Immaterial Labour: A New Vanguard of Struggle?

Abstract

There has been a resurgence of labour struggles on the plain of the global political economy, yet they remain disparate in their relation to the hegemonic or neo-liberal economic order. Specifically, emerging forces of labour are appearing within advanced industrial societies associated with their strategic role within the production of knowledge; however there is a significant lack of literature which seeks to theorise the coherency of these movements. In particular, 'postworkerist analyses of the emergent forms of immaterial labour have not received the attention they deserve' (Henninger and Mecchia, 2007, 5).   This thesis takes a critical look at the changing nature of work within advanced industrial societies, in line with the autonomist Marxist theory of immaterial labour and the modes of resistance emerging out of these relationships of production. By initially criticising the 'vanguard' logic of the immaterial labour position, this thesis then looks at the emergent forms of contestation within knowledge production and how the epistemological and methodological foundations of the immaterial thesis can help us to engage in potential new ways in which to research resistance at work in general. It develops a unique approach to labour studies in IPE by taking an under-researched theory and using a discourse analysis to critically look at management and human resource literature, alongside classic post-Marxist and poststructural political philosophy, to offer a unique insight into ways in which labour can be studied in IPE. This thesis offers both a critique of post-Marxist IPE theories, whilst looking at ways in which to develop their approach, by urging the discipline to engage more thoroughly with poststructural notions of power and subjectivity, as a way of augmenting their critical IPE and explaining more clearly the creation of social forces at work.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Matt Davies and Dr. Kyle Grayson for their advice and guidance before and during the completion of this paper. Special thanks also to Laura Ellis for her thorough proof reading and to Chris Steljes for the front cover design.

Contents

Introduction

Towards a Postworkerist perspective on resistance at work

This project seeks to analyse what the consequences are for the political behaviour of workers who are increasingly involved in immaterial labour. The key questions to be considered are: does immaterial labour incite political dissent and disaffection? If so, to what extent is the dissent/disaffection propitious (or not) for transformative and emancipatory social action? To engage with these questions, it is important to consider the theory of immaterial labour within the context of two other parallel discourses: other emerging and contrasting perspectives on work and their intrinsic relationship to the restructuring of the global political economy, specifically the increasing significance of knowledge production.

Immaterial labour is the term used by postworkerist theorists such as Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri and Maurizzio Lazzarato to describe the labour processes involved in the production of knowledge. This type of labour is responsible for the creation and dissemination of information, and can therefore be understood as that which produces and provides immaterial goods and services. The human labour involved in creating knowledge and information also consists of immeasurable factors such as intellect and personality, which distinguishes it from material production. Post-Marxists and capitalists alike are of the opinion that material production in advanced industrial societies, or that which relies upon routine manual skills to produce consumer durables and work with raw materials, has largely been replaced by that involved in the production of knowledge. Neoliberal economists argue that greater value now comes from investment in intangibles such as branding, marketing,

distribution and information management and therefore encouraging knowledge skills and creating an information economy are key factors in competing and developing in today's global market place (Dahlman and Utz, 2005). The impulses of global markets, it is assumed, are teleological in that they determine change and progress (Amoore, 2002) yet this type of discourse has resulted in a general neglect in the understanding of labour relations. Postworkerists seek to reverse this trend by emphasising the increasing importance of immaterial labour to capitalist production, suggesting that it is becoming the new vanguard of struggle. By exercising control over the minds and human potential of workers through immaterial labour, they further claim that it is distinctly more totalitarian than its material ancestor causing disaffection and political dissent, which will ultimately lead to transformative and emancipatory social action.

Yet one of the key criticisms of autonomous Marxism's claim that immaterial labour is the new vanguard of struggle is their lack of empirical evidence. As Tsianos and Papadopoulos (2006) indicate 'immaterial labour is capable of delivering a diagnosis of the present contradictions of production, but who's afraid of sociological descriptions of the present?' (Tsianos and Papadopoulos, 2006). Recent studies by Henwood (2003), Porter and Ketels (2003), Boltanski and Chapiero (2006) and Sennett (2006) have shown that the information revolution, rather than increasing innovative productivity and augmenting autonomy at work, has encouraged growth in the traditional economy, in areas of low value, low skill work that does not feed innovation and knowledge into production. Together with the general neglect of labour studies in the new economy within IPE, it can be argued that a critical investigation of this influential theory is needed. Yet this needs to be focused on 'the ruptures, blockades, lines of flight which are immanent in the configuration of

immaterial labour' (Tsianos Papadopoulos, 2006). My study will contribute to such research by looking at the development of the global information economy. It will do this by analysing the ways in which it seeks to encourage more innovation and knowledge within the corporate mode of production[1], in line with the theory of immaterial labour and the effect this is having on the political agency of its workers.

The individualisation of work, together with the process of deunionisation has lead to a perceived culture of both autonomy and responsibility which, it is argued, has helped overcome some of the problems of unpredictable global change by creating jobs in innovative industries. However, critics of the flexibility discourse such as Amoore (2004) have suggested that the perception of increased autonomy at work is undermined by the fact that many workers are facing social insecurity and so an increasingly unstable labour force is being created, which frequently contests the teleological impulses of global change through daily forms of tacit resistance based on common feelings of resentment. These issues can be considered within two specific research questions. How useful is the concept of immaterial labour to highlighting trends in work? Do immaterial labourers in any way resist the conditions of their employment?

This study will therefore depart theoretically from a 'postworkerist perspective' as it will critically analyse the idea that the contested experiences of workers can force economic restructuring and incite changes to production practises. However, labour studies in IPE have generally neglected the experiences of workers in challenging the changes imposed upon them by globalisation. This project will

---

[1] Corporatism or 'enterprise corporatism' (Cox, 1987,) can be understood as being the primary site of capitalist production since the privatisation of national industries from the 1970's onwards. This has allowed the private interests of corporations to gain significant influence over the economic polces of states and actors in the international arena. This will be termed 'the corporate mode of production' throughout this thesis.

therefore provide both a necessary critique of the ability of postworkerism to fully explain the actions and potential political agency of immaterial labourers, yet it will also aim to seek out ways in which to politicise our understanding of the restructuring of the global economy and its subsequent effect on workers. This will allow me to develop a detailed understanding of the real significance of immaterial labour vis-à-vis the new economy and its potential as an emancipatory subject. Furthermore, underlying the research is a contention that studies in IPE are in need of new epistemological foundations to catalyse ways in which to understand socio-political struggles in a global economy. Central to this thesis is a commitment to highlighting the significance of the autonomous Marxist theory of immaterial labour as being a crucial development in trying to articulate the struggles of knowledge workers. In chapter one I will begin by giving an historical context to the immaterial labour thesis and explain in detail what it is and why it is a significant contribution to the discourse of labour resistance. This will prepare the ground for chapter two, where I will specifically look at the restructuring of the world economy and the effect this has had on labour organisation. In chapter three I will consider other labour discourses and how they try to articulate struggles within the new economy, before returning to the immaterial labour thesis and critically assessing its viability as a theory of collective labour organisation, as well as highlighting the potential of a poststructural ethnographic IPE, for further research into labour struggles in the new economy.

Using poststructural notions of power and subjectivity, I hope to provide a unique basis for understanding and conceptualising worker resistance. It will be in the final chapter where I will suggest ways in which to both develop research into the immaterial labour thesis, as well as ways in which to augment our understanding of work, power and resistance in organisations through engaging in an ethnographic and

postructural research ethic. In this way we can hope to understand the intricacies of resistance 'emerging from the experiences in work and production' (Davies and Ryner in Davies and Ryner, 2006, 4), as they will aid in the 'recovery and representation of alternative voices' which have been 'marginalised by the hegemonic discourses of the free market' (Inayatulla and Blaney, 2004, 183).

Chapter 1

'When capital invests in the whole of life, life appears as resistance'

Antonio Negri, 2004

Autonomous Marxism and Postworkerism

Postworkerism is a branch of the autonomous Marxist movement which emerged out of the Italian industrial struggles of the 1960's and 1970's. During a decade of political turbulence, the revolutionary left found itself increasingly alienated by the very foundations of its tradition, as the nature of class and of work began to change. An association of groups under the banner Autonomia Operaia (Workers Autonomy) attacked the disciplinary regimes of factory work and organised themselves into worker councils, outside of the traditional party and unions structures. Their refusal of a lifetime imprisonment in the fordist factory autonomous Marxists claim, 'drove capitalists to invest in labour saving technologies and also to change the technical composition of the work process' (Bifo, 2004, online). Capital restructured its regime of profit by moving into increasingly automated, externalised and deregulated production. As Fleming (1991) explains, this crisis of refusal meant that production had to move beyond wage labour and become revalorised 'through social command' in the guise of 'housework, schooling, capitalist forms of sociality, anything that bears the work relation without the wage' (Fleming in Negri and Fleming, 1991, xii). This restructuring process was capital's tendency to be mobile and flexible as it subsumes the forces of change. The 'mass minority was defeated by the mobility of capital, by its speed, by the metamorphosis and transformation of that desert' (Revelli in Virno

and Hardt, 1996, 119); hence for postworkerists the new conditions of capitalist production led to a new paradigm of labour/capital relations. As Wright (2006) explains, 'autonomy' for autonomist Marxists was always meant as the 'ability for workers to define their own interest and struggle for them' and indeed one of the alluring features of autonomist thought is its 'tremendously resilient ability to mutate along with the times' (Wright, 2006) through an intricate study of these struggles. Greater attention therefore, was now to be paid to the historical context of this transformation through a return to the hypotheses of Marx.

As a foundation to their claims, postworkerists such as Antonio Negri and his peers mused over the speculations of Marx in *Grundrisse*, particularly the passage 'Fragment on Machines' which has become a central tenet of the autonomous Marxist critique of labour discourse. In this essay, Marx alludes to the gradual transformation of capitalist production to a mechanised tendency, where the conditions are created for the mechanical tasks of the workers to be taken over in a further step by machines. This process would initially see 'the worker's activity, reduced to a mere abstraction of activity' and 'determined and regulated on all sides by the movement of the machinery' (Marx, 1973, 693); where labour would appear as scattered among many points of the mechanical system. However the knowledge or 'general intellect' involved in this process cannot be simply explained as being one way, but rather as immanent to the struggle of labour itself where labour is a central part of the environment of machinery in which it now inhabits. Machines, rather than alienating workers from their labour, are in fact 'organs of the human brain, created by the human hand; the power of knowledge, objectified' (Marx, 1973, 694). Capital relies on the innovative capacity of labour to integrate any process of change to the production process. 'Fragment on Machines' raises the point therefore, that the

potential transformation of capital into mechanic production augments the productive power of labour through a greater concentration of knowledge through technology, social cooperation and communication. In an earlier passage Marx makes this very point clearly, arguing that 'the productive power of society, if you want, is the productive power of labour itself - such as results from science, invention, division and organisation of labour, improved communications, creation of the world market, machinery'. However, he is keen to highlight that this 'does not enrich the worker, but capital, and thus increases the power that dominates labour' (Marx, 1973, 214). Autonomous Marxists however, using the tool of the productive power of labour which Marx has given to them, are more interested in how this can in fact undermine, contest and disrupt the powers which dominate labour. Indeed, as Negri was later to argue, 'when capital invests in the whole of life, life appears as resistance' (Antonio Negri, 2004, online).

