A Stable Compromise in Unstable Times

Critical Examinations in the Capital-Labour Relation, and How a Basic Income Can Mobilise a New Sensibility Towards Value

Love thy Neighbor, Irvin Morazan (2017)

Name	Andreas Korntved Mortensen
CPR number	281291
Study Programme	Master's Thesis MSc., Business Administration and Philosophy
University	Copenhagen Business School
Hand in Date	15.01.18
Supervisor	Alexander Carnera, Department of Management, Politics and Philosophy
Number of pages	71
Characters with space	183.790

"There is something tragic in the fact that as soon as man had invented a machine to do his work he began to starve. This, however, is, of course, the result of our property system and our system of competition" (Oscar Wilde, 1891)

"The most important element for anyone who looks at my objects is my fundamental thesis: each human being is an artist. It is even my fundamental contribution to the history of art (...). Within each human being lies a virtual creative ability. This is not to say that everyone is a painter or a sculptor, but that there is some latent creativity within each domain of human work … each type of work has a connection to art; and art is no longer a type of activity or an isolated group, with people able to do art whilst the others have to do another type of work. … therefore culture and economy are one and the same thing and, within or society, the most important means of production, the most important factories that create capital are schools and universities. This is why they are in the hands of the state, and this is why we have to free them" (Joseph Beuys in Lazzarato, 2004)

"We must 'work' to create, quite intentionally, new forms of social life in order to reinvent a politics in which individuals are truly empowered." (Stanley Aronowitz, 1992)

Abstract

This thesis is a critical investigation of the ambivalent relationship between the concept of labour and the concept of value creation in western immaterial capitalism. The thesis defines this relationship as the labour-capital relation. The relationship is studied by an examining of the historical developments in the transition from a Fordist to a post-Fordist mode of production and the transition from a passive to an active labour policy. As a result, the thesis finds four breakdowns between: Life-labour, common-private, right-obligation, and work-labour – that all point to a form of discrepancy in the capital-labour relation. The thesis claims that these four breakdowns consequently result in precarious working conditions for workers and a weakened bargaining power for trade unions expressed in failed identity politics. The thesis claims that former attempts to cope with precarity and identity politics fail to understand the flexible and immaterial characteristics of contemporary labour and value production. The aim is to illustrate how attempts that either call for fixed employment and stable income (welfare) or quantify and standardise value (workfare) are insufficient. As a result, the thesis suggests looking at a basic income as a structural stable compromise in-between the four breakdown as respectively a – remuneration, compensation, stratification, and decommodification – that all point to a form of 'third way' in the capital-labour relation. The examination of basic income is approached on a macro level and not as a concrete application model. The focus is to propose how contemporary production and a basic income together share a critical potential to understand capital, labour and identity in a new way benefitting trade unions and worker rights. As such, the thesis suggests unions and Danish labour market policy to take in a broader recognition of labour and employment not only perceiving wage as predetermined for value production. One of the thesis' central insights is to understand how production not only should be understood economically, but socially and politically as well. The thesis has for the same reason methodologically engaged with fiction, i.e. constructing a fictive case, as an alternative methodological approach to cope with the wider socio-political infrastructure not applicable in quantitative and qualitative inquiries. The thesis asserts that working with fiction as a form of paradigmatic case provides a certain particularity and generality that is able to open up and provide a language for discussing, in this case, precarity and identity not only distinctive for categories such as workers or welfare recipients but as immanent within life itself.

1. Introduction

We have a peculiar relationship with labour. No matter where I go, no matter whom I talk to, no matter what some politician say, it is somehow always related to labour. If we take a step back and track the etymological roots of labour, we will find that it stems from the Latin *laborare*, which means 'to cultivate'. Tracking *laborare* through history we derive with three related words: *labour* (meaning pain or trouble)*, work* (meaning doing something) and *arbeit* (meaning slave). In western societies, we distinguish between *work* as non-paid labour, e.g. care work you do for your family. Labour, on the other hand, is wage-work and only happens when you are employed. The different words and their etymological meanings indicate a rather big gap between what is work and what is labour/arbeit. However, today, I believe few people really think of *pain* when they are considering themselves as part of the labour market; but maybe *trouble* is the right word? For something is definitely changing in the labour market at the moment.

The Economical Insight

The following introduction is both a motivation for writing the thesis but more importantly it is a description and definition of concepts that in the problem statement is presupposed. As a result, the problem statement is presented rather late (page 7). The reader is welcome to skip directly to the problem statement, but has to bear in mind that certain concepts are presented beforehand.

This thesis is a product of an observation I have made during the last year of my life as a number of events occurred. First of all I got a new job in a Strategic Foresight and Design Thinking Firm which has influenced my perception of what is regarded as labour and in relation to that what can be perceived as value. The second event that occurred was when my father, who is self-employed, became sick due to an inborn blood disease and was ordered by his doctor to take a month off work to recover and gain energy. Did my father recover? No, on the contrary he was diagnosed with stress a month after because he constantly had to reply, queue on the phone, fill out and document everything to his caseworker from the jobcentre who was given him a sickness benefit: "It's impossible to relax" as my father told me. This

has influenced my perception of rights and obligations in relation to being a citizen in a nation state.

Both events, though not related, confirm my disbelief about our peculiar relationship with labour. So what is our relationship with labour? As Eskil Halberg says: "Some believe we work too much, others say we need more work, while others say that work isn't worth it" (2017: 24, my own translation). Some get *burned out* because they work too much, others get *stressed* because they are not working, and some get *bored out* because they are not doing anything when they work. What is apparent is how labour on the one hand seems to be the solution to all our economic problems and on the other hand it seems to be the cause. This asserts itself in the fact that our neoliberal-political agenda tries to raise production through labour but simultaneously make efficient all production through the reduction of labour. We want more people on the labour market, but we also want to cut spending. We need to perform better with fewer resources. This resonates with Brynjolfsson and McAfee's (2014) famous graph that shows the change between production and median income: Production continues to rise while median income has stagnated. There are many reasons to this great decoupling, however one thing that is evident is the changing labour market and the mutation of what we understand as labour. In short, these transformations of labour and labour market are in the western world under the impact of globalisation, new information and communication technologies (ICT) and shifting neoliberal governance focusing on economic deregulation, commodification and privatisation. These changes have influenced our labour market in such a way that an increasing number of workers are engaged in insecure, irregular and contingent labour; what Guy Standing (2011) nominated as the *precariat*[1]. I only need to recall my father's job, when I want to think of the fast changing pace our jobs have taken the last decades. My father works as a locksmith. Currently, I work with strategic foresight designing scenarios for companies who want to learn how to navigate in an uncertain future. But although my father and I work with completely different things, we are both part of a labour market with insecure and uncertain working conditions. My father is self-employed and cannot sustain his own life if he is not making himself visible and available for those who need him. I am on a one-year

[1] An amalgamation between precarious and proletariat.

contract and do not now what the future will bring… A rather ambiguous situation now that I am making future scenarios for a living.

The Philosophical Hindsight

It has long been said that in a globalised economy, we have all the possibilities to enter and contest in the market that will make us all richer. But to be competitive we need to be prepared and sharpen our strengths. It is obvious that we in Denmark cannot compete with the 'Chinese' on wage, why it seems reasonable that we should outsource cheap labour and instead focus on our forces: Education, research & development and innovation; because that is what we do better than the 'Chinese'. But a globalised world is also a dynamic world with continuous change and flexible working conditions. Therefore, we need to be prepared for a lifelong learning if we want to stay put. Our Danish labour market policy is now famous for its ability to cope with a dynamic economy. We have flexible rules to hire or dismiss workers, a guaranteed security for unemployed, and an *active* focus on job training and supplementary education for those 'unable to contribute to the labour market': Flexicurity it is called.

While flexicurity is praised in many parts of the world (Faos 2007: 2), my father is less fond of it: "distrust and control is what it is," he told me. And though I can see both good and bad things about the system, there is one thing that keeps bothering me. That thing was something Nynne, a 'freelance-colleague', said to me one day we had a coffee and a chat about her job. By the end of the conversation, she said something that has made me wonder about the concept of value ever since – she said: "what I just told you, I normally sell for 6000 DKK". I was stunned. What she told me was definitely interesting. But was it worth 6000,-? I started to wonder about the concept of value creation. How Nynne creates value is definitely different from how my father creates value… or is it? The skills Nynne make use of are actually the same that *presuppose* that my father has a job: Although my father is better with his hands than with words, he is still unemployed if he is not putting the advert in the local newspaper, is nice to the people he visits and is available on the phone. So how do we define being at work? When my father was lying sick, he was implicitly told that he was not contributing to society and quickly had to get back on track. But when he was sick, he had the time to help move his neighbour's boat out of the harbour, he

helped me put of shelves in my apartment and, partly because of his jobcentre, he now learned to use a computer – and post a lot of stuff on Facebook. But all those activities were not producing value in the sense his jobcentre understood as value. I partly understand it; we financed the majority of our welfare society through tax on income, meaning that without a wage we are not financing our schools or healthcare. But I think it is absurd to say that my father was not producing value in any sense. I think he contributed with a lot of things – also on the labour market though maybe indirectly. Guy Standing points something central out, when he cites the economist Arthur Cecil Pigou: "If he hired a housekeeper, national income went up, economic growth increased, employment rose and unemployment fell. If he subsequently married her, and she continued to do precisely the same activities, national income and growth went down, employment fell and unemployment rose. This is absurd (and sexist)" (quoted in Standing 2017: 157). This insight constitutes a paradox, and will be a central part of my thesis.

Someone who has theorised the relation between value and labour is Karl Marx. When Marx in 1847 wrote about the relation between capital and labour he said: "… Capital therefore presupposes wage-labour; wage-labour presupposes capital. They condition each other; each brings the other into existence" (Marx 1999/1847: 32). This was in 1847. Does it still apply? Partly. Although my father owns his own means of production he still needs a person willing to pay him a 'wage' before he receives a means of subsistence[2]. But then two questions comes to my mind: Maybe my father was not able to generate capital (i.e. he was not paid) when he was lying sick, but was he not producing value when he engaged in online activities on social media platforms? Today, we know that engaging in social media platforms generate profit for private companies, as our online activities are harvested and sold to advertising companies. In the last quarter of 2016, Facebook made almost $20 in average revenue per user in USA and Canada alone (Statista 2017). And this seems to

[2] I find it necessary to mention Michel Foucault's analysis of American neoliberalism's perception of the capital-labour relation that Foucault lays out in *The Birth of Biopolitics* lecture 9 (1979). The perspective entails that when capital starts to become inseparable from the worker, the 'capital-labour relation' I describe shifts into a 'labour into capital-relation'. Labour power then becomes capital-ability. In this way, the worker appears as an enterprise. The worker is no longer a partner of exchange but instead an 'entrepreneur of himself' which makes wage not as an exchange but as a remuneration. When the worker is seen as an enterprise, concepts such as exploitation and alienation of labour renders into consumption and production of satisfaction. I do not agree with the neoliberal interpretation of the capital-labour relation, and I think a Marxist inspired analysis is the only perspective that is able to highlight the explorative underpinnings and political potential of immaterial labour.

contrast what Marx claims: That capital and labour presupposes each other – for we are not paid when we engage in online activities even though we generate a profit for the social media companies. This is way the thesis choose to use a contemporary Marxist perspective, represented by Paolo Virno and in general the perspective known as Autonomism, to analyse the relation between labour and capital[3]. Different from a traditional Marxist analysis, the Autonomist perspective emphasises the social role of labour and a broader definition of the working class - including unemployed, domestic work and students.

The Political Foresight

Since this thesis is a product of an observation that has made me critical of how productive activities are perceived in a socio-political sense, I feel an urge not only to critically reflect on this, but also to suggest a solution in the case of a basic income. As such, this thesis will be a critical-*normative* analysis. The theoretical perspective I make use of also implies this normative bias as the Autonomist movement are not only diagnosing the contemporary worker but interprets the worker as a critical-political 'possibility' to empower alternative life forms. This is important to emphasise when reading this thesis. In recent years, the tale of a *basic income* is: "experiencing a groundswell of popular support" (IPR 2017: x) and asking the social scientist Tony Fitzpatrick, basic income is an idea "whose time has come" (Fitzpatrick 1999: xiii). The thesis will formulate a basic income as a reformist instrument able to acknowledge new labour formations capitalising on human faculties but simultaneously mitigate the de facto precarious circumstances such labour formations are producing. The proposal will not be articulated as a concrete application model but rather formulated on a macro level stressing the new terms of productivity and labour with the emphasis and role of trade unions. I will define and elaborate on a basic income in chapter 5[4]. Following welfare state theorist Gøsta Esping Andersen (1990), the central principles for a welfare state is to ensure decommodification (a citizens' degree of immunisation from market dependency)

[3] In Marxist terms *capital* is normally referred to as *fixed* capital meaning money invested in fixed assets (buildings, machinery, infrastructure) opposed to circulating capital referring to raw materials and workers' wages. However, in an Autonomist perspective, following Antonio Negri (in Mackay et al. 2014: 369), capital in post-Fordist terms also refers to information technologies, personal media, intangible assets like software, patents, and forms of collective knowledge.

[4] In this paragraph I will also elaborate on the many titles, political underpinnings and characteristics that follows with a basic income. Basic income will in this thesis be described with four central features: That basic income is understood as being *individual*, *unconditional*, *universal* and *sufficient* to live on.

and equalise the social stratification in a society (reducing stigmatisation for people receiving benefits). It is within this context the thesis suggests a basic income. The thesis does not claim that a basic income is the *only* alternative in this sense. In Denmark, Kalundborg municipality is experimenting with 'benefits without counterclaims' and moreover are private companies experimenting with reductions in working hours (Paulsen 2015). These are interesting experiments, but only target people respectively with a job or without a job. Basic income is an alternative emphasising both groups simultaneously. This is an essential feature, since the thesis wants to nuance and broaden up our perception of labour. The reason why the thesis is investigating a basic income from the perspective of a labour market policy is because labour market policy is framing what can be termed as labour and non-labour in a regulative framework. A regulative perspective is bound to (citizen) rights and hence also determines the entitlements to receive social benefits. Labour policy is therefore already related to welfare principles on a broader level. As I described in the beginning, labour seems to be the (cause) and solution to all our societal problems. Analysing Danish labour market policy might enable the thesis to understand why this seems be the case. I have now set up the conditions to formulate what will become the thesis' problem statement.

Problem statement

Following my economical insight, my philosophical hindsight, and my political foresight, I want to pose the following problem statement:

How can we understand the capital-labour relation in contemporary western working life, how does it resonate with our understanding of productivity seen in the perspective of a Danish Labour market policy, and how can a basic income function as an alternative compromise within this relation?

Even though the 'capital-labour relation' is an abstract constellation, I have chosen to use it because it frames the *relation* rather than each category separately. To answer my problem statement, I will furthermore formulate three working questions to accompany me during the thesis.

1) *To what extent, if any, has the transition from Fordist to post-Fordist production changed the premises for value-creation, and how is that related to the capital-labour relation?*
2) *To what extent, if any, has the transition from passive to active labour market politics changed the premises for receiving welfare, and how is that related to the capital-labour relation?*
3) *How can a basic income contribute to a political-economical compromise between labour and capital?*

With these questions, the thesis wants to contribute to the basic income literature from an Autonomist perspective in the context of Danish labour policy. The next chapter will present the methodically- and methodological considerations underpinning this thesis.

2. Methodology

This section will first of all make an account for the premise underlying this thesis' field of inquiry. Since the thesis is examining and problematizing the relation between capital and labour in contemporary working life, what will become evident is that this relation is disturbed by *breakdowns* caused by collapses between fields such as politics, economy, and culture in general (Virno 2004). Politics as a field is no longer only politics but is intermingled in economy and culture as well. As a result, the thesis will conceptualise contemporary labour as 'biopolitical' as the term implicitly entails the production of not only economic capital, but also human-social capital such as communication, relationships and affects. The thesis' methodological inquiry can therefore not be bound to examine one specific area, but is dictated by an analysis of a wider socio-economic infrastructure of today's society. In other words, the reader must not expect this thesis to dive deep into one specific area, but rather to read this thesis as a critical examination (and navigation) in a number of different fields who all intersect with each other. Instead of an independent contribution to each subject area, it is rather a movement in between them and the correlating mechanisms. Using theory only related to the Autonomist tradition obviously poses a weakness for the validity of the thesis. This is important to stress out, since the Autonomist tradition is a radical critique of contemporary neoliberal economy. That

being said, the critical project allows the thesis exactly to approach labour in a different language that opens up for new understandings and possibilities. However, opposing the analysis with, lets say, the Chicago School-perspective would no doubt have nuanced the analysis. However, given the formal constraints of this thesis and given that the thesis consist of three separate pillars ('mode of production', 'labour market policy', and 'basic income') the attention has been used to bring these into play rather than discuss them internally. Another critical remark is how the theory ('Italian' Autonomism) is situated in a different setting then the analytical object ('Danish' policy). Even though the theory's concepts are abstract and therefore applicable to every given object (i.e. Danish policy), it is still reasonable to bear the geo-political distinctions in mind, since Andrea Fumagalli (supposedly) would prefer a Danish flexicurity-model rather than the Italian alternative when analysing precarity. Still, the thesis holds the theory to be relevant to whatever object the thesis is analysing. Secondly, since the thesis is investigating the *relation* between capital and labour, and since it is found that the relation is challenged by certain *breakdowns* – that is transitions and excesses normally stable within this relation – understanding capital and labour will not departure from either capital or labour but where they break down. These breakdowns allow the thesis to problematize the relationship- and overlaps of the different areas (politics, economics, culture) in better ways than if the thesis only examined one specific area (Carnera 2010: 27). As Carnera further points out, the breakdowns caused by the entry of 'knowledge' (i.e. as capital) in politics and economy blurs the demarcations of each field, why it is precisely the breakdowns (the friction points) that emerge as central to investigate (ibid.) – not each specific field. This is important to bear in mind when reading this thesis. What the thesis especially wants to emphasis during the thesis is respectively the transition in modes of production and the transition in Danish labour market policy. While it is no surprise that these transitions correlate with each other, the ambition is to highlight the underlying premises for each transition, and how these, by opening up for a more thorough understanding of the valorisation process (i.e. how one is 'productive'), generates a discrepancy which is expressed when one associate them with the premises for receiving social benefits. That is what the thesis wants to problematize by examining the premises for productive activities in contemporary working life.

