Rethinking Racial Capitalism
Cultural Studies and Marxism

Series Editor: Jaafar Aksikas, Columbia College Chicago

The Cultural Studies and Marxism series is a timely and valuable contribution to the larger field of contemporary cultural studies. The global capitalist crisis of the twenty-first century has prompted renewed interest in critical political economy and Marxist theory. At the same time, publishing institutions committed to a robust articulation between cultural studies, critical political economy, and Marxism are almost non-existent. The series is dedicated to addressing this situation by highlighting and making available important (and emergent) scholarship at the intersection of these three fields.

Titles in the Series

Hegemony, Mass Media and Cultural Studies, by Sean Johnson Andrews

Rethinking Racial Capitalism: Questions of Reproduction and Survival, by Gargi Bhattacharyya

Rethinking Racial Capitalism
Questions of Reproduction and Survival
Gargi Bhattacharyya

ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD

INTERNATIONAL

London • New York

In memory of Jolyon Jones

Introduction

Ten Theses on Racial Capitalism

1. Racial capitalism is a way of understanding the role of racism in enabling key moments of capitalist development—it is not a way of understanding capitalism as a racist conspiracy or racism as a capitalist conspiracy. To explain this point a little more: the analysis of the productivity of racialisation in the service of capitalism should not—must not—be read as an allegation of intentionality. There are racists in the world and some of them have profited through exploitation, but racial capitalism does not emerge as a result of a plan. No one maps out this programme and then enacts it. What we seek to understand is the place of racialisation in particular instances of capitalist formation, most of all when those instances are now.

2. To understand racial capitalism, we must revisit our understanding of the value of work and the conception of some activity as 'non-work'. This section of the discussion to follow borrows heavily from feminist debates about the conception of 'work' and an expanded conceptualisation of social reproduction allows us to understand the racialised differentiation of populations as enabling forms of supplementarity beyond households.

3. Accounts of racial capitalism cannot act as metatheories of racism. Racism has a distinctive history that precedes capitalism.

4. Racial capitalism operates both through the exercise of coercive power and through the mobilisation of desire. People are not only 'forced' to participate in economic arrangements that cast them to the social margins; they also rush to be included in this way and to become edge-subjects of capitalism.

5. Racial capitalism includes the sedimented histories of racialised dispossession that shape economic life in our time, but is never reducible to those histories. There are new and unpredictable modes of dispossession to be understood alongside the centuries-old carnage that moistens the earth beneath our feet.

6. Racial capitalism helps us to understand how people become divided from each other in the name of economic survival or in the name of economic well-being. One aspect of its techniques encompass the processes that appear to grant differential privileges to workers and almost workers and non-workers and the social relations that flow from these differentiations.

7. Although the insights of scholars of intersectionality interweave with the discussion that follows, this is not an account of the intersectionality of capitalism. Neither is it an argument for the 'primacy' of race. Racial capitalism describes a set of techniques and a formation, and in both registers the disciplining and ordering of bodies through gender and sexuality and dis/ability and age flow through what is happening. I continue to call this 'racial capitalism' because these techniques of othering and exclusion utilise the logics of race, regardless of the targeted population.

8. The racial capitalism that I seek to describe here is intimately intertwined with the processes precipitating ecological crisis. The myth of expendability—of expendable peoples and expendable regions—haunts our time and is a key motor of the forms of capitalist development that operate on the assumption that some populations will never be included and will never reach viability or sustainability.

9. The logics of racial capitalism suggest that capitalism cannot be 'fixed' or 'adapted' in a way that allows us all to be equal or all forms of humanity to be valued. This is not to say that change does not occur and that some historical disadvantages cannot be ameliorated. However, it is to argue that capitalism cannot function if we all are allowed to become fully human. Dehumanisation seems to be an unavoidable outcome of the processes of capitalist development.

10. Racial capitalism is a way of understanding why we seem to be so divided and yet remain so intimately intertwined with each other. It is a description, not a manifesto. As always, what comes next is to be decided elsewhere.

Let us start at the very beginning, a very good place to start.

Of course, this is not a story about all human life. Who could imagine such a thing, let alone embark on its telling? Class struggle may be the story of all human history, but it is not a one-volume job. Strictly for the instalment market.

The history of capitalism, on the other hand, that's a much more bite-size endeavour. Not a tiny morsel but only a small-sigh chunk in the history of humanity. So, racial capitalism. That might be the story of all human life but only in this instant. A snapshot of what feels like the longue durée to us but which is in reality a mere blinking of an eye. The human suffering of generations—all no more than one more ugly episode in the perpetual stand-off between those who have and those who do not.

Consider what follows not as a corrective ('the true-life histories of the raciality of capitalism in all its gore-filled details') but as a mystery ('the strange tale of recurring racism'), perhaps with a nod to horror ('blood and guts in accumulation').

The main point to remember is: none of us really know whodunnit. If we did, the story would not be worth telling.

At the heart of this mystery is the question 'why?' Why such dehumanisation, but only of some? Why such carnage? Why such devaluing of some lives? And alongside this over-arching instrumentalisation of human life, how are some deemed (even) less?

For us—of course, *of course*—there can be no retreat into fairy tales of human nature (so fallen, so evil). Not for us those tales of a racism that runs as deep as the secrets that make us human. The answers to the mystery of racial capitalism must lie in the mystery of capital itself. Or, at the very least, in shadows where capital meets other histories of dispossession.

Chapter 1
Beginning

WHAT RACIAL CAPITALISM IS

Imagine a house with many storeys—an attic and a cellar, several annexes that have no direct connections, main rooms filled with comfort and a maze of unmappable corridors leading to all sorts of barely remembered wings, snugs and the occasional route outside to a seemingly isolated out-house. There are people in each part of the house and sometimes some of them meet. But mostly their movements are shaped by the place in which they find themselves, and who they see and who they can be is delimited by the strange geography of the house. Racial capitalism is this kind of story. It is a story about imagining economic formations as demarcating the relations and walls between different groups of human beings. It is also a story about imaging who enters which rooms and how. One kind of narrative suggests that everyone will get into the living room eventually—they may take different journeys and come at different paces, but all the convoluted routes will lead to the living room in the end.

Others might suggest that the house will grow other new and different living rooms—separate from the original geography of the house but providing a similar experience of comfort and safety for the populations in those wings of the building.

Both accounts—and I would say that these have been the dominant accounts for some time— assume that occupation of the/a living room is achievable by all and is a marker of progress and enhanced material well-being.

This work begins from the belief that much of the world has never and will never enter that particular form of living room comfort and that this exclusion or expulsion is no accident. The integrity of the building demands that different groups remain in their separate wings and such differentiations are important for the maintenance of the building and its lovely main living room.

WHY 'RACIAL' CAPITALISM?

Using the framing of the racial risks perpetuating the illusion that there is a racial to name, to describe, to analyse. For projects seeking to chart continuities across time and space, just trying to tell the story of the place of race can seem like an argument for the underlying reality of race as the eternal truth of human existence. I try to use race to indicate a mode of social organisation, the mode that categorises with unpassable boundaries. Whereas some categorisation points to activity or location or performance, and may operate as fixing in ways just as troubling, race is the mode of categorisation that references the body, nature, an underlying and unchangeable essence that signals unpassable difference. How do such fictions of embodied otherness continue to play out in the economic formations of a capitalism that seeks to reduce us all to opportunities for value extraction?

IN WHICH WE CONFRONT OUR DOUBTS ABOUT THE WHOLE PROJECT

This work began its life as a response to the increasing confusion around the relationship between race and class that seemed to be filling both popular and academic discussion (for a UK-focused corrective to some central misapprehensions, see Shaheen and Khan, 2017; for a very informative and often funny account of these tensions in academic and activist circles in the United States, see Roediger, 2017). These discussions can be characterised by the reduction of both race and class to aspects of identity (which, of course, they are but not to the exclusion of all else) and the narrowing of the debate about race and class into a battle between competing affiliations and, sometimes, oppressions. As an approach, this has been one that offers almost no insight into what race or class do or how what they do gets done.

This work is an attempt to begin the discussion from a different starting point, in the hope that this other route will allow a different kind of engagement and the possibility of more productive interchange between those affiliated to an analysis of race and those affiliated to an analysis of

class. It is also an attempt to think about what capitalism does to human and other life in our time and how we might be touched and positioned differently by its workings.

This, then, is what I set out to do—and with the very best of intentions. And yet, as the project has gone on, I have felt increasingly doubtful. The claim of the title seems too grandiose and far too certain. So let it be settled from the outset. There is no metatheory to transfer between any and all locations here. No master idea conjured up to challenge the great fathers of social theory. Despite the connotations of discussing 'capitalism', this is not a work of theory at all. Instead I have attempted the more modest but still labour-intensive task of description. If we want to understand the many and varied practices that are undertaken in the name of capitalism, then the attempt to describe what is happening is an important step in this process. The attention that is required to really try to register what is happening—before even any attempt to enquire about why and how things happen—is an underrated aspect of intellectual labour. As time goes on, I have become more convinced that the will to describe is an honourable endeavour and one that underlies all other learning.

So—lower your expectations accordingly. There will be no blueprint for the coming revolution here. If I possessed such a thing I would not be wasting my time in the lonely work of scholarship. What I can offer is a series of stories about capitalism in which I seek to persuade you that the descriptor 'racial' adds to our shared knowledge about this beast.

A DETOUR

Well, of course I want to lower your expectations. The claim to illuminate the workings of capitalism has been made before and only the most foolhardy would seek to better that telling. But, also, and as with all story-tellers, I lied. I may not be able to offer a blueprint, but I hope most sincerely that you, dear reader, will discern the path to freedom and that this book will be among the maps that you consult. Because there is no point in writing about capitalism unless your hope is that it can and will be overthrown. And there can be no hope of momentous and freeing change unless we learn somehow to see each other more clearly. The fractious and often circular interchanges about race and class seem to disrupt the possibility of mutual recognition. Not always, to be fair, but too often. The leap into abstraction, even this descriptive abstraction that I offer, suggests a way of thinking of our relation to each other. Understanding more clearly the manners in which capitalism divides and differentiates us might be a helpful step towards charting our inter-connectedness despite a lack of literal commonality. A way of thinking about collective interest across locational variation.

So that is really my hope. That this book plays some small part in helping us to see each more clearly. Not so that we can say, oh look we are all the same, but so that we can say we are together despite our historical, experiential and locational differences. Because what really matters in this battle is togetherness.

MISERABLE STORIES OF LIFE UNDER CAPITALISM

When telling any story about capitalism, it is hard not to rely on the formulations of the misery memoire. The pain, the waste of human potential, the exploitation and suffering, the contamination of all human relations. When opening a book called *Racial Capitalism*, the reader knows full well that laughs will be few and far between. What could this be but a denunciation of centuries of dehumanisation as capital squats alongside the ugliest histories of human hatred?

I have tried to commence this book with a spirit of mystery. We may well know that there are many bodies, we may even know where many of the bodies are buried, as well as understanding the many hundreds of thousands who will never be buried (for one account of the devaluing of life under capitalism, see Tyner, 2016). What we do not know so certainly, so predictably, is how such carnage occurs. How do people continue to participate in systems that offer so little reward? How do capitalist subjects emerge in such unfriendly terrain and despite the limited possibilities for such subjecthood?

These are questions that have animated debates in cultural Marxism for decades. Despite the take-up of the term 'cultural Marxism' as a term of abuse/hysteria from the right, I take the view that a Marxist-informed analysis of cultural formations has linked attempts to understand how

capitalism survives through the Frankfurt School, the 'New Left' and much of the assorted work filed under 'cultural studies' (for an entertaining account of this question in the field of cultural studies, which acknowledges that the account of racism must wait until a future edition, see Hartley, 2003). The question here is not how capitalism formed, but how does it continue and how does it continue in a manner that infects our consciousness and become part of our own sense of self? I started this work through a preoccupation with the sufferings of racial capitalism and the recent configuration of this racialised suffering under capitalism. The murmur of capitalism's victims continues to animate my own quest to learn about the world and this particular work. However, I have realised through the course of writing this book that tales of suffering alone can never register the immensity of the movement that capitalism engenders. Yes, there is plenty of suffering. But there is also hope and hustle, and a constant stream of adaptations and new ways of being that emerge with capitalist restructuring across the globe. This sense of excitement, too, is part of racial capitalism and to ignore its pull is to misunderstand the manner in which capitalist restructuring inhabits the psyches of its victim-participants.

