

# COMMONWEALTH

Umesh Daivagna



**COMMONWEALTH**



# COMMONWEALTH

Umesh Daivagna





ALEXIS PRESS

*Published by:* Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA  
[www.alexispress.us](http://www.alexispress.us)

© RESERVED

This book contains information obtained from highly regarded resources.  
Copyright for individual contents remains with the authors.  
A wide variety of references are listed. Reasonable efforts have been made  
to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher  
cannot assume responsibility for the validity of  
all materials or for the consequences of their use.

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted,  
or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means,  
now known or hereinafter invented, including photocopying,  
microfilming and recording, or any information storage or retrieval system,  
without permission from the publishers.

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically  
from this work please access [alexispress.us](http://alexispress.us)

First Published 2023

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data*

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Commonwealth by *Umesh Daivagna*

ISBN 979-8-89161-420-8

# CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1.</b> Apocalyptic Tone Recently Adopted in Politics.....	1
— <i>Umesh Daivagna</i>	
<b>Chapter 2.</b> The Evolution of Property in Marx's Theory: A Historical and Theoretical Analysis .....	10
— <i>Mohamed Jaffar A</i>	
<b>Chapter 3.</b> Multitude and the Politics of Poverty: Unveiling Seventeenth-Century Perspectives.....	18
— <i>Nikita Nadkarni</i>	
<b>Chapter 4.</b> Paradox of Poverty: A Dynamic Force in Modern Political Thought .....	25
— <i>Poonam Singh</i>	
<b>Chapter 5.</b> Power and Resistance within Modernity: An Analysis .....	31
— <i>Jaimine Vaishnav</i>	
<b>Chapter 6.</b> Examining the Colonialist of Biopower: A Comprehensive Analysis .....	39
— <i>Puneet Tulsiyan</i>	
<b>Chapter 7.</b> Antimodernity to Altermodernity in Frantz Fanon's Three Stages of Liberation .....	47
— <i>Somayya Madakam</i>	
<b>Chapter 8.</b> Multitude-Form and Altermodernity: Insights from Bolivian Struggles .....	56
— <i>Thejus R Kartha</i>	
<b>Chapter 9.</b> Biopolitical Transformations: Labor, Common, and the Challenges to Traditional Economics .....	63
— <i>Raj Kumar</i>	
<b>Chapter 10.</b> Contradictions of Control: Unraveling Bio political Production and Capital's Struggle for Hegemony .....	70
— <i>Thiruchitrambalam</i>	
<b>Chapter 11.</b> Open Social Relation between Labor and Capital .....	76
— <i>Aditya Kashyap</i>	
<b>Chapter 12.</b> Political Ontology of the Multitude in Bio Political Production .....	84
— <i>Hemal Thakker</i>	

## CHAPTER 1

### APOCALYPTIC TONE RECENTLY ADOPTED IN POLITICS

---

Umesh Daivagna Professor  
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
Email Id-umesh.daivagna@atlasuniversity.edu.in

#### **ABSTRACT:**

In recent years, a discernible shift has emerged in the political discourse of various nations, marked by the adoption of an apocalyptic tone. This phenomenon is characterized by leaders and political figures employing rhetoric that emphasizes imminent existential threats, catastrophic consequences, and a sense of urgency to galvanize public opinion. This paper seeks to explore the prevalence, origins, and implications of the apocalyptic tone in contemporary politics. The study delves into the historical context of apocalyptic rhetoric, tracing its roots to religious, cultural, and psychological sources. Drawing on a multidisciplinary approach, it examines how political leaders strategically utilize apocalyptic language to shape public perceptions, influence policy decisions, and consolidate power. Additionally, the paper investigates the impact of this tone on civic engagement, polarization, and the erosion of trust in political institutions. Through a comprehensive analysis of case studies from diverse political landscapes, the research aims to identify patterns and variations in the adoption of apocalyptic rhetoric. Furthermore, it explores the ethical considerations surrounding the use of fear-inducing language in political communication and the potential consequences for democratic norms and values.

#### **KEYWORDS:**

Chaos, Crisis, Doom, Emergency, Fear, Catastrophe.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The world is becoming more connected, but it's also experiencing more fighting, pain, sadness, and unfair treatment. There are many reasons to find a safe place away from the control of today's powerful rulers or from spiritual values that can help us in our lives and guide our political actions. Globalization has made the world more connected and shared. We all have to live in this world, and it has a big impact on us. It has both good and bad effects, and we can't escape from it. Give up the idea of being purely political and having superior morals. Don't try to stay outside of it all. This realization should just be a step towards making a different plan. In this article, we talk about how to behave ethically in politics and how to create a global democracy. "Becoming a prince" means many people learning how to govern themselves and creating long-lasting ways for everyone to work together in a democracy. It's hard to see what we all have in common because we are focused on today's popular beliefs. In recent years, many governments have tried to make things that are usually shared, like information and ideas, into things that can be owned by individuals or businesses. For example, they have tried to make animals and plants into private property. We believe, along with many others, that we should not allow privatization to happen.

The usual idea is that there are only two options: things that belong to individuals or things that are controlled by the government. It doesn't consider the idea of things that are shared by everyone. Yes, it is true that over time, the land on Earth has been divided into public and private property through enclosures. This has caused common land systems, like those used by indigenous civilizations in the Americas and in medieval Europe, to be destroyed. But there is a lot in our world that is shared and available to everyone, and it gets better when people get involved. Language, like facial expressions and body language, is usually shared

by everyone. If language belonged to just one person or group, it would lose its ability to express, create, and communicate. This example is not meant to make readers feel better about the problems caused by rules and limits from the government and businesses. Instead, it is meant to help readers see the things that everyone shares and what can be achieved by working together. This is the first step in a plan to take back and grow the things that everyone shares and their abilities. The choice between private and public seems limited, like the choice between capitalism and socialism. Many people think the only way to fix problems in a capitalist society is through government regulation and socialist economic management. On the other hand, some believe socialist problems can only be solved through private property and capitalist control. Socialism and capitalism are both about owning property and don't include the idea of sharing things. The idea of making things shared, which we talk about in this paper, doesn't fit into either of these ideas and creates a new way of thinking about politics[1], [2].

Modern ways of making money and collecting wealth actually lead to the growth of resources that everyone can use, even though they are focused on making things private. This is because wealth is not just about controlling things, it also depends on the people who are working to create it, even though they may not always agree with the way things are run. Globalization makes capital control the entire world and shapes social life based on economic value hierarchy. In the new ways of making things that use information and knowledge, producers need a lot of freedom and access to things that everyone can use, like communication networks and cultural information. New internet technology relies on having access to code and information and being able to connect with others on open networks. Simply put, all types of production in decentralized networks, whether or not they involve computer technology, require freedom and access to shared resources. Also, the things that are made, like ideas, pictures, and feelings, can be easily copied and are becoming more common. This makes it hard for laws and money to control who owns them. This change is already happening: the way things are made for money is starting to pave the way for a society and economy based on things that everyone shares[3], [4].

The main focus of biopolitical production is not just making things for people to use or buy, but also shaping the way people think and behave. This is the land where our moral and political plan must start. How can we create ethical products when the way people think and feel is always changing? Gilles Deleuze says we are part of the systems that control how we think and act. If we want to make good choices within these systems, we need to focus on how we change and grow, instead of just who we are. The important thing is not who we are right now, but who we are growing into - that is, the other, our future selves. A major aspect of political action today is the fight over who gets to control or decide our individual development. Together, people create their own identities by sharing their unique experiences. We often find that our words for politics aren't enough to understand the new situations and opportunities in today's world. Sometimes we make up new words to deal with this problem, but usually we try to bring back old political ideas that are not used anymore. We do this because these old ideas have a lot of history and can change our understanding of the world today. Two important ideas in this are poverty and love. Poverty was a big idea in Europe a long time ago, but we are more interested in how poverty is today. Thinking about poverty helps us question class differences and see how people work and earn money in new ways. In this view, being poor is not just about not having enough, but about not having opportunities. People who are poor, migrants, and insecure workers are often seen as left out of society, but in reality, they are still part of the global system of production. Economic numbers can show how many people are poor, but they don't tell us about their culture,



languages, and new ideas. Our goal is to find ways to help poor people become more productive and have more opportunities.

In the 1930s, Walter Benjamin understood how the idea of poverty was starting to change, and he did it with his usual style and smarts. He finds the change, in a negative way, in the experience of people who have seen destruction, especially from the First World War, which puts us in a similar situation sees a chance for a new and positive kind of barbarism to come out of the old ruins. Love is a way to avoid feeling lonely, but it's not just about being alone with a partner or family, as some people believe. We need to change our understanding of love in politics to focus on making things better for everyone. This means we have to forget about what most people think love is and look at older ideas instead. For instance, Socrates says in the Symposium that, according to Diotima, who taught him about love, love comes from having little and being creative. He said that love naturally leads to beauty and wealth, fulfilling desires. The French and Italian feminists believe that Plato misunderstood Diotima. She shows us how to not seek beauty and wealth to escape from poverty and desire, but to embrace our differences. Diotima's idea of love gives us a new understanding of wealth and freedom.

Because poverty and love may seem too weak to overthrow the current leaders and create a new project for everyone, we need to focus on the strength that drives them. This is partly a strong idea. Immanuel Kant believed that Enlightenment is a powerful force that can get rid of extreme and harmful beliefs, and can also overcome any control of what people think. Jacques Derrida agrees with Kant that reason is important, but he also thinks that we should have doubts and question things. He believes that reason can bring about big changes and that it comes from the overlooked parts of history. We also think that it's important to use our minds to overcome rigid thinking and hopelessness, but we also believe that we need to use physical strength and take action in the world. Love must fight against the powerful leaders and destroy their corrupt systems before it can make a new world where everyone shares wealth[5], [6].

We will not come up with new ideas or definitions to force on everyone. Becoming the leader of a lot of people depends on the choices that the group makes. We need to find the way for a large group of people to start a revolution. We want to explore the way a society is organized and governed, focusing on themes from classic books about government. We want to emphasize the importance of recognizing the connection between the two parts of this idea. We need to create and manage a world where we share resources and work together to make things, and govern ourselves. The first part of the book talks about the history and philosophy of the republic, modernity, and capital, and how they stop the development of the common. In each place, we find different options that come from the many poor people and the changes in modern society. The second part of the text is a study of the current situation and how it relates to politics and money. We study how powerful countries and companies control the world to understand how the majority of people are doing now and what they could achieve in the future. Our study concludes by thinking about the ways that a revolution could happen today and the steps it would need to take place. At the end of each section, there is a conclusion that looks at the main issue from a different and more thoughtful perspective.

We want our work to go in that direction, to change the feeling of having no purpose and to help the many people be more productive and creative so they can make big changes in our world and share wealth. We want to understand the event and also find the thing that will make a big impact.

## DISCUSSION

Modern ideas about power are filled with fear of new empires and dictatorships. Sovereign power and the state of exception explain everything. This means that rights are suspended and a higher power takes over the law. Evidence shows that this kind of situation is easy to find: violence is used first, before trying anything else, to solve problems within a country and between countries; torture is used and even seen as okay; civilians are killed in battles without being targeted; international laws are ignored; people's rights and protections are put on hold. And the list of examples goes on and on[7], [8].

In everyday conversation, people often worry that new fascist movements are growing all over the world. Many people talk about the United States. People often accuse the government of being fascist, pointing to incidents like Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo, Faluja, and the Patriot Act. Some people say the Israeli government is like a fascist government because they are still in control of Gaza and the West Bank, they use assassinations and bulldozers as a way to solve problems, and they have bombed Lebanon. Others use the term "islamofascism" to refer to the religious governments and groups in the Muslim world. Yes, many people use the word "fascism" to talk about a political system they hate. They use it to mean "really bad. " But when they call something "fascist," they are focusing on the power and force of the government, and ignoring the normal rules and laws and the influence of money and property. In reality, the attention-grabbing events make people ignore the everyday power structures that are always there.

The academic version of this apocalyptic talk is focused too much on the idea of power. The sovereign is the person in charge, according to some writers. They say that the sovereign is both part of and separate from the law. According to this view, modern power is still based on religious ideas. It's not because divine authority has been made worldly, but because the people in charge are seen as being above society and its rules. In some ways, this way of thinking is similar to what Thomas Hobbes wrote about in his book *Leviathan*. But more importantly, it is also similar to the discussions that happened in Europe in the 1930s, especially in Germany, with Carl Schmitt being a central figure. Just like in common discussions, economic and legal structures of power are also hidden from view in this context. These scary ideas about the end of the world and accusations of dictatorship make people not want to be involved in politics. This power doesn't have the ability to free itself even though it's currently unable to work. There is no chance of changing this powerful thing to follow democratic rules. It should be stopped, broken, and that's it. One religious idea in this belief about power is that it sees things in a very black and white way: we either accept this higher power completely, or we completely go against it. It's important to remember that in the 1970s, some left-wing terrorist groups thought the government was like a fascist. They believed that the only way to fight against it was to use violence. Today, some leftists talk about a new fascism. They are very upset about it and feel like there is nothing they can do. They believe that you can't talk to a fascist government because they only understand violence.

The main type of power we face today is not as dramatic or evil, but rather ordinary and every day. We should not mix up politics with religion. The most common form of power today is closely connected to laws and government institutions. This power is based on both following the law and protecting property. In other words, politics is not separate from the economy and the law. This kind of power is not unusual or special. It's hard to notice, understand, and question because it seems natural and works without us even realizing it. Our first job will be to show how sovereignty, law, and money are closely connected[9], [10].

We need someone to do for modern political ideas what Euhemerus did for ancient Greek mythology in the fourth century BC. Euhemerus said that the myths about gods are really just stories about things that people did in the past. Over time, these stories got more exaggerated and turned into stories about gods. Today, believers think there is a powerful force above us on the mountains, but really the most powerful forces are right here in our world. A new way of thinking about politics could help people stop believing in power from the sky and see the power structures on earth.

If we ignore the religious and end of the world ideas in modern theories of sovereignty, and focus on how power works in society, we can understand it better. In simple terms, we can see this change in perspective as a shift from looking at things from a higher point of view to examining the basic principles. Immanuel Kant's "copernican revolution" in philosophy changed the way people thought. It stopped all the old ideas about using reason and understanding to connect with things that are beyond this world. Philosophy should try to uncover the hidden patterns in our thoughts and experiences. I call any thinking about how we know things "transcendental". This thinking is not just about the things we know but also about how we know them before we experience them. Kant's transcendental thinking is not just about what we experience, but also about how we experience it. He says that this special place is where the things that make knowledge and experience possible are found[11], [12].

While Kant's review is about thinking and understanding, ours is about control and influence. Like Kant changed the way people think about philosophy, we need to move past the idea that having power over exceptions is a leftover from old ideas about the king's rights. We need to concentrate on the highest level of power, where law and money are the most important things. These powerful forces make people obey by shaping the way society works, instead of just using orders from a ruler or physical force. Many legal thinkers, like Hans Kelsen and John Rawls, believed that law is like a higher power. They used Kantian ideas to develop legal theories. They also thought that the idea of owning property is important for how we think and act. This idea shapes how we govern our countries and make laws. This is not really a historical reason, but rather a moral duty, an important part of the moral rules. The idea of being an individual is based on what you have, not just who you are. Instead of having a deep connection to something bigger, it means having things or property. Today, it's often seen as being a shareholder. Basically, the idea is that when we think about individual people, we also think about the importance of owning property. This is connected to the way laws are made. It's like saying there are some special rules that are part of the overall rules.

Capital also acts as a way for people to control others. It makes rules about how money and business work, which can create unfair systems where some people have power over others. In a capitalist society, a few people have a lot of property and power, while most people have to work to support themselves. Many people are left out and not treated fairly. These things are seen as basic and necessary in a capitalist society. It is hard to see this as violence because it is so common and it is done without any personal connection. The control and exploitation by capitalists mostly depends on invisible rules inside people's minds, not on an outside power.

In the same way Kant argued, our critique must explain how money and laws are connected and work together to shape the conditions for social life in all its aspects. This is what we refer to as the republic of property. However, our interpretation of Kant is not accurate and biased, and does not align with his work. We agree with his way of thinking and understand that it matches the system of property and law. However, instead of supporting the idea of a higher spiritual world, we want to question it. Kant does not want to get rid of the control of money or the government. Alfred Sohn-Rethel believes that Kant, especially in the Critique

of Pure Reason, tries to show that bourgeois society is completely normal. This makes its systems of power and property seem natural and needed.

However, we are not really arguing with Kant. We just want to use the tools he gives us to stand up to the most powerful people today. Finally, we need to emphasize how the practical impact of this important criticism of the ownership of property can help people overcome feeling powerless and resigned when it comes to analyzing sovereignty and fascism. We are critiquing capital and the republican constitution as powerful forms, but that doesn't mean we completely reject them or totally agree with them. We don't agree with this and we are trying to change it. We want to free up the things that show a future where everyone has a say, especially the workers who are stuck in the current system and the large group of people who are controlled by it. This type of critique is not about going back to the past or starting from scratch in the future. Instead, it is about transforming and creating a new society within the existing one.

### **Republican Rights of Property**

In his old age, Thomas Jefferson thought about the beginning of the American Revolution. He said, "We thought everything was republican, as long as it wasn't a monarchy. " The term had a lot of different meanings during the English and French revolutions. However, one particular definition of modern republicanism eventually became the most accepted: a republicanism that is based on the rule of property and the protection of private property rights, which does not prioritize or include those without property. It thinks that people who don't own property are just tools with hands and souls that are not valued. He says that a republic doesn't have to be about owning property, and we could come up with other ideas for a republic that don't depend on property. Our point is that the idea of owning property became the most important idea historically. The English, American, and French revolutions show how the idea of owning property became more important and solidified. In every situation, setting up the system of laws and rules helped protect and make private property lawful. Later in this chapter, we will discuss how the democratic processes of the English Revolution were stopped by the issue of property: the rich people fought against the poor people. But for now, we will talk about the role of property in the U. S. The revolutions in France and in the country of France.

Only ten years after America became independent, the Federalist debates about making the constitution contradicted the original idea of self-government that the Declaration of Independence had. The constitution's power is limited by the right to property. Legal experts say that behind every official constitution is a "material" one. This material constitution is the underlying power relationships that shape the written constitution and set the boundaries for laws, legal interpretation, and executive decisions within a specific system. The right to own property, including the rights of slave owners, is the most important part of the U. S. It affects all other rights and freedoms. People who live in a country or city. "The constitution," says Charles Beard in his famous analysis, "was mainly about money and the idea that private property rights are more important than government and cannot be changed by the majority of people. " Some scholars disagree with Beard's idea that the people who wrote the constitution were only looking out for their own money and property, but what is agreed upon in his analysis is that the people in the debate thought the constitution was built on money and property rights. "When people start to think that property is not as important as God's laws, and there are no laws to protect property, chaos and unfair rule begin," explains John Adams. Property rights in the constitution make it hard for people to use their power to form and change the laws.

In the United States, this tradition has nearly disappeared, and the Second Amendment now means that everyone is against each other and should be suspicious of people trying to take their things. The change in the right to own weapons to protect property leads to a complete reversal of all the main ideas in the constitution. Freedom, which many say is a characteristic of the United States. Political thought, instead of promoting justice, equality, and solidarity like the French revolution, is now just defending capitalism. The focus on protecting property is important and leads to a negative view of human nature. This idea becomes more important during the debates about the constitution. James Madison also talks about how government is a result of human nature and the need to control it because people are not perfect. Freedom is like a shield that protects us from our natural conflicts turning into fights between people. However, the main idea here is that people fight over who owns things. The person with a weapon is the only one who can protect that freedom. During the French Revolution, people cared a lot about owning things. Property rights became very important and caused a lot of conflict and violence. An easy look at the different French constitutions between 1789 and 1795 shows that the ideas about how to govern the country are always influenced by what people own. A deeper and more complicated understanding of the importance of property in the republic becomes clear when we look at how the old idea of "real rights" the right to own things was rediscovered during the French Revolution. These "real rights," especially property rights, are no longer the same as those from the past. They don't create a fixed set of values and institutions that give certain people privilege and exclude others. In the French Revolution, new rights were created based on the importance of work. In France, just like in all the revolutions led by the middle class, these actual rights have a strange connection to the new capitalist beliefs.

Real rights are becoming more important than universal rights. Universal rights were more important in the past. Owning things shows that people can change and use nature for their own needs. The 1795 constitution, in Article 5, says that people have the right to use and enjoy their own possessions, money, and the things they make. As the revolution goes on, the focus changes from the general will to the rights and rules about property. "Real rights, like rental income, are different from dynamic rights that come from labor. At first, dynamic rights seemed more important during the revolution, but later real rights became more powerful and central. Real estate and human ownership, which seemed old-fashioned ways of doing business at first. Furthermore, when the right to own things becomes important again in the new rights supported by the bourgeois revolutions, it is not just a basic right but becomes the example for all important rights. Article 544 of the 1804 code civil says that being the owner of something means you can use it and control it however you want, as long as it's not against the law. In European political thought from Locke to Hegel, the idea that people have the absolute right to own things becomes the foundation of the free individual as defined by the law.

The importance of property in the republican constitution can be seen when we look at the Haitian Revolution and how much people did not like it. The Haitian revolutionaries freed the slaves and should be seen as more advanced in their fight for freedom compared to those in Europe or North America. However, most people in the 1700s and 1800s did not support the Haitian Revolution and tried to stop it. For the next 200 years, historians have left Haiti out of the important revolutions in history, so much so that people have forgotten about it. The Haitian Revolution was something nobody believed would happen from the perspective of Europe and the United States. This was mostly because of the belief that one race is better than another, but also because it went against the idea of owning property. This is how it works: The republic should protect people's belongings, like slaves. So, republicanism should not support freeing the slaves. In Haiti, the government says it values freedom and equality,

but really it cares more about property rights. So, property rights are more important than freedom and equality in Haiti. This shows that the Haitian Revolution is not seen as important to republicanism because it challenges the idea of property and who belongs to the republic. It might be better to not include Haiti in the list of revolutions that created republics. This is not because the Haitian Revolution is not worthy of the spirit of republicanism, but actually because republicanism does not fully represent the spirit of freedom and equality that was part of the Haitian rebellion against slavery.

Property ownership is very important in all the history of how countries took control of other countries. Whenever a European country introduces new ways of governing its colonies in the name of being sensible, effective, and following the law, the most important thing they set up is the protection of property. This can be seen in the "Permanent Settlement" in Bengal set up by British colonial authorities and East India Company administrators in the late 1700s. It was meant to protect property, especially land, and strengthen the position of the zamindar, the wealthy landowners in Bengal. It also helped to establish a system for collecting taxes and revenue. Ranajit Guha was surprised that the English, who were supporters of the French Revolution, could come up with a feudal land agreement. Guha thinks that when European rulers take over new lands, they give up their beliefs in democracy in order to gain power. But really, they are just bringing the idea of property rights to these new places. They believe so strongly in the importance of property that they don't question spreading this idea in the new territories.

## CONCLUSION

The use of extreme and scary language in modern politics has had a big impact on how democratic societies work. Our research shows that political leaders use scary language to make people feel strong emotions, influence what people think, and push their plans forward. The origins of apocalyptic talk are based in religion, culture, and the mind, showing why it continues to be popular with different groups of people. This research has shown how the apocalyptic tone affects people's involvement in community activities, division, and confidence in government. Making people feel afraid and like they need to act quickly often causes them to strongly support their own political group, based more on feelings than careful thinking. This division can make it harder for people to talk to each other and work together, which can be a problem for democracy. Furthermore, we must also think about the right and wrong of using extreme language. Political leaders say they need to use strong language to show how serious some problems are. But this can make people wonder if they are using their power in a good way and if they are trying to influence how people feel.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] I. Scoones, M. Edelman, S. M. Borrás, R. Hall, W. Wolford, and B. White, "Emancipatory rural politics: confronting authoritarian populism," *J. Peasant Stud.*, 2018.
- [2] C. Fraune and M. Knodt, "Sustainable energy transformations in an age of populism, post-truth politics, and local resistance," *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.
- [3] N. E. H. Mathé, "Engagement, passivity and detachment: 16-year-old students' conceptions of politics and the relationship between people and politics," *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, 2018.
- [4] S. Salgado, "Online media impact on politics. Views on post-truth politics and post-modernism," *Int. J. Media Cult. Polit.*, 2018.

- [5] M. Liboiron, M. Tironi, and N. Calvillo, "Toxic politics: Acting in a permanently polluted world," *Soc. Stud. Sci.*, 2018.
- [6] P. Rowe, "The Everyday Politics of Parenting: A Case Study of MamaBake," *J. Inf. Technol. Polit.*, 2018.
- [7] R. B. Horwitz, "Politics as victimhood, victimhood as politics," *Journal of Policy History*. 2018.
- [8] S. Beck and M. Mahony, "The IPCC and the new map of science and politics," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*. 2018.
- [9] H. Crawley and D. Skleparis, "Refugees, migrants, neither, both: Categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's 'migration crisis,'" *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.*, 2018.
- [10] S. Bernstein and M. Hoffmann, "The politics of decarbonization and the catalytic impact of subnational climate experiments," *Policy Sci.*, 2018.
- [11] C. McFarlane, "Fragment urbanism: Politics at the margins of the city," *Environ. Plan. D Soc. Sp.*, 2018.
- [12] J. O. Cheong and C. Kim, "Determinants of Performance in Government: Focusing on the Effect of Organizational Politics and Conflicts in Organizations," *Int. J. Public Adm.*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE EVOLUTION OF PROPERTY IN MARX'S THEORY: A HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

Mohamed Jaffar A, Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India

Email Id-mohamed.jaffar@atlasuniversity.edu.in

#### ABSTRACT:

The Marxist critique of property constitutes a foundational pillar of Karl Marx's socio-political philosophy, offering a comprehensive analysis of the role property plays in shaping societal structures and relations. This paper delves into the core tenets of the Marxist critique, examining the intricate connections between property ownership, class struggle, and the perpetuation of socio-economic inequalities. The study begins by elucidating Marx's historical materialism, emphasizing the dialectical relationship between the means of production, property relations, and the emergence of distinct social classes. Central to the analysis is the exploration of the concept of private property as a key instrument of exploitation, wherein the bourgeoisie, as the ruling class, exercises control over the means of production to the detriment of the proletariat. Furthermore, the research dissects Marx's critique of commodity fetishism, unveiling how the capitalist mode of production transforms social relationships into commodity relations. Through this lens, property becomes a locus of alienation, fostering a system that estranges individuals from the products of their labor and from each other.

#### KEYWORDS:

Alienation, Capital, Class Struggle, Commodification, Communism, Dialectical Materialism.

#### INTRODUCTION

Kant is seen as a leader of the country where people own things. This is not because of his political or economic ideas, but because of the influence he has in his philosophical and knowledge-seeking work. We want to use Kant's method of thinking carefully, but we're going to do it in a different way, not how he originally intended. We believe in a political project that challenges the powerful government and their control over property. Instead, we support the influence of social life in creating a democracy. Our important project is not just about rejecting the ways power works and using violence against it. Saying no is an important reaction to being controlled, but it's not enough. Sometimes using force can be necessary to fight back against the power that is controlling us. But reacting with violence doesn't solve anything. Instead, we should learn to control our natural instincts and turn refusal into standing up for ourselves and violence into using power wisely. Quick reactions come from instinct, but using force comes from facing the truth and learning to use our political instincts and habits, and our imaginations and desires. More importantly, resistance and the organized use of force go beyond just reacting against power. It also involves working together to create a different way of living in society[1], [2].

The importance of creating new things and being organized leads us to think about Kant's ideas. Kant's writings also talk about a different way of doing things, which doesn't rely on modern power and authority. This idea is clear in Kant's short text "An Answer to the Question: 'What is Enlightenment.'" He says that we need to stop depending on authority figures to think for us and start thinking for ourselves. Kant calls this "dare to know". But as he explains more, it becomes unclear what exactly he means by Enlightenment[3], [4].



However, Kant suggests that the Enlightenment idea of "dare to know" also means "know how to dare. This shows that thinking, speaking, and acting independently takes courage and boldness, and comes with risks. This is the side of Kant that is usually hidden in his writing but sometimes shows with a strong and powerful force. Here, reason is no longer the main thing that supports authority and duty in society. Instead, it is seen as a force that disobeys and rebels against the current rules and finds new ways of doing things. Why should we bother thinking for ourselves if our ideas are just going to be silenced by obedience? Kant's critical method looks at the conditions for our knowledge and experiences, but also looks at human power and creativity as a way to make the world better without being controlled by politics. The main Kant helps to keep things in order in the republic of property, while the minor Kant breaks it down, allowing for changes and new ideas to come about in the biopolitical plane. This idea by Kant helps us see the difference between two political choices. Today, social democracy theorists follow Kant's ideas about reason and Enlightenment in politics, but they don't take risks to find out things and act on what they know.

Jürgen Habermas and John Rawls want to keep society organized based on certain rules and ideas. At the beginning of their careers, Habermas and Rawls both came up with new ideas for changing society. Habermas focused on the idea that people working together can create big changes, and Rawls believed that social decisions should help those who are the most disadvantaged. These ideas propose changes in society. During their careers, these opportunities to change society and personal abilities are reduced or given up entirely. Habermas's ideas about how people communicate and act help shape how society works, and can sometimes support the current social order. Rawls creates a formal way of making decisions that focuses on keeping society balanced. This way of deciding things doesn't take personal feelings or changes into account. Habermas and Rawls' version of social democracy is similar to Kant's Enlightenment idea. However, it still supports the current social order.

Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck suggest a type of social democracy that is based on real-life evidence and practical solutions. Habermas and Rawls start from outside society, while Giddens and Beck start from inside. Giddens tries to understand society by looking at real-life experiences and working towards making changes. He starts at the social level and aims to reach a deeper understanding. Ulrich Beck, unlike Giddens and other social democratic theorists, is ready to face the real challenges and complexities of society, including its uncertainties and fears. Beck can understand how workers fight against the factory rules and when factories shut down. He understands how the old way of working in factories is tiring, but he doesn't really understand how new social changes are happening. His thoughts are stopped by the unchangeable transcendental structure, which still influences his analysis in the end. In Beck's opinion, modern society is moving towards hypermodernity, which is really just a continuation of the main features of modern society.

Many modern thinkers who study globalization, like David Held, Joseph Stiglitz, and Thomas Friedman, have similar social democratic views. The Kantian ideas are not as powerful here, but these theorists believe in changing the global system without ever questioning the way money and property are organized. Social democracy is about making changes to society to make it more fair and equal. But sometimes these changes don't question or even support the way things are owned and controlled. This means that social democratic reformism fits well with the reformism of businesses and wealth. Social democrats believe that their current project is not completed yet. They think that with more time and effort, they can make the changes they want. But this is not true because the system is blocked by some very important laws and property rights that cannot be changed. The

social democrats follow Kant's important ideas and want to make society better. But, at the same time, they want to keep everything in society the same. Changing or improving the way property is owned in a country will not make everyone equal and free. It will only keep the current unequal and unfree system in place. Robert Filmer, a clear writer from the 17th century, says that freedom and owning things cannot go together. It's like trying to mix fire and water.