Autonomous Marxism and contemporary social movements

The re-emergence of autonomous Marxism as a critical discipline has been largely synonymous with the broader movements against global capital in recent years. Groups and movements such as the Zapatistas, the Argentinean Unemployed Workers Movement (Movimento de Trabajadores Desocupados), Disobedienti, Tute Bianche and MST (Moviemento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra) who represent landless peasants in Brazil, have been at the forefront of the anti-capitalist movement and have augmented the autonomist cause through their unique vertical logic of organisation and international networks of supporters. All of these social movements share a commitment to developing a 'politics of difference that transcends antagonisms between different sections of the working class and the oppressed' (Kinsman, 2005, 6)

which re-affirms the autonomist mantra of 'freedom, self organisation and mutual aid' (Chatterton, 2005, 545). The 'mutually constructed or mediated character' (Kinsman, 2005, 6) of the Zapatistas, for example led to them becoming the iconic movement of the 'coalition of coalitions' (Klein, 2001, 86) giving a 'new wave of hope and energy among those engaged in the struggle for freedom all over the world' (Cleaver in Holloway and Palaez, 1998, 81).

Similarly, in Argentina the MTD have made significant progress in highlighting the destructive nature of neo-liberal economic policies since the collapse of the Argentinean economy in 1999. By creating a network of autonomous neighbourhoods across the country and making international links with movements across the globe, they have shown how 'militant pluriversalism' (Chatterton, 2005, 545) can be an alternative way of organising society. However, coinciding with these positive and progressive anti-systemic movements have been equally destructive activities which have undermined the autonomist project. During some of the most infamous G8 protests radical groups such as Black Bloc, Tute Bianche and Ya Basta have been associated with demonstrating tactics that have involved confrontation with the police as well as 'smashing the symbols of Capitalism' (Kingsnorth, 2003, 55), or in the case of Ya Basta issuing 'a declaration of war' (Neale, 2002, 20) on the day of the G8 summit in Genoa in 2001. Commentators have been quick to criticise autonomist Marxists indicating these are simply old alliances and political figures flaunting their discrepancies with the system on a global scale. Calinicos (2003) for example sees autonomous politics as being a threat to a more grounded and successful movement. Its affiliates involvement with organisations such as Potere Operaio and Autonomia Operaia in the 1970's, both of who followed projects of 'mass illegality', have resemblances with contemporary groups and tactics such as Black Bloc and Tute

Bianche. The latter of which is a fall out from Autonomia Operaia which disbanded some years ago. A perpetuation of their ideals through abstract terminology would simply further encourage such organisations. These are the 'the limits of autonomous politics' (Calinicos in Balakrishnan, 2003, 139).

To move beyond this, autonomous Marxists have been forced to take a step back and concentrate on theoretically justifying their significance to the movements against global capitalism. Central to this is their commitment to placing forces of labour at the heart of social struggles, rather than general pronouncements of organisation and revolution associated with popular anti-globalisation rhetoric; in particular, labour which exists within high-tech industrial societies and associated with knowledge production. This is what they term 'immaterial labour' and it is the most inventive and epistemologically unique aspect of their critical discourse and maintains that 'a detailed analysis of the real conditions of workers today is necessary to validate any analysis of contemporary capitalism' (Dowling, 2007, 117). Now that the theoretical position of autonomous Marxism has been introduced and the continued and contested significance of their contribution within the context of global social movements has been elaborated upon, I would now like to move into a detailed examination of the concept of immaterial labour. By considering the role of labour as a transformative subject, I would like to show how immaterial labour can be a useful way of trying to engage with and understand the restructuring of the global political economy.

Autonomous Marxism and Immaterial Labour
Returning to the discussion of labour, autonomous Marxists believe it is the labour power inherent in all production that determines not only the strength of labour but its capacity to create crises in capitalist accumulation. During the industrial struggles of

the 1970's, a refusal of work, both in the factory and other production areas, successfully instigated a crisis. The current shift from industrialised production to post-industrialised or immaterial production is capitalism's reaction to this, as it moves away from the manipulation of the non-capitalist environment to 'its own capitalist terrain' (Hardt and Negri, 2000, 268) through the increased significance of the production of knowledge to large advanced economies. Therefore it has been logical for postworkerists to investigate the social forces emerging in today's global economy. Dyer-Witherford's (1999) analysis of the struggles in high-tech capitalism is indicative of the current spate of writing to appear on this subject. For Dyer-Witheford, capital is no longer fixed within rigid structures of states and organisations but it flows into every aspect of life. The virtual world which has been created within the new dynamic of capitalism has created many 'sites' from which subversive activities can emerge. Furthermore, Virno (2004) has elucidated on the concept of 'general intellect', which he sees as burgeoning within the cultural industries of modern capitalism. As labour increasingly becomes creative and 'virtuous', we begin to see more clearly the intrinsic link between labour power and capitalist development or indeed, capitalist development's reliance upon creative labour; hence for Virno (2004) 'post-Fordism is the empirical realisation of the 'Fragment on Machines' (Virno, 2004, 100). These pronouncements are articulated more clearly in the literature which seeks to create a movement out of the struggles of high-tech capitalism: the movement of immaterial labour.

The first discussion of immaterial labour to appear in English translation was by Maurizio Lazzarato in an anthology of texts edited by Paulo Virno and Michael Hardt (1996). In his contribution, Lazzarato highlighted immaterial labour as being that which produces the cultural content of a product within industries such as

software production, advertising and multimedia and which consistently exploits the creative potential of workers through precarious employment and the claiming of intellectual property rights. This work requires 'creativity, communication, emotion, cooperation and values' (Lazzarato in Virno and Hardt, 1996, 146) as central features in the everyday process of production. The blurring, in this respect, between personality, intellect and work and its routinisation within the organisational matrix of flexible hours, contracts and hierarchies has further incited workers into individual forms of contestation. This type of work was indicative of capital's burgeoning reliance on innovation and knowledge as the material source of production and was evidence of the ambiguous boundaries between politics, culture and economy in contemporary society. Hardt and Negri (2000, 2004) developed these ideas by emphasising the significance of immaterial labour as the lifeblood of what they see as a new emancipatory subject. Hence a new kind of workforce, operating within the global network of communications and embedded in the potential of workers to become entrepreneurial subjects actively involved in the everyday creation of new and innovative modes of production, emerged during the decade between 1970 and 1980 (Negri, 2005) . However, the perceived prosperity and freedom for workers that the new economy has produced, has increasingly been exposed by the contradictions which have simultaneously followed it. A useful historical example which autonomists are keen to highlight, is the demise of the 'dotcommania' (Bifo, 2004, online) period of the mid to late 1990's. The myth that virtual business literally created a free market was expelled when the internet market crashed, as small enterprises involved in internet entrepreneurialism were inevitably swallowed by established monopolies. The postworkerist argument is therefore, that immaterial labour has been defeated by monopoly capital such that it can potentially see itself as

'a cognitariat, building institutions of knowledge, of creation, of care, of invention and of education that are autonomous from capital' (Bifo, 2004, online). This new terrain of engagement is where 'a kind of spontaneous and elementary Communism' (Hardt and Negri, 2000, 294) is possible as the subjectivity of the new workers struggles can be realised on a global and universal level.

In their seminal works Empire (2000) and Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire (2004); both influential texts within the study of global resistance and international political economy, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri wee keen to articulate this argument further. If immaterial workers commonly find themselves in casualised, precarious and exploited circumstances they either are, or are becoming the manifestation of an emancipatory subject. They argue that since advanced industrial economies increasingly rely upon the creative collaboration of subjective minds to add value to the economy, there is greater potential for workers to resist and challenge the very foundations of capitalist production. As immaterial labourers provide creativity, intelligence and innovation to the technologies of firms, it is argued they are increasingly detached from the traditional controls associated with the capital/labour dynamic. Their acquiescence can no longer be bought through organisational practises and instead antagonisms break out and challenge the prevailing power structures.   I would now like to focus on the variations and characteristics of immaterial labour and begin to establish a foundation from which to connect them to competing dialogues within the discourses of globalisation; therefore creating avenues which this approach which can be criticised in the following chapter.

Hardt and Negri (2000) indicate three types of immaterial labour present on the plain of the global political economy. Firstly, manual labour such as that found in

the manufacturing of consumer durables, finance and the information based services, has moved into increasingly informationalised production, whereby symbolic and aesthetic values and processes are becoming more significant (Allen in du Gay and Pryke, 2002) and require the input of constant innovative knowledge to expand and embed brands within the global market place. Secondly, the manipulation of data for use in areas such as marketing creates labour involved in 'routine symbolic tasks' (Hardt and Negri, 2000, 293) where the level of creative involvement of the worker varies depending to what affect the data is reproduced. The third type of immaterial labour is the manipulation of the 'affect' of information which corresponds to simple tasks such as data collection. It is here that the 'bodily' engagement within the dynamic of the new economy becomes removed as the importance of actual human contact diminishes and is replaced by the increased use of the cognitive reciprocity between workers. Each of these tendencies of immaterial labour shares the intrinsic characteristic of increasing 'social interaction and cooperation' (Hardt and Negri, 2000, 294) which gives immaterial labour its immanent and perpetuating mode of commutarianism.   Furthermore, this allows for a level of detachment from organisational control, especially within the higher echelons of immaterial production and entrepreneurialism, which leads to a greater 'managerial function' (Lazzarato in Virno and Hardt, 1996, 137) on behalf of the individual subject; allowing their labour to 'manage its own activity and act as the coordinator of the immaterial labour of others' (137). This is also the case within low level forms of routine immaterial production, which this will be investigated in more detail later. At this stage we must give priority to the necessity of giving weight to these ideas. Indeed as Lazzarato (1996) indicates, the individuisation of work through the informatisation of production, which has seen an increase in the autonomy of workers within these

labouring contexts, emphasises that the classical macroeconomic model for studying modes of labour 'is corroded by a new and irreducible anthropological reality' (Lazzarato in Virno and Hardt, 1996, 138). So, without more analytical and empirical examples, the immaterial labour theory lacks any kind of tangible coherency and instead simply helps to reinforce the criticisms of autonomous politics previously discussed.

The journals Fibreculture and Ephemera have begun to correspond to the need for empirical and analytical examples of modes of immaterial labour; their invaluable contribution to this debate will inform the next part of this chapter. Using the examples of the activities and resistances of immaterial labourers within these journals, I will begin to develop my own critique of the autonomist position. The following section will critically consider some empirical and ethnographic studies, based within the theoretical context of immaterial labour, which have been conducted in the digital game, advertising and service industries across Europe, Canada and North America.

Case Studies of Immaterial Labour

I will begin by looking at immaterial labour in the highly creative industries of digital game and advertising production, before moving on to lower skill, routine immaterial labour in the shop and restaurant services. I will be able to make comparisons between the two, in line with the theory of immaterial labour, before offering a critique of the autonomist 'vanguard' position in my conclusion to the chapter. The studies I will consider here are de Peuter and Dyer Witheford (2005); who produced a study of digital game labour after a three year investigation into the conditions of work within the Canadian game industry and Arvidsson (2007); who looked at the advertising

industry in Copenhagen in 2005. I would contend that both digital game labour and advertising can be considered within the typology of immaterial labour, where the creative manipulation of information within the virtual dynamic of capital and through the input of constant innovative knowledge is integral, to the production practise as a whole.