One of the things this work tries to add to existing debate is a reminder of the seductive character of capitalist living, even for those who are most damaged by the workings of capitalism. This point is made not in order to claim some new account of false consciousness. Instead my interest is in the particular work that is done by this regime of longing. While we have been accustomed to a longstanding account of consumer society as creating want in order to fuel demand, less has been said about the place of consumer longing in anchoring accumulation processes and also in disciplining populations more generally. We will revisit these questions in chapter 6.

In the course of writing this book, an endeavour that has caused considerable worry and sleeplessness as well as the usual wild-eyed obsessions of the truly possessed, I have come to think of racial capitalism as a process by which capitalist formations create by default the edge-populations that serve as the other and limit of the working class. This move, whether inadvertent or planned (and it can be either one, depending on the location and circumstances), becomes the basis of racialisation of one section of the population. Being cast out or pushed to the edge itself becomes the occasion of racialising discourses and practices. Or, at least, this is the idea that I have been trying to work with. How well it can fit events must be decided by the reader.

There are some immediate difficulties with this formulation, and I am all too aware of this. The suggestion that racialisation for some arises retrospectively as a result of marginalisation from structures of production and/or the formal labour market does echo some famous accounts. It is not far, for example, from Eric Williams's ground-breaking account in *Empire and Slavery*. And yet it still feels wilfully unread to assert that the fiction of race springs up, conveniently and almost spontaneously, to give a rationale to the exigencies of capital.

The major work in the history of racisms has focused on versions of a history of ideas and it has done so with good reason. In the absence of any over-arching reason or logic, the odd variations of racist history must be explained with a far more contextual eye. Without some engagement with historical analysis, we cannot plot the intersections that give rise to these unhappy outcomes. But more than this, this must be a history of ideas and of beliefs, because no listing of events can uncover the making of racist outcomes.

In the chapters that follow, these discussions of the idea and of the fantasy of race play their part. It is almost impossible to tell the history of racism in any of its forms without some detour through the history of ideas. However, let me stress again that the emphasis of this work is quite different to this discussion of ideas. Whatever the articulations of otherness or of unreason, the practices of racism or of those leading to racist outcomes do not spring spontaneously from these beliefs. Despite our best efforts, too great a focus on the history of ideas of race and racism can add to the sense that the history of racism is a story of an enormous global conspiracy. So, if only to stretch our ability to think imaginatively about the character of evil, this work tries to focus firstly on processes and actions, on the materiality of racist exclusion before any attention is given to the narrative that is mobilised to explain or justify such exclusion.

Firstly, a reminder: what we think we know or do not know or have come to know about the beast, capitalism.

1. That it is nothing but pain.
2. That capitalism takes a similar trajectory of development everywhere.
3. That capitalism is endlessly voracious in its spread.
4. That capitalism fosters democracy as part of building liberal consumer societies.
5. That capitalism transforms all social relations into its own image.
6. That capitalism supersedes all preceding social structures.

Okay, I am poking fun here, but only a little. Although point 4 has been quietly abandoned by the cheerleaders of capital more recently, the others have been consistent themes across left and liberal analyses, and, on the whole and apart from point 1, have been embraced also by proponents of the market. The concept of racial capitalism might be seen as a corrective or question to each of these long-held, although admittedly not universal, assumptions.

In response to each of the above, the suggestions (not a critique but an expansion) offered by thinking of and through racial capitalism might be:

1. Both the promise and the actual if short-lived experience of pleasure and desire sew people into capitalist ways of life that also cause them and others considerable pain.
2. Capitalism can make spaces differently, and does so. This includes expelling some populations, containing others and adapting to local conditions to take a variety of mixed forms.
3. Capital is voracious, but its appetite may not absorb all populations in similar ways and not everyone may become the ideal type of the producer-consumer. This unevenness is part of the workings of capitalism, not something that will be overcome by the push to homogeneity eventually.
4. Consumer practices represent almost inescapable processes of subjugation that capture many who do not enter formal waged work. Understanding these processes helps us to understand how we are variably subjugated by capitalism, while some are simultaneously excluded from the status of 'productive' worker.
5. Capitalism both occupies and reconstructs a range of diverse spaces, each with its own set of social relations. The shared experience of dispossession is complicated by other differentiating processes and the battle to retain access to increasingly scarce resources is mobilising differences, not commonalities, between groups.
6. Although capitalism casts a global shadow, the opportunistic utilisation of other ways of life and social organisation to enable and sustain capital accumulation is part of capitalist business as usual.

The pages that follow attempt to explicate each of these points, or to point to work that demonstrates the point. Please remember that this is no more than a descriptive pamphlet, a bringing together differently of some aspects of our collective knowledge with a view to telling a well-known story (slightly) differently. There is, of course, much more to be said, but that is for others to complete. So remember, a description, a bringing together of the already known, a familiar tale told otherwise.

ON WHY THIS IS NOT A 'THEORY' OF RACIAL CAPITALISM

Inevitably, I rely heavily on the work of others here and bundle diverse events into simplified headings, not to build a metatheory but in order to enable some navigation of such diverse and wide-ranging material.

My sense is that there are some themes of understanding that take on a theoretical status, in that they can illuminate multiple instances and offer some route to understanding emerging events. However, these themes do not constitute an alternative theory of capitalism. Readers should understand that the scaffolding of this work consists of a very orthodox, if not dull, understanding of what capitalism is and how it develops.

This project begins from the belief that there is a political economy arising from contemporary practices of racialisation or racial exclusion or racist boundary-marking. My initial interest is to

map these varied and often very odd economic processes. I do not begin from the assumption that there is one over-arching logic guiding such practices. I suspect that there is not. However, there may be continuities and borrowings between zones of activity and perhaps there are some practices of racial capitalism that take on a global reach in our time. Importantly, this work arises from curiosity—sometimes outright confusion—and in this much it is not a manifesto or the basis of a programme. I start from the assumption that most readers will agree that the racialised dispossession enacted in the pursuit of profit degrades us all. However, if this is not your view, I am not trying to persuade you of this moral point.

One of the lessons that has been learnt through the later twentieth and twenty-first centuries is that capitalism can be endlessly adaptive to local circumstances, with the most taught account arising from the suggestion of varieties of capitalism (following Soskice and Hall, 2001). However, while instructive, the debates on variety can seem to imply that capitalism will 'work', regardless of context and with little sense of resistance. More usefully, other trajectories chart the manner in which political-economic space is remade in an adaptation to local circumstances (Brenner and Theodore, 2002) or the processes of mobilisation and accommodation that can shape even the most autocratic spaces (Hung, 2013). Through such attention, we learn that capitalism can accommodate both authoritarian centralism and libertarian small states, multiculturalism and ethnic nationalism, highly globalised or highly localised economies. All can be bent to the will of accumulation and all can be accommodated in the quest for profit.

Nothing is necessary.

What is important to note for this project is the extreme variation that can exist alongside the processes of accumulation. This suggests that racialised exploitation and expropriation is not a necessary aspect of capitalist formations. Just as capitalism can accommodate some elements of gender equality so also we might imagine an antiracist capitalism, albeit within tight limits. So —no will towards an over-arching theory, no master narrative. No

RACIAL CAPITALISM—as a claim that this is the new improved account, the real story of capitalism. Everything we have learned about capitalism reminds us that only the will to accumulate remains the same. No such thing as *the* capitalist state. No arrangement of workers that is replicated everywhere. No necessary similarity in the pattern of concessions that workers may win.

Given this, the project of this book appears impossible. What is there to discuss if we begin from the premise that there is no such thing as racial capitalism?

But, of course, the term 'racial capitalism' makes such sense to our raised-in-total-immersion-in-racism ears. Just the linking of the two terms suggests an opening into mutual recognition and a way of acknowledging the formative role of racist exploitation in the making of capitalism. How hard not to be relieved by this conceptual rapprochement. At last, at last, a chance to see each other clearly. I, too, start from this tug of recognition and the term is chosen because of this. However, almost immediately, the pretence of a coherent narrative started to unravel. It seemed impossible to begin any account without a preceding assumption of the solidity and continuity of racialising categorisation. To attribute racial or racist characteristics to a model of a system, and a model that promises insight into historical development, is to stray all too easily into the realm of the transhistorical. If this thing can be traced in any moment of formation, then it is deemed to be a contributing factor and takes on the status of a force or object that pre-exists the system under discussion. More bluntly, speaking about racial capitalism can sound like an explanation of the timelessness of racism and the solidity of the category of race.

Instead of constructing a theory of racial capitalism in all times and places, this work presents a necessarily more fragmented account. I have been interested in the flashpoints where capitalist crisis becomes racialised and where that racialisation seems to become a fix or an amplification in response. In brief, these moments include in recent times: the marking and policing of borders for the purposes of immigration control; the simultaneous exploitation through differentiation of the workforce alongside a celebration of particular forms of commodified difference; the racialised understanding that comes into play when categorising human activity as work and non-work; the

resurgent battles over the terms of economic justice in a time of dwindling resources. These moments of interest are not, on the whole, what has animated discussion of racial capitalism to date. However, I try here to chart some continuities between more longstanding debates and these other discussions of the struggle to recognise value in human lives.

In this process, this work traces three distinct strands of what might be termed 'racial capitalism', in an attempt to re-evaluate this concept for our own time and challenges.

Broadly, the three strands of discussion are:

- The suggestion that all capitalism emerges from a basis of racialised division and that racial capitalism is the underlying, if unacknowledged, character of capitalism as such;
- The parallel but distinct suggestion that capitalism creates spaces of non-capitalism or almost-capitalism, and this edge space represents the need within capitalism to designate some spaces and populations as non-productive; and
- Another and very different suggestion about the role of capitalist subjectivity/ subjectification as always already enmeshed in processes of racialisation.

The first suggestion comes from Cedric Robinson and his ground-breaking account of racial capitalism in *Black Marxism*. The second is a collapsing of various debates about allegedly non-productive labour, primitive accumulation and accumulation by dispossession, with a particular debt to the work of Kalyan Sanyal and his account of the postcolonial wasteland. The last, and this is a quite other set of debates, arises from a revisiting of the Frankfurt School and more recent continuations of their work and the suggestion that the dehumanisation of capitalist development holds the dangerous kernel of racist annihilation within its own logic.

CEDRIC ROBINSON AND THE SUGGESTIONS OF 'BLACK MARXISM'

On 7 June 2016, while I was working on this book, the news came through on Twitter that Cedric Robinson had died. I had regretfully and foolishly, it turned out, turned down an opportunity to share a platform with him on 3 June—unable to square my family commitments with a trip to the States in the middle of mark processing. And now that opportunity was lost forever.

So now I admit to myself that this book that I have been worrying over is a tribute to and conversation with Cedric Robinson. Not only with him and also showing the marks of so many other influences, but centrally a way to revisit an argument that I learned by reading *Black Marxism* as a student in what seems like another lifetime. For those who are not familiar with Robinson's ground-breaking work, here we revisit some of the key terms of his argument.

This is a work that has contributed to the reassertion and wider appreciation of a black radical tradition and offers a way of thinking about the histories of the African diaspora/s as a resource for anti-capitalist struggle (for a moving collection that demonstrates the range of this influence, see Johnson and Lubin, 2017). Beyond the headline arguments, important though they are, Robinson also nudges us towards a more open and critical way of thinking of the emergence of capitalism in Europe. He offers a way of comprehending the emergence of capitalism in a less bounded manner, with a critical awareness of the porosity of 'nation', but also in a way that reinserts the role played by (imagined) ethnic differences in the gathering together of concentrated resources. Among his most enlightening points is the discussion, almost in passing, of the role of populations in movement in supplementing European expansion.