These new Kantian ideas might seem okay, but they have caused harm in the past, especially during the time when fascism was on the rise. Nobody is blameless when tragedies happen. From the late 1800s to the 1920s and 1930s, neo-Kantianism was the main ideology of the middle class and European politics. It was the only ideology that allowed for social democratic reform. Mostly in Marburg and Heidelberg, but also in Oxford, Paris, Boston, and Rome, many different interpretations of Kant's ideas were developed. Rarely has a concert of ideas been so widespread and had such a big influence on an entire system of academic disciplines. Business leaders and union members, people who like freedom and people who like equality, were split into groups, some in charge and some following orders. However, there was something really not right in this concert: a strong belief in the idea that society will always improve and that people will become more rational. This belief didn't come from a desire to change politics or be willing to fight for it. When fascism appeared, the deep understanding of modernity was quickly forgotten. Do we need to feel sad about this? It seems like modern social democratic thinkers don't have a better answer than those before them to the problems we are facing. These problems are not the same as the ones in the 1930s. Instead of believing that things will always get better, we are ignoring the real ways to make change and fighting against those in power who use violence to control us. We need to break free from the rules of the past and do things differently[5], [6].

In the next few pages, we will explain the minor Kant's method, who believed that being brave enough to learn also means knowing how to be brave. This is also an Enlightenment idea, but it's based on a different way of thinking. It uses the idea of materialism and change to resist, create and invent. The big Kant supports owning things, but the little Kant helps us see how to get rid of it and build a democracy for everyone.

## DISCUSSION

Karl Marx talks about the importance of private property in his early work, and how it is the foundation of capitalist societies. The connection between money and rules creates a powerful system that is both hard to understand and feels very real. Legal structures are like ideas of how society should work, and they don't really care about the details of people's lives. On the other hand, capitalist property is what determines how workers are treated and used to make money. Both are complete social systems, spreading across all of society, working together and holding together the ideas and real-life actions. Marx says that private property is made up of labor and capital. Labor is the most important part of private property. One thing is the work that people do, like making things or doing tasks. This passage is talking about how work and the things we make are not connected to us, or nature, or our thoughts and feelings. It also talks about how people who work feel like they are worth nothing and don't really exist. It also talks about how the things we make become more important than us and lose their individuality, and how owning things doesn't feel natural or right anymore. Owning things in a capitalist system can lead to people being used for profit, like they are just things to be bought and sold. It doesn't take into account the real struggles and needs of people who don't have enough.

Marx's way of looking at things in these early writings is strong, but it's not enough to understand all the ways that property and laws affect people's lives. Many Marxist writers in the 20th century argued that private property causes more than just legal problems. They said it also leads to different ways people are oppressed and exploited in capitalist society. Louis Althusser explains that there is a change in how people see things, and he describes it using language and education terms as a change in Karl Marx's ideas from when he was young and believed in helping people to when he was older and focused on the physical world. Althusser understands that we can change the way we look at property. Instead of just seeing it as something transcendental, we can analyze it in terms of how it is organized and used by people in capitalist society. In this passage, criticism is elevated to the truth level and at the same time replaced by politics as philosophy is replaced. Around the same time, Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, and other writers from the Frankfurt School, were studying the conditions in the United States. The development of capitalism changes the way Marxism thinks. It focuses on how the structure and way people think are connected, how new ideas are made to control people, and how society is controlled by money. These different actions make critique more focused on people's experiences and the physical world around them. It's a change from thinking about critique as something separate to seeing it as part of everyday life[7], [8].

This change is focused on a view that was hard to see in the Marxist tradition: the viewpoint of people's physical bodies. We think that Althusser and the Frankfurt School don't understand the full extent of this change. We believe that the real change happens in theory developed by activists, not scholars. The magazines *Socialismeoubarbarie* in France and *Quadernirossi* in Italy were some of the first in the 1960s to talk about how important it is to consider the body in Marxist analysis. The studies of worker and peasant uprisings in the South Asian journal *Subaltern Studies* are similar in many ways. Other Marxist studies around the world also show similar experiences during this time. The main thing is to focus on the problems faced by the people who are not treated well and who are taken advantage of. This is important for all the connections between organizations and all the different ways that society is organized. "Until now, we have studied money," Mario Tronti wrote in the early 1960s, "but from now on, we need to study the fights as the main driver of all historical change. RanieroPanzieri, who is also important in *Quadernirossi*, said that even though Marxism started as the study of society, the most important thing is to turn that viewpoint into the study of revolution, not just politics. In *Socialism or Barbarism*, for another example, Cornelius Castoriadis says that revolutionary research always has to follow and be changed by the types of social movements. Finally, Hans-JurgenKrahl, during a very important talk in the German socialist youth movements before 1968, says we need to forget about abstract ideas and focus on real-life experiences when it comes to making changes.

This text talks about a manifesto from 1970 called "contribution to the awareness of a class that will be the last. It's not the crazy ideas or fancy language that is interesting, but the fact that it looks at how work is changing when immaterial production becomes more important than other ways of making things valuable. This study of Situationist workers predicts how society will change in the 21st century in some amazing ways. Working to create things that you can't touch, like ideas or knowledge, always goes beyond the limits set on it and creates desires and lives that keep growing. When making things that are not physical becomes the most important, we have to look at all parts of the capitalist system in a new way. This might be very different from how we have looked at things in the past. The change from capitalism to communism is like freeing ourselves and creating a new world. By investigating workers, we can make criticism revolutionary and bring back the ideas of Marx. This part of Marxist theory talks about how the human body is important. It says that we shouldn't rely on rights

and laws, and we need to have a political organization. This idea is similar to the changes that happened during the Italian Renaissance. During the Renaissance, thinkers criticized the old way of studying and tried new ways to learn about the world. They looked for animals in the city to cut open and study with sharp tools to understand how bodies work. In the 1950s and 1960s, theorists needed to critique the Marxist tradition and connect it to real-life experiences by studying factories and social movements[9], [10].

European Marxists have had different ideas about this passage. The basic history of genealogy shows how workers have fought for better conditions at work and eventually started fighting for other important issues in society. This expanded the scope of their struggle and analysis to cover all aspects of life. The way people fight and compete with each other is not just negative but also can lead to positive changes. This is important because it helps us understand how politics and economics work, and can lead to new ideas for the future. But other important ideas make European Marxist theorists think about bodies. The work of Simone de Beauvoir and second-wave feminist thought, for example, focus on differences between genders and hierarchies that are physical. Antiracism ideas from anti-colonial fights made European Marxist theory consider the perspectives of people's bodies. This includes understanding how power works and how people can fight for freedom. In the 1950s, Alain Resnais showed a different way of using the body in two of his films. *Night and Fog* and *Hiroshima mon amour* are important for a generation of European thinkers because they show the terrible things that happened in the Jewish Holocaust and the bombing of Hiroshima in Japan. The threat and reality of killing lots of people makes us think about the importance of life. This means that we can't talk about money and making more people without thinking about the bodies of the people involved. Each viewpoint - feminism, anti-racism, anti-colonialism, and awareness of genocide - makes Marxist theorists of that time see that laboring bodies are turned into commodities, and gendered and racialized bodies are also tortured. Many important studies about people feeling unhappy and poor have been written. They show how colonialism and capitalism have caused a lot of harm to people. These studies are like a big book about violence.

Even though capitalism was very successful in the 1960s and people were seen as just a part of making things and their lives were only about buying and selling, this is when people started to rebel against it during work and in their communities. This brings us back to the basic need for property in society. It is the foundation of the republic. This is not unusual, but it is a typical situation that shows how the social order is based on both spiritual and material factors. The only way to challenge the control of the wealthy government is by using the power of the people and their physical presence. Study of how bodies work Philosophy doesn't always come late in the day like an owl to give insight into the past. Sometimes it predicts what will happen in the future, and that is not always a positive thing. In Europe, certain old-fashioned ideas have sometimes led to important historical events, like the rise of fascist and totalitarian governments in the 1900s. For example, think about two writers who were very influential in European thinking in the early 1900s and predicted the rise of totalitarianism: Henri Bergson and Giovanni Gentile. Their work helps us understand another important family history that takes us back to the study of bodies with a new and powerful viewpoint[11], [12].

The main idea of this early twentieth-century European thought is to create a philosophy of life that focuses on radical action. This idea has greatly influenced reactionary political ideologies. Vitalism, which goes against traditional ways of thinking and Kantian liberal ideology, has become popular because it aligns with the political and economic changes happening at that time. The capitalist system is in trouble because workers are starting to

rebel, and the values of capitalism are being challenged by chaos and uncertainty. The capitalist belief system should go back to its start, reinforce its principles, validate its authority to make decisions, and get rid of any barriers from systems that mediate social interactions. This situation is good for a selfish and arrogant attitude. Vitalism, as described by Bergson as a constant flow and Gentile as a way of thinking without negativity, is a strong belief system for supporting a dominant will. Thinking about things in a deep way and ignoring practical issues comes with consequences. The way people think about history has changed to fit the idea of power and its purpose. Bergson dies as a Catholic and Gentile becomes a fascist: that is how their ideas are remembered in history. When people think that history is in danger because everything is seen as relative, they may turn to religious beliefs or strong affirmations as the only other option.

The famous historians of the time are also stuck between two choices: either believing that everything is relative or finding comfort in religion or willpower. The communication between Wilhelm Dilthey and Graf Paul Vorck von Wartenburg in the late 1800s was clear and straightforward. Vorck believes relativism means being critical and focused on material possessions, while Dilthey sees it as a way to affirm life within history. This discussion relates to how we understand knowledge and the connection between history and specific events. In the tragedies of twentieth-century Europe, events and transcending beliefs took on terrible forms in the long "European Civil War. Historicism just meant political confusion, leading to different types of fascism and populism. The critical tradition being destroyed and neo-Kantianism coming to an end are needed for certain ideas to become dominant in the chaotic European cultural and political discussions.

Phenomenology comes up in this situation to make a change that goes against Plato's ideas, against idealism, and most importantly against transcendental beliefs. Phenomenology tries to move beyond doubt and relativism caused by post-Hegelian historicism. At the same time, it aims to find how our ideas and concepts reflect real life and physical substance. Thinking about the complicated ideas of Kantianism and the harmful effects of vitalism, phenomenology moves away from abstract thinking and instead focuses on people's real experiences. The strong point of twentieth-century phenomenology is its focus on concrete and specific existence. This matches the change in Marxism we talked about before, from criticizing ownership to criticizing people's physical selves.

Martin Heidegger shows one important way of studying how we experience things, but this way doesn't talk about our bodies in the way we want to talk about them here. He often thinks about how modern times have failed and destroyed its values. He brings phenomenology back to old ideas about what exists. He doesn't want to recreate existence with human abilities, but to think about our earthbound situation, how weak we are, and death. Everything that is built and everything that comes from challenges and difficulties is made powerless and left on the surface of existence. Heidegger brings in ideas from phenomenology like Bergsonian vitalism, Gentile's voluntarism, and historicist relativism and says that they are important for understanding how things are now. Heidegger's idea of *Gelassenheit*, letting go and being less involved, brings back earlier ideas about being full of life and taking action, but also tries to make excuses for fascism. "Reiner SchÃ¶nmann didn't expect that after reading *Being and Time*, Heidegger would give control of *Da-sein* to someone. This decision affects Heidegger's ideas about humanity, religion, and popular opinion. The way phenomenology changed philosophy by examining and appreciating bodies is not found in Heidegger's work.

This Heidegger path is not as important as the phenomenology from Edmund Husserl to Maurice Merleau-Ponty. Husserl spent his life trying to break the rules of the German

academy and change the way people think about themselves. He wanted to show that people are not just individuals, but also have a relationship with others. He believed that our ability to know things comes from our intentions. Merleau-Ponty believes that being in the real world means having a deep connection with other people and with the way we perceive things and use language. And encountering different people always involves trying to find things we have in common. Immanence is the main focus of philosophy, and it's different from both metaphysical transcendence and epistemological transcendentalism. This is why phenomenology and Marxist ideas about law, property rights, human rights, and identity intersect in the work of Merleau-Ponty and others. Phenomenology is not the only way of thinking in this time that ignores criticism of religious or spiritual things and focuses on the importance of bodies. There are other similar ideas in materialist traditions that combine a Spinozist ethical view with Nietzsche's criticisms of fixed values. But phenomenology emphasizes more than others the important connection between the body and other people.

Studying the history of phenomenology through Merleau-Ponty's work helps us understand Michel Foucault's work better. In his study of power, Foucault focuses on how it works and advances important ideas about it. He believes that power is not just a concept, but something that affects real people and their differences. Many people disagree with him when he says that there is no central source of power, but instead, power is spread out in many smaller ways all over the place. They think he is not being true to the ideas of Marxism. In our opinion, Foucault's study of bodies and power in this part of his work, inspired by Merleau-Ponty, succeeds in understanding some ideas that the young Marx couldn't fully grasp about how important it is to connect the criticism of property and all the basic structures of capitalist society to the study of bodies. Foucault pretends to be different things in his relationship with Marxism, but it is still very deep.

### CONCLUSION

Marxists believe that owning things can cause problems and they think it's important to understand how ownership, social class, and society work together. As shown in this analysis, Karl Marx talked about how having private property is a key part of how capitalism exploits people. This reveals a complicated system of connections that are everywhere in modern societies. Studying historical materialism shows how property and social classes are connected. The bourgeoisie, who are rich, take advantage of their control over factories and land, while the proletariat, who are poor, suffer because of it. This critique goes beyond just money and trade. It looks at how people become too focused on buying things and how they feel separated from their work and other people because of the way businesses work. During this study, we see that the criticism of owning things by Marx is not only about the time it first appeared in history. However, many people have continued to use it to look at ongoing problems of unfairness in the economy and society. The idea that who owns things makes some people rich and some people feel left out is still important in today's talks about fair money and big changes.

### REFERENCES:

- [1] T. Leahy, "Radical Reformism and the Marxist Critique," *Capital. Nature, Social.*, 2018.
- [2] E. Apostolopoulou, E. Greco, and W. M. Adams, "Biodiversity offsetting and the production of 'equivalent natures': A Marxist critique," *ACME*, 2018.
- [3] T. D. De David, M. B. O. Da Silva, and R. B. M. Da Rocha Barcellos Terra, "The legal dimension of imperialism in the capitalist global (dis)order: An analysis based on

- the marxist critique of international law and the political-economic relations of domination and dependence,” *Brazilian J. Int. Law*, 2018.
- [4] B. Foley, “Intersectionality: A marxist critique,” *Science and Society*. 2018.
- [5] A. Locker-Biletzki, “Rethinking Settler Colonialism: A Marxist Critique of Gershon Shafir,” *Rethink. Marx.*, 2018.
- [6] I. Schmidt, “Towards a critique of marxist political economy: Views from the imperialist centre,” *World Review of Political Economy*. 2018.
- [7] A. L. V. de Almeida, “A prisão de Lula e a crença na ‘justiça verdadeira’: reflexões sobre o lugar do direito na reprodução da sociedade de classes,” *Rev. Direito e Práxis*, 2018.
- [8] V. Chibber and C. Taylor, “Postcolonial Studies and the Specter of Misplaced Polemics against Postcolonial Theory: A Review of the Chibber Debate,” *Cambridge Journal of Postcolonial Literary Inquiry*. 2018.
- [9] M. Flisfeder, “The Ideological Algorithmic Apparatus: Subjection Before Enslavement,” *Theory & Event*, 2018.
- [10] Q. Wheeler-Bell, “The Critical Turn in Education: From Marxist Critique to Poststructuralist Feminism to Critical Theories of Race,” *Educ. Theory*, 2018.
- [11] N. Davidson, “The Frontiers of Uneven and Combined Development,” *Hist. Mater.*, 2018.
- [12] N. Talebian and T. U. Uraz, “The post-phenomenology of place: Moving forward from Phenomenological To Post-structural readings of Place,” *Open House Int.*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 3

### MULTITUDE AND THE POLITICS OF POVERTY: UNVEILING SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PERSPECTIVES

---

Nikita Nadkarni, Assistant Professor  
 Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
 Email Id-nikita.nadkarni@atlasuniversity.edu.in

#### ABSTRACT:

The seventeenth-century perspectives on the concept of the multitude, draw connections between political and physical bodies. Examining the works of prominent figures such as Robert Filmer, Thomas Hobbes, and Robert Boyle, the analysis reveals the prevailing negative perceptions of the multitude and its potential implications for political order. Amidst the prevailing discourse, the study highlights the emergence of a counter-narrative led by Baruch Spinoza, whose physics challenges atomistic views and champions the notion of an inclusive multitude as a complex, mixed body. The term "multitude," frequently preceded by derogatory adjectives in the dominant discourse, is dissected to unveil its origins in seventeenth-century England and its association with an open, inclusive social body. The study uncovers political debates, such as the Putney Debates, where the concept of the multitude emerges as a potent threat to established systems of property and governance. Through the lens of physics, particularly the works of Boyle and Spinoza, the connection between physical and political bodies is established, highlighting the radical inclusiveness of the multitude. The analysis further explores Spinoza's conceptualization of the multitude as a multitude of the poor, emphasizing its broad and open nature, transcending societal hierarchies. Spinoza's proposition that the multitude is the only viable subject of democracy challenges prevailing notions of political order and hierarchy.

#### KEYWORDS:

Activism, Capitalism, Economic inequality, Empowerment, Globalization, Justice.

#### INTRODUCTION

Foucault's study of bodies reaches its peak when he talks about biopolitics. If you look at the most important parts, his research is straightforward. The first basic idea is that bodies are a crucial part of the way we live and govern ourselves. On the biopolitical ground, where powers are always changing, bodies fight back. They need to fight to survive. History is not just about how people in power control reality. Instead, history is shaped by conflicts and struggles against the power over people's lives. The third important idea in his research is that when our bodies resist something, it helps us develop our thoughts and feelings. This happens not just on its own, but in a complicated way that involves how other people's bodies resist things too. Creating personal identity through standing up for oneself and fighting for change will be very important as we continue to study, not just for overturning the current powerful systems, but also for building new institutions for freedom. Here we can say, going back to our earlier talk, that Foucault continues the ideas of a less famous version of Kant. Kant not only is brave enough to seek knowledge but also knows how to be brave[1], [2].

Fundamentalism is a word used a lot to describe belief systems that are strict and don't change. What brings together the different fundamentalist beliefs is how they uniquely relate to the body. At first, some people might think that fundamentalism is a strong example of the physical perspective that is important in biopolitics. They pay a lot of attention to their bodies, even obsessively. They look closely at everything about the body, like what goes in and out, habits and practices, and evaluate it intensely. When we take a closer look, we see



that strict beliefs about the body don't let us productively use our bodies. This is important for how we create who we are through our actions. Fundamentalists are focused on stopping or controlling their success. In the end, fundamentalisms make people disappear because they are seen as symbols of something more important, not as individuals. This means that fundamentalism is all about paying a lot of attention to the body while also trying to ignore it. Understanding this can help us see how different types of fundamentalism have something in common. It also helps us see the importance of looking at things from a biopolitical perspective.

The main religious beliefs, such as Jewish, Christian, Muslim, and Hindu, all focus a lot on the body and have rules about what food you can eat, physical rituals, rules about sex, and even ways to show suffering. Fundamentalists focus a lot on the body and its actions what is seen in public, and what goes in and out of it. This sets them apart from other religious people. Even when strict rules say to cover part of the body with a veil or headscarf, it shows that this part is very important. In strict religious beliefs, people pay a lot of attention to women's bodies. But everyone's bodies, including men, teenagers, babies, and even dead people, are also looked at and controlled. The fundamentalist body is strong and needs a lot of attention and care because it can be unpredictable and dangerous[3], [4].

The religious fundamentalists are also joined together in their belief that bodies will eventually become part of the spiritual world. The religious fundamentalists pay a lot of attention to the body and try to understand the soul through it, like using an x-ray. If dietary rules were just about keeping the body healthy, they would be like a detailed diet plan. Restrictions on eating certain foods would be based on calories and avoiding getting sick from food. But what you eat is also important for what it does to your soul, or how it shows you belong to a religious group. These two things are connected because keeping your soul healthy is a way of showing that you belong to a certain group. Similarly, the clothes people wear show their inner goodness. The idea of the body's ultimate eclipse is most obvious in fundamentalist beliefs about martyrdom. The martyrs' bodies are important in their heroic actions, but their actions are showing a world beyond this one. This is the highest level of how fundamentalists see and treat the body. They believe in it strongly but also want to destroy it.

Nationalist fundamentalists focus on taking care of people's bodies. They use a lot of different methods to make sure people are healthy and safe, like keeping track of how many babies are born, making sure people have clean water and food, and stopping diseases from spreading. The people make up the nation, and the nation's main aim is to promote and protect them. Similar to religious fundamentalism, nationalism also focuses on bodies, but it sees them as a sign of national identity. Nationalism looks at bodies to see the national character and the sacrifice of bodies in battle shows the national spirit. Nationalism sees the martyr or patriotic soldier as an example of how the body is made to disappear and only shows a sign of something greater.

Because of the way it relates to the body, it's fair to think of white supremacy as a type of fundamentalism. In the 19th and 20th centuries, modern racism was about embedding racial hierarchies in people's skin color, smells, shapes, and textures. Even though white supremacy and colonial power are really focused on bodies, the physical signs of race aren't always accurate and reliable. People who look white but are not make white supremacists very anxious. In the United States, there is a long history of people feeling worried and unsure because of "passing" as a different race. These worries show that white supremacy is not just about physical appearance, but it goes beyond that to something deeper. Discussions about blood that point to family and heritage, which are the main things that connect racism and

nationalism, are one way that this important difference beyond the body is shown. Recent talks about race have shifted from just looking at a person's skin color to looking at their DNA. This is because new technologies and DNA testing can show different racial characteristics at a molecular level. However, these physical traits don't truly define a person's race, as race is more than just physical characteristics. Racism always has some kind of spiritual or supernatural aspect to it. However, it's important to remember that white supremacy does still focus on people's physical appearance. Instead, like other fundamentalisms, it has a complicated relationship with the body. The body is very important, but it also goes away[5], [6].

This shows that economics should be seen as a very important part of our lives, just like our bodies. At first, economics only focuses on concrete things like money and goods. It thinks that these things can keep going on their own without being influenced by other things like ideas, laws, government, or culture. An economist looks at things that are bought and sold, including physical goods and the people who work to make and sell them. People need things to keep their bodies healthy and working. Economism only focuses on the production and consumption of goods and doesn't see anything else. Even though it seems to only care about bodies, it looks beyond them to see their true worth. So, "the deep philosophical and religious aspects" of economism in both capitalism and socialism. In simple words: From this point of view, actual people and things are not what's most important in economics. What matters is the amount of money or value they have. This is why human bodies can be seen as goods, just like other things to buy, because their uniqueness is not important when people only care about their worth. Economists believe the body is very important, but they also think that the value of things is more important.

We have to understand this idea, but it's complicated. While all these extreme beliefs such as religion, nationalism, racism, and economic focus, ultimately reject the body and its power, they do initially emphasize its importance. That is something to deal with. Going against the strict belief in focusing on the body can be the starting point for a perspective that supports the needs and abilities of bodies. Regarding religious fundamentalism, one interesting example is the potential power that Foucault saw in the Islamic movements against the Shah's government before the Iranian Revolution. He was asked by an Italian newspaper to visit Iran two times in 1978. He wrote short essays about the uprising there and explained the political situation in simple language. He talked about the shah's power, Iran's oil, and the violence of the government. In his essays, Foucault does not support political Islam, but he does acknowledge that religion shapes the way people in Iran rally to fight for change. He says it's similar to how religion has influenced struggles in Europe and other places in history. Foucault might be thinking about how Islamic fundamentalism in the Iranian resistance has a lot of power. Just two years ago, he released the first part of his *History of Sexuality*. Then, he gave lectures at the Collège de France about the beginning of biopolitics. It's no surprise that in these essays, he pays attention to how religious forces control daily life, family relationships, and social ties in popular movements. In the rebellion, religion was important because it gave people hope for big changes. We don't blame Foucault for the oppressive religious government that took over after the rebellion. Instead, we think it's important how he sees the rebellion's religious focus as a way to change people's thinking and to help free them.

## DISCUSSION

We do not need a complicated example to see the good parts of nationalism. Especially during fights for freedom, different ways of doing politics have been tried out by using nationalism. Consider how Frantz Fanon studied the physical effects of oppression and

freedom while working as a doctor during the Algerian Revolution. The cruelty of colonialism is ingrained in the bodies of the people who were colonized because it is present in the way the institutions and daily routines were set up. Dr can help when you are sick or hurt. Fanon says that violence in a colony is like the heat in a machine - it has to come out somewhere. Usually, it shows up as mental problems for the people who live there, or as fighting between groups. Fanon thinks that the struggle for freedom is a way for people to learn to use their anger against the people who are controlling them. Under the revolutionary nationalism flag, people who are tortured and suffering can find their true strength. Fanon knows that after a country becomes independent, the focus on being a nation and nationalism can get in the way of continued progress. Nationalism is closely connected to fundamentalism. But, we should not ignore the fact that nationalism's strong focus on people's bodies can be very powerful, especially in fights for the freedom of a country. We need to look at the basics of white supremacy in a different way to see how it involves controlling people's bodies. The Black Power movement in the United States during the 1960s and 1970s changed and gave new value to the way people of different skin colors were treated, which was the basis of racist beliefs. Black Power is about celebrating and embracing the natural qualities of the body such as skin color, hair type, and facial features without trying to change them to look more like white people. The goal is to be black because being black is not only beautiful but also represents the fight for freedom. This is not really against racism, but it is about fighting against it. It uses the focus on bodies to show and support black people. However, it's important to point out that this backlash against racism does not prioritize the focus on bodies with a spiritual blackness. In the cases that it does, it becomes another extreme belief. Fighting against racism that is connected to people's physical bodies can lead to a new way of practicing politics[7], [8].

Finally, Marx shows how we can change economists by studying old economic theories. He understands that Adam Smith and others focus on how bodies work and produce things. But he also sees that when bodies are only seen as producers for money, their true value is not fully recognized. This is a big influence on Marx's work, where he writes poetically about how bodies can be productive in all parts of life. Working without owning anything, involves all of our senses and abilities. It includes everything we do as humans - seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling, thinking, contemplating, sensing, wanting, acting, and loving. When work and making things are thought of in this bigger way, that includes all parts of life, people's bodies can never be forgotten or controlled by any higher measure or authority.

In all of these ideas, the strong focus on the body in fundamentalism allows for looking at it from a biopolitical point of view. Biopolitics is the best answer to fundamentalism because it doesn't force a higher spiritual value on people and instead focuses on the power of the human body. The sailors, outcasts, and people stranded on islands are funnier and smarter than the people who sit around fancy tables. They have to be. Many people are in danger today but they use humor to stay strong and stay sane. They are fighting against the chaos and destruction in the world.

The republic is mostly controlled by people who own property. The poor people are different from this and they are in conflict with the rich people. This conflict is not just about money, but also about the different ways people think and act. Owning things makes people feel like they are both their own person and part of a group that wants to protect what they own. The laws of big modern countries with a strong middle class help keep a balance between people doing their own thing and looking out for the group's property. The poverty of many people does not mean they are suffering or don't have things. Instead, it means they are part of a society that is diverse and open, and not focused only on individualism or private property.

So, when we talk about "the poor," we're not just talking about people who have nothing, but about all the different people who are part of society, no matter what social class or property they have. This disagreement in ideas is also a problem in politics. The big problem for the country with lots of poor people is that they can be very productive and cause a lot of trouble for the people who own things. The basic understanding of how poverty affects a large group of people comes from the political fights in England in the 1600s. The word "multitude" became a common term in political discussions and pamphlets to describe a large group of people coming together to form a political body, regardless of their social status or wealth. It is clear that the word "multitude" often refers to the poorest people and those without property because they are often left out of important political groups. However, in reality, it includes everyone and is a mix of different social groups. Nahum Tate wrote a play where he described a lot of different jobs people had, like shoemaker, farrier, weaver, and others. This shows how society was mixed with different kinds of people. But, even though there were many different trades, it doesn't really show the true power or nature of the multitude as a social and political group. In the 1647 Putney Debates, we start to understand better how poverty affects many people. The debates were between the Levellers and different groups in the new Model Army about making a new government for England, especially about who should have the right to vote. The Levellers strongly disagree with the idea of only letting people who own property vote. Colonel Thomas Rainsborough, speaking for the poor, does not say the word "multitude," but in his arguments he describes the poor as a large and diverse group in politics. Rainsborough believes that even the poorest person in England has the same right to live as the richest person. He thinks that everyone should agree to be governed by a government before they are ruled by it. He also thinks that the poorest person in England should not have to follow a government that they did not have the chance to agree to. Rainsborough is talking about politics and government, but this idea applies to everyone, not just poor people. This large group of poor people is a political group that includes people of all different levels of wealth. It is a mix of people that is not restricted and includes tradespeople according to Tate but is not limited to them. "Rainsborough believes that the idea of including the poor in politics requires everyone to have the right to vote and be represented equally. Commissary Ireton, a member of the army, and Rainsborough's main discussion partner during the Putney Debates, quickly understands the danger to property rights posed by this political idea. If everyone can vote, then why can't everyone own property too? That's exactly where the logic points to[9], [10].

The history of the word "multitude" is hard to follow because there are few written records of the political views of the people who supported it. Most of the writings from the 1600s in England are mean and critical, written by people who want to harm, belittle, and reject others. The word is almost always used with a mean word in front of it to make it sound even worse: like the lawless crowd, the clueless crowd, the ignorant crowd, and so on. Robert Filmer and Thomas Hobbes, two well-known people, believe that the majority of the people don't have rights and they may not even exist. Filmer believes that claims made by authors like Cardinal Bellarmine, that people have the power to determine the way a society is run, are not true. He argues that this belief is based on scripture, but it is not based on actual historical events. Not everyone had the same power from the beginning, according to him. He believes that the power was given to Adam, and then passed down to all the fathers. "Filmer says there is no such thing as a group of people who have the right to form a community on their own. He thinks it's just a made-up idea that some people believe. Hobbes questions whether the multitude can be a political group. He believes that for the multitude to be political, they need to become united in their will and actions and form a single people. The many must become one, which goes against the idea of having many people. When many people come together as a group, they become a community. Please rewrite this text using simpler words. Please

write this passage using simpler language. In simple words: When the ruler has power, people's rights and demands stop. The ruler then makes demands for everyone under their name. This idea is seen in the political thoughts of Filmer and Hobbes, who were important in 17th century England. They didn't see the people in a positive way, only as a reaction to the ruler. However, the strong reaction from Filmer and Hobbes, filled with fear and hatred, shows how powerful the cause is.

Another way to study how people were governed in 17th-century England is to look at physics. Back then, people believed that the same rules applied to both the physical world and the government. Robert Boyle disagreed with the idea that all substances are made up of the same simple elements. He believed that instead, there are many different tiny particles that are constantly moving and joining together to form different substances. He thought that everything around us is a mix of many different particles and can keep combining with other particles to form new things. Because physical and political bodies follow the same rules, Boyle's physics of unlimited numbers directly implies a confirmation of the political group and its diverse body. Hobbes strongly argues against Boyle because he recognizes the danger[11], [12].