Both de Peuter and Dyer Witheford (2005) and Arvidsson's (2007) reports indicate that the digital game and advertising industries have a strategic role within the global economy as they operate predominately in advanced post-industrial economies such as the United States, Japan, China and Europe. Furthermore, jobs within these industries are much sought after because of their perceived informal, flexible and potentially profitable conditions and pay. Because of this, as de Peuter and Dyer Witheford (2005) contend, 'game companies roam the entire planet in search of workers and consumers, establishing a globe-girdling network of production and consumption' (de Peuter and Dyer Witheford, 2005, online). Their research has shown however that rather than being an idyllic job, the sort of which was promised by the 'new economy', it has a distinct 'dark side' which has incited workers to unite and resist the organisational practises which undermine their creative labour.

In Arvidsson's (2007) case, advertising, rather than being an industry of progression and creative freedom, is increasingly exploiting the 'relatively autonomous forms of social cooperation that unfolds in the urban environment' (Arvidsson, 2007, 10) for the profit of a minority of corporate elites. Games labourers on the other hand, work excessive hours due to the speed and changing nature of the environment in which they operate, where updates and deadlines are frequently incorporated and moved forward; as well as the more 'obvious interest of game companies in extracting more labour for less from their workers' (de Peuter and Dyer

Witheford, 2005, online). On top of this there is a culture of 'ruthless meritocracy' where wages are often only exchanged when certain deadlines are met. In advertising, companies are increasingly using the activates of what Arvidsson (2007) calls the creative 'underground' to develop campaigns which ultimately take away the intellectual property of, for example, the music or art of independent producers. This 'mass intellectuality' (Virno, 2004) which autonomist Marxists see as the collective potential of immaterial labour is on the one hand re-appropriated by capital and on the other hand, controlled through unfair organsational practises.

Another example of this would be the increasing surveillance of digital game labour through the monitoring of individual worker and team productivity, which further correlates with the immaterial labour theory that as work increasingly relies upon cognitive ability and the use of innovative knowledge, more control is exerted over labour time through surveillance, resulting in an unstable working environment where resistances emerge. Creativity within the 'underground' for example, is engaged in an ongoing war with advertising agencies, which have lost considerable profits due to the entrepreneurial endeavours of independents through initiatives such as promoting online music production. As Arvidsson (2007) indicates, they have 'lost control of the means of production' (Arvidsson, 2007, 16) and therefore now seek to standardise creativity through copying and reproducing successful campaigns; thus limiting the ability of independents working within the 'underground' to gain advantage over companies. Similarly, resistance in digital game labour has taken the form of two specific tendencies – sabotage and networking - which together have helped to create better standards for game labourers, but have significantly encouraged autonomous and mutually sustaining production which has challenged the very nature of the profitability and intellectual property of the industry. 'Modding',

where workers incorporate subversive themes such as anti corporate plots into games are common and have lead to workers re-selling modified games for their own gain, by claiming intellectual property over the different versions of the games available. Networking has also raised awareness of digital game labourers working conditions. De Peuter and Dyer Witheford (2005) give the example of an anonymous blog circulated by an EA Games worker amongst his colleagues and media outlets in 2004 which resulted in a frenzy of discords being articulated throughout the industry and game labourers to re-assess their strategic roles within game enterprises and bargain for greater protection at work. These activities, which remain 'autonomous to capital' (Arvidsson, 2007, 12), are the key weapons of immaterial labour, highlighting its potential role as a vanguard subject. I will now consider, and make comparisons with modes of immaterial labour in the service sectors before moving into a critical conclusion.

In this section I will look at the research conducted by Carls (2007) who analyses the effects of   transformations in the retail service industry in Milan, during research conducted in the summer of 2006 and at that of Dowling (2007) during an eighteen month contract as a restaurant waitress. I would contend that both restaurant and retail labour can be considered within the typology of immaterial labour where the importance of human contact diminishes and is replaced by the increased use of the cognitive reciprocity between workers. Carls' (2007) report indicates that the internationalisation of corporate retail has resulted in the industry being an increasingly relevant site of competition which has resulted in the intensification and standardisation of work across the sector. Dowling (2007) also looks at how the restaurant business has increasingly become integrated into the capitalist dynamic of

the new economy where dining becomes an 'experience' and waitressing is increasingly 'affective' and controlled.

In the retail business, workers who are largely employed on temporary and part time contracts and have very little protection, have found a staunch increase in the intensification of their work. This intensification can be seen as being 'immaterial' as it is their behaviour and not their actual labour which is scrutinised. Carls (2007) uses the example of a stricter adherence of appearance and attitude which must adhere to company values such as 'how to apply makeup, dress and smile in the correct way' (Carls, 2007, 51) as well as 'covert supervision' through techniques such as mystery shoppers who come to check these standards. Similarly, Dowling (2007) points to the importance of pretence as a way of providing high standards of customer service, where a certain detachment from personal engagement with customers is replaced by a logical adherence to scripted conversation and interaction. This, she argues, shows how work in the sector is overtly 'constituent not attributive' (Dowling, 2007, 121). Again the perceived informality and subjectivity of these kinds of jobs, like those within the digital game and advertising industries, have subtle methods of intrusion and re-appropriation of the personality and intellect of the worker.

Another example of this within the retail sector is the individual responsibilities of workers. This subjectivity in retail is supposed to raise the standard of labour and encourage motivation, whilst reducing the levels of hierarchy in the day to day operations. Yet if we compare this to what Carls terms 'forced availability', where retail workers are expected to simply comply to the ever increasing pressures of work in the sector, by working at short notice, for unexpected lengths of time, means the 'self responsibility' is merely a 'false logic of merit' (Carls, 2007, 53). With waitressing, there is a need to convey to customers that the 'team' are capable and

competent at their jobs and have an expertise in the role in which they are subjugated into, but staff must also appear to be self reliant and without hierarchy. Yet 'incentives' are given to high performing staff and a significant division of labour, based around favour, emerges because of this; adding pressure and insecurity to their labour overall. Unlike the advertising and digital game industries, resistance is not as common. Retail workers often collect in smaller, exclusive networks to voice their concerns and share their experiences of difficult working conditions, however there is little evidence that suggests this actually challenges the organisational controls placed upon them. In the restaurant sector, Dowling (2007) can only describe the tacit discrepancies of workers, yet again there seems to be no channels of collective solidarity. This point leads me to the conclusion of the chapter, where I will move towards a critical discussion of the immaterial labour thesis.

Summary: Towards a critique of Immaterial Labour.

In this chapter I have introduced the politics of autonomist Marxism and revealed the intricacies of the theory of immaterial labour and how it has augmented our understanding of labour resistance against neo-liberal economic globalisation. Specifically, how immaterial labour can be understood as an emerging form of critical labour with the potential to be perceived as a 'vanguard' social subject. Furthermore, I have highlighted the need for autonomist Marxism to move away from its historical reputation as a violent revolutionary politics, which has perhaps encouraged contemporary social movement organisations to participate in disruptive protest actions, undermining the many positive aspects of the rise of mainstream activism. Instead I have indicated that autonomist Marxism should consolidate its critical position by focusing its attention on the theory of organisation, which emphasises the

forces of labour as the heart of social contention. Through the work of key thinkers such as Hardt, Negri, Lazzarato and Virno the immaterial labour thesis has and continues to influence academics and activists across the globe and is successfully gaining an analytical and empirical framework from which to justify and move beyond the often inflammatory rhetoric of its historical contributors. It is also necessary also to continue this 'cooperative process', where 'political initiatives are events that can be fostered by textual personal encounters' (Mecchia and Henninger, 2007, 7) thus creating further avenues of investigation. This process has however, brought to light inconsistencies and contradictions in the theory which need to be scrutinised further and this will be the aim of the following chapters of this project. The problems and questions which have arisen within the literature and in practise can be placed into the following categories: The distinct division of labour within knowledge work; the lack of spontaneous revolt especially within low skill immaterial labour; the question of measure and the 'realities' of the new economy and the lingering issue of the 'one size fits all' theory against an epistemology based on perpetual creation, which raises a key question: can there be such a thing as a vanguard subject of immaterial labour?   It will be these issues which will be investigated, against the criticisms and inconsistencies previously discussed, in the following chapters. I will now discuss in more detail the 'realities' of the new economy and the effects this has on labour organisation, this will give more depth to my analysis of the forces of labour, before I return to the immaterial labour thesis in the concluding chapter.

Chapter 2

'Reality Check: Are we living in an immaterial world?'

Steve Wight, 2005

'From the ashes of the individual bargaining power of workers there is born the collective power of labour'

Giovanni Arrighi, 1978

The 'new' economy: flexibility, knowledge and innovation

As indicated in the last chapter, one of the key criticisms of the immaterial labour thesis is its lack of empirical concern for the 'realities' of the new economy. Rather than being a nirvana of high-tech jobs where workers, who are increasingly flexible and free to contest the organisational scrutiny of their labour through autonomous and self creating networks of solidarity and have a natural instinct to take advantage of the greater reciprocity which comes with their increasing role as cognitive and 'immeasurable' subjects within organisations, there are infact numerous studies which indicate quite the opposite. Some liberal theorists even go as far to say that autonomist Marxists are in some respect 'no different from the more extreme neoliberalisers' (Held and McGrew, 2002, 115). In the first part of this chapter I would like to expand upon the discussion of the 'new economy', explaining what is meant by the term and placing it into an historical context, before moving into a discussion of the

increasing importance of human resource and innovation management to firms operating in the new economy; in this respect I will be focusing my enquiry on the corporate mode of production. This will lead me into a more detailed look at the contrasting critical positions that exist to explain what many theorists describe as the harsh 'realities' of the new economy and how they contradict the positions put forward in the immaterial labour thesis. I will then elaborate on the effects that the 'new economy' has had on labour organisation within knowledge firms before moving into the final chapter, where I will look at the 'return of a critical labour' through the work of other alternative labour discourses.

To conceptualise the new economy, we have to think within other parallel theoretical and epistemological paradigms which emerged during the 1970's. These intellectual endeavours, which have circulated concepts and ideas such as 'post-industrialism', 'post-Fordism' and 'Taylorism', all allude to the changes in production from both manual to non-physical labour and also the move from material to knowledge services and property. Daniel Bell (1976) is often cited as the first person to try to articulate these changes into a coherent theory of development, doing so when 'knowledge and information society was in its embryonic phase' (Boje in Boje and Furaker, 2003, 124). Ideas such as his then became a catalyst for policy driven initiatives, largely in North America and Western Europe, to hone the potential of a knowledge intensive driven future. As Poynter (2000) indicates, by the end of the 1970's, computerisation had moved into most large scale companies and by the 1980's this had progressed again to see an increase in digital technologies, enabling firms to integrate their operational services and minimise delays in the labour process. With the incorporation of functions such as email in the 1990's, the landscape of company organisation and worker relations had been completely transformed. The

result was the 'information revolution'; where 'the global economy took to the skies' (Sennett, 2006, 42) and academics and policy makers were quick to claim the end of class conflict and of recessions, as the globalised economy, built on its new foundation of innovation and ideas, was open to everyone to participate in and exploit (Henwood, 2003). What were once speculations by theorists such as Daniel Bell have instead become key features in state economic policy. For example in the UK, a recent DTI (Department of Trade and Industry) report emphasises that there are 'no longer raw materials, land or cheap labour' to exploit, but only 'knowledge, skills and creativity' (Porter and Ketels, 2003, 5). This 'network society' has allowed firms to maximise the potential of 'knowledge based productivity through the development and diffusion of information technologies' (Castells, 2000, 204) and move the bulk of their productivity into the delivery of services; basically functioning with the purpose of offering the market 'fairly sophisticated knowledge based products' (Alvesson, 2004, 17). Significantly, this has created new organisational methods and values within firms which have changed the nature of work.