To Robinson, the erasure of migrant labour in accounts of early modern Europe, that famous site from which capitalism as we know it emerged, prevents us from comprehending the forces and sources of value that made that leap possible. The implied boundedness of the European nation —with nation here signifying stock, blood, shared history, not at all a bureaucracy of state— relegates all of our thinking to ideas of economic development (and revolution) in one nation, when the history of capitalism shows us that these nations have never been one. In this, Robinson extends the possibilities opened by imagining the emergence of capitalism as a world system (Wallerstein, 1979, 2004) and anticipates more recent re-worldings of the history of capitalism (Anievas and Nisancioglu, 2015). For Robinson, the fictionality of the 'nation' as agent

or receptacle of economic development is revealed in the failure to recognise migrant labour in the formations of early capitalism,

There has never been a moment in modern European history (if before) that migratory and/or immigrant labor was not a significant aspect of European economies. That this is not more widely understood seems to be a consequence of conceptualization and analysis: the mistaken use of the nation as a social, historical, and economic category; a resultant and persistent reference to national labor 'pools' (e.g., 'the English working class'); and a subsequent failure of historical investigation (Robinson, 1983, 23)

Robinson's point here is salutary but perhaps is not yet a critique of the erasure of the 'racial'. We understand here that the (often unquestioning) take-up of an idea of nation as the location of economic development erases movement and, in the process, over-emphasises a sense of European exceptionalism, as if such a leap forward could occur without contact and combined development with other regions of the world.

Once we displace the misused concept of nation when thinking about early capitalism, we are able to notice the variety and reach of the factors and actors that lead to the moment of 'early capitalism'. A significant strand of Robinson's argument revolves around the identities and statuses associated with class roles (or pre-class roles) in the development of capitalism. Robinson describes a social universe in which ethnic attributes are folded into classed identities, and where class-type statuses are narrated as aspects of (imagined) ethnicities.

The bourgeoisie that led the development of capitalism were drawn from particular ethnic and cultural groups; the European proletariats and the mercenaries of the leading states from others; its peasants from still other cultures; and its slaves from entirely different worlds. The tendency of European civilization through capitalism was thus not to homogenize but to differentiate—to exaggerate regional, subcultural, and dialectical differences into 'racial' ones. (Robinson, 1983, 26)

This point is central for Robinson and for our interests here. This central claim that the tendency of capitalism has been 'not to homogenize but to differentiate' lies at the very heart of the conceptualisation of racial capitalism. All the other core themes of Robinson's case flow from this central point. If capitalism tends towards differentiation, then the repeated assertions of one route to development become more hollow. If capitalism emerges and continues through differentiation, this opens the possibility of thinking differently about the possibilities of political agency. Robinson's work presents these three important corrections/suggestions, primarily it seems for those Marxists who wish to listen. The correctives are to critique the assumption that early capitalism emerges in bounded national spaces, to challenge the account that suggests that there is one and only one route of economic and societal development, and to argue that there is no pre-determined political agent who holds the key to revolutionary change. Centrally, Robinson argues for a more expansive understanding of the agent of resistance.

[It] . . . should not have ended with wage slavery. It properly should also include peonage, sharecropping, tenant-farming, forced labor, penal labor, and modern peasantry. Nevertheless, we must also remind ourselves that whatever the forms primitive accumulation assumed, its social harvest would also include acts of resistance, rebellion, and, ultimately, revolution. In the peripheral and semi-peripheral regions of the modern world system, at least, Gramsci's hegemonic class rule was never to be more than a momentary presence. (Robinson, 1983, 164)

This is the first key question to note: What is the role of raciality in the differentiation of populations under capitalism and how can we understand the positioning and agency that can arise from such differentiation?

The second question that arises from this first is: How is it that different forms of human activity lead to differentiated statuses?

PRODUCTIVE WORK AND THE HIERARCHIES OF
RACIAL CAPITALISM

This question is central to how we comprehend the histories of capitalism that divide humanity into the productive and non-productive. Although this is not the only categorisation that has made

the racialised divisions of capitalist history, the realm of allegedly non-productive humanity must be a central consideration for our discussion. To understand why, it is helpful to revisit the concept of reproductive labour.

A central inspiration for this work has been the mind-expanding contributions of Maria Mies (1986) and of Silvia Federici (2004) in their analyses of capitalism as a necessarily patriarchal project that is built on the erasure of the work of women and of others deemed 'non-productive'. In chapter 2, we will share a more substantial discussion of the ordering of social reproduction. For now, it is enough to be reminded of the key points of this powerful critique of productivity and its relation to violence.

I consider this narrow, capitalist concept of 'productive labour' the most formidable hurdle in our struggle to come to an understanding of women's labour both under capitalism and actually existing socialism. (Mies, 1986, 48)

Mies is brutally clear in her assessment. It is this formulation of 'productive labour', deriving from yet inattentive to Marx, that has erased women's labour in accounts of capitalist development. This erasure and what is revealed by the erasure lies at the heart of Mies's alternative account of capitalist development. Her argument is not only that 'non-productive work'—that is the 'general production of life'—has been an unacknowledged presence in human life under capitalism and at all times, but also that all capitalist development, all 'productive labour' rests always and necessarily on this foundation of the general production of life.

This general production of life, or subsistence production . . . constitutes the perennial basis upon which 'capitalist productive labour' can be built up and exploited. (Mies, 1986, 48)

This has been the important argument put forward by a range of feminist thinkers seeking to reinsert the role of reproductive labour into our shared understandings of capitalism (for a summary of some of these debates about domestic labour and its value, see Vogel, 2008; for an earlier discussion of patriarchy and capitalism, see Hamilton, 2012, reprinted from 1978). What is more immediately pertinent for our discussion in Mies's account is her identification of the work that constitutes this underlying general production of life. In her account, this is 'mainly performed through the non-wage labour of women and other non-wage labourers as slaves, contract workers and peasants in the colonies' (1986, 48).

Mies's primary focus is the erasure of women's work. This may include, very importantly, the erasure of the work that women conduct as non-wage workers and not only in the home, and her argument revolves around the impact of housewifisation on the visibility of labour. In this, she offers a way of identifying and analysing the processes that render some human activity 'non-work' and of recognising the manner in which gender mythologies operate to enable capitalist exploitation of both formal and informal economic activity. We will go on to discuss the concept of housewifisation in more detail in the next chapter. For now, we need to consider how and why 'other non-wage labourers' might also constitute the perennial basis for productive labour.

The immediate response among a more traditional Marxism has been that this input from slavery and 'the colonies' has been necessary but is not perennial, that is, is not ongoing (for a reader-friendly overview of Marxist discussions of imperialism, see Brewer, 2002). This account fits easily into accepted and linear understandings of primitive accumulation as a temporal stage that precedes capitalist development as we know it. However, this previous certainty has been pushed aside in recent years by an energetic re-engagement with the terms of primitive accumulation. This re-engagement has been so successful that the concept of accumulation by dispossession has itself become a kind of new orthodoxy, with an explosion of work following the suggestion of David Harvey that violent dispossession continues to form an aspect of accumulation processes in every stage of capitalism (for Harvey's account of this concept, see Harvey, 2003).

It is this claim that promises to illuminate one aspect of racial capitalism. The discussion of primitive accumulation is an area of debate that has been reignited in our time. Derek Hall remarks in his careful mapping of recent debates about primitive accumulation and land-grabbing that after the original coinage from Marx, all of the many works discussing this term in relation to

land-grabs have been published since 2001. Apart from the vagaries of academic fashion, we might take this recent re-emergent interest in the character of primitive accumulation as an indication of the political challenges arising in twenty-first-century capitalism. If the promises of linear economic development and industrialisation ever appeared achievable, that promise evaporated by the later years of the twentieth century. The twentieth century ended convulsed with protests against the unrealised promises of 'development' and with the emergence of sustained and serious critiques of the paradigm of development (for an introduction to some of these ideas, see Pieterse, 1998; Escobar, 2000). The persistence of spaces beyond the reach of capitalist development, imagined as productive economy, is our next point of interest.

THE WASTELAND WITHIN AND BESIDE CAPITALISM

A third central contribution to the formulation of this work comes from Kalyan Sanyal and his account of postcolonial capitalism. In his debate-changing work, *Rethinking Capitalist Development*, Sanyal proposes an urgent corrective to the various mythologies of progress that have informed the conduct of 'development'. As a critical commentator on 'development economics', Sanyal examines the continuing and growing gap between ideas of a developing and intensifying formal/modern sector that will, eventually, absorb the entire working population and the actuality of substantial populations who continue to fall outside of the terms of development as participation in the productive economy.

Sanyal views proletarianisation as a process that was imposed by force, even after the ejection from the land and the means of subsistence (this point is present in Marx's account but the violence that forces the dispossessed away from vagrancy into waged work is described as a phase after which memories of pre-proletarian life are erased). Even in the absence of access to their previous means of livelihood, many resented and resisted the entry into waged labour. Violence was the additional factor that forced the situation. In this much, Sanyal's account echoes that of others—primitive accumulation is a process of overt violence.

However, Sanyal's assertion that development displaces primitive accumulation and introduces biopower to the spaces of development runs counter to much of the other recent literature on primitive accumulation. In his critique of the discourse of development as coterminous with capitalism, Sanyal pinpoints the manner in which capitalism also works to construct an 'outside' which expels some populations from the terms of economic inclusion,

The pre-capitalist subsistence sector is constituted as the 'other' of the capitalist sector, as what capital is not. The representation denies the subsistence sector any rationality of its own, subjects it to capitalist profit accounting and thereby renders a section of its inhabitants 'redundant and surplus'. (Sanyal, 2007, 142)

In his account of this process, Sanyal presents a series of game-changing points: that a significant proportion of the population of the 'developing world' has been proletarianised but has no opportunity to enter the workforce; that this 'redundant and surplus' population occupies a space alongside the capitalist city which Sanyal terms the wasteland; that this 'non-capitalist' space is also an outcome of processes of capitalist development; that accumulation under postcolonial capitalism also relies on this parallel non-capitalist space of what Sanyal terms the 'needs economy'.

Although Sanyal arrives at his analysis through an encounter with development economics, his account of the postcolonial wasteland echoes many aspects of the experiences of racially subordinated groups in other settings. Sanyal acknowledges these points of resonance when outlining the quite recent rise to policy prominence of 'the informal sector', what he describes as 'the discursive constitution of the informal sector' (193).

After 50 years, it has dawned on the global architects of development that far from a transitory phenomenon in a dual economy, unemployment and underemployment are now a permanent and integral part of the process of development itself. (Sanyal, 2007, 196)

What is described is the variegated economy of every global city and perhaps of all capitalist spaces. Unemployment and underemployment are permanent features of the segmented global city and are borne disproportionately by racially subordinated groups. Despite various and

variously insulting attempts to address culture, aspiration and training, it is apparent that capitalism in urban settings works to constantly recreate these divisions among the workforce, so that temporary entry for any particular group only intensifies exclusion for another. Sanyal offers an explanation of this emergence of a parallel space of other economic behaviours.

The informal sector is the product of capitalist development, of its primitive accumulation, the modern sector in the course of its own arising creates the space of the dispossessed, the space in which the informal activities take place. In this representation underdevelopment is the product of development rather than its initial condition. (Sanyal, 2007, 206)

Just as the spaces of alleged underdevelopment arise as an outcome of development, the spaces of the informal economy arise as an element of the movement of the so-called formal economy. We should understand that 'informal economy' has come to signify all that cannot be named as 'productive' work but which, nevertheless, enters the money economy. In Portes's famous formulation, the informal economy is 'not a euphemism for poverty—it is a specific form of relationships of production' (Portes, 1989, 12). This myriad of activity may include all kinds of legal, semi-legal and illegal activities and may include some activity, such as small-scale entrepreneurship, that seems almost indistinguishable from the business of the 'formal economy'. More recently, it has been argued that the informal economy should be understood to include the informality of both *enterprise* and *employment* relationships, with informal employment characterised by a lack of social or labour rights protection (Chen, 2007, 2). Sanyal, however, makes a different distinction and argues that the difference is not given by the activity but by the outcome, with the informal economy operating to fulfil the immediate needs of participants.

I call the realm of capitalist production the accumulation economy and that of informal production the need economy. In the first, production is for accumulation, and in the second, it is for meeting need. . . . While one is driven by the logic of accumulation, production in the other is organised to support a certain level of consumption. (Sanyal, 2007, 212)

We will return in the final chapter to the place of this consumption of the wasteland. Although Sanyal asserts that these consumer practices are not part of the accumulation economy, others have argued that it is precisely this engagement in consumption that represents the linking experience of proletarianisation for us (for one example of this view, see Autonomies, 2017; for an overview of the conceptualisation made famous by Stiegler, see Stiegler, 2010). For now, it is enough to note that Sanyal is describing a process whereby some populations are not hailed by capital as actual or potential sources of labour power but nevertheless are entwined in the money economy through other means.

For our purposes, the account of the wasteland suggests a way of understanding the emergence of subordinated sections of the economy as an outcome of capitalist development and, also, a way of thinking about the interplay between subordinated social status and (semi-)exclusion from the mainstream economy.