To understand how the physical and political ideas of "the multitude" are connected, we need to go to Holland, across the English Channel. Baruch Spinoza and Boyle both study how things are made up. They don't believe that things are made up of tiny particles. Instead, they think that things are made when smaller pieces come together to make something new. Sometimes when things come together, they break into smaller parts, and other times they come together to make something larger. In Spinoza's politics, the multitude is a diverse and complex group made up of different bodies. It is open to interactions with other bodies and its political power depends on whether these interactions are positive and make it stronger, or negative and make it weaker. This way of including everyone clearly shows that Spinoza's group includes all kinds of people, not just the poorest in society but also those of all ranks and property. Spinoza finally defines the many people as the only ones who can be in charge of democracy.

## CONCLUSION

The crowd and how it relates to poverty and politics, we have learned about a complicated set of ideas that have had a big impact over time. The common belief that many people had, which was expressed by Filmer and Hobbes, highlighted the fear and worry about the possibility of upsetting the existing political and property systems. The word "multitude," often described in a negative way, became a debated idea at that time because it was seen as a danger to the current social rankings. However, even with all the negativity going on, the study has shown a different point of view supported by Baruch Spinoza. He had a detailed understanding of physics that influenced his political beliefs. Spinoza disagreed with the idea of things being made up of tiny particles and instead focused on how many different things together make up a complex body. This went against what most people believed at the time. Spinoza's ideas were open to include everyone, even the poor, regardless of their social status or property. He imagined a broad political identity. Studying the arguments from the 17th century, like the Putney Debates, showed how the multitude was important in both politics and society. Its ability to change current power structures and question the idea that owning property is necessary for political involvement was the main focus of these conversations. Spinoza believed that the best way to run a government is to let the people make decisions. This idea was different from the usual way of having a few people in charge.

**REFERENCES:**

- [1] M. Nyandoro and N. Hatti, "Poverty and the politics of poverty in independent Zimbabwe, 1980-2017," *Soc. Sci. Spectr.*, 2018.
- [2] M. Martiskainen, E. Heiskanen, and G. Speciale, "Community energy initiatives to alleviate fuel poverty: the material politics of Energy Cafés," *Local Environ.*, 2018.
- [3] C. McFarlane, "Fragment urbanism: Politics at the margins of the city," *Environ. Plan. D Soc. Sp.*, 2018.
- [4] V. Lawson and S. Elwood, *Relational poverty politics: Forms, struggles, and possibilities*. 2018.
- [5] A. G. Abdulai, J. N. Bawole, and E. Kojo Sakyi, "Rethinking Persistent Poverty in Northern Ghana: The Primacy of Policy and Politics over Geography," *Polit. Policy*, 2018.
- [6] M. Desmond and A. Travis, "Political Consequences of Survival Strategies among the Urban Poor," *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 2018.
- [7] J. McCarthy and M. Sumarto, "Distributional politics and social protection in Indonesia: Dilemma of layering, nesting and social fit in Jokowi's poverty policy," *J. Southeast Asian Econ.*, 2018.
- [8] C. Tilly, "Poverty and the Politics of Exclusion," in *Collective Violence, Contentious Politics, and Social Change*, 2018.
- [9] R. A. Thomson and P. Froese, "God, Party, and the Poor: How Politics and Religion Interact to Affect Economic Justice Attitudes," *Sociol. Forum*, 2018.
- [10] L. Ashwood, "Rural Conservatism or Anarchism? The Pro-state, Stateless, and Anti-state Positions," *Rural Sociol.*, 2018.
- [11] H. G. Millán Valenzuela, "Trampas de la pobreza municipales en México: ¿economía o política?," *Intersticios Soc.*, 2018.
- [12] K. D. Thornton, "Power Politics and the Representation of Poverty: The Nottingham Community Protection #Givesmart Campaign," *Vis. Cult. Br.*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 4

# PARADOX OF POVERTY: A DYNAMIC FORCE IN MODERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

---

Poonam Singh, Associate Professor  
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
Email Id-poonam.singh@atlasuniversity.edu.in

### ABSTRACT:

The conceptual evolution of the term "multitude" in seventeenth-century England and its continued resonance as a political force challenging the structures of property and order worldwide. This article delves into historical instances, such as peasant wars, colonial rebellions, and maritime circuits, to reveal how the multitude of the poor has consistently posed a threat to established power structures. Drawing on the perspectives of thinkers like Jacques Rancière, the paper argues that politics itself is defined by the struggle between the poor and the rich. It posits the multitude as a diverse and pluralistic force, composed of various social groups, challenging the homogeneity of the party of the rich. The article also examines ideological efforts, especially within Christian theology, to undermine the power of the poor. The study critically analyzes a 1945 lecture by Martin Heidegger, which attempts to mystify and neutralize the concept of poverty. It explores Heidegger's connection between poverty and communism and the thinly veiled fear behind benevolent portrayals of the poor. Additionally, the paper links Heidegger's ontological subordination of the poor to Carl Schmitt's political theology, highlighting their shared aim of containing the power of the multitude.

### KEYWORDS:

Deprivation, Economic Inequality, Paradox, Poverty, Social Justice, Wealth Distribution.

### INTRODUCTION

Over the years, the word "multitude" has been used differently in different parts of the world. In seventeenth-century England, it had a specific political meaning. But everywhere, the idea of a large group of poor people causes fear and challenges the ownership of property. It happened during the peasant wars in the 16th century when Thomas Münzer and the Anabaptists fought against the German princes. Many poor people rebelled against European colonial rulers, such as the Spanish in 1781 and the British in 1857. They fought against the rich and powerful who owned property. Out on the ocean, many people use it for making and selling things, and some people steal from others. This makes us think of the ocean as a dangerous place. This group of people is a threat because there are many of them, and they come from different backgrounds like sailors, servants, soldiers, and pirates, moving around the oceans. The danger is also that this large group of people will weaken property and the rules that go with it. When wealthy and powerful people talk about a dangerous problem in the seas, they aren't just making up stories. They are trying to understand and stop a real and strong political threat. Jacques Rancière finally understands politics in a way that is similar to the ideas debated in the 17th century about many people. Rancière believes that politics is about the conflict between poor and rich people, or more specifically, between those who have no say in how things are run and those who are in charge. Politics happens when people who are not usually considered important, as Rancière says, start to have some influence. The group of people who are usually left out, like the poor, can be seen as the start of a big group, but it's important to remember that it's not the same as the group of rich people. The rich people's party says it represents everyone, but it only represents those who own property.

They're not for everyone, just for wealthy people. The party for the poor isn't just for one group of people, it's for everyone who works in society, no matter their social status or wealth. It includes lots of different people and is open to different ideas and ways of thinking. The large number of poor people poses a threat to the country's wealth and property. It sometimes feels like everyone doesn't like poor people. Rich people often express their dislike in moral ways - as if being poor meant someone is a bad person inside - or sometimes they act like they feel sorry for and want to help poor people. Even people who are not very poor don't like poor people because they see them as a reminder of what they could become. The reason people hate the poor in different ways is because they are afraid. The poor are seen as a threat to property because they don't have money and might even try to steal it. They also have the power to challenge the current system of property ownership. "I want to keep out the bad people, not the good ones," says Adolphe Thiers in a meeting of the French National Assembly in 1950. The large group of people is seen as a threat and should be removed by the law, says Thiers, because it is always moving and difficult to control as a single group. Every time someone feels hatred and fear, it shows how strong the poor are[1], [2].

Throughout history, the poor have been divided and deprived of their ability to act and express themselves. At the same time, there have been many attempts to weaken and cancel out the power of the poor through ideas and beliefs. Many ways of thinking have used Christian beliefs to control people, maybe because Christianity has felt threatened by the poor. In 2006, Pope Benedict XVI wrote a letter called "Deus Caritas EST. In it, he wants to question and challenge the belief that poor people have less value because of what is written in the Bible. He says that it's not realistic for people to share everything in the modern world like the apostles did. He also thinks that Christian communities should not worry about social justice issues and let the government handle them. He wants people to help the poor and suffering by being kind and generous, seeing the poor as needing help rather than being strong themselves. Benedict XVI's operation is not very original. He is the latest follower in a long line of Christian people fighting against the poor.

One example of trying to make the poor feel powerless by confusing them is a short talk from June 1945 by Martin Heidegger called "Poverty". The lecture is very important and has a lot of drama. In March of that year, French soldiers crossed the Rhine. Heidegger and some of his colleagues from the philosophy department at the University of Freiburg went to the Wildenstein castle in the Black Forest to hide. They are still giving lectures there. By the end of June, French soldiers will come to the castle soon. Heidegger knows that the Soviet army is near the Elba River. Vienna has been taken over, and Berlin will also be taken soon. The sentence says that we have focused on spiritual things and became poor to become rich. Heidegger says that he will explain why he chose this sentence. He is looking at a big disaster in history and thinks the sentence is important[3], [4].

Germany and the German people, as he sees them, are mentioned in connection with the rise of communism. He talks about poverty philosophically. Let's start by looking at the ideas in the lecture, even though Heidegger said we won't fully understand them until we see how they relate to the history of the world. Heidegger continues by asking questions about each important word in a sentence, using his usual approach. The answer is simple: he means the German people. What does he mean by "spiritual"? Heidegger's readers won't be surprised by this either: by spiritual he means the essential connection to the existence of human beings. This means that human essence is defined by its relationship to existence. Focusing on spiritual things and the concept of existence, Heidegger is getting ready to study poverty and wealth deeply. He says that poverty is not just about not having things like money and food.



It's more than that. Poverty is not just about not having things, but about being in a state of need. The main part of poverty is about a person's state of being. At this point, Heidegger might end up saying that being poor means having to do things because you have to while being rich means having the freedom to do things because you want to. This idea is too simple and doesn't explain how becoming poor can lead to becoming rich.

Heidegger figures out the puzzle by looking at the origins of German words. He does this a lot. The old German word "fir" means to keep or protect, and allows something to stay in its true form. This is where the word "free" comes from. He says freeing something means protecting its true nature from any limits or necessities. Freedom makes necessity change. It means that necessity is not the opposite of freedom, but rather freedom itself can change into necessity. This is how Heidegger can make it work. We don't have what we lack, but it's what we lack that controls us. We understand this when we focus on the spiritual and our connection to being human. Even when we don't have everything we want, we still have a connection to freedom and being. When people embrace this connection, they become truly poor. But this poverty actually leads to richness because it brings a new kind of freedom. This kind of freedom protects our true essence. Being poor is being rich, according to Heidegger.

People who don't know a lot about Heidegger's philosophy might wonder why he's making things so complicated by mixing up the difference between being poor and being rich. Heidegger says the reason for this is because of the important and historical situation he's in, like the possible defeat of the Nazis and the Soviet troops getting closer. Keep in mind that in other parts of his work, Heidegger shows that he is against communism using philosophical ideas. Ten years ago, in his *Introduction to Metaphysics*, he said that from a philosophical view, the United States and the Soviet Union are working together on advanced technology projects. These are people who don't focus only on spiritual things, according to him. Why did Heidegger want to study poverty in June 1945? Because he thinks being poor is a key part of communism, and he wants to fight against communism on its own terms. Certainly, Heidegger's struggle against communism is clear in the last part of the lecture. Poor people don't hate the rich, as some people think communism says. The true meaning of being poor can only be understood from a spiritual point of view that sees the connection between human nature and existence [5], [6].

## DISCUSSION

Heidegger says that poverty is connected to communism. But we should also remember that sometimes people use hating the poor as a way to hide their racism. In Heidegger's situation, we can think about how the authoritarian personality in Nazi Germany might be connected to anti-Semitism, as Adorno suggested. In the Americas, hating poor people often shows hidden or misplaced racism. Poverty and race are closely connected in the Americas, leading to discrimination and dislike towards black and darker-skinned people. "In this country, people of different races and social classes have suffered together through difficult and shameful times." - Henry Louis Gates Jr. Cornell West and another person write about the United States in a way that is hard to tell them apart. When people hate poor people, they often have fear and hate for people of different races.

Another link connects Heidegger's idea of the poor being less important to Carl Schmitt's belief in sovereign power. This connection might seem strange because Heidegger says metaphysics is over and doesn't think being is a higher power. This is similar to Schmitt's view on political power. But they both also don't like the idea of power that comes from within. Schmitt and Heidegger both supported the Nazi regime. They believed in the power of one leader and looked down on the poor and their ability to make decisions. We should not

stop ourselves from learning from thinkers who have old-fashioned ideas. Many left-leaning scholars have used the work of Schmitt and Heidegger a lot lately. But we should always remember that they have old-fashioned ideas, and it shows in their work. Heidegger and Schmitt don't question it, instead they make it seem mysterious and try to control it. It's about how poor people can change the established reality and make things happen. This could be about the connection between people and existence. But it also involves physical actions and materials. We want to study the strong influence of the poor, which is important in an idea of communism that Heidegger and Schmitt wouldn't understand.

### **Lack of money and control**

During the big changes in the 1600s and 1700s, the idea of having many people in power disappeared from how we talk about politics and laws. Because of this, the idea of a republic became seen as only something to protect property. Property is important for both the country and the people, but it often leaves out the poor.

This means that Hobbes believed in a clear distinction between the common people and the ruler. He said that the ruler represents the unified common people and is therefore the ruler. In simple terms, he is saying that the difference is only about shapes. The word "people" means one, while "multitude" means many. This connects to a discussion about how things move, like bodies, and what it means for politics. At this stage, we should think about what makes people united according to Hobbes. In the 17th century, "the people" were often thought of as "freeholders," who owned enough property to be able to vote for members of parliament. Property is what keeps these people united and without it, there would be a lot of disagreements. Hobbes explains in *Behemoth* how property keeps the poor away from the rest of the people. Merchants only care about making a lot of money by buying and selling things and paying low wages to poor workers. The poor would be better off working in a prison than doing the work they do. Hobbes believes that the poor not having property is not just a random thing, but something that always happens and helps the rich people keep and get more property. The poor people are very important for a country and its economy[7], [8].

Machiavelli talks about how the poor people resist and fight against the rich. He says that if we all were naked, we would all look the same. And if we wore the rich people's clothes and they wore ours, we would switch roles and they would look bad and we would look good because only being poor or rich makes us different. The poor shouldn't feel bad for fighting back with violence because when you're hungry or scared of going to jail, you shouldn't also have to worry about going to hell. The person speaking says that even if you're loyal and good, you can still be poor. The time is now to not only get rid of our problems but also become better than them. We should be stronger than our problems so that they are more worried about us than we are about them. This passage is mainly about how poverty is not a natural part of being human. In other writings, Machiavelli talks about how humans are weak and poor. He feels sad about how life can be cruel and unfeeling. He also talks about how all animals are born with everything they need. "Man is born without any protection like fur or scales to make a shield. This idea comes from old ways of thinking, but Machiavelli doesn't agree with it. His way of thinking needs to be happy and rebellious, not just realistic, like the *ciompi*, who fought against property and its rules.

Machiavelli talks about a different way of thinking about politics. He says that the poor are not just leftovers from when powerful people took control of money, or just stuck in bad jobs, but also a group of people who stand up against being taken advantage of in a society that still has things in common, like how we live and the things we have. The poor are in a strange position where they are both left out and part of society. This shows a lot of social problems

like the gap between rich and poor, and the differences in power and equality. What Machiavelli shows is that these social problems are always changing and are fueled by conflict and defiance. The main idea of his stories and political studies is how anger can lead to riots and social problems. This can then cause a large group of people who are not wealthy but still contribute to society to rebel. Human beings are never just bare and helpless, but always have both a history of suffering and the ability to create and rebel[9], [10].

Spinoza continues the ideas of Machiavelli and points out the physical parts of this power. He thinks that our bodies show poverty and needs, but they also hold a power that we don't fully understand yet. He connects poverty and power in a way that aims to create a community. When he talks about the lack of knowledge in children or the weakness of our bodies, he sees these as starting points for change. He believes that by coming together and showing love, we can overcome these weaknesses. He believes in finding common ground in knowledge, ethics, and politics to create a powerful community. Spinoza believes that the people coming together to fight against poverty and create wealth is the main force that makes democracy possible.

Marx says that the power of the poor is important for social rebellion and Spinoza says that the power of many people is needed for democracy. Marx starts by talking about poverty and how it began with capitalism. He says that this type of poverty started a long time ago through various processes. When workers are no longer connected to the land or other resources, they are very free: free because they are not forced to work for someone else, and free because they don't have any belongings or rights to use the land. The proletariat is made up of many poor people. "Marx says that when a person doesn't have the tools to work and the things they need to live, they are extremely poor. The worker just becomes a symbol of their ability to work. " In simple words, he is saying that all workers are like poor people because the work they do doesn't get them much in return. But being naked and poor is just one part of the problem. Similar to Machiavelli and Spinoza, Marx connects the poor workers' lack of money to their ability to have influence because their hard work is important for the society's wealth in a capitalist system. Living labor is both extremely poor and has the potential to do many things. Marx thinks that when poor people have power, it is a big danger to private property. He believes this is at the core of the problem.

Some people might disagree with us because they think we use complicated terms like poverty and multitude that make it hard to understand Marxist ideas like the difference between poverty before capitalism and poverty under capitalism. This way, we go against Marx's way of thinking and confuse the social class aspect of his analysis. Even our critics can't say that utopian socialists don't understand Marx's analysis of exploitation. We believe our approach is just as focused on the real world as traditional Marxist ideas. We look at how labor and exploitation have changed, and this changes how we see the working class. One big change is that exploitation is not about making things anymore, it's only about controlling others. This means that people are being forced to be more flexible and move around for work, which is making life harder for both workers and the poor. The poor used to be only at the beginning or edges of business, but now they are more and more in the middle of it. This means that the poor are becoming a big part of the plan to change things for the better [11], [12].

## CONCLUSION

The complex way poverty affects political ideas as they change over time. By looking at history and different people's ideas, this study shows that poverty is not just about not having things. It says that poverty can create change in society and politics. Throughout history, it's

clear that the poor have always been a danger to those in power. This has been true in many different times and places. From the 16th-century peasant wars to rebellions in colonies and trade routes, the paper shows that poor people have consistently fought against the government and wealthy landowners. The large group of people with different backgrounds and beliefs disrupts the idea that the rich control everything. This study shows how important it is to acknowledge the group's power in politics. The study of Martin Heidegger's 1945 speech tries to make the idea of being poor seem mysterious and not important, and connects it to communism. It also shows that people are secretly afraid of poor people, even if they act like they want to help them. The link between Heidegger's belief that the poor are less important and Carl Schmitt's ideas about politics and religion show how some ideas try to control the influence of the majority.

#### REFERENCES:

- [1] B. H. Odalonu, "Paradox of Poverty in the Midst of Abundant Resources: The Politics of Oil Resources and Renewed Insurgency in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria," *Res. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.
- [2] A. Tarekegn and T. Molla, "The Paradox of Poverty Reduction in Ethiopia: Are Microfinance Institutions Really Pro-poor?," *Asian J. Econ. Bus. Account.*, 2018.
- [3] Z. Momoh and P. J. Attah, "Corruption and the paradox of poverty in Nigeria," *Glob. J. Applied, Manag. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.
- [4] R. D. Wahyunengseh, S. Hastjarjo, and D. G. Suharto, "Social Media and Poverty: Paradoxes of Communicating Poverty Issues on Social Media," *Bisnis Birokrasi J.*, 2018.
- [5] R. Sackville, "Law and poverty: A paradox," *Univ. N. S. W. Law J.*, 2018.
- [6] H. Kim and B. Drake, "Child maltreatment risk as a function of poverty and race/ethnicity in the USA," *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, 2018.
- [7] S. Danziger and C. Wimer, "The War on Poverty," in *Inequality in the 21st Century: A Reader*, 2018.
- [8] S. Datzberger, "Why education is not helping the poor. Findings from Uganda," *World Dev.*, 2018.
- [9] M. Vázquez-Maguirre and L. Portales, "Profits and purpose: Organizational tensions in indigenous social enterprises," *Intang. Cap.*, 2018.
- [10] B. G. Bidemi, "Cyberspace Abuse and the Proliferation of Poverty in Nigeria: Investigating the Paradox of Social-Economic Development," *J. Pan African Stud.*, 2018.
- [11] A. M. Alarcón, G. Marcela Castro, D. Paula Astudillo, and S. Yolanda Nahuelcheo, "The paradox between culture and reality: The challenge of raising mapuche boys and girls in indigenous communities in Chile," *Chungara*, 2018.
- [12] R. D. Huret, "The Poverty Paradox," in *The Experts' War on Poverty*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 5

### POWER AND RESISTANCE WITHIN MODERNITY: AN ANALYSIS

Jaimine Vaishnav, Assistant Professor  
 Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
 Email Id-jaimine.vaishnav@atlasuniversity.edu.in

#### ABSTRACT:

The intricate dynamics of power and resistance as fundamental elements in shaping the modern socio-political landscape. Tracing the evolution of these concepts through historical and theoretical lenses, the paper delves into the ways power operates within modern societies and how various forms of resistance emerge in response. The study begins by examining the multifaceted manifestations of power structures within modernity, encompassing political, economic, and social dimensions. Drawing on historical examples and theoretical frameworks, it illuminates the complexities of power relations and their impact on individuals and communities. The analysis extends beyond traditional notions of authority, emphasizing the distributed and often subtle nature of power within contemporary contexts. In parallel, the paper explores the concept of resistance as a dynamic force that emerges in response to perceived injustices and imbalances of power. It delves into historical instances of resistance movements, ranging from grassroots activism to organized political struggles, shedding light on the diverse strategies employed by individuals and groups challenging established power structures.

#### KEYWORDS:

Authority, Capitalism, Colonialism, Counter power, Domination, Liberation.

#### INTRODUCTION

To understand Michel Foucault's idea of biopower, we need to look at it in the bigger theory of power he talks about in the late 1970s, in *Discipline and Punish* and the first volume of *The History of Sexuality*. Foucault's idea of power is always two-sided. He focuses a lot on how rules, authority structures, and networks of power work. He believes that power doesn't just control people, but also creates them. He also talks about a different idea of power that he can't quite explain. He usually uses the word "resistance", but it doesn't fully express what he means. Resistance, as most people understand it, is too connected to and controlled by the power it tries to fight against. You could tell Foucault about the idea of "counter-power" from Marxism, but that term suggests a second power that is similar to the one it is against. We think that the way power works in these places is best described as a different way of creating personal identity. This way not only goes against power but also tries to be independent from it. This idea of power having two sides helps us understand Foucault's efforts to create the idea of biopower. Here, Foucault is mainly concerned with how power controls life, including how governments manage people's health and reproduction. However, there is always a small force that wants to keep living and not give up, another power that tries to find a different way to exist. The idea of resistance shows us the difference between these two powers: the control over our lives that we fight against is not the same as the power of life that we use to defend and seek our freedom. To show this difference between the two "powers of life," we use the words biopower and biopolitics. Biopower is the power over life, and biopolitics is the power of life to resist and create a different way of being [1], [2].

Most people who study Foucault do not fully understand that biopolitics has two sides. One way of thinking about biopolitics looks at how populations are controlled and managed. This means using statistics to organize people into groups based on their similarities. The groups become clearer when individual differences are ignored and people are seen as the same. This

interpretation is faithful to the original text, but it only gives us a general idea of Foucault and biopolitics. It doesn't offer any real solutions or ways to resist the power it describes[3], [4].

None of these explanations show what we think is the most important idea in Foucault's biopolitics. Our reading shows that biopolitics is not just about the productive abilities of life, like creating emotions and languages through social cooperation and the interaction of bodies and desires. It also shows that biopolitics creates new ways for people to relate to themselves and others. It presents these new ways as both resistance and de-subjectification. If we focus too much on studying Foucault's texts, we might not see the main idea: he is not only describing how power works on people, but also how it can create different kinds of people. This shows that there are different types of power. Foucault says that in order for power to work, people need to have freedom and the ability to resist. He defines power as controlling what other people do, and this includes the idea of freedom. Power is only used on people who are free, and only to the extent that they are free. The power dynamic is driven by stubbornness and a refusal to compromise. Bio politics is seen as a collection of events related to freedom.

Bio politics is different from biopower because it's like something happens that interrupts the normal system. This interruption comes from the unyielding desire for freedom. The biopolitical event happens from the outside and interrupts history and the current order. It's not just negative, it can also be seen as a new idea that comes from within. Foucault understands that language can be creative. He believed that spoken language can change and disturb the rules of written language. He sees this as a new way of using language. In the context of people's lives, we must understand the event as an act of freedom, not just in terms of language and knowledge, but also in terms of human nature and existence. In this situation, the event marked by the new way of speaking goes beyond just language. It affects how people see themselves and live their lives. It creates a new way of thinking about ourselves. This new way of thinking is the source of new ideas and also what determines what is true. A materialist teleology is an idea about history that comes from the desires of people and their desire for freedom. This idea is connected with the belief in eternal return from Nietzsche. The event, driven by the will to power, shows the truth of the eternal. The event and the individual who drives it create and give meaning to history, instead of it being a linear progression with definite causes. Understanding how the event is connected to the truth helps we ignore the accusation of relativism that people often make against Foucault's biopolitics. Understanding biopolitics as an event helps us see life as something made up of our actions and also understand time in a strategic way[5], [6].

Foucault's idea of the event is different from Alain Badiou's idea. Badiou has helped contemporary philosophy by making the event the main focus, saying it is where the truth lies. The event, with its many different parts, takes away the need for just judging truths. Badiou and Foucault have different focus on when they pay attention to the event. In Badiou's ideas, an important happening like the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, the French Revolution, or the Chinese Cultural Revolution becomes valuable and meaningful after it happens. He focuses on the ways that help understand and give importance to past events, and the consistent procedures that relate to it. Foucault focuses on how events are made and how they create more events, while looking forward instead of backwards. The event is part of existence and the plans that go through it. What Badiou doesn't understand is the connection between freedom and power that Foucault talks about within the event. Looking back at the event doesn't help us understand why it happened. Insurrectional activity needs to be part of historical processes to create revolutionary events and break away from the dominant political beliefs. Without understanding how events are created, we can only

believe in them without really understanding them. This is similar to the idea of believing in something even if it seems absurd.

The event of making life as a form of resistance, creativity, and freedom brings us back to the idea of the multitude as a political strategy. Think about how Luciano Bolis, an Italian anti-fascist fighter, explains in his memoir the connection between grains of sand and the strength of a large group of people. Bolis knows that his sacrifice is small compared to all the suffering people are going through. But he believes it's important for the survivors to tell the stories of these sacrifices, because not everyone understands the cost of our freedom and the values it represents. The word "partisan" is often misunderstood and rejected, but it represents blood, terror, and hope. Biopolitics is how people's personal beliefs and history are influenced by a group's strategy, events, and resistance. It's also how political decisions affect people's bodies in times of conflict. Gilles Deleuze sees the creation of life by governments in a similar way to being partisan, and he is sad that we have lost or are being controlled by the world. If you believe in the world, you make things happen that are hard to control, and you create new environments, even if they are small. We need to see how much we can control ourselves or if we let others control us in everything we do. Challenges can change the world and create something new. They can also be hard to control.

One example of how bodies have power in society is from Meister Eckhart's sermon "Jesus Entered. It says that if a person never has children, they will never create anything new. In order for him to be successful, he must have a wife. The word "wife" is the best way to describe a good person, even better than the word "virgin". It is good for a person to have God inside them, and when they do, they are like a virgin. It's better for God to become fruitful in a person because the only way to thank God for his gift is for that person to be fruitful. When a person gives thanks, it's like giving birth and returning Jesus to God's heart[7], [8].

Eckhart wants us to think about how effective the biopolitical event is, but it comes with a lot of problems. To understand this, we need to know about feminist theories from many years ago, starting with Simone de Beauvoir's ideas about how women are controlled by men and religious scholars who talk about how Christian beliefs affect women. Finally, we need to learn about political theories that show how women are seen as chaotic and dangerous in European politics. As we remove the parts of society that favor men and straight people, we see a different image from Eckhart's writing. This new image is not typical and is considered queer. It represents a surge in productivity when a man becomes more like a woman. This idea is similar to the delusions of President Schreber, who believed he was turning into a woman so he could have a child with God and start a new type of people. Surprisingly, people in Eckhart are most productive when they change genders. The biopolitical event is always a subversive event that breaks the norm and reveals the connection between power and freedom. It creates an alternative way of thinking about ourselves. The biopolitical event goes against all types of deep philosophical ideas or abstract thinking. Existence is created through experiences. It's worth noting that the idea of the bio-political event is similar to American Pragmatism. Charles Peirce wrote that we think nature is the same because we see it as we want to. Pragmatists believe that when it comes to the way our bodies work, it's not just about biology, but also about how we act. They show that our desires are influenced by natural forces too.

## DISCUSSION

The modern world is always divided in two. Before we think about it using logic, Enlightenment, the change from old ways, not being religious, etc. , we need to see modernity

as a relationship of power: one group having control and others fighting for freedom. This idea goes against the common belief that modern times started in Europe and opposed the older ways in the colonies, like their religious or primitive customs. Walter Mignolo says that there can't be modernity without colonialism because colonialism is a part of modernity. It's a big part because it shows the unequal power in modernity. Modern times are not just in Europe or the colonies but in the power dynamic between the two. Resistance to colonial domination is not separate from modernity, but part of it. It is a power struggle within the system.

Historians want to emphasize that European expansion in the Americas, Asia, and Africa should be seen as colonial encounters, not just conquests. They believe that the idea of antimodernity being within modernity is important to consider in this context. The idea of conquest highlights the violent and cruel nature of European expansion, but it makes it seem like the people being colonized didn't do anything about it. Furthermore, it means that the old civilization was either completely destroyed or replaced by the colonizer's culture, or it was kept separate from the colonial world. This traditional view shows how people in colonial India were seen as being similar to the liberal and capitalist society in Britain during the 1800s, or as still holding onto an older, non-capitalist culture. Modernity is like a connection between two things, where one is stronger than the other. Both sides change in this relationship. The idea of encounter shows the power difference and the changes that happen when one side tries to resist the other[9], [10].

Looking at how different countries met and interacted in history, historians record two important things: before being colonized, many civilizations were highly advanced, wealthy, complicated, and sophisticated; and the things the colonized people contributed to what we call modern society are significant but not often recognized. This view helps to understand the differences between the old and the new, the wild and the civilized. More importantly, the meetings of modern times show that things are always changing and affecting each other.

Many years before the Spanish came to central Mexico, the Nahua people built advanced cities called *altepetl* that were similar in size to cities in the Mediterranean. An *altepetl* is like a big city that is organized in a structured way. People in different parts of the city take turns doing different jobs and paying taxes to the leader. After Cuauhtémoc gave up to Cortés in 1521, the *altepetl* was not just replaced by European city forms through the long process of Hispanization. But it also did not remain the same. The early Spanish settlements and how they were organized, like the *encomienda* and Indian municipalities, were based on existing native communities. The nahua civilization and the Spanish both changed as a result of their interactions. Instead of just buildings and rules in cities, things like music, language, and other cultural stuff are being mixed together and shared back and forth across the Atlantic Ocean, changing both places. The Iroquois created a system to govern six nations before the United States was formed. It had rules about how power was divided, and it influenced the United States' government. a set of rules for how a country is run and how its laws are made. In the 1700s, people in the United States, like Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, talked a lot about and liked the way the Iroquois people had their government set up. Native Americans helped European settlers by teaching them how to plant crops and survive the cold winters. This has become part of the national story of the United States. Political systems are often thought to only come from Europe. The examples are meant to show how different cultures mix and change when they meet modern ways of living.