A key part of this has been the increasing importance of human resource (HR) management to firms' day to day operations. When engaging with HR literature, you can begin to see how integral company 'values' and new organisational practises have become. Lawler (1996) discusses the 'new logic' of firms, where employees must have 'a sense of purpose and mission as well as values that guide their behaviour' (Lawler, 1996, 64). This must involve having a clear sense of the firms' aims and ideals, whereby they can then 'make decisions and manage themselves and their work' (64). Boltanski and Chapiero (2006), whose research was based around a critique of HR journals, elaborate on these changes. Competition within the 'new spirit of capitalism' has encouraged firms to face the challenges of a global

marketplace by organising their employees into networks with 'a multitude of participants' involved in 'team projects, intent on customer satisfaction, and a 'general mobilisation of workers' under a clear 'vision' (Boltanski and Chapiero, 2006, 73) . This is a distinct move away from the 'career path model' of the 1960's, into a more realistic 'genuine autonomy' based on 'self knowledge and personal fulfilment' (Boltanski and Chapiero, 2006, 90).The flexibility of hours, roles and positions of hierarchy within high-tech business were intended to allow 'workers to work with considerable freedom', whilst encouraging them to 'engage in formal interaction in the performance of their tasks' (Castells, 2000, 261). Integral to this is to allow workers, for example, to take part in skills improvement training as a way of helping them to improve their 'employability as a form of human capital' (Budgen, 2000, 153). Therefore, as Alvesson (2004) explains, a standard blueprint for a modern firm operating within the new economy, has the following basic characteristics: 'highly qualified individuals', taking part in 'intellectual' and 'symbolic' tasks, a high degree of 'individual autonomy', 'extensive' 'communication', 'coordination' and 'problem solving' initiatives and 'subjective and uncertain quality assessment' (Alvesson, 2004, 21).

A central tenet of the knowledge firm, functioning within these dynamics of operation and organisation, is the role of innovation management. Frederick (2007) discusses the role of brand management within this context. Firms must rely on their ability to standardise their brand, creating a recognisable formula and strategy which can maintain 'lasting positions of market power' (Frederick, 2007, 37). However, simply creating a recognisable product, which can endure the market for innumerable years, is no longer a feasible business model. Instead, firms operating in the new economy have to learn to defend against speculative capital, through a commitment to

constant innovative practises, to help their brand or product to transcend the temporal instabilities of the global marketplace. The role of innovation gurus such as Jay Paap, have become integral to the business strategies of large corporations. Paap's (2004) seminal paper, 'anticipating disruptive innovation' gives advice and guidance to firms who wish to avoid being outdone by the innovative capacities of their rivals. By alluding firms to the realities of 'dualism' (Paap and Katz, 2004, 13), his term for the competing market strategies discussed above, he then argues that firms must learn to 'predict the unpredictable' to become market leaders. The key point here, and one which autonomists also base their theory of immaterial labour around, is that you can't have innovation without the intellect and ideas of real people, there are '6 billion minds co-creating the future' (Murray and Greenes, 2007) as the potential of everyone can be realised within the dynamic of new economy. It can therefore be argued that the language and ideals of the new economy are very similar to the positions put forward within the immaterial labour thesis. In the next section, I would like to look at the criticisms of the new economy and relate them to the critiques made against the immaterial labour thesis, specifically focusing on the problem of trying to articulate a general concept of struggle.

The 'realities' of the new economy and its effect on worker attitudes and labour organisation

There are three general key criticisms I would like to focus on at the beginning of this section, before I move into a detailed study of the effect of the new economy on labour organisation and the many criticisms it reveals about the intricacies of the restructuring process. Firstly, pioneers of the new economy use rhetoric which glosses over significant problems inherent in the restructuring of the global economy and

undermine the political implications of such changes. As Alvesson (2004) suggests, many powerful political, business and social elites are keen to promote the supposed benefits which the new economy brings to societies, both in developing and advanced economies. Speculative capital is at the heart of these international markets, whereby merely to 'question a bright future in which the knowledge society creates the good working life' (Alvesson, 2004, 9), can severely harm business and political incentives. Secondly, the technological impact of the new economy is overstated. In the UK for example, ICT producing businesses only account for seven percent of UK output (Porter and Ketels, 2003) and one fifth of productivity in the OECD; or as Boje (2003) indicates, there is an issue over the classification of workers, who are often labelled as service sector workers in order to 'retain flexibility and cut costs' (Boje in Boje and Furaker, 2003, 126). This indicates that technology driven industries don't necessarily prosper from heightened capital investment, or that the reality of the importance of services over manual labour is misinterpreted. Thirdly, firms are increasingly criticised for their activities within the dynamic of the new economy. Rather than following their charter of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), they are frequently scrutinised because of a lack of concern for their perceived role as stakeholders in communities (Monbiot, 2000), or for failing to involve key social actors such as trade unions in decisions which effect jobs, the environment and communities in general. Furthermore, rather than creating a free, flexible and 'immaterial' landscape, the new economy is still indebted to 'material measures' (Law in du Gay and Pryke, 2002, 25) which enforce the standardisation and bureaucratisation of economic and corporate policies, which further undermines subjectivity and the potential of the individual. All of these criticisms can be looked at and elaborated upon further, if we place them into the context of knowledge work in

general. I will now consider the effects that the 'realties' of the new economy have had on worker attitudes and labour organisation, before moving into the final chapter which will consider the 'return of a critical labour'.

The restructuring of the global economy has been embedded with top down corporate management practises, which have undermined and ignored the real difficulties faced by the workers forced to adapt to them. As Sennett (2006) argues, rather than uniting workers under a new paradigm of workplace autonomy, the 'fragmenting of big institutions has left many people's lives in a fragmented state' (Sennett, 2006, 2). Research has shown that the restructuring of the internal operations of firms within the new economy, has severely effected worker relations within the knowledge sectors in advanced industrial economies. I would now like to outline some of the changes in work and their subsequent effects, by engaging with literature which has tried to criticise rather than promote the benefits of the new economy for knowledge workers.

In the past, the reciprocal relationship between managers and workers was vertical, and managerial functions were based around the accepted responsibility for the 'introduction of new work methods; dealing with unforeseen problems; maintaining discipline; handling disputes; training; record keeping and assisting with operational work' (Hales, 2005, online). The changes brought about by the new economy, and specifically through the introduction of HR management, managerial functions are now spread across firms in 'flattened hierarchies' and the implementation of controlling mechanisms become more subtle and 'ambiguous'(Hales, 2005, online) . Instead of simply supervising work and maintaining standards, workers find their productivity measured through surveillance and other micro-management practises. HR, as Amoore (2002) explains, 'offers a

menu of rational solutions to the perceived process of globalisation' (Amoore, 2002, 33) by positioning workers as 'malleable, adaptable and flexible commodities' (32); their human input is essential, but their human endeavours are incidental. Measuring knowledge work is increasingly important to firms operating in the new economy. A host of management journals now seek to offer insights into how team and individual productivity can be increased. Examples from these include, 'The Dynamic Organic Transformational (D.O.T.) team model for high-performance knowledge-worker teams' (Courtney, Navarro, and O'Hare, 2007) , 'Sharing User Experiences in the Product Innovation Process: Participatory Design Needs Participatory Communication' (Sleeswijk Visser, van der Lugt, and Stappers, 2007) and Research of Game Theory and Incentive Mechanism on Knowledge Sharing between Knowledge-based Organization and Knowledge Worker' (Zhang, Huang and He, 2005). They all assume the placid roll of the worker, who will simply adhere to organisational changes without voicing any personal or collective discrepancies.

Furthermore, the perceived positive aspect of flexibility, allowed through the organisational changes within new economy jobs, means that workers now have to contend with 'uncertain hours and pay', a 'blurring of work and non work' as well as the 'intensification of work and surveillance practices' (Amoore, 2004, 182). This has reduced their capacity to determine patterns of work, free time and the ability to bargain with their employers. Furthermore, the democratisation of ownership through shareholding and the transcendental belief in the power of technology (Henwood 2003), has added to the pressures of workers to conform to the new workplace standards, whereby it is assumed that their efforts are needed to drive structural changes to make them work for everyone. The disintegration of collectivity and community at work means that it is 'the value of individual effort' that is 'taken as a

more reliable indicator of achievement' (Mcrobbie in Du Gay and Pryke, 2002, 101) and this is causing friction and creating new forms of contestation within the corporate relations of production.

Contestation, again as research has shown, is increasingly brought about through the added pressures of workers to comply with the changes imposed on them by restructuring. These pressures generally take two forms; the increased penetration of work into non-work life and the overwhelming environment of insecurity. If we take the first point; work within new economy jobs, both in low and high skilled sectors, is often a central feature of people's lives and inhibits the building of wider social relations. A qualitative example of this would be that software engineers show a tendency to 'continue to think about their job after work' because of a 'high level of organisational commitment' brought on by the responsibilities given to workers through the new ethic of autonomy and self management and the 'decreased attachment to collectivism' (Marchington, 2004, online). One of the subsequent and parallel effects of this is also the issue of increased insecurity at work. In small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and also in firms moving up market, informal working practises often become standardised as a way of trying to control staff attrition. Yet schemes such as sick pay, holidays and consistent hours are overlooked, or not offered, as these firms can do little to create any kind of regular security, because of unstable market conditions (Gilman, Edwards, Monder and Arrowsmith, 2002). The result of these conditions of work is that 'HR policies are unable to resolve the potential conflicts and contradictions inherent in the employment relationship' (Marchington, 2004, online) and contests emerge which seek to challenge the mechanisms of control imposed upon knowledge workers. Knights (1996) highlights a correlation between a generic worker 'distrust in management' (Knights, 1996, 10)

with a limit in the amount of control firms can place over the development and improvement and honing of innovation. Other factors include the reduced loyalty of employees, resulting in low levels of attrition and a general societal distrust in the profiteering initiatives of companies, which reduces overall employer commitment (Marchington, 2004, online).   A key issue however, is the lack of real bargaining power that knowledge workers have to collectively dispute their conditions of work.

In industries where union representation is increasingly scarce, Roscigno and Hudson (2004) have found that 'individual resistance' (Roscigno and Hudson, 2004, 14) has often successfully incited collective action in the form of more traditional methods of mobilisation. Within the UK's audiovisual industries, the lack of organised representation, together with a natural tendency for workers to 'exploit contracts to further their own careers' (Saundry, Antcliff and Stuart, 2006, 378), tensions have grown with regards to the stability and definition of work within this field. The result has been a move by audiovisual workers to seek solutions to these issues through interpersonal networks, which have assumed a central role within the employment relationship.   The increase in informal networking has therefore given workers the opportunity for 'sharing of information, the articulation of ideas and the development of effective campaigns over specific issues' (389), leading to a re-emergence of the traditional reciprocal relationship between workers and recognised trade unions, who have helped to articulate the grievances arising from the networks of audiovisual workers. In the lower end of corporate enterprise, where worker antagonisms have seen even less recognition during the global restructuring of industry, steps have also been taken to frame the experiences of workers within SMEs into more organised and articulated political structures. Moore and Read (2006) highlight how agency within SMEs has predominantly been managed by a

commitment to 'individual bargaining power' (Moore and Read, 2006, 358); whereby individuals can contest the terms of employment they oppose, yet are given no formal mechanisms to pursue them at an institutional level. The actions from a minority of activists within SMEs in recent years have led to a legal challenge with firms to recognise some involvement of union activity. SMEs have been obliging to some extent, yet to create a domino effect within the lower end of the corporate enterprise, Moore and Read suggest more efforts are needed to train workers in wider social and political concerns to develop activist skills and 'mobilise collective interests in the workplace' (373).