DIFFERENTIATION AND VARIETIES OF NECROPOLITICS

Accounts of primitive accumulation can tell us something about the racialised divisions of labour at a global scale. However, we learn little about the divisions of the metropolis. Here also the demarcations of racialisation stratify workers and almost-workers and sometimes-workers, but the particular formations of 'non-work' are relegated to private space. What are we to make then of the racisms within particular workspaces and professions? And of the racisms among those who appear to hold the same role, perhaps for the same employer? How are we to account for workplace discrimination?

To approach this ongoing consignment of some to lesser status, we might revisit Achille Mbembe's famous account of necropolitics. In counter-position to Foucault's account of the biopolis and the exercise of political power that allows life, Mbembe argues that there are other spaces in which politics remains the business of death and, importantly, of living death. He describes this process as

the various ways in which, in our contemporary world, weapons are deployed in the interest of maximum destruction of persons and the creation of death-worlds, new and unique forms of

social existence in which vast populations are subjected to conditions of life conferring upon them the status of living dead. (Mbembe, 2003, 40)

What Mbembe describes echoes Sanyal's conception of the postcolonial wasteland, but whereas Sanyal argues that it is the governmentality of development that disciplines this space, Mbembe suggests a more punitive and violent regime of power. If Sanyal seeks to differentiate the spaces of the poor and excluded in the supposedly independent postcolonial state, Mbembe reminds us that colonial violence is not so easy to shake off.

Colonies are zones in which war and disorder, internal and external figures of the political, stand side by side or alternate with each other. As such, the colonies are the location par excellence where the controls and guarantees of judicial order can be suspended—the zone where the violence of the state of exception is deemed to operate in the service of 'civilization'. (Mbembe, 2003, 24)

Mbembe writes of the demarcation of spaces of living death where lawlessness itself becomes institutionalised, deployed as a technique of defending 'civilisation'. This is the map of the world made by colonial pasts and presents, in which the privileges of some spaces are built on the chaos and living death of others. Yet, at the same time, the spectre of necropolitics serves as a disciplining reminder and trace within the metropolis. The possibility of this other regime of power runs alongside the more genteel operations of biopolitics, most often in the association with racialised bodies that signal vulnerability to 'exceptional' violences and exclusions. In this way not only the consignment to living (or actual) death but also the suspension of legality and legal redress reveal the traces of a necropolitical order existing in the racialised crevices of metropolitan spaces. Treatment in economic transactions in accordance with the terms of judicial order, including when such terms deem exploitative relations as lawful, is among the central promises of capitalist freedoms (for a review of Weber's arguments on the centrality of law to capitalist development, see Trubek, 1972; for an overview of more recent interest in law as a necessary condition of economic development, see Dam, 2007). This is one element of the progressive thrust of capitalist societies and has been a key claim and boon of bourgeois revolutions. Practices of racial subordination in the economic realm, alongside state violences, reveal a limit to the judicial order of economic contract. In this way, aspects of the necropolis may enter and exist alongside or within the biopolis and vice versa. McIntyre and Nast characterise this as the bio(necro)polis and the necro(bio)polis.

'Bio(necro)polis' refers to the irruption of the necropolis into the biopolis, constituted by those racially devalued bodies long present within the biopolis, the necropolitans who have recently migrated to the necropolis, and those biopolitans who are threatened with demotion to the ranks of the surplus population. 'Necro(bio)polis' refers to the emergence of heightened possibilities of capital accumulation within the necropolis . . . and the concomitant emergence of a class of ex-necropolitans whose wealth and life of cosmopolitan luxury ranks with that the most favored biopolitans, even as most residents of the necro(bio)polis remain subject to hyper-exploitation or consignment to the category of human waste. (McIntyre and Nast, 2011, 1482)

While the nomination of the biopolis and the necropolis serve a kind of descriptive sense, this formulation leads to a flattening out of some of the particularity of so-called noncapitalist spaces. In fact, this is a formulation that begins with the assumption that there is no space beyond the logic of capitalist production and, importantly that spaces of hyperexploitation and/or noncapitalist forms of production are already and always have been in service to an imperial centre. Central to this conception is the belief that the economic formation of the necropolis is a constant compliment to the biopolis. However stretched the relationship, the space of the necropolis serves as a reserve army of labour with all the disciplinary impact on the workforce of the biopolis that this implies.

Canalized, criminalized, ostracized, stigmatized, the necropolis—that spatiality through which the necropolitan is defined or constituted—becomes a reserve of multifarious material proportions: of negative symbolic potential and death's liminal pleasures; a reserve of labor (as noted in chapter 25 of *Capital*); a nature reserve open for appropriation; a reserve of potentially fecund land for

settlers; and a reserve of waste land for colonialism's human and environmental detritus. (McIntyre and Nast, 2011, 1474)

Within this imagined dialectic, it is the mark of race that enables the differentiation of labour into human and not quite human. Yet, if we follow the account so carefully constructed by Sanyal, we might consider the postcolonial formation of capitalism as largely beyond dialogue with the biopolis. The postcolonial wasteland, as described by Sanyal, is not a reserve in waiting for any imperial centre. Individuals from the wasteland may risk lives and well-being to break into the spaces of wage relations, either as internal or as transnational migrants, but this opportunity is open to only a minority, whatever fears of swamping are expressed in the biopolis. Capitalism may not have the globalising reach that we have imagined. Growth without end may be turning out to be no more than a marketing fantasy. The tendency to differentiate territory and populations into varying economic arrangements and differently configured economic actors may be increasing in our time. The inhabitants of the necropolis may no longer represent a reserve of labour, if they ever did, and we may need to think again about whether symbolic others, holding spaces and unmarked territories constitute, the same kinds of reserve at all.

Better by far to think of capitalism as highly differentiated and opportunistic in its formations. Local histories and conflicts, unexpected alliances and accidents of geography all contribute to a highly variegated 'global capitalism'. Within this variegated terrain, we might consider some of the exclusionary, punishing and demeaning actions of the biopolis as desperately defensive gestures against the potential loss of racialised privilege, a threat embodied in the arrival of necropolitans, however few in number. Part of understanding this variegation is to understand that the biopolis may not hold sway over the economic or other choices of the necropolis—and equally that the necropolis may not be so central to the economic planning and aspirations of the biopolis as it once was. Nast and McIntyre do acknowledge this changing relationship in their formulations of the necro(bio)polis and the bio(necro)polis—the first indicating an elite within the necropolis that is governed by biopolitics and the second indicating the incursion of the necropolitans into the worlds of the biopolis, both as migrant labour and through the extension of the processes of necropolitics. Yet these terms, too, suggest that all practices can be folded back into capital accumulation. This may become our conclusion, but, for a moment, perhaps we could defer this certainty and consider the possibility that there is no easily mapped symbiosis between the worlds of the biopolis and the necropolis, even when they are at their most intensely intertwined.

The point to note here is that, still now in this time of planetary movement, most of the inhabitants of the necropolis do not move or do not move far. The intersections of rich and poor world are relatively slight, in terms of proportions of populations. Most importantly, most inhabitants of the necropolis do not serve as a reserve army of labour for the biopolis because they are not available for such work, are not sufficiently mobile and, most importantly of all, because the economies of the biopolis are not expanding in a manner that requires or desires such supplies of cheapened but hard to access labour. The unfortunate machinery of border control may serve to create a pool of precarious workers who occupy a particular role in the semi-formal and informal economies but it also confirms the exclusion of the greater mass of the world's poor. The taint of death may well circumscribe the lives of those who are racially subordinated, but the spaces of death may not present opportunities for accumulation in any straightforward sense. To be rendered surplus is not to be paid less, it is to be left dying or for dead. Rush too quickly to brush away this ugly distinction and we are in danger of collapsing all racialised economic violence into a claim for equal pay.

We know that the racisms of the metropolis also lead to arbitrarily premature deaths, sometimes as an outcome of state violence, and that the systematic exclusions, disadvantages and humiliations of everyday and official racisms erode well-being and limit lives. However, this taint of death as an outcome and excuse for limited access to social goods or meaningful rights is not the relegation to the space of exception where death is the central mode of politics. No doubt, as Nast and McIntyre suggest, those deemed to be 'necropolitans' become the repository for all manner of anxious symbolism. Racialised bodies continue to trigger the deep-rooted fear that the

barbarism underlying capitalist cultures will unleash some well-deserved tragedy, whether conceived as 'the horror' at the heart of darkness or the post-imperial melancholy that fully expects their world to crumble. Whatever might have enabled or animated racist exclusions in the metropolis previously, we might guess that the metropolitan racisms of our time are, in part at least, an expression of defensive anxiety in the face of changes that threaten to unsettle previous racialised privileges, including those associated with stable employment and access to social goods.

In this work I try to outline some key aspects of the manner in which capitalism creates subordinated sections of the population and to consider why such differentiation of populations might be needed. This construction of subordinated groups is not absolute—the attribution of racial status may not determine economic position. But the cultural impact of racially subordinated groups ripples into other parts of the economy. The persistence of the wasteland or the necropolis within the metropolis or the urban outcasts can come to adhere to those associated with those spaces and shape the attitudes of others to their economic participation. In the following chapters, we consider some ways of thinking about this transfer of lesser status into other arenas of economic transaction.

ACTING AS IF WE KNOW THE ANSWERS ALREADY

It is so tempting to rush to a total explanation, to tidy away anything that does not fit, to lay the stress on the parts that we seem to know with some certainty and to pass over the messier and less-known parts. When it comes to racism, that is easily condemned. And it is so much easier to condemn racism than to condemn capitalism. Or, at least, it is so much easier to follow the script of condemnation in relation to racism because racism has come to be the kind of evil that produces, demands, the articulation of condemnation. Racism is that kind of thing, for us in this sort of time. An expression of the distasteful or the evil or the immoral, and as such something that should be met with disgust.

So somehow this work must avoid the endless temptation to condemn. We know all of that. The pages that follow ride on rivers of pain, but that is all well-known. A book that sought to demonstrate no more than that capitalism leads to racialised pain would be brief and dull.

So what instead?

The history of capitalism reveals to us how endlessly pliable this beast can be. The logic of accumulation can twist itself into all manner of spaces, such diversity towards the same end. How, then, could one story of the racial encompass all these many ways?

I have to accept that there may be a capitalism that is not racial. That much is given in the designation.

And yet it is so difficult to divide the racial trajectories of capitalism from capitalism as usual. Instead of attempting an account of flavours of capitalism, my suggestion is that the practices of racial capitalism can arise as an opportunity (for some) but also as an attempted defence. The tendency of capitalism is to dehumanise labour in the pursuit of profit. Racialised differentiation can be used as an attempted defence against this over-arching tendency, a set of practices that arises to deflect the dehumanising tendencies onto a particular population and to redirect the encroachment of such tendencies into the lives of those designated (however fictionally and temporarily) as lesser beings. This, then, is a clue to follow: in the realm of the economic, racism is an attempt to safeguard the interests of those deemed dominant or 'unraced'.

THE MYSTERY OF RACIAL CAPITALISM

Racism is expensive. It requires resources to be deployed in the defence of racialised privilege. If we accept an understanding of capitalism that considers the increasing interchangeability of labour as a central tendency in capitalist development, the omniscience of racialised divisions in economic life makes no sense. Yet we see that while processes of exploitation become more flexible and varied, the irrational expense of subsidising racialised privilege continues.

I write about racial capitalism while often doubting its existence. Why this 'racial'? So much of what I seek to describe is 'just' capitalism. The dispossession and the displacements, the blood and the guts, these aspects are all there in Marx ('capital comes dripping from head to foot, from

every pore, with blood and dirt' [*Capital*, vol. 1, 533]), as part of the account of what capitalism is and what it must be until it is replaced by another and more humane way of organising our collective material needs. If I am using 'racial' as no more than a marker of 'extra nasty' capitalism, aren't I refuting my own argument? To test this particular doubt I played a thought experiment with myself. What would be the distinctive characteristics of 'extra nasty' capitalism and what resources were at my disposal to analyse this object?