This is mentioned not only because it frames how the reader *methodologically* needs to read the thesis, but also, and specially, because it poses a challenge on how to *methodically* document and analyse these transitions. How do the thesis visualise and articulate this so-called discrepancy? And how do it legitimise the assumption that these transitions actually generate a discrepancy? Since this thesis is based on a critical-normative examination on Danish labour market policy, and more generally what is characterised as 'labour' vis-à-vis 'value production', the question is how the thesis validates its analytical findings in order to pose a theoretical argument of a basic income? Throughout the thesis, empirical data from reports and theoretical insights from thinkers will be used to back up the analysis. However, this empirical material will only be used as secondary data throughout the thesis and never stand out as a case, survey, interview etc. What then, besides conceptual input from chosen scholars, is used as primary data to validate the analysis' normative claim? The thesis have chosen to construct a fictive, but nonetheless realistic, story as a case which is meant to constitute a paradigm (Agamben 1990), meaning that it is both general for contemporary working life, but the events occurring are particular for the protagonist. The ambition is to enable the reader to connect and understand some of the ambiguities the protagonist is faced with during the story. However, before this is elaborated on, the thesis first needs to discuss its ambition to pose an argument for a use of a basic income as a form of modernisation of the welfare state.

How to Methodically Approach a Basic Income?

As explained earlier, the analysis of a basic income will not be proposed as a concrete application model, but rather build on a broader macro-analysis. As such, it is a theoretical study. This implies that the thesis will analyse and compare underlying premises constituting each 'regime of labour policy'. Some of the challenges with writing about basic income academically are bound to the fact that basic income has only been tested on an experimental basis why the validity and general effect can be challenged in relation to variables such as the political-economical condition of the particular country, the number of recipients, the size of payment etc. This is the reason why the thesis explicitly states its ambition as being a *theoretical* argument, that is, it is discussing a basic income as an idea in terms of welfare- and state theory (Esping-Andersen 1990, Jessop 1993a, Christensen 2000) within the perspective of

Danish labour market policy. As an outcome, the thesis will not, and cannot, discuss the effects of a potential implementation of a basic income. There exist a wide range of different political standpoints on the reason why basic income should be considered. This thesis' standpoint is within what is referred to as the 'capital-labour relation', but it would nevertheless be wrong to understand 'right and obligations' from a *worker*-perspective within labour policy, but rather as a *citizen*-perspective since the underlying premise for these perspectives are erased. The movement between the worker- and the citizen perspective is methodologically essential, and is based on the argument that today politics, culture, and economy are no longer separated but intermingled (Virno 2004). Thus, the biopolitical production is not only found within an economical sphere but in social and political spheres as well. The consequence of this is a broader 'targeting' that goes outside identity-categories.

The thesis will not try to answer and explain all possible reasons for the implementation of a basic income nor argue against all critical remarks; the thesis is merely one argument among many others. Posing it as a theoretical argument also opens up for discussion and further research and a necessary negotiation of pros and cons. As such, to propose a basic income can also be seen as a recommendation to how the thesis can be processed further in research.

When labour alters its characteristics, it also changes the epistemological attitudes towards the examined object. If the thesis constrains itself only to examine the concept of labour within the wage-relation (time- and spatial context) it thereby loses essential qualities in relation to capital production. As such, the methodological framing is closely tied to the analytical approach. It is the intention to render labour's production of surplus value outside the wage-relation visible. By doing so, the thesis make use of a *fictive story* as an example which enables me to visualise the mechanisms inside these breakdowns the thesis extrapolate between biopolitical value production and Danish labour market policy.

Using Fiction in Academic Research

The reason why a fictive story is used is first of all because it is believed to be the most suitable way to approach the analysis. Obviously, the thesis would never engage in such a controversial methodological endeavour if it had not any theoretical backlist to legitimise and support the analysis. As explained above, examining the capital-labour

relation, and more specifically the concept of labour as an analytical object, forces the thesis to make reservations since labour's phenomenological characteristics are no longer confined within time and space, but on the contrary immanent within life itself. Using more conventional methodological approaches such as interviews, ethnographic studies etc. therefore fails to comprehend the dynamic characteristics of labour in contemporary life. A story enables the thesis, through fiction, to make an 'overall impression' of the protagonist. Exactly because the thesis wants to look at the whole and not just the protagonist subjectified as either an 'employee', 'mother', or 'recipient of social benefits' but as a 'whole'. Constructing a story allows it better to highlight ambiguities such as the relationship between work/labour (decommodification) and the feeling of embarrassment as an unemployed (stratification). For those reasons, the thesis believes a fictive story is able to provide the most suitable approach.

The use of an extreme case resembles what the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben has categorised as *example* (or *paradigm* which he uses synonymously). In his reading of Roman law, in his revisiting of old concepts such as *homo sacer*, Agamben stated that *the camp* today had become the biopolitical *example* of modern politics. When Agamben did so, he did not intend to state a historical fact; in his methodology he was not trying to investigate the historical origins of politics 'as a historian', but rather the contrary, to investigate what seemed to be lacking or escape history. In this sense, the camp is today the threshold of (bio)politics. The camp is constituted on the relation of being outside what politics can administer. It is within the same ambition that the thesis wants to investigate post-Fordist labour in relation to employment. Agamben states that the example is what escapes the antinomy between the universal and the particular (Agamben 2007: 9). The antinomy of the universal and the particular has its origin in language. When designating something 'a tree' the concrete singular properties of that thing (a tree) are transformed into a member of a general class of Tress defined by certain common properties: "The comprehension of singular distinct objects *m* in a whole M is nothing but the name" (ibid. 9). This is what Agamben means when he states that the act of designating has its origin in language. And that is the antinomy between the universal and the particular. However, the example is neither particular nor universal: "Every example is treated in effect as a real particular case; but on the other, it remains understood

that it cannot serve in its particularity" (ibid. 10). When the thesis constructs the story of Sara, it is both to show that her experience is one particular example of many while at the same time constitute her example as the defining class of a contemporary post-Fordist worker. As such, the story of Sara is used as an exemplary figure. When Agamben make use of the example, he does it in such a way that his exemplary figures establish a double nature: Both as a form of historical figure and as a capacity of being an example. The double nature opens up for a space of negotiation and discussion. The thesis will refer to the story as an Example, with a capital 'E', from now on.

Although an Example in an Agambian sense does not have to be fiction, the thesis believes this is most suitable. Using narration, storytelling and fiction in social research has gained a lot of popularity the latest decade. Narrative Studies has "exploded and extended across all fields that study human reality" (Meretoja 2016: 82) which is "marked by a general aspiration towards interdisciplinarity" (ibid. 83) while "fiction, generally, and poetry, specifically, offers a site of critique and reconstruction" (Agathangelou & Ling 2005: 4). Telling stories through fiction is also another way of "transforming and reconstructing our worlds" (ibid.: 13) which provides voice to hidden or untold stories: "Showing the spaces where gaps exist between voices does not signal an end to understanding but a beginning to negotiations across these gaps in a location that is suspended, if only for the moment, between locations of power" (ibid. 13). The strength of fiction lies in its ability to construct experiences in more direct ways by opening up for a field of interpretation that normal research cannot do by conventional methodical tools. The story is an interpretative, dialogical and performative activity of sense making that is part of how we understand 'possibility' (Meretoja 2016). Although backed up by a more conventional academic approach, the fictive story that the thesis unfolds is supposed to offer isolated scenarios which the thesis nevertheless brings into play by exemplifying certain overarching principles. In this sense, it is only I, as the author, that is able to claim the story's validity: This is obviously controversial in an academic sense. However, the conditions under which the story will take place is still highly reliable with actual policy rules and working conditions and is by no means distanced from a so-called 'reality'. As a matter of fact, the story is partly inspired by real life events that in the first place caused an initial indignation that began this thesis. Only,

the thesis breaks up life events into a story as a way to construct it as an *extreme case* that allows the thesis to highlight and extract valuable insights. Fiction is in this sense used as an organisation of sensibilities to highlight gaps and provide critique.

The philosophical underpinnings of such an approach are, however, based on certain ontological understandings of the world (ibid.). Meretoja emphasises the limitation in separating the realms between history and literature into a dichotomy between the actual and the possible, and how that fails to make use of fiction's ability to engage the reader emotionally with an "ethically problematic lifeworld without uncritically adapting the protagonist's perspective" (Meretoja 2015: 1). Stories (fiction) together with research (fact) can also be seen as a methodological inquiry and a way of argumentation. Using fiction in research first of all states this thesis within a particular ontology in regards to the relationship between fact/fiction, object/concept and theory/practice. Using fiction as a methodical inquiry also stems from the thesis' conviction that reality is not something that independently exist 'outside' as an absolute which can be extracted with the right methodical tools (positivism), or that reality is inseparable from the observer (social constructivism). Neither is the thesis stated in the belief that theory represents a synthesised unit which one can test on a 'practical reality' (Carnera 2010: 34-38) but rather that theory and concepts already is produced in a relationship with their problems that created them in the first place. In other words, the thesis does not believe in the distinction between theory and practice. Reality is not 'produced' in the process in which the researcher engages in it; reality is apart from the researcher but always 'affected' by an inquiry with it. It is from this conviction that the thesis allows itself to use fiction as a method for academic research. But other fictionist/aesthetic methods might as well have been used. This can also be seen as the thesis' methodological contribution to academia. In conclusion, it should also be mentioned that since the Example only contain one *particular* story, it provides the Example with certain limitations in the sense that the protagonist of the story only is able to have a number of realistic attributes: Sara has a citizenship, she is a mother, and is working, in what could seem like a rather privileged position, as a self-employed with a large degree of empowerment. It is constructed this way because it gives the thesis the broadest scope to apply theoretical insights to the Example. During the Example, Sara will

come under stress and be confronted with jobcentres and social benefit insurances[5]. The stress is not meant to be paradigmatic, but occurs as a narrative element because the Example both needed to visualise Sara with a job and without one since the thesis is analysing both cases.

Structure of the thesis

This section will provide the reader with an overview of the structure of the thesis. As this thesis started out with a philosophical curiosity concerning the concept of labour in our current labour market and how (and with what premises) we understand productive and non-productive activities I have set out to investigate the relation between capital and labour in following ways:

In chapter 3, the transition in the mode of production from Fordist to post-Fordist production is examined using primarily Virno (2004). Virno not only identifies new features of modes of production within a globalised economy, but also critically examines potentials within a new form of life. The chapter will in the end answer the first working question related to the problem statement. The point is not only to elaborate on the transition, but also to highlight overlaps challenged due to the fact that labour no longer is defined by a fixed relationship with 'time-space' and firm exchange between 'common-private'. When these dichotomies (life/labour, common/private) dissonates, the capital-labour relation starts to break down. *This will be the first argument for a basic income as 'remuneration' and 'compensation'.*

In chapter 4, the thesis will examine the historical progress of Danish labour market policy from welfare to workfare. Esping-Andersen is used to introduce the concepts *decommodification* and *stratification*. Bob Jessop's *Keynesian Welfare State* (KWS) and *Schumpeterian Workfare state* (SWS) concepts are used to set up a conceptual framework that is able to encompass the development in these policies. In the methodological approach, the thesis has chosen to have a (discursive-) historical reading of the developments in welfare policy because it is a politicised subject with a lot of ideological underpinnings. What is emphasised during the paragraph is how welfare principles is neglected in workfare policy as labour policy no longer is attached to a universal-citizen principle but rather conditioned to what is called a market-principle. As a consequence, welfare recipients are de facto perceived as a

5 In Danish: Arbejdsløshedskasse

'cost' which tightens the lines between rights and obligations as well as what is regarded as productive and non-productive contributions. This elaboration will then be an answer to the second working question related to the problem statement. When these dichotomies (included/excluded and work/labour) dissonates the labour-capital relation starts to break down. *This will be by second argument for a basic income as 'decommodification' and 'stratification'.*

Chapter 3 and 4 will be followed up by a summary that unfolds the implications of each chapter and points towards the structural and existential precarity of post-Fordist labour and the role of trade unions in this regard. What is central is how identity is both presupposed and challenged.

In chapter 5, the thesis will introduce the idea of a basic income as a structural compromise between capital and labour. Moreover, it will position the idea within the autonomist perspective and emphasise the theoretical points that follows this perspective. This elaboration will be an answer to the third working question.

In chapter 6, the Example is laid out. It is written purely as fiction both including a first person- and third person narrative. The Example will not be analysed before the subsequent chapter.

The thesis will in chapter 7 attempt to gather all insights elaborated in the previous chapters. As such, each of the four parts (departing from the breakdowns) of the analysis will start with quotes from the story as a paradigmatic example of the challenges situated for the contemporary western worker. These examples will be challenged with the theoretical findings which halfway is confronted with the idea of a basic income as a way to compromise the breakdown as a more suitable policy than either welfare or workfare.

Before the conclusion, chapter 8 will first of all summarise the analysis in a model that visualises the thesis' analytical points. Afterwards, it will discuss the use of the Example as well as the role of basic income from the autonomist perspective. What will become evident is that basic income, understood as a structural stable compromise between capital and labour, neither is a form of welfare nor workfare, but a form of *commonfare* - a 'third way'.

3. A New Mode of Production: The Humanisation of Capital

This chapter will examine the transition from Fordist to the post-Fordist era but will begin with a broader macro-analysis of the power structures within the different economies. Put roughly, it is possible to outline our economy since the middle Ages in three different economies: Agriculture, industry and knowledge-based. Of course, the shift from one economy to the other does not mean that the former has ended. Although the advanced capitalistic societies primarily are occupied in a knowledge-based economy (service), agricultural operations still exist all over the world. The transitions and developments in technologies can however influence the usual costumes: With the rise of industrialisation, new machines transformed the status quo of agricultural operations. And with the rise of IC-technologies they too influenced the industrial status quo. Before we dive into this last transition, the thesis wants to briefly elaborate on the power-relationship between the industrial economy and the knowledge-based one. When the western economy is described as 'post-industrial' it does not mean that the industrial economy is without importance. Although the majority of people are employed in 'post-industrial jobs' (e.g. health, education, administration and finance) – which only increases in number (McKinsey 2017) - the industrial economy is crucial for the service economy to prosper. Increased wealth might demand more service, but the economy is still dependent on the traditional production of manual goods (Chang 2016: 89). Hardt and Negri (2000) agree, but then ask how it might be that the First World, who produce less than the Third World, still are economically superior? The answer is political. Wealth seems to rely less of traditional production and more on what Hardt and Negri call biopolitical production: "The production of social life itself, in which the economic, the political, and the cultural increasingly overlap and invest one another" (Hardt & Negri 2000: xiii). *Bio* refer to 'life' and *political* refer to 'social interaction' which is political in its essence. This insight is central. The increased significance of biopolitical production does not replace the material production, but reverses it and changes the role of value: "it becomes imperative to have the possibility of changing the material conditions of production. Production begins to mimic, in its material organisation, the versatility of taste [...]. If the economy is becoming increasingly flexible ... it is because the central core of value rests now on immaterialities" (Moulier-Boutang 2011: 33). Even though the classic industrial production is still

quantitatively dominant in scale, the new social modes of production have become *qualitatively* dominant in scope (Hardt & Negri 2004: 109). Virno identifies Henry Ford's famous assembly line as a paradigmatic example of the industrial mode of production. But the contemporary change of commodity also alters the mode of production and thus what we define as labour. When a commodity's price is no longer determined by cost but by *taste*, the organisation of labour has to change along. To illustrate this transition, the thesis will in the following lie out the rise and fall of Fords assembly line.

Around 1920, Henry Ford, the founder of Ford Motor Company, developed a manufacturing system designed to streamline the industrial production in the most effective way enabling reductions in production cost and therefore also the possibility for average consumers to afford automobiles. What characterised this design was the perfection of the assembly line: Dividing a process into a number of fractions allowing a product to be finished faster with less labour. The assembly line was characterised by a *standardisation* of both product design as well as the organisational structure of labour[6]. The reason why Virno uses Ford as a typology is because Virno sees the assembly line as a metaphor of how labour, and more specifically the workers, was imposed with a certain institutionalised work ethic that was suitable for rapid and standardised movements in the factory. This was the rise of the Fordist era, and the development of the welfare state where the majority of people were employed in the factory and alike. People were at first satisfied with the standardised Ford T Model but as wealth began to rise, a change in consumption patters occurred. With a wider range of cars and clever marketing, Ford's biggest competitor General Motors changed the rules of the game when they began to *customize* their different models of automobiles by listening to people's wants through market surveys (McCraw 1997: 290). Before that, Ford Motors had had a relatively 'mute' relationship to the market (Hardt & Negri 2000: 290). Now, General Motors was able to embed knowledge from the market, not as an asset in the production line, but as a precondition for sales. What made Ford successful at first (*standardisation*) was what made him unsuccessful later on (lack of *customisation).*

[6] Conceptualising modes of productions as constitutive for national economies means a number of historical fallacies. Following Bob Jessop (2013) the conceptualisation of accumulation regimes only make sense insofar as it emphasises some general social, organisational, economical changes in national economy in general and in the capital-labour relation in specific.

Later, Toyota developed its "just in time"-fabrication which was a perfect combination of a streamlined production and a relationship with the market. Production planning would communicate with the market on a continuously basis. Factories will maintain zero stock until an actual demand would start production. Thus, the Toyotist model is based on an inversion of the Fordist structure of communication between production and consumption (ibid.). As such, the walls between the inside and the outside of the factory start to break down. Nowadays, the main part of automobile companies has devoted their time to the production of design and brand. This reason is bipartite. Technological development in manufacturing has first of all automated the majority of the physical production and thus rendered manual labour less important. Secondly, the production of parts is contracted to sub-suppliers in third world countries. This means that the western countries has prioritised, not the material features of a car, but rather the immaterial. Today we not only buy a car, we buy a brand – *an Audi* – and with it all connotations attached to that particular brand. This does not mean that the labour has become obsolete in the line of production, but rather redefined: The ability to decode, interpret and affect the market has become central. This changes the organisational character of labour: The production of immaterialities does not thrive in a fixed and standardised working environment. The assembly line, which was once the paradigmatic representation of the industrial society, has now rendered inoperative in advanced capitalistic societies. What is now needed is not monotone- but flexible movement: A network that makes the capacities to interpret, interact and negotiate to thrive: The rise of the post-Ford era. This transition both changes the intrinsic and extrinsic qualities of labour. As a result, the primary function of a car might be to go from A to B, but it is all the secondary features that give value to the car: Stories, design, software, smell and sound. The industrial economy thus too begins to resemble a service economy.

But does the post-Fordist era change what Marx called the capital-labour relation? Is capital and labour still not each other's preconditions? The following section will examine the deeper premises for this relation. As Virno states, when capital rely on the capacities of human faculty rather than the material outcome of these, the temporal and spatial conditions of labour change. If labour time virtually extends to life time, what is life and what is labour starts to break down.