As we can see, the restructuring of work brought about by the changes in production within the new economy, has created an environment where the plight of labour, specifically within the knowledge producing industries, is increasingly undermined in favour of pronouncements which seek to consolidate the potential of an ever expending knowledge economy. Workers are simply expected to comply with organisational changes which directly affect their work and non-work lives, in the hope that things will improve when the restructuring process stabilises. I would now like to conclude this chapter by going back to the criticisms made against the immaterial labour argument and highlight the inconsistencies within it, which have been illuminated further, by looking at the real effects of the new economy on knowledge work.

Summary: Towards a general concept of labour struggle emerging out of knowledge production?

In this chapter I have discussed the 'new economy', placing it into an historical context and specifically looking at the changes it has brought about in production and

work. I have argued that integral to these changes, are both the implementation of strategic managerial practises in line with the increase in the role of human resource management; which have on the one hand created more flexible hierarchies and augmented individual autonomy at work, but at the same time created a highly pressured and insecure environment for workers and also, the increasing importance of the honing of innovative production through the exploitation of individual intellect and time of workers, to companies competing in an unstable global marketplace. The result of these changes, I have shown, has severely damaged traditional worker relations in firms and has incited minor forms of contestation rising out of the forced changes imposed upon working conditions and lives. As Huws (1999) argues, 'real people with real bodies have contributed real time' to the development of the supposed 'weightless economy' (Huws, 1999, online). Significantly therefore, in relation to the critique of the immaterial labour thesis made at the end of the last chapter, I have shown that although conditions within the knowledge industries I have looked at correspond to the speculations of work made by the theorists who promote the movement of immaterial labour, they do not show a consistency of resistances emerging out of the relationships of production; hence there is little evidence which suggests that immaterial labour found in knowledge production is, or is becoming, a vanguard social subject. Furthermore, the increased surveillance of knowledge production and the standardisation of organisational practises have highlighted a tendency for knowledge work to be intricately measured. Therefore, I would argue, it cannot be considered within a new paradigm of worker relations based on 'immaterial', autonomous reciprocity; as individual work shows 'no immediate correlation between the value of an individual commodity and the profit it returns in the market' (Wright, 2005, online) or any real ascendancy to collective organisation

and resistance. If we are to consider ways in which to articulate a general concept of labour struggle emerging out of the new economy, we need to 'reach far beyond the horizons of immaterial labour' (Wright, 2005, online); this will be the aim of the final chapter. What this chapter has shown however, is that the reduction in the bargaining power of labour through the changes imposed by the restructuring of worker relations, together with the conditions of intensity and insecurity at work, has brought about antagonisms which are beginning, at least in an embryonic stage, to challenge the prevailing structures of power within organisations. In this respect, there are three key areas of discussion which I would like to introduce that will inform the detail of the second part of the following chapter. Firstly, the networked organisation which is emerging out of knowledge production, secondly, the need for labour studies to engage with postructural notions of power and resistance from an epistemological and methodological context; and thirdly, a critique of the traditional conception of resistance as being a means to an end. Firstly however, I would like to consider the 'return of a critical labour' in the opening part of the following chapter, by looking at alternative discourses of labour on the plain of the global economy. I will then situate them vis-a-vis the immaterial labour thesis and consider the problems there are for developing a general concept of labour struggle emerging out of knowledge production within the context of the areas for further discussion indicated previously. I will then look at new ways in which to engage in labour studies in the new economy.

Chapter 3

'Through our labouring activity we are constituted by and constitutive of the power relations that organise our world. As a mediating practice linking human beings to social forces, labour is one key to the reproduction of the self as agent'

Kathi Weeks, 1995

'Today, all political practice needs to be directed towards bringing about a class recomposition...a productive power capable of confronting and, ultimately, breaking with neo-liberal, post-Fordist social relations'

Ben Trott, 2007

The return of a critical labour

In the previous chapter, I highlighted how the realties of the new economy, namely the introduction of new managerial practises and methods of organisational control in knowledge producing firms, have created an environment of increasing pressure for knowledge workers within advanced industrial economies to conform to these changes. Specifically, these changes have undermined the general security of work and significantly imposed on non-working lives through a valorisation of the time and the intellectual input of individual labour. Fundamentally, as I have shown, this has severely damaged the traditional avenues of worker contestation through the

disintegration of the bargaining power of labour. Subsequently, labour within the new dynamic of capitalist production, is realising new directions of contention which are emerging out of these relations of production. At the end of the last chapter, I indicted that these new forms of contestation are minor and disparate, but show a potential for articulating a new general concept of struggle emerging out of knowledge production. The immaterial labour thesis, which I discussed in the first chapter, argues that it is workers within knowledge producing industries, who can be distinguished by their ever increasing immaterial forms of work and production, are the vanguard of the new labour struggles emerging within advanced capitalism. I have argued however, that this theory lacks any real empirical evidence because of the multiplicity of struggles which exist and which show various forms of viable and non-viable resistance tendencies. I therefore indicated that to move beyond this and consider how we might actually try to understand emerging forms of transformative social subjects within the new dynamic of capitalist production, we have to consider the rest of the plain first. The first part of this chapter will analyse other movements and discourses of labour within the global political economy; showing how the return of a critical labour has augmented our understanding of the modes of resistance that exist. This will lead me back to the immaterial labour thesis, where I will argue for greater empirical and analytical study into immaterial forms of work to develop the theory in line with other labour discourses, as well as highlight new ways in which to engage in labour studies in general.

The re-emergence of mainstream critical labour discourse has been synonymous with the neoliberal restructuring of the global political economy. I would like to focus on some of the key movements which seek to establish a critical response to the restructuring of international labour markets and production practises. These

include world systems theory and the return of older forms of labour struggle, such as industrial workers and trade unions, and the neo-Gramscian hegemonic theories of the social relations of production; specifically the movements of the global poor, global feminism, and precarious workers.

Beginning with the re-emergence of old labour struggles. I have already indicated previously that a large part of the labouring classes still work within industrial enterprises and have a significant influence on labour and global social movements in general. World systems theorists are keen to establish that the traditional 'power relations between capital and labour have never been restored' (Arrighi, Hopkins and Wallerstein, 1989, 105) since the capitalist restructuring began in the 1960s. This has resulted in the creation of new regional blocs of industrial workers movements which have a strategic role in the resistance against global capital. The restructuring of the international system has the seen the migration of manual labour from the core to the peripheral states; creating 'national locales' (Arrighi and Silver in Bergquist, 1984, 214) of worker struggles in developing countries such as Brazil, South Africa and China. Theses struggles are 'concentrated in large factories' and 'assembly lines' and can be considered as the 'main sites' of working class formation (Silver, 2005, online). In the core countries too, industrial workers still have a large stake in worker resistance movements. American factory workers continue to have a history of successful strike actions which have challenged the power relations in within industrial enterprises. Their 'cultures of solidarity' have re-installed the belief in 'the power of collective responses to grievances' (Fantasia, 1988, 235). For example as Calinicos (2003a) argues, the 'large scale trade union involvement' present in the anti-globalisation movement gives it 'a social weight' that 'would it otherwise lack' (Calinicos, 2003a, 98). To broaden this aspect of popular

dissidence, traditional worker movements need to forge greater links with the dispossessed workers in the peripheral developing states.

Alternatively, there are new labour internationalisms which are significantly deserting the traditional avenues of worker movements and forming coalitions which are reducible to both different modes of production and different strategic classes of the proletariat. Waterman (2001) explains that due to the economic crisis of contemporary capitalism, together with the rise of new technologies, there has been a rejection of the 'inadequacy of the dominant traditional union, labour and socialist organisations and ideologies' (Waterman, 2001, 71). Unions have found it difficult to 'elaborate a common platform' for mobilisation and instead the 'territory, rather than the enterprise' (Miguelez in Smith, 2002, 237) has become the setting for labour struggles. Networks of smaller, issue based political labour movements have emerged, which are trying to re-articulate how we should engage in class struggle within post-Fordist capitalism. A theoretical position which seeks to make sense of this is the neo-Gramscian school of political thought; this approach to IPE has sought to incite bottom up perspectives in labour studies. By looking at the social relations of production, neo-Gramscian's argue that contestation within different modes of production can lead to 'a change in the structure of social power' (Cox, 1987, 12). By re-aligning the importance of the universal activity of work to IPE studies, we can seek to articulate new tendencies of contestation which can lead to 'the formation of ideologies that could bridge the gaps between fragmented sources of discontent' (Cox, 1987, 382). Three central labour struggles within this theoretical framework are: the movements of the global poor, global feminism and the precarious worker.

If we begin with the global poor, neoliberal economic restructuring has not only created significant divisions between the rich and the poor in developed and

developing states but, as Davies and Ryner (2006) indicate, 'in some cases the number of poor' has 'increased' (Davies and Ryner in Davies and Ryner, 2006, 2). Research has shown that within areas of extreme inequality, social tensions are heightened and therefore areas of severe poverty become significant sites of contestation within the new dynamic of labour/capital struggles. Harrod (2006) argues that it is the global poor who may offer political theorists the transformative global subject needed to create a catalyst for international recognition for the plight of the working classes. In South Africa for example, the retail sector has seen a huge increase in informal working conditions, where workers receive 'lower pay, fewer benefits, have less job security and often have on-call working arrangements'(Clarke in Davies and Ryner, 2006, 170); hence they have 'little power over production and working conditions' (173). Clarke describes workers in this sector as 'the working poor', and their conditions of employment are showing an increasing tendency across developing regions and states. Harrod indicates that it is from within these relationships of production that 'radical and revolutionary groups' emerge which have 'the capacity to undermine and disrupt the privileged circuits of production and consumption' (Harrod in Davies and Ryner, 2006, 38/39).

Similarly, within the feminist movement, theorists argue that the conditions of work for women suggest that distinct social relations of production emerge; giving women's labour a privileged place within global labour movements in general. As Weeks (1995) argues, women's labour remains 'invisible' on the plane of the global political economy, however the skills that women develop through 'socially necessary caring labour, or labour in the concrete bodily mode', such as sex work or housework 'are typically naturalised and undervalued' (Weeks in Callari, Cullenberg and Biewener, 1995, 293). Household services, as Harrod (1987) argues, are 'a lifetime

constant for woman', where external commitments very rarely create a 'psychological, social or material force' greater than housework, which makes their labour in general a 'special case' (Harrod, 1987, 295,) separate from other relationships of production. Furthermore, the issue of the gendered division of labour is another significant factor within this theoretical tradition. For example, Healy's (2006) research into Mexican maquilladoras indicates that one of the key obstructive factors to creating a coherent movement out of the exploitation of work within South American sweatshops is, the 'paternalistic authoritarian dimensions of hegemonic masculinity experienced by working class communities' (Healey in Davies and Ryner, 2006, 202). This point can be integrated into any relationship of production; as the foundation of the feminist argument is that there cannot be any conception of labour or resistance without a consideration of the plight of women within the particular context of study. Finally, the precarious workers movement is also becoming a significant labour struggle within advanced capitalism. This movement emerged in Italy (Tari and Vanni, 2005) and has subsequently spread across many advanced industrial economies. Precarious workers are 'the low skilled, the low paid, the young worker, the student and the illegal' who are 'hired and fired according to the whims of the market place' (Doogan, 2005, online). Their role has been to contest the precarious conditions of work they face, through demonstrations and acts of sabotage (Tari and Vanni, 2005) to highlight the plight of workers who face fragmented, unpredictable and low paid employment.

