalist vortex multiplied the chances of its rupture, destabilization and destruction.”⁶⁹ The question remains,

however, how this can engage colonial violence. Is Autonomist Marxism inhibited by a methodological whiteness that can only go as far as understanding racism-without-colonialism as a side effect of precaritization?

To understand this, it is important to explore another manifestation of autonomist politics, this time in a fundamentally different context. Much has been written and discussed about the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) as one of the most vivid expressions of armed indigenous struggles that gained worldwide attention when, on 1 January 1994, it seized control of large swatches of land in the Mexican state of Chiapas. Although its war against the Mexican state – as well as neoliberalism more broadly – speaks to the imagination of many anti-capitalist movements worldwide, the EZLN's insurgency is merely the latest chapter of indigenous resistance in the Americas that started in 1492. Ideologically speaking, the EZLN is often categorized through the prism of Mexican revolutionary Emiliano Zapata and, most commonly, Autonomist Marxism.⁷⁰ Yet it is rather the indigenous ways of organizing and Mayan cosmology that have informed its modes of struggle against neoliberalism; it is called the Fourth World War after the Cold War (i.e. the Third World War).⁷¹ It is precisely the victory of capitalism after the Cold War that has opened up the entire globe to neoliberal exploitation and precaritization: "Vast territories, wealth, and, above all, an immense available workforce await their new master."⁷² These are the words of Subcommandante Marcos, often wrongly referred to as the leader of EZLN but in reality its spokesperson. Marcos is himself not indigenous but rather a Marxist intellectual and activist from Mexico City. Schooled in Leninist Marxism, he (and many other like him) joined the cause of the indigenous peoples in Chiapas with the intention of staging the proletarian revolution against the bourgeoisie. The answer to their vanguard politics was just silence, followed by a sobering rebuttal: "They said they weren't workers and, besides, land wasn't property but the heart of their communities. Having failed as a Marxist missionary, Marcos immersed himself in Mayan culture. The more he learned, the less he knew."⁷³ This is why he became a subcommander; the one to follow orders.

There is much to unpack from this all too brief history, but what seems clear is that the EZLN disrupted prevailing Marxist analyses about class, exploitation, and precarity under neoliberalism by folding these logics back into their historical enmeshment with colonial violence. EZLN is indeed not strictly speaking an indigenous movement, but one fighting for humanity, for a world of many worlds.⁷⁴ The learning to unlearn that Marcos and many other like him had to undergo is precisely the foregrounding of dehumanization and exploitation that has enriched the implicit treatment of precarity-as-norm that, in the works of John Holloway, sees the struggle of

EZLN as one that seeks “to make the world anew, to create a world of dignity, a world of humanity.”⁷⁵ In Holloway’s thought, this unlearning allowed for a radical rethinking of the relation to precarity and thereby work. In more conventional Marxist theorizing, the precarity of human beings as things/objects is typically depicted as something that can either be accepted as a contradiction that—potentially through acceleration—will someday set off the destruction of the capitalist order, or be disrupted through an appeal to the Leninist vanguard. Looking at this through the prism of the precarity/coloniality nexus, the problem with this binary is that it either normalizes ongoing colonial and racial violence or reproduces white savior narratives. However, by rethinking precarity not as something complete, but rather a process—a process of precaritization—it becomes clear that this is a dynamic that constantly needs to re-establish itself as a logic of dehumanization. The point about this dependency of colonial capitalism upon precarity, Holloway argues, is that it opens up the struggle of the latter as a way of conceiving the power of the powerless: “The power of the powerless is constituted by that which makes them (us) human, namely work.”⁷⁶ The power of work as the power of the powerless consists in resisting the precaritization of work as the creative power of human practice.⁷⁷ Refusal and resistance then become laboratories of different ways of doing; something that should be differentiated from counter-hegemonic narratives about inventing the future through the state-based policies. It is indeed through the autonomous practices of the EZLN that the state is exposed as a colonial institution that contributes to the incessant reproduction of colonial and racial violence. Thus dispensing with the illusion of the state ultimately shows the fundamental contribution of the EZLN—and other autonomous movements in Latin America⁷⁸—to engaging and seeking to move beyond the precarity/coloniality nexus. By reconstituting work as something inherently human, as that which *makes* us human, it seems then that “there is no other way of conceiving of a future for humanity.”⁷⁹ The fact that this is not a matter of simply issuing state-based demands such as full automation or basic income is prefigured by the specter of Blackness as captive labor that still structures contemporary distributions of precarity. What has hopefully become clear throughout this argument is that resisting or refusing precaritization is ultimately about the prefigurative task of reclaiming humanity as a collective practice. Such project cannot help but to resonate with the later Fanon’s urge to his comrades to leave the European game behind and bring about a new humanity.⁸⁰ It is perhaps here then, in the struggle of decolonization as one of reclaiming humanity, that discussions to address precarity will ultimately find their resonance, strength, and efficacy.