From Fordism to post-Fordism: Blurring the Line

In *A Grammar for the Multitude* (2004) Virno examines the socio-economic implications of capital and labour in the post-Fordist era. Virno describes how the 'breaking down of the factory walls' has a number of social, political and economical implications in contemporary society. Even though Virno centres his broad analysis only on the transition of modes of production, his central point is exactly that this is what impacts the wider socio-political horizon. As Virno emphasises, when the borders between the private and the public break down the demarcation of labour and non-labour becomes indistinctive. This has a socio-political influence on the way we organise life. Virno argues that the transformation constitutes a need to reconceptualise certain categories since they longer apply to what they define. Virno introduces the concept *multitude* (deriving from Spinoza), understood as "the many, as being many" (Virno 2004: 23) which he believes share some salient features with the post-Fordist mode of production. Virno contrasts *multitude* with todays equivalent *people*, understood as a unity correlated with the state, as one will (ibid: 24). Both concepts were at the heart of much controversy in the establishment of the modern state, and how to understand the public sphere. The political philosopher Thomas Hobbes' social contract that defined a unity as a 'people' was constituted by a fear from the outside which was compromised by offering a degree of freedom in exchange for the state's degree of sovereignty. Thus, an 'us' (inside) and a 'them' (outside) was established. The people prevailed the 'heterogeneous network'. But binary categories such as public-private and collective-individual (between private life, factory, nation state) no longer fit current society. We see how our sense of unity is under pressure from a genuine change in urban life, working life and public life. However, as Virno argues, the concept multitude has today the capacity to encapsulate some of the binary ruptures the constitution of people now face in the contemporary western world. When there no longer is an outside, the traditional understanding of people (us/them) collapse. Reconceptualising binary units is not a form of redemption but rather a renegotiations of identity and rights that is necessary if we want to discuss the premises for productivity:

> "I believe that in today's forms of life one has a direct perception of the fact that the coupling of the terms public-private, as well as the coupling of the terms collective-

> individual, can no longer stand up on their own, that they are gasping for air, burning themselves out. This is just like what is happening in the world of contemporary production, provided that production — loaded as it is with ethos, culture, linguistic interaction — not give itself over to econometric analysis, but rather be understood as a broad-based experience of the world." (ibid.: 25)

We can no longer speak of a people converging with the unity of the state, but the multitude is not in opposition with unity, it rather redefines what is understood as such. For Virno, the multitude are those who "share the feeling of "not feeling at home" and who, in fact, place this experience at the center of their own social and political praxis (ibid. 35). What Virno means by this is that the orientation towards unity is no longer of institutional character – of what Virno refers to as "special places": The factory, the football club, the church, or the local political party is no longer sufficiently able to offer a standard of orientation, a unity of specific costumes (ibid. 38). The loss of "special places" is the cause behind the sense of not belonging. The search for substantial communities is what Virno refers to as a "permanent insecurity" (ibid. 32). Rather than finding the sense of belonging in special places, the multitude must 'produce' these communities itself. It is from the communal factories of the human race; that is, language and intellect – what Virno refers to as "common places" that the multitude must find its sense of belonging (ibid. 26). When the public offers no unity, when one's identity is not 'given', the escape of "not belonging" is today the ability to experiment with life forms, to perform new modes of expression which necessitates logical-linguistic modalities: "These "common places," and these alone, are what exist in terms of offering us a standard of orientation (ibid. 36). The point is then how the nature of the public starts to imitate the post-Fordist mode of production. Consequently, as the outside is subsumed – by globalisation, Internet, refugees, finansialisation – the spheres between politics, culture and economy not only resemble; they merge.

Virno finds this unity in the concept *general intellect* deriving from Marx' (1858/1974) *Fragment on Machines*. The general intellect is defined as "the exterior, collective, social character of intelligent activity when this activity becomes the true mainspring of the production of wealth" (ibid. 39). In other words, on behalf of the breakdown between inside-outside, Virno perceives the General Intellect is a *non-*

state public sphere. When Marx wrote the fragment in 1858 he found that the development in fixed capital indicated to what degree the social knowledge was embedded in the machines. Capital functions by appropriating the surplus value from the labour performed by the worker, but when the productivity no longer require a machine but is attached to the worker himself, there is always a 'remnant' that capital is unable to subsume. This remnant is the political potentiality of the multitude as such. Virno understands that the power of the general intellect is that it defines the logical-linguistic capacity as the true mainspring of wealth. The implication of this is that 'productivity' which formerly belonged to the economic sphere starts to intermingle with the political- and cultural sphere. That is also why the multitude, if multitude is not undertaken a political form, risks increasingly being victim to forms of economical submission: "The multitude is a mode of being, the prevalent mode of being today: but, like all modes of being, it is ambivalent, or, we might say, it contains within itself both loss and salvation, acquiescence and conflict, servility and freedom" (Virno 2004: 26). One example of this could be how private companies tries to generate revenue by privatising intellect through *intellectual property rights*[7] (IPR) that artificially create scarcity that per se is abundant and belonging to no one. It is in this ambivalence between loss and salvation that a potentiality of the contemporary worker lays: The potentiality for the worker to choose over life rather than being subsumed by capital (Carnera 2010). For Virno, the multitude is therefore not defined by the conditions 'under which' it produces (like the working class), but rather by the conditions 'on how' it produces – the *virtuosity* of production: Virno describes labour as virtuous due to its resemblance with political and cultural action. When politics and economy merge, the citizen and the producer merges into the virtuoso. Virtuosity is a performative act that requires an audience. To communicate with an audience you need a common language in which to cooperate with, just as the teacher needs a student or the artist a pupil. Today, labour resembles the virtuoso: "Virtuosity, with its intrinsic political dimension, not only characterizes the culture industry but the totality of contemporary social production. One could say that in the organization of labor in the post-Ford era, activity without an end product, [...] becomes the prototype of all wage labor" (ibid. 62). We see this everywhere today.

7 And equal privatisation mechanisms such as: Patents, Royalties, Copyrights & Design rights.

The farmer might grow quality crop, the carpenter might do quality craftsmanship, and the chief might cook quality food, but to every one of them the same set of *communicative* skills requires them to create spaces to be seen and heard – every sphere has become a performative battlefield. But this insight must be understood even more profound. Social production is not only economical production, but political and cultural production as well. Consequently, it is the organisation of 'production' that has changed: Communication has become the prototype of all production (Carnera 2010: 113). When visibility determines value and communication presupposes skill, the result is that virtuosity becomes the underlying premise for productivity. The point is not only that we *can* produce; the point is rather that we *must* produce to exist (ibid. 120). We should not ask how we measure the 'activity with no end product', but on the other hand acknowledge that what determines wealth is no longer measurable in economical quantifiable units. This insight is what the thesis believes a basic income can comprehend.

The Breakdown between Life and Labour: The Role of Time and Space

We now know that the virtuoso only works outside the factory, but also that the factory works inside him: "I believe that the hybridization between the different spheres (pure thought, political life and labor) begins precisely when the Intellect, as principal productive force, becomes public" (ibid. 65). Thus, life as such becomes the centre stage of production. This is why Virno takes up the concept of *biopolitics* deriving from Foucault (1979), which means how life as mere biological process begins to be governed politically. In short, Foucault examined how power as an institutionalised repressive force (exercised in factories, schools, churches) gradually mutates to additionally become a productive force that, instead of confining bodies, control and empower bodies into desired directions. When the valorisation process is dependent on human interaction the most important element in the organisation must be 'access' and 'mobility' which is not found on the assembly line but rather the network. The network becomes the dominant form of organisation inasmuch as biopolitical production must accumulate. But in the context of global competitiveness, the accumulation of flexibility puts increasingly pressure on our traditional understanding of labour, wage, and employment. The result is what is termed as *precarious circumstances* for employees: It is now becoming ever more

important to 'keep doors open' for new opportunities: Friends can be future colleagues, projects might be just around the corner and new sets of skills can be required every now and then. The nomadic circumstances require the individual to 'self-manage' – to become an entrepreneur. Not just the unemployed but also the employed needs to articulate and validate competences and relevance. This has also pervaded into the logics of policy as will become evident chapter 4. A new politico-economical terminology such as 'human capital' and 'human resource management' expresses the human being as a set of competences. The accumulation of flexibility is a structural condition that is both a result and a condition of the immeasurability of these intangibilities. The Fordist compromise between stable employment and monotonous labour collapses as the temporal and spatial conditions of labour changes which puts pressure to the ordinary wage system. The roaming existence of workers is additionally weakening the bargaining positions of unions since their only reply to these circumstances is the old Fordist compromise of stable employment.

This thesis argues that what the unions fail to comprehend is that the accumulation of knowledge *presupposes* flexibility. The unions' weaponry belongs to the past and they need to renew before they again can fight. What Virno wants to emphasise on his take on biopolitics is how mere life has become the source of production but as a consequence also understood as an object of governance. The dialectic between life as a productive force and life as an object of governance suggest the ambivalent role of power that Virno says is both the loss and salvation for the multitude. Virno suggests that we need to elaborate on a number of Marxist concepts in order to reach the full understanding of biopolitics. In Marxian terminology, labour power is what the worker sells, and what the capitalist buys. We must understand that all labour is different from each other. The dentist's work does not equal that of the carpenter and hence we must understand labour as abstract: As labour power. Labour power essentially means "the potential to produce" (Virno 2004: 82). Potential here means not-yet-realized. This means that labour, as being paid for with a wage, is the *actualisation* of *potential* labour power. For Marx, the labourer does not sell *himself* as a commodity, but rather sell his *labour power* as a commodity, which is paid for in a certain time and space. But paid labour does not reimburse the capitalist for his money spent, but produces a *surplus value*. To understand this event, it is necessary to introduce the concept of *use-value*. Use-value

has value only in use, and is realised only in the process of consumption (Marx 1977/1859). Thus, when the intellect has become the primary productive force, as the use-value is not materialised in a physical product, the potential of use-value is inseparable from- and incarnated in the body itself: “The living body of the worker is the substratum of that labor-power which, in itself, has no independent existence. "Life," pure and simple bios, acquires a specific importance in as much as it is the tabernacle of dynamis, of mere potential” (Virno 2004: 84). This is here the inescapable paradox of value and labour in post-Fordism lies, since life as such has taken on the character of a commodity. Life and production coincide simultaneously. ‘Labour as subjectivity’, as Virno puts it (ibid.: 83). This is exactly the difference that is causing the capital-labour relation Marx articulated in 1847 to shatter. Labour time and life blurs as the spatial and temporal dimensions of productivity break down. When immaterial production exceeds confined spaces, the modes of organisation propagate to the rest of the society. And this is the reason why Virno emphasises biopolitics: “The living body becomes an object to be governed not for its intrinsic value, but because it is the substratum of what really matters: labor-power as the aggregate of the most diverse human faculties (ibid. 84). Labour-power is not as much longer a commodity that is sold in an exchange for wage, but rather changed to a production of life, life as an indivisible commodity. Life has been put to work. Essentially, the question is then if life has been put to value – and if not, can a basic income then compromise it?

The Breakdown between Private and Common: The Role of Property

This paragraph wants to dive deeper into the character of property in relation to the capital-labour relation. When capital relies less on traditional wage-labour and more on social interaction, the role of capital becomes a battlefield for property. The French economist Yann Moulier-Boutang has in relation to property developed a useful bee-metaphor able to comprehend how capital to a larger extent has become external to the traditional capital-labour relation, and how this affects companies’ capitalisation of what is essentially common to all. The pollination-metaphor derives from the fact that humans for a long time believed honey to be the ‘wealth’ of the bees’ production when actually it is the bees’ pollination. This is evident if the pollination is measured in economic terms, as one output of pollination is 790 to

1000 times more worth than 1 output of honey. In economical terms, the metaphor emphasises the importance of what is known as *positive externalities*. Externalities are the result of economic transactions that generate unforeseen 'spill over' effects. But in a biopolitical production the value is not determined so much by the physical product (the honey) but rather the capacity to engage in creative processes (the pollination). We can therefore associate the positive externalities with the general intellect and the humming bees with the multitude. The property of capital is usually understood as either public or private, but positive externalities are however situated in none of them. In economic terms, knowledge as capital is equal to other raw materials as land or water. The point is however that knowledge is never 'raw' but always already accumulated within a social interaction. Positive externalities therefore seem to establish an ontological inappropriability that first of all guarantees a sort of democratic accessibility and secondly a violent capturing *if* appropriated. Positive externalities are in other words *commons*. Externalities are no longer marginal to the economic transaction, but have become the central locus of production. A well-educated society is in this way a positive externality. But a well-educated society does essentially not apply to the mechanisms of the market. In other words, when capital is external the market looses control of capital. This is why investments are made in R&D, education and innovation with the intended purpose to make it flourish and then capture the spill-over effects. The purpose of capitalism is therefore to 'reap the fruits' of the positive externalities produced through pollination of creative processes. Whether it is social media firms that reap the data accumulated through online interactions, financial institutions that reap surplus from fluctuations in markets, or companies that reap innovation and creativity from the interactions of employees. The majority of the economy is gradually beginning to adjust to this business model. It is not only digital companies such as Facebook, Apple or Google that reap the data from their users and sell them to commercial companies. Amazon, Walmart, and Tesco are all capitalising on their costumers' information: Data-mining captures preferences, locations, and behaviours which give companies competitive advantage. A new form of digital infrastructure exchanges free accessibility for the capturing of positive externalities. This is what Moulier-Boutang refers to as the exploitation of the commons. Capital is not only external from the labour relation; capital *is* an externality. The user might be termed as a

costumer in the exchange for access, but it is a remnant, the mere subjectivity, that is capitalised on. However, when capital is externalised it puts a number of implications on two things: How can we determine the value of the positive externalities on market premises? And how is it possible to demarcate were the value is deriving from? In the end, both implications are determined by the interpretation of property. This dilemma is what the thesis believes a basic income can comprehend and will be elaborated on in chapter 7.

Normally, we measure value on the market in terms of price: How much is a certain chair with a certain brand worth? On the market, we measure the price in a supply-and-demand graph. The price is the equilibrium between the two curves. The scarce number of chairs produced determines the supply; the number of people willing to buy the product determines the demand. But with 'biopolitical products' the price tends to misbehave as social- (to a certain degree) and digital production is abundant but held artificially scarce and private. An example of this is the price of a *Beatles* album. Today, we rarely we buy the album in physical stores, but rather look for it at virtual stores like iTunes. The price is currently set to 179 DKK. The unusual thing is however that the price is not determined by any scarcity factor since the album is digital and thus has a zero marginal cost of reproducing ('copy-paste'). But because of IPR, in this case owned by Apple, the scarcity is artificially kept low. But once one single Beatles album is obtained, the digital file allow people to copy-paste and hence mass-distribute *Beatles* album without any extra cost. The distribution incites companies to monopolise their goods through property rights which result in a false market price in relation to the normal equilibrium mechanism (Moulier-Boutang 2011: 103). Standing (2016) notes an unprecedented surge in filing patents the last couple of years. In 2011, over 2 million applicants were filed world wide, more than double the number in 1995. In 2013 the number of filing was 2.6 million patents, but already the year after another 2.7 million patents were filed (Standing 2016: 102). The numbers suggest, as Standing notes, not only that the immaterial assets grow, but also that private companies increasingly tries to privatise them. The fact that digitalisation undermines the scarcity-factor and allows assets to be shared freely consequently dissolves the distinction between common and private further. Moulier-Boutang's points is that in order for capital to appropriate raw materials, in order for it to transmute into economic value, it has to navigate freely without any

property-base; to allow “the multitude to pollinate society through the wings of the digital” (ibid.: 108). The ambiguity occurs in the transaction of value that is created by *social* input based on open and free access that then exchanges into an economic output determined by *private* property.

A new digital currency is evolving. Not only in the value of products and companies, but also in social capital. Bloggers, politicians and athletes begin to understand that their worth is less measured in quality but rather in quantity, e.g. in *followers* and *reach*. Virno stresses the identical form of productivity between labour and non-labour; employment and non-employment: “From the point of view of "what" is done and "how" it is done, there is no substantial difference between employment and unemployment (Virno 2004: 103-104). When people engage in productive activities they exercise the same general human faculties as every other. When we begin to understand the centrality of the positive externalities, the relation between wage and productivity comes under pressure which further destabilises the status of employment: “Working endlessly can be justified with good reasons, and working less and less frequently can be equally justified. These paradoxical formulas, contradicting each other, when put together demonstrate how social time has come unhinged [...] The border between these two lives is arbitrary, changeable, subject to political decision making.” (Virno 2004: 103-104). Virno is not asserting that whatever productive activities the nurse or the teacher is engaging in equals that of the unemployed. The point is on the other hand that the conditions under which the productive activity is actualised are not exclusive to the labour market: “...the production of capital converges ever more with the production and reproduction of social life itself” (Hardt & Negri 2000: 402). The similarity points to a (gender based) discrepancy between what is and what is not productive. The idea that only wage-labour generates wealth, positions wage-labour in superiority to reproductive work, which evidently is based on a patriarchal construction of society – elucidated by the fact that the capacities of wealth in the post-Fordist era resembles the capacities of reproductive work. This is not only apparent in reproductive work, but also asserts itself in other forms of work such as political, creative and care work. Virno recalls how Marx defined the unemployed, what he defined as the *industrial reserve army* living under conditions of instability, insecurity and termination. Virno sees how the contemporary working conditions start to resemble the industrial reserve army.

Under the regime of flexible accumulation, the employed is situated in temporal, part-time, and overtime labour. We could say that while capital is gradually externalised from labour, the industrial reserve army is gradually internalised in employment. The discrepancy between activity and productivity puts pressure on the urge to measure. When capital to a larger extent becomes external to labour, and when the employment status, and hence wage-labour, resembles that of non-wage labour, the capital-labour relation dissonates. This is what the thesis will illustrate in its particularity in the Example and subsequently suggest a general solution to. But before this, it is necessary to examine the historical evolution of Danish labour market policy to legitimise basic income as a new form of labour policy.