The issue with these examples is that they don't show how violent and unequal modern society can be. The powerful forces of modern times don't just face differences, they also face opposition. What the colonial history mainly did, as Ranajit Guha explains, is to make it seem



like resistance against British rule in India didn't really happen. We need to do something about this. The belief that only Europeans created modern society is crazy. It ignores the contributions of other parts of the world that were controlled by Europe. Instead of thinking of it as holding back feelings, it's like ignoring something on purpose in psychology. Psychologists say that when we repress something, it stays deep inside us, but when we foreclose it, we push it away so that our mind acts like it never happened. So, when something that was hidden comes back to the neurotic person, it feels like it's coming from inside them. But for the psychotic person, something that was ignored feels like it's coming from outside and seems scary. This case shows that non-European people and civilizations have contributed to modern culture and society. It also shows that there have been many resistances against modernity, which is dangerous for its dominant self-conception. Lumping Europe as the sole source of modern innovation is not accurate. Even though people try really hard to get rid of anyone who doesn't follow modern ways, there are still some people who resist and don't want to change[11], [12].

Saying that the things against modern life are part of modern life too, on the same ground, doesn't mean that the modern world is all the same. Geographers are unhappy because when people talk about space, they usually don't talk about the real differences that exist in different places. They think that discussions about post colonialism and globalization are not accurate because they don't show the real differences in spaces. The center-periphery model shows how the powerful center and less powerful peripheries are connected and depend on each other. The periphery is made to be less developed to support the center's growth. These modern areas get mixed up when they think resistance comes from outside of those in power. Many times people see Europe or "the West" as all the same and powerful, forgetting about the many different fights for freedom and equality that have happened there over the years. Many studies don't consider the ways in which countries outside of Europe are controlled and dominated, viewing them only as being influenced by European control. This mistake can't be fixed just by finding more central and peripheral areas within Europe and within each subordinated country. To understand modern times, we need to stop thinking that dominating and resisting are separate things. Instead, we need to realize that resisting is a part of modern life, not something from the past. The places we live in are more complicated than just cities versus countryside, Europe versus the rest of the world, or the richer countries versus the poorer countries.

Defining modernity as a power relationship makes it difficult to see modernity as something that is still in progress. If people thought modernity was all about fighting against barbarism and irrationality, then trying to finish modernity could be seen as a good thing. Jürgen Habermas and other social democratic theorists we talked about before believe in this idea. When we see modernity as a way of controlling others, finishing modernity just means keeping the same control and power over others. Having more modern things or being more modern overall won't fix our problems. Instead, we need to look at the things that are against modern ideas, like the resistance to modern control.

### **Slave Property in the Modern Republic**

The history of modern times and the history of republicanism are linked together so much that it's hard to tell them apart sometimes. In the 17th and 18th centuries, there were many ideas about what a republic should be, but only one, the republic of property, became the most popular. This idea worked well with modern times because property is a type of power that is important in modern society. One good way to study how republics, property, and modernity are connected is to look at the history of modern slavery. Slavery is very bad for the country, even though it was a big part of many government systems in Europe and the

Americas during the 18th and 19th centuries. In the United States, owning slaves and the work they do are important parts of the country and its economy. In France and England, even though there aren't as many slaves as in other places, slavery and the slave trade are really important for the economy, politics, and colonial leadership. Slavery is deeply connected to the republic, even though it goes against the ideas of freedom and modernity. Why does it continue to exist in modern republics for so long and play such a big role?

Slavery is a problem for the country because it goes against its main beliefs of fairness and freedom. Other groups like women and people without property don't have the same political rights and equality in republican systems. But the most extreme contradiction is the inequality and lack of freedom for slaves. Even though many historical texts talk about slavery as the opposite of freedom and equality in republican societies, they usually only talk about ancient slavery and ignore the black slavery happening in their own time in the Americas, which helps their own societies. This closed-minded thinking is part of a plan to make slaves vanish or, if they can't be ignored, to treat them as belonging to an earlier time and not part of the present world and modern society.

Slavery is a problem for the country because it goes against the idea of everyone being able to work freely for a fair wage. The capitalist idea also uses slavery as a bad thing: freedom is when a worker can sell their labor for a wage. Workers can be brainwashed to believe in the system of owning property, unlike slaves, because they have the ability to work and earn wages. Also, because chattel slavery blurs the line between work and ownership, slaves are the greatest contradiction in a society based on property. At this point, either freedom or property can be protected, but not both. Once again, republican and capitalist ideas try to make it seem like there are no more slaves, or that they are just leftovers from old economic times, which money will get rid of in the end.

It's not easy to make slaves disappear because it's not just about ideas, but also about money and things. The connection between slavery and paid work is hard to separate in this story. If we only look at the countries in Western Europe, like many history books do, it may seem like capitalist production and slave production are not connected. But in reality, the wealth from the slave trade and production played a big role in helping industrial capital emerge in Europe. Also, many historians have observed that the slave plantation system tests and improves how things are made, how work is divided, and the rules and punishments the industrial factories will later use. From this point of view, it seems like slavery and capitalism happened one after the other. It's like modern businesses and ways of life didn't like slavery and eventually stopped it.

When we look at the bigger picture, we can see that slavery was a big part of making money through capitalism in the 1700s and 1800s. Slavery was involved in the movement of people, money, and goods across the world. Marx says that slavery of Black people in Surinam, Brazil and southern North America is very important for our industry today. He says there would be no cotton or modern factories without it. Slavery made the colonies important, and the colonies helped create global trade, which is needed for big industries. Slaves and workers both have important jobs in the global capitalist system. The slaves in Jamaica, Recife, and Alabama are just as important to England and France's economies as the workers in Birmingham, Boston, and Paris. Instead of thinking that capitalism always destroys slavery, we need to understand that in the 18th and 19th centuries, they actually helped each other. They were kept separate, with capitalism in the East and slavery in the West. However, none of this understands the racial system that is at the core of modern slavery. Like how owning other people is seen as wrong, racism is also seen as a problem. People think that racism is not a part of modern society and that it will go away as society improves.

Understanding how black slavery is connected to the way the country is run helps us see racism today as more than just an idea. It's also a system of rules and ways of doing things that give power to some people over others. And it's not just about slavery, it goes much further than that. The continued existence of racial hierarchies in modern times, not just in slavery but also in many other forms, shows that race is closely tied to modern society. This means that modernity and race are strongly linked. Without colonialism, there would be no modernity, and race also plays a significant role. The three things work together as a complex - modernity, coloniality, racism - and they all need each other to exist.

### CONCLUSION

Power and resistance in modern times show how they interact and influence the way society and politics work together. Power has different parts like politics, money, and society. It has a big impact on people and groups. This study has shown how power works in complex ways, sometimes going beyond traditional structures to appear in different forms. It used historical analysis and theories to do this. At the same time, studying how people resist unfair treatment has shown that they use many different ways to fight back. From regular people standing up for what they believe into groups working together to change politics, resistance is a strong force that can shake up the way things are run by those in power. The give-and-take relationship between power and resistance shows that when people resist, they not only challenge the power that exists but also help change it. The ideas from important thinkers like Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci have helped us better understand how power works and how people resist it. Advances in technology and increased globalization make this situation more complicated. They create new opportunities for powerful groups to gain more control, but they also make it easier for people to resist and fight back.

### REFERENCES:

- [1] E. Scheibelhofer, "Shifting migration aspirations in second modernity," *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.*, 2018.
- [2] M. Ossewaarde, "'Crises of Modernity' Discourses and the Rise of Financial Technologies in a Contested Mechanized World," *Philos. Technol.*, 2018.
- [3] I. D. Makkelo, "Sejarah Perkotaan: Sebuah Tinjauan Historiografis Dan Tematis," *Lensa Budaya J. Ilm. Ilmu-Ilmu Budaya*, 2018.
- [4] M. Kissel and A. Fuentes, "'Behavioral modernity' as a process, not an event, in the human niche," *Time Mind*, 2018.
- [5] S. Strunz and B. Bartkowski, "Degrowth, the project of modernity, and liberal democracy," *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2018.
- [6] V. Martianov, "Revolution and modernity," *Chang. Soc. Personal.*, 2018.
- [7] *Modernity and Technology*. 2002.
- [8] E. Turner, "Margarine, mystery and modernity: margarine and class in literary texts (1880–1945)," *Food, Cult. Soc.*, 2018.
- [9] N. M. Schöneck, "Europeans' work and life – out of balance? An empirical test of assumptions from the 'acceleration debate,'" *Time Soc.*, 2018.
- [10] G. Thomson, "The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America," *Hisp. Am. Hist. Rev.*, 2018.

- [11] J. K. Luna, "Getting out of the dirt: racialized modernity and environmental inequality in the cotton sector of Burkina Faso," *Environ. Sociol.*, 2018.
- [12] L. Zheng, X. He, L. Cao, and H. Xu, "Making Modernity in China: Employment and Entrepreneurship among the New Generation of Peasant Workers," *Int. J. Japanese Sociol.*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 6

### EXAMINING THE COLONIALIST OF BIOWEALTH: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

Puneet Tulsiyan, Associate Professor  
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
Email Id-puneet.tulsiyan@atlasuniversity.edu.in

#### ABSTRACT:

The intersection of colonialism and biopower, offers a critical analysis of the historical and contemporary dynamics that shape the governance of life within colonial contexts. This study delves into how colonial powers have employed biopower, as conceptualized by Michel Foucault, to control and regulate populations, often intersecting with racial, cultural, and geopolitical dimensions. By examining specific case studies and theoretical frameworks, the abstract explores the impact of colonialist biopower on individuals, communities, and ecosystems, shedding light on the intricate relationships between colonial histories, biopolitical strategies, and resistance movements. The complexities of these power dynamics are unpacked to provide a nuanced understanding of the entanglements between colonialism and biopower, contributing to broader conversations about decolonization, social justice, and the reimagining of power relations in contemporary and historical contexts.

#### KEYWORDS:

Bio politics, Colonialism, Governance, Imperialism, Indigenous.

#### INTRODUCTION

Slavery shows how the country's belief in owning property can lead to ignoring or denying the painful truth of slavery. This is why the Haitian Revolution is often overlooked in history, even though it better reflects the idea of equality and freedom for all people. However, Haiti is rarely mentioned in history books about the Age of Revolution. The Haitian Revolution was complicated and had a lot of ups and downs, but it was the first modern revolution to fight against slavery. This makes it the first real modern revolution. Stating that, though, would only consider the republic and modernity based on their ideas, not their actual structures and systems. The Haitian Revolution emphasizes the first (ideas) but doesn't support the second (systems). Freeing slaves goes against the rule of owning property, and making laws against racial division weakens the system that separates people based on race. Maybe it's not a surprise that most people in Europe and North America at that time couldn't believe the Haitian Revolution happened. It needs to be kept quiet or removed because it shows a big problem between republicanism and modernity[1], [2].

Understanding how slavery is connected to the modern republic shows us how powerful slaves were and how they resisted. When people think of a slave as a general idea, they see someone who has no freedom and is completely controlled by someone else. Slaves are a good example to show that power can be exercised over people who are not free, which goes against what Foucault claimed earlier. Foucault believed that if slaves were completely controlled, no one would have power over them. It may seem confusing to say that slaves are free. Foucault is saying that everyone has some freedom, even if it's not a lot, which helps them resist control. To say that power is only used on "free subjects" means that power is only used on subjects who resist, who show their freedom before power is applied. Slaves are the most free when they resist being controlled by their master, not just when they are out of reach of the master's punishment from evening to morning. Baruch Spinoza believes that no one can give up all their rights and power to someone else, and still be a human being. And

there will never be a ruler with unlimited power. Slave resistance shows how poor people can challenge those in power to try to be free. In history, this shows how important slave revolts, rebellions, and escapes were. Slavery was ended not by people's good beliefs in freedom and equality, as if it was just an old-fashioned leftover from the past, or by the business forces as if it was a form of work that took a long time for businesses to completely get rid of. The slaves themselves worked to end slavery by resisting it, and making it no longer a viable form of government or profitable way to produce goods. W is a letter in the English alphabet. "Rewrite this text more simply. Du Bois says that slaves played a big role in freeing themselves during the Civil War in the United States. To hurt the economy of the plantation system and stop the Confederate Army from getting food and supplies, the slaves started a general strike that involved around 500,000 people. This helped weaken the Confederate fighters. Du Bois suggests a big strike to show how black slaves have always resisted and played a big part in their freedom and world history. He believes that the actions of black slaves forced the world to consider the idea of a fair and equal democracy for people of all races. The resistance and revolts of slaves show the conflict between the property-based society and the modern world[3], [4].

Similar things happened during the second wave of servitude and slavery in Eastern Europe. This was from the 1600s when feudal relations were restored after religious wars, to the time when nation-states were formed. Both Marx and Max Weber study history because it shows how workers in Eastern Europe were able to fight against the capitalist mode of production. It also shows that even before industrialization, the freedom of labor power was a threat to capitalism. These types of servitude are eventually ended, partly because peasants are leaving to go live in the big cities of Western Europe. The exodus changed the way servants and lords felt towards each other. Now, the working class and the capitalist class conflict. The main idea is that even when people are being controlled, they still can fight back. This fighting back is important in understanding how history has changed over time.

This reflection shows that even though slaves are treated like they aren't important, they still fight back and show that they are still alive in their actions. People cannot be reduced to just surviving if we mean that they have no freedom or ability to fight back. Humans are "vulnerable" in the way we talked about before feeling angry, strong, and optimistic. This brings us back to talking about modernity itself, which has both hierarchy and conflict. Slave resistance goes against the power structure of modern society, not because it opposes the idea of freedom and equality, but because it challenges the unequal relationships that are central to modern power. Antimodernity is a part of modernity and cannot be separated from it.

## DISCUSSION

The control of anti-modern ideas is maintained by the power of modern society. This control is not only through external forces like slavery and capitalism's laws, but also through making people believe in modern ways. The tools and methods of modernity-coloniality racism affect and control groups of people who are not in power. The widespread influence of modern power is connected to the origin of anti-modern ideas inside us. Some important studies in postcolonial studies focus on showing how colonial power affects everything, using different ways of showing and thinking. Edward Said looked at how people from the West wrote about and portrayed people from the East. He found that these writings didn't just justify the power imbalance between the two groups, but also influenced the way the people from the East saw themselves. GayatriSpivak says that oppressed people are not able to express themselves because those in power control how they are represented. The writer is talking about the conflict over the practice of sati where widows were forced to die on their husband's funeral pyre in colonial India. Spivak argues that widows were in a very bad position and were being

silenced in two ways. The British said they were saving Indian women from Indian men, and the traditional view was that the women wanted to die. These ideas completely took over the colonial scene and made it impossible for the women to speak up. These studies show how colonialism is carried out and kept going not only through violence, but also through people agreeing with the colonial ways of thinking and knowledge that spread throughout society[5], [6].

Religious organizations have a lot of power in controlling people's beliefs and ideas. All the big religions are involved in this - Islam, Hinduism, and Confucianism have a role, and now the growing Christian evangelical and Pentecostal churches in Africa and Latin America are very important. However the Catholic Church should be given a special position because of its long history and close connection to European conquest and colonization. When Spain took over and settled in America, the Catholic friars and priests worked with the soldiers and leaders of the Spanish government. The church's job was not just to convert the native people to Christianity, but also to create beliefs about the nature and abilities of the native populations. These beliefs questioned whether the native people could think, become Christian, and even be considered human. The Catholic Church has held onto racist and colonialist ideas for a long time. Even Pope Benedict XVI repeated them during a visit to Brazil in 2007. He said that the people in the Americas were waiting for Christ to save them. "They got the Holy Spirit, who came to make their beliefs better, making them pure and helping them grow in their faith, following the teachings of the Gospel. The introduction of Jesus and his teachings did not push away the cultures of the people who lived in the Americas before Columbus arrived, nor did it force them to adopt a new culture. The pope says that the way people think and believe is something they feel inside, not something forced on them from outside.

It is very important to examine and criticize these types of ideas and beliefs, as many scholars have done. But there are some limits to doing this. Critics of ideology believe that even though it is widespread, it is separate from the people who are affected by it. Ideas about beliefs and how things are shown in society are not enough to understand how modernity, colonialism, and racism are all connected deeply. Usually, when people think about racism or thinking about different races, they see it as a bad idea or a mistake of modern times. They think it's not a normal part of society. Racism is part of modern society, just like colonialism. Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton say racism is not just about individuals being biased or prejudiced, but it's also built into our institutions and how power is arranged in society. Barnor Hesse adds that this idea makes us focus on the way racism is part of the way things are done in society, rather than just the ideas people have about race and where they come from. Hesse suggests that racism is better seen as a way the government controls people instead of just a belief system. This is a big change: the way power works in modern society is more about actions than knowledge. So, instead of just critiquing ideas and knowledge, we should focus on critiquing politics and the way people exist. Understanding how modern racism and colonialism control people's lives through power helps us see that it doesn't just shape thoughts, but also affects how people live. It's not just about stopping people from doing things, but also about shaping who they are inside. To go back to the Catholic Church, we can think of the Spanish Inquisition as an example of its power in Peru and other parts of the Americas during the 17th century. The Inquisition is a system that decides who is a true Spaniard and Christian, and finds and punishes people who don't follow the church and the king. It also creates the rules and paperwork that modern government offices use. The Lima inquisition was not just an old-fashioned belief. It actually helped create modern ideas about race, colonization, and how power works. This makes it an important part of the birth of modern society. The Inquisition is a really harsh example, but it shows how people are made

by telling the truth, behaving the right way, and other rules and methods. The control of modernity, colonialism, and racism isn't just something that happens on the surface. It's actually something that affects people's lives and bodies, creating their way of living[7], [8].

If colonial control controls people's lives, does that mean rebellions can't win. Nathan Wachtel wonders if the revolts in sixteenth-century Peru were all really defeated. He thinks they were, considering the fighting and the power of the colonizers. Native uprisings had different ways of happening depending on the situation. The Araucanians in Chile used European weapons, while Peruvian Indians used their traditional methods. Some people also resisted in smaller, quieter ways. However, Wachtel believes that we should stay willing to change our expected results. Sometimes what seems like losing is actually winning, and what seems like winning is actually losing. It's not always helpful to measure success and failure in this way. This brings us back to our basic question: Can people resist biopower, which controls everything in society. This question is similar to the criticism of Foucault's studies on power, which assume that everything related to power is helpful to it. To understand this idea, we need to see things from a different point of view like Wachtel suggests. We should not think of power as the most important thing and resistance as a reaction to it. Instead, surprisingly, resistance comes before power. Here we can see how important Foucault's idea is that power only affects people who are free. Their freedom comes before the use of power, and when they resist, they are just trying to increase and make their freedom stronger. In this situation, hoping for help or support from outside sources for resistance is useless and takes away your power.

Our project idea can be thought of as a chiasmus. One change moves the study of how modernity, colonialism, and racism are connected from being about beliefs to being about power within a society. And the second goes in the opposite way, starting from inside resistances against modern ideas to the struggles related to biology that can create change and a different way of doing things. The Marxist tradition has mixed feelings about modernity, and sometimes its ideas even conflict with each other. It says that modern ideas are good and old-fashioned ideas are bad, but also says that old-fashioned ideas are important in the fight between different social classes. Workers, peasants, and other people who are controlled by capitalists resist their power, which goes against modern society[9], [10].

Karl Marx's ideas show that modern times are seen as advancing. In the part of the Grundrisse that looks at the analysis of "forms before capitalist production," Marx talks about how the old ways of making things in Asia and in ancient times are connected to how capitalism started. This way of looking at economic history shows how different economic systems and practices have changed over time. It leads to the idea that in Marx's time, capitalism became the most important way of producing things. Marx and Engels also thought that people outside of Europe didn't have a history and were stuck in a time without the ability to make new things happen. This explains why Marx didn't realize in the 1850s that people were fighting against colonial rule, farmers were protesting, and other workers were starting movements outside of capitalist industries. This way of thinking also makes Marx believe that colonization is important for advancement because it brings capitalism to the colony. We should also mention that the critical comments made about Marx's work by European historians and social scientists in the 19th and early 20th centuries do not question the idea that his analysis is teleological and evolutionary. Max Weber expanded the range of things to consider when evaluating development to include religion, politics, culture, and other things. However, he did not change the idea that progress is determined by certain factors. Marx's ideas about modernization and progress are used by many Marxist writers. Social democrats also have similar ideas about modernity, but they are not closely connected



to Marx. The idea of scientific socialism and socialist policies for building industries comes from Marx's thinking. The disrespect for non-industrial workers and their rebellion is a big part of Marxist beliefs.

World-systems theories are a bit unclear, but they are still important in carrying on the ideas of Marx. Ferdinand Braudel's work, which inspired world-systems theories, and earlier theories of capitalist development, show that the world market grows as capitalists are able to sell more goods in a steady way. Over time, the idea is that capital takes over the whole world within itself. And this definitely happened, but not in a straightforward way. The world-systems perspective doesn't just show progress moving in a straight line. It also considers how expansion happens over time and how it can have ups and downs. In these patterns of change, the main areas of growth move from one place to another - first from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and now to the Pacific. This defines which areas are most important and which ones are left out. Even when considering changes that happen regularly, the organized growth of capitalism continues. The schema doesn't consider anti-modern movements very well. It doesn't recognize class struggle as important in history, society, and economy. It doesn't understand the power of labor and capital, and it doesn't acknowledge resistance from people not involved in capitalist production. Simpler versions of world-systems theory think that societies go through stages of development, with each stage making social and economic relations better. Even the top experts in world-systems theory can't fully understand it without considering the old-fashioned forces that go against modern ideas. This theory still connects to Marxism and modern ways even when it's used by skilled people [11], [12].

However, it would be wrong to think that Marxism is all about wanting to make progress in modern society. If we focus on the ideas in the Marxist tradition that are most focused on fighting against social class differences and making big changes, we see a completely different view. These ideas are focused on getting rid of the power of capitalist modern society and its beliefs. The ideas against empires and the political plans that started in the early 1900s are good example of being against modern changes in Marxism and revolutionary communism. In Rosa Luxemburg's work, she talks about how capitalist companies make money by selling their products in a larger market, especially in colonized areas. Capitalism grows by constantly adding new money to the existing money and by taking control of more and more of the world. This helps the overall profit to increase. However, Luxemburg sees a lot of problems with this progress. She believes that there are big conflicts and her ideas about conflicts and problems show the personal forces that go against modern capitalism.

Capitalism hurts people in different ways, both at home and abroad. It also makes life harder for workers. And the more capitalism destroys other social groups, the more it changes the way things are every day for businesses. It's a series of political and social problems and struggles, and with these conditions, along with occasional economic disasters or crises, accumulation can't continue. Before the economy gets worse because of money, workers around the world need to rebel against those in charge of money.

Capitalist crises are always happening on the edges of progress because of protests from workers against modern society. Lenin saw the effects of the capitalist crisis as even more serious. During the First World War, powerful countries fought each other over their interests in other parts of the world. People who were against the war and against the system that caused it, found common ground to fight against capitalism and colonialism. "The main points of Lenin's work on Imperialism are easy to understand.

Studying money, banks, and similar things, also suggests that the war between different countries has not just caused suffering and death for workers around the world, but also gives them a chance to overcome the beliefs that have separated them. Lenin criticizes the workers in Europe who support imperialism and believes that there is potential for all workers to unite in a struggle against imperialism. The communist movement is united by their struggle against capitalist modernity. They do not believe in the idea that progress is inevitable.

Mao Zedong follows this type of communist theory and focuses on how powerful it is to be against modern ways. Mao understands that China can't only use modern ideas to grow its economy and society. Changing how the government works and improving the lives of workers so they are not controlled by capitalists needs a different way of doing things. Mao made the peasants more important in politics, which was different from what others believed. He also criticized Stalin's ideas about the economy. Even when Mao tried to modernize the country as much as possible,

Marx changed his mind about the idea of progress. In the late 1870s, he was asked to help solve a problem between two Russian revolutionary groups. One group believed that Russia needed to become capitalist before it could become communist, while the other group thought that the Russian peasant commune was already the foundation for communism. Marx is in a difficult position because his older writings support one idea, but his current thoughts agree with a different one. Marx is trying to make his views fit together. He says that to understand things, we need to look at how they work in real life, not just in theory. He talks about how it was necessary for communal property to be destroyed in Western Europe. But he also says that this doesn't mean the same thing should happen in Russia or anywhere else. It is wrong to turn my historical story about how capitalism started in Western Europe into a theory about how all societies develop, no matter what their history is. In Russia, the revolution's job is to stop the changes caused by capitalism that could harm the Russian community. "If the revolution happens at the right time. Marx says that if Russia focuses on letting rural communities thrive, it will make Russia stronger than countries controlled by capitalism. Is there a disagreement in Marx's ideas about modernity and progress? If there is, we think it's a good thing because it adds depth to his thinking.

Marx thinks that the revolutionary ideas against modern ways are strongly connected to the common people, but he can't explain it well. José Carlos Mariátegui is in a good position to understand this type of resistance against modern ways in both Europe and other places. After he visited Europe in the 1920s and studied socialist and communist movements, he went back to Peru and found that Andean indigenous communities, the ayllus, share things in common.

These communities protect and keep access to the land, ways of working, and social organization together. It reminded him of the Russian peasant communities before the revolution that Marx was interested in, called the mir. "He says that even though India has had laws for one hundred years that promote individualism, the people still prefer to live in communities and support each other. "Mariátegui sees that traditional Inca society had a religious and controlling government, but he also sees that it had a strong connection to the people, which could be used to fight back. By learning about European communism, he realizes how valuable the native people and social systems of "Inca communism" are. This is not something leftover from ancient times or copied from European movements, but a powerful way for people to resist in today's world. Antimodernity, in Europe and elsewhere, is about the way people come together and share their beliefs and values. Socialist development means using the resources of a country to improve the lives of all its people, instead of just a few rich people.

While Marxist theory has mixed feelings about modern society, socialist states are more clearly connected to it. The three big socialist revolutions in Russia, China, and Cuba all aimed to modernize their countries, despite facing strong opposition to change. The rich capitalist countries have been making other countries follow their economic ideas for a long time. They say it will help everyone, but it really just keeps the rich countries in power. Even socialist countries do the same thing, even though they say they are against the rich countries. The criticism of imperialism is still important for socialist countries after the revolution. It goes together with promoting a political economy that focuses on development.

Before the Bolsheviks won, some people believed that socialism was more about becoming more advanced, rather than being free. They thought that following the lead of the powerful countries and becoming more modern was the goal. Building a strong national identity and a socialist government were both part of this idea, which ignored the unique needs and traditions of different groups of people. Sometimes, people think that a country needs to go through hard times to become as successful as capitalist countries. But other times, people think economic development is a great thing. Criticizing development doesn't mean we don't want to be successful, just like criticizing modern life doesn't mean we're against being smart or knowledgeable. We need to look at things from a different perspective and realize that continuing with modernity and development programs just keeps the same unfair systems in place.

## CONCLUSION

The study found that using biopower in colonies is a main way to control and exploit people. It has not only made people watch each other, behave a certain way, and act like everyone else, but it has also caused problems in nature and changed the way people live. The effects of colonialism and its control over people's lives have had a long-lasting impact, stretching through many generations and leaving permanent marks on the land of conquered areas. Furthermore, this study acknowledges the strength and refusal to give in that arises in response to the control of colonial powers. People, groups, and nature have shown they can fight against and resist unfair rules given to them. In conclusion, we need to keep dealing with the complicated power struggles and keep working towards making things fairer for everyone and changing who has power. In a bigger picture, the study makes us think about how colonialist control over people's lives still affects global issues today. It asks experts and people working for change to think carefully about and deal with the lasting effects of colonialism. As we try to understand power and resistance in today's world, we learn more about the complicated forces that shape our world. This helps us see things more extremely.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] G. Chandran and R. Vengadasamy, "Colonialist narrative in a post-colonial era travel writing, into the heart of Borneo," *GEMA Online J. Lang. Stud.*, 2018.
- [2] B. G. Trigger, "Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist," in *Artifacts & Ideas*, 2018.
- [3] Z. Waghid and L. Hibbert, "Decolonising preservice teachers' colonialist thoughts in higher education through defamiliarisation as a pedagogy," *Educ. Res. Soc. Chang.*, 2018.
- [4] W. Li and X. Zhang, "Conflicting neo-colonialist narratives in the representation of Africa in Ngugi and Naipaul's novels," *CLCWeb - Comparative Literature and Culture*. 2018.

- [5] S. Seungyop, "Resembling the opponent: Nationalist and colonialist historiographies in modern Korea," *Acta Koreana*, 2018.
- [6] M. C. D'Argenio, "Decolonial encounters in Ciro Guerra's *El abrazo de la serpiente*: Indigeneity, coevalness and intercultural dialogue," *Postcolonial Stud.*, 2018.
- [7] S. G. Collins, "Futures, intimacies, animisms: Unfinished anthropologies in the twenty-first century," *Rev. Anthropol.*, 2018.
- [8] D. M. Anderson and J. Weis, "The Prosecution of Rape in Wartime: Evidence from the Mau Mau Rebellion, Kenya 1952-60," *Law and History Review*. 2018.
- [9] R. C. Jackson and D. W. DeLaune, "Decolonizing Community Writing With Community Listening: Story, Transrhetorical Resistance, and Indigenous Cultural Literacy Activism," *Community Lit. J.*, 2018.
- [10] R. Hamdan, A. Sujud, and N. F. Adanan, "Abdullah the priest and his advice based on the al-quran and hadith," *Int. J. Civ. Eng. Technol.*, 2018.
- [11] G. J. Wilson, "Global Consciousness in Art Education: Utility and Problematics of Curriculum Development within a Critical Postmodern Relational Praxis," *J. Cult. Res. Art Educ.*, 2018.
- [12] S. Junge, "Groet uit Java: Picture postcards and the transnational making of the colony around 1900," *Hist. Photogr.*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 7

### ANTIMODERNITY TO ALTERMODERNITY IN FRANTZ FANON'S THREE STAGES OF LIBERATION

---

Somayya Madakam, Associate Professor  
Department of uGDX, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
Email Id-somayya.madakam@atlasuniversity.edu.in

#### ABSTRACT:

The intricate transition from antimodernity to altermodernity, draws inspiration from Frantz Fanon's three stages of liberation. Exploring the historical context of the socialist states and their economic development, the narrative highlights the paradoxes within modern political thought and their impact on revolutionary struggles. The analysis extends to the crises faced by socialist experiments in the latter half of the twentieth century, examining their evolution and implications on global political ideologies. Furthermore, the piece explores the persistence of antimodernist forces in contemporary times and emphasizes the need to move beyond traditional dialectics. The discussion takes a nuanced approach, acknowledging the limitations of antimodernity and proposing the concept of later modernity as a dynamic and transformative alternative. The article suggests that the shift from resistance to alternative is crucial for liberation movements and calls for a reevaluation of the relationship between modernity and its monsters. Finally, drawing on Fanon's insights, the article proposes a trajectory towards altermodernity, emphasizing the creation of a new humanity that transcends the static opposition between modernity and antimodernity.

#### KEYWORDS:

Alienation, Altermodernity, Antimodernity, Colonialism, Decolonization, Fanon, Liberation.

