AFTER 2-15-2003

when millions of people marched worldwide against the second US invasion of Iraq, the peace movement lost its strength, and so did the global movement against the corporations.

The social forces that merged in the counterglobalization movement have dispersed, the world landscape has been submerged by the endless war started by Bush and Cheney, and despair has taken a central place in the cultural scene. For three years after the Seattle events of November 1999, the counterglobalization movement organized demonstrations and media-actions all around the globe, but this wave of mobilization never went beyond ethical declarations; it never became a process of social autonomy. During those years, every Saturday afternoon the streets were full of people protesting against this and against that, but on Monday morning the same people were sitting in the offices and factories and schools and laboratories, bending to corporate rule.

After February 15, 2003, impotence prevailed, energy dissolved, and people were forced to accept the blackmail of war, competition, and precarity. But the crucial question is why the social class of the general intellect, the precarious cognitariat and the forces of labor in general, have not been able to create their space of autonomy. In order to understand labor's inability to react to growing exploitation, we have to analyze the effects of recombinant semicapitalism, and the effects of the precarization of labor.

This is what I want to do in this last part of the book: I want to understand the social and cultural roots of the present palsy of the social organism, overcoming the bitterness that originates from the current humiliation of human life and intelligence. The task of a thinker—assuming that thinking has a task—is not to breathe hope into hearts, but to help in understanding reality, because only understanding can call forth new possibilities.

After a general analysis of the precarization of labor and its effects, I'll plunge into the new landscape that has emerged from the crisis of the global economy. I'll try to describe the evolution of capitalism following the financial catastrophe of September 2008. Furthermore, I'll attempt to describe the relationship between language, affection and sociability in order to look into the future of subjectivation, or lack
of it. Finally, I'll explore new theoretical pathways in the field of the imagination of the future.

The outcome of the catastrophe that the financial crisis has triggered, along with the military defeat of the West in Iraq and Afghanistan, is not predictable at the moment. The next decade will be marked by a massive redistribution of power and wealth. But it's impossible to say now if neoliberal ideology will fade, and give way to a return of social solidarity, or if the criminal class that has grown up in the shadow of neoliberal deregulation will instigate ethnic and national war, launching a planetary genocide for the possession of decreasing resources.

So far, the second scenario has been prevailing. In the first year after the financial collapse of September 2008, nation-states have invested a huge amount of money to rescue the financial class that has redirected monetary resources from social needs. The entire society, especially the new generation, has been called upon to pay to save the criminal class. If workers do not find the means to change direction, we are heading toward a growing destruction of the material and immaterial structures of civilized life, a barbarization of the social landscape.

**PRECARIOUS FUTURE**

The concepts of the subject and subjectivity have been crucial in the philosophy of the last fifty years, from the Hegelian Renaissance of the 1960s, tied to the surfacing of dissent in the socialist countries and anticonsumerist movements in the West, to the neo-Marxist thought of the Italian workerist school, the poststructuralist thought of Deleuze and Guattari, and the genealogical work of Michel Foucault. In the word "subject," two different concepts are contained: one is action, the other is consciousness. Only by grasping the inner mediation that connects the concept of the subject to the idealistic vision of History as the realization of Spirit and Substance, can we understand the complicated evolutions of the subject in modern philosophy. "In my view... everything turns on grasping and expressing the True, not only as Substance, but equally as Subject," writes Hegel (1977, 9-10) in the "Preface" to Phenomenology of Spirit. He also argues that: "The living Substance is being which is in truth Subject, or, what is the same, is in truth actual only in so far as it is the movement of positing itself, or is the mediation of its self-othering with the self" (10). And finally: "The True is the whole. But the whole is nothing other than the essence consuming itself through its development. Of the Absolute it must be said that it is essentially a result, that only in the end is it what it truly is; and that precisely in this consists its nature, viz. to be actual, subject, the spontaneous becoming of itself" (11).

Consciousness is implied in the Hegelian concept of the subject, because consciousness is the mediation between the action and its actor. But here I want to elaborate precisely on the relationship between action and consciousness, as I am questioning the conscious character of social action in the recombinant age. Therefore, here I dismiss the concept of the "subject" (as it implies consciousness) and substitute the word "actor."

I speak of agency, of a collective actor, of singularity in the Guattarian sense, and, finally, I speak of "movement." Movement is the process of society: the cultural process that makes possible the political unity of different social actors who are in conflict in public space. When social actors find a common ground of understanding and act together for a common goal, I see a movement, the active and conscious side of social transformation, and also of cultural evolution. Movement is the subjective (conscious and collective) aspect of the recomposition of the living social sphere against the domination of the dead (capital).

At the end of the zero zero decade, for the first time in my life, I've been obliged to recognize that the actor is absent: you see actions, but you don't see an actor. Actions without an actor play out on the ground of social visibility, but they don't create any common ground in the space of consciousness and affectivity. Actions are performed in the theater of social production, but the agent of recomposition is not there, in the theater, but backstage, and the consciousness of the process does not belong to the process itself.

Human beings perform productive actions, but they are not conscious actors of what they are doing, and seem unable to unite feeling and thought in a common space of consciousness. Capitalism has destroyed the conditions of recomposition, and society has become unrecomposable. The noncomposability of society means that the process of subjectivation cannot take place. This is why the future has lost its
zest and people have lost all trust in it: the future no longer appears as a choice or a collective conscious action, but is a kind of unavoidable catastrophe that we cannot oppose in any way.

The future is the subject of this book: I have tried to rethink what the imagination of the future was during the century marked by the struggles of labor against capitalist exploitation, and by the creation of broad social realms of autonomy from capitalist rule. But for the remainder of the book I’m trying to investigate the present collapse of the imagination of the future, from the point of view of the (apparently) impossible recomposition of social subjectivity. Of course I don’t want to stop here, I don’t want to be the gloomy doomsayer. But I think that we have to be able to see things as they are, if we want to find a way beyond the present depressing reality.

My point of view has been shaped by two centuries of progressive enlightened history: it is the point of view of an epoch, of a generation that has been always convinced it bears the fulfillment of the modern promise. But this means I have a problem of imagination where the past and future are concerned. The way I imagine and narrate time is connected to the way history has developed during the last two centuries. But the digital mutation, coupled with neoliberal ideology, has completely reframed the perception of time, and the relationship between human beings and their social environment. We can no longer think the flow of collective time within a frame of progressive becoming.

Of course, I see very well that the progressive process has come to a halt in the age of capitalist counteroffensive and media colonization; but, I can’t help perceiving this as a temporary halt; I can’t stop thinking that my political and cultural energies have to be dedicated entirely to bringing back the old progressive rhythm of history, restoring the order of civilization that I considered eternal during the years of my cultural formation. This attitude is blinding and misleading me, and it’s preventing me from understanding what is really going on in the deep structure of the social imagination.

The progressive perception of historical time is a prejudice, and this prejudice puts me on the wrong path, giving me the false impression that something can be done in order to go back to the past history of civilization. On the contrary, nothing can be done, because the periodization I have in mind has to be reframed. Progressive ideology was based on the idealistic premise that the history of mankind is essentially the history of the progressive realization of Reason. Now we are facing a reality that has nothing to do with the realization of Reason, and also has nothing to do with an evolutionary progressive vision. Evolution is not progressive.

The progressive vision is based on the idea that evolution is human-oriented. Evolution is not human-oriented. Evolution has gone beyond the limits of a human-oriented civilization, because the limits of what humans can know or control have been surpassed.

Let us focus on two concepts recently introduced into the debate on labor and subjectivation. The concept of “recomposition” comes from the theoretical laboratory of Italian operasio. The concept of “recombination” has been proposed by Arthur Kroeker and Michael Weinstein (1993) and by the Critical Art Ensemble (1994) in order to define the epistemology of the new technologies (namely informatics and biotech). I want to apply these concepts to the organization of labor in the age of networked globalization.

I define recombinant as the technical form of the labor process in the digital environment, while recomposition means the social and cultural process enabling fragments of labor to become conscious subjectivity. My central thesis is the following: the recombinant form of the labor process has changed the very foundation of exploitation, and has displaced the social landscape in such a way that any social conscious recomposition seems impossible.

We can start with the political side of the problem. For the last two decades, the defeat of the Left around the world has often been explained by the crumbling of socialist states and the subsequent dissolution of the Communist parties. But I think the reasons for the social and political defeat have to be found in the change in labor organization and the cultural mutation produced by the media colonization of the social mind. In recent decades, the fragmentation of the political Left has been a problem, perhaps, and the defeat of the leftist parties in national elections in Europe is a symptom of this crisis. But I think that the basic problem for the progressive movement is the cultural inability to start the process of labor’s social recomposition.

Social composition is the cultural process that unifies the social body through the fusion of imaginary and cultural flows. The concept of composition originally comes from chemical science, not from the political lexicon. In the process of social composition, it’s possible to
find the material genesis of solidarity, or lack of it. The concept of composition has been elaborated in the neo-Marxist Italian theoretical landscape of the 1960s and 1970s (Tronti, Bologna, Negri), in opposition to the dogmatic vision of the prevailing Hegelian historicism of the Italian Communist Party.

In the parlance of the Italian workerist school, the root of the working class's autonomy, its ability to organize against exploitation, is to be found in the fusion of the cultural components of the social fabric. Myth, ideology, media, advertising; these forces are producing effects in the composition of society. They can produce effects of recomposition, when the different segments of social labor find a common ground of sensibility and understanding, and stand united against the exploiters. They can produce effects of decomposition, when technological and ideological capitalist action destroy feelings of friendship, the institutions of labor organization, and society's sympathy for itself.