4. The Birth of Welfare: Decommodification & Stratification

To begin his analysis of the capitalistic welfare regimes, Gösta Esping-Andersen (1990) outline three different ideal-typical welfare regimes: The Scandinavian (Sweden), the Conservative (Germany) and the Liberal (USA). Denmark is part of the Scandinavian welfare regime. While this is no surprise, the static institutional framework tend to distract attention from the changes within the given welfare regime (see Torfing 2003: 7). Having said that, Esping-Andersen provides an appropriate starting point since it is necessary to examine the development of the welfare state as such as much of the labour market policy is embedded in social policy (Esping-Andersen 1990: 221). Much has happened since Esping-Andersen elaborated his ideal-typical welfare regimes, and although the thesis will concentrate on the labour market policy in Denmark, Esping-Andersen's typological setup and theoretical approach allow me to explore the labour market policy within a framework that makes it abstract and relatable to other welfare regimes, and thus has a broader scope. By the end of this paragraph, the historical reading will show how the interpretation of the dichotomy between 'rights and obligations' becomes decisive for the structural construction of labour policy. Today, obligations have taking de facto precedence of rights which means that social rights today are presupposed by contributing to the labour market.

To begin his analysis of the modern welfare states, Esping-Andersen introduces the concept of *decommodification* as a guiding principle to understand

the emergence of the modern welfare state. Decommodification "refers to the degree to which individuals, or families, can uphold a socially acceptable standard of living independently of market participation" (1990: 37) and is a response to the industrialisation's deskilling of independent producers into propertyless wage-earners (i.e. a commodification of people into labour power). The emergent hegemonic form of wage-earners created a class division between capitalists and proletarians. Consequently, the division made it the primary goal of workers and labour movements to unite and call for the lessening of the peoples' enslavement to the cash nexus. Decommodification became a central principle in labour movement policies and the emergent welfare regimes (ibid: 44). The synergy between the mobilisation of the working class and the emergence of social rights is a corollary. In relation to the development of social policies (i.e. poor reliefs) Esping-Andersen introduces the concept of *stratification* that describes the redistributive characteristics of the welfare state and to what degree the state is "intervening in the ordering of social relations and inequality" (ibid. 23). But it also emphasises the degree of social stigma related to the receiving of social benefits. Social policy on the one hand addresses problems of stratification but on the other hand also produces it (ibid.: 3). This is emphasised as the first social policies were designed as means of stratification. The purpose was both to consolidate divisions among wage-earners that kept them from mobilising and also to tie recipient's loyalty to the authority providing the benefit (ibid. 24). Consequently, the working class was rather the object than the subject of early social policy. For the same reason, the working class were opposing such reforms when they were first rolled out. Rather than reforms, the majority of the working class was embedded in the Marxist belief of revolution (ibid. 44). The working class perceived social benefits as a stopgap solution that would make their existence tolerable, retain the class division, and thereby weaken the revolution needed to achieve a socialist economy. Yet, in Germany the conservative chancellor Otto Von Bismarck succeeded with the implementation of an old-age social insurance programme which also became one of first of its kind. Despite the working class' hostility, the insurance programme was partly legitimised by the fact that a gradual improvement in welfare also enabled the labour movement to unite in power mobilisations (ibid.: 45). This would be the start of the welfare state.

In Denmark, the development of the labour market policy was born with *the September Compromise*[8] in 1899. The September Compromise is a result of a long struggle between the unions and the employers' organizations (LO and DA). But the agreement provided a stable, flexible, and efficient basis for negotiations and is now one of the cornerstones in what is today known as the Danish 'flexicurity model'. The agreement constitutes the self-regulation of both parties. The labour market policy is further expanded in 1907 where the social insurance scheme[9] was initiated. The insurance schemes were neither compulsory nor restricted to workers only, but emphasised egalitarian principles and kept low by redistributive tax financing. Social insurance was then the primary source of social aid and was depleted before poor relief was issued. In 1933 the Social Reform Act[10] were issued. The Social Reform Act was a systemic rationalisation and continuation of the social policy, which also emphasised the central position of the state regarding labour marked policies characteristic from the Scandinavian Welfare regimes (ibid.). Modern labour market policy as a separate sector was first born in the years after the World War II due to the tradition of self-regulation parties (Bredgaard et al. 2011: 13). It is also at this time the concept of a welfare state is starting to resonate throughout the rest of the continent. By the year 1956, the Danish welfare model advance further when the Peoples Pension[11] substituted the age allowance[12]. This introduction had an important significance for the Danish welfare model since the People's Pension was given to everyone (unlike the age allowance) reached the age of 67 and thus constituted the first *universal* welfare benefit in Denmark. This is a decisive factor for the welfare state since every other provision of welfare insurance beforehand had meant a loss of civil-or political rights (e.g. the right to vote): "In the social democratic welfare state, individual citizens acquired rights as part of their citizenship, not as contributors to social insurance as in Bismarck's social insurance system" (Christensen 2008: 52). Citizens now had the right to universal social transfers provided through the universal tax liability. A 'citizenship element' was then installed. A further reduction of means-tested welfare provisions continues

8 Septemberforliget
9 Arbejdsløshedsforsikringssystem
10 Social reformen
11 Folkepension
12 Aldersrente

throughout the 50s, 60s and start 70s. Following Esping-Andersen, the numerous welfare initiatives expressed a high degree of decommodification and stratification. At this point the relation between rights and obligations were formed such as every worker had a right to work while the state had an obligation to secure full employment. The state's obligation is not secured by the Constitution, but is however linked to the Constitution's self-provision obligation (ibid.). As such, the ties between contributions and rights were structurally separated: "The universal right to social welfare state services builds on the assumption that all citizens have an obligation to pay taxes so that the universal rights can be realised" (ibid.). But at the same time as the unemployment benefits was raised, Denmark bumped into the global stagflation crisis which eventually had severe influence of the development of labour market policy later on. However, at this point it is safe to say that Denmark had what Esping-Andersen describes as a fully implemented welfare state, which initially means that the welfare state is the one responsible for providing security of all its citizens.

From Welfare to Workfare: Tighten the Line

In the years between the 80s and 90s there is a change of perspective in right and obligation. Torfing denotes the shift from passive labour market policies to active labour market policies as the determining factor in the shift from a Keynesian *welfare* state to a Schumpeterian *workfare* regime in Denmark (Torfing 2003: 6). This shift is demonstrated in policies that instead of providing economical *provision* try to *activate* the unemployed through initiatives focusing on lacking motivational or qualificational skills. The shift from welfare policy to workfare policy is not a shift in what they focus on – employment - but a shift in how they approach it. In other words, it is a shift from *de*commodification to *re*commodification. On a global scale, Bob Jessop (1993a) emphasises that that shift from KWS to SWS in western countries was in large part influenced by a tendential shift in modes of production[13]. The KWS is concerned with a Fordist mode of production that entails a relatively closed economy focused on a standardised mass consumption and economies of scale with a social regulation policy promoting full employment through demand-side management. However, what was a successful administration and amendment of the

[13] Although there exist some difference in the conceptualisation of Fordism- and post-Fordism between the regulation approach (Jessop) and Autonomia (Virno), I claim, within this context, that it is not important to go into detail on the differences since the emphasise is laid on the typological framework between KWS and SWS and its focus on social policy which Virno (2004) lacks.

welfare state in Denmark in the 50s and 60s inspired by Keynesian fiscal-and monetary policy, ran into significant difficulties when the global stagflation crisis, largely due to the oil crisis, produced mass-unemployment and inflation simultaneously which rendered the Keynesian demand-side management inoperative. Initially, the social democratic governments' responses to the stagflation was more expansionary economic policy which only turned out counter-productive and went into a deep economic recession and a higher level of unemployment reaching 9% in the beginning of the 1980s (Torfing 2003: 12). During the crisis in the 70s and onwards to 1993 the welfare state's labour market policies changed between a) wage subsidies to private firms, public employment projects, and municipalities, b) attempts to reduce labour supply by initiating early retirement schemes, and c) provision of social transfer payments and cash assistance for the unemployed (ibid.: 13). From this, it is clear that the Danish job strategy in the years between the 70s and 90s in large part was based on a commitment to the provision of the welfare state and a passive labour policy. Following Torfing (2003) the policy discourse however started to change throughout the 80s against an increasing emphasis on workfare. This was, as mentioned in the previous, seen in the expansion of educational programmes directly linked to the need for structural-economic policies that coped with the rise of new technologies as well as new competition from low-wage areas based on globalisation (ibid.: 14). Globalisation, neoliberal policies, and change in production altered the attitude towards employment. Jessop (1993a) conceptualises this phenomenon as respectively *structural competitiveness* and *structural unemployment* whereas the former is the structures that influence the capacities of firms to compete effectively and their ability to respond to ever-changing external factors and the latter as unemployment caused by structural rigidities that prevent the market from clearing supply of certain labour (ibid.). The significant change in discourse during the 1980s towards an increased emphasis on workfare began, however, first to manifest itself in policy in the start 1990s (Torfing 2003: 14). Based on a number of White Paper reports regarding labour policy, reforms during the 1990s began the transition from the welfare- to workfare state (ibid.). All these reports addressed the *structural* difficulties regarding the tendential shift in the global market that the welfare state allegedly could not dispense properly.

This resulted in a comprehensive labour market reform in 1993 that directly shifted the labour policy from a 'safety-net model' to a 'trampoline model' (ibid. 15). This did not mean that the unemployment benefits were removed, but that they now were linked to a much more aggressive attempt to get people back into employment. This link has a profound influence on the welfare principles of decommodification and stratification. Not only did the qualification-programmes aim people outside the labour market, but also people already working which also secured a more *pro*-active approach and the emphasis on 'lifelong learning'. The new policy reconstructions emphasising the structural competitiveness- and unemployment had significant influence on the employment rate as well as the inflation rate. Whereas Denmark by the year 1993 had a record high unemployment rate corresponding to 12% of the labour force, the numbers dropped by 1997 to 7.9 % while keeping the inflation rate down to about 2%. The focus on structural competitiveness- and unemployment rather than macro-economic steering and a full employment paradigm constitutes what Jessop (1993) calls the transition from the KWS to the SWR. Jessop's conceptualisation thus provides a general dichotomy between the fundamental transitions taking place in Denmark: Instead of a centralised governmental system operating in a rather closed economy it is now a decentred and multi-tired system of socio-economic governance; the social policy is no longer de-coupled from the economy but subordinated to the requirements of labour market flexibility. However, the state has still the overall responsibility for the outcome of different policies but the responsibility of operationalizing these policies are increasingly shared with other non-state actors. The universal welfare policies changes from having *unconditional* rights with almost no obligations to workfare policies with *conditional* rights linked to obligations[14].

The Breakdown Between Rights and Obligations: The Market Rules

To eliminate structural unemployment, new policy reforms from 1994 to 1996 issued what became known as the 'flexicurity model' (Bredgaard et al. 2011). Flexicurity meant in other words that there was no longer any contradictions between the demand for flexibility in the market and the demand for security for the wage-

[14] It is important to mention the differences between Jessop's and Torfing's examinations and approach of the welfare-workfare transition, since Torfing highlights that not only is it due to casual economic forces, but also discursive-political factors. They however both agree that rights start to be assigned to market premises.

earners. The workfare model's success of lessening the rate of unemployment however also meant that rights no longer was bound to a *universal* citizen principle, but instead *conditional* to the fluctuations of the market. Put differently, the market now verified the welfare state. This is evident since the ministry of finance, which controlled the reaction of economic fluctuations, now took precedence of other ministries (e.g. education and health). The result was a de facto centralisation of political-economical power. If tax revenue determined the level of welfare in the welfare state, it was now the market (growth) that determined the welfare in the workfare state (Schjørring 2016: 196). Consequently, the universal rights that constituted the unconditional 'citizen'-component were changed into a conditional relationship in the Danish welfare model. Because the citizen received welfare, he or she now had to pay it back. In the 60s and 70s, the state was a provider of the citizen, now the citizen is a provider of the state. The relationship between state and citizen then changes (ibid.: 197): As a result, stratification and commodification related to unemployment starts to re-enter into labour market policy again. This is exemplified in the Danish media debate when the change of perspective in welfare has produced political figures and concepts such as 'Dovne-Robert' (Lazy-Robert), 'Fattig-Carina' (Poor-Carina), 'fjumreår' (Flounder-Years), 'ældrebyrden' (Elder-Burden) and 'cafepenge' (Café-money) which all are condescending and stigmatising expressions of social benefits that emphasise the belief that they are not contributing to economical growth: "On a market, you must give to get" (Christensen 2008: 55). Perceiving unemployment as self-inflicted also expresses a shift from structural inequality to individual inadequacy based on the transition from welfare to workfare. The transition from welfare to workfare also changes the relationship between right and responsibility. Rights normally do not equal obligations. Of course, it can be argued that a right to some degree is bound to a responsibility. This is known as *reciprocity*. But a political right necessarily have to be universal: Common suffrage is not the same as compulsory suffrage: "The elision of 'right' and 'obligation' continuous today with arguments for 'no rights without responsibilities' and 'reciprocity', by which is meant the obligation of people receiving benefits to do or seek labour in return. This negates the very idea of a right since a right cannot be conditioned on reciprocity" (Standing 2017: 172). Schjørring describes how the welfare, in opposition to what the left-wing claimed at the time, was not being

dismantled nor reduced but on the contrary that the state to a larger extent began to focus on a biopolitical procurement of the human- and societal resources that a variable global economy required (Schjørring 2016: 199). The basis for the transition was not the 'size' of the welfare but the 'reason' why the welfare was being issued. Welfare was now a means to maintain and increase one's human capital: To be competitive and contribute to the creation of growth. In 2013, the social democratic minister of finance Bjarne Corydon expressed his confidence in the so-called 'competition state' as: "the modern welfare state" (ibid.: 199). A competition state (echoing the workfare regime) is a state that is in a constant competition with every other nation on the global market who all competes on the same parameters in order to generate growth. In a competition state, every citizen is no longer a 'citizen' but rather 'consumers' who consume welfare as a commodity - in order to produce growth (ibid.). The citizen as consumer and producer: A total marketization of the state, in which formerly independent political areas all become part of a hegemonic growth-perspective in which the market dictates means and ends. Welfare is now an investment. Not a universal right. Understanding welfare as a means to an improvement in human capital and hence an investment in competition and growth, universal principles such as decommodification and stratification are conditioned, and hence not universal anymore.

The Breakdown Between Work and Labour: The Wage Rules

When a parent is looking after her own child, she is doing just as much work as someone who is paid to look after the child of another. Activities such of these are numerous, and all show a degree of absurdity in our economical understanding of what are contributory and non-contributory activities (Standing 2017). This phenomenon is not only bound to labour market policy, as it is a much broader economical mechanism, however, it is in the labour market policy that such activities are framed as non-contributory compared to labour. The division between work and labour is a historical event and not something evident in pre-modern societies. The reproduction of life - necessary in order to sell one's labour power - was seen as equally important as labour before the constitution of the welfare state (Halberg 2017: 42). Concepts such as labour-time and wage-labour are therefore unfitting when talking about the 'production' to maintain life: "This capitalistic division

[between labour and housework] is also that which complicates the price- and value assessment on a wide variety of working fields in which quantification of labour is challenged. The separation of productive activities happens where activities are unable to be quantifiable included in labour. First of all housework and reproduction which in a paradoxical manner are the whole prerequisite for the preservation of labour power, but is not perceived as valuable activities and hence not labour" (ibid. 44, my own translation). This meant that the concept of labour as a category neither existed as a separate category nor bound to a specific time, space or situation. When workfare policies fail to regard work as contributory or as a prerequisite for labour, it structurally marginalises and undervalues work. Such a conception of work seems to be based on a narrow 'industrial conception of work' as well as the post-Fordist conception of wealth. An example of the unequal relationship between work and labour can be exemplified in a negative income tax-experiment made in Canada in the 1970s known as Mincome in which a number of citizens were given an income corresponding to a low basic income[15]. Data from the experiment showed that the income led to a modest reduction in 'work'. However, these data were only referring to paid employment or to job seeking, but not to many other forms of work (Standing 2017: 162). Taking hours off one's job to look after one's child or elderly relative was regarded as a reduction of 'work'. Moreover, the measured labour supply was reported "statistically insignificant, or so small as to be of no serious concern to policymakers" (ibid.). An example like this shows how 'work' tends to be framed only as wage-labour which is bound to a patriarchal notion of societal structures.

Another kind of work that is neither regarded as valuable is *work-for-labour* which, as both Standing (2011, 2016 & 2017), Fumagalli (2013), Fumagalli & Lucarelli (2008) argue is due to the increased precariousation of the contemporary labour market. The increased spreading of temporary jobs and flexible working conditions have posed an increased variety of extra working tasks on the welfare recipient, as well as the precarious worker, which is not regarded as part of any labour relation: Job-seeking, recruitment, queuing, form-filling, networking outside office hours, commuting or reading company or organisational reports, and transportation to and

15 "The families in the treatment groups received an income guarantee or minimum cash benefit according to family size that was reduced by a specific amount (35, 50 or 75 cents) for every dollar they earned by working." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mincome

from work are numerous example of this. As Fumagalli (2013) argues, the combination of an 'active' workfare policy together with a 'flexible' post-Fordist labour market have increasingly driving freelancers and unemployed into precarious labour that puts them in no positions of negotiation when they try to find their next job. This tricky circle is known as the *precarity trap*. This happens when the costs of finding a stable job are too high: The time spent applying for social benefits, the search of finding a new job, the time and cost of learning, and the adjustment of all other reproductive activities in relation to these. A survey from Cevea (2017) showed that 22,7% people in the workforce in Denmark is in atypical employment (part-time & temporary), and 6,1 % of the workforce is involuntarily in atypical employment. Moreover, the rise in employment the last couple of years is largely based on atypical employment and not fulltime. The director of Cevea, Kristian Weise, notes that this tendency puts insufficiently pressure on the flexicurity-model, and states in a related article that we need to rethink the current welfare model if we want to cope with this tendency (3f.dk). This is backed up by a survey from ETUI, that, although putting emphasis on Denmark, also refer to this tendency in rest of the world as a "worrying development given that most of the increases in part-time work concerned low-wage and low-skilled workers (ETUI 2017: 28). As a result, the workfare policy is an income support that assures the recipient to survive any material need (negative freedom), but on the other hand hampers the recipient to negotiate, or say no to, certain working conditions (positive freedom) due to the strict obligations of benefits.

Summary: The Market & The Multitude

In this paragraph, the thesis briefly wants to lay out the main findings from both theoretical paragraphs in one assembled summary, and afterwards discuss the results and those influence on trade unions and the status of employment. From both paragraphs, a historical account was made investigating the transitions from respectively *fordism to post-Fordism* as well as *welfare to workfare*.