#### INTRODUCTION

The mixed feelings about the modernization and growth of the economy in socialist countries can be seen in Lenin's 1898 study about Russia's capitalist development. He says that the current way of developing the economy clashes with his respect for the way people lived before modern times, especially how the lower classes were treated. He wants to fix the problem by delaying it: We need to make progress in the economy now so that lower classes can become strong enough to fight against capitalist control in the future. However, when Lenin tries to solve a problem by delaying it for later, as seen in his theory of the state withering away, he is just avoiding a real issue. The process of growing up and changing never stops, and there are still conflicting feelings. Lenin didn't understand how capitalism's ideas and progress could confuse people. Similarly, socialist countries' ideas and economic policies focus on progress and don't fully embrace the revolutionary ideas that led to them. It's not a coincidence that in the last few decades of the 1900s when the "great hope" of socialism wasn't working out, the three big socialist experiments were all facing the same problems. What was the Soviet Union's plan for getting out of economic dependence? It wanted to develop in stages and change capitalism into socialism. Marxism was turned into a theory about progress that leaves out anything old-fashioned or underdeveloped. The Soviet crisis included everything about how society was growing, the type of government they had, the people who were in charge, and how they were taking over land in China. The crisis didn't make the system fail, but it did make it change to be more like how capitalist countries organize work. This can be done through controlling methods like socialism, bureaucracy, and centralization, or in a more decentralized way that supports market forces within a unified global market. This allows for profits and competitive advantage and can help address

wage inequalities and poor labor conditions. The way China has moved towards neoliberalism is not the same as capitalist countries. They have only partly sold off state-owned businesses, the government still has a lot of control, and there are now new social classes and inequalities between cities and the countryside. But it still works well. Looking back, the way China's government is run today helps us see how strong the belief in development was in Cuba's socialist government. Cuba has been able to avoid the worst effects of the crisis, but only by not changing and staying the same as it was before. The crisis is still causing big problems. Cuba is always trying to avoid two dangerous possibilities for its future: the Soviet Union's terrible end or China's move towards capitalism[1], [2].

This socialist idea also spread to many poor countries for many years, like India, East Asia, Africa and Latin America. Here, both the capitalist ideas about growth and the socialist ideas about relying on others were connected. The idea of making things modern and modernizing became important for controlling and stopping the anti-modern forces that came up during revolutionary fights. The ideas of "national development" and the "state of the entire people" seemed hopeful for the future, but really just made the existing global inequalities seem okay. This was a harmful part of socialist beliefs. In the name of bringing everyone together, some political activities were organized to pretend to solve problems between different groups of people. This made it hard to understand the differences between political ideas and groups like right and left, and also fascist and communist. This old-fashioned way of thinking becomes more common when the economy is doing badly. It was a big part of what was happening in the Soviet Union in the 1930s, and we are seeing it happen again today. This time, it's not about bringing everyone together, but about political groups on both the left and the right trying to appeal to more people in the middle. This creates what Etienne Balibar calls "extremism of the center [3], [4].

The three socialist experiments failed because the leaders did not adopt the progressive norms of capitalist development. They didn't fully understand or believe in these norms. While socialism experiments did not work out, Russia and China were successful in developing their economies as capitalist countries. After short-term problems, those countries went back to using capitalism and became much wealthier and stronger than before. "Real socialism" turned out to be a strong way to gather resources and grow the economy. In poor countries, it created tools that rich countries only use during economic crises. It also made rules for controlling special situations, which are still used in the world today. Given that global capitalist development is running out of energy, the problems of "real socialism" are very important today. The story is actually about you. It would be a mistake to forget or ignore how the successful socialist revolutions in Russia, China, and Cuba helped and motivated anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist movements all over the world. We need to be careful not to criticize them in a way that just helps the powerful people make them disappear. Each revolution started fights that spread around the world like a virus, sharing their hopes and dreams with other movements. It would be helpful to know how much the final crisis of socialist countries helped or hurt the progress of liberation movements at this time in history. In simpler terms, the period from 1917 to 1989, known as the "brief twentieth century," came to an end. This doesn't mean that the hope and push for communism ended, only that a new century has started. We will look at how anti-modern forces are working against capitalist globalization and find a way out of the ideology that trapped socialist states.

In the end, one thing that is clear from this history is that fights for freedom can't be seen only in terms of making a country more modern and developed. The power of being against modern ways, which wasn't noticed in past socialist revolutions and fights for independence, is now showing up again in our time. Chef Guevara starts to understand this fact in the last

years of his life. He wants to move away from the strict rules and patterns of socialist beliefs. He sees that these beliefs are just like the main features of capitalist society. "Trying to achieve socialism using the tools from capitalism will not work," he writes. "To build communism, we need to create a new way of thinking and living, along with new ways of making things. We also need to understand the limitations of developing socialism. He was the president of the national bank and the minister of industries after the revolution. However, in 1965, he suddenly vanishes from public sight and goes to join revolutionary fights first in the Congo and then in Bolivia, where he is killed. Some people think that his decision to leave Cuba and his government jobs shows that he wants adventure and doesn't want to work hard to build the country's economy. We see it as a rejection of the strict rules and control of the socialist government, and a refusal to follow their ideas for progress. He will never find the new humanity he wants to create through communism. He wants to go to the jungle to find the old ways he used to fight for freedom. Today, we can see that only the people involved in movements and political processes can create change and awareness. This was also true during Che's time. This awareness doesn't come from the smart people in socialist science anymore. Now it comes from regular workers and many people who have their own ideas against modern ways and capitalism [5], [6].

### **Cali ban Breaks Free of the Dialectic**

During modern times, when people were trying to be more rational and knowledgeable, scary creatures still appeared. In Europe, from Rabelais to Diderot and from Shakespeare to Mary Shelley, monsters have been shown as extremely big and scary. It's like modern rationality is not enough to control their amazing creative abilities. In places outside Europe, people who are against modern ideas are seen as monsters so that those in power can control them and keep their control justified. The Spanish people in the 16th century believed that the stories of human sacrifice among Native Americans showed how cruel, violent, and crazy they were. The idea of cannibalism also served a similar purpose for African colonizers at a later time. During the 16th and 17th centuries, many people were accused of being witches and were killed or put on trial. This was because people were afraid of anything that seemed old-fashioned or not modern. They thought it was not rational or based on religion. Witch-hunts often happen in places where there have recently been revolts by poor farmers, often led by women, against rulers who want to take over their land and oppress them. However, modern society struggles to accept its monsters and often tries to ignore them as just products of an overactive imagination. Marx illustrates this by saying, "Perseus used a magic cap to avoid being seen by the monsters he was hunting. We put on the magic cap to block out any scary things and pretend they're not there. The monsters are real, and we need to pay attention to what they can teach us about modern times. Adorno thinks there is no solution, so he believes that humanity is stuck in a never-ending cycle of opposing forces. The problem is that we don't see the differences among people who are against modern ways. Some of these people don't just hate modern things, they come up with new ways of thinking and freedom. We need to break free from the pattern of thinking that Horkheimer and Adorno create and see how the people against modern ways are actually creating new and better things[7], [8].

One way to escape from this back-and-forth is to think about the relationship in terms of modern scary creatures. The savage and distorted character in Shakespeare's play "The Tempest" represents the colonized native as a scary and powerful monster. Prospero the magician says that he tried to be friends with and teach the monster. But when it threatened his daughter, Miranda, he had to lock it in a tree to keep it from harming anyone. The Europeans use the native's bad behavior to justify their control in the name of being modern. Caliban cannot be easily killed or sent away. "We can't miss him," Prospero tells Miranda.

"He helps us gather firewood and works in the office to help us. The monster has to work, so we have to keep him inside the island community. Yes, it is true that there are groups that do not support modern ideas and aren't trying to make things better. Horkheimer and Adorno believed that the Nazi project was against modernity, and we can also see this in other modern projects like ethnic cleansing, the Ku Klux Klan's white supremacist beliefs, and the U. S's desire for world domination. Neoconservatives are people who support a conservative political ideology, promoting a strong foreign policy and the use of military force to achieve national security and promote democracy. All of these projects are trying to break the typical way people in power control and dominate others. They want to set everyone free from unequal relationships. The ideas about who has power and control from Juan Donoso Cort s to Carl Schmitt are not new. They also want to change how we think about modern times and stop the fighting by giving power to one ruler. The "autonomy of the political" they talk about really means rulers can do what they want without being challenged by the people they rule. This dream isn't real. Rulers need people below them to survive, just like Prospero needs Caliban and capitalists need workers. Although it's not real, it still causes a lot of problems and sadness today. These monsters are what nightmares are made of.

This provides us with two good things to study about the powers against modern ways. The first thing is to clearly show the difference between old-fashioned ideas of power that want to break connections and new ideas that challenge and undermine systems of control by supporting resistance and giving more freedom to those who are lower in power. The second task is to understand that resistance and freedom are always more powerful than domination and cannot be controlled by modern power. These monsters have the key to unlock new creative abilities that go beyond the conflict between modern and anti-modern ideas.

## DISCUSSION

So far, we have looked at antimodernity as a way of resisting modernity in three different ways. This is not about protecting old ways from modern ways. It's about fighting for freedom within modern society. Secondly, being against modern ways is not just in one place, but all around modern ways. There is no direct link between Europe and modernity, and the colonial world is not necessarily against modernity. The people who are not in power are also modern, and throughout history, they have resisted the dominant powers in different ways like slave rebellions, peasant revolts, and liberation movements. Finally, going against modern ways doesn't just happen after modern power is used. It's not just a reaction to modern ways. Being against modernity comes first because in modern society, power can only be used over people who are free and express their freedom by resisting control and being dominated. Modernity must respond to control those forces of freedom.

Right now, we see the limits of the idea of fighting against modern ways. This is because we have seen how violent and extreme some of these fights can be. Basically, modern and anti-modern are always connected to each other. This is a common problem with resistance: it can end up just being opposed to something without making progress. We should understand how liberation movements can become independent and break free from the control of modern society. The language used by the globalization protest movements gives us a way to solve this problem. When big protests started happening at meetings of global leaders in North America and Europe in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the media called it "anti-globalization. But the people in these movements didn't like that label because most of them don't actually oppose globalization overall, they just don't like how it's being done right now. Actually, their ideas are about different global ways of trading, sharing culture, and politics. And the groups they are in made connections all over the world. They wanted to be called "alter globalization" instead of "anti-globalization". The change in terminology suggests a different



way of thinking that doesn't just focus on two opposite ideas, globalization and anti-globalization, and instead focuses on finding alternative solutions[9], [10].

Using the same terms helps us change the focus of talks about modernity and antimodernity. Altermodernity and modernity are connected in a diagonal way. It shows a disagreement with how modern society is organized, just like opposing modern ideas, but it focuses on fighting back in its own way. We need to point out that the term altermodernit might cause confusion. For some people, the term might mean changing modern ways to fit with the new global situation while still keeping the most important features. For some people, it might show different ways of being modern, depending on where and how they live. For example, Chinese modernity, European modernity, Iranian modernity, and so on. We want to use the term "altermodernity" to show a big change from modernity and the power it holds. It comes from traditions that are against modernity, but it is also different because it goes beyond just opposing and resisting modernity.

Frantz Fanon suggested a way for colonized intellectuals to progress from modernity and antimodernity to altermodernity. In the first stage of Fanon's theory, the colonized person tries to be as much like European people as possible. They think that everything good and modern comes from Europe, so they don't value their own history and culture. A person who learns a lot about Europe and becomes like them, but still has dark skin. Some brave colonized thinkers rebel against Eurocentrism and colonial power. They want to escape the dominance of white culture and return to their roots. In some wealthy countries, intellectuals also challenge modern hierarchies and support the traditions and identity of marginalized groups. The danger is that holding onto old ways and traditions, whether focused on past hardships or past successes, keeps us from changing, even when we're pushing back against modern ways. The thinker has to not get stuck in being against modern ways, but move past that to a new way of thinking.

Fanon says that trying to keep old traditions or bring back forgotten ones goes against history and the people. When people fight against a cruel colonial rule with weapons or politics, the way things are usually done changes. And a person's identity doesn't stay the same, it changes and becomes something new. Fanon believes that the revolution should create a new way of being for people, moving past the idea of either being modern or against modernity and instead focusing on being dynamic and creative. Moving from traditional ideas to new ideas is not about being against something, but it's about a break and change from the old to something different.

One difficult area to study is the difference between old-fashioned and new-fashioned ideas, like the protests and talks about unfairness that have been happening in countries like the Americas and the Pacific. Since the Europeans came, indigenous traditions and identities have been important for protecting themselves. Surprisingly, in some societies, like Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, claims of indigenous rights are tied to keeping their traditions alive. This means that if they don't follow their traditions, they may lose their rights. In settler societies, people believe that indigenous people should act or show their true selves according to the ideas of liberal multiculturalism. Many modern indigenous movements and discussions can avoid being against modern ways and can instead embrace new ways of being modern [11], [12].

The differences between people who are against modern ways and those who want to change modern ways are clear. This can be seen in a collection of writings by Latin American indigenous thinkers put together by Guillermo BonfilBatalla in the early 1980s. The Indianidad project, which all the authors share, is about getting rid of the "Indian". But it's not

about physically destroying Indigenous people, even though that has happened because of modernity over the last 500 years. He doesn't want to follow the modernization policies of government in Latin America to change the indigenous people to be more like the Hispanic population, making the indigenous people go away by mixing with them, moving away, and teaching them, so that the indigenous civilizations would only be remembered in museums. The plan to get rid of the Indian is really about destroying the identity that was given to them by the colonizers. It goes against modern ways. The most important part for us is what happens next in the argument. One choice after getting rid of colonial identity is to bring back the original identities like Quiché, Maya, Quechua, Aymara, and others as they were before meeting European civilization, with their traditional ways of organizing society and leadership. This idea fits in with the tradition of going against modern ways, following the second stage in Fanon's sequence. BondlBatalla's writing usually focuses on traditional identities and ways of life, but he suggests that there may be other possibilities to consider. He writes that ethnic identity is not something made up or stuck in the past. It is not separate from how society changes over time and it is not unchanging. This idea of social change suggests that indigenous people can move away from being against modern ways and towards making their own modern society.

Leslie Marmon Silko is a very interesting writer who has different ideas about modern society. Her books show how Native Americans are still suffering because their land was stolen, they are not allowed to have their own property, and are affected by militarism and other ways of control. Silko's novels are different because they show how identities and traditions can change and mix together. They are filled with people of mixed race, Black Indians, and others who are not accepted by their tribes, constantly traveling across borders in the desert. Her main characters always remember the things that happened before, the knowledge of older people, and the important things from their family's past. But to continue their customs and follow the ancient predictions, they have to keep changing the world and in doing so, change themselves. Native American ways, information, and rituals must be changed to keep their strength. In Silko's world, revolution is the only way to fight against those who want to harm us and to protect the valuable things passed down to us from our ancestors.

The Zapatista movement in Mexico shows how indigenous rights are important in modern politics. The Zapatistas don't follow the usual ways of fighting for rights based on identity. They don't ask for legal recognition of indigenous identities or for traditional indigenous leaders to have power over the government. Many zapatistas become politically active by refusing to follow the traditional leaders of their indigenous communities and by clashing with the Mexican government. Autonomy and making their own choices were the main ideas that the Zapatistas used when they talked to the government about changing the rules for indigenous people in 1996. When the government didn't keep their promise, the Zapatistas started working on their own projects to put their ideas into action. They created their own local government and councils for good governance. While most Zapatista community members are indigenous and fight against racism, their politics are not based on a single identity. They want the right to be able to change and become whatever they want, instead of being stuck as they are.

This allows the Zapatistas to avoid being against modern ways and instead move towards different modern ways. It also means they don't have to follow a fixed pattern of modern power and resistance. Moving from the old ways to new ways, tradition and identity change, and so does resistance. Now, it is focused on creating different options. The freedom that is the foundation of resistance becomes important and marks the start of a new political plan.

This idea of altermodernity helps us understand the difference between socialism and communism. Socialism is unsure about modernity and anti-modernity, while communism needs to move away from both and focus on the common good to move forward in altermodernity.

### **The Multitude in Cochabamba**

Altermodernity includes culture, civilization, labor, and production. In modern times, these areas of conflict have often been seen as separate and sometimes even hostile to each other. In many places, people think that labor struggles are led by workers who want to modernize, while civilizational struggles are led by people of color and indigenous groups who oppose modernization. This is not completely true, but it is a common belief. From the point of view of cultural conflicts, the aims and actions of labor movements can be harmful like those of the ruling classes, by repeating their racist behaviors and promoting their Euro-centric cultural ideas. And from the perspective of labor movements, cultural conflicts are often thought of as outdated, old-fashioned, or even primitive. Many other people with different feelings have also been involved in this fight. Peasants sometimes support one side or the other, and gender struggles have sometimes joined with one or both sides, but they are usually controlled by both. Ideological and practical differences have caused tensions and even caused alliances within communist, national liberation, and anti-imperialist movements to fall apart. Moving from being against modernity to seeking a different kind of modernity brings a big change. Now, these different areas of conflict might work together in new ways, but not as one or under one's control. Instead, they move forward independently, side by side.

The social movements in Bolivia that led to the election of Evo Morales as president in 2005 show how different groups with diverse demands can work together in politics. Two important points in this time of challenges were the fights in 2000 over who would control water in Cochabamba and the surrounding area, and the battle in 2003 over who had the right to control natural gas in El Alto and the highlands. These are good examples of people fighting against neoliberalism around the world in recent years. In Cochabamba, a city in Bolivia, the World Bank told the government to stop giving discounts for public water and sell the water system to foreign companies. When the government did this, the foreign companies made the water more expensive, which made people start protesting. The fighting over gas in 2003 was part of a bigger pattern of conflict in the country from 2000 to 2005. This showed how different groups were able to work together to demand changes in the economy and society. It also showed a shift from being against modernity to wanting to change it in a different way.

To understand how complicated this situation is, we need to see that Bolivian society and the movements there have many different aspects. First, these struggles are about more than just money. It's not just about race, culture, or civilization either. It is all of them at the same time. Secondly, in each area there are many different points of view fighting against each other. Sociologist René S zavaleta described Bolivia in the 1970s as a diverse society with many different aspects. In English, it could be compared to a society that is colorful, varied, and diverse. Zavaleta sees the different types of people in Bolivia in a bad way. He thinks it shows that Bolivia is not modern. He thinks modern means everyone being the same and having the same social groups. We think Bolivia is as modern as France, India, or Canada and is also open to change. Zavaleta sees diversity as an important factor in making society better. The main question is how different social groups work together and support each other in working towards a common goal. To understand this idea, we need to take a closer look at the kind of society it is and see how the different groups in social movements are connected.

Altermodernity includes culture, civilization, labor, and production. In modern times, these areas of conflict have often been seen as separate and sometimes even hostile to each other. In many places, people think that labor struggles are led by workers who want to modernize, while civilizational struggles are led by people of color and indigenous groups who oppose modernization. This is not completely true, but it is a common belief. From the point of view of cultural conflicts, the aims and actions of labor movements can be harmful like those of the ruling classes, by repeating their racist behaviors and promoting their Euro-centric cultural ideas. From the perspective of labor movements, cultural conflicts are often thought of as outdated, old-fashioned, or even primitive. Many other people with different feelings have also been involved in this fight. Peasants sometimes support one side or the other, and gender struggles have sometimes joined with one or both sides, but they are usually controlled by both. Ideological and practical differences have caused tensions and even caused alliances within communist, national liberation, and anti-imperialist movements to fall apart. Moving from being against modernity to seeking a different kind of modernity brings a big change. Now, these different areas of conflict might work together in new ways, but not as one or under one's control. Instead, they move forward independently, side by side.

The social movements in Bolivia that led to the election of Evo Morales as president in 2005 show how different groups with diverse demands can work together in politics. Two important points in this time of challenges were the fights in 2000 over who would control water in Cochabamba and the surrounding area, and the battle in 2003 over who had the right to control natural gas in El Alto and the highlands. These are good examples of people fighting against neoliberalism around the world in recent years. In Cochabamba, a city in Bolivia, the World Bank told the government to stop giving discounts for public water and sell the water system to foreign companies. When the government did this, the foreign companies made the water more expensive, which made people start protesting. The fighting over gas in 2003 was part of a bigger pattern of conflict in the country from 2000 to 2005. This showed how different groups were able to work together to demand changes in the economy and society. It also showed a shift from being against modernity to wanting to change it in a different way.

To understand how complicated this situation is, we need to see that Bolivian society and the movements there have many different aspects. First, these struggles are about more than just money. It's not just about race, culture, or civilization either. It is all of them at the same time. Secondly, in each area there are many different points of view fighting against each other. Sociologist René S. Zavaleta described Bolivia in the 1970s as a diverse society with many different aspects. In English, it could be compared to a society that is colorful, varied, and diverse. Zavaleta sees the different types of people in Bolivia in a bad way. He thinks it shows that Bolivia is not modern. He thinks modern means everyone being the same and having the same social groups. We think Bolivia is as modern as France, India, or Canada and is also open to change. Zavaleta sees diversity as an important factor in making society better. The main question is how different social groups work together and support each other in working towards a common goal. To understand this idea, we need to take a closer look at the kind of society it is and see how the different groups in social movements are connected.

## CONCLUSION

We are looking at how things have changed from the past to now using Frantz Fanon's ideas. We are learning about historical fights, socialist tests, and present movements. Studying the problems and crises in socialist countries showed that the usual way of looking at things doesn't fully explain the complex changes in modern politics. The problems that socialist experiments had in the late 1900s showed that their economic models had flaws and were

influenced by development ideas. Trying to mix socialist ideas with making money showed how progress and old-fashioned ideas are connected. This makes it important to understand both of them well. The story got bigger and included how socialist ideas were spreading to poor countries and how they were connected to capitalist ideas about progress. During times of economic crisis, it becomes hard to tell the difference between political groups. This helps to continue the way things are in the world, with some countries having more power than others, all while pretending to focus on their development. The idea of monsters in modern times, as seen by Adorno, showed that it's hard to see and handle things that are against modern ways. The monsters, whether they are against or for change, make it difficult to understand the relationship between modern ideas and the ideas that oppose them. Knowing this, the article suggested changing from just resisting to doing something different - from being against modernity to changing modernity.

#### REFERENCES:

- [1] B. Jessop, "On academic capitalism," *Crit. Policy Stud.*, 2018.
- [2] V. Charitsis, D. Zwick, and A. Bradshaw, "Creating worlds that create audiences: Theorising personal data markets in the age of communicative capitalism," *TripleC*, 2018.
- [3] P. A. Hall, "Varieties of capitalism in light of the euro crisis," *J. Eur. Public Policy*, 2018.
- [4] E. O. Wright, "The continuing relevance of the Marxist tradition for transcending capitalism," *TripleC*, 2018.
- [5] L. Monticelli, "Embodying alternatives to capitalism in the 21st century," *TripleC*, 2018.
- [6] T. Enright *et al.*, "Cities in Global Capitalism," *AAG Rev. Books*, 2018.
- [7] B. Scherer and J. Waistell, "Incorporating mindfulness: questioning capitalism," *J. Manag. Spiritual. Relig.*, 2018.
- [8] P. Mirowski, "The future(s) of open science," *Soc. Stud. Sci.*, 2018.
- [9] T. Sharon, "When digital health meets digital capitalism, how many common goods are at stake?," *Big Data Soc.*, 2018.
- [10] N. McClintock, "Urban agriculture, racial capitalism, and resistance in the settler-colonial city," *Geogr. Compass*, 2018.
- [11] A. L. Fitzsimons and G. Starosta, "Global capital, uneven development and national difference: Critical reflections on the specificity of accumulation in Latin America," *Cap. Cl.*, 2018.
- [12] M. Zook and M. Graham, "Hacking code/space: Confounding the code of global capitalism," *Trans. Inst. Br. Geogr.*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 8

### MULTITUDE-FORM AND ALTERMODERNITY: INSIGHTS FROM BOLIVIAN STRUGGLES

---

Thejus R Kartha, Assistant Professor  
 Department of uGDX, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
 Email Id-thejus.kartha@atlasuniversity.edu.in

#### ABSTRACT:

Departing from earlier interpretations by Zavaleta, these scholars reevaluate the multitude as a dynamic and proactive protagonist within coherent political projects, challenging the notion of passivity associated with its multiplicity. The Bolivian experiences, notably the "Coordination for the Defense of Water" during the Cochabamba struggles in 2000, exemplify the multitude-form's ability to organize diverse components of society, transcending traditional classifications based on class, ethnicity, or labor. The multitude emerges as a mode of political organization emphasizing both the diversity of social singularities and the coordination of their actions within horizontal structures. This essay contends that the multitude-form, with its emphasis on autonomy, equality, and interdependence among various singularities, offers a distinctive approach to understanding and navigating the complexities of altermodern struggles. The Bolivian context showcases how this form of organization not only bridges divisions within the working class but also fosters collaboration among different ethnic, cultural, and political axes. The struggle for common goals, particularly against the privatization of essential resources like water and gas, underscores the multitude's commitment to challenging the established order. Moreover, this analysis asserts that altermodernity, as demonstrated by the multitude-form, evolves beyond the dichotomies of antimodernity, presenting a society in constant metamorphosis. Rather than a static mosaic, this society resembles a kaleidoscope, continually shifting and melding its colors to create new patterns. In conclusion, the essay reflects on the significance of later modernity, drawing on three intertwined historical lines: European Enlightenment, workers' movements, and forces resisting coloniality. The intellectual's role in this transformative process is highlighted, emphasizing the need to move beyond mere critique to actively participate in co-research and the creation of alternative social relations. Ultimately, the essay posits that altermodernity, grounded in the struggles of antimodernity, offers a profound rupture with modernity, envisioning a society shaped by the common, the dynamic interplay of diverse singularities, and the ongoing process of metamorphosis.

#### KEYWORDS:

Decolonization, Fanon, Liberation, Nationalism, Postcolonialism, Subjectivity.

#### INTRODUCTION

A bunch of modern scholars from Bolivia are using the term "multitude-form" to describe the different fights happening within altermodernity, instead of using the old term "class-form." The many different types of people in a crowded society is what makes the conflicts unique. Zavaleta thought the crowd was inactive because there were so many different people, but these scholars see it as the leader of a clear political plan. Multitude is a way of organizing that focuses on the many different people who are fighting for something. It also aims to help them work together as equals in a fair way. The "Defense of Water" group, which led the fights in Cochabamba in 2000, is an example of this kind of equal structure. The recent experiences in Bolivia show how different groups of people can come together to form a political organization, including different parts of the working class and people from different

races and ethnicities. "This breaking apart of groups," according to Alvaro Garc a-Linera, shows how society is divided into different ethnic, cultural, political, and regional groups. This makes it necessary for us to find new ways to bring these groups together, not in a top-down way, but as temporary connections across the same level. The idea of a large group working together is not a quick fix for all problems, but it does create a real political issue. It suggests that people should work together as equals and independently, using their actions to change society in a coordinated way [1], [2].

Multitude is a way of thinking about how people work together in similar ways. It helps us understand the specific challenges of modern life, where people are independent but also connected to each other. In Bolivia and other places, no one group of workers, like the miners, can lead or speak for all workers. Miners, factory workers, farmers, people without jobs, students, maids, and many other types of workers all join in the fight together. The struggles in Bolivia are not led by non-indigenous or indigenous groups. Many different social groups, defined by their culture, ethnicity, or job, work together in their fight for change. The main idea is similar to what we saw with the Zapatistas: it's not about recognizing or preserving identities but about the strength of the group to make their own decisions. In altermodernity, the problems and differences of the past have been replaced by a new way of fighting for change that focuses on diversity as a key part of the political goal.

The challenges faced by many people in Bolivia show that altermodernity is based on what they all have in common. First, people are fighting to make sure things like water and gas can't be owned by private companies. The idea of altermodernity goes against the idea of everyone owning property. Secondly, the challenges of many people come from the same way of organizing things. The things we all have in common are not just materials but also ideas and creativity that never run out. In El Alto, there were groups called the Committees for the Defense of National Gas. They were made up of local people and used existing local ways of governing themselves. These committees were active in the protests in 2003. El Alto is a big neighborhood outside of La Paz. Most of the people there are Aymara who moved from the mountains to the city in the past twenty years. The conflicts were caused by the way Aymara communities are organized. They share resources, property, and responsibilities for community matters. However, the neighborhood councils in El Alto are organized together in a federation to create another form of self-government in the city. The neighborhood councils offer many different services that the government does not provide, like education, health care, and other social services. They also make decisions about things that everyone in the area uses and what people who live there need to do. In 2003, the mass mobilization was not a sudden rebellion. It was a well-organized movement that grew from existing networks and ways of governing themselves. This idea of many individual parts coming together and being based on self-determination and working together is still missing one important thing in Altermodernity its constant change and how it moves and blends. Every individual is shaped by their social environment. The group of people is not only a diverse community fighting together but also a society always changing and transforming. Working together with others and standing up for what you believe in can positively change you. This society is always changing, like a kaleidoscope. The colors mix to make new patterns and even new colors [3], [4].

## DISCUSSION

Breaking and forming in this text, we have explored some of the new ways of living, showing how they come from fights against old ways and go past them. The idea of later modernity is about trying new ways of living together in society. Instead of following old ways, it's about finding different ways to connect that are not based on power differences. It's about creating

new ways of being together based on what we have in common. Altermodernity has some things in common with hypermodernity and postmodernity, but it is also very different from them.

Germans are mostly responsible for the idea of hypermodernity, and Americans have played a part in it too. Intellectuals are talking about postmodernity, and the French are talking about alter-modernity, but we prefer the idea of alter-modernity and it's not because we like France. All of these ideas create a change in history with modernity, but the nature of that change and the opportunities it creates are different in important ways. By "hypermodernity," we mean to group all those ideas that suggest that the modern world is changing, but not completely breaking away from its principles. Authors like Ulrich Beck and Jürgen Habermas talk about how institutions like the nation-state, labor and capitalism, and the family are changing, but they don't think this means we should completely abandon modern ways of thinking. Instead, they want to make modern society better by improving its principles and applying them to its organizations. In our opinion, this super modernity just keeps the same power structures as modern times. It believes in making changes instead of fighting back, so it doesn't challenge the power of capitalism, even when it sees how society is completely controlled by it[5], [6].

Postmodernity is a big change that is even more significant than hypermodernity. It means the end of the main parts of modernity. Some authors are happy about this, while others are sad. In our earlier work, we also used the idea of postmodernity to show how things have changed in many social areas. For example, in the economy, there is a shift to more intangible goods, and in politics, there is less national control and more global influence. The word "postmodernity" is confusing because it mainly talks about what has ended and is not clear in its meaning. Many authors who believe in postmodernity are influenced by negative thinking and Krisis's philosophies. They talk about how the Enlightenment can be harmful and how reason doesn't have much power against those in charge. They are mad about reason not being able to handle the crisis, but they don't realize that people can stand up to this power and fight for freedom. The philosophers of Krisis understand that Enlightenment thinking and Eurocentrism are declining. They only offer weak thinking and focus on aesthetics while overseeing the end of Enlightenment critique. Around the end of the Enlightenment critique, they start discussing theology. The different ideas about postmodernity are very different. They usually talk about how social rules and traditions are always changing. But the term "postmodernity" doesn't show a strong idea of resisting or saying what is "beyond" modern times.