During the decades of the 1960s and 1970s, world society underwent a process of internal recomposition that made possible the autonomy of the workers' movement from the domination of capital. Then, after the victory of Thatcher and Reagan, capital's counteroffensive smashed the organized force of labor, decentralized the factories, invaded the social brain with corporate media flows, and finally reduced the international cycle of labor to an infinite ocean of microfragments of nervous connection.

The notion of composition is very close to the Guattarian concept of subjectivation. In his books, Guattari says that we should not speak of a subject, in the old Hegel-dialectical way. The subject is not there from the beginning, as an ideal force, able to fight and win. There are no subjects in history, there are women and men, poor, frail organisms trying to escape misery and death. There are conscious and sensitive organisms expressing desire and creating rhizomes. The social molecules may find common understanding and common sensibility and may act like a subject, if they are able to share the same "refrain," as Guattari would say.

Precarity refers not only to the deregulation of the labor market and the fragmentation of work, but also the dissolution of community. A continuous flow of infolabor runs in the global network, and it is the general factor of capital valorization, but this flow isn't able to subjectivize, to coagulate in the conscious action of the collective body. This is why the labor force has apparently become unrecomposable. Solidarity between the workers of the world was the main basis of democracy during the past century, and the only guarantee of workers' human rights; it no longer exists, having been destroyed by the new division and fragmentation of recombinant labor.

Migrants, precarious workers, cognitive workers: they share the same condition of weakness, in different degrees. But they are unable to find a common ground of solidarity and struggle. This apparent unrecomposability of labor is the effect of the digitalization of the production process, and of the subsequent fractalization and precarization of labor.

In the global digital network, labor is transformed into small parcels of nervous energy picked up by the recombinant machine. In this sense, I would say that it is fractalized, and recombined by the technofinancial network. The workers are deprived of every individual consistency. Strictly speaking, the workers no longer exist. Their time exists, their time is there, permanently available to connect, to produce in exchange for a temporary salary.

Marx's prophecy about the "atom of time" is fulfilled. In the process of networked production we no longer find working persons, but abstract, depersonalized, fractal atoms of time available in the network. This is why the labor force has become unrecomposable, unable to recognize itself as a community of sensible and sensitive beings who share the same social interests and the same cultural expectations.

Is the recomposition process (which we can call a process of collective subjectivation) still possible in this new condition? The productive force of cognitive labor has been multiplied by the creation of the recombinant network. The "general intellect" to which Marx refers in the Grundrisse is the ability of knowledge to act as a value-producing force. Thanks to the introduction of digital machines, capital has incorporated the product of the general brain in its system of machines. But the living process of knowledge still resides in the mind of the individual scientist and technician.

In the digital network we are dealing with a different reality: the living brains of individuals are absorbed (subsumed) inside the process of network production and submitted to a system of technolinguistic automatisms. Recombination is the (informational and biopolitical) technique that transforms the activity of individual brains in an
abstract productive continuum. The individual brain can act effectively only through the recombinant modality: functional recombination of fragments of cognitive labor scattered in time and space, but functionally unified inside the Net.

Interoperability is the general goal of the network, and in order to connect, the recombinant fragments of living labor time have to become compatible:

The core problem of getting computers to communicate with each other is, by definition, one of compatibility. As the network grows bigger, incompatibilities must be overcome ... if an incompatibility emerges, it produces a trigger for change requiring new technical and social negotiations. Generally however a new protocol or level is introduced that, by operating between or on top of different layers, will allow them all to coexist under a single common framework. (Terranova 2004, 58–59).

Desingularization of living thought and activity is mandatory for access to the network. In the global network there are not working persons, but an infinite brain-sprawl, an ever-changing mosaic of fractal cells of available nervous energy. The person is nothing but the residue—therefore precarious—of the process of valorization.

From the point of view of subjectivation, the productive and functional potency of cognitive labor, its interoperability, seems to be inversely proportional to its social and political recomposability. The collective brain is functionally recombined in the sphere of the Net. But at the social and affective level, the social brain appears unable to recompose, to find common strategies of behavior, incapable of common narration and of solidarity. Therefore, the expansion of the productive potency of the general intellect coincides with a schizoid fragmentation of the collective brain, incapable of recomposing as conscious subjectivity, unable to act in a conscious, collective way.

During modernity, the industrial labor force was composed by persons, bearers of individual ability to perform tasks, and also bearers of physical needs and political rights, like the right to unionize, negotiate, and strike. Today, the labor force can be described as a sprawl of nervous energy, of depersonalized time available to cellular recombination. This time has been fractalized and compatibilized and so made recombinable. In order to interoperate, the individual mind has to become a cell of the networked mind, a compatible fractal: this implies a technological mutation but also a psychic mutation of the living mind.

As Christian Marazzi has explained in his books, language and capital tighten their relationship: language becomes the economic resource, the productive force, and the market. This is why I speak of semicapital: the realm of signs and the realm of production tend to coincide.

Language undergoes a mutation, which is both technological and psychic. In the human psyche, as Freud says, the access to language has much to do with affection and primarily with the body of the mother. What happens to the linguistic relationship between the mother and child when the infosphere is saturated with infostimuli and the mother's presence becomes so scarce? In The Show and Tell Machine, published in 1977, the American anthropologist Rose Goldsen argued that we are giving birth to human beings who will learn more words from machines than from mothers. In the first decade of the new century, this generation has occupied the stage of social activity, and is ready to become compatible with the digital flow.

For the new generation, access to language has more and more to do with inorganic connection, and less and less to do with the body of the mother. In her book L'ordine simbolico della madre [The Symbolic Order of the Mother], Luisa Muraro (1991) explores the intimate relationship between signifier and signified, between sign and meaning, between word and affection. I believe in the meaning of the word “water” and I acknowledge the relationship between the signifier “water” and the liquid because I trust in my mother. She has certified the relation between signifier and signified. What happens when the relation is broken, when access to language is separated from the body and from affection, reduced to mere interoperability between machinic segments of an emotionless exchange? Language is made precarious, frail, unable to grasp the emotional meaning of words. Actually, the generation that is now entering the social sphere seems psychologically frail and scarcely fit to link emotion and verbal exchange. The huge multiplication of tools for communication, the digital saturation of the infosphere, has dramatically reduced the spaces and the times of bodily interaction between persons.

Let us think of the crowd of people sitting in the subway every morning. They are precarious workers moving toward the industrial
and financial districts of the city, toward the places where they are working in precarious conditions. Everyone wears headphones, everybody looks at their cellular device, everybody sits alone and silent, never looking at the people who sit close, never speaking or smiling or exchanging any kind of signal. They are traveling alone in their lonely relationship with the universal electronic flow. Their cognitive and affective formation has made of them the perfect object of a process of desingularization. They have been pre-empted and transformed into carriers of abstract fractal ability to connect, devoid of sensitive empathy so as to become smooth, compatible parts of a system of interoperability. Although they suffer from nervous aggression, and from the exploitation that semi-capitalism is imposing on them, although they suffer from the separation between functional being and sensible body and mind, they seem incapable of human communication and solidarity; in short, they seem unable to start any process of conscious collective subjectivation.

The infosphere is the dimension of intentional signs surrounding the sensible organism. Sensibility is an interface between organism and world: we might see it specifically as the ability to understand the meaning of what cannot be said through words, the point of connection between sensitivity and language. Sensibility rather than judgment is where the mental mutation produced by the infosphere happens. Changes of perception are intertwined with the technological architecture surrounding the perceptive organism. Prior to modernity, a regime of slow transmission characterized the infosphere, man’s psychic time, and his expectations of events and signals. The acceleration of semiotic transmission and the proliferation of sources of information transformed the perception of living time. The infosphere became more rapid and dense, and sensibility underwent increasing exposure to the flow of infostimuli. Due to an intensification of electronic signals, sensibility was dragged into a vertigo of simulated stimulation that increased its speed to panic levels.

The perception of the other and its body is reshaped, too. Pressure, acceleration, and automation affect gestural, postural behavior and the whole disposition and interaction of bodies in space. At the foundation of social concern with spatial arrangements lies an effort to elaborate, hide, excite, or repress eroticism. The social arrangement of space intervenes to change the disposition of the bodies that meet in the street or sit together in the office or at school. Societies also experience varying degrees of tension and aggressiveness according to the different ways they manage eroticism and the circulation of bodies.

Throughout the history of civilization, perception has been molded by artificial regimes of images and techniques of representation. Through digital technology the image begins to proliferate vertiginously and our faculty of imagination undergoes vortices of acceleration. The image should not be considered as the brute perception of empirical data brought to our visual attention by matter: it is rather the effect of a semiconscious elaboration. The technical mode through which we receive and elaborate images acts upon the formation of the imaginary. The imaginary, in turn, shapes the imagination, the activity whereby we produce images, imagine worlds, and thus make them possible in real life. The repertoire of images at our disposal limits, exalts, amplifies, or circumscribes the forms of life and events that, through our imagination, we can project onto the world, put into being, build, and inhabit.

Technocommunicative and psychocognitive mutations are as interdependent as the organism and its ecosystem. The conscious organism is also sensuous; it is a bundle of sensitive receptors. The infosphere is more and more transformed into a tv-zapping, nonlinear, and highly chaotic flow. The social unconscious does not easily adapt to this transformation of the infosphere, because the social investment of desire is structured around the nucleus of identity, which is fleeing and dissolving in all directions.

Suddenly awoken by this semiotic proliferation, deprived of the filters that the critical and disciplinary mind of modernity once possessed, the conscious organism reacts with panic. The communicative power of digital technology produces an excess of information with respect to the socially available time of attention. How is sensibility redefined and how does it adapt to over-stimulation?