Post-Fordism is not only a mode of production understood as the production of intangibilities. It is also a mode of organisation understood as a flexible and mobile working condition. A new worker has emerged which no longer produces in a confined space with fixed working hours. The worker has become a virtuoso. The virtuoso relies just as much on own capacities to perform as an audience to perform

for. The virtuoso wonders around always looking for an audience. This is both evident for crops the farmer wants someone to buy or the classes the teacher wants the pupils to learn from. When a communicative arena has become a prerequisite, the production is inevitable tied to the human being which means the line between inside/outside breaks down. When outside no longer is given, but has to be actively produced, a multitude of people render into an existential insecurity between the power to assembly and the fear of being excluded. This permanent insecurity changes labour understood as a separate category from being a certain way to organise in productive manners to become a mode of being as such: The General Intellect as a non-state public sphere underlying everyone. When labour is less constituted by time and space, wage no longer determines production. This means value-creation to a larger extent is external the capital-labour relation.

The Danish welfare state has historically been defined to have a high degree of the decommodification and stratification. These concepts constitute how labour market politics are issued. In the beginning of the welfare state, receiving social welfare equalled the loss of social rights, but later post-war welfare state changed as a citizen-principle was installed which meant that the de facto relation between obligation and right was separated as rights were universal and hence incapable of being conditioned. However, during the 80s and 90s a range of economical (crisis, unemployment), cultural (globalisation and ICT) and political (neoliberalism) events resulted in structural difficulties for nation states as well as private companies. To fight these structural difficulties, the market increasingly began to influence political protocol which resulted in a change to conditional rights reciprocal to the market and an active procurement in human capital. Welfare was now perceived as an investment in people's level of competency and ability to act on the labour market. Hence, welfare changes from right to commodity, and recipient from citizen to consumer. The right to receive welfare is now also conditioned to an obligation to employ oneself and pay back on the labour market. Moreover, the articulation of 'active' employment and 'passive' provision articulates a sharp distinction between productive labour and reproductive work.

No Unity in Union: Identity Politics & Work Ethics – A Matter of Control?

Following these parallel historical developments, we end up where this thesis began: With the capital-labour relation in contemporary working life. The next part of the thesis will go more into depth with the possibility to suggest a basic income as a structural solution to the asymmetrical and precarious circumstances on the labour market, but before that, the thesis wants to examine the current compromise between labour and capital in Denmark; that is, the flexicurity model:

In an article investigating current labour market approaches to precarity, Francesco Di Bernardo perceives the Danish flexicurity-model as the current capital-labour compromise in a post-Fordist economy (Bernardo 2016). On the same note, Bernardo believes the general attempt for trade unions to go back to post-war welfare is naïve and does not account for the transformation of labour. For Bernardo, flexicurity acknowledges the growing need to adapt to precarious labour but interprets it as an inescapable condition as a result from globalisation, intensified competition and the changing characteristics of labour. Bernardo quotes Professor of Employment Relations Jason Hayes as he states: "Implicit in the flexicurity approach is the idea that governments should dilute, or at least not reinforce, employment protection" (Hayes 2011, quoted in Bernardo 2016). In other words, flexicurity *seems* to be the only answer to precarious labour: A reformatory answer implicitly trying to retain the current formation as the only solution. This thesis both agrees and disagrees with this perspective. Since this thesis wants to suggest basic income as a new form of labour policy, it disagrees with Bernardo in that the only suitable alternative is a Marxist revolution because he believes precarity is a working class condition under capitalism. However, this thesis agrees that precarity is a structural and existential condition under the current labour market; and that, under the current economical circumstances and transformation of labour, going back to a post-war welfare is naïve. Nevertheless, post-welfare conditions seem to be the only alternative the current trade unions (and labour parties) suggest. And interestingly, both unions and left-wing parties seem to be the biggest opponents to a basic income (Fumagalli 2013: 71). This struggle will be elaborated in the following.

Going back in history, one of the first slogans used when trade unions fought for better circumstances was the "Do your duty, demand your right"-slogan. This was said in the 1870s back when the social democrats were a minor workers' party: The

rights included the rights to suffrage, free speech, and to assembly. Later, one of the most piercing slogans started in 1953 and still echoing today is the "right to work"-slogan: The right to wage-labour and full employment which meant that workers demanded rights in order to take care of them self (Christensen 2008: 49-50). Both slogans share the fact that unions demanded rights *through* labour. Even though trade unions' strategic starting point was the abolition of wage-labour – i.e. commodification (Esping-Andersen 1990; Halberg 2017: 71). There is not enough space to dive deep into the history of the trade unions, but it is enough to know that trade unions throughout most of the 20th century have perceived hard work and diligence as a cornerstone for their organisational culture and identity – something the slogans also suggest (Halberg 2017: 76). But due to a lot of internally differences among the members (from the religious farmer to the metropolitan academic) the trade unions sought to mobilise their members through strategic identity politics. Historically, rights were obtained from hard work and so too should the identity politics mobilise a common identity through the 'ordinary wage-earners' who got up early and made 'leverpostejsmadder' (ibid.: 79). The formation of the "equal pay for equal work"-slogan was an attempt to mobilise workers into one group who all fought hard and deserved to be acknowledged. But with the emergence of workfare and the new "no rights without responsibilities"-slogan, a strong emphasise on labour have internally divided 'hard-working' wage earners with the 'lazy' unemployed who needed activation since labour market participation seems to be essential (ibid. 79). The trade unions strategic goal today is the continuous fight for labour and creation of new jobs for their members but what they fail to comprehend, this thesis claims, is how the post-Fordist era has transformed labour and the flexibilisation of employment: "The current difficulty in measuring social productivity does not allow for the regulation of salaries on the basis of a relation between salary and productivity" (Fumagalli 2013: 77). Being temporally unemployed is continually a structural condition today. This puts pressure on the occupational identity unions try to construct. Rather, what workers have in common today is the sense of a permanent insecurity – a lack of unity without any class formation. In other words, they are a multitude (Virno 2004). But when labour is fragmented and individualised the bargaining power of unions is weakened. This is partly the reason why unions keep fighting for the 'keynesian principle' of stable income and full employment.

Something Bernardo referred to as naïve. The financial crisis accelerated precarity further as firms needed to cut labour costs which was done through flexibility measures. The result was a decrease in full employment and a rise in part-time work (Standing 2011: 49; ETUI 2017; Cevea 2017). Although more notably in countries like Italy and England, Fumagalli (2013) and Standing (2011) claim workfare regimes generates 'precarity traps' as already mentioned: This can be exemplified in Denmark, as the strong activation requirements and conditional welfare rights forces the recipient to take temporal and part-time jobs instead of using the time to regain energy and find a stable job. However, if no jobs are available activities such as 'utility jobs', 'rehabilitation' and 'internships'[16] are constructed to ensure the activation of the recipient. These seem-like-labour activities founded on an artificial labour market are not contributing economically, but are issued because the recipients have (a right and…) and obligation to engage in predefined activities before benefits are provided: *No pain no gain*[17]*,* so to speak. However, the pseudo-activities seem to dissonate with the initial condition of receiving social benefits, since the activities no longer provide any economical benefit, but becomes a tool of discipline based on control and distrust. This is also what David Graeber (Nytid 2017) indicate when he ask why technology has not replaced, but rather displaced jobs: Keynes (1930) predicted that technology within the turn of the millennium would have become so advanced to make a 15-hour workweek possible. However, today, we work almost as much as back then. As Graeber states, Keynes is in principle right but he forgot to account for the massive raise in consumption patterns that makes it necessary for sustain the amount of hours. The jobs Keynes imagined were all Fordist 'productive' labour; but today the majority of western people are employed in post-Fordist labour such as administration and service. Many of these kinds of jobs are what Graeber terms *bullshit-jobs* since they are neither contributing nor meaningful: "They are just there". This seems to suggest a certain kind of *work ethic*. In his study of idleness and workplace resistance, Roland Paulsen states that 1.7 hour per day in average is used on *empty labour* whereas the most listed reason with 20% was that there was not enough work to do (Paulsen 2015: 121-122). This examination is interesting in itself, but especially also if we compare the study with the steady rise in productivity and

16 In Danish: Nyttejobs, resourceforløb & virksomhedspraktik

17 The sentence in Denmark would go "*Man skal yde før man kan nyde"*

stagnating wages the last decades (Brynjolfsson and McAfee 2014). Empty labour can among many things be Internet surfing, non-work related conversations, naps and masturbation. Empty labour is of course different from each kind of business, and happens most likely work where the task is complex and specific – that is, within knowledge intense tasks. The whole phenomenon seems to suggest that we to some degree no longer sell our labour power, but rather our (labour) time (Halberg 2017: 57). Time has been the new exchange for a wage. People should not work because they economically need to but rather they should work because of a certain calling (cf. Weber 1905). And following Fumagalli, this is exactly what the trade unions are subscribing to as well (2013: 72). As such, labour seems less important due to its economical benefit but rather because it provides a tool for control: When wage and productivity are increasingly separated as capital is externalised, labour becomes an institutionalised quasi-container for measurement necessary to sustain, direct and control the general intellect under traditional labour structures. This was the same reason Virno emphasised the governmental dimension in his elaboration of biopolitics. Therefore, to support the "equal pay for equal work"-slogan makes no sense in the post-Fordist era, when labour cannot be individualised and measured. In the end, we need to ask ourselves: Is there an alternative between a Marxist revolution and the current flexicurity model? This thesis suggests looking at a basic income as an alternative. But as long as the trade unions and labour parties subscribe to an industrial perception of labour, a basic income cannot function as an alternative. Therefore, as this thesis started, we need to understand labour in broader terms. The next paragraph will introduce the ideas behind a basic income.

5. Introducing a Basic Income

What is a *basic income*? Broadly speaking, a basic income can be formulated as *a general right for all residents or citizens to receive a grant large enough to sustain a minimum living without any means testing or obligation to repay no matter the individual's occupation besides*. As such, in its idealistic form a basic income has four core principles: It is *unconditional* which means that no means testing, requirements or obligations are evident. It is *individual* which means that the income is not family based or given to people with a certain age. It is *sufficient* which means that the

amount paid is large enough for the individual to live of. And it is *universal* which means that it should be paid to everyone. A basic income has never been fully implemented on a long-term basis in any nation, but has been, and is being tested in a wide variety of pilots around the world (e.g. MINCOME in Canada 1974-79, SEWA in India 2011-13, GiveDirectly in Kenya 2016-2028, and in Finland 2017-18). A basic income is an old political idea with a large variety of components - sometimes opposed with each other (e.g. 'negative income tax' against 'basic endowment'). The diverse and multifaceted character of a basic income is evident from its diverse range of names such as: »unconditional basic income«, »social dividend«, »social wage«, »guaranteed citizen income«, »state bonus«, »basic endowment«, and »negative income tax«. The underlying reason behind the range of names is that, although each basic income-form shares several components, the core principles behind the idea are sought to solve different political challenges. However, one of the challenges with a basic income, and partly why it is referred to in so many titles, is that it is represented by such a diverse crowd of disciplines ranging from economy, sociology, and political philosophy which within each discipline have different political beliefs: Libertarian, socialistic, and communistic. As Fitzpatrick rightly states: "what BI lacks in 'depth' it makes up in 'breadth'" (1999: 5). Consequently, a basic income is both seen as a new radical reform of the welfare state (Bay & Pedersen 2006), a resistance against unlimited growth towards ecology (Daly 1973), a tool to secure full employment (Meade 1993), a way to avoid negative effects of employment testing (Godin 2001), a one-time stakeholder grant due to every humans equal ownership of the commons (Paine 1794/1976), a redefinition of the tax system towards a more liberal, equal and efficient system (Friedman 1962), a real freedom for all (Van Parijs 1995), a democratisation of citizenship and gender equality (Frazer 1994, Pateman 2004), a solution to the prospect of mass unemployment due to automation (Mason 2016) and as a new stable compromise between labour and capital (Fumagalli & Lucarelli 2008, Moulier-Boutang 2015). The last perspective is the departure of this thesis.

This thesis perceives a basic income as a political-structural solution to the breakdowns found in the capital-labour relation in the perspective of a Danish labour market policy. But further more, the thesis also attempts to liberate a fragmented Left and an archaic trade union from a too narrow definition of labour i.e. productive activity. The point of departure is not to examine a basic income as such, but first of

all to compare the premises for productive activities with the premises for labour policy, and secondly construct the case for a structural political alternative: In this case a basic income from a macro analytical perspective. For that reason, as mentioned in the methodology, the thesis does not want to discuss the arguments against the implementation of a basic income.

The Autonomist Take: A Stable Compromise between Capital & Labour

Starting from Fumagalli (2013), Fumagalli & Lucarelli (2008) and Moulier-Boutang (2015), the thesis wants to present a basic income from the autonomist perspective with the emphasis of non-paid productive activities. Fumagalli & Lucarelli (2008) are elaborating on the immeasurability of biopolitical production stressing the increased income polarisation in advanced capitalist societies. What they want to emphasise is how they do not perceive a basic income as a policy for raised wellbeing, but rather as a structural policy for a more "equitable compromise between capital and labour" (2008: 71) – in order words: Basic income as a redistribution of productivity gains: Consequently, not a welfare intervention but as a primary wage, since the usual labour contract is unable to contain the positive externalities. Moulier-Boutang (2015) is along the same lines elaborating on the erosion of regular wage-labour emphasising the disequilibrium between the (communist nature of) collaborative activities on virtual platforms and the (capitalist nature of) market inspired models that capture the spreading of information, data, and ideas (2015: 239) – in other words: Positive externalities. Common for Fumagalli & Lucarelli and Moulier-Boutang is how the mutation of capital is making a basic income, in their words, the only *stable* and *structural* compromise between labour and productivity. The underlying premise for Fumagalli and Lucarelli's argument is how a basic income is not only avoiding exploitation of learning and income polarisation - the consequence of instability in the capital-labour relation - but also acts as an investment in learning processes (2008: 81). Thus, their argument is not based on a social premise, but an economic one. Labour-power is thus a form of life-power or, in other words, a general intellect: "General intellect is defined by the combination of dynamic learning economies (λ) and dynamic network economies (k) whose intensity varies according to the distribution of both codified and tacit knowledge" (Fumagalli & Lucarelli 2008: 79). For them, the distribution of knowledge is determined by a minimum living

standard. The more precarious one's life is, the less distribution of (valuable) knowledge is present. The investment in the general intellect with the intention of appropriating surplus value is then, for Fumagalli & Lucarelli, a basic income for every individual. Moulier-Boutang argues that our productivity as employees is mistakenly measured by our marketable output which then determines our input (salary). The relationship between output/input is for Moulier-Boutang creating disequilibrium between capital and labour since our current wage system fails to comprehend the accurate scope of human pollination. Moulier-Boutang's point is that new technologies such as *Big Data*, *Machine Learning*, and in general new advanced automation technologies (e.g. automated vehicles, chat- and translation bots) are increasingly dependent on a constant continuation of online social activities since they all rely on data as *constant* input. When both our wage-system as well as our labour market policy is unable to measure and comprehend intangibilities they structurally make the labour conditions more precarious as employees' market value depend on a kind of 'performativity' which forces continuous documentation and visibility. The immeasurability are destabilising the capital-labour relation and makes the workers' remuneration to be dependent on company performance which weakens the employees bargaining power: "The absence of a fair social compromise determines the ambiguity of this finance-driven growth. As Boyer (2004b: 49) says: "… the concomitant loss of the collective bargaining power of employees made them accept forms of payment that were increasingly dependent on the performance of the company, particularly with respect to financial earnings." (quouted in Fumagalli & Lucarelli 2008: 80). The weakened bargaining power is exactly why Moulier-Boutang (2015) believes a basic income has acquired strategic importance: "… when exploitation has reached life in society and not in the factory and when activity in life overcomes working hours in factories or office, the bargaining of the creative force can only be measured at a global level. This is the reason why the objective of an unconditional basic income for all (…) has acquired a strategic importance" (Moulier-Boutang 2015: 244). Hence, a basic income makes the insecure and vulnerable able to say no to 'bullshit jobs' and to escape precarity traps.

Following Fumagalli, the conventional leftish critique of workfare has been how neoliberal policies have dismantled the (Keynesian) simple form of stable and permanent employment (Fumagalli 2015: 10). But what Fumagalli notes, is how the

usual leftish critique fails to comprehend that the virtuosity of the workplace is in its essence precarious – understood as labour being fragmented and based on flexible and social interactions rarely based on fixed spaces. Just as Moulier-Boutang (2015) and Fumagalli & Lucarelli (2008) claim, the autonomy of contemporary workers are weakening the collective bargaining power which "empties the capacity of representation of the traditional trade unions" (ibid. 9). But more over, when the production of wealth is less and less based on material production but rather on social cooperation, the definition of productivity, and hence obligation to contribution, breaks down. A basic income is thus the fight for the acknowledgement of the general intellect: That capital today *also* is social, and it therefore needs to be taken into account in labour policy.

Structural Pressure: Framing Basic Income as a Third Way

The intention of this thesis is however not merely to replicate and then apply an autonomist perspective to the following analysis. Rather, the thesis suggests looking at basic income from four different breakdowns expressed in the capital-labour relation: That is as a (1) remuneration, (2) compensation, (3) stratification, and (4) decommodification. What are characteristic for these four principles? Common for all four is that they represent what the thesis will refer to as 'a third way'. In the historical readings of the development in respectively the transition from Fordist to post-Fordist production and from welfare to workfare the thesis found four 'breakdowns' between: (a) life/labour, (b) common/private, (c) right/obligation, and (d) work/labour. Mutual for the Fordist production and the welfare regime was that a sharp dichotomy was made without any structural complications[18]. However, today the dualisms have been put under immense pressure. A basic income is thus presented to function as a compromise - 'third way' - in between these dichotomies.

When life and labour renders into a zone of indistinction, as time and space are no longer prerequisites for productive activities, the consequence for the immeasurability of value is what Virno termed as a virtuosic attitude in which performance and etos are deemed necessary. From an autonomist perspective, a basic income stands as *remuneration* for a life subsumed by labour.

[18] This is obviously not true for the work/labour dichotomy, since the distinction (among other things) always have favoured a patriarchal structured society. But the central difference in the post-Fordist era is that the merits demanded today have the exact same semblance of the merits female work has always consisted of. I will elaborate on this in the paragraph *Work vs. Labour*

When capital increasingly becomes external to the wage-productivity relation since it is increasingly based on social interactions, the consequence for the indetermination of property is what Moulier-Boutang termed as exploitation of the commons as the market increasingly tries to capture positive externalities through privatisation mechanisms such as IPR. From an autonomist perspective, a basic income stands as compensation between what is private and what is common.

When social benefits no longer are bound to citizen rights but are de facto subjugated to the market as human capital investment, the stratification increases in society as benefits are conditioning by activation which Christensen (2000) refers to as stigmatising. From an autonomist perspective, a basic income stands as a tool for reducing stratification as the market de facto conditions rights.