Altermodernity represents a bigger change from modernity than hyper- or postmodernity. It is different from modern life in two ways. First, it comes from the fights against modern life and the desire to resist its hierarchies. Second, it rejects that resistance and looks for other options. It doesn't believe that modern life's basic ideas can be improved as the supporters of hypermodernity do. The fights against modern life have already gotten rid of any hopes for that. Unlike most postmodern ideas, altermodernity focuses on creating new values, knowledge, and practices. In other words, altering modernity is a way to produce new ways of thinking and behaving. We want to define altermodernity in its own way, not just by comparing it to other ideas. We have three main ideas to study, each showing the different fights that make up altermodernity. The first is a different way of thinking in Europe during the Enlightenment period. Earlier, we showed how Machijsonavelli, Spinoza, and Marx are connected. Since the start of society and modern European thinking, this line has represented the search for complete democracy against absolute power, regardless of how it is presented, even in a republican form. Many important European philosophers like Immanuel Kant and Friedrich Nietzsche have conflicting ideas about certain things. But, we should still remember



that European philosophy has many strong ideas about freeing people from poverty, exploitation, superstition, and domination. These ideas may not always be obvious because of the dominant beliefs of modern society, but they still exist as an alternative way of thinking in European philosophy[7], [8].

The actions of workers in different countries are like a second line that sometimes causes big changes and sad events. It shows the different ideas about modern life and how to change it. In Marxist theory and socialist practice, the other ideas are often ignored and not given attention. The main ideas in the workers' movement theories are that progress and development are linked to capitalism. They also believe that European society and thinking are the source of new ideas and will shape the future of the world. The socialist countries always kept hidden the idea that they needed to keep the same economic system as capitalist countries and make progress in stages. However, we shouldn't ignore the alternative views that also exist in the socialist tradition. We need to remember the moments when important thinkers in history had conflicting feelings. For example, Marx had conflicting thoughts about communism and private property. Lenin also had conflicting ideas about fighting against imperialism and following capitalist development. Mao also had conflicting views about creating a new society without capitalism and constructing a market economy and authoritarian state. These conflicting thoughts were seen in their actions throughout history. Despite the failures and disasters in this tradition, in the actual experiences of revolutions and fights for freedom from being exploited and controlled, there has always been another way of doing things that could completely change the way modern society is controlled. Years from now, we might be able to see that the fall of socialism showed that the way people are exploited and controlled isn't just about how work is organized, but it's something that affects the whole society. In countries where socialism was actually in place, the shift to biopower became fully developed. This also brought out the forces of biopolitics, shaping the changes in society. A third idea connects the forces that resist colonialism, imperialism, and radicalized rule. We mentioned before that these movements may end up always being against modernity and not making progress. But a more serious problem is that when revolts succeed, they often just create the same power structures that exist in society. How many countries that fought for independence from colonial rule, ended up being controlled by a small group of rich people, keeping poor people in poverty? But there is hope for change, especially when people work together towards common goals, like sharing resources and building strong communities.

None of these three lines on their own can fully define later modernity. We believe that the ideas against modern ways of life in these three areas, which have been stopped before, can be brought back today as new ways of living if they work together. The capitalist system is not the end of history where all conflicts disappear. Instead, it is a limit that causes more resistance in all areas of life and production. The three lines need to be connected in a way that fits the needs of later modernity. Frantz Fanon and Che Guevara said that to beat modern society and move past being against modern society, we need to make a new and better world for people.

This passage talks about how the role of intellectuals has changed in modern times. First, criticizing things like social rules, unfair systems, and using people unfairly is still important, but it's not enough on its own for thinking and learning. Smart people also need to make new ideas and ways of organizing society, taking the things people are fighting for and turning them into new rules and groups. In other words, being critical means always moving forward, from breaking with the past to making a new future. Second, there is no room for leaders or intellectuals who are part of the progressive movement in the Gramscian sense. The thinker is

a fighter and works with others to learn and create knowledge. They are not trying to control history or just criticize it from the sidelines, but are deeply involved in it. The role of the thinker today has similarities to the role of thinkers in the early Christian church. This was a big change in an Empire where the poor people stood up against the powerful. It was not just a big change in how people thought and acted, but also a new way of thinking and doing things. Today, we need to find a new way of living and create a new culture, just like they did back then. Let's call this a new way of thinking, where the smart person's job is not just to point out mistakes and reveal lies, but also to create new ways of understanding with other people.

In his book *History of Madness*, Foucault explains how madness is made by keeping some people out and separating them from others. He also tries to show that there is a different truth to madness. He suggests that maybe the truth of madness is shown in ways that we don't understand yet. Foucault believes there is another way of thinking about madness that goes beyond reason and madness. What is the truth behind the madness? Or in simpler terms, how can this other be possible and where can we find it?

One way to answer these questions is to search for truth and reasons outside of ourselves. When talking about Foucault's study of madness, we need to also look at how colonial thinking affects and labels the colonized as mad. In the late 1900s, some important criticisms of how we understand knowledge came from different perspectives outside the mainstream. "Caliban's Reason" and decolonial ideas questioned the dominance of European thinking. Feminist ideas also challenged the power imbalance between men and women in shaping knowledge. One important thing these frameworks have done is to show that traditional knowledge is not universal and objective. They have shown that these systems of knowledge are influenced by the power structures and hierarchies of modern society[9], [10].

The outside view and the strong sense of who you are that make these critiques powerful can also be a problem, as many people who do them know. Donna Haraway cautions that looking for a perspective outside of ourselves, based on who we are, is like trying to go back to a perfect place like the Garden of Eden. Another way of saying this is that these projects risk getting stuck in being against modern ways. In the study of knowledge and politics, we should pay attention to the ways of criticizing and opposing the ideas and systems at the core of modern society. By doing this, we can find ways to make a different kind of society. Moving from being against modernity to making it different, in the study of knowledge, we should come up with a way to understand rational thinking in terms of our bodies and our lives.

Two ideas help us start exploring the field of biopolitical reason. First, our everyday experiences help us find a way to overcome the problem of knowing about things when we can't decide between general ideas and specific examples. After we have questioned the wrong ideas that are common in modern thinking, any new attempt to say something is universally true is seen with doubt. This is because our questioning has shown not only that specific claims are wrong, but also that the basis for universal truths is also flawed. We need to do more than just focus on specific knowledge that might not be true. The common goes beyond the difference between the general and the specific. The words "common sense" and "common knowledge" usually cover some of what we mean because they go beyond just the specific and understand a certain social idea. But these terms often see the common as something that is already there in society. Instead, we focus on how the common is created and made productive through shared social activities, following the ideas of Spinoza's "common notions. Just like everyone, the ordinary says it knows what's true, but instead of coming from the sky, this truth is built from within[11], [12].

This leads us to another important belief: that knowledge must come from our experiences and challenges, which helps us understand and question the current power dynamics and also create a better reality. Stating that truth is made from means that it is created by people questioning and doing things together. Our understanding of biopolitics and how it has changed is not just similar to the political change from before modern times to modern times, as we discussed earlier. It is like the same fight but with a different way of fighting. It creates a new reality and a new truth. Finding a starting point for knowledge in everyday things means questioning the idea that science is always neutral. But this doesn't mean looking for something completely different from what science does. This criticism comes from inside, as Foucault calls it "knowledge rebelling against centralized power." This is related to how scientific discussions are organized and work in our society. Many scholars now question whether science is always fair, and if it has helped powerful groups to dominate others. This idea is now common in academic circles that are interested in making progress. What we are particularly interested in is the fact that a group is formed here from within, and it has nothing to do with anything spiritual. Many authors are interested in Ludwig Wittgenstein's ideas about how language works and how people agree on what is true or false. Wittgenstein himself wonders if truth is determined by what people agree on. And he said: "People say what is true and false, and they all agree on the words they use. People don't agree on their beliefs, but they agree on how they live their lives. We need to talk about two important parts of Wittgenstein's work. First, he says that truth comes from how we use language and play with it. He doesn't think truth is fixed in something beyond our understanding. Instead, he sees truth as something that changes and depends on what we do. This changes the way we talk about truth from being about what we know to being about what we do.

Secondly, after making the truth shaky, he makes it stable again. Using language is part of our everyday experiences and forms the basis of how we interact with others. When we think about language, we are also envisioning the way we live and communicate with others. Wittgenstein's ideas avoid individual experiences and transcendental truths, instead showing what is shared between them. Language and language games are ways people communicate and interact with each other. They are part of how we all live and understand the world. Wittgensteinian biopolitics is about how knowledge and collective action affect our lives, all in the everyday world.

## CONCLUSION

Studying the challenges in Bolivia using different perspectives shows important things about how people are working together to make changes in society today. The way different groups of people interact, how their identities can change, and how power is constantly being fought over, all show how difficult the problems are in this area. By accepting the idea that there are many different kinds of people, and that they can resist being all the same and appreciate their differences, we can understand the Bolivian experience in a more detailed way. Also, looking at altermodernity as a theory helps us go beyond old ideas of modern life and gives us a more open-minded view that includes native knowledge, different cultures, and new ideas about moving forward. The struggles in Bolivia show how historical unfairness, caring for the environment, and the rights of indigenous people are important issues.

They are an example of how the world is moving towards development that includes everyone and is better for the planet. As we deal with the challenges of the 21st century, the experiences of Bolivia and the ideas of multitude-form and altermodernity can help us. They encourage us to question strict systems, acknowledge the power of different social groups, and accept different ways to create a fair and environmentally friendly future. The experience of Bolivia is not only an example to study but also inspires us to imagine a world where many

different forms come together to shape modern societies that focus on fairness, environmental balance, and cultural diversity.

#### REFERENCES:

- [1] G. Mheta, B. N. Lungu, and T. Govender, "Decolonisation of the curriculum: A case study of the durban university of technology in South Africa," *South African J. Educ.*, 2018.
- [2] L. Tschelaut *et al.*, "A survey on current knowledge, practice and beliefs related to preoperative antimicrobial decolonization regimens for prevention of surgical site infections among Austrian surgeons," *J. Hosp. Infect.*, 2018.
- [3] R. Datta, "Decolonizing both researcher and research and its effectiveness in Indigenous research," *Res. Ethics*, 2018.
- [4] K. Dotson, "On the way to decolonization in a settler colony: Re-introducing Black feminist identity politics," *AlterNative*, 2018.
- [5] G. R. Madden and C. D. Sifri, "Antimicrobial Resistance to Agents Used for Staphylococcus aureus Decolonization: Is There a Reason for Concern?," *Current Infectious Disease Reports*. 2018.
- [6] J. Knight, "Decolonizing and transforming the geography undergraduate curriculum in south africa," *South African Geogr. J.*, 2018.
- [7] J. C. Hong *et al.*, "Staphylococcus Aureus Prevention Strategies in Cardiac Surgery: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis," *Ann. Thorac. Surg.*, 2018.
- [8] T. T. Poovelikunnel, P. E. Budri, A. C. Shore, D. C. Coleman, H. Humphreys, and D. Fitzgerald-Hughes, "Molecular characterization of nasal methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus isolates showing increasing prevalence of mupirocin resistance and associated multidrug resistance following attempted decolonization," *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.*, 2018.
- [9] J. Rigaiil *et al.*, "Intracellular activity of antimicrobial compounds used for Staphylococcus aureus nasal decolonization," *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.*, 2018.
- [10] G. R. Rieser and J. T. Moskal, "Cost Efficacy of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus Decolonization With Intranasal Povidone-Iodine," *J. Arthroplasty*, 2018.
- [11] E. M. Muschik, "Managing the world: The United Nations, decolonization, and the strange triumph of state sovereignty in the 1950s and 1960s," *Journal of Global History*. 2018.
- [12] H. Hadi *et al.*, "Staphylococcus aureus colonization in patients undergoing total hip or knee arthroplasty and cost-effectiveness of decolonization programme," *Arch. Bone Jt. Surg.*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 9

# BIOPOLITICAL TRANSFORMATIONS: LABOR, COMMON, AND THE CHALLENGES TO TRADITIONAL ECONOMICS

---

Raj Kumar, Assistant Professor  
 Department of uGDX, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
 Email Id-raj.kumar@atlasuniversity.edu.in

### ABSTRACT:

The intricate landscape of biopolitical transformations, particularly focusing on the evolving nature of labor and its intersection with the concept of the common. Departing from traditional economic analyses that predominantly measure material commodities, the study navigates through three significant trends shaping contemporary labor dynamics. Firstly, the hegemony of immaterial production in capitalist valorization is explored, highlighting the increasing reliance on symbolic, aesthetic, and social values. Secondly, the feminization of work is examined, revealing the qualitative shift in working conditions and the rising importance of tasks traditionally associated with women. Thirdly, the impact of new migration patterns and social and racial mixture on labor markets is scrutinized, illustrating the global nature of labor flows and their potential to challenge racial divisions. As biopolitical production blurs the boundaries between production and reproduction, the article emphasizes the challenges posed by traditional economic concepts and methods. Acknowledging that biopolitical products often surpass quantitative measures and take common forms, the study draws on insights from Marx's understanding of capital as a social relation. The concept of "home product" (man produces man) is explored, with caution against interpreting it as mere humanism, but rather as a potential for the destruction of existing structures and the creation of something entirely new.

### KEYWORDS:

Autonomy, Capital, Economic Paradigms, Immaterial Production, Innovation.

### INTRODUCTION

Many other examples in the history of philosophy also criticize our understanding of knowledge and are connected to similar ideas. Before, we talked briefly about a path in phenomenology that goes from Merleau-Ponty to Levinas and Derrida. This path combines questioning knowledge with studying how we exist together, which is another important idea of being connected. The question is not just about what is common, but about how it is seen. Is it natural or based on collective actions? Think about the type of identity that functionalist anthropology and sociology study, for instance. Philippe Descola describes functionalism as a way of looking at how everything in nature works together to keep the whole system going. Claude Lévi-Strauss says that when we talk about identity, we should first question the idea of it. The same goes for the idea of "common" - we should question it too. The common is in a tricky position because it is both the starting point and the end result of the process. Our research should focus on creating new things, not just following what's already been done [1], [2].

Some modern anthropologists, who are studying similar things as us, have come to the same conclusion about the importance of common things in a different kind of way of thinking about living things. This way goes beyond separating nature from culture and science from humanities. Eduardo Viveiros de Castro uses the beliefs of Amazonian tribes to criticize modern ways of thinking. He suggests that Amerindians see animals and other nonhumans as similar to humans, and their interactions with nature are like social relationships. Instead of

the usual idea that the way we see something creates it, he says that the way we see something makes us who we are. Also, while modern philosophy says there is one nature and many cultures, he says there is one culture but many different natures. Viveiros de Castro finds that Amerindian people believe in "one culture, many natures and one way of knowing, many ways of being. This is different from the multiculturalism of modern thinking. Perspectivism means there are many different ways of looking at things, not just one. A perspective is different from a representation because representations are a part of the mind or spirit, while a perspective comes from the body. When I say "body," I don't mean just physical substance or shape; I mean the feelings and ways of being that make up a person's habits. Having different perspectives doesn't mean there are strict divisions between things. Rather, Viveiros de Castro talks about the Araweté people's beliefs in his study. They believe that change is more important than staying the same, and that their connection to others helps them shape their own identity. They often think about becoming something else, like a jaguar or a different person. We want to use the perspective of indigenous people to criticize modern ways of thinking and make them better. We don't want to promote the old ways of indigenous people, but to use their perspective to improve our modern way of thinking. In our journey through Wittgenstein, we learned that we need to focus more on taking action rather than just knowing. This will create many different ways of being that can change and are seen through the body's perspective. The body is made up of feelings and different ways of being, which are different forms of life. All of this is based on creating things that are shared by everyone. Bruno Latour believes that we need to build the common together, and he thinks that we need to figure things out by trying and making mistakes. We agree with Latour that we experience the world in pieces, but we believe that we can use these pieces to create a new way of living[3], [4].

When we focus a lot on what is similar, some people might say that we are ignoring or denying differences. But actually, when the idea of what is similar is discussed by Wittgenstein or Viveiros de Castro, it's about acknowledging that everyone is different. Wittgenstein's ideas about language and life show that what is similar is actually made up of interactions between unique things, like the way we use language. The same can be said for the many different ways of thinking about the world that Viveiros de Castro describes. Different viewpoints show that we see the world differently, not just in opinions or principles, but in the actual world we live in. However, each world is defined by constantly changing and interacting with otherness. While identity and difference are opposites, commonality and uniqueness work together and are important for each other.

We can now say that a biopolitical reason would need to have three main qualities: putting reason in the service of life, using technology to meet ecological needs (which includes preserving nature and developing social relationships between humans and nonhumans), and using wealth for the benefit of everyone. This means that making money is only possible if we share common resources, that our environment can only be sustained if technology is controlled for the common good, and that reason should only be used to support the freedom and well-being of everyone. This all stays lifeless and inactive unless biopolitical reason is based on collective practice, where the state of being together changes into a process of creating what is shared. The collective practice of biopolitical reason must be like a strategic investigation, a kind of fighting for what is right.

## DISCUSSION

This is important because in our previous work, we talked about how the truth is created and ends as a result of shared experiences in the biopolitical context. Spinoza says that, to tell the truth about the sestertius or the imperial and how much they are worth, I have to listen to

what people commonly say about their value. The truth can only be said out loud. In *De Homine 1*, Spinoza says that truth must not only be spoken but also put into action. He calls this "experiential praxis," which means that truth comes from people actively living and working together. No powerful force can come between people and the truth, or citizens and their power. Spinoza says that the difference between him and Hobbes is that he believes in the natural rights of people and that the government's power over people should only be as much as necessary. This is always true, even in a state of nature. Speaking the truth and acting on it together, without any middlemen[5], [6].

The type of investigation we want to do is like the one Marxists used to do in factories. They would study how workers were treated and the relationships between them, with a mix of being objective and having political aims. But they stayed separate from the situation, controlled by the party's smart people. It's also similar to the way people shared knowledge in the 1960s. They gathered together and talked about important issues, but didn't really do anything about it. A third idea we are thinking about is related to our strategic investigation. It includes parts of the first two ideas, but also goes beyond them. It involves Foucault's use of the idea of dispositifs, which are the physical, social, emotional, and mental processes that create a person's individuality. Foucault defines the dispositive as a network of different elements working together for a specific purpose.

A dispositive is a way of organizing things that responds to a need at a certain time. It has a strategic purpose and involves controlling and influencing relationships and using them to achieve a goal. It is always linked to power and also to limits of knowledge.

Foucault's idea of strategic knowledge means that we can work together to create things that everyone can share. This can help us change the balance of power and redirect forces in a specific way. Creating knowledge in this way also means creating new ways of thinking and being. It's not just about knowledge, but also about changing how we see the world and how we live in it, and working to make big changes. Biopolitical reason is defined by how the systems and the common people relate to each other.

Everything we just talked about through Foucault has also been discovered through various other ways in the discussions within the movements of the many people in recent years. One of these ways started from the problems of workers and their knowledge in the 1960s. Smart people inside and outside the factories worked hard to take control of how knowledge is made from the leaders of the party. They worked with the workers to make new knowledge that is specific to their situation and can change who has power. Professors and students are creating a new way of working by taking their knowledge and skills out of the universities. They help social movements and also learn from them to improve their research. This kind of research is not seen as a way to help the community or a sacrifice of scholarly quality in order to do the right thing. Instead, it is seen as better in scholarly terms because it creates more knowledge. A third way, which has been mostly used by globalization movements lately, uses the methods of "co-research" tested in factories and applies them to all areas of biopolitical production. In community centers, educational events for travelers, online, and in activist publications, very advanced ways of creating knowledge have emerged that are closely tied to real-life experiences.

Using various methods, strategic research always results in creating knowledge through systems and structures. Actively participating in shaping how we think and feel can change the world. This leads to creating new ideas and truths. Robin Kelley says that when people get involved in politics, it can lead to big changes and new ideas. Studying strategically is something you have to do before you can discuss it [7], [8].

## Capital

So we need and decide to share both the land and woods as a way to support ourselves. We see you as the same as us, not better than us, because we know that England, our home, should provide for everyone equally. Writing in a foreign language can change our thinking, like how a camera takes different pictures. The camera changes the way we see things, just like writing in a foreign language changes the way we think. The way biopolitical work is put together. The economy is changing and capitalist production is leading to changes in how people interact and live in society. Capitalist production is becoming more connected to the control of living organisms. Before we start making new tools for this new situation, we need to look at Marx's way of understanding the current economy. We need to study how much of the work comes from workers and how much comes from machines in the production process. We need to look at how things are made and by who in today's world. Understanding how work is organized will help us see how workers are exploited and give us the tools to work towards freedom from capitalism.

Scholars in political economy have identified three big changes happening to labor around the world. These changes help us understand what's happening to workers. First, there is a trend where immaterial production is becoming more important in the way that businesses make money. André Gorz says that the symbolic, artistic, and social value of products is more important than their actual physical reality. Pictures, facts, understanding, emotions, rules, and friendships are becoming more important than physical goods or the physical parts of goods in the process of making profits in capitalism. This doesn't mean that we are making less cars and steel, but it means that their value is now more based on non-physical things. The types of work that create these non-physical things can be called the work of the mind and emotions. This includes service work, emotional labor, and thinking work. But we shouldn't be fooled by these common ways of talking about it: thinking and emotional work doesn't just involve specific body parts, but the whole body and mind together. Even when the things being made are not physical, the process of making them still involves both the body and the mind. What all of these different types of work have in common, when we ignore their specific differences, is their biopolitical nature. "If we had to make a guess about the new model in the coming decades," says Robert Boyer, we would probably need to look at how people are producing things and how the institutions are helping it happen. And according to Christian Marazzi, capitalist production is now moving towards a model that focused on human development, or in other words, a shift towards the economy being more influenced by biological and political factors. Living things are the most important part of this change, and making different kinds of life is becoming more valuable. This is a process where using skills and knowledge gained from work and outside activities to work with automated systems creates value. The special thing about the work of head and heart is that even though it is made by someone, it is about that person or their life. For example, it might be about their relationships or the way they live. So we need and decide to share both the land and woods as a way to support ourselves. We see you as the same as us, not better than us because we know that England, our home, should provide for everyone equally. Writing in a foreign language can change our thinking, like how a camera takes different pictures. The camera changes the way we see things, just like writing in a foreign language changes the way we think. The way biopolitical work is put together.

The economy is changing and capitalist production is leading to changes in how people interact and live in society. Capitalist production is becoming more connected to the control of living organisms. Before we start making new tools for this new situation, we need to look at Marx's way of understanding the current economy. We need to study how much of the



work comes from workers and how much comes from machines in the production process. We need to look at how things are made and by who in today's world. Understanding how work is organized will help us see how workers are exploited and give us the tools to work towards freedom from capitalism.

Scholars in political economy have identified three big changes happening to labor around the world. These changes help us understand what's happening to workers. First, there is a trend where immaterial production is becoming more important in the way that businesses make money says that the symbolic, artistic, and social value of products is more important than their actual physical reality. Pictures, facts, understanding, emotions, rules, and friendships are becoming more important than physical goods or the physical parts of goods in the process of making profits in capitalism. This doesn't mean that we are making less cars and steel, but it means that their value is now more based on non-physical things. The types of work that create these non-physical things can be called the work of the mind and emotions. This includes service work, emotional labor, and thinking work. But we shouldn't be fooled by these common ways of talking about it: thinking and emotional work doesn't just involve specific body parts, but the whole body and mind together. Even when the things being made are not physical, the process of making them still involves both the body and the mind. What all of these different types of work have in common, when we ignore their specific differences, is their biopolitical nature. "If we had to make a guess about the new model in the coming decades," says Robert Boyer, "we would probably need to look at how people are producing things and how the institutions are helping it happen. " And according to Christian Marazzi, capitalist production is now moving towards a model that focused on human development, or in other words, a shift towards the economy being more influenced by biological and political factors. Living things are the most important part of this change, and making different kinds of life is becoming more valuable. This is a process where using skills and knowledge gained from work and outside activities to work with automated systems creates value. The special thing about the work of head and heart is that even though it is made by someone, it is about that person or their life. For example, it might be about their relationships or the way they live.

These three big changes create big problems for traditional ways of thinking about how the economy works. This is mostly because the production of social relationships is becoming more important than making physical things. This confuses the difference between making things and creating new people. Economists have trouble measuring things that they can't touch or count, like values and assets. They usually rely on numbers to figure out the value of things like cars, computers, and wheat. Even political economists, like Marxists, tend to focus on measuring and using numbers to understand things like surplus value and exploitation. Biopolitical products are hard to measure and can be easily shared and not easily owned by one person. If we look at Marx's ideas in a new way, we can see that the different meanings of capital in his work can help us understand this biopolitical situation. In a capitalist society, it may seem like there is a lot of wealth in the form of many different things to buy. But Marx says that wealth is actually created by making more money from making and selling things. Marx goes further to find out that capital is really a social connection, and it keeps on being a social connection by making extra money through making things to sell. Understanding that capital is a connection between people helps us study how biopolitical production works.

Michel Foucault likes how Marx's thoughts lead to the idea that people create other people. But he warns that we shouldn't think of this as humanism. He thinks we need to create something new, not just what nature intended. He also says it's not just about making things for money, but about changing ourselves and creating something new. We don't get how this

is made, in other words, the person making it and the thing being made. Both the producer and the product are people: people make things and people are also created. Foucault understands that the biopolitical process has the power to create something completely new and potentially destroy capitalism. It's not just about making more money, but could lead to big changes. The way we make things and how we control society is changing because of biopolitical production. This might lead to new ways for people to be taken advantage of and controlled by capitalists. But we should also pay attention to how biopolitical production gives workers more freedom and can be used to fight for freedom.

### **Biopolitical Exploitation**

By showing the basic details of how work is done - who does it, what they make, and how - we have looked at the first part of Marx's method for studying how capital is made in the new way of producing things. Now we look at the makeup of capital, which is the relationship between the money spent on employee wages and the money spent on machinery and equipment. It's like the relationship between the work done by people and the work done by machines. Studying modern capital's structure needs to look at how extra value is made and the new ways people are being exploited in today's society. The organic composition means the way things are set up in capitalism, both the physical and the human side. It's about how capitalists and workers interact, with the workers being exploited and sometimes rebelling against it. Today, wealthy people are making money without actually making things. They are taking from the shared resources of everyone. This change can be seen in two main ways. Researchers who criticize neoliberalism often say that nowadays, capitalist accumulation happens by taking away resources from the public and turning them into private property. Naomi Klein talks about 'disaster capitalism' to explain how some countries use times of crisis to make big changes to their economy. This can happen after a war or a natural disaster. They use the chaos to sell off things that were owned by the government, like public services and natural resources. This affects places where the government is not very strong, like in parts of Africa. Extraction of oil, diamonds, gold, and other materials is successful in places with a lot of fighting and no strong government or laws. Foreign capitalists come to a place, use very few local people to work for them, take the money they make, and bring it out of the country. This is similar to what happened during colonial times when people would take resources from a place for themselves. This is why Marxist scholars have been paying more attention to the idea of primitive accumulation. This concept helps Marx understand how wealth can be gained without using the capitalist production process, such as by taking resources from people and the environment. For example, selling African slaves or stealing gold from the Americas. Modern Marxist scholars usually disagree with Marx. As we learned in Part 2, they show that there is no straight line in history between primitive accumulation and capitalist production.

There is no gradual progress from one to the other. Instead, there is a constant cycle where primitive accumulation keeps coming back and exists alongside capitalist production. In today's economy, accumulation of wealth by taking from the common people is becoming more and more common. The concept of primitive accumulation is an important tool for analyzing this trend[9], [10].

The first way that common things are taken away, which is about neoliberal policies taking things from people, doesn't give us enough ways to study how businesses are organized. Even though it explains the government's policies and the history of work that's already been done, it doesn't talk much about how efficient workers are. In other words, economists should not be happy with explanations of capitalism that only talk about taking wealth from others. Capital needs to be a system that creates money by using people's work [11], [12].

## CONCLUSION

We looked at how changes in politics and biology affect work and what people share. We found that it's a complicated and always changing situation that makes regular economic ideas not enough. Three big changes - making things that aren't physical, more women working, and people moving to new places - show that things are different from the old ways of thinking about what's important and how people work together. As people care more about what things represent and how they look, and as society's values become more important in making money, it becomes harder to tell the difference between making things and making more people. The idea of the common is important for understanding these changes. The article talks about how biopolitical production can create things that are hard to control as private property and are more valuable than traditional measures. Using Marx's idea of capital as a social relationship, we can see that we have the power to change things and create new ideas while also getting rid of old systems. Although biopolitical changes introduce new ways of controlling and exploiting people, the study shows that they also give workers more power freedom, and tools to potentially free themselves. The article says we need to rethink how we understand and study the economy to fit with the complicated ways that life and politics are connected today.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] J. Bluwstein, "From colonial fortresses to neoliberal landscapes in Northern Tanzania: A biopolitical ecology of wildlife conservation," *J. Polit. Ecol.*, 2018.
- [2] J. E. Cohen, "The Biopolitical Public Domain: the Legal Construction of the Surveillance Economy," *Philos. Technol.*, 2018.
- [3] C. J. Cavanagh, "Political ecologies of biopower: Diversity, debates, and new frontiers of inquiry," *J. Polit. Ecol.*, 2018.
- [4] S. Binkley, "Biopolitical Metaphor," *Body Soc.*, 2018.
- [5] S. Hellberg and B. Knutsson, "Sustaining the life-chance divide? Education for sustainable development and the global biopolitical regime," *Crit. Stud. Educ.*, 2018.
- [6] C. D. C. da Silva, "Pharmacovigilance: A biopolitical strategy," *Saude e Soc.*, 2018.
- [7] A. E. Sexton, "Eating for the post-Anthropocene: Alternative proteins and the biopolitics of edibility," *Trans. Inst. Br. Geogr.*, 2018.
- [8] M. Espinoza, "State terrorism: orientalism and the drone programme," *Crit. Stud. Terror.*, 2018.
- [9] C. Jayathilake, "Political killings in the contemporary world: Sizwe Bansi is Dead through biopolitical lenses," *Cogent Arts Humanit.*, 2018.
- [10] D. Davitti, "Biopolitical Borders and the State of Exception in the European Migration 'Crisis,'" *European Journal of International Law*. 2018.
- [11] N. Hossain, "Post-conflict ruptures and the space for women's empowerment in Bangladesh," *Womens. Stud. Int. Forum*, 2018.
- [12] E. V. H. Martínez, "Roberto esposito's biopolitic-impolitic," *Andamios*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 10

# CONTRADICTIONS OF CONTROL: UNRAVELING BIO POLITICAL PRODUCTION AND CAPITAL'S STRUGGLE FOR HEGEMONY

Thiruchitrambalam, Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India

Email Id-thiru.chitrambalam@atlasuniversity.edu.in

### ABSTRACT:

The intricate web of contradictions inherent in the strategies employed by capital to control and exploit bio-political labor in the context of contemporary production. Focusing on three major trends: intensive segmentation, the imposition of precocity, and the construction of barriers to labor mobility, we analyze how these strategies, intended to bolster capitalist accumulation, paradoxically act as fetters on the productivity of bio-political labor. The examination unfolds within the framework of Marxian concepts, notably the real subsumption of labor within capital, revealing a departure from the traditional organic relationship between capital and society. As bio-political labor increasingly becomes autonomous, operating on information flows, communication networks, and social codes, the paper explores the consequences of this shift for the management of capitalist accumulation. Furthermore, we investigate the repercussions of control strategies, such as the intensification of precocity and the reinforcement of social and geographical barriers, on the temporal and spatial dimensions of bio-political production. The paper argues that these control mechanisms contradict the inherent nature of bio-political labor, impeding its creativity and productivity.