I think that the effect of semi-capitalist acceleration and overexploitation of nervous energies is exhaustion. Nervous breakdown, psychopathology, panic, depression, suicidal epidemic. "A titanic battle is about to begin, a Darwinian struggle between competing psychopathies," says Ballard in Super-Cannes, his 2000 book about the psychic catastrophe of the virtual class.
EXHAUSTION: REREADING BAUDRILLARD

The concept of exhaustion entered public discourse in the 1970s with the publication of Limits to Growth, a report for the Club of Rome:

Under the direction of a team of systems analysts based at Massachusetts Institute of Technology ... the report gave voice to the prevailing consensus that Fordist manufacture had entered a period of irreversible decline. But it also brought something palpably new to the analysis. If there was a crisis in the offing, it was not one that could be measured in conventional economic terms—a crisis in productivity or economic growth rates—but rather a wholesale crisis in the realm of reproduction. For the Club of Rome what was at stake was no less than the continuing reproduction of the earth’s biosphere and hence the future of life on earth. The most visible signs of the impending crisis were therefore to be found in the existence of all kind of ecological disequilibria, exhaustion, and breakdown, from rising levels of pollution to famine and the increase in extinction rates. (Cooper 2008, 15–16).

The report refers to the physical resources, not to the dangers of overexploitation of the nervous energies of the social mind. But the report wreaked havoc, because for the first time the intrinsic impossibility of unlimited growth was revealed. In her remarkable book, Melinda Cooper relates the concept of exhaustion to the fields of biology and mental energy. Cooper writes:

Twenty years later, armed with more sophisticated modeling tools, the same team came up with a slightly more nuanced prognosis for the future. Limits to growth, they now argued, were time-like rather than space-like. This meant that we might have already gone beyond the threshold at which an essential resource such as oil could be sustainably consumed, long before we would notice its actual depletion. In fact, it was highly probable according to the report’s author, that we were already living beyond our limit, in a state of suspended crisis, innocently waiting for the

future to boomerang back in our faces. Time is in fact the ultimate limit in the world’s model. (Cooper 2008, 16–17).

Time is in the mind. The essential limit to growth is the mental impossibility to extend time (cybertime) beyond a certain point. I think that we are here touching upon a crucial point. The process of recombination, of conscious and collective subjectivation, finds here a new—paradoxical—path. Modern radical thought has always seen subjectivation as an energetic process: mobilization, social desire and political activism, expression, participation have been the modes of conscious collective subjectivation in the age of the revolutions. But in our age, energy is running out and desire, which has given modern social dynamics their soul, is absorbed in the black hole of virtualization and financial games, as Jean Baudrillard argues in his 1976 book, Symbolic Exchange and Death. In this book, Baudrillard analyzes the hyperrealistic stage of capitalism, and the instauration of the logic of simulation.

The end of the spectacle brings with it the collapse of reality into hyperrealism, the meticulous reduplication of the real, preferably through another reproductive medium such as advertising or photography. Through reproduction from one medium into another the real becomes volatile, it becomes the allegory of death, but it also draws strength from its own destruction, becoming the real for its own sake, a fetishism of the lost object which is no longer the object of representation, but the ecstasy of denegation and its own ritual extermination: the hyperreal. […]

The reality principle corresponds to a certain stage of the law of value. Today the whole system is swamped by indeterminacy, and every reality is absorbed by the hyperreality of the code and simulation. The principle of simulation governs us now, rather than that outdated reality principle. We feed on those forms whose finalities have disappeared. No more ideology, only simulacra. We must therefore reconstruct the entire genealogy of the law of value and its simulacra in order to grasp the hegemony and the enchantment of the current system. A structural revolution of value. This genealogy must cover political economy, where it will appear as a second-order simulacrum, just like all those that
stake everything on the real: the real of production, the real of signification, whether conscious or unconscious.

Capital no longer belongs to the order of political economy: it operates with political economy as its simulated model. The entire apparatus of the commodity law of value is absorbed and recycled in the larger apparatus of the structural law of value, this becoming part of the third order of simulacra. Political economy is thus assured a second life, an eternity, within the confines of an apparatus in which it has lost all its strict determinacy, but maintains an effective presence as a system of reference for simulation. (Baudrillard 1993a: 71-72, 2).

Simulation is the new plane of consistency of capitalist growth: financial speculation, for instance, has displaced exploitation from the sphere of material production to the sphere of expectations, desire, and immaterial labor. The simulation process (cyberspace) is proliferating without limits, irradiating signs that go everywhere in the attention market. In semicapitalist hyperreality, the brain is the market. And the brain is not limitless, the brain cannot expand and accelerate indefinitely.

Collective subjectivation (i.e. social reconstitution) implies the development of a common language-affection, which must happen in the temporal dimension. The semicapitalist acceleration of time has destroyed the social possibility of sensitive elaboration of the semioflow. The proliferation of simulacra in the infosphere has saturated the space of attention and imagination. Advertising and stimulated hyperexpression ("just do it"), have submitted the energies of the social psyche to permanent mobilization. Exhaustion follows, and exhaustion is the only escape:

Nothing, not even the system, can avoid the symbolic obligation, and it is in this trap that the only chance of a catastrophe for capital remains. The system turns on itself, as a scorpion does when encircled by the challenge of death. For it is summoned to answer, if it is not to lose face, to what can only be death. The system must itself commit suicide in response to the multiplied challenge of death and suicide.

So hostages are taken. On the symbolic or sacrificial plane, from which every moral consideration of the innocence of the victims is ruled out, the hostage is the substitute, the alter-ego of the terrorist—the hostages death for the terrorist's. Hostage and terrorist may thereafter become confused in the same sacrificial act. (Baudrillard 1993a: 37).

In these impressive pages, Baudrillard outlines the end of the modern dialectics of revolution against power, of the labor movement against capitalist domination, and predicts the advent of a new form of action that will be marked by the sacrificial gift of death (and self-annihilation). After the destruction of the World Trade Center in the most important terrorist act ever, Baudrillard wrote a short text titled The Spirit of Terrorism, in which he goes back to his own predictions and recognizes the emergence of a catastrophic age. When the code becomes the enemy, the only strategy can be catastrophic:

all the counterphobic ravings about exorcizing evil: it is because it is there, everywhere, like an obscure object of desire. Without this deep-seated complicity, the event would not have had the resonance it has, and in their symbolic strategy the terrorists doubtless know that they can count on this unavowable complicity. (Baudrillard 2003, 6).

This goes much further than hatred for the dominant global power by the dispossessed and the exploited, those who fell on the wrong side of global order. This malignant desire is in the very heart of those who share this order's benefits. An allergy to all definitive order, to all definitive power is happily universal, and the two towers of the World Trade Center embodied perfectly, in their very double-ness (literally twin-ness), this definitive order:

No need, then, for a death drive or a destructive instinct, or even for perverse, unintended effects. Very logically—and inexorably—the increase in the power of power heightens the will to destroy it. And it was partly to its own destruction. When the two towers collapsed, you had the impression that they were responding to the suicide of the suicide-planes with their own
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suicides. It has been said that “Even God cannot declare war on Himself.” Well, He can. The West, in position of God (divine omnipotence and absolute moral legitimacy), has become suicidal, and declared war on itself. (Baudrillard 2003, 6–7).

In Baudrillard’s catastrophic vision I see a new way of thinking subjectivity: a reversal of the energetic subjectivation that animates the revolutionary theories of the twentieth century, and the opening of an implosive theory of subversion, based on depression and exhaustion.

In the activist view, exhaustion is seen as the inability of the social body to escape the vicious destiny that capitalism has prepared: deactivation of the social energies that once upon a time animated democracy and political struggle. But exhaustion could also become the beginning of a slow movement toward a “wu wei” civilization, based on the withdrawal, and frugal expectations for life and consumption. Radicalism could abandon the mode of activism, and adopt the mode of passivity. A radical passivity would definitely threaten the ethos of relentless productivity that neoliberal politics has imposed.

The mother of all the bubbles, the work bubble, would finally deflate. We have been working too much during the last three or four centuries, and outrageously too much during the last thirty years. The current depression could be the beginning of a massive abandonment of competition, consumerist drive, and dependence on work. Actually, if we think of the geopolitical struggle of the first decade of the twenty-first century—the struggle between western domination and jihadist Islam—we recognize that the most powerful weapon has been suicide. September 11 was the most impressive act of this suicidal war, but thousands of people have killed themselves in order to destroy American military hegemony. And they’ve won, forcing the western world into the bunker of paranoid security, defeating the hypertechnological armies of the West both in Iraq, and in Afghanistan.

The suicidal implosion has not been confined to the Islamists. Suicide has become a form of political action everywhere. Against neoliberal politics, Indian farmers have killed themselves. Against exploitation, hundreds of workers and employees have killed themselves in the French factories of Peugeot, and in the offices of France Telecom. In Italy, when the 2009 recession destroyed one million jobs, many workers, haunted by the fear of unemployment, climbed on the roofs of the factories, threatening to kill themselves. Is it possible to divert this implosive trend from the direction of death, murder, and suicide, toward a new kind of autonomy, social creativity and of life?

I think that it is possible only if we start from exhaustion, if we emphasize the creative side of withdrawal. The exchange between life and money could be abandoned, and exhaustion could give way to a huge wave of withdrawal from the sphere of economic exchange. A new refrain could emerge in that moment and write out the law of economic growth. The self-organization of the general intellect could abandon the law of accumulation and growth, and start a new concatenation, where collective intelligence is only subjected to the common good.