When labour are taking further precedence of reproductive activities and work due to stronger commodification requirements, citizens are *re*commodified rather than what Esping-Andersen termed as *de*commodified. From an autonomist perspective, a basic income stands as a tool for decommodification since the distinction between productive and reproductive is to a larger degree artificial.

The four 'breakdowns' caused by workfare/post-Fordism are generating a structural pressure under each dichotomy: And the thesis believe a basic income can compromise this pressure. This thesis' claim is that the structural breakdowns can be understood by Virno's analysis of the *Multitude* since the concept depends on an essential insight: When politics, culture and economics blends together in the post-Fordist era, the lines between public-private and individual-collective shatters the ground on which the civil subject is constituted. The external fear that before defined the subject is now internal. A permanent insecurity forces the individual to re-establish modes of beings based on commonalities: Logical-linguistic aptitudes which at the same time pre-supposes a new form of production as such. The structural breakdowns of life/labour, common/private, right/obligation, and work/labour are thus all emphasised and explained in the underlying idea behind the multitude*: The general intellect*. Virno further points to the biopolitical ambivalence of the multitude now that the multitude has the capacity to choose life over capital, but with the inherent risk that capital will subsume life. This thesis identifies a basic income, not as an emancipatory tool, but rather as a reformist compromise consisting in between the biopolitical ambivalence of the multitude as a fair compromise for life as capital.

6. Example: Sara at Work

In the following section, the thesis will present the fictive story of Sara as an Example of contemporary working life. Sara will present herself as a singular individual with such and such particular entities but will in her generality constitute a relation to a class of precarious workers and function as an example to this. It is this double nature that methodically enables the thesis to formulate a certain sensibility towards the capital-labour relation with its implications of precarity - both as an existential and ontological category. The thesis will relate the Example to the rest of the theory in the subsequent analysis.

Scenario I: Outside-in

Sara is on her way to Scenario, she is in a hurry. Sara just followed her son to the kindergarten, but she was already late out the door, since she was finishing a presentation for an important client for tomorrow*: "It's bizarre*" Sara thinks while biking*: "What I just prepared this morning … the presentation I'm selling for 6000,- tomorrow … is exactly the same presentation I'm presenting for another client later this month for 4000,-, and for free for my friends in Scenario in a few minutes*!". But Sara is however accustomed to dynamic wages. It is not only a matter of the paycheck. It is also a matter of the amount of hours determining each project. The value of proper negotiation is something Sara has learned the hard way, because what sometimes seems as a good deal turns out very expensive later due to the time spent. For the same reason, Sara has begun to track her time in an app called Harvest on her smartphone. The idea is to outline when she is working on one project, working on another and when she is not.

Despite the fact that Sara has chosen to 'sell' her presentation for free in Scenario, Sara could actually use some extra money. The last months have been rough. All those network events, 'business-coffee-meetings', business proposals, tax-filling and negotiations have taken a lot of energy and time – energy and time she fells could have been used on other things*: "I work way more than I am paid"* Sara says to herself. But Sara knows her friends from Scenario very well. Even though she is doing them a favour now, she also knows that one good turn deserves another. Sara has already worked freelance for them on a few projects before. They supply each other very well and Sara feels they provide a good team when they share their

strengths. The presentation at Scenario is not the only thing Sara is during today. In the afternoon she is attending what Sara believes is an important conference on 'The Future of Living'. Sara has paid 550,- to attend the conference, but it is not only because of the content nor the wine and sandwiches she is attending the conference. Sara also knows the conference is a good opportunity to get in contact with new potential business partners. On her way to Scenario, Sara feels an unusual pricking in her stomach and a feeling of dizziness in her body*: "Strange*" Sara thinks. But now when she thinks about it, she has had that feeling some times before recently …

The presentation at Scenario turned out good, and Sara received valuable comments and insights which she will include in her presentation before her client tomorrow. Doing these informal presentations is a good opportunity to 'fine-tune' her thoughts and ideas. Besides the comments, the people from Scenario said they might even wanted Sara to be a part on an upcoming project. They however still needed to get the budget straight before they were sure Sara was needed. After the presentation, and while some of the other people from Scenario were presenting some of their thoughts on a similar topic, Sara finds the time to update her Instagram-account and LinkedIn-profile: "*Always a true inspiration to work with you guys at Scenario. Love visiting you*" Sara writes and accompanies the text with a selfie with them. Sara knows the importance of visibility; and showing that she is active and outgoing is always a good signal to send her contacts on social media platforms. After the visit at Scenario, Sara drives to the conference on the future of living. During the breaks she is eager to talk with some of the people and exchange business cards.

Before the conference is over Sara has to leave since she has to pick up her boy in kindergarten. Although she is happy about the day with an insightful presentation and a bunch of exchanged business cards, Sara still feels a form of emptiness. The fact that she has used most of the day today for the sake of future projects is stressing. And she is nervous about her presentation for her client tomorrow. Meanwhile Sara is reflecting on all this, the pricking in her stomach comes back. She feels exhausted: *"Have I worked too much lately?"* Sara asks herself. She just wants to skip her client tomorrow and take a day off. But she knows she can't.

Right before the reaches the kindergarten, her phone rings. It is Amanda – her contact person from the client tomorrow*: "Hi Sara"* Amanda says*: "I wanted to call you and say that we are looking very much forward to hear your presentation*

tomorrow". Sara now stands right in front of the kindergarten, but doesn't dare to ask if Amanda can wait. Sara knows something is up, since Amanda is calling her now. *"You know, Sara … I know I already confirmed your presentation for tomorrow, but I just talked with my CEO and he thought you were giving some more examples on applied business design. Do you think you do that? I know it's late, but I think it would be a really good idea if you prepared some kind of a case or something like that… Just to have something to compare with"* Sara hesitates with an answer: "*don't worry, Sara … we can easily pay you some extra, that would only be fair*" Amanda ends: "*Ok*" Sara responds, although she gets a bad feeling in the stomach when she agrees to: "*Fantastic. See you tomorrow, Sara*". Sara ends the call and watches her screen on the telephone that shows the call lasted 14 minutes. She picks up her boy and returns home to prepare some dinner.

During the evening Sara sits in front of her computer and prepares a case. She is not feeling well and is very tired. Her son enters the room: "*Do you wanna play a game*? But she asks him to wait and leave the room. Her son teases her and wants attention. Sara gets mad and shouts at her son. He gets upset, starts to scream and leaves the room while slamming the door in frustration. Sara sits hunched over with her head down her hands. All of a sudden, she is reminded that she forgot to turn on Harvest - her time-tracker app – and she cannot possible remember how much time she used on each thing. Sara's heart starts to beat. Faster and faster. And suddenly, everything turns dark. Sara falls to the ground. All burned out …

This was the first part of Sara's story. What we encountered here was not only the breakdown of the lines between life and labour, but also the breakdown of Sara. As a result, Sara decides to take a break. But she needed a steady income to support herself and her son. She therefore applied for a sickness benefit at her unemployment insurance fund. In the following scenario I lay out Sara's experiences with her job centre. To get a sickness benefit, Sara needed to prove her sickness.

Scenario II: Inside-out

With a sickness benefit Sara can receive a grant in a total of 22 weeks but only until she is 'ready to re-enter the labour market again'. However, what Sara experiences before she even started, was that Sara apparently wasn't stressed enough to receive a

sickness benefit. Her medical certificate didn't show clear signs of stress, and Sara is told that she instead should apply for a normal unemployment benefit. Sara is confused about the whole situation. If she agrees to receive a benefit, she simultaneously has to turn down offers from clients. She cannot both receive social benefits and gain income through her business. However, Sara initially decides to receive a grant and apply for a regular job*: "If I found a regular wage-job, I might acquire some more stability in my life"* Sara reasons.

Sara sits in the office. In front of her sits her job counsellor. They are at the job centre. Sara doesn't feel very well. Although Sara looks forward to get, what she thinks, is a well-deserved break. Sara doesn't feel fully equipped to get back on the labour market just yet. She would prefer a more stable environment. Also just to take care of herself and her health. In order for Sara to receive unemployment benefit, she is told that she needs to 'shut down her business'. It's the first time Sara sees herself as a business … *"shut down my business…"* Sara pondered to herself while she looked at the job counsellor*: "I am my business*!" Sara reasons. *"But then you need to shut yourself down"* the job counsellor replied*: "But don't worry, we will get you back in shape. We at Activate are very successful to get people back in job with our rehabilitation scheme: "by the way, did you fill out the documents on your affiliation to the labour market as self-employed? … "You need to pass our employment-requirements and prove that you worked 1.924 hours within the last year*" the counsellor says. Sara did manage to document her work-hours, but found it difficult to recall what she considered leisure and what was considered labour.

A few months have gone by. Sara is still receiving benefits, and therefore also still applying for jobs. Sara is mandatorily meeting every once a week at the job centre and every seventh day she has to check job proposals at *jobnet.dk*. Sara is encouraged to take *LinkedIn* and *InDesign*-courses to improve her CV, but personally Sara thinks it's are a waste of time: "I want to get back on the labour market … I just need a few months to regain my strength". However, Sara still feels the pricking in her stomach when she receives letters regarding her joblessness in her E-box. During the time as a jobless, Sara hasn't considered herself 'passive' although she has tried to avoid employment-offers. On the contrary, Sara has had more time than ever to play with her son, talk her granddad at the nursing home and finally finished *Stoner* by John

Williams. However, one effect she didn't expect is the isolation from other people. It was very evident when she was contacted by Scenario about the project they wanted her to be a part of which she had to turn down. Weeks later, Sara was going through her LinkedIn-wall and saw that Scenarios had uploaded a picture with them and a client from their latest project - the same project which Sara should have been a part of. Sara could feel that it affected her self-esteem. Being on Instagram and LinkedIn felt wrong, because she couldn't really see identify herself with the person she used to express herself as. For Sara, it seemed like she was alone from 9-17 during the day.

One day around noon, after Sara had returned her son in kindergarten, she went to the library. First of all she thought that she wanted to find a number of good children books to her son, and secondly because she could use the time to write a job application. Sara often goes to public spaces with her computer, because she doesn't like to sit all by herself at home. During the time, Sara takes a break and surfs around the Internet. She stumbles upon an article from *The Times*: "*Three in four mothers are now working*[19]" the headline said. *"Funny" Sara thought feeling very provoked. "Then what were they doing before?"* she asked herself. Sara felt such an indignation about the *Times*-article, because it hit her on a personal level: "*Maybe I have no job, but does that mean that I'm not working?*" The article stayed with her the rest of the day, and during the afternoon she decided to due something about it. Sara began writing a letter to the editor to a Danish newspaper. She wanted to debate if one could work without being paid for it? Throughout the rest of the evening she wrote the article without much hesitation. The day after she found out that the newspaper had accepted her letter and that they would publish it the following day. Sara was of course surprised, but felt nonetheless that she had a good cause. She wanted to discuss her current situation. In following days, the article is discussed far and wide. Everyone seems to have a stand on the matter. But most importantly for Sara, she received a large amount of messages from people, both men and women, who felt they were in the same position as herself – fighting with a stable job and balancing a lot of other activities. Most of them tell her they struggle with the same problems as Sara, and it gave them a sense of empowerment to hear they were not alone. Most interestingly, a manager from a company read her article and sympathised with Sara.

[19] https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/three-in-four-mothers-are-now-working-rfb3vqgbz

In a public response, he tells her Sara is more than welcome to step by for a job interview, since they didn't wanted to differentiate between people and needed strong, independent women like Sara. Unfortunately, Sara finds out, the job was only a temporary position…

7. Four Breakdowns - and a Third Way?

The following analysis is separated in four parts, each departing from one of the four breakdowns. Each part begins with a quote from the Example which illustrates a certain breakdown. This quote departures from a particularity concerning Sara, but the analysis will then, using theoretical insights from the historical readings, unfold how this breakdown asserts itself in a universal relation to contemporary (working) life. Each part will halfway discuss how a basic income can be perceived as a compromise between capital and labour: as a form of third way.

Life vs. Labour: Basic income as Remuneration?

> *"What I just prepared this morning … the presentation I'm selling for 6000,- tomorrow … is exactly the same presentation I'm presenting for another client later this month for 4000,-, and for free for my friends in Scenario in a few minutes!"*

In the Example, we saw how Sara was unable to distinguish between life (leisure) and labour, and how her labour starts to resemble her life and vice versa. One way to put it is to say that Sara's work is not socialised, but rather they her social life is part of her job. Sara is not being paid for her presentation at Scenario. However, as the Example disclosed, she later got an offer to be part on a project. Would Sara have gotten this offer if she had chosen to stay at home? We obviously cannot tell for sure, but if we assume her presence was required, it was not necessarily based on the quality of her presentation, but rather her ability to be visible. Insofar as Sara had the possibility to accept their project, the offer was more or less based on a *relation*. But what does this relation promise? This is what Virno stress when he states that: "Life, instead, takes the place of the productive potential, of the invisible *dynamis*" (Virno 2004: 39). The invisible dynamis requires the visibility (virtuosity) of life, since life and labour are inseparable from each other. This however, puts pressure on Sara, who finds it harder and harder to gain a stable income although she is 'working' all

the time. This reveals itself from the fact that Sara's compromise between labour and capital is dynamic wages. During the first day in the Example we also see what Paulsen calls the *reversing worlds* (2015: 123) in which work becomes home and home becomes work: At Scenario, Sara is visiting friends, chatting and posting pictures, later she is attending conference about learning, eating sandwiches and drinking vine. However, the time Sara was actually preparing the presentation was at home in during the morning and at home during the evening. This is also way Sara finds it necessary to track her hours at the Harvest App, but in the end shows itself incapable of showing the exact amount of hours. The tracking-app illustrates the unfeasibility to measure 'work'. Although Sara is used as a paradigmatic example, we must remember that the same goes for the carpenter and the pianist. A majority of people is influenced by the flexibilisation and deregulation of the market. We learned from Virno that labour today presupposes what was called a 'communicative arena' where everyone fights to be relevant and visible. Sara finds necessary to present her findings at Scenario, upload pictures of her meeting, and subsequently attend the networking event: Activities in which none of them are paid. Although all three acts fail to encompass what is usually understood as labour, the work is vital for Sara to nurture her relations and sow future project. For the same reason, to be part of a 'network' is essential to attain a job. Interestingly, the post-Fordist era is organised as a network: The plugging in and out of projects. The net-work. When part of the *net*, everything is seemingly *work*. For Virno, Sara produces a product with no end. Since there is no physical production of goods to function as a measuring stick, the criterion for skill is unclear. The tendency then is to measure whatever is measurable. Virno quotes the Italian writer Luciano Bianciardi as he claims: "the excellence of politicians is [...] based on the swiftness with which they get to the top and on the amount of time they last there. [...] *Since there is no visible production of goods to function as a measuring stick* [for post-Fordist labour], the criterion will be the same" (Bianciardi quoted in Virno 2004: 57-58, original italics). Virno claims that swiftness now is an element of measurement. Or put differently, deadlines determine wage. Sara is only paid for a certain amount of hours. Whether she is able to deliver within the given hours is of no matter. This is demonstrated in the Example when Sara is offered the same amount of hours for the same product but to a different wage. The 'law of value' is less determined by labour time but by the 'general

intellect': "Science, information, knowledge in general, cooperation, these present themselves as the key support system of production — these, rather than labor time" (ibid. 101). Virno is very precise when he states that: "Overtime, which is a potential source of wealth, manifests itself as poverty" (ibid.). If Sara works overtime on a given project, she is decreasing her hourly wage which already is determined.

What then is it that a basic income could guarantee? In post-Fordist terms, the focus and outcome of production has changed towards intangibles such as 'innovation' and 'creativity', and although such intangibilities tend to be articulated as tangible objects we can quantify on the assembly line, they are not the direct outcome of production (the honey) but the intangible oil that lubricate the whole production (the pollination): "The idea of basic income is based on the concept of compensation or remuneration and not of support or assistance (subsidies, transfer payments, etc.). The logic that justifies its existence is then completely opposed to the doxastic interpretation of the current situation, that is, to measures that would guarantee a continuity of revenue in a temporary, conditioned way"(Fumagalli 2015: 11). It therefore seems contradictory to go back to the old promise of strict and stable labour. Fumagalli continues: "… In other words, basic income is nothing other, today, than the equivalent of salary in Fordist times" (ibid.). This is also why the 'obsolescence' of Marx' terminology exactly makes him relevant today in the context of labour market policy. The fact that Marx formulated the concept of labour power in the times of the assembly line - back when the law of value was determined by labour time - makes it possible today to show the breakdown of the relationship between capital and labour. We also see this in the Example, when Sara recalls the 'hidden labour' connected to her life. Sara uses time on 'network events, business-coffee-meetings and business proposals'. Can these activities be understood in the capital-labour relation? No, they are excluded from any exchange. As such, it does not make sense to apply the terminology from Marx to understand this relation. However these activities presuppose a job in Sara's case. This is why this thesis argues that the inapplicability of the capital-labour relation reveals a room for negotiation. In other words, when Virno reformulates Marx' labour power as 'commodity' to labour power as 'life' it is not enough to make it applicable as a new concept to determine the law of value nor to frame what is labour today. It only shows the breakdown between capital and labour. When labour is life, and labour market predetermines rights, labour rules

the citizen. This is here Virno's notes on the multitude becomes relevant. When public-private, inside-outside break down the usual categories are off target. A basic income represents in this sense a third way; not a Keynesian welfare state nor a Schumpeterian workfare regime but a compensation accepting structural flexibility but appreciating the social character of productivity. A right not bound to a certain life, but bound on what we have in common.

Common vs. Private: Basic income as Compensation?