This is what I thought:

Extra nasty capitalism takes the logics and practices of exploitation and intensifies them in order to subjugate vulnerable populations. It is not a different mode of capitalism but a demonstration of what capitalism is when populations are left without even minimal protection by states, social norms or other institutions. It is extra nasty because it is able to extract additional value from people who are deemed to be lesser or who are made more vulnerable by exclusionary structures of un/belonging. However, extra nasty capitalism is not a space apart from cuddlier capitalism. Cuddlier capitalism needs the extra nastiness to keep business ticking over. The partial benefits of cuddlier capitalism are realised through the subsidy of extra nasty capitalism. Importantly, the parallel existence of cuddlier and extra nasty capitalisms enables structures of government that harden and defend differential privilege between sections of the population, including the working population.

So far so familiar? Doesn't this sound like an account of business as usual for twenty-first-century capitalism? This is the world described in alarming technicolour by scholars of neoliberalism and other modern demons (see, as examples of a much larger literature, Springer, 2008; Harvey, 2007; Peet, 2011; Kiely, 2007). The challenge for me, then, is to persuade the reader that these divisions are best understood through the category of the 'racial'. In this endeavour, I meet some obstacles. Without the possibility of referencing an object that demonstrates the 'racial' character of extra nasty capitalism, I am left resorting to circular arguments. The category is 'racial' because the techniques of the racial serve to create the populations vulnerable to extra nasty capitalism. The objects of extra nasty capitalism are racialised through their positioning and exploitation through its processes. There may be no preceding process of racialisation that leads to this positioning—although equally there may be histories that lead to this racialised position that is then consolidated by extra nasty capitalism. Although the highly racialised histories of capitalism make some aspects of extra nasty capitalism today predictable, in that it is no surprise that some kinds of people are repeatedly subjected to extra nasty as opposed to cuddlier capitalism, there are surprises and groups can move in and out of the spaces of the extra nasty. Equally the extra nasty can shift location, moving across space to take advantage of war, disaster and other handy hitching posts.

In the discussion that follows, it is the terms and shape of extra nasty capitalism that demands attention. Most, but not all, of this work focuses on this entity, the capitalism that is deadly and differentiating and the importance, or not, of this realm to cuddlier zones of capitalism.

WHO ARE THE WORKING CLASS?

This question is one that underlies the discussion of racial capitalism. How is class formed and what shapes class agency? We are living through a time where there is a widespread understanding that something has shifted in the techniques of capitalism. We know very well that both the profile and distribution of work has been shifting. The pretence that everyone in the world will enter the industrial working class eventually is rarely repeated in our time. Even the official accounts of global labour relations point to a world-changing shift in our conception of the worker (Gallin, 2001; for a simultaneously depressing and energising account, see Neilson and Rossiter, 2005).

At its heart, the concept of racial capitalism is a discussion of the human consequences and organisation of capital. The primary terms of discussion centre around work and labour-power and, perhaps, markets. In our discussion we will also revisit debates about commodification and cultures of consumption, in order to put forward an account of how racial capitalism inhabits the affective structures of our time.

What this summary introduction suggests is that racial capitalism may be better understood through the terms of 'class' than through the analysis of 'capital'. Our interest is in the manner through which human populations are organised into the service of capital. Once in service, accumulation occurs in much the same way regardless of the source of value. The question is whether and how differentiated populations fall into such service.

For this reason, it is useful to look again at our conceptions of class and class formation and to think about what we mean by the term 'proletariat' from the viewpoint of the twenty-first century. Who, in the end, are the working class?

WORK AND THE WORKING CLASS

In its report on *World Employment Social Outlooks – Trends 2015*, the International Labour Organization (ILO) highlights the gap between traditional accounts of 'waged work' and the patterns of employment that are emerging and becoming embedded across the globe.

The ILO estimates that global unemployment figures reached 201 million in 2014, over 30 million higher than before the start of the global crisis in 2008.1 Moreover, providing jobs to more than 40 million additional people who enter the global labour market every year is proving to be a daunting challenge. (ILO, 2015, 1)

This is the primary point made by the ILO, the gap between those who need work and numbers of available jobs is increasing. The financial crisis of 2008 has exacerbated this issue, but it is an underlying trend that predates the crisis. The numbers of potential workers who are entering the world job market far outnumber the capacity of anyone or anything to 'create jobs'. We know that this tension has contributed to unrest. Yet, on the whole, discussions of economic development continue to focus on the miracle of paid employment as a route out of poverty (see, for example, the *World Development Report* on jobs which acknowledges the extreme variation in modes of employment, stating 'informal is normal', but continuing to task 'the private sector' with the creation of jobs to enable economic development [World Bank, 2012]).

In the same report, the ILO suggests that waged and salaried employment makes up around half of global employment and as little as 20 per cent of employment in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. For a significant proportion of the world's population, being in receipt of regular payment for work is a minority experience. Globally, of those in waged and salaried work, the ILO suggest that only 45 per cent are in full-time permanent work, so more than half of those who experience the wage cannot rely on their waged work to continue or to provide sufficient work to sustain life. Overall, the ILO suggest that worldwide only one in four workers are in what was previously considered as 'standard employment'. In parallel with this shift in the balance of working lives, the ILO identify that we have been undergoing a shortage in aggregate demand that leads to further contraction and further challenges in creating employment for a growing global population.

Does the nature of work matter? In one sense, of course, it doesn't. The working poor have not required confirmation of their working-class status in order to recognise each other or organise together—in fact, we have not yet witnessed a 'proletarian' revolution that does not encompass other poor people, most often those formerly known as 'the peasantry'.

However, the categorisation and value ascribed to different work has an impact on access to economic arenas and other associated goods, including social goods. In particular, employment law may be framed with reference to particular employment characteristics and those who do not fulfil these criteria may be left 'unprotected' (for a discussion of the concept of 'unprotected workers', see Bernhardt et al., 2009).

Overall, the ILO document shows the falling away from work which is full-time, permanent, in the formal economy towards an increasing precarious experience of waged work across the world. The promised ascent into an increasingly unified industrial working class—or even an ascent into

recognisable forms of work, as opposed to the endless innovation of precarious activities that may or may not constitute 'work'—is not the experience of the twenty-first century.

IS THIS THE END FOR THE GLOBAL WORKING CLASS?

Various commentators have pointed to the falling requirement for labour in the global economy. Some, such as Blacker (2013), link this to a kind of death drive and the overall unsustainability of capitalism in the shadow of scarce resources. Others, with less overt political affiliations, have suggested that the rise of the (almost) smart machine or machinic systems leads us into a time when human judgement no longer holds economic value, therefore eroding the last criteria for retaining human over machinic labour (Harari, 2016).

For our interests, these apocalyptic accounts should be refocused through a global lens. The history of the so-called Third World has been one of excluded would-be workers for some time. Yet, at the same time, some of the most intense tensions around access to work are arising in emerging/emerged economies. To understand why these battles might be interpreted, by some, as a dissolution of class, we must review briefly debates about the theory of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall.

The first condition of accumulation is that the capitalist must have contrived to sell his commodities, and to reconvert into capital the greater part of the money so received. (*Capital*, vol. 1, 395)

The theory of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall is extrapolated from readings of the Grundrisse. Despite the extensive debate about the statistical evidence for such a tendency at a systemic level, there is widespread acceptance that factors such as market saturation and lack of new markets is likely to lead to a fall in the rate of profit. This may occur differentially across sectors.

For our purposes, the controversy about a *general* tendency of the rate of profit to fall is not central. Our interest is in the manner of political and economic responses to the perception that profit levels cannot be maintained. This is a matter of lesser controversy, and there is considerable agreement that, in the absence of innovation and/or new markets, rates of profit are likely to fall.

For left and right, for many years the promise of innovation has been forwarded as the solution to this issue. However, in the long period still indicated by the elastic phrase 'late capitalism', the most capital-intensive regions of the world have seen falling rates of profit and the advent of so-called (perhaps now 'once-called') emerging economies has revealed the far greater dynamism and profitability arising in regions where new markets can be entered (and even 'created').

The important point for our discussion here is the recognition that both states and businesses have come to view economic expansion as having necessary limits. More than this, the economic dangers of unlimited expansion of productive forces are translated into threats to the status and profit of the world's haves. An increasing consciousness of ecological limit amplifies this sense—not necessarily by providing any support for 'green industries' but by introducing a different consciousness of scarcity and of the consequences of previous mythologies of consumer expansion without end. Alongside this, we are witnessing a contraction of the global labour market, whether in the face of technological innovation or limited resources. Taken together, these factors create a strong consciousness of limit and constraint, and this sense of scarcity adds to the will to expel some from access to coveted resources. It is this process of expulsion, an aspect of the underlying trend towards exclusion identified by Saskia Sassen (2014), that threatens to unmake the global working class.

EDGE POPULATIONS

These expelled or pushed to the edge populations are a recurring theme in this work—those on the edge of capitalist formations with occasional entry to insecure waged work and participating in the consumer markets shaped by these productive forces, yet unable to gain recognition or secure entry to the terms of capitalist citizenship in that location. This relegation to the edges of capitalist living seems a good candidate for one aspect of capitalist racialisation. It is this location

as almost included and yet on the boundary that constitutes one (often if not always) racialised economic position.

The suggestion that the terms of exclusion may change (not so unexpected a suggestion and something that is well documented) and also that the numbers excluded may increase significantly and rapidly (less usual but certainly registered in other phases of capitalist development) raises some further questions about the character of edge populations.

Most importantly, if true, the contraction of the global labour market could signal the racialised exclusion, often by violence, of increasing numbers across the world. As part of such a shift, the terms of racialised otherness become more malleable and local circumstances may shape inclusion and exclusion in relation to work and related economic activity. Importantly, access to work may not coincide with other forms of entitlement or power (see Kuhn and Shen, 2014, on employer preference for 'undocumented' workers; see Schwenken, 2005, on the role of immigration and security processes in shutting down domestic workers' access to 'rights'). The disjuncture between forms of social power and inclusion may itself lead to other violences in societies navigating scarce and contracting access to resources.

There are more established accounts of such racialised tensions in relation to changing access to resources in discussions of environmental crisis (for an overview of some recent debates, see Burrows and Kinney, 2016). However, the focus of an analysis of racial capitalism is a little more than this. Not only an account of the racialising impact of capitalism, although this is important, but also a consideration of the manner in which racialising processes become incorporated into the workings of capitalism.

There is something about the edge places of capitalism and the people who inhabit these zones that helps us to understand the role of arbitrary divisions in the functioning of capitalism. So one part, one major part, of the story of this book is the tale of such edges and the things that link the edge-places and edge-people to others who live in and through the heart of exploitation. There is something in this relation, however much the characters and location vary, that reveals the thing that it is racial capitalism.

For our purposes—the shared attempt to comprehend what is happening around us and what may be distinctive or significant about the capitalism of our time—what matters is the role of racist expropriation or categorisation in remaking populations in the service of capital *now*. As part of such a quest, there must be consideration of what has gone before and the continuing impact of what has gone before, but the primary focus is on today and tomorrow. This is not to say that there is no attention to the past, only that this is not (primarily) a historical project. That work is being done elsewhere and with far greater expertise. Racial capitalism today continues some practices of the past and builds on some key histories of expropriation and continuing inequality. However, it is not a formation that can be read as linear narrative from then to now. Other processes of expropriation enter the equation. Different populations become entangled in the terms of racialised exploitation. The benefits of analysing the workings of racial capitalism include the possibility of finding ways of showing that none of this is inevitable and could and should be changed.

THINKING AGAIN ABOUT PROLETARIANIZATION

One resistance to thinking about racial capitalism can be the sense that thinking about such a concept at all signals (admits) that the working class is divided. As such thoughts cannot be countenanced, in case this suggestion of division increases pessimism and contributes to the further immiseration of working people, some choose to focus insistently and exclusively on the actual, if underlying, unity of the proletariat.

In order to enable some point of engagement, I should say here that my interest is in describing and understanding the significance of dividing working-class populations for capitalism to 'work'. I also am heavily invested in the 'actual', if somewhat submerged, unity of the proletariat. However, simply asserting this unity while capital operates to divide and distribute us into factions that sometimes compete but, mainly, barely see each other seems at best wrong-headed. Better,

surely, to heed the reminder of Jodi Dean, following Balibar, that the process of proletarianisation is always in movement.