EXHAUSTION AND SUBJECTIVITY

The global recession officially started in September 2008 and officially lasted until the summer of 2009. Since the summer of 2009, the official truth in the media, political statements, and economic talk was recovery. Stock market indices began to rise and the banks again started paying huge bonuses to their managers.

Meanwhile, unemployment was exploding everywhere, wages were falling, welfare was curtailed, ninety million more are expected to join the army of poverty in the next year. Is this recovery? Our conditional reflex (influenced by the Keynesian knowledge that recovery is the recovery of the “real economy”) answers: no, this is not recovery. Capitalism cannot recover only by financial means.

But we should reframe our vision. Finance is no longer a mere tool of capitalist growth. The financialization of capitalism has made finance the very ground of accumulation, as Christian Marazzi has explained in The Violence of Financial Capitalism (2010) and other recent works.

In the sphere of semi-capitalism, financial signs are not only signifiers pointing to particular referents. The distinction between sign and referent is over. The sign is the thing, the product, the process. The “real” economy and financial expectations are no longer distinct spheres. In the past, when riches were created in the sphere of industrial production, when finance was only a tool for the mobilization of capital investment in the field of material production, recovery could not be limited to the financial sphere. It also took employment and

NECRONOMY

The global recession officially started in September 2008 and officially lasted until the summer of 2009. Since the summer of 2009, the official truth in the media, political statements, and economic talk was recovery. Stock market indices began to rise and the banks again started paying huge bonuses to their managers.

Meanwhile, unemployment was exploding everywhere, wages were falling, welfare was curtailed, ninety million more are expected to join the army of poverty in the next year. Is this recovery? Our conditional reflex (influenced by the Keynesian knowledge that recovery is the recovery of the “real economy”) answers: no, this is not recovery. Capitalism cannot recover only by financial means.

But we should reframe our vision. Finance is no longer a mere tool of capitalist growth. The financialization of capitalism has made finance the very ground of accumulation, as Christian Marazzi has explained in The Violence of Financial Capitalism (2010) and other recent works.

In the sphere of semi-capitalism, financial signs are not only signifiers pointing to particular referents. The distinction between sign and referent is over. The sign is the thing, the product, the process. The “real” economy and financial expectations are no longer distinct spheres. In the past, when riches were created in the sphere of industrial production, when finance was only a tool for the mobilization of capital investment in the field of material production, recovery could not be limited to the financial sphere. It also took employment and
demand. Industrial capitalism could not grow if society did not grow. Nowadays, we must accept the idea that financial capitalism can recover and thrive without social recovery. Social life has become residual, redundant, irrelevant.

The financial cycle is bleeding the social environment dry: sucking energies, resources, and the future. And giving nothing back. Recovery of the financial process of valorization of capital is totally separated from the cycle of material production and social demand. Financial capitalism has achieved autonomy from social life.

Let's consider the political side of the same problem. Once upon a time, when society was suffering the blows of recession, workers reacted with strikes, struggle, and political organization, forcing state intervention to increase demand. Industrial growth needed mass consumption and social stability. What is remarkable in the ongoing crisis, on the contrary, is the widespread passivity of the workers, their inability to unionize. The political trend in Europe is the meltdown of leftist parties and the labor movement. In the US, Obama is daily attacked by racist and populist mobs, but no progressive social movement is emerging. There have been millions of foreclosures in the US since the subprime swindle, but no organized reaction has surfaced. People suffer and cry alone.

In industrial capitalism's past, the working class could fight against a target that was precisely identified: the boss, the entrepreneur who owned material things like the factory and the products of his employees' labor. Today, the boss has vanished. He is fragmented into billions of financial segments, disseminated into millions of financial agents scattered all around the world. The workers themselves are part of recombinant financial capital. They are expecting future revenues from their pension fund investments. They own stock options in the enterprise exploiting their labor. They are hooked up, like a fly in a spider web: if they move, they get strangled, but if they don't move, the spider will suck their life from them. Society may rot, fall apart, agonize. It is not going to affect the political and economic stability of capitalism. What is called economic recovery is a new round of social devastation.

So the recession is over, capitalism is recovering. Nonetheless, unemployment is rising and misery is spreading. This means that financial capitalism is autonomous from society. Capitalism doesn't need workers: it just needs cellular fractals of labor, underpaid, precarious, depersonalized. Fragments of impersonal nervous energy, recombined by the network. The crisis is going to push forward technological change and the substitution of human labor with machines. The employment rate is not going to rise in the future, and productivity will increase. A shrinking number of workers will be forced to work overtime to produce more and more.

The real bubble is the work bubble. We have been working too much; we are still working too much. The human race does not need more goods, it needs a redistribution of existing goods, an intelligent application of technology and a worldwide decrease in the life-time dedicated to labor. Social energies have to be freed from their dependence on labor and returned to the fields of social affection, education, and therapy.

We should take the concept of autonomy seriously. Under present conditions autonomy means an exodus from the domain of economic law: Outsourcing, abandonment of the field of economic exchange, self-organization of knowledge and production in a social life that is no longer dependent on economic culture and expectations—barter, free exchange of time and competence, food self-reliance, occupation of territories in the cities, and organization of self-defense.

The fantastic collapse that has shaken the global economy since September 2008 has opened a new phase in the history of the world. After some months of amazement and confusion, the media, political institutions, and economists have started to repeat the self-reassuring mantra: recovery is coming soon. I don't know what will happen next, but I think that the word recovery means very little in the current situation. What is sure, in my opinion, is that the workers will not recover if neoliberal ideology is not abandoned, if the myth of growth is not substituted with a new narrative. Unemployment is rising everywhere and wages are falling. And the huge debt accumulated for the rescue of the banks is weighing upon the future of society.

More than ever, economic rationality is at odds with social rationality. Economic science is not part of the solution to the crisis: it is the source of the problem. The lead article in The Economist of July 18, 2009, was: "What went wrong with economics?" The text is an attempt to downplay the crisis of economic knowledge and the profession of economics. For neoliberal economists, the central dogma of growth, profit, and competition cannot be questioned, because it is identified
with the perfect mathematical rationality of the market. And belief in the intrinsic rationality of the market is crucial in the economic theology of neoliberalism.

But the reduction of social life to the rational exchange of economic values is an obsession that has nothing to do with science. It's a political strategy aimed at identifying humans as calculating machines, at shaping behavior and perception in such a way that money becomes the only motivation for social action. But it's not an accurate description of social dynamics, the conflicts, pathologies, and irrationality of human relationships. It's an attempt to create the anthropological form of *homo calculans* that Foucault (2008) has described in his 1979/80 seminar, *The Birth of Biopolitics*.

This attempt to see human beings as calculating devices has produced cultural devastation, and has finally shown itself to be based upon flawed assumptions. Human beings do calculate, but their calculation isn't perfectly rational, because the value of goods is not determined by objective reasons, and because decisions are influenced by what Keynes called "animal spirits." In their book of the same name, Akerlof and Shiller (2009, 1) note, "We will never really understand important economic events unless we confront the fact that their causes are largely mental in nature," echoing Keynes's assumption that the rationality of the market is not perfect in itself. Akerlof and Shiller are acknowledging the crisis of neoliberal thought, but their critique is not radical enough, and does not touch the legitimacy of the economic episteme.

*Animal Spirits* is also the title of a book by Matteo Pasquinoelli (2008). Pasquinoelli deals with bodies, numbers, and parasites, and goes much deeper in his understanding of the roots of the crisis than Akerlof and Shiller: "Cognitive capitalism emerges later in the form of a parasite: it subjects social knowledge and inhibits its emancipatory potential" (93), "Beyond the computer screen, precarious workers and freelancers experience how Free Labor and competition are increasingly devouring their everyday life" (15).

Pasquinoelli goes to the core of the problem: the virtualization of social production has caused the proliferation of a parasite, destroying the prerequisites of living relationships, absorbing and neutralizing the living energies of cognitive workers. The economic recession is not only the effect of financial craziness, but also the effect of the devitalization of the social field. This is why the collapse of the economic system is also the collapse of an economic epistemology that has guided politics for the last two centuries.

Economics cannot understand the depth of the crisis, because below the crisis of financial exchange there is the crisis of symbolic exchange. I mean the psychotic boom of panic, depression, and suicide, the general decline of desire and social empathy. The question that rises from the collapse is so radical that its answer cannot be found in an economic conceptual framework.

Furthermore, one must ask if economics really is a science? If the word "science" means the creation of concepts in order to understand and describe an object, economics is not a science. Its object does not exist. The objects of economics (scarcity, wage labor, and profit) do not exist before and outside the performative action of the economic episteme. Production, consumption, and daily life become part of the economic discourse when labor is detached and opposed to human activity, when it falls under the domination of capitalist rule.

The economic object does not pre-exist conceptual activity, and economic description is in fact normative. In this sense, economics is a technique, a semioticization of the world, and also a mythology, a narration. Economics is a suggestion and a categorical imperative:

Money makes things happen. It is the source of action in the world and perhaps the only power we invest in. Life seems to depend on it. Everything within us would like to say that it does not, that this cannot be. But the Almighty Dollar has taken command. The more it is denied the more it shows itself as Almighty. Perhaps in every other respect, in every other value, bankruptcy has been declared, giving money the power of some sacred deity, demanding to be recognized. Economics no longer persuades money to behave. Numbers cannot make the beast lie down and be quiet or sit up and do tricks. At best, economics is a neurosis of money, a symptom contrived to hold the beast in abeyance.... Thus economics shares the language of psychopathology—flation, depression, lows and highs, slumps and peaks, investments and losses. (Sordello 1983).