Notes

1. Gilles Perret and François Ruffin, *Je Veux Du Soleil* (Paris: Les 400 Clous, 2019).
2. "We are fed up"
3. Harriet Agnew. "Mamoudou Gassamma: What the 'Spider-Man' of Paris Did Next." Accessed 1 November 2019. <https://www.ft.com/content/c9feb9b8-1a5b-11e9-b93e-f4351a53f1c3>.
4. McKenzie Wark, *Capital is Dead. Is This Something Worse?* (London: Verso, 2019).
5. David Graeber, *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory* (London: Penguin Random House, 2019), 180-181.
6. Nelson Maldonado-Torres, "On the Coloniality of Being: Contribution to the Development of A Concept," *Cultural Studies*, 21 (2007): 243.
7. Gurminder K. Bhambra, "Why Are The White Working Classes Still Held Responsible for Trump and Brexit?" Accessed 1 November 2019. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/brexit/2017/11/10/why-are-the-white-working-classes-still-being-held-responsible-for-brexit-and-trump/>
8. Franco Berard, "Bifo," *After the Future* (Chico, CA: AK Press, 2011)
9. Andrea Komlosy, *Work: The Last 1,000 Years* (London: Verso, 2018).
10. Arwa Mahdawi, "What Jobs Will Still Be Around in 20 Years?" Accessed 1 November 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jun/26/jobs-future-automation-robots-skills-creative-health>.
11. Carl Frey and Michael Osborne, "The Future of Employment: How Susceptible are Jobs to Unemployment?" Accessed 1 November 2019. https://www.oxfordmartin.ox.ac.uk/downloads/academic/The_Future_of_Employment.pdf
12. Nick Dyer-Witheford, *Cyber-Proletariat: Global Labor in the Digital Vortex* (London: Pluto Press, 2015).
13. Among others, Paul Mason, *Post-Capitalism: A Guide to Our Future* (London: Penguin, 2015); Peter Frase, *Four Futures: Life After Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2016); Rutger Bregman, *Utopia For Realists: The Case for a Universal Basic Income, Open Borders, and a 15-hour Workweek* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016); Aaron Bastani, *Fully Automated Luxury Communism* (London: Verso, 2019).
14. Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams, *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work*. (London: Verso, 2015), 85-106.
15. Mark Fisher, *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?* (London: Zero Books, 2009).
16. While this list is not exhaustive, the following works have engaged in various critiques of capitalist accumulation and extractivism as well as discussion of labor and post-capitalist imaginaries. Glenn S. Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2016); Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation* (New York: Autonomedia, 2017); Macarena Gómez-Barris, *The Extractive Zone: Social*

- Ecologies and Decolonial Perspectives* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017); Robinson, Cedric, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005); Frances Widdowson and Albert Howard, *Disrobing the Aboriginal Industry: The Deception Behind Indigenous Cultural Preservation* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008); Kathryn Yussof, *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2018).
17. Bhambra, "Trump And Brexit."
 18. Srnicek and Williams, "Inventing the Future," 85.
 19. Srnicek and Williams, "Inventing the Future," 19.
 20. Srnicek and Williams, "Inventing the Future," 25.
 21. Sadhani Naithani, "The Colonizer-Folklorist," *Journal of Folklore Research*, 34 (1997): 1-14.
 22. Meera Sabaratnam, *Decolonising Intervention: International Statebuilding in Mozambique* (London: Rowman and Littlefield International, 2017).
 23. John Holloway, *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today* (London: Pluto Press, 2002), 167
 24. Guy Standing, *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011)
 25. Paul Apostolidis, *The Fight For Time: Migrant Day Labourers and the Politics of Precarity* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press), 4.
 26. Standing, *The Precariat*, 24.
 27. Runnymede Trust "Who Cares About The White Working Class?" Accessed 1 November 2019. <https://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/WhoCaresAboutTheWhiteWorkingClass-2009.pdf>.
 28. Apostolidis, "The Fight For Time," 7.
 29. Maurizio Lazzarato, *Governing by Debt* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2015).
 30. Brett Neilson and Ned Rossiter, "Precarity as a Political Concept, or, Fordism as Exception," *Theory Culture Society*, 25 (2008): 57.
 31. Sandro Mezzadra, "How Many Histories of Labour? Towards a Theory of Postcolonial Capitalism," *Postcolonial Studies*, 14 (2011), 164.
 32. Franco Barchiesi, "Precarity as Capture: A Conceptual Deconstruction of the Worker-Slave Analogy," in *On Marronage: Ethical Confrontations with Anti-Blackness*, P. Khalil Saucier and Tryon P. Woods, eds. (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2015), 195.
 33. Standing, *The Precariat*, 18.
 34. Standing, *The Precariat*, 12.
 35. Srnicek and Williams, "Inventing the Future," 65.
 36. Apostolidis, "The Fight for Time," 6; Albenza Almazova, *Capitalism on Edge: How Fighting Precarity Can Achieve Radical Change Without Crisis or Utopia* (New York: Columbia University Press) 105.
 37. Judith Butler, *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* (London: Verso, 2009), 18.