The various global labour struggles which are emerging out of the dynamics of advanced capitalism, confirm that there are a multiplicity of modes of resistance rising out of the various modes of production that exist. At the same time there are new regional blocs of workers struggles consolidating themselves; specifically within

developing states and pursuing international links with broader social movements. However, all of these struggles show varying degrees of organisation and disorganisation, limiting their potential for transformative, emancipatory social action. In the next part of this chapter I would like to return to the immaterial labour thesis and consider how the epistemological foundations of the theory can help us to find ways in which to create more coherencies to research into global labour movements. I will specifically look at the nature of networked organisation and the notion of power relationships that exist within immaterial forms of production. This will lead to a conclusion, where I will suggest further avenues of research.

Networks, power and the potential of new ways in which to research global labour struggles

So far we have seen that resistance does emerge from the activities of labour and that it continues to do so globally, against the conditions of post-Fordist capital and within national and economic regions, modes of production and individual, spontaneous attacks within organisations. I would now like to return to the immaterial labour thesis and consider how the epistemological and methodological aspects can help us to understand and study other labour struggles, which could be aided by the development of articulating 'a productive power capable of confronting and, ultimately, breaking with neo-liberal, post-Fordist social relations' (Trott, 2007, 227).

In Multitude: War and Democracy in the age of Empire, Hardt and Negri (2004) begin to address some of the criticisms against the immaterial labour thesis. Against such critiques as Henwood's (2003) who argues that 'they don't cite any statistics' 'more Americans are truck drivers than computer professionals' (Henwood, 2003, 185), Hardt and Negri point to the 'qualitative' aspect of the immaterial labour

thesis in that rather than being actually quantifiably hegemonic, immaterial labour has 'imposed a tendency on other forms of labour and society itself' (Hardt and Negri, 2004, 109) and has the privilege of being in the same position as industrial labour was 150 years ago. Yet this is a positive position to be in; it is breaking down formal mechanisms of control and organisation and creating 'innumerable and indeterminate relationships of distributed networks' (Hardt and Negri, 2004, 113) which are slowly creating common forms of experience and subsequently, common blocs of solidarity. Hence, they indicate three key reasons to maintain that immaterial labour needs to be investigated further to help overcome the inconsistencies which have been highlighted in empirical studies of immaterial work. Firstly, to continue to focus on the trends of employment in advanced industrial societies and also the tendency of shifts in production away from manual labour. Secondly, the increasing importance of communication and reciprocity in work, which has augmented the cognitive capacity of the labour involved and finally, the contests between intellectual property and the rise of networked organisation.

I will begin by taking a theoretical look at networked organisation which is emerging out of knowledge production. Firstly, as we have seen, individual resistance within corporate enterprises has often resulted in the emergence of collective organisation in the form of networks. As a form of protection against the climate of insecurity, individuals tend to 'come and go according to what holds a passing affinity for them' (Lovink and Rossiter, 2005, 14) instead of committing to a particular collective; thus temporary networks of association develop. In corporate enterprises, flexibility at work together with the reduction in official avenues of worker representation has made it increasingly difficult for workers to articulate their grievances at a formal level. Within a culture of uncertainty and insecurity, they have

been forced to create networked alliances to bargain for greater protection, which have a tendency to branch out and 'resist structures of domination' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, 8) to further its own end. Furthermore, examples of powerful networked resistance can be found in the peer to peer (P2P) movement, which seeks to 'produce use value through free cooperation of producers who have access to distributed capital' (Bauwens, 2006). This has largely been an internet phenomenon, where individuals have been able to participate in the free exchange of music and other digital media. Internet activism in general is at the heart of networked organisation where it has 'assisted activists in protests of corporate-led globalisation, facilitated union struggles' and 'provided alternatives to mainstream news media' (Jacobs, 2005, 68). The emergence of resistance based around the 'ownership and control of information' (Neilson and Rossiter, 2005, online) is generating an environment where subversive activities become integrated into the social fabric of everyday life, as the entrepreneurial potential of new technologies fosters the subjectivity of the individual to disrupt the 'institutional nucleus of capitalist society' (Dafermos, 2005, 5).

The second point of consideration is that the 'anthropological reality' of studying resistance, emerging out of knowledge production, highlights the need for a more intricate and analytical consideration into the notion of power, which can be critical to comprehending how we analyse the social relations of production within the corporate enterprise and other global labour struggles. As we have seen, the restructuring of firms has resulted in the fragmenting of work; creating cultures of individualism and competition amongst workers and leading to resistance practises which have stemmed from intuitive and spontaneous attacks on the structures of power within firms. Foucault's (1976) concept of power, as being 'exercised from

innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations' (Foucault, 1976, 93), provides a useful basis to how we can view individual struggles against an ever changing environment of control and perceived autonomy; specifically, 'forms of resistance against different forms of power' (Foucault in Rainbow and Rose, 2003, 128) that may exist within the corporate enterprise as well as the relationships which develop 'outside the institution' (140). At the heart of the immaterial thesis is a commitment to poststructuralism; both as an epistemological foundation and as a tool of methodological enquiry. As we have seen, within knowledge producing firms there are 'complex divisions of labour, anti-union prohibitions and the extreme experience of competition' (Clegg in Jermier, Knights and Nord, 1994, 291). Poststructuralism can give us a clearer understanding into the genealogies of power, subjectivity and resistance and their intricate relationship to political and structural change within the context of these production relations. If we take Foucault's (1976) idea that power within the new dynamic of capitalist control comes from innumerable points, it becomes clearer to understand how 'people hired as labour power will retain ultimate discretion over themselves, what they do and how they do it' (291) as resistance will inevitably emerge out of this 'inescapable and irreducible embodiment of labour power' (291). To take an intricate look at the types of power relations within knowledge production can lead to rediscovery of 'mixed or overlapping spaces of interest' (Inayatulla and Blaney, 2004, 183) which have become normalised or institutionalised by the controlling mechanisms of knowledge firms, such as the ones discussed in chapter two. For example, as Harrod (1997) argues, neglecting this approach in labour studies has made it difficult for researchers to appoint blame to individuals in companies (Harrod, 1997); therefore studying power relations can

47

reveal the 'disguises of power' (Harrod, 1997, 114) which in turn can potentially change organisational practises and attitudes at work.

Liberal policy within advanced economies is increasingly based on the idea that human development is premised upon meaningful, creative work; which suggests that the benefits of working where mental and manual labour are conjoined are not merely economic, but also important for the development of personality (Levine and Turab-Rizvi, 2005). This also indicates that studies into the labour process would have to realign their focus into the individual perspectives of work and production. As we have already seen, contestation does emerge, regardless of whether it is policy driven for the benefit of individuals or a natural tendency within capital's evolution, to 'govern and control the labour force as mental entity' (Vahamaki, 2004, 235). Therefore, we have a situation where power within knowledge producing firms is increasingly concerned with the 'management of multiplicity' (Lazzarato, 2005, online) antagonising the intrinsic 'dialectic of power' (Clegg in Jermier, Knights and Nord, 1994, 286), where agency inevitably contests it within an organisational context and doing so from and multiple perspectives. However, I would contend that the ignorance of collective agencies or knowledge of the tacit resistances and common experiences of others' restricts the transformative abilities of these forms of contestation. As Negri (2003) argues, 'capital can no longer exploit the worker, it can only exploit cooperation amongst workers' (Negri, 2003, online) by limiting the possibilities of collective organisation and increasing the competitive function of labour, thus making resistance 'an unusual and out of the ordinary state of affairs' (Clegg in Jermier, Knights and Nord, 1994, 284). These circumstances require a micro-political engagement with the different and emerging power relations within modes of production.

Finally, Lazzarato (2004) speaks of the corporate firm 'without factories' which seeks to benefit from the multiplicity of abilities that individuals can bring to it. Instead of looking at modes of production in that sense, he sees the restructuring of firms which has resulted in new environments of work, as creating a 'production of modes' (Lazzarato, 2004, 202) of resistance that are emerging from within and outside of the corporate enterprise. As Nielsen (2007) explains, 'the circumstances of the global proletariat are not uniformly reducible to a common pattern of formal and real subordination' (Nielsen, 2007, 106). This is largely due to the disaggregated middle classes who on the one hand 'continue to be proletarianised' and the other hand 'are linked to full membership of the capitalist class' (115). As Huws (2003) argues, the increasing role of services to advanced economies has seen the proletarianisation of large sectors of clerical, telecommunication and ICT producing industries, together with the cost cutting provided by off-shoring and this is leading to the complete collapse of public infrastructure; catalysed further by the 'shift from collectivism to individualism in the domains of political actions and everyday life' (Leitch, 2007, 297). At the same time, the rise of cultural workers who, rather than using their strategic role as the intellectual class, 'are accustomed to think of themselves' (Ross, 2007, online). As Ross (2007) speculates, the result of this is that this 'will probably take a generation of proletarianisation and another big recession to persuade them that collective organising is in their long-term interest' (Ross, 2007, online). The sheer range and scope of labour struggles, both emerging out of knowledge production and in other regions and sectors across the globe, would suggest that there is little chance of creating a movement of immaterial labour, a general concept of struggle emerging out of knowledge production or any formal coherency to global labour movements. Moving towards a conclusion I would

therefore contend that rather than there being a need to look for a vanguard class within the new dynamic of capitalist production, there is instead an urgency to instigate 'an intensification of struggle everywhere that can eventually bring about a transformation of the global system' (Nunes, 2007, 196) and key to this, I would argue, is the re-articulation of how we engage in research and in activism within contexts of work and production.

Summary: Towards an ethnographic and poststructural study of labour struggles in the global political economy

In this chapter I have looked at other global labour movements and discourses which have emerged within the new dynamic of capitalist production. I have emphasised that, like the immaterial thesis, they indicate strategic roles of labour resistance against post-Fordist production within potential organisational, regional and economic blocs of solidarity. However, they also indicate that global labour struggles are still distinctly disparate in their relation to each other. I then returned to the immaterial labour thesis and argued that despite the inconsistencies within its theoretical position, it still offers unique ways in which to critically engage with how resistance emerges and takes form. Specifically, the emphasis it gives to both studying networked forms of organisation as well as the need to consider in more detail the relationships of power within organisations and labouring contexts. The conclusion that I have reached is that instead of looking for a vanguard labour subject to lead the struggle against global capitalism, we should instead look at the transformative and emancipatory potential of resistant subjects within all contexts of labour organisation and production. To do so, I contend that we must engage with new ways in which to study and also articulate how resistance emerges. In this way we can hope to gain a

greater understanding of the conditions of labour within strategic relationships of production and therefore we could both move towards and incite more realistic and coherent strategies of resistance from a multiplicity of perspectives, rather than an objective and singular vanguard position. I will now outline epistemological and methodological approaches which I believe are the key to further study in this context.