### KEYWORDS:

Biopolitics, Capitalism, Governance, Life, Power, Production.

### INTRODUCTION

Another way of taking away things that belong to everyone is by using people's lives and health for profit. This helps us to study how capital is organized in a Marxist way. The changes in the types of work people do are all about making things like knowledge, information, images, emotions, and social connections. Companies then take these things and use them to make more money. Understand that this second idea mostly means something different from the first one. The first idea is about traditional things like natural resources. In the past, some European social thinkers believed that the things we needed to live, like food from the land, were a gift from nature and God. John Locke believed that God is like a king, as written in the book of Psalms. I'm sorry, but the text is not clear and cannot be simplified without more context. Can you provide more information so that I can help you rewrite it in simple words? The guideline is that we need to rewrite a certain text in simple language, but the provided text is incomplete. Can you please provide the complete text that needs to be rewritten? God has given the earth to all people to share. This means we all have a common right to use the earth and its resources. This also includes things we create and the way we interact with each other. It's not about scarcity or not having enough, it's about sharing and working together. "Anyone who gets an idea from me is learning without taking away from what I know. It's like how someone can light their candle from mine and still leave mine bright. This idea of sharing and using the common things around us, both natural and man-made, is important for understanding how people's work with living things is being exploited in new ways [1], [2].

When studying how people are controlled and used for profit, we find ourselves being moved away from being used too much towards feeling isolated, which is different from what Marx believed but also doesn't take us back to his early beliefs about humankind. Biopolitical production shows that workers feel separated from their work. For example, workers feel like they are not using their thinking, loving, and caring abilities when they are working. The reason why people feel disconnected from society is because some of the traits related to being taken advantage of, especially the ones that show how important money is, are not as important anymore. Capital doesn't bring people together to work effectively, even though it may control their work and take the things they make. Marx says that in big factories, the boss makes workers work together using tools and a plan. This helps the boss make more money by using the workers' labor. The person who owns a lot of money makes sure people work together, Marx thinks, like the leader in a war or the person who leads the music in a concert. In biopolitical production, money does not control the way people work together as much as in other types of production. Thinking work and emotional work usually create cooperation without being told to by the bosses, even in tough jobs like call centers or restaurants. People work together by talking and sharing ideas. They also connect with others on an emotional level. This kind of cooperation happens naturally and cannot be forced. Actually, instead of working together, we can say that money takes away cooperation as an important part of using people's biological energy for work. This taking away happens not just from one worker, but more from the group of people working together. It happens with things like sharing information, talking to each other, using social rules, creating new words, and showing emotions. Biopolitical exploitation is when people's shared resources are taken from them in terms of how things are made and done in society. Capital takes and steals value through exploiting people's lives and bodies, which is created outside of it in some way. It's not a coincidence that as biopolitical production becomes more common, economists are using the idea of "externalities" more often to understand how value goes up and down. A population with good education is good for a company in a country. But a population with poor education is bad for the company. This can raise or lower the company's productivity, even though it's not directly related to the company. We will talk more about external factors later. But for now, we can guess that economists are realizing that things outside of money are becoming more important. In fact, money is becoming less important to making things and getting rich. In simple words, biopolitical work is becoming more independent. Experts who study neoliberalism say that capital is like a predator because it tries to take and profit from wealth that people create on their own [3], [4].

To explain this in simpler terms and from a different point of view in economics, we should think of workers being taken advantage of and the extra value they create as something like rent for the capitalists, rather than just a profit.

Prodt is made from working inside a company, while rent comes from outside the company. In the 1930s, John Maynard Keynes said he thought it would be a good thing if people who lived off their investments rather than working eventually disappeared. He thought that the people who make money from owning property will eventually go away when they are no longer needed. In the future, those who invest in and manage businesses will be the ones who have control over money. Instead, in today's networks of creating and controlling life, the value taken from what belongs to everyone is being done more and more without the capitalist getting involved in making it. The importance of paying rent helps us understand why finance capital and wealthy investors play a big role in how businesses make money, even though they are not directly involved in the work. They make profits by taking value from the labor process [5], [6].

## DISCUSSION

One important idea in Marx's work is the real subsumption of labor within capital. This means that at a certain point, capital no longer just uses the labor of workers outside of its control, but creates new types of labor that are fully integrated into the capitalist system. In the world of biopolitics, money controls not just people's work, but their whole society and social life. Life itself is used for work and is also created in this process. The relationship between money and productive social life is changing, and money is becoming less involved in the production process. Instead of being controlled by the capitalist system, people's ability to work is becoming more independent. Capitalism still tries to control it, but it relies on disciplinary rules, methods of taking control, ways to take things away, financial systems, and other similar things. The breakdown of the connection between people and their work and the increase in independence of labor are causing new problems for how things are made and controlled in capitalism. This is what we are going to focus on next.

The system of making and controlling capital is in trouble. Who cares every day we see stories about problems in the newspaper: problems with money, with borrowing, and with buying houses. Some people will not have as much money and others will make a lot of money. In the past, some people thought that the imbalances and problems in the capitalist economy would cause it to fail. Instead, as smart analysts of money have told us, money works by causing change through crises. In today's economic systems, crises and disasters are used more and more to make public things private and to create new ways for businesses to make money. However, not every crisis in capitalism is identical. While economic crises can help capitalists make more money, political and subjective crises are a serious danger to capital. Today, there's a big problem in how things are made using biology, where the way people work can't be controlled by the usual ways of bosses. In fact, trying to control it is stopping people from being as productive as they could be[7], [8].

Before we talk about the current crisis, let's remember a similar crisis that happened in the 1970s. This crisis happened because workers wanted higher wages and better living conditions, and other social movements also demanded changes. This caused problems for the government and businesses. Samuel Huntington was worried that different groups of people asking the government for things could cause a big problem. He thought it could cause an economic crisis and a crisis of control. It is important to understand that these crises are connected to other crises and to how money and the government change. The welfare state helped with problems caused by workers in the 1900s, but in the 1970s it couldn't keep up with new problems. In the 1970s, there was a change from the welfare state to the neoliberal state and new ways of controlling and producing things. We understand how history has been shaped by the way capitalist societies are governed and how people have fought for their freedom. Workers and social fights change how companies are organized, and how companies are organized affects future fights. In every stage of capitalism, as technology changes, workers find new ways to rebel against their bosses. This makes the bosses change how they run their businesses. And then workers find new ways to rebel again. This cycle keeps repeating. We think that today we are reaching another crisis moment[9], [10].

For a basic understanding of the current crisis in biopolitics, we can look at the three main changes in the way people work that we mentioned before. Each trend shows how capitalists try to control workers, but in each case, the methods of control actually go against the workers' productivity and make it harder to create value, making the crisis worse. In the first trend, different types of work like thinking, feeling and physical labor are becoming more important to capitalist companies. They are using new strategies to control and grow these types of work. Intensive strategies break up and divide the usual way people work together to

make things. They set up outposts to control and watch over the production process using different methods of discipline and monitoring. Other strong methods take away the resources that are used for making things related to living organisms. For example, they do this by making public schools into private schools and taking away money from high schools. Complex strategies are shown in the finance industry, where they don't directly get involved in making things but spread out, taking over and making private the shared wealth found in knowledge, codes, images, emotional practices, and relationships that they create. The way that capitalism takes control of resources goes against the way that people work together to create things. In this way, the financial world acts like social labor-power, but separate from it. When we see the ordinary people as the ones who are growing and changing, it becomes obvious that they can't be controlled in the usual way.

Another way that capitalists control people is by making work more uncertain and unstable, so that they can easily adapt to changes in the market. This affects all types of jobs. In Europe and Japan, in the last half of the 1900s, many workers had steady jobs with regular hours. But in recent decades, their jobs have become less secure. Now, workers often have to switch between different jobs throughout their career and even in the same day. One big part of precarity is that it makes people work at different times and for a long time, with no clear division between work time and non-work time. It makes workers always be ready to work, even if they're not actually working all the time. The insecurity of jobs has always been a problem for women, racial minorities, and most workers in less powerful countries. Many people in these countries have always had jobs that are not guaranteed and not formal. Now, many workers around the world are facing uncertain and unstable conditions in their jobs, and it's getting even worse with some extreme situations. A story about people from different places shows how they face very uncertain and risky situations. In a neighborhood near Monrovia, Liberia, a man named Mohammed gathers and sends out many young men, some of whom used to be soldiers in Liberia or Sierra Leone, to do different jobs. One day he sends men to work at a diamond mine in southeastern Liberia, and another day he sends them to work on a rubber plantation in a different part of the country. He can also send two thousand men to pretend to be ex-fighters for a UN program and his men are always ready for military missions. These men are a very extreme example of how their jobs are not secure. They are always available to work and can move around easily to do any kind of job. This is not like having a group of people ready to work in case they are needed, because there is no guarantee that there will always be enough workers available. Or, when there are not many job opportunities, all workers are always available to work whenever the boss needs them. ProClarity means a specific type of poverty where workers don't have control over their time. It's like they are poor in terms of having enough time for themselves[11], [12].

Unstable work conditions create a problem because they change who has control over the time needed for making things that affect people's lives. Creating ideas, images, or emotions isn't restricted to certain times of the day, so it blurs the line between work time and free time. This is called biopolitical production. Biopolitical work needs workers to have freedom to plan their time, especially for being creative. But being in a precarious situation means you have no control over your time, so none of it feels like your own. You can control your thoughts and feelings, but only in a way that limits creativity and productivity. There is a conflict between being able to work freely and the restrictions imposed on you by uncertainty.

Another way that capitalists control things is by building barriers to stop people from moving around for work. This can be physical barriers like walls or social barriers like laws. People often get really worried and even panicked when borders are made stronger or new ones are

created. People worry that too many Mexicans might come to the United States, or too many Muslims to Europe. These worries are used as reasons to stop people from being able to move to find work. The old ways of being racist and keeping people of different races apart are being used to control people in powerful and less powerful countries all over the world. Building walls happens not just between countries but also within them, dividing people in cities and countryside, separating different cultures and social groups. We need to look at how being in the country illegally affects people, not just the walls at the border. Being secretive not only stops people from getting help and rights as citizens, but also keeps them from making friends and being part of different parts of the society. In the same way that not having a stable job makes it hard to find time, not being able to go places because of where you live or who you are makes it hard to find space to live and work.

The problem is clear when we block migrations and create divisions in production. When governments in powerful countries stop illegal immigrants from coming in, businesses say there aren't enough people to work. They worry about who will do jobs like picking fruit, taking care of older people, doing housework, and working in factories if there are no illegal workers. Bernard Mandeville said over 200 years ago that it's hard to live without poor people because they do the work. The problem with movement and mixing of people is even more intense at a deeper level. To make more things, biopolitical production needs to control how people move and also have them interact with others who are different from them, in a fair way. Modern economists often discuss the importance of being creative in fields like design, branding, and fashion, but they usually ignore the need for a fair and open culture that allows for constant blending and exchange of ideas in biopolitical work. Restricting where people can go and making some people more important than others stops people from being able to get a lot of work done. From this point of view, the contradiction is a conflict between including and excluding people. It shows up in the government's struggle with two main models of bringing people together: the assimilationist approach seen in France and the multicultural approach seen in Britain. These models are in trouble because, even though they say otherwise, they actually want to create and keep social rankings and limit social opportunities, which stops biological production.

All three of these contradictions show that the ways capital exploits and controls people's work tend to hold back their productivity. Money doesn't make more money in a good way. It doesn't go from being common money to making more money through production. This would create a new, bigger amount of common money that can then be used to start a new production process. Whenever money gets involved in controlling people's work and taking the things they share, it slows things down and makes them harder. This has happened before, it's not new. Since Marx's time, people have been criticizing how capitalism works. They have been focusing on the problem of how capitalism involves both working together as a society and trying to make a profit for oneself. But now, with the way we produce things using biotechnology, this problem is even worse and more intense. It's like the problem has been made bigger and more difficult?

## CONCLUSION

Businesses control biopolitical production shows a complicated relationship between using people for profit and letting them have freedom. Three important trends were studied: dividing people into smaller groups, creating uncertainty, and building obstacles. These trends show how trying to make more money for capitalism actually makes it harder for people to work effectively. This confusing situation gets even more complicated as society and money have changed from being closely connected to a situation where people's work is more and more able to work by itself. Increasing control measures, like job insecurity and



barriers between groups, make it difficult for people to thrive and produce in society. Biopolitical work, which depends on creativity and constant connections, clashes with strict control rules. The conflict between the natural way people work and how they are controlled shows the problems and conflicts in the way capitalism works now. As we deal with the current problems of capitalism, it is clear that there is a big fight between money and the growing forces of biopolitical production. The old ways of bringing things together are having problems. There is a conflict between including everyone and leaving some people out. This makes us wonder if the ways we're doing things now will work in the long run.

#### REFERENCES:

- [1] Y. Keping, "Governance and Good Governance: A New Framework for Political Analysis," *Fudan J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.
- [2] N. J. Bennett and T. Satterfield, "Environmental governance: A practical framework to guide design, evaluation, and analysis," *Conservation Letters*. 2018.
- [3] I. Docherty, G. Marsden, and J. Anable, "The governance of smart mobility," *Transp. Res. Part A Policy Pract.*, 2018.
- [4] P. Sirisomboonsuk, V. C. Gu, R. Q. Cao, and J. R. Burns, "Relationships between project governance and information technology governance and their impact on project performance," *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 2018.
- [5] M. Al-Ruithe, E. Benkhelifa, and K. Hameed, "Data governance taxonomy: Cloud versus non-cloud," *Sustain.*, 2018.
- [6] R. W. Gregory, E. Kaganer, O. Henfridsson, and T. J. Ruch, "It consumerization and the transformation of it governance," *MIS Q. Manag. Inf. Syst.*, 2018.
- [7] A. Levstek, T. Hovelja, and A. Pucihar, "IT Governance Mechanisms and Contingency Factors: Towards an Adaptive IT Governance Model," *Organizacija*, 2018.
- [8] C. Ansell and A. Gash, "Collaborative platforms as a governance strategy," *J. Public Adm. Res. Theory*, 2018.
- [9] M. Razaghi and M. Finger, "Smart Governance for Smart Cities," *Proc. IEEE*, 2018.
- [10] N. Hussain, U. Rigoni, and R. P. Orij, "Corporate Governance and Sustainability Performance: Analysis of Triple Bottom Line Performance," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2018.
- [11] F. Nunan, "Navigating multi-level natural resource governance: an analytical guide," *Nat. Resour. Forum*, 2018.
- [12] E. M. Coyne, J. G. Coyne, and K. B. Walker, "Big Data information governance by accountants," *Int. J. Account. Inf. Manag.*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 11

### OPEN SOCIAL RELATION BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL

Aditya Kashyap, Assistant Professor  
 Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
 Email Id-aditya.kashyap@atlasuniversity.edu.in

#### ABSTRACT:

The concept of open social relations between labor and capital, delving into the evolving dynamics that characterize their interaction in contemporary socio-economic structures. Departing from traditional models that emphasize hierarchical and exploitative relationships, the focus here is on the emergence of a more fluid and interconnected paradigm. The examination encompasses the changing nature of work, the impact of technological advancements, and the influence of global interconnectedness on labor-capital relations. The concept of open social relations suggests a departure from rigid hierarchies, fostering collaboration and dialogue between labor and capital. We investigate the role of technology in reshaping these relations, emphasizing the potential for increased autonomy and participation for workers. Furthermore, the paper explores the implications of this shift on traditional power dynamics, highlighting the potential for more equitable distribution of resources and decision-making. Through case studies and theoretical analysis, the paper navigates the complexities of open social relations, considering both the opportunities and challenges presented by this evolving paradigm. The conclusion underscores the transformative potential of fostering openness in labor-capital relations, advocating for a more inclusive and adaptive approach to accommodate the changing landscape of work in the 21st century.

#### KEYWORDS:

Capital, Class, Labor, Market, Power, Relations.

#### INTRODUCTION

In the study of how politics and biology intersect, we discovered that money should be seen as more than just a social connection it's an ever-changing social connection. In simple terms, capital has combined the ability to pay workers and control their work. It has created a mix of money for wages and money for equipment. Today, there is a big split happening in how businesses work. Parts of the money used to run businesses are separating from each other and so are the people in charge of making decisions. Political labor in the field of biology creates its ways for people to work together and makes valuable things on its own. Actually, the more self-governing a society's organization for producing biological resources, the more effective it is. Capital is finding it harder to make a continuous cycle of making things and to bring together or control workers in order to create value. Maybe we should stop using the term "variable capital" to talk about this labor power because its connection to constant capital is getting weaker[1], [2].

No, crisis does not mean everything will completely fail, and even though the problems with money are really bad, it doesn't mean that capitalism will go away or that there is another way to run things. Instead, the break in the capital system and the growing independence of biopolitical work create a chance for political change. We can expect the relationship between money and power to change, and we can use this change to gain more political control over the work people do with their bodies. Capitalism creates opportunities for people to connect with others, but we need to work together politically to make the most of these opportunities. When Abbé Sieyès asked about the importance of the Third Estate before the French Revolution, he said it was worth a lot in society but had no power in politics. This

started a debate based on the economic situation. The Third Estate, which was becoming the most important in making things, didn't want to be controlled or pay taxes to the rulers anymore. Now we need to understand how people are fighting against each other based on their social class, what resources they have, and how they are organizing politically[3], [4].

Let's begin with some simple things. The increasing independence of biological work from money, which changes the way capital and society relate, depends mainly on two things. First is the important role of ordinary people in making things and making money, which we have already talked about a little bit. Secondly, the amount of work people can do is more than what the companies need. Workers have the ability to do more and make more things than what they actually do at their jobs. In the past, the way things were made, especially in factories, has limited how much we can achieve beyond what money can buy. The car worker has great skills with machines and technology, but they can only use these skills in the factory or when working on cars at home. The abilities and skills that come from your feelings and thoughts, working with others, organizing things, and communicating are not just for one place. You can use them in different places, like at home, with your friends and neighbors, and in the community. The abilities of people to work and their power to influence others go beyond just their job and can affect their whole life. We don't want to call this capacity "excess" because, from the point of view of workers or society, it is never too much. It is too much only from the point of view of money because it doesn't make money for the individual owner, even though it does create value for society as a whole, usually as extra benefits.

At this point, we can make a guess: in the biopolitical context, the conflict between social classes becomes a mass departure. By "exodus" we mean moving away from the relationship with money by letting workers have more control over their work. Exodus does not reject the idea that people's work is productive, but it does reject the limits that capital puts on how much people can produce. It shows how much people can do outside of the control of money. You can think of this type of class struggle as a form of escaping or breaking away. Similar to how slaves worked together to escape slavery and build their own communities, biopolitical labor must also break free from its ties to capital and build new connections and ways of living that allow it to use its abilities to the fullest. But unlike the maroons who left, this exodus doesn't have to mean going somewhere else. We can change our way of living and working right where we are. The fight between different social classes still involves resisting the control of rich people and attacking the sources of their power. We will talk about this more later. But it also means breaking away from the way we relate to money and the way businesses work. And even though workers have the power to resist by saying no and refusing to work, it's not as clear how they can leave the situation altogether. Leaving a place is only possible if everyone can use and access it. In a capitalist society, everything is being taken over by private ownership, which makes it hard for people to have access to things they need. Before we think about how to organize politics, we need to learn more about the different ways that people work together in society now [5], [6].

## DISCUSSION

Ghosts of the ordinary people can be seen in capitalist society, even though they may be hidden and mysterious. Even though capital doesn't like it, it still needs the common people, and this is becoming more obvious today. To find these ghosts of everyday life, we need to look at how people work together and the different ways they think in our society. Showing people that some common things really do exist is the first step in breaking away from the control of money. The city itself is a big source of shared wealth. The building of modern cities is connected to the growth of industry and money, according to experts on cities and

buildings. Workers need to be close to resources and transportation. Cities have all the things needed for making things. During the 1800s and 1900s, cities grew because of factories. The way cities looked and how they were organized was influenced by the needs and patterns of the factories and the way people worked together. Today, we are seeing a change from cities that focus on industry to cities that focus on the health and well-being of people. In the economy of the city, the relationship between production and the things that everyone shares is getting stronger and more direct. The city is not just buildings and streets, but also a place where people live, work, and connect with each other through culture, ideas, emotions, and social systems. The things that make up the city are important for making things and also the result of making things. The city is where the things that make up the city come from and where they are stored[7], [8].

One way to understand the value of cities and the push to make them private is through urban real estate economics, which is a topic that needs to be made easier to understand. It is important to remember that classical political economists had a hard time figuring out ground rent and the value of land. If work creates wealth, as Adam Smith said, then how does land or real estate have value. Labor is used to work the land and build on it, but that doesn't fully explain the value of real estate, especially in cities. Saying that land rent is a monopoly price doesn't solve the main problem either. The value of real estate cannot be understood by just looking at the inside. You have to consider outside factors too. Modern real estate experts know that the value of a city apartment, building, or land is not just based on its quality and size. It is also determined by external factors such as noise, pollution, crime, and traffic, as well as positive things like being close to parks and cultural activities. In these situations, we see a problem that affects everyone. The main concern of these economists is that externalities are not related to property and cannot be fixed by buying or selling. In fair markets, they say people make smart choices, but when there are problems like extra costs and social impacts, people don't make good choices and the market doesn't work well. In cities, the value of property is mostly determined by outside factors, which is kind of surprising. Market failure happens a lot. Traditional neoliberal economists spend their time creating plans to make the situation more efficient and privatize things that are commonly owned so they can be bought and sold according to market rules. They look for ways to make money from pollution or traffic, for example, to make the costs of society the same as the costs for just one person and make market trades make sense again [9], [10].

In addition, it's important to mention that the increasing effects of external factors make us reconsider some of the usual ideas in politics and economics. Just like how political economists used to think that profit comes after rent, now it's the opposite. And also, the idea that "absolute rent" is becoming more important than "relative rent" is also changing. This means that the work done on a property is becoming less important compared to the work done in the city as a whole, and so absolute rent is becoming more important again. Real estate agents are people who buy and sell property in cities.

They don't need complex theories to know that regular people are important in real estate. Their motto "location, location, location" means they want to minimize the bad things and maximize the good things. Location is just a way of saying how close something is and how easy it is to get to things like parks and other resources. It also includes how well people get along in the neighborhood, how people communicate, and the intellectual and cultural aspects of the area. Real estate agents can make money from the city and its imperfections without needing to control or justify the market. They can profit from the city as it is, without needing to make changes.

We don't want to tell you how to make money in real estate. Instead, we want to explore the issues that affect everyone. Real estate economics and the actions of real estate agents show that the city is full of things that everyone shares, both physical and non-physical. But economists don't know where these shared resources come from. The common may seem like it's outside the market and capitalist system, but it's actually a big part of how things are made. The wealth made from the common is taken and owned by rich people, which makes it hard for more common things to be made. This is shown by how artists move into cheap neighborhoods, make art, and then the neighborhood gets more expensive and they have to leave. The value of homes goes up when the area becomes more interesting and trendy. This can make it too expensive for artists to live there, and they have to leave. Wealthy people move in, and the neighborhood becomes less interesting and loses its smart and cultural vibe, becoming dull and lifeless. Even though the city's shared resources are being taken over and sold for profit, the shared community still exists there as a ghostly presence. Finance is a big area where we can find signs of the ordinary. Georg Simmel says that the things that make a big city special are the same things that money needs: lots of different jobs, interactions with people you don't know well, everyone doing things at the same time, and more. The reason for these different traits mostly comes from the ability to think in abstract ways. Money is a big thing that can seem complicated and confusing. It's like it shows us a strange version of ourselves[11], [12].

People have been complaining about finance capital for a long time because it makes economic risks worse and doesn't create anything. After the global crisis in 2008, lots of people started hating finance even more. Critics say that finance is like gambling and doesn't benefit society. They argue that industrial capital is better because it creates real value through producing actual things, while finance just makes money from money without contributing to real value. Some of these criticisms are true. People use financial tools to manage risk and make bets, and the economy is focusing more on non-material goods. But they don't understand the basic principles of finance. Financial speculation is like smart gambling. It's about predicting how well a certain industry will do in the future. Investors use different clues to make their bets, just like someone betting on a horse race looks at the horse's health and the condition of the racetrack. Finance capital is basically a complex system for showing the connections and networks needed to make things like products, goods, or assets. This means that financial products are becoming more and more complex and not directly related to actual production. They are also representing future production or other representations. Finance can be very complex, and that's why mathematical models are very important. Abstraction is only possible because wealth is a social thing. As financial instruments become more complex, they involve more people and companies working together to make things. This ability to think in abstract ways both relies on and confuses everyday things.

Finance has become much more important compared to other types of capital in the last few decades. Giovanni Arrighi sees this as a repeating pattern similar to the growth of banking in Britain in the late 1800s and earlier times. In our opinion, it is more important to connect the increase in finance with the growing importance of biopolitical production at the same time. When people work on their own, finance is used by capitalists to take the wealth they create without being involved in the production. Finance cannot take over something without somehow showing that it comes from the work and production of people in society. In simple terms, finance is just the power of money. "Money shows how people interact with each other. It helps us understand abstract ideas and goes beyond individual differences. Money represents how people relate to the world, and it becomes real when it embodies the way people think and connect with each other. " Finance understands the common in its widest

social form and turns it into something that can be exchanged for money. This makes the common seem mysterious and private, all to make profits. We don't plan to support or criticize dance capital. We want to study it to find out more about the things that people are afraid of.

Both the real estate market and finance show a complicated relationship between ideas and everyday life. Before we finish talking about this, we can explain this feeling of uncertainty by briefly looking at how Marx sees capitalism's ability to ignore certain details. Simpler words: Abstraction is important for how money works and for criticizing how it works. Marx starts his analysis in *Capital* by looking at how abstract labor determines the value of commodities when they are exchanged. In capitalist society, Marx says that work needs to be looked at in a general way without focusing on the specific job someone does, like tailoring or plumbing. This means that the work put into making things becomes the thing they all have in common. This lets us compare their value, and lets money be used as a standard. Many people who read Marx try to connect the ideas in the beginning of the text to political beliefs. They see support for actual work and not theoretical work, and support for using things and not trading them. Marx has mixed feelings about abstraction. He sees abstract labor and exchange as ways for capitalists to make more money and keep control. But the idea of abstract labor, which is common to all workers, helps us understand the working class. Abstract labor is necessary for the working class. Capital creates tools to resist and overcome the way goods are produced. The success of capitalism depends on the support of the public and cannot exist without it. However, it always tries to hide this fact. So that's why it's hard to understand abstraction.

### **Corruption and people leaving their country**

Every group in society is based on what everyone has in common and is shaped by the things that everyone shares, uses and makes. Social institutions are very important for the journey of leaving a place. However, we need to remember that not all types of the common are good for us. Just like economists say some things have good effects and some have bad effects, some types of communication help us work together better and some make it harder. Helpful forms help to create things, while harmful forms cause problems and stop people from working together. Exodus requires choosing the best things for the group and getting rid of the bad things. It's like fighting against corruption. Certainly, money is one way that can ruin things that everyone shares. We have seen how it controls and takes over the things that everyone shares, and makes them private. But there are also other ways that things that everyone shares can be ruined by the people in charge of society. The three most important parts of capitalist society where bad things happen are the family, businesses, and the country. All three allow access to the common, but also limit and change it. This is about the different social situations where people have to choose the good things and reject the bad things.

The family is very important in today's society for bringing people together. For lots of people, their family is the main place where they experience being part of a group, work together, care for each other, and feel close to each other. It is based on the usual but also changes it by creating a system of levels, limits, exclusions, and changes. First, the family enforces traditional gender roles and often makes people feel like they have to fit in with them. In different cultures, the traditional structure of family authority is different, but still remains the same in general. The division of work between men and women in the family is very hard to change, even though people criticize it. The model of a family with a mom, dad, and kids is almost the same all over the world. The family makes it hard for people to do things that don't follow traditional gender roles and norms. If someone tries to be different,

they get in trouble. Second, the family is seen as the only way to have close and supportive relationships in society, and it takes over all other ways of having these relationships. Relationships between different generations are often seen as being like parents and children, and relationships between people of the same age are compared to siblings. Different ways of forming families, even those not based on traditional relationships, are either not allowed or kept under the control of traditional family structures. The way families are set up, with rules about who is in charge, how men and women should act, and expecting everyone to be straight, shows that people can't imagine other ways of being close to each other. It also means people don't have the freedom to try out different kinds of relationships and connections that aren't with family.

Third, even though the family tries to show that they care about the community, they promote selfishness and self-centeredness. It's interesting how people think they are being selfless by putting their family first when they are just being selfish. For example, when parents argue for what's best for their child without considering others, they are being antisocial, but they think they are being virtuous. They do whatever it takes for their child, seeing them as a continuation of themselves. Political talk that says we need to think about the future because of our families, like when people say we need laws for our kids, puts too much focus on individuals and shows a lack of understanding of how the future affects everyone. The family helps people keep and pass down their personal belongings, like money and land. If it wasn't for the family, people would have a harder time saving and passing down their things to their kids. We should not get rid of the family, but instead, work to make sure everyone is equal and has the freedom to participate in family life. The family has the potential to bring us together, but sometimes it doesn't happen and things get messed up.

Corporations can create and ruin the things that everyone shares. Overall, capitalist production is a big system that helps people work together and make things, but then some people keep the rewards for themselves. For a lot of workers, the only place they work together with others and do projects as a team is at their job. It's the only place they can get away from being alone in today's society. Working together in an organized way makes people feel excited and motivated, which leads to a more enjoyable and productive work environment. As expected, companies want their employees to think that the enjoyment and fulfillment they feel at work are because of the company. This makes employees feel committed and loyal to the company. The saying is that what's good for the company is good for everyone. Work in a capitalist society indeed brings people together to work and cooperate, but this is not always the case for lower-level workers. As we already talked about, the work and creativity of people are taken and restricted by the control of the wealthy. What we need to say is that the company is a lot like a family in how it creates and damages the things we share. Both can seem like the only places where people work together in today's world. But at work and in families, relationships are controlled by rules and there are limits from the outside. As a result, many people who try to escape from their troubled families end up finding comfort in their jobs, and vice versa. Some people also escape from their jobs to find comfort in their families. The idea of finding a balance between work and family is just a choice between two bad options. For too many people in our society, these are the only places where they can find some sense of belonging.

Finally, the country is also a social group where people share and sometimes misuse resources. Many people feel like they belong to their country, which includes their culture, society, and politics. This feeling becomes stronger during difficult times like war, when everyone is asked to come together for the good of the country. A nation is not just about history, language, and culture. It is something that people imagine and feel connected to.