From the age of the enclosures in England, the economic process has been a process that produces scarcity (sarcification). The
Enclosures were intended to scarcify the land, the basic means of survival, so that people who so far had been able to cultivate food for their family were forced to become proletarians, then waged industrial workers. Capitalism is based on the artificial creation of need, and economic science is essentially a technique of scarcification of time, life, and food. Under conditions of scarcity, human beings are subjected to exploitation and to the domain of profit-oriented activity. After scarring the land (enclosures) capitalism has scarified time itself, forcing people who don't have property beyond their own life and body, to lend their life-time to capital. Now the capitalist obsession for growth is making both water and air scarce.

Economic science is not the science of prediction: it is the technique of producing, implementing, and exacerbating scarcity and need. This is why Marx did not speak of economy, but of political economy. The technique of economic scarcity is based on a mythology, a narration that identifies wealth as property and acquisition, and subjugates the possibility of living to the lending of time and the transformation of human activity into wage labor.

In recent decades, technological change has slowly eroded the very foundations of economic science. Shifting from the sphere of production of material objects to the semicapitalist production of immaterial goods, the economic concepts are losing their foundation and legitimacy. The basic categories of economics are becoming totally artificial.

The theoretical justification of private property, as one can read in the writings of John Locke, is based on the need for exclusive consumption. An apple must be privatized, if you want to avoid the danger that someone else might eat your apple. But what happens when goods are immaterial, infinitely replicable without cost? Thanks to digitalization and immaterialization of the production process, the economic norm of private property loses its ground, its raison d'être, and it can be imposed only by force. Furthermore, the very foundation of wages, the relationship between time needed to produce and value of the product, is vanishing. The immaterialization and cognitization of production makes it almost impossible to quantify the average time needed to produce value. Time and value become incommensurable, and violence becomes the only law able to determine price and wage.

The neoliberal school, which has opened the way to the worldwide deregulation of social production, has fostered the mythology of rational expectations in economic exchange, and has touted the idea of a self-regulated market, primarily the labor market. But self-regulation is a lie. In order to increase exploitation, and to destroy social welfare, global capitalism has used political institutions like the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization, not to mention the military enforcement of the political decisions of these institutions. Far from being self-regulated, the market is militarily regulated.

The mythology of free individuals loyally competing on the basis of perfect knowledge of the market is a lie, too. Real human beings are not perfect, rational calculating machines. And the myth of rational expectations has finally crashed after the explosion of the real estate mortgage bubble. The theory of rational expectation is crucial in neoliberal thought: the economic agents are supposed to be free to choose in a perfectly rational way the best deal in selling and buying. The fraud perpetrated by the investment agencies has destroyed the lives of millions of Americans, and has exposed the theoretical swindle.

Economic exchange cannot be described as a rational game, because irrational factors play a crucial role in social life in general. Trickery, misleading information, and psychic manipulation are not exceptions, but the professional tools of advertisers, financial agents, and economic consultants.

The idea that social relationships can be described in mathematical terms has the force of myth, but it is not science, and it has nothing to do with natural law. Notwithstanding the failure of the theory, neoliberal politics are still in control of the global machine, because the criminal class that has seized power has no intention of stepping down, and because the social brain is unable to recompose and find the way to self-organization. I read in the New York Times on September 6, 2009:

After the mortgage business imploded last year, Wall Street investment banks began searching for another big idea to make money. They think they may have found one.

The bankers plan to buy "life settlements," life insurance policies that ill and elderly people sell for cash—$400,000 for a $1 million policy, say, depending on the life expectancy of the insured person. Then they plan to "securitize" these policies, in Wall Street jargon, by packaging hundreds or thousands together.
into bonds. They will then resell those bonds to investors, like big pension funds, who will receive the payouts when people with the insurance die.

The earlier the policyholder dies, the bigger the return—though if people live longer than expected, investors could get poor returns or even lose money.

Imagine that I buy an insurance policy on my life (something I would absolutely not do). My insurer, of course, will wish me a long life, so I'll pay the premiums for a long time, rather than him paying lots of money to my family if I die. But some enlightened finance guru has the brilliant idea of insuring the insurer. He buys the risk, and he invests in the hope that I die soon. You don't need the imagination of Philip K. Dick to guess how the story ends: financial agents will be motivated to kill me overnight.

The talk of recovery is based on necromancy, the economy of death. It's not new, as capitalism has always profited from wars, slaughters, and genocides. But now the equation becomes unequivocal. Death is the promise, death is the investment and the hope. Death is the best future that capitalism may secure.

The logic of speculation is different from the logic of spectacle that was dominant in late-modern times. Spectacle is the mirrorization of life, the transfer of life in the mirror of spectacular accumulation. Speculation is the subjugation of the future to its financial mirror, the substitution of present life with future money that will never come, because death will come first.

The lesson that we must learn from the first year of the global recession is sad: neoliberal folly is not going away, the financial high rollers will not stop their speculation, corporations will not stop their exploitation, and the political class, largely controlled by the corporate lobbies, is unwilling or unable to protect society from the final assault.

In 1996 J. G. Ballard (188) wrote: "the most perfect crime of all—when the victims are either willing, or aren't aware that they are victims." Democracy seems unable to stop the criminal class that has seized control of the economy, because the decisions are no longer made in the sphere of political opinion, but in the inaccessible sphere of economic automatism. The economy has been declared the basic standard around which decisions are made, and the economists have systematically identified the economy with the capitalist obsession of growth. No room for political choice is left, as corporate principles have become embedded in the technical fabric of language and imagination.

**SINGULARITY INSURRECTION**

Activism has generally conceived the process of subjectivation in terms of resistance. In the book he dedicated to Foucault, Gilles Deleuze speaks about subjectivity, and identifies processes of subjectivation and resistance: "Is not life this capacity to resist force?" (Deleuze 1988, 77). I think that it's time to ask: what if society can no longer resist the destructive effects of unbounded capitalism? What if society can no longer resist the devastating power of financial accumulation? The identification of the subject with resistance is dangerous in a certain sense. Deleuze himself has written that when we escape we are not simply escaping, but also looking for a new weapon.

We have to disentangle autonomy from resistance. And if we want to do that, we have to disentangle desire from energy. The prevailing focus of modern capitalism has been energy: the ability to produce, to compete, to dominate. A sort of Energolatria, a cult of energy, has dominated the cultural scene of the West from Faust to the Futurists. The ever-growing availability of energy has been its dogma. Now we know that energy isn't boundless. In the social psyche of the West, energy is fading. I think we should reframe the concept and practice of autonomy from this point of view. The social body is unable to reaffirm its rights against the wild assertiveness of capital, because the pursuit of rights can never be dissociated from the exercise of force.

When workers were strong in the 1960s and 1970s, they did not restrict themselves to asking for their rights, to peaceful demonstrations of their will. They acted in solidarity, refusing to work, redistributing wealth, sharing things, services, and spaces. Capitalists, on their side, do not merely ask or demonstrate, they do not simply declare their wish; they enact it. They make things happen, they invest, disinvest, displace, they destroy and they build. Only force makes autonomy possible in the relation between capital and society. But what is force? What is force nowadays?
The identification of desire with energy has produced the identification of force with violence that turned out so badly for the Italian movement in the 1970s and 1980s. We have to distinguish energy and desire. Energy is falling, but desire has to be saved. Similarly, we have to distinguish force from violence. Fighting power with violence is suicidal or useless nowadays. How can we think of activitists going against professional organizations of killers in the mold of Blackwater, Haliburton, secret services, mafias?

Only suicide has proved to be efficient in the struggle against power. And actually suicide has become decisive in contemporary history. The dark side of the multitude meets here the loneliness of death. Activist culture should avoid the danger of becoming a culture of resentment. Acknowledging the irreversibility of the catastrophic trends that capitalism has inscribed in the history of society does not mean renouncing it. On the contrary, we have today a new cultural task: to live the inevitable with a relaxed soul. To call forth a big wave of withdrawal, of massive disassociation, of desertion from the scene of the economy, of nonparticipation in the fake show of politics. The crucial focus of social transformation is creative singularity. The existence of singularities is not to be conceived as a personal way to salvation, they may become a contagious force.

"Yes we can," the slogan of Barack Obama's campaign, the three words that mobilized the hope and political energies of the American people in 2008, have a disturbing echo just one year after his victory. They sound much more like an exorcism than a promise. "Yes we can" may be read as a lapse in the Freudian sense, a sign coming from the collective subconscious, a diversion from the hidden intuition that, in fact, we can't. The mantra of Barack Obama has gathered the energies of the best part of the American people, and collected the best of the American cultural legacy.

But what about the results? So far, Obama has been unable to deal with global environmental threats, the effects of the geopolitical disaster produced by Cheney-Bush, the effects of the powerful lobbies imposing the interest of the corporations (for instance, of the private health insurers). When we think of the ecological catastrophe, of geopolitical threats, of economic collapse provoked by the financial politics of neoliberalism, it's hard to dispel the feeling that irreversible trends are already at work within the world machine. Political will seems paralyzed in the face of the economic power of the criminal class.

The age of modern social civilization seems on the brink of dissolution, and it's hard to imagine how society will be able to react. Modern civilization was based on the convergence and integration of the capitalist exploitation of labor and the political regulation of social conflict. The regulator State, the heir of Enlightenment and Socialism, has been the guarantor of human rights and the negotiator of social equilibrium. When, at the end of a ferocious class struggle between labor and capital—and within the capitalist class itself—the financial class has seized power by destroying the legal regulation and transforming social composition, the entire edifice of modern civilization has begun to crumble.