In labour studies, ethnography has increasingly been a method employed by political researchers, as it allows them to increase their rapport with observants by 'establishing oneself in a normal role in the social system' which in turn decreases their conspicuousness (Johnson, Avenarius and Weatherford, 2006, 114). I contend that this can 'enrich the theoretical foundations' (Welch et al, online) of any research agenda because it allows for reflexivity and the development of subjective identities that help to change and guide the research as it is being conducted. Ethnographic studies, I would therefore argue, will allow workers to imagine their situation, in that it may incite their agency rather than their passivity. With regards to labour studies, this level of scrutiny where humans 'constitute their reality and organise their experience in terms of cognitive (or knowledge guiding) interests' (Crotty, 1999, 142) can lead to a clearer and more intricate understanding of the creation of the political self. Further research into knowledge production and other modes of production should therefore emphasise the importance of ethnography as a way of accessing the actual experiences of workers; creating a commentary which will inform, rather than instruct the research process. It will be possible to articulate a better understanding of the dynamics of power; whilst giving power and autonomy to those who participate in the research. Also, by emphasising a poststructural epistemology, the researcher can maintain that other than trying to construct a meaning to a perceived problem, the ethnographic study is intended to deconstruct 'whatever remains silent, unthought or

'untruthed', so that presence can come into being' (Derrida in Hall, 1997, 41). The individuals or groups involved in the research therefore inform it throughout, instead of being subjected to scrutiny or misrepresentation. To build transformative and emancipatory knowledge about labour struggles within the global political economy that can challenge the prevailing structures of power, we should look to poststructuralism's ability to 'demystify the experience of reality' (Crotty, 1999, 204) which will help us to understand various realities that exist from multiple perspectives. I would now like to conclude this thesis by taking a reflexive look at the research I have conducted, highlighting what I perceive to be the problems and gaps within it and suggesting further avenues of research that can be done within this theoretical and methodological context.

Conclusion

There were four specific research questions at the heart of this thesis: How useful is the concept of immaterial labour to highlighting trends in work? Does immaterial labour incite political dissent and disaffection? Do immaterial labourers in any way resist the conditions of their employment? To what extent is the dissent/disaffection propitious (or not) for transformative and emancipatory social action? I will now show how each of these questions was answered before I take a reflexive look at the research I have conducted and the ways in which it can be improved and developed.

In chapter one, I introduced the theoretical perspective of autonomist Marxism and argued that their theory of immaterial labour was both a unique contribution to labour studies in IPE and also a useful catalyst for understanding new ways in which to consider resistance emerging out of knowledge production. I then critically analysed the theory and concluded that immaterial labour, to some extent, does mirror the types of work found in knowledge production, however there were significant flaws in the argument, as knowledge workers find their labour both intricately measured and lacking in the natural reciprocity which the immaterial labour thesis speculates. At the same time though, we have seen a tendency for work to be more intellectual and symbolic and therefore further empirical research into these types labouring activities is needed. In chapter two I moved into a more extensive critique of the immaterial labour thesis by looking at other discourses of work within the knowledge economy. I found that the conditions of work experienced by knowledge

workers within the new economy has lead to disaffection within the workplace, largely due to the blurring of boundaries between work and non-work time and the lack of formal mechanisms for workers to voice their discrepancies. This has lead to emerging forms of resistance within knowledge producing firms but this resistance does not show a potential for transformative, emancipatory social action because of the disparate and inconsistent modes of struggle which emerge from it. This led me to conclude at this stage that the potential for immaterial labour to form a vanguard subject was not a viable resistance strategy as, not only was the immaterial argument lacking in any real empirical evidence, but there was little coherency to the struggles emerging within knowledge work generally. In chapter three I reassessed my position by firstly looking at how other modes of resistance emerging out of the new dynamic of capitalism are challenging the structures of power within different modes of production in the global political economy. When I retuned to the immaterial labour thesis I then argued that instead of actually focussing our research into the potential of a vanguard labour subject, we need to realign how we do research into global labour movements as a way of understanding better the relationships of power inherent in different modes of production; with the aim of trying to intensify labour struggles on a global scale. I suggested that ways in which to do so should include a micro-political engagement with new forms of organisation such as networks, as well as a postructural analysis of the forms of power which exist in competing struggles of labour and capital. Central to this, I argued, should be a move towards an ethnographical IPE with a distinct postructural epistemological agenda. I would now like to suggest ways in which to improve and develop research within this theoretical context.

Autonomist Marist theory, despite its recent popularity in critical global studies, has in some respects reached a dead end (Dowling, Nunes and Trott, 2007, 5). Their position on class organisation as well as the theoretical impact of the immaterial labour thesis has been severely scrutinised by academics and activists on many levels. A central part of this criticism, I would argue, is their reluctance to take a critical stance against the perceived existence of a knowledge economy, where they instead reinforce many of the theories and speculations of the liberal and neo-liberal economists who have pioneered and consolidated this approach to financial and labour markets. The production of knowledge and information are a central part of how capitalism maintains a hegemonic position in the contemporary global economy; however this type of production is strategic to proximate regional and global economies and not to the system as a whole. Therefore, resistance can also only be understood from a more segmented and economy specific position, not, as the autonomist Marists would claim, from a vanguard position. I would agree with Wright (2002) however, that autonomist Marxism has highlighted the 'inherently contradictory experiences of workers whether waged or otherwise' (Wright, 2002, 226), where the contradictions which arise out of contested experiences within relationships of work and exploitation; workers struggles are immediately a key area of focus when looking into the potential disruption of capitalist production. Research that should be conducted from within this theoretical perspective should therefore include more empirical studies into resistance emerging out of work, the power of social networks and cultural flows that 'comprise the business activities and the movement of finance capital in general' (Nielsen and Rossiter, 2005, online). This would add issues such as debt, 'money as capital' (Wright, 2005, online) and the instability of markets as other ways in which to show how labour becomes

radicalised. These studies should however, as I argued in the final chapter, have ethnographic and poststructural research foundations that are concerned with how research can encourage subjective understanding, whereby 'everything is therefore open to doubt or question except for what is immediately experienced' (Colebrook, 2002, 72). In this respect the 'space between the micro-physics of power and the institutions of domination is propitious for a politics of becoming and creation, for the invention of new forms of subjectivity' (Lazzarato, 2007, 105) and this will only help to further augment our understanding of the modes of resistance emerging out of the relations of production in the global political economy. By engaging in studies into contemporary experiences of work, we can seek to resolve the increasingly fragile social relations of production and using the interpretative function of poststructuralism highlight the emergence of new forms of subjectivity. The de-industrialisation of the economies of advanced industrial societies has seen an increase in new forms of work within corporate structures and the burgeoning similarities of the struggles within them. The resistances emerging out of this mode of production could yet prove to be integral to the formation of a counter-hegemonic historical bloc.

Bibliography

Allen, J. (2002), 'Symbolic economies: the culturalisation of economic knowledge' in du Gay, P. and Pryke, M. Eds. *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life (Culture, Representation & Identities)*, London: Sage, pp. 39-59.

Amoore, L. (2002) *Globalisation Contested: An International Political Economy of Work*. Manchester University Press: Manchester

Amoore, L. (2004) 'Risk, reward and discipline at work', *Economy and Society*, 33 (2), pp. 174-196

Arrighi, G. (1978), 'Towards a Theory of Capitalist Crisis', *New Left Review,* 111, pp. 3-24.

Arrighi, G. and Silver, B.J. (1984), 'Labour Movements and Capital Migration: The United States and Western Europe in World-Historical Perspective' in Bergquist, C. Ed. *Labour in the Capitalist World Economy*, London: Sage, pp. 183-217

Arrighi, G. Hopkins, T.K. and Wallerstein, I. (1989), *Anti-systemic Movements*, London: Verso

Alvesson, M. (2004), *Knowledge Work and Knowledge-Intensive Firms*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arvidsson, A. (2007), 'Creative Class or Administrative Class? On Advertising and the 'Underground', *Ephemera: theory and politics in organisation*, 7(1), pp. 8-23.

Bauwens, M. (2006), 'The political economy of peer production' [Conference Paper]. *Immaterial Labour, Multitudes and New Social Subjects*, Cambridge University, 29-30 April 2006.

Bell, D. (1976), *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*, New York: Basic Books.

Bifo, F. B (2004) 'What is the meaning of autonomy today?' [Online]. Available at http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=04/01/16/1733237&mode=nested&tid=9 (Accessed: 30 September 2003)

Boje, T.P. (2003), 'Towards a post-industrial service society' in Boje, T.P and Furaker, B. Eds. *Post-industrial Labour Markets: Profiles of North America and Scandinavia*, London: Routledge, pp. 124-147.

Boltanski, L. and Chapiero, E. (2006), *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, London: Verso

Budgen, S. (2000), 'A New 'Spirit of Capitalism', *New Left Review*, Jan/Feb 2000, pp. 149-156

Calinicos, A. (2003), 'Toni Negri in perspective' in Balakrishnan, G. Ed. *Debating Empire,* London: Verso, p.121-144.
Calinicos, A. (2003a), *An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Carls, K. (2007), 'Affective Labour in Milanese Large Scale Retailing: Labour Control and Employees Coping Strategies', *Ephemera: theory and politics in organisation*, 7(1), pp. 46-59.

Castells, M. (2000), *The Rise of the Network Society*, 2nd Ed, Oxford: Blackwell

Chatterton, P. (2005) 'Making autonomous geographies: Argentina's popular uprising and the 'Movimento de Trabajadores Desocupados' (Unemployed Workers Movement)', *Geoforum*, 36 (5), pp. 545-561

Clarke, M. (2006), 'The Working Poor: Labour Market Reform and Unprotected Workers in the South African Retail Sector' in Davies, M. and Ryner, M. Eds. *Poverty and the Production of World Politics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 154-178

Cleaver, H. (1998), 'The Zapatistas and the electronic fabric of struggle' in Holloway, J. and Palaez, E. Eds. *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*, London: Pluto Press, pp. 80-115.

Clegg, S. (1994), 'Power relations and the constitution of the resistant subject' in Jermier, J.M. Knights, D. and Nord, W.R. Eds. *Resistance and Power in Organisations*, London: Routledge, pp. 274-326.

Colebrook, C (2002), *Routledge Critical Thinkers: Gilles Deleuze,* London: Routledge.

Courtney, H. S. Navarro, E. and O'Hare, C. A. (2007), 'The Dynamic Organic Transformational (D.O.T.) team model for high-performance knowledge-worker teams', *Team Performance Management,* 13 (1/2), pp. 34-46

Cox, R. W. (1987), *Production, Power and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Crotty, M. (1999), *The Foundations of Social Research*, London: Sage

Dafermos, G. (2005), *5 Theses on Cognitive Capitalism*, Chaos Communication Congress, pp. 1-8**.**

Dahlman, C. and Utz, A. (2005), 'India and the Knowledge Economy: Leveraging Strengths and Opportunities', *Washington, D.C: The World Bank*

Davies, M. and Ryner, M. (2006), 'Introduction' in Davies, M. and Ryner, M. Eds. *Poverty and the Production of World Politics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-13

Deleuze, G and Guattari, F (1987), *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, University of Minnesota Press.
Derrida, J. (1997), 'The spectacle of 'the other' in Hall, S. (Ed), *Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practises*, London: Sage, pp. 223-290

Doogan, K. (2005), 'The Nomad, the disciplined and the settler worker in the 21st century' [Online]. Available at http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=05/11/24/1638255 (Accessed: 24th November 2005).

Dowling, E. (2007), 'Producing the Dining Experience: Measure, Subjectivity and the Affective Worker', *Ephemera: theory and politics in organisation*, 7(1), pp. 117-132.

Dowling, E. Nunes, R. and Trott, B. (2007), 'Immaterial and Affective Labour: Explored' *Ephemera: theory and politics in organisation*, 7(1), pp. 1-7.

Dyer-Witheford, N. (1999), *Cyber-Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High-Technology Capitalism,* University of Illinois Press

Fantasia, R. (1988), *Cultures of Solidarity: Consciousness, action and contemporary American workers,* California: University of California Press.