Rather than a static social group, *proletarianisation* is a dynamic, the process through which capitalism produces, uses up, and discards the workers it needs (a process facilitated by capitalist use of the state). (Dean, 2012, 75)

The question of how proletarianisation happens has become increasingly central to debates across the left. Dean presents one position in this debate with her proposition to consider the proletariat to be 'the rest of us', a term she uses to indicate the unbridgeable gap between the promise of 'we, the people' and the ongoing dispossession of lives under capitalism for most. It is a laudable aim, however, in the rush to demarcate political life as a constitutive antagonism in which the proletariat are in a constant process of formation and becoming, the suggestion that 'we' are becoming unified by this process makes it hard for us to think about what in the processes of class struggle in our time works to fragment 'us'. Of course, the enemies of the people, the capitalists, are doing this all the time—we accept this viewpoint in order to engage with the larger story. Yet the possibility that there is something in the processes of proletarianisation and how we conceive of proletarianisation that tells a story of both fragmentation and (potential) unification gets lost in the wish to retrieve the communist horizon. Dean herself proceeds her argument by identifying three factors in the decline of the organised working class in the United States: decline in trade union membership, 'the spread of an individualist conception of work' (75) and the internal politics of the Democratic Party. For Dean, there are two problems arising from the individualisation of work. One is the allegation, often repeated, that the distraction of issues championed by new social movements has sidelined issues of class. The other is that the individualisation of workplace grievances, particularly through the framing of law, contributed to the erosion of collective consciousness. The first allegation is the less interesting. It takes only the most cursory review of the political mobilisations of the last fifty years to see the central role taken by the 'traditional' left in many if not all mobilisations to increase or augment rights or to defend minorities or to resist state or popular violence. Equally, the quick elision between the rise of new movements and the decline of traditional working-class organisation implies a causative relation that seems unlikely. Dean herself moves on quickly to the decline of trade union membership and the transformation of the economy as other, in my view more important and plausibly causal, factors in the decline of working-class organisation.

The second allegation is more interesting because it recognises the impact of the interim victories of protective legislation on how class grievances are conceived and fought. For Dean, the move to seeking redress through law is tied to the translation of workplace grievances into complaints about discrimination, so that claims of gender and race displace the claims of class. However, much employment protection demands that claims are made on the basis of individual loss: this is as much the case for unfair dismissal as it is for discrimination. It is the framing of the legal claim as a defence against attacks on the person that individualises, not the introduction of claims against discrimination. To aid our later discussion, it is helpful to note here that workers tend not to have a legal claim against exploitation, only against exploitation that has not been undertaken according to the agreed contract.

A different kind of account of what proletarianisation means in our time is offered in the much-discussed works of Bernard Stiegler. In his celebrated and influential work, *For a New Critique of Political Economy*, Stiegler argues forcefully for a rethinking of the terms of political economy, taking the 2008 financial crisis as a signal of a longer demise in one phase of economic formation, what he describes as 'the end of the consumerist model' (4).

Stiegler presents a kind of addiction or wilful denial on the part of governing classes who attempt to rectify the impact of the financial crisis of 2008 by increasing 'investment' in order to stimulate consumption. In his (very convincing) account, the consumerist model represents 'an industrial model based on the automobile, on oil, and on the construction of highway networks, as well as on the Hertzian networks of the culture industries' (Stiegler, 2010, 4).

This is the economic formation that has revealed its obsolescence in the moment of the financial crisis. Neither the industrial dynamic nor the possibility of extending the consumption associated with such products and practices retain the potential to bring salvation. Stiegler presents such an intoxicating promise, that of insight into the coming moment, that it can be hard to pull back to more mundane concerns about, say, the quality of work.

However, this level of abstraction assists us in refocusing on the central questions of racial capitalism. If we have spent too much energy berating the unacceptable working conditions borne by racialised groups, have we not again fallen into the trap of lobbying, despite ourselves, for a more humane exploitation? There is a need to register the excessive dehumanisation of some groups as an illuminating symptom of racial capitalism without falling into framing demands from the insights of such a critique.

For our purposes, therefore, a central question raised by Stiegler revolves around proletarianisation in a time when the consumerist model is in terminal decline. Importantly for our discussion, Stiegler moves away from a focus on the *proletariat*, preferring an analysis of proletarianisation. As we have moved from the productionist model of capitalism and are witnessing the implosion of the consumerist model, this is not framed as a process arising from any particular work status. Instead, Stiegler argues that

it will also include *savoir-vivre*, that is, behavior in general, from user profiling to the grammatization of affects—all of which will lead toward the 'cognitive' and 'cultural' capitalism of the hyper industrial *service* economies. (Stiegler, 2010, 33)

This is an account of proletarianisation that ranges across populations. Our contact with capitalism, as workers, as consumers and as inhabitants who refract so much of our lives through the infrastructures of commodification, means that the loss of the knowledge of how to live infects us all. We might consider that for some, such a loss takes place as an outcome of displacement or as a by-product of the loss of a previous habit of life or due to the violent exclusion from the means of life. The loss of 'savour-vivre' also arises in these more particular contexts of racialised violence and what is lost—the knowledge to navigate the terms of life—may indicate both the limitations of consumption (in the mismatch between access and need) and the invasive intrusion of consumption (so that all knowledge of how to live is replaced, including the knowledge of what we like so that even our own preferences are suggested to us). In the discussion to follow we will return to this question of populations who are differentiated through processes of consumption as well as through the organisation of production.

ECOLOGICAL CRISIS AND RACIAL CAPITALISM

This is the back-drop to racial capitalism in our time, and I suggest that it is this consciousness of scarcity that informs an escalating rush to divide humanity into the worthy and the disposable. Racial capitalism provides both a set of techniques and a logic for such differentiation. In the process, economics may ride alongside governance and/or war and/or ecological collapse. However, in each case, human beings are imagined as of differing worth and of differing usefulness.

The consciousness of entering a phase of limited resources and limited expansion infects our time. When the International Monetary Fund warns the world that we will be 'toasted, roasted and grilled', this can be understood as the official view of the global stewards of international capitalism. While no-one is suggesting that the workings of global capitalism reflect human (or other) consciousness, the collective impact of the knowledge of ecological limitation becomes part of the world of economics.

At the most conspiratorial, this can be told as the moment when many of us become surplus to the requirements of capital. We might be useful as consumers but the dangers posed by ecological limitation mean that not all populations can be maintained as useful consumer markets. Instead of the push, so long imagined and planned for, to absorb all humanity into capitalist circuits of production, now it is clear that this over-reach cannot be sustained. In a world still riven by the deep divisions of the colonial era, the economic planning of the affluent world must be adjusted to maintain relative privilege and survival rather than to maximise profit alone.

If there is one overwhelming point of difference about capitalism in our moment, it is the realisation of ecological limit. While geologists may herald a new knowledge of the Anthropocene, there is also an additional shift which arises from the consciousness of human impact on a world that is not endlessly extendable or renewable. I want to argue that there is something about the emergence of an ecological sensibility that informs the racial capitalism of the twenty-first century. In saying this, I am not suggesting that there is consensus about the extent or reality of ecological crisis—we know that climate change denial has emerged as a new industry against regulation (predictably linked to other dubious lobbies against the 'big state'). However, the impact of environmental crisis constrains the expansionary fantasies of our time, and this consciousness makes our time unlike any other that has gone before.

ACCUMULATION BY DISPOSSESSION AND THE RETURN OF PRIMITIVE ACCUMULATION

There has been a resurgent interest in the concept of primitive accumulation in recent years. One thoughtful survey of such debates suggests that of the major literature in this field, all but *Das Kapital* had been published since the year 2000. We might think, then, of the twenty-first century as the century when we rediscovered primitive accumulation as an ongoing process within and alongside capitalist development and not an early and long-completed historical moment that precedes capitalism as we know it. This, in essence, has been the central argument of the revisiting of primitive accumulation as a concept.

Primitive accumulation has been identified as a central process in the remaking of the map of the global economy. This is the machinery of neo-colonialism in our time, allegedly. For some this is explicitly a continuation of earlier forms of neo-colonialism. It is global corporate interests that initiate the dispossession of the world's poor, from land, from natural resources and, in some accounts, from public services. This is work that describes populations forcibly exited from noncapitalist forms of being, such as small-scale agrarianism, but not positioned to enter any other mode of economic being. They are proletarianised in the sense that they are stripped of resources but cannot enter any alternative economy. Harvey summarises,

What accumulation by dispossession does is to release a set of assets (including labour power) at very low (and in some instances zero) cost. Overaccumulated capital can seize hold of such assets and immediately turn them to profitable use. (Harvey, 2003, 149)

The framing of accumulation by dispossession has re-ignited debate about the manner in which the poor continue to be dispossessed by processes of capital accumulation. It is this conceptual framework more than any other that has inspired a renewed interest in the interweaving of economics, coercion and theft.

In his very thorough review of the take-up of the concept of primitive accumulation and accumulation by dispossession in debates about global land grabs, Derek Hall summarises three key foci of discussion.

Dispossessory responses to capitalist crises, the use of extra economic means of capital accumulation, and the creation, expansion and reproduction of capitalist social relations. (Hall, 2013, 1598)

Hall argues that some of the assumptions embedded in analyses of contemporary primitive accumulation imply that 'people dispossessed by land grabs were previously and straightforwardly "outside" capitalism' (Hall, 2013, 1596).

He carries on to explain,

The danger here, put starkly, is that drawing on Marx's analysis of primitive accumulation may make us assume that people being dispossessed today live under the same conditions as did the mediaeval English peasantry. . . . One of the great strengths of the primitive accumulation framework is its analysis of the centuries long process by which capitalism has become truly global, but the framework can simultaneously encourage us to ignore the effects of that history of capitalist expansion on the places where land grabs are now taking place. (Hall, 2013, 1597)

In part Hall is seeking to question the appropriateness of the term 'primitive accumulation' for processes that clearly dispossess but may not signal an 'expansion' of capitalism by forcing access to resources that previously lay somehow outside capitalism.

It is a simple but essential point. The world beyond or at the edge of or alongside global capitalism is not frozen in aspic. Economic accounts can imply that history only begins with the encounter with capitalism—with spaces beyond capitalist production portrayed as in a state of arrested development, awaiting the awakening kiss of mechanisation. Yet the reach of global capitalism also remakes the spaces alongside. Perhaps the spaces alongside also reshape the patterns of capitalism development. What emerges is a capitalism with global but uneven and differentiating reach. The racialised differentiations of global capitalism that we inhabit arise from this interplay.

This could be understood as one scale of the map of racial capitalism, in many ways the easiest to see. In an account of the impact of being rendered 'surplus' through processes of accumulation by dispossession, Li pursues the logic of 'letting die' articulated by Agamben and in the framing of necropolitics.

Letting die, I want to stress, is not a counterfactual. . . . Letting die is not an apocalypse. It is not a media event, like a massacre, an earthquake, or a famine that kills large numbers in a compressed period of time. Nor is it a Malthusian problem of inadequate global food supply. It is a stealthy violence that consigns large numbers of people to lead short and limited lives. (Li, 2010, 66)

The account presented is heart-rending, but also in continuity with many other accounts of the 'letting die' of so-called surplus populations, most of all in the echo of Gilmore's summary of racism as 'state-sanctioned and/or extra-legal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death' (Gilmore, 2007, 28). However, the ease with which we have come to use the phrase 'surplus population' itself can represent an internalisation of the logic of usefulness and of disposability. Li addresses the difficulties of this term, as if with repetition we are confirming the dehumanisation of these others who are reduced to the status of flotsam and jetsam, but she argues,

the truth is that large numbers are in fact abandoned. Some are kept alive in prisons, refugee camps and ghettos, but they are not being prepared for work, as they were in the workhouses of industrializing Britain. . . . The key to their predicament is that their labour is surplus *in relation to* its utility for capital. (Li, 2010, 68)

This is another recurring question for this work: Is it possible that some populations represent no 'utility' for capital, and if so, what does this mean for all of our lives? The consequences of becoming 'surplus' are fear-inducing. Although human communities have fought to retain the means of life and recent history shows many examples of dispossessed groups hanging on to the means of life by the thinnest of threads, no-one doubts that becoming surplus is a process that brings pain and threatens death. When the resource-grabs of this age of ecological crisis mobilise existing chauvinism and/or lesser status, the outcomes can be extreme violence and ethnic cleansing. When so-called surplus populations are displaced, new dynamics of racial capitalism remake the global map, new battles for resources come into play. Once again, capitalism remakes the world as a war for survival, squatting in the human capacities for hatred and for co-existence, ready to use either one.