Social Darwinist ideology has legitimized the violent imposition of the law of the strongest, and the very foundations of democracy have been reduced to rubble. This accelerated destruction of tolerance, culture, and human feelings has given an unprecedented impetus to the process of accumulation and has increased the velocity and extent of economic growth throughout the last two decades of the twentieth century. But it has also created the premises of a war against human society that is underway in the new century.

The war against society is waged at two different levels: at the economic level it is known as privatization and is based on the idea that every fragment and every cell of the biological, affective, linguistic spheres have to be turned into profit machines. The effect of this privatization is the impoverishment of daily life, the loss of sensibility in the fields of sex, communication, and human relationships, as well as the increasing inequality between a hyperbolic minority and a dispossessed majority. At the social level, this war is waged in terms of criminalization and destabilization of territory and economic life. In large areas of the planet, which are getting bigger, production and exchange have become the ground of violent confrontation between military groups and criminal organizations. Slavery, blackmail, extortion, and murder are integral parts of the economic lexicon.

Scattered insurrections will take place in the coming years, but we should not expect much from them. They'll be unable to touch the real centers of power because of the militarization of metropolitan space, and they will not be able to gain much in terms of material wealth or political power. Just as the long wave of counterglobalization's moral
protests could not destroy neoliberal power, so the insurrections will not find a solution, not unless a new consciousness and sensibility surfaces and spreads, changing everyday life and creating Non-Temporal Autonomous Zones rooted in the culture and consciousness of the global network.

Full employment is over. The world does not need so much labor and so much exploitation. A radical reduction of labor time is necessary. Basic income has to be affirmed as a right to life, independent of employment and disjoined from the lending of labor time. Competence, knowledge, and skills have to be separated from the economic context of exchange value and rethought in terms of free social activity.

We should not look at the current recession only from an economic point of view. We must see it essentially as an anthropological turning point that is going to change the distribution of world resources and world power. Europe is doomed to lose its economic privilege, as five hundred years of colonialism are ending. The debt that western people have accumulated is not only economic but also moral: the debt of oppression, violence, and genocide has to be paid now, and it’s not going to be easy. A large part of the European population is not prepared to accept the redistribution of wealth that the recession will impose. Europe, stormed by waves of migration, is going to face a growing racist threat. Ethnic war will be difficult to avoid. In the US, the expectations raised by Obama’s victory have been largely disappointed. But at the same time a wave of nonidentitarian, indigenous Renaissance is rising, especially in Latin America.

The privatization of basic needs (housing, transportation, food) and social services is based on the cultural identification of wealth and well-being with the amount of private property owned. In the anthropology of modern capitalism, well-being has been equated with acquisition, never with enjoyment. In the course of the social turmoil we will live through in the coming years, the identification of well-being with property has to be questioned. It’s a political task, but above all it is a cultural task, and a psychotherapeutic one too.

When it comes to semiotic products, private property becomes irrelevant; in fact, it’s more and more difficult to enforce. The campaigns against piracy are paradoxical because the real pirates are the corporations that are desperately trying to privatize the products of collective intelligence, and artificially trying to impose a tax on the community of producers. The products of collective intelligence are immanently common because knowledge can neither be fragmented nor privately owned. A new brand of communism was already springing from the technological transformations of digital networks, when the collapse of the financial markets and neoliberal ideology exposed the frailty of the foundations of hypercapitalism. Now we can predict a new wave of transformation from the current collapse of growth, increasing debt, and questioning of private consumption as well-being. Because of these three forces—commonality of knowledge, ideological crisis of private ownership, mandatory communalization of need—a new horizon is visible and a new landscape is going to surface. Communism is coming back.

The old face of communism, based on the will and voluntarism of an avant-garde, and the paranoid expectations of a new totality, was defeated at the end of the twentieth century and will not be resurrected. A totally new brand of communism is going to surface as a form of necessity, the inevitable outcome of the stormy collapse of the capitalist system. The communism of capital is a barbaric necessity. We must put freedom in this necessity, we need to make this necessity a conscious organized choice.

Communism is back, but we should give it a different name, because historical memory identifies this particular form of social organization with the political tyranny of a religion. The historical communism of the twentieth century was based on the idea of the primacy of totality over singularity. But the dialectical framework that defined the communist movement of the twentieth century has been completely abandoned and nobody will resurrect it.

The Hegelian ascendance played a major role in the formation of that kind of religious belief that was labeled “historicism.” The Aufhebung (abolition of the Real to realize the Idea) is the paranoid background of the whole concept of communism. Within that dialectical framework, communism was viewed as an all-encompassing totality expected to abolish and supersede the all-encompassing capitalist totality. The subject (the will and action of the working class) was viewed as the instrument for the abolition of the old and the inauguration of the new.

The industrial working class, being external to the production of concepts, could only identify with the mythology of abolition and
totalization, but the general intellect cannot do that. The general intellect does not need an expressive subject, such as the Leninist Party in the twentieth century. The political expression of the general intellect is at one with its activity of understanding and producing signs. We have abandoned the territory of dialectics in favor of the multilayered co-evolution of singularities. Capitalism is over, but it's not going to disappear. The creation of Non-Definite Autonomous Zones will not give birth to any totalization. We are not going to witness a cathartic event of revolution, won't see the sudden breakdown of state power. In the coming years, we will witness a sort of revolution without a subject. In order to subjectivize this revolution, we have to proliferate singularities. This, in my humble opinion, is our cultural and political task.

After abandoning the dialectics of abolition and totalization, we are now trying to build a theory of the dynamics of recombination and singularization, concepts clearly drawn from the works of Félix Guattari, particularly from his last book, *Chaosmosis*. By the word singularity, I mean the expression of a never before seen concatenation. The actor of this expression can be an individual or a collective, but also an event. We call it singularity if this actor recombines the multiple flows traversing its field of existence, following a principle that is not repetitive or referring to any pre-existing form of subjectified activity. By the world singularity, I mean an agency that does not follow any rule of conformity or repetition, and is not framed in any historical necessity or sequential understanding of history—it is an emergent, self-creative process.

Rather than a swift change in the social landscape, we should expect the slow surfacing of new trends: communities abandoning the field of the crumbling ruling economies, more and more individuals giving up their search for a job and creating their own networks of services.

The dismantling of industry is unstoppable for the simple reason that social life does not need industrial labor anymore. The myth of growth is going to be abandoned and people will look for new modes of wealth distribution. Singular communities will transform the very perception of well-being and wealth through a sense of frugality and freedom. The cultural revolution that we need in this transition leads from the perception of wealth as the private ownership of a growing number of goods that we cannot enjoy because we are too busy making the money needed for acquisition, to the perception of wealth as

the enjoyment of an essential number of things that we can share with other people.

The privatization of services and goods will be made possible by this much needed cultural revolution. This will not happen in a planned and uniform way; it will rather be the effect of the withdrawal of singular individuals and communities, and the creation of an economy of shared use of common goods and services and the liberation of time for culture, pleasure, and affection. While this process expands at the margins of society, the criminal class will hang on to its power and enforce more and more repressive legislation, the majority of people will be increasingly aggressive and desperate. Ethnic civil war will spread all over Europe, wrecking the very fabric of civil life.

The proliferation of singularities (the withdrawal and building of Non-Definite Autonomous Zones) will be a peaceful process, but the conformist majority will react violently, and this is already happening. The conformist majority is frightened by the fleeing of intelligent energy and simultaneously is attacking the expression of intelligent activity. The situation can be described as a fight between the mass ignorance produced by media totalitarianism and the shared intelligence of the general intellect.

We cannot predict what the outcome of this process will be. Our task is to extend and protect the field of autonomy, and to avoid as much as possible any violent contact with the field of aggressive mass ignorance. This strategy of nonconfrontational withdrawal will not always succeed. Sometimes confrontation will be made inevitable by racism and fascism. It is impossible to predict what should be done in the case of unwanted conflict. A nonviolent response is obviously the best choice, but it will not always be possible. The identification of well-being with private property is so deeply rooted that a barbarization of the human environment cannot be completely ruled out. But the task of the general intellect is exactly this: fleeing from paranoia, creating zones of human resistance, experimenting with autonomous forms of production using high-tech-low-energy methods—while avoiding confrontation with the criminal class and the conformist population.

Politics and therapy will be one and the same activity in the coming years. People will feel hopeless and depressed and panic, because they are unable to deal with the post-growth economy, and because they will miss their dissolving modern identity. Our cultural task will
be attending to those people and taking care of their insanity, showing them the way of a happy adaptation at hand. Our task will be the creation of social zones of human resistance that act like zones of therapeutic contagion. The development of autonomy must not be seen as Aufhebung, but as therapy. In this sense, it is not totalizing or intended to destroy and abolish the past. Like psychoanalytic therapy it should be considered an unending process.

WHEN OLD PEOPLE FALL IN LOVE

In the film Cloud Nine (Wolke 9 is the original German title), Andreas Dresen stages a simple love story: Inge is married to Werner, but she meets and falls in love with Karl. She decides to leave her husband and live with her lover. One night, while she is sleeping in the arms of her beloved Karl, Inge receives a phone call: Werner has killed himself.