Foucault, M. (1976), *The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality Volume 1*, London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (2003), 'The Subject and Power' in Rainbow, P. and Rose, N. (Eds), *The Essential Foucault*, London: The New Press, pp. 126-144

Frederick, G. (2007), 'Strategic Bundling: Information Products, market power and the future of globalisation', *Review of International Political Economy*, 14 (1), pp. 26-48.

Gilman, M. Edwards, P. Monder, M. and Arrowsmith, J. (2002), 'Pay determination in small firms in the UK: the case of the response to the National Minimum Wage', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 33 (1), pp. 52-67

Hales, C. (2005) 'Extent and impact of managerial work among first-line managers' [Online] Available at http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/ViewAwardPage.aspx?AwardId =1580 (Accessed: 7 October 2006).

Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2000), *Empire,* Harvard University Press

Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2004), *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire,* London: New York: Penguin

Harrod, J. (1987), *Power, Production and the Unprotected Worker*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Harrod, J. (1997), 'Social Forces and International Political Economy: Joining the Two IRs' in Gill, S. and Mittleman, J. H. (Eds), *Innovation and Transformation in International Studies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 105-117.

Harrod, J. (2006), 'The Global Poor and Global Politics: Neo-materialism and the Sources of Political Action' in Davies, M. and Ryner, M. Eds. *Poverty and the Production of World Politics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 38-62

Healy, T. (2006), 'The Condition of Hegemony and Labour Militancy: The Restructuring of Gender and Production Patterns in Mexico' in Davies, M. and Ryner, M. Eds. *Poverty and the Production of World Politics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 178-204

Held, D. and McGrew, A. (2002), *Globalisation/Anti-Globalisation*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Henninger, M. and Mecchia, G. (2007) 'Introduction', *Substance #112*, 36 (1), pp. 3-7

Henwood, D. (2003), *After the New Economy,* New York: The New Press

Huws, U. (1999), 'Material World: The myth of the weightless economy' [Online]. Available at http://socialistregister.com/socialistregister.com/files/SR_1999_Huws.pdf (Accessed: 26 July 2007).

Huws, U. (2003), *The Making of a Cybertariat: Virtual Work in a Real World*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Inayatulla, N. and Blaney, D.L. (2004), *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*, London: Routledge.

Jacobs, D. (2005), 'Internet Activism and Democratic Emergency in the U.S.' *Ephemera*: *theory and politics in organisation,* 5 (1), pp. 68- 77

Johnson, J.C. Avenarius, C. and Weatherford, J. (2006), The Active-Participant Observer: Applying Social Role Analysis to Participant Observation, *Field Methods*, 18 (2), pp. 111-134.

Kingsnorth, P. (2003), *One No, Many Yeses: A Journey to the Heart of the Global Resistance Movement,* London: The Free Press.

Kinsman, G. (2005) 'Learning from Autonomist Marxism' [Online]. Available at http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=05/10/06/132435 (Accessed 5 October 2006).

Klein, N. (2001), 'Reclaiming the Commons', *New Left Review*, 9, May/Jun. 2001, pp. 85-88.

Knights, D. (1996), *Past, Present and Future Innovations in UK Management Control: A critical examination of power, identity and trust*, ESRC, pp.1-33

Law, J. (2003), 'Economics as Interface' in du Gay, P. and Pryke, M. Eds. *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life (Culture, Representation & Identities)*, London: Sage, pp. 21-39.

Lawler, E. E. (1996), *From the Ground Up: Six Principles for Building the New Logic Corporation*, California: Jossey-Bass.

Lazzarato, M. (1996), 'Immaterial Labour' in Virno, P. and Hardt, M. Eds. *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics,* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 133-151.

Lazzarato, M. (2004), 'From Capital Labour to Capital Life', *Ephemera*: *theory and politics in organisation,* 4 (3), pp. 187- 208

Lazzarato, M. (2005), 'Biopolitics/Bioeconomics: a politics of multiplicity' [Online]. Available at http://www.generation-online.org/p/fplazzarato2.htm (Accessed: 27 November 2005).

Lazzarato, M. (2007), 'The Revolutions of Capitalism', Substance *#112*, 36 (1), pp. 98-105

Leitch, R. (2007), 'Review of the Making of a Cybertariat: Virtual Work in a Real World', *Review of Radical Political Economics*, (39), pp. 295-298.

Levine, D and Turab-Rizvi, A. (2005), *Poverty, Work and Freedom*: *Political Economy and the Moral Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lovink, G. and Rossiter, N. (2005), 'Dawn of the Organised Networks', *Fibreculture* (5), [available online at http://journal.fibreculture.org/issue5/lovink_rossiter.html

Marchington, M. (2004), 'Changing Organisational Forms and the Re-shaping of Work: Case Study Interviews, 1999-2002' [Online] Available at http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/findingData/snDescription.asp?sn=5041 (Accessed: 20 July 2007).

Marx, K. (1973), *Grundrisse*, London: Penguin Group.

Mcrobbie, A. (2002) 'From Hollywood to Hollywood: happiness at work in the new cultural economy? In du Gay, P. and Pryke, M. (Eds), *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life (Culture, Representation & Identities)*, London: Sage, pp. 97-115

Miguelez, F. (2002), 'The working class and labour movements since the onset of democracy' in Smith, A. Ed. *Red Barcelona: Social Protest and Labour Mobilisation in the Twentieth Century*, London: Routledge, pp. 223-240.

Monbiot, G. (2000), *Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain*, London: Pan Books.

Moore, S. and Read, I. (2006), 'Collective organisation in small and medium sized enterprises – an application of mobilisation theory', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16 (4), pp. 357-375

Murray, A. J. and Greenes, K.A. (2007), 'From the knowledge worker to the knowledge economy: Six billion minds co-creating the future', *Vine*, 37 (1), pp. 7-13.

Neale, J. (2002), *You are G8, We are 6 Billion: The Truth Behind the Genoa Protests*, London: Vision Paperbacks.

Negri, A. (2003), 'Public sphere, labour, multitude: strategies of resistance in Empire' [Online]. Available at http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=03/02/13/1115252 (Accessed: 2 March 2003)

Negri, A. (2004), 'A Contribution on Foucault' [Online]. Available at http://www.generation-online.org/p/fpnegri14.htm (Accessed: 9 October 2004).

Negri, A. (2005), *The Politics of Subversion: A Manifesto for the 21st Century*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Negri, A. and Fleming, J. (1991), *Marx Beyond Marx: lessons from the Grundrisse*, Autonomedia Pluto: New York

Neilson, B. and Rossiter, N. (2005), 'From Precarity to Precariousness and Back Again: Labour, life and unstable networks', *Fibreculture* (5) [available online at http://journal.fibreculture.org/issue5/neilson_rossiter.html]

Neilson, D. (2007), 'Formal and real subordination and the contemporary proletariat: Re-coupling Marxist class theory and labour process analyses', *Capital and Class*, 91 (1), pp. 89-125.

Nunes, R. (2007), ''Forward How? Forward Where?' I: (Post-) Operaismo Beyond the Immaterial Labour Thesis', *Ephemera: theory and politics in organisation*, 7(1), pp. 178-202.

Paap, J. and Katz, R. (2004), 'Predicting the Unpredictable: Anticipating Disruptive Innovation', *Industrial Research Institute: Technology Management*, Sep-Oct, 2004, pp. 13-22.

de Peuter, G. and Dyer-Witheford, N. (2005), 'A Playful Multitude? Mobilising and Counter Mobilising Immaterial Game Labour', *Fibreculture* (5) [available online at http://journal.fibreculture.org/issue5/depeuter_dyerwitheford.html]

Porter, M.E. and Ketels, C.H.M. (2003), 'UK Competitiveness: Moving to the next stage', *DTI Economics Paper* (3), pp. 4-55.

Poynter, G. (2000), *Restructuring in the Service Industries: Management Reform and Workplace Relations in the UK Service Sector*, New York: Mansell Publishing.

Revelli, M. (1996), 'Worker Identity in the Factory Desert', in Virno, P. and Hardt, M. Eds. *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics,* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 99-115.

Roscigno, V.J. and Hodson, R. (2004), 'The organisational and social foundations of worker resistance', *American Sociological Review*, 69 (1), pp.14-39

Ross, A. (2007), 'Organic Intellectual Work: Interview with Andrew Ross by Geert Lovink' [Online]. Available at http://www.networkcultures.org/geert/interview-with-andrew-ross/ (Accessed: 2 August 2007).

Saundry, R. Stuart, M. and Antcliff, V. (2006), 'It's more than who you know: networks and trade unions in the audiovisual industries', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16 (4) pp. 376-392

Sennett, R. (2006), *The Culture of the New Capitalism*, Yale University Press.

Silver, B. J. (2005), 'The Heart of the Beast – An Unknown Equity: Workers power and the future of Operaism' [Online]. Available at http://www.akweb.de/ak_s/ak500/07 (Accessed: 30 April 2006).

Sleeswijk Visser, F. van der Lugt, R. and Stappers, P. J. (2007), 'Sharing User Experiences in the Product Innovation Process: Participatory Design Needs Participatory Communication', *Creativity and Innovation Management,* 16 (1), pp. 35-45.

Tari, M. and Vanni, I. (2005), 'On the life and deeds of San Precario, Patron Saint of precarious workers', *Fibreculture* (5), [available online at http://journal.fibreculture.org/issue5/tari_vanni.html

Trott, B. (2007), 'Immaterial Labour and World Order: An Evaluation of a Thesis', Ephemera: *theory and politics in organisation,* 7 (1), pp. 203- 232

Tsianos, V. and Papadopoulos, D. (2006), 'Who's afraid of immaterial workers? Embodied capitalism, precarity, imperceptibility', [Conference Paper]. *Immaterial Labour, Multitudes and New Social Subjects*, Cambridge University, 29-30 April 2006.

Vahamaki, J. (2004), 'Controlling the Multitude', *Ephemera: theory and politics in organisation*, 4 (3), pp. 233-245.

Virno, P. (2004), *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*, New York: Semiotext (e).

Waterman, P. (2001), *Globalisation, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms*, London: Continuum.

Weeks, K. (1995), 'Feminist Standpoint Theories and the Return of Labour' in Callari, A. Cullenberg, S. and Biewener, C. Eds. *Marxism in the Postmodern Age: Confronting the New World Order*, New York: The Guilford Press, pp. 292-301.

Welch, C et al. 'Interviewing elites in international organisations: A balancing act for the researcher' [Online]. Available at http://www.uni-muenster.de/PeaCon/dgs-mills/mills-texte/The%20QualitativeInterview-InternationalBusinessResearch.htm (Accessed: 3 April 2007)

Wright, S. (2002), *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*, London: Pluto Press.

Wright, S. (2005), 'Reality check: Are we living in an Immaterial World?' [Online]. Available at http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=05/12/27/0513241 (Accessed: 23 November 2005).

Wright, S. (2006), 'There and back again: mapping the pathways within autonomist Marxism', [Conference Paper]. *Immaterial Labour, Multitudes and New Social Subjects*, Cambridge University, 29-30 April 2006.

Zhang, K-y, Huang, R-h and He, Y. (2005), 'Research of Game Theory and Incentive Mechanism on Knowledge Sharing between Knowledge-based Organization and Knowledge Worker', *Proceedings Of International Conference On Management Science And Engineering Conference,* 12 (2), pp. 1516-1520