"The presentation at Scenario turned out good, and Sara received valuable comments and insights which she will include in her presentation before her client tomorrow"
"If she agrees to receive a benefit, she simultaneously has to turn down offers from clients… "

When is capital deriving from the 'private' and when is it deriving from the 'common'? We saw this concretely take place on a micro level when the people from Scenario helped nuance Sara's presentation before her client. What Virno draws attention to, and what is also illustrated in the Example, is how Sara crafted her 'occupation' though and on behalf of others. Virno says that today it is imperative to be communicative in order to participate in the common (public) space. That is precisely what Sara experiences, when she performs her own subjectivity via her article in the newspaper from which she gain access and creates a form of voice. Her story is heard and Sara is offered a job on behalf on her unemployment. Sara turns her undesirable situation upside down and reverses the negativity to a productive power. This is the biopolitical ambivalence par excellence. However, in the context of Sara's status as unemployed, what this thesis wants to emphasise is how Sara's 'labour as subjectivity' in a way exceeds the lines between the public and the private space that in the end ensure her what is perceived as a 'proper' job. The complex tension shows itself, presupposed by what Virno calls the collapse of the political-economical-cultural spheres, in the relationship between Sara's labour-as-subjectivity and the exclusion-from-market mechanism she is exposed to through her insurance fund that clientise her. The breakdown is clarified in the deadlock that reveals itself when Sara as jobless both is *outside* the market, even though the market in this regard is understood as ubiquitous, and *inside* the market since her constant 'occupation' functions on the new premises of the market, understood as a communicative praxis. This deadlock is exemplified when Sara through her article in

a way 'commodifies' herself outside the market which exceeds the either-or logic of the current labour system. The rigidity of the system seems to suggest an unsuitable neglect of the flexible working life because the system subscribes to a dualistic perception of productive/unproductive. The rigidity of the 'social benefit system' is systemically unable to comprehend that before and within the job-offer is a form of pre-productive premise presupposed by Sara's existence. The thesis argues that Virno is able to articulate how Sara is caught between two logics: Between the de jure 'Fordist' perception of wage-labour with a sharply divided line between public-private and right-obligation; and a de facto 'post-Fordist' occupation from which Sara always already have to construct a communicative arena with the help of her human capacities ('common places') and whatever they entail. This is where both Hardt, Negri and Moulier-Boutang's examinations of 'the common' becomes relevant. Virno describes the communicative arenas that presuppose human capacities which today is a condition for production in any sense – these arenas are exactly the arenas that generate the positive externalities Moulier-Boutang points out are appropriated by private companies without any compensation in return. People constantly negotiate, update, communicate, articulate, perform and produce arenas that supposedly, in this context, become exchanges for a job. These exchanges produce simultaneously externalities which indirectly converts into an accumulation of capital in the form of data (sold to private companies), knowledge (from tacit to codified knowledge) and relations (new meetings for productive occupations). This is what Moulier-Boutang (2015) refers to as exploitation of the commons. When these intangibilities are equally external as it is internal, the reaction from private companies is to privatise these developments and create rentier mechanisms (Standing 2016). All these exchanges are also the reason why Virno understands the General Intellect as the primary base for wealth today. When Sara despite her situation is able to use this communicative arena to her own advantage, it is important to understand the biopolitical ambivalence. Sara uses her own subjectivity as a form of commodity; in other words, she consumes what she herself produces. A term that describes this ambivalence is the neologism *prosumer* – a merge between producer and consumer. But when all productive activity in every sense presupposes this communicative game, a breakdown arises in the context of the current labour market policy which is structurally unable to comprehend the general character of productivity (Fumagalli

2013: 67). That is why this dichotomy is defined as 'common' and 'private'. The breakdown suggests a readjustment. And this is why a basic income becomes relevant. Not just as a strategic tool, but also as a new narrative to unite the Left, unions, workers and the unemployed.

The breakdown occurs when the underlying premise for receiving welfare benefits is build on the premise of activation that entails that the receiver in return needs to engage in productive occupations on the market when however the underlying premise for existence today is already productive. That being said, it is important to remember that the current policy is in some cases necessary and relevant. But it is the underlying premise for the activation, that this thesis argues, is mistaken. And Sara is in this sense used as a paradigmatic example of this. And this is why the thesis suggests perceiving a basic income as a compensation for a productive life unappreciated by old systems of employment and wage: "BI […] should be seen as an indispensable structural policy for achieving a healthier social order geared around a more equitable compromise between capital and labor than those characterizing both past and present accumulation paradigms (Fumagalli & Lucarelli 2008: 72). On that note, Fumagalli reminds us that: "Today, as we have seen, being jobless is no longer tantamount to being unproductive and those who hold a formal occupation (with fixed working hours) are no longer the only ones considered productive from a capitalistic point of view." (Fumagalli 2013: 67). Fumagalli is not implying that we should be subsidised in accordance with what we produce; the point is merely that the *exact* measurement of ones productive existence is impossible to estimate. When unemployment no longer entails an unproductive existence, the labour market policies render inoperative and inevitably constitute a crisis of wage-labour: "All redistributional proposals that reference either employment status […] or the obligation to make contractual commitments, even if detached from labor performance […], are discriminatory" (ibid. 70). Insofar as we accept the post-Fordist mode of production - both in productive and organisational terms – and insofar as we want to cope with the current precarity of our working lives, a basic income is the only stable compromise between *capital* (immeasurable modalities of value largely based on social interaction) and *labour* (flexible and volatile organisation of activity).

Right vs. Obligation: Basic income as Stratification?

"If she agrees to receive a benefit, she simultaneously has to turn down offers from clients …"
"… and every seventh day she has to check job proposals at jobnet.dk"

When Sara is asked if she can join Scenario, she has to decline the offer due to the fact that she now receives social benefits and hence is unable to gain incomes from other sources. Sara is considering the offer, but feels that the best thing for her is a break from a hectic working life. Nevertheless, being excluded from the labour market makes Sara feel ashamed and affects her self-esteem. Basically, in labour policy today you are either employed or unemployed, but when temporal and part-time jobs are raising the distinction seems too rigid. Sara is obliged to meet at the job centre once a week to talk with her job counsellor. Every seventh day Sara has to check her job proposals at jobnet.dk. As we learn from the Example, Sara feels a sort of lack of authorisation when told what to do when to do it. Even though Sara knows the job counsellor has the best intentions, the premise of which the job counsellor is supervising seems misguided. Sara is only partly receiving benefits because she lacks employment; she simply also needs a break from her working life. But the activation forces her to apply jobs, encourage her to take education courses etc. Christensen, in reference to Habermas (1996c), explains this dilemma as the double face of the welfare state in a capitalistic society noting how the 'empowerment' through social security shifts to 'supervision' because the administration of the system becomes paternalistic in the sense that it regulates in proportion to a normal labour market (2000: 139). To gain rights is de facto to commodify oneself. What is commodification? It is to sell one's labour power; in other words, the ability to generate wage through employment. And the activation is helping recipients to sell their labour power, i.e. invest in their human capital. The system structurally clientises recipients (Christensen 2000: 141). Christensen (2000) referred to this supervision and paternalistic control as stigmatising. These sensational implications are a consequence of the precedence of obligations before rights. But Virno's reading of the post-Fordist terms of production makes a new interpretation of rights possible. Insofar as rights are bound to productivity, and insofar as productivity cannot be separated from life, the fact that citizens only have rights on the labour makes creates a discrepancy. Virno (2004) framed 'production' as an ontological category with a

much broader scope than in an economical sense, but nonetheless relevant for the post-Fordist economy and an alternative way to understand society (Carnera 2010: 125). This ontological category is what constitutes the multitude. We must remember here that the multitude is double: Both ontological, understood as a social being, and political, understood as a potential possibility. The question is then how we can apprehend this understanding of society in a relevant way in relation to the precarious worker caught in the deadlock exemplified with Sara. The consequence is evidently that we either must understand the market in broader terms and/or revise the conditions under which rights are issued. It is in this sense that a basic income becomes relevant as a political tool. Not only to renegotiate Danish labour policy, but also because a basic income represents a structural alternative to approach the line between 'rights' and 'productivity'.

What is apparent when rights are conditionalised is that it produces certain identity categories. When the thesis outlined a number of worker slogans in the chapter *No Unity in Union* one of the points was to highlight the centrality of identity. A basic income would nullify this stigma. Historically, identity politics have always been essential for the fight for rights. What Virno (2004), and also Hardt & Negri (2009), emphasise is how political affiliations rather impede today in the post-Fordist era. To be part of the working class is not resonating with the precarity because they in a lesser degree identify themselves as workers in the traditional sense. Following Virno, we must understand this primarily through the changing characteristics of labour: "The characteristic aspects of the intellectuality of the masses, its identity, so to speak, cannot be found in relation to labor, but, above all, on the level of life forms, of cultural consumption, of linguistic practices" (Virno 2004: 108). These forms of life are essential in the multitude. The identity of the worker presupposes hierarchy and class, but the multitude is horizontal and has only unity in difference. This is why Hardt and Negri sees the emancipation not of work but *from* work: "The primary object of class struggle, in other words, is not to kill capitalists but to demolish the social structures and institutions that maintain their privilege and authority, abolishing too, thereby, the conditions of proletarian subordination" (Hardt & Negri 2009: 332). This is what the trade unions fail to acknowledge. Partly because the unions reason for existence relies on the worker identity in traditional sense, partly because unions are accustomed to fight the

employers and not the broader system in a structural sense. But instead of fighting a basic income they should rather adopt the idea and acknowledging the changing labour market: "In cognitive biocapitalism, the trade unions' slogan "right to work" should be changed to "right to choose work." (Fumagalli 2013: 66). This is what Virno means when he refers to 'life forms'; the multitude exists in difference and as such it cannot and should not be formulated through a workers identity. One could claim that we already have a basic income-system in Denmark: Subsistence allowance, cash benefit, leave of absence, sickness benefit, paid maternity leave, early retirement, state pension, SU, child benefit, artist grant, rehabilitation etc. However, all these incomes are conditioned with a certain life form and in that sense bound to a certain dualistic language – 'either-or'. Obviously, going on maternity leave the recipient is either pregnant or not. But in general, being conditioned to a certain identity constitutes a form of control and exclusion mechanism for the authority since the receiver can lose the benefit. But when the lines between politics, economy and culture blurs, the need to establish a new language presents itself. Biopolitical production entails a multitude of life forms which exist simultaneously. In more practical terms, we should open up for a society with a broader scope of activities available for employment. This is why a basic income represents itself as a tool for stratification because it does not separate and thus produce stigma.

Work vs. Labour: Basic income as Decommodification?

""Three in four mothers are now working" the headline said. "Funny" Sara thought feeling very provoked. "Then what were they doing before?" she asked herself"

"All those network events, 'business-coffee-meetings', business proposals, tax-filling and negotiations have taken a lot of energy and time"

As the *Times*-headline indirectly presupposes: Reproductive work cannot *really* be considered work. The headline seems to be positioned in two logics: 1) only on the labour market is something valuable, and 2) there is a clear separation between work and labour. Although the headline writes 'working' what the article means is 'labouring'. In the Example, this logic fills Sara with a kind of unease. Why is it not considered valuable for Sara to use time on her son? Standing (2017) is advocating for an alternative interpretation between work and labour, and refers to a statistic from 2015 that states that unvalued work is considered worth half the size of the

money economy in UK[20]. The question is if a basic income can alter the current interpretation? The position of the Autonomia, with emphasis on post-Fordist labour, suggests an alternative argument. The characteristics of labour today resembles 'reproductive work' to a higher degree in the post-Fordist era: "Human faculties that were before constrained inside the sphere of reproductive and relational activities (considered "unproductive" from the capitalistic point of view), together with the pervasive diffusion of language and technologies, has led to the modification of the social composition of labour" (Fumagalli 2015: 3). Despite the confusion of the division in production and reproduction, the scope of labour remains as narrow as in the Fordist era. As elaborated earlier, when labour relies heavier on intangibilities the reaction is instead of broadening op the scope of labour rather to narrowing it down. This is evident from the continuous inclination to quantify and measure intangible outcomes such as teachers need to formulate competence requirements and standardised time for caretakers no matter the circumstances. Insofar as we accept the notion of positive externalities, spending time on 'work' understood as domestic work, but also voluntary-, political- and creative work, all these would evidently contribute to wealth. But as the Example shows us, it is not only such kind of work which is unremunerated. What Standing (2011, 2017) terms *work-for-labour* is an inherent part of a precarious existence. In the Example, we see a lot of different examples of unremunerated work performed by Sara. Sara is filling tax returns and other form-filling, seeking jobs, travels to meet people for potential jobs. Such activities are under the current labour market considered as leisure or self-imposed, and have become more and more common to presuppose in order to gain labour. But the perception of employment is exactly dictated by policies that respond to precarity with stricter requirements to activation, visibility and performance. The resembling characteristics between contemporary labour and reproductive work puts, although not exclusively related to BI-literature, further pressure on the discussion of 'fair' remuneration of productive activities: Feminist studies have long advocated for a more equal division between productive and reproductive work (Weeks 2011: 113-114), but recognising the characteristics of post-Fordist labour further adds to the

[20] Quoted in Standing (2017: 158): https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/nationalaccounts/satelliteaccounts/articles/changesinthevalueanddivisionofunpaidcareworkintheuk/2000to2015

argumentation of a more equal remuneration of reproductive work. Due to the current workfare-inspired interpretation of the reciprocity principle, an active workfare policy is unable to perceive productivity in anyway other sense than through labour which is why the only answer to unemployment is to create what could be called an 'artificial' labour market constituted by pseudo-activities such as 'utility jobs', 'job training', and 'job rotation' (Christensen 2008: 55). While these initiatives may be able to provide a suitable entrance to a job, they principally still emphasise a narrow-defined labour market as the only place for productive activities which necessitates the commodification of citizens. What then seems to be the decisive mechanism between labour and work is the relation of wage. The wage is the central dispute of capital control over labour: Wage determines the degree of commodification. However, this thesis advocates for a broader conception of labour, since the current conception seems to generate a discrepancy between the premise and promise of wage; that is a productive activity. From the perspective of Sara who in many ways are working but not 'labouring', to argue for a more symmetrical relationship between her productive affairs and her status as an unemployed, the struggle must present itself through wage: Or, more precisely, through a basic income understood as a primary wage, and not as a welfare intervention seen from either the welfare or workfare perspective.

But the implementation of a basic income is not only a decommodification tool. Although a basic income is able to prevent workers as Sara to commodify themselves, it can also be perceived to empower commodification in the sense that workers are inclined to enter a more flexible labour market. The central point is however to understand that basic income presents itself as a third way, in-between commodification and decommodification. An empowering tool which however not passes into supervision. It is therefore not only a form of negative freedom, a freedom from doing x, but also a positive freedom, a freedom to do x. Understanding labour in the terminology of the autonomist perspective adds to the possibility to interpret labour today in broader terms. And a way to articulate this labour would be to advocate for a basic income as an instrument of decommodification.

8. From Capital-Labour to Capital-Multitude?

To sum up the four 'breakdowns' the following model presents an overview of the analysis and how a basic income represents itself as a 'third way' – a structural compromise - in between the breakdowns:

Figure 1: Summarising the thesis

Elaborated in chapter:		*(3) & (4)*		*(5)*	*(6)*
Point of view		**Breakdown between**	**Crisis in**	**Results into**	**Basic Income as**
	Mode of Production Fordist ↓ post-Fordist	Life / Labour	Time & Space	Immeasurability of value	Remuneration
		Common / Private	Property	Exploitation of the commons	Compensation
	Labour Policy Welfare ↓ Workfare	Right / Obligation	Reciprocity	Social stigmatisation	Stratification
		Work / Labour	Production & Reproduction	Recommodification	Decommodification

What did we Learn From the Example?

We know from Agamben (1990) that the Example is both something particular and something universal. In relation to this, the thesis' intention has been to use the fictive story of Sara, the precarious worker, as an Example of contemporary Western working life: As a micro case simultaneously stating something universal. Sara faced a number of insecurities, both as employed and unemployed, always balancing on the threshold between inside and outside … of what? Both inside-outside the labour market, but also inside-outside of having rights as a civil citizen. This is one of the thesis' fundamental analytical points. Why? Exactly because this is what the trade unions need to understand to fight today's precarity. Central to this point is the role of identity. Which is also why the Autonomist analysis of labour (as subjectivity) is relevant. Today, society in general, and trade unions in particular (to whom this thesis is relevant for), do not seem to understand the changing role of labour vis-à-vis

subjectivity, which Following Fumagalli (2015), is also why the keep fighting basic income due to its fundamental violence against the Calvinistic idea of work ethics, not as an economical need but as a transcendent *calling*. Nevertheless, this thesis finds a number of traits in basic income which could redeem the precarity of contemporary working life, which the current labour policy seems insufficient to cope with. These traits, that is unconditionality, individuality, universality and sufficiency, is not evident in other labour policy alternatives such as 'reduced working hours' (because it only applies to employed) or 'cash benefits without counterclaims' (because it only applies to unemployed). The Example, that is Sara, is used as an interface – constantly on the threshold between employed-unemployed. But the *story* of Sara is also used as a fictitious case that opens up for a room of negotiation. Besides Agamben's use of the Example, the thesis has also tried to construct the story, that is a fictive story, as a space for orientation and critique that showcases Sara as a whole: Not only as a mother or as unemployed. Sara is not a subject, *sub*-jected to certain juridical applications, but a conjoint set of singularities. What this whole-ness brings into play is exactly a form of sensibility related to the everyday life of Sara. What the story wants to 'open up for negotiation', which other quantitative and qualitative methods could not do to the same degree, is the circumstances under which Sara is employed. Sara might be 'employed' in the first part of the Example, but the precarity is still present everywhere she goes. In other words, although Sara has a job, she still *senses* the insecurity. Why is this then important to highlight? It is because unions today distinguish between employed/unemployed, and therefore lack the eye for an increasing part of the precarious workforce. The unions' understanding of labour is divided between employment-unemployment, when in fact a larger part of the workforce is what Virno termed the modern days *industrial reserve army*.

Is it Too Late or Too Soon? And is the 'Commonfare' Possible?