Well, so what? It's a love story, as I've said. I forgot to note something important: Inge and Werner and Karl are in their seventies. I think Dresen has made a beautiful movie. The love of old people is a subject that literature and cinema, with very few exceptions, have not recounted, a subject we know very little about, for the quite simple reason that old people have never existed. Until some decades ago, people over sixty were such a small minority that they were lonely and rare. Sometimes surrounded by an aura of respect and veneration, but more often rejected and pushed to the margins of society, and always alone, they were deprived of means for survival, unable to become a community. The extension of average life expectancy has been coupled so far with some reward for one's previous contributions to the growth of society: the right to retirement money. In the coming years in Europe, one-third of the population will join the ranks of old age. This is the generation that was born after the war, when the fulfillment of the modern promise of peace, democracy, and well-being was apparently at hand. Five hundred years of brutal capitalist expansion were supposedly alleviated by the political force of the organized workers. The generation born between 1945 and 1975 carried in its cultural background expectations of freedom and peace and justice, as if they were universal values. Of course, they are not, because universal values don't exist; they are the idealistic translation of cultural expectations produced by social relationships.

Over three decades of triumphant neoliberalism, the capitalist countercurrent has destroyed the very conditions for the possibility of freedom and justice, imposing the brutal law of competition in the deregulated labor market and subjugating social life to the unbounded domination of profit. The generations now coming to the labor market, who grew up during the years of the capitalist countercurrent, possess neither the memory of the past social civilization nor the political force to defend their existence from the predatory economy.

What about old people, now? We know very little about growing old and nothing about old people's emotions, their capacity for social organization, solidarity, and political force. We don't know because we have not experienced it. But now that experience is beginning. The age of senilization is here, and Europe is the place where it will first develop. Negative population growth has started in the territory of old Europe because the postwar generation has not proliferated with the same intensity of previous generations. This trend is spreading all over the world for many reasons—diffusion of contraceptives, the cult of individual realization, conscious refusal of maternity, high costs of reproduction in the urban environment—and, in Europe, it's already yielding its fruits, and we can speak of an advanced state of senility.

I don't want to speak of the economic effects of senilization, nor of the dilemmas of a society where more and more people reach the age of retirement while fewer and fewer people are in the age of producing. On this point, I want to say only this: the assertion that it's necessary to force seniors to postpone their retirement is purely a neoliberal trick aimed at prolonging the time of labor and trapping young people in unemployment and precarity.

What is interesting here is the cultural effect of social senility in the long run. The senilization of Europe parallels a process of massive migration that the policy of containment (Schengen) will not be able to stop. Migration is, in part, the push of poor people who are demanding a redistribution of the wealth that has been concentrated in Europe during five hundred years of colonialism. This is why we have to see the senilization of Europe as a facet of the redefinition of the planetary economic balance.
In the next decade, Europe will be forced to make a choice between two possibilities. One is a redistribution of wealth and resources that implies opening European borders to the crowds coming from Africa and Asia, a downsizing of western consumption, and the adoption of lifestyles heading toward the "UnGrowth" of production and consumption. The other is the intensification of an inter-ethnic civil war whose first signs are already visible in the European territory. The success of the xenophobic parties in the elections of June 2009 is one of those signs. Most Europeans are desperately defending the privilege accumulated over centuries of colonialism, but this privilege has been deteriorating since the fall of colonial empires in the past century, and is now really falling apart in the global recession. The June 2009 elections display a European sadness, the inability to deal with senility or the psycho-energetic decay of the social organism. The result at the polls is not the effect of political will, but rather the symptom of a rapidly expanding senile dementia.

During the age of modernity, a very delicate balance was created between the infosphere and reason. The political will could act rationally because this balance gave historical actors the possibility of comprehending a relatively narrow range of information and therefore of making decisions based on it. But the acceleration of semiotic emissions and the thickening of the infosphere has produced, in the long run, an effect of overload and, therefore, of anxiety and panic. At the same time, Europe has grown old. It's a demographic problem, first of all, but it's not only demographic. Europe is a country of old people groping desperately at their lives, not out of love, but for property. A country of old people needing young nurses from the Philippines, Moldavia, and Morocco; old idiots tormented by despising the agility of those young people, people who have suffered so much at our hands that they don't fear any more suffering, and don't care about the punishment of European law. Senile dementia (loss of memory, irrational fear of the unknown) is spreading in every generational stratum of European society, mentally frail and socially tired. Young voters who vote for rightist nationalist parties are no less obtuse than the frightened elderly, just as unable to think or find a way out their conformism.

How will it end? It's easy to predict. Old Europeans are well armed and they will kill. Pogrom, mass violence, inter-ethnic civil war. This the future of Europe. We should find a way to translate in nonreligious terms the Christian concept of "resignation." What is to be done when nothing can be done, when too much hate has accumulated in the collective karma? How can we continue being happy and free when we understand that a war machine is hidden in every niche? This is the question that I am addressing to myself, to my friends, and to my generation—the generation born after the last war fought by young people, before senility took hold of us, making a pacific wisdom possible, or pushing us toward the abyss of aggressive dementia.

The generation that grew up in the decades of postwar hope is today facing a huge cultural task, no less important than the task we were able to carry out in 1968. Now we need to create the conditions for European society to consciously start a process of UnGrowth, and to repay the immense debt that western society has accumulated during five hundred years of colonialism.

The current recession is a consequence of the financial debt that the West (especially the US) has taken on during recent decades. But there's also a much heavier debt that cannot in any way be repaid. It is the symbolic debt that comes from the genocide of the native populations of America, and from the deportation and enslavement of millions of human beings from Africa and Asia.

The senile generation of Europe may become the subject of a cultural revolution to prepare western society for a long-lasting agreement on the redistribution of wealth and resources. Such a cultural revolution should start with a critique of the energeticjuvenilism permeating modern culture. The ideology of unbounded growth and the cult of aggressive competition are the foundations of capitalist development; they also nourished the romantic and nationalist ideologies that have aggressively mobilized western society in late-modern times.

A senile culture aspiring to UnGrowth and the reduction of the consumerist push, on the activation of solidarity and sharing, seems today—I must concede—a very unlikely possibility. The elections have shown that the European population is determined to defend its privilege with all the means at hand. But this stance cannot bring anything good, and is already bringing a lot of evil. An inter-ethnic civil war is hiding in daily life, and we are going to see it explode with unimaginable violence. Young people accustomed to very difficult living conditions are surrounding the fortress. They are bearing the unconscious memory of centuries of exploitation and humiliation; they are also...
bearing the conscious expectation of those things that advertising and global ideology have promised to them.

During past decades, Europe was looking like the continent of peace and social justice. Now it's sinking in a wave of sadness and cynicism. Young people seem unable to change social conditions, and are wandering in a labyrinth of a society without solidarity or relaxation. The sterile population could be the bearer of a new hope, if they are able to face the inevitable with a relaxed soul. They could discover something that humankind has never known: the love of the aged, the sensuous slowness of those who do not expect anything better from life than wisdom, the wisdom of those who have seen much, forgotten nothing, but look at everything as if for the first time.

**HAPPY END**

I'm often invited to lecture about the subjects I deal with in this book. The audience is generally composed of social activists, radical thinkers, and artists. Although the discussions that follow my talks are generally lively and the participation intense, by the end I sometimes feel a sense of bitterness in my audience. I share this sense of malaise, and easily guess the reason for it: my argument does not have a happy ending.

It's true, I don't have a happy ending for my fabulation. I don't see any discernable subjectivation, resurrection of consciousness, or emancipatory forms in the foreseeable future. And I don't like to cheat at this game. I don't like empty words of self-reassurance, or rhetoric about the multitude. I prefer to tell the truth, at least, the limited truth as I see it: there is no way out, social civilization is over, the neoliberal precarization of labor and the media dictatorship have destroyed the cultural antibodies that, in the past, made resistance possible. As far as I know.

But I only know what I can see from my limited point of observation, of course. During the twentieth century, the moral revolt against exploitation was based on the reasonable prospect of society's autonomy from the cultural and economic domination of capitalist rule. This prospect was based on a realistic approach to the analysis of existing conditions.

Then something changed. During the past few decades, I've witnessed the mutation induced by the capitalist economy, and I've decided that this mutation is irreversible: it hasn't only affected the social sphere, but also the semiotic, biological, and psychic spheres.

Therefore, my knowledge and my understanding disown the possibility of an alternative, of an escape from the hell emerging as the legacy of thirty years of unlettered capitalist rule.

The dissociation of capitalism and modernity is complete: capitalist rule is getting rid of modern civilization. Humanism, Enlightenment, Socialism, the cultural regulators of modern democracy, have been swept away by the cultural deregulation implied in the capitalist final assault. Privatization of every living space and activity, competition and economic brutality in the social sphere, have deeply affected the self-perception of the social body. In my knowledge and my understanding, this process now seems inevitable and irreversible, because it has not only destroyed the structures of social civilization that modernity created, but it has also jeopardized the affective fabric of the social environment and the cultural expectations of the new generation.

This is what I see, what I think, and this is what I say, so I understand the dissatisfaction of the activists who gather to attend my lectures. They seem to ask: "So, why resist? What is the point of radical thought, what's the point of critique and intellectual engagement, if you think that no conscious collective subjectivation is possible, and no way to hijack the criminal train of capitalism?"

In these final pages, I want to answer this question.

In 1992, Félix Guattari published his last book, *Chaosmosis*. It is about schizoanalysis, and also about how the political and environmental landscape was getting more and more catastrophic in those final years of the century. Here is the problem Guattari sets himself:

Among the fogs and miasmas which obscure our fin de milénaire, the question of subjectivity is now returning as a leitmotiv. It is not a natural given any more than air or water. How do we produce it, capture it, enrich it, and permanently reinvent it in a way that renders it compatible with Universes of mutant value? How do we work for its liberation, that is, for its resingularization? (Guattari 1995, 135).
Guattari is wondering here about the possibility of a process of liberation, defining liberation as "resingularization." He also speaks of fogs and miasmas. After the illusion of peace that followed the crash of the Soviet empire, a chaotic war exploded in the Persian Gulf. The Cold War geopolitical order was over and the new conflict was a symptom of a general chaos in world relations.