38. Butler, *Frames of War*, 31.
39. Isabell Lorey, *State of Insecurity: Government of the Precarious* (London: Verso, 2015), 21.
40. Butler, *Frames of War*, 24.
41. Butler, Judith, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (London, Verso, 2006).
42. Maldonado-Torres, "Coloniality of Being," 243
43. Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 22.
44. Lorey, *State of Insecurity*, 22.
45. Lorey, *State of Insecurity*, 30.
46. Alexander G. Weheliye, *Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015).
47. Alison Howell and Melanie Richter-Monpetit, "Racism in Foucauldian Security Studies: Biopolitics, Liberal War, and the Whitewashing of Colonial and Racial Violence," *International Political Sociology* 13 (2019), 3.
48. Achille Mbembe, "Necropolitics," *Public Culture* 15 (2003), 27.
49. Eric Williams, *Capitalism & Slavery* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1994).
50. Barchiesi, "Precarity as Capture," 186.
51. Barchiesi, "Precarity as Capture," 190.
52. Mikko Joronen, "Negotiating Colonial Violence: Spaces of Precarization in Palestine," *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography*, 51 (2019): 838-857.
53. David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (New York: Verso, 1991).
54. Barchiesi, "Precarity as Capture," 198.
55. Steve Wright, *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*. (London: Pluto Press, 2007).
56. In that order: Anna C. Dinerstein, *The Politics of Autonomy in Latin America: The Art of Organising Hope* (London: Routledge, 2015); John Holloway, *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today* (London: Pluto Press, 2002); Cornelius Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society* (Cambridge US, The MIT Press, 1998); Bernard Stiegler, *What Makes Life Worth Living?* (London: Polity, 2014); Kathi Weeks, *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).
57. Stiegler, *What Makes Life Worth Living?*, 41.
58. George Katsiaficas, *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonisation of Everyday Life* (Baltimore: AK Press, 2007), 17.
59. Andrew Robinson, "Autonomism: The Future of Activism?" Accessed 1 November 2019. <https://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-5-autonomism/>.

60. Antonio Negri, *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons On the Grundrisse*. (London: Pluto Press, 1991), 166.
61. Mario Tronti, *Workers and Capital* (London: Verso, 2019), xiii.
62. Weeks, *The Problem with Work*, 92; see also David Frayne, *The Refusal of Work: The Theory and Practice of Resistance against Work* (London: Zed Books, 2015).
63. Harry Cleaver, "The Inversion of Class Perspective in Marxian Theory: From Valorisation to Self-Valorisation," in: *Open Marxism*, Werner Bonefeld, Richard Gunn and Kosmas Psychopedis, eds. (London: Pluto Press, 1992), 129.
64. Weeks, *The Problem with Work*, 97.
65. Weeks, *The Problem with Work*, 101.
66. Brian Marks, "Autonomist Marxist Theory and Practice in the Current Crisis," *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 11 (2012), 467-91.
67. Dyer-Witheford, "Cyber-Proletariat," 13.
68. George Caffentzis, *In Letters of Blood and Fire: Work, Machines, and Value in the Bad Infinity of Capitalism* (New York: PM Press, 2013); Silvia Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction and Feminist Struggle* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012).
69. Dyer-Witheford, "Cyber-Proletariat," 31.
70. John Holloway and Eloina Pelaez, *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico* (London: Pluto Press, 1998).
71. Subcomandante Marcos, "The Fourth World War has Begun," *Neplanta: Views from South*, 2 (1997): 559-572.
72. Marcos, "The Fourth World War," 559.
73. Naomi Klein, "Farewell to the End of History: Organization and Vision in Anti-Corporate Movements," *The Socialist Register*, 2002: 11.
74. Holloway, *Change the World*, 103.
75. Holloway, *Change the World*, 20.
76. John Holloway, "From Scream of Refusal to Scream of Power: The Centrality of Work," in *Open Marxism: Volume II: Emancipating Marx*, Werner Bonefeld, Richard Gunn, John Holloway, Kosmas Psychopedis, eds. (London: Pluto Press, 1995), 177.
77. Holloway, *The Centrality of Work*, 171.
78. Dinerstein, , *The Politics of Autonomy in Latin America: The Art of Organizing Hope..*
79. Holloway, *The Centrality of Work*, 177.
80. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2001).