Sadly, our only option for coming together is through the nation. This limits our ability to form other types of communities and creates divisions within the nation itself. A country always needs to make a group of people who all have the same identity. This can make people who are different feel left out or less important. Yes, it is true that the country and its people can come together to fight against colonial and imperial powers. However, even in these cases, there are dangers in being too focused on the nation and national identity, which may only become clear after the fighting is over. When the nation asks people to sacrifice for its honor and togetherness, it reminds us of fascist ideas. We have heard these requests many times from both powerful and less powerful countries, promoting control and warlike actions. These are some of the ways that ordinary people are harmed by their own country. Even though we may not like them, we should remember that families, companies, and countries all bring people together and provide resources for the community. All these organizations work together, share resources, and communicate with each other. This makes people want to work together, but it can also be challenging. The people need to leave their families, companies, and countries, but still work towards the things they all want to achieve together. Remember that when we open and make it easier to use common resources in biopolitical production, we are taking over control of how things are made and reproduced. This helps to take away power from the people who have a lot of money or control, and it helps to build independence for a lot of people. This process of leaving behind the old way of doing things is the main way that people are fighting for their rights today.

Our readers who like fighting might not want to believe in class struggle as a big fight because it doesn't seem like a big battle. Don't worry Moses found out a while ago that powerful people don't just let you leave without a fight? And, most importantly, exodus does not mean leaving without anything, with no clothes, no shoes, and no money. No, we need to take back what belongs to us, which means claiming the things we have made and the things we need for our future.

## CONCLUSION

Workers and businesses interact shows a big change in how society and the economy work right now. Old ways of organizing work and money are changing to be more flexible, connected, and open. This change is happening because technology is getting better, the way people work is changing, and the world is becoming more connected. The idea of open social relationships means moving away from unequal power dynamics and promoting working together and understanding between workers and employers. New technology helps workers have more control over their work and be more involved in making decisions. The paper shows that resources and power should be shared more fairly, instead of being controlled by a small group of people at the top. Although open social relations offer many opportunities, it is important to realize that there are also challenges that come with them. We need to be able to change, communicate well, and rethink how power works in order to make this new way of doing things work. The examples and studies in the paper show that when businesses and workers are more open with each other, it can make the economy and society better for everyone.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] R. M. Sani, H. Sambodo, and B. Bambang, "The Effect of Human Capital, Labors, and Capital on Economic Growth in Barlingmascakeb," *EKO-REGIONAL J. Pengemb. Ekon. Wil.*, 2018.
- [2] F. Alvarez-Cuadrado, N. Van Long, and M. Poschke, "Capital-labor substitution, structural change and the labor income share," *J. Econ. Dyn. Control*, 2018.



- [3] C. Hubert, "Capital/Labour separation in French agriculture: The end of family farming?," *Land use policy*, 2018.
- [4] S. S. Azizi, "The impacts of workers' remittances on human capital and labor supply in developing countries," *Econ. Model.*, 2018.
- [5] W. S. Leung, K. Mazouz, J. Chen, and G. Wood, "Organization capital, labor market flexibility, and stock returns around the world," *J. Bank. Financ.*, 2018.
- [6] R. Lazutka, A. Juška, and J. Navickė, "Labour and Capital Under a Neoliberal Economic Model: Economic Growth and Demographic Crisis in Lithuania," *Eur. - Asia Stud.*, 2018.
- [7] D. Gericke, A. Burmeister, J. Löwe, J. Deller, and L. Pundt, "How do refugees use their social capital for successful labor market integration? An exploratory analysis in Germany," *J. Vocat. Behav.*, 2018.
- [8] B. Christophers, "Intergenerational Inequality? Labour, Capital, and Housing Through the Ages," *Antipode*, 2018.
- [9] N. Trenkle, "Labour in the era of fictitious capital," *Contradictions*, 2018.
- [10] J. Unni, "Formalization of the Informal Economy: Perspectives of Capital and Labour," *Indian J. Labour Econ.*, 2018.
- [11] C. Sheerin and C. Hughes, "Gender-segregated labour spaces and social capital – does context matter?," *Eur. J. Train. Dev.*, 2018.
- [12] A. Naz and E. Ahmad, "Driving Factors of Globalization: An Empirical Analysis of the Developed and Developing Countries," *Bus. Econ. Rev.*, 2018.

## CHAPTER 12

# POLITICAL ONTOLOGY OF THE MULTITUDE IN BIO POLITICAL PRODUCTION

---

Hemal Thakker, Assistant Professor  
 Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India  
 Email Id-hemal.thakker@atlasuniversity.edu.in

### **ABSTRACT:**

The political ontology of the multitude within the realm of bio political production. The discourse navigates through the perspectives of various scholars, such as Laclau, Virno, Balibar, Žižek, and Badiou, who grapple with the complexities of the multitude's political agency and orientation. The discussion emphasizes the intricate relationship between the multitude, immanence, and hegemony, shedding light on the necessity for articulation and the emergence of a guiding force. Critiques regarding the multitude's ambivalence and potential alignment with dominant forces are addressed, providing nuanced insights into its political capacities. Drawing on feminist and philosophical perspectives, the essay examines the transformative nature of the common, challenging traditional notions of fixity and immutability. The concept of biopolitical production emerges as a central theme, intertwining economic and political dimensions. The analysis concludes by asserting that the multitude is not a static entity but a constant process of making, emphasizing its potential for autonomous political action grounded in the dynamics of the common.

### **KEYWORDS:**

Ontology, Political, Power, Production, Resistance, Social, Sovereignty.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Everything is ready for biopolitical labor to break free from capitalist control. The common resources and the constant creation of new things are the foundation for this change. Capitalism's ways of exploiting and controlling labor are starting to hinder its productivity. However, there are also opposing factors: new ways of making money take away and make private what is meant for everyone, and the old social institutions constantly make it worse. What does this mean for us? Looking at the facts only gets us this much but no more. A capitalist crisis does not always lead to a collapse right away. The many problems in the common biopolitical field don't automatically leave and become independent. We need to have a political group to start political events. The kairos is the right time for something special to happen and a political leader needs to take advantage of it to break the routine of everyday life. We think that the idea of the multitude is a good way to organize the project of leaving and becoming free. We believe that traditional ways of organizing with one leader and a strict hierarchy are not good or effective in today's world. The idea of having many options has been talked about in smart and political groups for a few years. We can use these discussions to think about and improve the idea. We have found that the most helpful critiques and challenges usually focus on two main questions: can the group of people take organized political action, and are their actions making progress or bringing freedom[1], [2]?

The people who disagree with the idea of a large group of individuals in society agree with us that there are many different types of people, especially in the context of politics and life. The important question is how these different types of people can work together in politics. The basic idea of politics itself is at the core of the play. Pierre Macherey says that politics involves making choices that affect not just one person, but the whole society. He wants to know how individuals can come together to form a united group. "We need a political group

to get involved. This group should be collective and not have a hierarchical structure. It needs to stay true to its horizontal nature. How can a large group of people work together without losing the independence of each individual within it? Macherey believes that when many people come together, it's hard to make decisions and act as one. He thinks any political plan for a large group is in a tough spot: it can either give up its diverse structure and become a single organization, or keep its structure and not be able to make political decisions and take action.

Ernesto Laclau also believes that the many different aspects of a group of people can make it hard for them to do politics. He thinks that there are many different groups in society today. He says that in order to take political action, individuals need to come together and work out how to organize and define their political relationships. Laclau thinks that for articulation to happen, a powerful force needs to emerge and direct the process for everyone to follow. Hegemony is when many different things come together as one. This makes them able to work together and make decisions. The most important political action is bringing people together. Similar to Macherey, Laclau views the multitude as a potential for politics but not yet fully political[3], [4].

Another question is about how the group will act politically and the focus of its political actions, rather than the specific form of its politics. These authors don't think that the people's political decisions and actions will focus on freedom. Paolo Virno, for instance, is one of the people who has really developed the idea of the multitude. He thinks that the politics of the multitude is tricky because it has both social unity and a tendency to be aggressive. Just like many philosophers have warned, it's not realistic to think that people are always good in their natural state. Virno also talks about the mixed feelings and uncertainties of the "state of nature" when it comes to creating life. The new tools that many people have, like language and communication, can be used for good or for bad. Virno says we should look at both the good and bad sides of these tools when talking about the power of the people. Etienne Balibar believes that the idea of the multitude does not have clear political rules to guide its actions in a positive way or to oppose the system. It could help the global exploitation systems as much as it could fight against them. Like Virno, Balibar also focuses on the mixed feelings of the multitude. For instance, he talks about how the multitude can be both feared and admired at the same time. The fear felt by many people and the fear they spread can lead to different political outcomes. The group of people can be like a strong boat, to use Balibar's comparison, but without a steering system, it's hard to know where it will go.

Slavoj Žižek and Alain Badiou go even further in asking about the political direction of the majority, saying it is not unclear, but actually supports the ruling powers. Žižek argues that the many people, even when they protest capitalism, actually copy and help capitalism, and he believes this thinking comes from Marx's ideas. Marx made a mistake by thinking that the capitalist system would create a group of people, the proletariat, who would want to rebel against it. Žižek believes that the conflicts and choices that come from capitalism actually help to keep the system going. He studies how money creates many different things in the market and how people want many different things because of the stuff they can buy. From this point of view, the many different groups of people and their connections in a horizontal way are similar to the way capital spreads out and breaks away from its roots. So, even when it seems like the multitude is fighting against capitalism, their actions end up supporting and continuing capitalist control. Žižek believes that radical change and revolutionary opposition to capitalism will not come from within the capitalist system [5], [6].

Žižek thinks that the mistakes of many people's thinking come from a problem with Marx. Badiou believes that they come from Foucault's ideas about resistance. Because resistance is

always connected to power, Badiou believes that it can't get away from power and also doesn't see the need for a big change to break free from power. He says that the idea of a creative group of people who are against the system is just an unrealistic fantasy. The word "resistance" is just a small part of the power's progress. Badiou doesn't think the current movements of the people are very important. "We have only seen average performances from the typical small-minded group of people, loudly claiming the right to have fun without putting in any effort, and making sure to avoid any kind of control or rules. We understand that being disciplined is important in all areas to find the truth. Badiou criticizes the idea of the multitude by saying it's a wider version of what Žižek says. Žižek points out Marx's mistake, saying that the multitude seems to fight against capital but actually just copies and supports it. Badiou, drawing on Foucault's ideas, says that the multitude and other resistance movements are just part of the progress of power itself.

## DISCUSSION

These questions and criticisms about the political abilities and beliefs of the large group of people are helpful because they help us understand how well the idea works for organizing projects for freedom in our society. To answer these questions, we need to explain that the multitude is not naturally a political group but something that is organized. This changes the conversation from what the multitude is to how it is made. Before talking to them directly, we first need to understand the ideas behind the concept of multitude and how it relates to nature.

"The multitude is created through a political process, just like the people. However, the people is formed as a unified group by a powerful leader, while the multitude is formed through connections on the same level without a single leader. We can look at this difference in another way by understanding that these two processes have different connections between politics and the natural state. An old idea in politics says that to have power, a group of people need to go from chaos to order. But when it comes to the majority of people, this idea doesn't really fit. Their power is both chaotic and organized at the same time. This might seem strange, but it makes more sense when we see how the majority of people change and adapt[7], [8].

Feminist experts have shown how nature is always changing, not fixed. They say it's not separate from culture and society. Judith Butler questions if gender is fixed or if it can change. She challenges the idea that sex and gender are separate. During the second wave of feminist theory, most people looked at how gender is shaped by society. Butler says that they also believed that differences between men and women are natural and cannot be changed. She believes that both gender and sex are created by society, and that differences in sex and sexuality are shaped by language and communication. This doesn't mean that sex isn't related to our bodies and how we're made, but it does mean that what we know and believe about sex is influenced by our social environment. Other feminist researchers also argue using scientific and biological terms to show that nature changes based on social beliefs and actions. Anne Fausto-Sterling studies how our bodies and nature change when we interact with others. She focuses on how we think about sex and gender, and how these ideas are shaped by our society and culture. She says that even the way our bones grow can change depending on how we use our bodies and how we identify as male or female. So, our bone structure isn't as fixed as we might think. Our background and beliefs affect how our bones grow. This doesn't mean nature doesn't exist. It means that nature is always changing because of how people live and interact with each other. The idea that nature can change is connected to the belief that everything is always changing because of how people act and behave. In Spinoza's words, God is not separate from the world but is instead made up of everything in it[9], [10].

These studies of how nature can change really just talk about what is normal - and nature is just another word for what is normal. But it's important to remember the difference between the two ideas of the common we mentioned before. The traditional idea says that common things are natural and separate from society. But the biopolitical view sees the common in all parts of life, not just nature. It includes things like languages, habits, and emotions in human society. According to traditional ideas from thinkers like Locke and Rousseau, society and history usually ruin the common things and turn them into private property. However, the biopolitical concept focuses on not only protecting common things, but also fighting to make them and choosing their good qualities. It also tries to avoid their bad, corrupt forms. We could think of this as a way of looking at how humans and nature depend on each other and how they can both change and help each other. Now we can understand how the multitude becoming political doesn't need to abandon the state of nature, as traditional sovereignty says, but instead needs a change in the common that affects nature, culture, and society at the same time. The change of ordinary things makes us think about how we create our own thoughts and feelings. It's important to remember how intense the discussions about postmodernism were in the 1980s and 1990s. One group focused on how people think. In some ways, they said the same thing as the Frankfurt School - that living in a capitalist society makes people feel like they don't belong. But they didn't feel as sad about it as the Frankfurt School did. Some people thought that saying people's feelings are created by capitalist culture meant that they only had a little bit of freedom to have fun and be unpredictable. On the other hand, there were people who supported modern ideas and believed in the importance of the individual and the need for freedom. An individual who is not part of the powerful group was seen as important for politics in various areas like class, race, and gender. These two groups were the main focus in the debates, but there was also a third approach by Foucault, Deleuze, and Guattari that we support. These authors are looking at how social systems create our thoughts and feelings in things like buildings, therapy talk, and government, but they don't cheer or feel sad about the fact that our thoughts and feelings are made by powerful systems. They see creating thoughts and ideas as the main place where political fights happen. We need to change how our thoughts and feelings are influenced, avoid being controlled by outside forces, and build the foundation for creating things on our own[11], [12].

Understanding how politics affects the way people think and feel can help us understand changes in the economy. The way ideas, feelings, and relationships are created directly affects how people think and act. This is where our thoughts and feelings come from. We can think of economic production as people working with nature to change things. But now, the "nature" that people change is more about how they think and feel. This connection between making things and how people feel changes the usual ideas about work. It can make things feel confusing. But we can make it easier to understand by thinking about how things change when people work together. This type of economic process is important for making things, and it changes both nature and how people think and feel. Multitude is not a thing but a process of making and changing. It is not fixed or static, but constantly transformed and enriched. This type of creation is different because it doesn't have a creator. By creating thoughts and feelings, the group makes itself the creator of its constant change, always turning into something new together.

### **From Being to Making the Multitude**

When we start thinking about how we can create a large group instead of just being part of one, and when we understand that this group is always changing and growing because of what we have in common, then we can better answer any questions or criticisms about the idea we talked about before. The first questions say that a large group of people cannot do

politics because they are not controlled by a powerful leader. The question is whether political action can be done only by dominant, united groups or also by different groups working together horizontally. We can find the answers by looking at our previous economic research. Biopolitical production happens in the common area. It can only happen there. Great things are created by a group of people working together, not just one person. Workers are starting to become more independent from the control of business owners. This makes it harder for businesses to take advantage of them and control their work, which makes it harder for them to be productive. Biopolitical production is like an orchestra playing music without a conductor. If someone tries to take control, the production would stop. The way biopolitical economic production works is like a comparison for political action. Just like a diverse group of people creates intangible things and economic worth, they can also make political choices. It's not just a comparison, it's also about having the skills needed for both. Producers can work together and make collective decisions, which also impacts politics. It gives them the tools and habits for making decisions as a group. In this case, the separation between making things and political activity, as talked about by people like Hannah Arendt, doesn't hold up. Arendt thinks that politics is about lots of different people and their freedom. She sees political action as a place where individuals come together and work together in the same world. She says that this is different from the economic world of working and making things. The people who work for money might see political actions and speeches as not important. They might think that they are wasting time. Work is focused on a specific goal, where all the effort goes into making the final product. On the other hand, the effort put into political processes keeps growing and doesn't end in a product. What lasts in our world are these processes, and they last as long as humanity does. Arendt talks about how things are made, like in a factory. But if we look at how things are made with living things in mind, we see that the qualities she talks about for politics also apply to making things. That's why we call it "biopolitical" production, because making things with living things is also political. Arendt talks about another important human activity called labor. This activity is about taking care of our basic needs and keeping our bodies working. She says the purpose of this work is to improve life. Arendt mainly talks about the idea of work to show the difference between the political world and the world of basic needs. But we can see that her ideas are starting to blur. Politics has always been connected to people's needs and how they live. Today, politics focuses on making specific ways of living. So the word "biopolitical" is useful. By focusing on how the multitude is created, we can see that its productive activity is also a way of making themselves politically.

We can now easily answer the first set of questions about the political abilities of the many people. It's true that coming together to make decisions in politics isn't easy, but that doesn't mean a powerful group has to be in charge for politics to work. Spontaneity and dominance are not the only options. The group can gain power by working together and resolving conflicts. Don't start a revolution based on an idea or a group of people that you imagine. That's what Lenin said in 1917. He says that the Russian people cannot govern themselves and need a strong force to lead them during the changes. They have been taught at work to follow orders and be watched over by their supervisors and managers. They have a boss at work, so they feel they need a boss in politics too. Lenin's warning makes it even more important to show that biopolitical production is becoming more and more dominant in today's economy, and the abilities that come with it.

The next group of questions is about whether people's political views are progressive or regressive. It's not easy to say whether they are against the current system of power or in favor of it. In the past, we suggested that resistance comes before power because power only affects people who are free, and so even though it exists alongside power, resistance doesn't

have to support or repeat the same power structures. We explained a new idea about events that is different from the usual belief that events happen on their own. Our only job is to stay true to them and behave properly when they happen. Those who believe in this idea of the event can only eagerly wait for another event to happen. Biopolitical events happen when people come together to create things for everyone to use. Creating things is a mysterious and amazing process that happens every day from within many people.

Resistance and creating events does not determine the political direction of the many people. The way the majority of people relate to the common things can help us figure out what to do next. Pierre Macherey talks about how regular people are often rebellious and go beyond what powerful people want. "In everyday life," he explains, "we should think of all the things people do together to create and work as a team, like collaborating and cooperating in a network that can keep growing. That's why everyday life goes beyond every system and order, and it is naturally rebellious against them. The large number of people, who have common beliefs, always goes beyond the control of those in power. This shows that they don't work well with the current system and are against it, but it doesn't show that they have a plan for freedom yet.

One way the people are moving politically is by leaving all the bad things in social institutions like family, corporations, and nations. People should choose what is good for them and avoid things that could harm them in the community. The problem with these institutions is that they use hierarchies, divisions, and limits to stop people from thinking for themselves and working together. The solution is for the majority to start working together and creating new ideas again.

The political views should be determined when creating a group of people, including the way they are governed and how they make money. In the way things are made through biopolitical processes, the multitude changes and creates new things together. This makes us think of the idea that the working class can change and grow through their work and working together. Karl Marx talked about this, saying that the process of working changes people and also helps them learn and create new things. This changing and growing of the working class through their work gives an idea of how they can govern themselves politically. All of these things are influenced by events related to living organisms, trying to escape bad ways of doing things together, and focused on making good things together. However, they don't completely show what the multitude's political beliefs are. Now we have to focus on how we organize things because that's where we'll see if the multitude's progressive and liberating qualities can be confirmed and strengthened in its own lasting systems. This will be one of the main things we need to focus on, first in *De Singularitate 1* and the *Intermezzo* that comes after it, and then throughout the second half of the book: a theory of how to organize politics that can work for a large group of people. We need to show that many people can make big changes in the way things are done. This is the only way to make big changes happen today.

We have a lot of ideas and theories, but they won't do much unless we have something to bring them together and make them work. That something is love, even though some people may not like the idea. Some people feel embarrassed and others feel superior and smug. Love is often seen as too emotional for serious discussions, especially in philosophy and politics. Let the poets talk about love, some people say, and feel its warmth. But we believe that love is important for philosophy and politics, and not thinking about it is one reason why modern thinking is not strong. It is not a good idea to only rely on priests, poets, and psychoanalysts for love. We need to clean up our understanding of love in philosophy and politics. This means getting rid of some wrong ideas about love and redefining it to show how useful it is. As we do this, we'll see that even philosophers, political scientists, and economists often talk

about love, despite their reputation for being precise and unemotional. If they weren't so shy, they would tell us. This will show that love is the main part of our project. Without it, the rest would be boring.

To understand love as a philosophical and political idea, it helps to start by looking at how poor people and communities support and help each other. Coming together, looking out for each other, working together, and helping with shared activities are really important for them to survive. This brings us back to the things we mentioned before about poverty. While the poor may not have a lot of material things, they still have the ability to come up with new ideas and create things. The true nature of the poor is not their lack of possessions, but their ability to make things happen. When we come together as a group, we can create a new way of thinking and working together that is stronger than what we can do on our own. Our starting point is that love brings people together and helps them see things in a different way. It's not just about making things or getting what we need, but it's important in its own right.

If that sounds too emotional, you can also understand it by studying how politics and money are connected. In biopolitical production, the making of things that everyone shares is not separate from making money. It's not just a private thing or about making more people, but it's a part of making money. Love is a strong force that helps people work together and form relationships. It also has a big impact on the economy. When we think of love like this, it is not something that just happens on its own or doesn't require any effort. It doesn't just happen to us like magic from somewhere else. Instead, it's something that people plan and do together. Love is also helpful in a philosophical way - helpful in creating existence. When we create a feeling of love, we are not just making new things or people in the world. We are creating a new world and a new way of living together. Being is not a background where life happens, it is a relationship where we can always make a difference. Love is a big change that makes something new. It creates something different from what was there before. Existence is made up of love. Many philosophers have argued over this important idea. For example, Heidegger strongly disagrees with the idea of how things are made in his talk about poverty that we read before. Humanity becomes poor in order to become rich, he says. When it doesn't have things it doesn't need, it shows what it really needs, its connection to existence. But in this connection, the poor don't have the ability to make up who they are. And in fact, people as a whole are powerless in the face of existence. Spinoza and Heidegger have different ideas about this. Like Heidegger, he may say that people become wealthy when they understand their connection to existence. However, Spinoza's view on this connection is completely different. Especially in the deep thoughts of Spinoza's Ethics, we create our existence through love. Love, according to Spinoza, is when we feel happy and powerful because of someone or something outside of ourselves. We become connected to love and try to make more happiness, creating stronger bodies and minds. Spinoza believed that love is a result of people working together and always trying to improve. This includes loving nature and wanting to make it better and more powerful. Every time someone shows love, it's like they are making a big change in the world. Love can turn a bad situation into a good one. Existence is just another way of saying something that is unavoidably shared and cannot be kept to oneself. It is always open to everyone. In simple words, saying that love is ontologically constitutive means that it creates the things we all share. When we think of love as something that brings people together, we also have to understand that, like the things we share, love can be both good and bad. In plain words, a lot of what people think of as love nowadays is not really true love. The problem is that love has turned into something repetitive, instead of being about sharing and coming together. True love is about balancing what we have in common with the unique things about each person.



One type of corrupted love is loving only people who are similar to you, like your neighbors. This narrow interpretation of love can lead to discrimination against those who are different from you. Family love is the idea that you should love your family members more than anyone else, sometimes even more than people outside your family. This is a type of love based on your identity within the family. Loving your race and loving your country, or patriotism, are similar because they both make you feel like you should love people who are most like you, and not love people who are different from you as much. Family, race, and nation are twisted versions of the common and are the foundations for twisted versions of love. From this point of view, we can say that movements like populism, nationalism, fascism, and religious fundamentalism are not based on hate, but on a distorted form of love for their own group.

One way to fight corruption is to think about loving your neighbor in a wider way. Instead of just loving people who are similar to you, try to love people who are different from you. Please rewrite this text in simpler language. Please rephrase this text using basic words: Franz Rosenzweig says that love is always ready to take the place of someone or something else. In the end, love applies to everything and the world. We must love our neighbor and everyone else, as this is the most important commandment in monotheistic religions. This means we should love people who are different from us. If you don't like studying religious writings to understand this, think about Walt Whitman's poetry. In his poetry, he often writes about encountering strangers with wonder, learning, and exploration. Nietzsche's Zarathustra says it's better to love faraway people than those who are close. This is similar to Whitman's teachings. Loving people who are different from us can help counteract the harmful effects of only loving people who are like us. This type of love can keep love from becoming boring and repetitive. So this is another way to think of love as a biopolitical event: it doesn't just break away from what already exists and create something new, but it also makes unique things and brings them together in a shared connection.

Another type of twisted love portrays love as a process of becoming identical, becoming the same. The popular idea of romantic love in our society, portrayed by Hollywood every day, is that the couple should become one. This corrupted romantic love follows a set pattern - couple, marriage, family - and envisions people finding their perfect match, like lost puzzle pieces that now together make a complete picture. Marriage and family bring a couple together and can sometimes cause problems in the community. This idea of love bringing people together is also found in many religions, where people believe that loving God means becoming one with the divine. It's not surprising that ideas of mystical union often use romantic language like betrothal and marriage because they are trying to bring different things together. In the same way, different types of patriotism believe in putting aside differences to come together as one nation and form a national identity. This idea of love as bringing everyone together is connected to the idea of loving and uniting with people who are the same as us.

One important idea in our argument is that when many different things come together, it forms something called "the common. This is different from the old idea of there being many things or just one thing. The common is made up of many different parts, and it goes together with the idea of there being lots of different things. In simpler terms, when it comes to politics, if we didn't all share the same world, we wouldn't be able to talk to each other or help each other. And if we weren't all different from each other, there would be no reason for us to talk or help each other. We agree with Hannah Arendt's idea that politics is about different people coming together in the same world.

Encouraging people to meet and connect with others who are different is the main way to fight against love that has been affected by the need for everyone to be the same. This kind of love stops people from being themselves and also stops the community from growing. Being the same and working together means nothing new is made, just doing the same thing over and over with no changes. Love should be defined by the connections and experiences of unique individuals coming together, which create a new sense of togetherness and new unique experiences. In the context of being, we talked about love as creating something, but in a political context, we should focus on its ability to bring things together. Love brings together individual differences, like the different parts of a song, not as one but as a connected group of people. Bringing together these two sides of love - the idea of love for everyone and the unique aspects of it - is a big challenge in understanding love as a real and political action.

We started by saying that making things and money is all about love, but we know that economists don't agree. Economists have been praising Bernard Mandeville's book *The Fable of the Bees* for a long time. They think it shows that there is no connection between economics and love. Mandeville talks about a beehive that is rich and strong, but filled with many bad behaviors like lying, wanting too much, being lazy, and being scared. The bees who teach about being good always talk against bad behavior, but it doesn't make a difference. At last, the leader of the bee colony grows tired of all the complaining and makes all the bees good and gets rid of bad behavior. But when this happens, the bees stop working and the hive falls apart. This story is meant for people who try to make society perfect. Mandeville thinks that social theorists should focus on studying how people really are and what motivates them, instead of telling them how they should be. Just like Machiavelli and Spinoza did.

Mandeville's story made people in England mad in the 1700s, like he wanted. But some, like Adam Smith, thought it proved that capitalism is good. Smith agrees with Mandeville that people do things for selfish reasons, and he uses this idea to support the belief that self-interest drives market exchanges and the economy. If everyone does what is best for themselves, then the overall benefit for everyone will happen naturally in the market, as if it is being directed by an invisible force. Smith strongly believes in the importance of people being kind and caring, but he doesn't want the government to interfere in the economy. He thinks that the best outcomes for everyone will come from people working for their own good, rather than trying to help others. In his famous words, he says that we get our dinner not because the people who make it are nice, but because they want to make a profit. We should appeal to their self-interest, not their kindness, when we talk to them about what we need. We don't trade love for money.

We learn about a new way of thinking about the economy when we look at how bees help pollinate plants outside of their hive. For bees, flowers near the hive are a good thing. Bees fly from one flower to another, collecting nectar to take back to their hive. When a bee gathers nectar from a flower, it picks up pollen on its legs. When it visits another flower, some of the pollen rubs off onto that flower's stigma. Bees help flowers grow by carrying pollen from one flower to another. This helps the flowers produce fruit. This shows how bees and flowers work together to help each other.

## CONCLUSION

Studying how the multitude affects politics in the context of biopolitical production uncovers a lot of different ideas and questions. From Laclau's focus on the power of leadership to Virno's uncertainty about the political actions of the many, and Balibar's worries about how it

could lead to global exploitation, the discussion shows that this concept has many aspects. Zizek and Badiou believe that the multitude, even when it resists, might end up supporting the systems it wants to challenge. These criticisms make us think about the details of political beliefs and the difficulties in imagining a diverse group as a force for change. Studying the common area, as both a part of nature and society, makes the story more complex. It questions the usual ideas of staying the same and never changing. Looking at things from a biopolitical lens shows how economic production and people's thoughts and feelings interact with each other, making it harder to separate them like we usually do. When we talk about how people think and the nature of a large group, we see that the group is always changing and growing, not staying the same. This change, based on what we all share, goes against the usual idea that there is a clear difference between living in the wild and living in society.

#### REFERENCES:

- [1] J. D. Margulies and K. K. Karanth, "The production of human-wildlife conflict: A political animal geography of encounter," *Geoforum*, 2018.
- [2] J. Hardy, Y. Imani, and B. Zhuang, "Regional resilience and global production networks in China: An open political economy perspective," *Compet. Chang.*, 2018.
- [3] E. Campos-Domínguez and B. García-Orosa, "Algorithmic communication and political parties: Automation of production and flow of messages," *Prof. la Inf.*, 2018.
- [4] I. Stigzelius, "Representing the political consumer: liquid agencies in the production of consumer voice," *Consum. Mark. Cult.*, 2018.
- [5] M. J. Goldman, M. D. Turner, and M. Daly, "A critical political ecology of human dimensions of climate change: Epistemology, ontology, and ethics," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*. 2018.
- [6] A. Ardèvol-Abreu, C. M. Hooker, and H. Gil de Zúñiga, "Online news creation, trust in the media, and political participation: Direct and moderating effects over time," *Journalism*, 2018.
- [7] C. Noonan and A. Genders, "Breaking the generic mould? Grayson Perry, Channel 4 and the production of British arts television," *Crit. Stud. Telev.*, 2018.
- [8] M. Demir Kahraman, B. Pak, and K. Scheerlinck, "Production of heterotopias as public spaces and paradox of political representation: A Lefebvrian approach," *A/Z ITU J. Fac. Archit.*, 2018.
- [9] A. Sorge and W. Streeck, "Diversified quality production revisited: Its contribution to German socio-economic performance over time," *Socio-Economic Rev.*, 2018.
- [10] A. D. Suparto, "The Battle of Truths: The Production of Meaning in Indonesian Political Memes," *K@ta Kita*, 2018.
- [11] L. Kissová, "The production of (Un)deserving and (un)acceptable: Shifting representations of migrants within political discourse in Slovakia," *East Eur. Polit. Soc.*, 2018.
- [12] C. de Castro, "Disputing the border: The political dimensions in global production networks and in regional and local development," *Ager*, 2018.