In this work, I try to argue that differentiating processes that have played a key role in capitalist development have been socially enacted as racialisation. The double process of incorporating some populations as workers or potential workers, while expelling others as non-workers or occasional workers or invisible workers, disciplines the boundaries of economic space allocating lesser (let us say 'racialised') status to excluded groups. This process can attach to different groups, with changing demarcations of membership. A previously elevated status may be no defence against relegation. We may be witnessing the expulsion of greater numbers into the most uncertain edge spaces of capitalism.

Today's poverty is not a product of exploitation within production, but rather an exclusion from production. Anyone who is still employed in regular capitalist production counts among the relatively privileged. The problematic and 'dangerous' bulk of society is no longer defined by its 'position in the productive process' but by its position in secondary, derivative areas of circulation and distribution. This social segment is comprised of the permanently unemployed, recipients of social assistance or cheaply outsourced service-sector workers, which extends to 'poverty contractors', street-merchants and junk collectors. These forms of reproduction are, in view of legal standards, increasingly irregular; incomes in these sectors hover at a level that barely covers the minimums for survival or even fall below this border. (Kurz, n.d., 1)

Yet despite this rapid movement, the attribution of race continues to arise as an explanation for the degradation of some and as a (perhaps forlorn) hope for the protection of others. The rest of our discussion will focus on the manner in which racialisation is deployed as a differentiating force that (temporarily) defends some and relegates others in times of extreme turbulence and uncertainty.

ALWAYS TOO LATE

There has been a revival of interest in the question of racial capitalism in recent years, triggered in large part by the amplification of racialised forms of dispossession in a time of a changing capitalist crisis. My work seeks to contribute to this discussion, as always, a little too late. Here I indicate some key aspects of these other recent accounts of racial/ised capitalism to show the continuities between our accounts, and also to identify one point of disagreement.

In a piece introducing a new journal dedicated to critical ethnic studies, Jodi Melamed extends Ruth Wilson Gilmore's famous account of racism as the production of vulnerability to premature death to present racial capitalism 'as a technology of antirelationality (a technology for reducing collective life to the relations that sustain neoliberal democratic capitalism)' (Melamed, 2015, 78). My own attempt to outline the characteristics of racial capitalism in our time echoes that of Melamed in key aspects. However, whereas Melamed builds on Gilmore to describe a network of 'antirelationality' that divides populations while connecting them, she also presents an account of capitalism as inevitably 'racial' and, it seems, incorporating all populations albeit in relations of differentiation.

Nikhil Pal Singh also implies the inevitability of a racial capitalism that extends to all humanity (eventually?). His truly wonderful and highly instructive revisiting of concepts of primitive accumulation traces the manner in which Marx's conceptualisation of primitive accumulation must skirt around the role of Atlantic slavery in underpinning capitalist expansion (Singh, 2016). Singh proposes a corrective amendment to Marx's summary of the capital-labour relation:

Capital ceases to be capital without the ongoing differentiation of free labor and slavery, waged labor and unpaid labor. (Singh, 2016, 51, italics in original)

Both Melamed and Singh present careful revisitings of the emergence and continuation of capitalist forms of production in order to illuminate the racialised divisions that continue to legitimise extreme violence and dispossession despite the claims of (fast waning) liberal democracies.

Unfortunately (for me), I did not know of Nancy Fraser's suggestive outline of racialised capitalism and differing regimes of accumulation until very late in my own writing process. Fraser proposes an understanding of capitalism based on three 'exes'—exchange, exploitation and expropriation. Whereas Marx sought to uncover the secret of exploitation that was obscured by the respectable fictions of exchange, Fraser argues that expropriation, 'accumulation by other means' (Fraser, 2016b, 166), is more submerged still. In common with Melamed and Singh, Fraser also returns to concepts of primitive accumulation in order to argue that violent expropriation in the name of accumulation continues as an ongoing and never-ending process, that is, that this is not a stage to be superseded but constitutes an unavoidable element of accumulation processes. This symbiotic relationship between exploitation and expropriation indicates the divisions of racialisation, described in Du Bois's formulation as 'the colour line'.

However, Fraser argues that we can understand the circumstances necessary for some to be relegated to the unprotected status where expropriation becomes possible,

only by thematizing the political order of capitalist society that we can grasp the constitution of that distinction—and its correlation with the color line. (Fraser, 2016b, 169)

Without an account of political order, we cannot grasp the processes that relegate some to lesser and less protected status. At times, such as in formally segregated societies, this demarcation of lesser status has been enshrined in law while also augmented by an array of non-official violence. In others, the failure of the state to extend protection and equal treatment to some groups leaves them vulnerable to expropriation. In all cases, it is politics that allocates people to differential status in the economy.

This work echoes the considerable insights of Melamed, Singh and Fraser. Our concerns overlap and I am only sorry that I come to their work so late in the day. My consolation is the realisation that my preoccupations have been shared by others, although, of course, the weaknesses in my account are mine alone. However, I have realised also that each of these other accounts assumes that all human life will be, perhaps already has been, folded into processes of accumulation in one way or another. On this point, I am not so sure. Although we are living through a time when capitalism has developed increasingly diffuse processes by which to extract value, I am not sure that humanity can be divided into those subject to exploitation and those suffering expropriation. At the very least, it seems necessary to acknowledge another 'ex', that of expulsion (I take this term from Saskia Sassen's suggestive book, 2014). These are the populations who are rendered surplus and represent no 'utility', those who, for whatever reason, are expelled from possibilities of exploitation and of expropriation. In a time of ecological crisis, populations already depleted by exploitation or expropriation or both become increasingly vulnerable to expulsion. The racial capitalism that I seek to chart includes these three interlocking regimes—exploitation, expropriation, expulsion.

Throughout this work I have tried to hold on to the reminder from Patrick Wolfe that colonialists did not seek to institute a system of racialised hierarchy and exclusion—their interest was in getting rich, everything else is a by-product. My guess is that all systems of racialised hierarchy and exclusion are similar in that they are not ends in themselves but outcomes of processes where some or other interest has been pursued. Often this has been the quest to gain territory, resources and wealth. However, the reminder is as important in relation to instances where the ostensible reasoning for racialised violence and expropriation is mistaken, such as the belief that erasing heathens will bring you closer to your god/s. It is hard to think of any system of racist domination that does not operate through a larger logic, whatever we may think of the basis of such reasoning. No system of racist violence occurs in the manner of the pre-thought reflex of crushing a scurrying spider, although the processes of such expropriation and violence may seek to institute ways of living and thinking that naturalise responses of non-empathy and disgust.

Sanyal's careful account of phases of capitalist hegemony in relation to development offers a way of thinking about the creation of a space posited as beyond capitalism and yet as an outcome of capitalism and in thrall, indirectly, to the logic of accumulation. Although Sanyal's interest is the manner in which orthodoxies of economic development retain global hegemony by seeking to recognise and include populations who have not and will not be absorbed into the processes of capitalist production, as was imagined by earlier phases of development-talk, his formulation allows us to think about the manner in which capitalism differentiates populations while also recuperating diverse economic activity into the logic of accumulation. Racial capitalism is a shorthand phrase to describe this pattern across settings—the emergence of a space apart or alongside or within capitalist space. The separateness may be fictional and maintained only with the help of cultures of racism. Yet thinking of the processes that give rise to this differentiation can help us to understand how and why some racisms feed capitalism and of how capitalism enables some racisms.

I began this work in order to consider the repercussions and continuing existence of racial capitalism in our time. The project arises from the belief that the historical sedimentation of

racialised disadvantage and exploitation must shape the economic formations of today in some manner. At the same time, the events of the early twenty-first century remind us all again of the economic ramifications of racism, including in spaces that wish to proclaim post-racialism and in those spaces where factors other than race appear to take centre stage.

However, and it is important to state this, this work also begins from a sense of uncertainty about the place of racism in different moments of the history of capitalism. In particular, the work seeks to reflect my own sense that just because it was so, that is not to say that it was necessarily so. In this, I am influenced by the work of Gibson-Graham among others and the suggestion that one aspect of capitalocentric thought is to naturalise the components and trajectory of capitalist development. I do not believe that the laws of capitalism are unchanging and predictable across time and space. Instead, this is an account that leans heavily on a range of quirky Marxists in order to highlight, where possible, the extreme contingency of historical outcomes. Nothing need be like this necessarily, but our task is to see more clearly why such events may be significant and to understand a little more about both how events are formed and of how they leave a trace in what follows. Nothing is written and yet, at the same time, nothing can be unwritten.

Social Reproduction
Gender, Racism, Nature

In the first decades of the twenty-first century, the resurgence of authoritarian movements coupled with the environmental crisis refocuses attention on the racialised implications of social reproduction. Who is reproduced and for what ends become questions of population control and not only (if they ever were) a matter of feeding the formal economy.

Both the barely forgotten battles about the threatened 'browning' of America (for a discussion of the collapsing of a number of racialised fears under the term 'browning', see Sundstrom, 2008), and the toxic warnings of a coming 'Eurabia' (see Carr, 2006; Larsson, 2012), as well as longstanding fertility panics embodied in the trope of the welfare mother (Hancock, 2004), reveal the fear that the wrong kinds of population will be reproduced. The racist mythology underlying all of these fears stems from the assertion that the body belongs to the racially lesser, that fecundity is itself a racial characteristic and that, like weeds, these people can reproduce in the most inhospitable of circumstances. Allowed free access to the means of life, racially privileged groups will be overwhelmed within a few generations.

What links these frightened stories is the presentation of scarce resources as a racialised battle for survival. The lesson for those enjoying racialised privilege and economic power is that both statuses might be threatened by the numbers of those subject to both subordination and (hyper)exploitation. The quest to maximise the benefits of exploitation must be balanced against the dangers of allowing this rush of reproduction—maintaining racialised economic privilege (and this may the only kind of economic privilege there is for us) requires a limiting of economic expansion in the interests of racialised hegemony.

HOW TO CONCEIVE OF REPRODUCTIVE LABOUR

The underlying story of all capitalist development is that of what lies underneath. Who washes the dishes and makes the beds, who cooks the meals and raises the children—all so that the demon Capital may have bodies to serve his endlessly hungry needs?

Of course, the answer has been, for as long as answers have been offered—women. Workaday wives and doting mothers, put-upon sisters, almost invisible spinsters, aunties and whores, mammies and ayahs, maids and lovers and landladies galore. All of them remaking the bruised bodies that must recuperate enough for work tomorrow.

The punchline of this tale, so old it does not even merit a groan, is that none of this is 'work'. Perhaps somewhere a little money changes hands and the activity it rewards can blink into visibility for a moment. Perhaps some are able to transfer the long practice of domestic skills into something called the 'labour market', and through this transaction make the business of love and duty into 'real work'. But in the main, this is the stuff that precedes 'work', or underlies it or runs alongside to make the stuff of economics possible.

We have known all of this. Unpaid women's work is the supplement enabling the continuation of all human life, an observation becoming more, not less, apparent with time, as the business of reproducing everyday life is revealed as the most labour-intensive of activities. However, the extensive discussion of reproductive labour as women's work has remained tied largely to the idea that human beings are reproduced in the relatively private spaces of the family and also that the reproduction of human beings is a matter of reproducing productive workers. For our interest in racial capitalism, both implications demand greater attention.

What if we begin to imagine networks of human and other life which sustain each other, including through care and through subsistence work, and in the process some may be equipped to enter waged work but this is neither the only nor the central outcome? Could reproductive labour be a far wider ecological matter in which the drudgery of housework plays only one part? This bringing together of domestic labour and the other unregistered values of nature (and society?) has been a renewed focus of debate among feminist scholars and activists (Bear et al., 2015). This is work

that reminds us that the invention of the 'productive economy' obscures the far longer history of social reproduction as the business of life (Federici, 2004). From these discussions, we learn again of the conglomeration of inputs that remake life, including our underlying dependency on collective activity, non-human resources and, most importantly of all, the interfeed between these two arenas.

If we imagine economic life in these terms, then the subordinated or excised role of racialised (non-)labour may be understood quite differently.

Human beings encounter capital collectively, even if that collectivity has not been articulated yet and is experienced as the rush of the crowd. Some parts of life may be more individuated or sliced into smaller segments, a circle of friends or a huddle of loved ones. But the encounter with economic forces, that is a group experience. We may come to it alone, but this is a process that is never ours alone. The whole point is that other multitudes also live like this, through this, with these constraints and these demands.