So, what does the title refer to? What is either too late or too soon? The answer is two things: Is basic income as a political device too soon? And is the autonomist analysis of labour as life too late? Obviously, the question is wrongly put, since it both implies a form of normativity as well as a deterministic standpoint. However, the intention with the question is rather to imply when something present itself as timely and/or relevant. Will a basic income only present itself as relevant, if it is advocated as being

such? Not much has happened since Hardt and Negri inspired Leftist supports to believe in the new political potential of the emerging immaterial worker. As mentioned, the thesis has used the Autonomist perspective to analyse the capital-labour relation in contemporary western working life. The was first of all due to its Marxist inspired system of terminology that made visible how the exchange- and surplus value intrinsically has changed in post-Fordist labour. This insight was used to, not undermine, but challenge the perspective of production represented in labour policy. But following Virno, the implication of post-Fordist labour is however that the capital-labour relation now only consists of workers since they, to a much larger degree, both are labour *and* capital. The implication is that capital today is biopolitical which is an intrinsic part of the worker. If this is true, why do we then still see capitalism in the form of neoliberalism thrive today? As Mikkel Bolt rightly states on behalf of Hardt and Negri's account on the multitude: "The portrayal of the multitude is so positive that it almost seems unbelievable that capitalism today has not yet perished" (Bolt 2013: 173). The autonomist account simply lacks a form of negativity build in its account on the multitude. This brings us to the second reason why the thesis still has chosen to use the autonomist perspective. The thesis believes that they are correct in their organisational descriptions of post-Fordist labour. Virno shows that labour today is more collective than ever, and therefore harder to point which worker is contributing with what, however the valorisation process is not only based on social relations, i.e. the general intellect, but to some extent still dependent on fixed capital. But what Virno points out is that post-Fordist labour is precarious in its essence due to its flexible accumulation features. This is notably not the only reason why precarity is rising, since a number of structural reforms reduced employment protection that was meant to increase employment and flexibility on the labour market. Virno's examination also points to a number of identical aspects that seems asymmetrical with the current labour policy and trade union politics that both aim to 'target' and 'mark'. It is within this targeting that there today seems to exist a discrepancy. The examination gives the thesis a language of critique to frame and make visible the shifts and displacements in the capital-labour development. In this sense, the analysis is an attempt, among other things, to contribute and propose the trade unions to realise that they should not distinguish between employed-unemployed, since the precarity is much more profound, and not only visible for

those out of jobs. But why should this then be 'too late' as the title section referred to? Since the Autonomist popularity and optimism today is lacking. Basic income, on the other hand, has never been so popular as it is now – notably for different reasons. The ambition of this thesis has been to reinterpret the critical potential of Autonomism with basic income as a concrete political instrument in a Danish context. Why? Because the thesis believes that there are some valid analytical points on identity and the concept of labour that seems valid in relation to an argumentation for a basic income but is however lacking in the literature and media. The multitude is an interesting concept because it produces a number of radical changes on politics, the welfare state, and labour policy. This radicalness is also the reason why the thesis' point of departure had to be a wider socio-economic assessment, not contributing to one specific area. How must we understand labour today? Following Virno, labour today is not part of a class struggle; it is not a category of subjectivity, but an ontological mode of being. Human capacities as such are today moved inside the productive centre. As such, the capital-labour relation Marx described is today rather *capital-multitude*: Enmeshed in each other.

Why should the basic income then be 'too early'? First of all, in a Danish context, although the unions are weakened (Ibsen & Toubøl 2015) the flexicurity system is to some degree capable of functioning with precarity understood as flexible labour and reduced terms of employment. Moreover, as the ETUI-rapport (2017) stated, the problem is not the numbers of people in involuntarily atypical jobs per se, but on the other hand that the numbers are raising. In Denmark, the majority are still in stable full-time employment, but if the tendency continues, a basic income could seem as a relevant possibility? So why, noting the invalidity of framing a question this way, discuss a basic income at this point 'already'? Exactly because, as mentioned in the introduction, the thesis is not only interested in the unemployed, but on the contrary the concept of labour in general. This is also what the 'capital-multitude relation' implies. The multitude is an organisation and form of life that evade the usual institutional logic of being a *specific* subjectivity; the multitude produces life forms which capital cannot entirely subsume. This gives rise to other forms of work, of being human, which escapes the usual capital-labour logic: A rediscovering of the civil society and a strengthening of grassroots movements? The problem seems to be a question of power structures, since the (bio)political power functions on the inside

of life, and therefore always tries to control life towards capital production. In this sense, following the Autonomists, the political compromise for the multitude is today a basic income because it is a concrete resistance that makes possible a life without the *necessity* to commodify it. In the end, a basic income would radically restructure and redefine the policies of both welfare as well as workfare. What then would this 'third way' present itself? The logical consequence of this thesis would be a call for what Fumagalli refers to as *Commonfare*: "The notion of Commonfare starts from the pre-supposition that social cooperation is the production of the Common [...]. We define the Common as the potential to expand social cooperation that attends the paradigmatic transformation of productive forces and the prominence of new forms of labour in contemporary capitalism" (Fumagalli & Lucarelli 2015: 61). Of course, it is neither this thesis intention to develop a whole new policy paradigm nor within its capability. The point is rather to emphasise how new configurations forces new measurements, and this thesis is written within the critical-normative belief that the current coping with structural competiveness- and employment, that is the flexible market compromise, creates a number of unsuitable implications, and that the alternative, which the unions represent, is too much embedded in Keynesian principles and therefore lacking a deeper understanding of post-Fordism. To experiment with a basic income would be a revisiting of rights and obligations, an assessment of productive contribution and a critical possibility to open up for new forms of life not depending on market principles.

9. Conclusion

The present thesis has sought out to give a critical account for capital-labour relation in contemporary working life seen from the perspective of Danish labour policy. The intention to examine the concept of labour and value production from a 'labour-capital-perspective' can obviously be challenged, since it presupposes a number of conditions not present today. Nevertheless, it is argued how it gives the thesis a language and approach to study the intangibilities which exceeds today's understanding of production. The first part of the thesis tracked the historical transition from a Fordist to a post-Fordist mode of production and from welfare to a workfare policy. In conclusion, the thesis found out that humans to a less degree need

fixed capital such as machines and land to accumulate capital. In the post-Fordist mode of production, the capacities to be productive is no longer confined within time and space as it is the workers' basic human faculties that to a much larger degree is the central locus of value production. This is both evident in the organisational- and collective form of labour. In the shift to a post-Fordist era, Virno furthermore understood production not just in economic terms but in social- and political as well. Production is a communicative praxis necessary to perform life. In this sense, the thesis points out that value production correspondingly needs to be understood in broader terms since the labour market today still have a too narrow understanding of capital and labour. Although companies have increasingly begun to understand the new external character of value, the thesis argues that the labour market policy fails to comprehend it. Although praised to cope with flexible market conditions, the Danish flexicurity system still have a strict either-or understanding of employment resonating with a Fordist understanding of labour which, as argued, is causing a de facto precedence of obligations before rights thus conditioning the recipient to market terms. This structurally values wage-labour over any other form of work. The thesis does not claim that immaterial labour is *potentially* productive all the time and therefore should be paid accordingly. The thesis is rather interested in the challenges to quantify and measure immaterial activities and how this affects employment. This is put in comparison with data that showcases increasing productivity, stagnating wage and decreasing worker rights.

In the historical elaboration from Fordism to post-Fordism and welfare to workfare, the thesis found four *once* stable dichotomies: Life-labour, common-private, right-obligation, and work-labour. The thesis finds that new developments in contemporary working life are causing the dichotomies to break down. The thesis argues that all four breakdowns can be compromised by initiating a basic income as a 'third way' in-between the dichotomies. This compromise is illustrated in *figure 1*, which in a way represents this thesis' contribution to the basic income literature.

The thesis has tried to exemplify these breakdowns by constructing a fictive story. This was a methodological decision since it is argued that primary data represented as either qualitative or quantitative data would not comprehend the scope of (working) life. Furthermore, the thesis argues that the distinction between science (fact) and science (fiction) can, to some degree, be understood as too rigid,

and fails to recognise fiction as an aesthetic method capable of opening up for a sensibility and negotiation. The Example also illustrates a form of paradigmatic figure of the precarious worker. The thesis is well aware that to state that a figure like Sara, a seemingly well-educated western worker belonging to the creative class, is living a precarious life is an insult against Third World country workers, immigrants and the poor. The point is however not to sympathise with Sara, but on the contrary to show that people like Sara first of all are living in a threshold of the labour market, and secondly that Sara together with blue-collar workers, immigrants, employed *and* unemployed must differentiate between present class categories and unite as one group in order to cope with precarity. When the labour market no longer is one homogeneous group but increasingly diversified and fragmented, identity politics fail to comprehend the scope. The thesis therefore also claims that a basic income has gained political and strategic importance: A structural stable compromise between capital and labour. Although the reasons may vary, the unconditionality of a basic income can bring together the multitude on the premises of what they have in common. This is why the Autonomist perspective is used in the thesis. The multitude offers a new language and understanding of societal categories, value and modes of life. The thesis argues, that a shift from capital-labour to capital-multitude formulated together with a basic income would nuance and comprehend the complexity of biopolitical labour. This also gives current trade unionist identity-tactics an alternative strategy to cope with precarity, since the concept of the multitude encapsulates the breakdowns found in the current capital-labour relation. In the end of the thesis, the idea of *Commonfare* is touched upon very briefly. The thesis does not claim that Commonfare represents a serious alternative at the moment, but rather uses it as an idea and concept to think of market, politics and civil society in new ways: Towards a new sensibility of value.

Bibliography

Books

Agamben, G. (1990/2007)
The Coming Community. Translated by Michael Hardt. University of Minnesota Press. *Chapter III*.

Bredgaard, T., Madsen, P., Jørgensen, H. (2011)
Dansk arbejdsmarkedspolitik. Djøf forlag

Brynjolffson, E. & Mcafee, A. (2014)
The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies. W.W. Norton & Company. *Figure 9.1*

Bolt, M. (2013)
Krise til opstand – Noter om det igangværende sammenbrud. Antipyrine.

Carnera, A. (2010)
Magten over Livet og Livet som Magt – Studier i den Biopolitiske Ambivalens. Copenhagen Business School, Institut for Ledelse, politik og filosofi

Chang, H. J. (2016)
23 ting man fortier om kapitalismen. Translated by Joachim Wrang. Klim. *Chap. 4*

Christensen, E. (2000)
Borgerløn. Fortællinger om en politisk ide. Forlaget Hovedland.

Christensen, E. (2008)
The Heretical Political Discourse – a Discourse Analysis of the Danish Debate on Basic Income. Aalborg University Press. *Chapter 2*.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990)
The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism. Polity Press. Chapter 2, 3 & 6.

Fitzpatrick, T. (1999)
Freedom and Security: An Introduction to the Basic Income Debate. MacMillian Press LTD.

Halberg, E. (2017)
Roden til alt ondt – Hvori det vises at arbejdet, som institution, lægger beslag på hele menneskets tilværelse, og at det således på politisk afvikles. Tumulti. Forlaget Nemo.

Hardt, M. & Negri. A. (2000)
Empire. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts. *Preface, part 2 & 4*.

Hardt, M. & Negri. A. (2004)
Multitude. The Penguin Press. *Part 2*

Hardt, M. & Negri. A. (2009)
Commonwealth. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. *Part 5*.

Mason, P. (2016)
Postcapitalism: A Guide To Our Future. People's Press.

McCraw, T. H. (1997)
Creating Modern Capitalism. Harvard University Press. *Chap. 8*.

Meade, J.E. (1993)
Agathotopia: The Economics of Partnership A Tract for the Times Addressed to All Capitalists and Socialists who Seek to Make the Best of Both Worlds. Palgrave Macmillan, London. *Chap 5*.

Moulier-Boutang, Y. M. (2011)
Cognitive Capitalism. Polity Press. Translated by Ed Emery.

Paulsen, R. (2015)
Empty Labor – Idleness and Workplace Resistance. Cambridge University Press. *Chap. 7*

Standing, G. (2011)
The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class. Bloomsbury Academic.

Standing, G. (2016)
The Corruption of Capitalism: Why Rentiers Thrive and Work does not Pay. Biteback Publishing. *Chap. 1 & 5. E-pub version*.

Standing, G. (2017)
Basic Income: And how we can make it Happen. Penguin Books. *Chap. 8*.

Torfing, J. (2004)
Det stille sporskifte i velfærdsstaten: En diskursteoretisk beslutningsprocesanalyse. Århus Universitets Forlag. Pp. 48-58.

Van Parijs, P. (1995)
Real Freedom for All What (If Anything) Can Justify Capitalism? Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Virno, P. (2004)
A Grammar of the Multitude. Semiotext(e)# All rights reserved. The MIT Press.

Weeks (2011)

The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries. Duke University Press Durham and London (2011). *Chap. 3*

Articles

Agathangelou, A. & Ling, L. (2005):
"FICTION AS METHOD/METHOD AS FICTION: Stories and Storytelling in the Social Sciences". International Affairs Working Paper 2005-05 November 2005.

Bay, A-H. & Pedersen, A. W. (2006)
"The Limits of Social Solidarity: Basic Income, Immigration and the Legitimacy of the Universal Welfare State". Acta Sociologica, 49 (4): 419-436.

Bernardo, F. (2016)
"The Impossibility of Precarity". Radical Philosophy: Philosophical journal of the independent Left, RP 198. Jul/Aug 2016.

Fraser, N. (1994)
"After the Family Wage. Gender Equity and the Welfare State. Political Theory, vol. 22. no.4: 591-618.

Fumagalli, A. & Lucarelli, S. (2008)
Basic Income and Productivity in Cognitive Capitalism. Review of Social Economy · March 2008

Fumagalli, A. & Lucarelli, S. (2015)
"Finance, Austerity and Commonfare". Theory, Culture & Society 2015, Vol. 32(7–8) 51–65. Special Section: Eurocrisis, Neoliberalism and the Common

Fumagalli, A. (2013)
"Cognitive Biocapitalism, the Precarity Trap, and Basic Income: Post-Crisis Perspectives". in García Agustín Óscar, Ydesen Christian (eds.), Post-Crisis Perspectives: The Common and its Powers, Publisher: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften; 1 edition.

Fumagalli, A. (2015)
"Cognitive, Relational (Creative) Labor and the Precarious Movement for "Common-fare": "San Precario" and EuroMayDay. in *Creative Capitalism, Multitudinous Creativity* (Edi.) Cocco, G., Szaniecki, B. Lexington Books.

Godin, R. E. (2001b)
"Work and Welfare: Towards a Post-productivist Welfare Regime". British Journal of Political Science, 31: 13-39.

Ibsen, C. & Toubøl, J. (2015)

"LO: Svag fagbevægelse truer danske lønninger" Politikens analyse. 2015; 4. december 2015. s. 8.

Jessop, B. (1993a)
"Towards a Schumpeterian workfare State? Preliminary Remarks on Post-Fordist Political Economy". Studies in Political Economy 40, Spring 1993 7

Kristensen, J. (2008)
"Kapitalismens nye ånd og økonomiske hamskifte – Boltanski og Chiapello og tesen om den kognitive kapitalisme". DANSK SOCIOLOGI Nr. 2/19. årg. 2008

Marx, K. (1847/1999)
Wage Labour and Capital. Online version: Marx/Engels Internet Archive (marxists.org) 1993, 1999; Proofed: and corrected by Alek Blain, 2006. *Chap: Relation of Wage-Labour to Capital*

Marx, K. (1859/1977)
A Contribution to the Critique of the Political Economy. Progress Publishers, Moscow. Online Version: Marx.org 1993 (Preface, 1993), Marxists.org 1999. *Part 1: The Commodity*.

Meretoja, H. (2015)
"Fiction, History and the Possible Jonathan Littell's Les Bienveillantes" Orbis Litterarum 0:0 1–34, 2015 © 2015 John Wiley & Sons A/S. Published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd

Meretoja, H. (2016)
Exploring the Possible: Philosophical Reflection, Historical Imagination, and Narrative Agency" NARRATIVE WORKS: ISSUES, INVESTIGATIONS, & INTERVENTIONS 6(1), 82–107 ©Hanna Meretoja, 2016

Moulier-Boutang, Y. (2015)
"The Pollination of Creativity: For a Basic Income in the Creative Capitalism of Network Societies" in *Creative Capitalism, Multitudinous Creativity* (Edi.) Cocco, G., Szaniecki, B. Lexington Books.

Paine, T. (1794/1994)
"Age of Reason". Luxembourg, 8th Pluviose, Second Year of the French Republic, one and indivisible. January 27, O. S. 1794.
http://www.constitution.org/tp/agereason.htm

Pateman, C. (2004)
"Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income". POLITICS & SOCIETY, Vol. 32 No. 1, March 2004 89-105 DOI: 10.1177/0032329203261100. © 2004 Sage Publications

Schjørring, E. (2016)

"Gamle mestre I nye tider. Om viden og politik i velfærdsstaten. Plaidoyer for et privat akademi. I Tænkningens veje. Et festskrift til Søren Gosvig Olesen. Per Jepsen (red.). Forlaget Wunderbuch

Torfing, J. (2003)
"Workfare with welfare: Recent reforms of the Danish welfare state". *Journal of European Social Policy* 0958-9287 (199902)9:1 Copyright © 1999 SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi, Vol 9 (1): 5–28; 006856

Websites

3f: Rise in atypical jobs.
https://www.3f.dk/soemaend/aktuelt/nyheder/deltidsjob-og-usikre-job-er-i-vaekst-i-danmark. Last visited: 19.10.17

New York Times (2013):
"Fixing the digital economy".
http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/09/opinion/sunday/fixing-the-digital-economy.html. Last visited: *13/8-17.*

Nytid: Graeber, D. (2017): Bullshit jobs
"Hvorfor kapitalismen skaper meningsløse jobber.
https://www.nytid.no/kapitalismen-skaper-meningslose-jobber/. Last visited: 17.10.17

Statista (2017).
"Facebook's average revenue per user as of 4th quarter 2016, by region (in U.S. dollars)".
https://www.statista.com/statistics/251328/facebooks-average-revenue-per-user-by-region/ *Last visited 13/8-17.*

The Times (2017): "Three in four mothers are now working"
https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/three-in-four-mothers-are-now-working-rfb3vqgbz. Last visited. 19.10.17

Reports

Cevea (2017)
"140.000 er ufrivilligt atypiske ansatte i Danmark". © Cevea. Published 27.10.2017. https://cevea.dk/filer/140.000-er-ufrivilligt-atypiske-ansatte-i-Danmark.pdf

ETUI (2017)
"Benchmarking Working Europe 2017" Confederation Syndicat European Trade Union. http://www.etui.org/Publications2/Books/Benchmarking-Working-Europe-2017

McKinsey Global Institute (2016)

"Technology, Jobs, And the Future of Work". Copyright © McKinsey & Company 2016.

McKinsey Global Institute (2017)
"A Future that Works: Automation, Employment, and Productivity. January 2017. Copyright © McKinsey & Company 2017

Faos (2007):
"The Danish Flexicurity Model - a Lesson for the US?" Anna Ilsøe 2007. Introduction. http://faos.ku.dk/english/pdf/publications/2007/fnotat81.pdf

IPR Bath (2017)
"Assessing the Case for a Universal Basic Income in the UK" Dr Luke Martinelli IPR Research Associate, University of Bath. September 2017. http://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/assessing-the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income-in-the-uk/attachments/basic_income_policy_brief.pdf

Front Page Picture

The Neighbors, part three: Love Thy Neighbor (2017)
March 1, 2017 to June 11, 2017. Bronx Museum. Page last visited 26.10.17http://thisandthat.site/content/2-projects/15-bronx-museum-love-thy-neighbor/press-image_irvin-morazan_requiem-4.jpg