In 1992, in order to make some decisions about the global environment, a summit of the leading nations of the world was called in Rio de Janeiro. On that occasion George Bush senior informed the world that the American lifestyle was non-negotiable, and the Americans refused to talk about the environmental catastrophe. The Rio de Janeiro summit was a failure, and it opened the way to the present environmental chaos.

When Félix Guattari died, some months after the Rio de Janeiro summit, he was conscious of the extreme dangers of the world situation. In the last years of his life, he experienced the double black hole of internal and external chaos. In the black hole that psychiatrists call depression, we can never distinguish among the personal, the social, and the planetary. Peoples, races, mobs are always there in the mental landscape of schizo-consciousness (and unconsciousness).

This is my starting point about chaos: the world-chaos that Guattari talks about in his last book is not only depression, fog, and miasma. Chaos is much more than this. It's also the infinity of colors, dazzling lights, hyperspeed intuitions, and breathtaking emotions.

Chaos is a twofold word: in the last book they wrote together (What Is Philosophy?), Guattari and Deleuze say that Chaos is both friend and foe. It's both enemy and ally: "It is as if the struggle against chaos does not take place without an affinity with the enemy" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 203).

Chaos is an enemy, but it can also become a friend, because chaos is the door of creation. We are walking in darkness, but we are able to create concepts that illuminate the surroundings.

Friendship is one of the keywords of this last book by Deleuze and Guattari. Friendship means sharing a refrain, a semiotic set that allows us to see the same vision and helps to create a world out of chaos.

Chaos is not in the world; reality knows neither chaos nor order. Chaos is in the relationship between the speed of our brain and the changing speed of reality. Chaos is a complexity that is too dense, too thick, too intense, too speedy, too fast, too much for our brains to decipher. We speak of chaos when our speed of psychic elaboration is overwhelmed by the speed and the complexity of the world.

Chaos chaotizes, disentangles any consistency into infinite pieces. But the task of philosophy is the creation of planes of consistency without losing the infinity out of which thought arises.

The chaos we are dealing with has both a mental and a physical existence—not the physical existence of the world, but the physical existence of the organism (as a conscious and sensitive entity). The physical existence of the body is the space where chaos arises and takes place. In this space of unhappiness and mental disorder, of panic, depression, and loneliness, the projected order of the world collapses.

Chaos is too complex an environment to be decoded by the available explanatory grids, it is an environment in which semiotic and emotional flows are circulating too fast for our minds to elaborate.

The elaboration of chaos is made possible by the emergence of a semiogenetic machine that Guattari calls a refrain. This is chaosmosis, the emergence of a form: creative morphogenesis.

The morphogenetic process has long been described in deterministic terms by modern epistemology: Newton and Galileo founded physics on the idea that a unifying language—the language of Mathematics—frames the whole of creation. The final goal of theoretical and scientific work was the understanding of laws that describe the determinist generation of any natural process. Biology and biogenetics have developed in the same deterministic frame: they describe biological morphogenesis in terms of a deterministic relation between the code and the organism. Following the discovery of DNA in the 1950s, the body has been conceived of as development and realization of the code, an implied order that accounts for the unfolding of life.

This vision of nature went along with the social episteme of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which was based on a deterministic relationship between economic factors and social effects. The epistemological framework based on determinism has been fertile in the modern age, in the sense that the mechanical paradigm has been useful to understand a world that was based on industrial production and mechanical technologies. But the acceleration that electronic technologies have imposed on production and knowledge has opened a new dimension that cannot be described in deterministic terms. Determinism fails
to understand the fuzzy, hypercomplex organization of the network of cognitive labor: the relation between labor time and value is dissolved, and the very idea of determination fades.

The uncertainty principle, first asserted by Heisenberg in the field of microphysics, frames the new social consciousness.

Just as in microphysics you cannot determine the moment and the speed of a particle, because the presence of the observer alters the picture, so too in sociology you cannot determine the relation between the present and the future, because the subjective factor is too complex to be understood and described.

At the present moment, the predictive power of knowledge is at stake. The global mind's complexity is beyond the understanding of the situated mind of any individual, group, party, or state.

Marxism has long been understood as a form of predictive science. Being able to analyze the relationship between different social actors (bourgeoisie and working class), being able to predict the dynamics of economic crises (overproduction, fall of the profit rate, breakdown of the capitalist economy), the scholastic vision of Marxism claimed to also predict the outcome of the story: the final victory of communism, the abolition of classes, and the realization of reason. In the official version of dialectical materialism (Diamat), inherited from Hegel and reformulated by Engels, the relationship between the present condition and the future was explained in terms of a deterministic reduction. The future was imagined as the unfurling of a tendency inscribed in the present. Repetition prevailed, and difference was ignored. The faith in a progressive future was based on this deterministic reduction, and it evaporated as soon as that conceptual framework was abandoned.

The event is not predictable because it is not the development of what we presently know. The event is a creative gesture creating a new refrain.

So, I answer the question: why resist, why persist in seeking autonomy from power? Where is the hope? The hope is in the limits of my knowledge and understanding. My knowledge and understanding don't see how any development of the social catastrophe could cultivate social well-being. But the catastrophe (in the etymology of kata and stratein) is exactly the point where a new landscape is going to be revealed.

I don't see that landscape because my knowledge and my understanding are limited, and the limits of my language are the limits of my world. My knowledge and understanding miss the event, the singularity. So I must act "as if." As if the forces of labor and knowledge might overcome the forces of greed and of proprietary obsession. As if the cognitive workers might overcome the fractalization of their life and intelligence, and give birth to the self-organization of collective knowledge. I must resist simply because I cannot know what will happen after the future, and I must preserve the consciousness and sensibility of social solidarity, of human empathy, of gratuitous activity — of freedom, equality, and fraternity. Just in case, right? Just because we don't know what is going to happen next, in the empty space that comes after the future of modernity. I must resist because this is the only way to be in peace with myself. In the name of self-love, we must resist. And self-love is the basic ethical rule that an anarchist prizes.

The present ignorance has to be seen as the space of a possibility. We have to start from the ignorance of the general intellect. The force of collective intelligence is boundless. Theoretically. But it currently lacks any consciousness of itself. Intelligence without self-consciousness.

I am talking about the self-consciousness of the general intellect, millions and millions of people worldwide producing the inflow that makes the planet go around. Creating a form of self-consciousness of the general intellect is the political task of the future. And it is not only political, but philosophical, epistemological, and, in the end, therapeutic.

Poetry and therapy (thera-poetry) will be the forces leading to the creation of a cognitarian self-consciousness: not a political party, not the organization of interests, but the reactivation of the cognitarian sensibility.

The ignorance of the general intellect is the starting point, after the future.

Why are the cognitariat weak and disunited and unable to assert their rights as laborers, their knowledge as researchers? Because they live in a bifurcated form, because their brain is detached from their body, because their communication communicates less and less, while more and more freezing sensitivity to life. The new space of activism is here, in the connection of poetry, therapy, and the creation of new paradigms.
AFTER FUTURISM

One hundred years ago Filippo Tommaso Marinetti published the manifesto that introduced the century that believed in the future. The 1909 Futurist Manifesto, which you can find in the first pages of this book, expounds the becoming-machine of mankind. This becoming-machine reached its finale with the concatenations of the global Web. It has now been overturned by the crisis of a financial system that was founded on the futurization of the economy, debt, and economic promise. The promise is over. The era of post-future has begun.

MANIFESTO OF POST-FUTURISM
Franco Berardi

1. We sing of the danger of love, the daily creation of a sweet energy that is never dispersed.
2. The essential elements of our poetry will be irony, tenderness, and rebellion.
3. Ideology and advertising have engirded the permanent mobilization of the productive and nervous energies of humankind toward profit and war. We exalt tenderness, sleep, and ecstasy, the frugality of needs and the pleasure of the senses.
4. We declare that the splendor of the world has been enriched by a new beauty: the beauty of autonomy. Each to her own rhythm; nobody should be constrained to march at a uniform pace. Cars have lost their allure of rarity and, above all, they can no longer perform the task for which they were conceived. Speed has slowed down. Cars are as immobile as stupid slumbering tortoises in the city traffic. Only slowness is fast.
5. We sing of the men and the women who caress one another to know one another and the world better.
6. The poet must expend herself with warmth and prodigality to increase the power of collective intelligence and reduce the time of wage labor.
7. Beauty exists only in autonomy. No work that fails to express the intelligence of the possible can be a masterpiece. Poetry is a bridge cast over the abyss of nothingness to allow the sharing of different imaginations and to free singularities.
8. We are on the extreme promontory of the centuries. We must look behind us to remember the abyss of violence and horror that military aggressiveness and nationalist ignorance is capable of conjuring up at any moment. We have lived in the stagnant time of religion for too long. Omnipresent and eternal speed is already behind us, in the Internet, so we can forget its syncopated rhymes and find our singular rhythm.
9. We ridicule the idiots who spread the discourse of war: the fanatics of competition, the fanatics of the bearded gods who incite massacres, the fanatics terrorized by the disarming femininity blossoming in all of us.
10. We demand that art turn into a life-changing force. We seek to abolish the separation between poetry and mass communication, to reclaim the power of media from the merchants and return it to the poets and the sages.

11. We sing of the great crowds who can finally free themselves from the slavery of wage labor through collective revolt against exploitation. We sing of the infinite web of knowledge and invention, the immaterial technology that frees us from physical hardship. We sing of the rebellious cognitariat who are in touch with their bodies. We sing to the infinity of the present and abandon the illusion of a future.