REPRODUCING THE WORLD

Thinking about reproduction demands that we think about how human beings come into the world and what they are able to be once there. Understandably, this has been a debate that focuses primarily on the role of women. This is the arena of domestic labour. That place where the hidden, dirty and endlessly essential work of replenishing bodies and lives takes place. However, to locate this hidden arena of the economy only in the home and in the battle between sexes serves to occlude the complex structures that have enabled the global reproduction of capital. Some of the most influential work in this field begins through an explicit charting of the connections between colonisation and the subjugation of women (Mies, 1986; Federici, 2004). Not, it must be understood, figuratively. This is not work that conceives of the colonial encounter as a metaphor for the subjugation of women. For Mies and for Federici, colonial exploitation is the parallel process to the invisibilisation of women and their work.

This chapter is an attempt to think again about global reproduction, building on these insights. It is also an attempt to bring together the insights of feminist scholars and the other debate about racialisation and racialised divisions to enhance our understanding of capitalism's shadow underside.

Central to the chapter is the question of what should be included in our conception of reproductive labour. Certainly, the business of maintaining households for waged workers and also the creation of the next generation of potential waged labour. However, this longstanding understanding of reproductive work as centred around individual and atomised households has been criticised for so narrow an understanding of what is needed to remake human life. The narrowing is itself an aspect of tying women's work into oppressively privatised spaces and narrowing human life to no more than the creation of functionaries for an external economy.

To focus the terms of social reproduction solely at the level of household and family is to naturalise, again, the terms of capitalism. Both collective and non-human elements of reproduction become invisible, while our attention is focused on the reproduction of the individual/ised waged worker, as if each one of us is coaxed back to humanness only and exclusively in the space of an idealised private sphere.

What is lost in such an account is a recognition of the non-individuated aspects of social reproduction and the sources of value that these aspects represent. The conceptualisation of collective consumption has centred on state actions, indicating forms of social good that must be consumed collectively but positing the state as purchaser (Pinch, 2014). In feminist revisitings of social reproduction as a collective process, the state can remain the key imagined actor, overseeing and juggling a range of 'labour' but with little thought of activities beyond 'labour' or of inputs beyond the human (Luxton and Bezanson, 2006). This oversight becomes more surprising when we remember the unintended recognition of collective reproduction present in colonial discourse depicting encounters with 'empty territory'.

For our interest in the place of racialised division and exploitation in the formation of capitalism, this question is central. The hidden and unvalued work that surrounds and precedes waged

labour, and which allows waged labour to be possible, is a matter at the heart of how humanity comes to be divided and allocated differential value. However, to relinquish our conception of 'life' to the demands of productive work, imagining reproduction to relate primarily or only to the activity needed to remake contributions and contributors to the formal economy, is to miss much of what remakes life. My hope here is that revisiting questions relating to what must occur not only for waged work but also for life to be possible will help us to see the contours of contemporary racial capitalism more clearly.

WORK AND NON-WORK

The perceived boundary between work and non-work goes to the heart of the practices of differentiation for exploitation and expropriation that make up racial capitalism. In fact, we may take this as one focus of our wider discussion. If one account of the development of capitalism suggests that there is an inexorable trend towards the homogenisation of the labour force (and we may add now, perhaps also the population of consumers) then racial capitalism might be a name for the manner in which workers and working populations are divided and differentiated in the service of capital. Racial capitalism is the conceptual framework through which to understand all the ways in which labour does not become interchangeable.

Yet even in this (only slightly tidier) summary, the divisions of racial capitalism are implied to be among and between labour. A certain sureness in the world of work remains—as if work is self-evident and what is known and it is only the differentiations of status between workers that should concern us. What is added by a more attentive and concerted engagement with feminism (again, of course particular feminisms, the feminisms most embedded in the battles of class and race and ecology) is a way of thinking again about how some human activity is delineated as 'work' and some is not.

THE PLACE OF FREE VALUE

Much work has been done already on the role of violent expropriation in the formation of capitalism (Glassman, 2006; De Angelis, 2001). These debates around the terms of primitive accumulation are present in the founding texts of Marxism and in a longer scholarship that charts the essential role played by imperialism and slavery in financing European development (Frank, 2011; Wallerstein, 2011). To this extent, it is accepted that racialised violence has formed the backdrop to capitalist expansion and this violence has been a source of value. Yet one experience of the edge populations of more recent racial capitalism consists of the extent to which their own social reproduction is relegated to a space beyond or alongside the wage economy.

Those subordinated by the operation of racial capitalism may be excluded from the formal wage economy or may be relegated to lower paid and/or lower status work or may be able to access only fleeting forms of waged work or a varying combination of these experiences. All of these positionings jeopardise the processes of social reproduction, both for individual 'households', more extended family groupings and for communities or neighbourhoods. This is one trait of racial capitalism—the greater and often extreme challenges faced by some groups in the quest to continually remake the means of life. Whereas previously this might have been considered to be a phase in the process of proletarianisation, renewed discussion of concepts of primitive accumulation suggests that there may be no entry to formal waged work or that such work may be intermittent (for some examples, see Munslow, 2011; Bayat, 2000).

At the same time, processes of racial capitalism may distribute economic opportunities and outcomes along racially demarcated lines and, perhaps as a by-product, confirm cultures of inequality that also perpetuate systematic racialised discrimination and disadvantage in other arenas of work. Necessarily, these varying exclusions impact on the means of everyday life, calling up greater and perhaps more varied need from the spaces of replenishment deemed 'non-work'. We might consider this to be another variety of depletion through social reproduction, so that the expenditure of effort and resources required to remake bodies, households and communities are depleted by external demands and too limited access to necessary resources (Rai, Hoskyns and Thomas, 2013). The social reproduction of those disadvantaged by racial

capitalism—that is, not all of those who may be exploited but those who are relegated to the edges of the labour market or to periodic exclusion from the labour market or to a subordinated position in the labour market—requires additional input, to compensate for the components of life that occasional or non-existent or depleted wages will not cover and perhaps also to remake a sense of humanness in the face of the particular dehumanisations of racism.

While development-speak has taught us to term such activity among, say, slum-dwellers or those displaced into camps as 'the informal economy' (for a discussion of some of these debates, see Roy, 2005), it is useful to remember other, less technically inclined accounts of similar processes. For example, the invocation by bell hooks of 'homeplace' seeks to name processes of replenishment that resist racist dehumanisation and exceed exploitative relations and also of a home that remakes our sense of self against the ravages of capital, as opposed to in its service (hooks, 1990). This amplifies black feminism's reminder that 'home', despite its many threats and tensions, also represents a necessary space of emotional recuperation in the face of dehumanisation, depletion and racist terror.

The degradations and depletions of racial capitalism require someone else to remake undervalued bodies and to soothe broken psyches. This may not mean that such replenishment is valued or recognised or that the transactions of the wage, when it exists, include resources for such replenishment. However, in the manner suggested by Federici (2012), the impetus for the labour of this remaking and replenishment is not to prepare again for the onslaught of the labour market. Instead the labour of remaking human beings against the battering of racial capitalism takes place for the far more usual reasons of love, care, community, survival.

This is, of course and as usual, a domain overwhelmingly occupied by women.

PATRIARCHAL ACCUMULATION AS A BLUEPRINT FOR RACIAL CAPITALISM

My inspiration for revisiting these arguments about the underlying exploitations that must take place for capitalist accumulation to be possible arise from another paradigm-shifting work, Maria Mies's breath-taking *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*. In this work, Mies puts forward a re-reading of capitalist development that places the unacknowledged labours of women at the heart of accumulation.

My own reconstruction of racial capitalism is less decisive. I cannot suggest so total an account or argue in good faith that all capitalism is racist in the manner that Mies argues that all capitalism is patriarchal. Instead, there is something about the approach that Mies employs to construct her argument that offers techniques of understanding that are useful for the project in hand.

Among Mies's many useful insights, her pithy explanation of the need to think in terms of exploitation when discussing the position of women allows us to think again about the framework through which to view racisms. Mies, critiquing some other feminist thinkers, argues that matters of oppression and/or subordination cannot be understood without 'reference to exploitation' (Mies, 1986, 36), because without an account of the interests involved we become stuck in ideas of culture or ideology which cannot be explained without 'the notion of some inborn aggressive or sadistic tendencies in men' (Mies, 1986, 2014, 36).

We might substitute for 'men', 'whites' or 'citizens' or, a little more carefully, 'dominant racial groups' and the warning against naturalising dominance holds. While the irrationality of much racism is important to recognise, it is helpful to think of this as an *imagined* instrumentalism. Accounts of bad behaviour which do not reference material (or perhaps symbolic) benefit to the perpetrator are vulnerable to naturalising narratives. In order to address this, Mies proposes a revision and extension of concepts of exploitation that will uncover the place of patriarchal exploitation in capitalist accumulation.

It is my thesis that capitalism cannot function without patriarchy, that the goal of this system, namely the never-ending process of capital accumulation, cannot be achieved unless patriarchal man-woman relations are maintained or newly created. . . . As capitalism is necessarily patriarchal it would be misleading to talk of two separate systems. (Mies, 1986, 2014, 38)

I am exhilarated by Mies's ability to synthesise feminist critiques of innovations in the exploitation of women and accounts of a changing global capitalism, but I am more doubtful about the scale of claims that can made for a racial capitalism, not least because some are destined to live outside the relations of exploitation. In fact, this possibility is included in Mies's account of the unseen work that underlies capitalist formations, but in her account all so-called non-work becomes the underpinning of the extraction of surplus value. As new generations revisit the question of social reproduction in times of increasing precarity, they too assert the necessary supplement represented by non-work (for a wonderful collection showcasing recent writing on social reproduction, see Bhattacharya, 2017; for an equally inspiring collection that examines the everyday detail of reproduction, see Meehan and Strauss, 2015). The expansive account of capitalist exploitation offered by Mies extends to connect the exploitation of women, of nature and of the colonies—and it is, significantly, this triple formation that she centres in her account of what must be overcome.

Feminism has to struggle against all capitalist-patriarchal relations, beginning with the man-woman relation, to the relation of human beings to nature, to the relation between metropolis and colonies. It cannot hope to reach its goal by only concentrating on one of these relations, because they are interrelated. (Mies, 1986, 2014, 38)

For our discussion of racial capitalism, this conceptualisation of the interrelated exploitations of those and of that considered 'a natural resource' is important. The three forms of expropriation operate differently, yet the claim that they intersect and contribute to each other uncovers the continuities between these processes of occluding the source of value. Mies argues that this continuity arises from the manner in which value is taken, a mode of exploitation that runs above and beyond the expropriation of the wage.

In contrast to Marx, I consider the capitalist production process as one which comprises both: the superexploitation of non-wage labourers (women, colonies, peasants) upon which wage labour exploitation then is possible. I define their exploitation as superexploitation because it is not based on the appropriation (by the capitalist) of the time and labour over and above the 'necessary' labour time, the surplus labour, but of the time and labour necessary for people's own survival or subsistence production. (Mies, 1986, 48)

This, then, is a way of thinking about the living death of the necropolitans and an insight into what characterises 'surplus' populations. This squeezing dry of the very terms of maintaining life goes beyond the imbalances of waged labour and, as we understand from the renewed discussions of accumulation by dispossession, are 'mainly determined by force or coercive institutions' (Mies, 48). In the account presented by Mies, the processes of proletarianisation as the extension of waged work run alongside a process of housewifisation, the processes by which non-waged work is harnessed to accumulation.

Housewifization means the externalisation, or ex-territorialization of costs which otherwise would have to be covered by the capitalists. This means women's labour is considered a natural resource, freely available like air and water. (Mies, 1986, 110)

In the division between productive economy and natural resources, the labour of those subordinated by race or gender can be transformed into the stuff of nature. In this transformation, the minimal protections of economic contract cease to apply and the distinction between exploitation and violence can be collapsed. Although beyond the contractual exchanges of the wage, those subject to housewifisation constitute the unacknowledged supplement necessary for accumulation.

Much of the discussion that follows circles back to this central question. If capitalism swallows the world, is all economic activity incorporated into global capitalism? This is not to dispute that noncapitalist forms of work continue or that there are arenas beyond the reach of capitalist modes of production; however, it is a question about the direction of capitalist voracity and a question about whether all the outcomes of human endeavour might be incorporated into capitalist forms of production eventually.

WHY FOCUS ON REPRODUCTIVE LABOUR

Of course, debates about the value and visibility of reproductive labour have arisen through the concerted efforts of feminist scholars and activists. This, we may have understood, is a debate about the gendered divisions of work—not about racialisation at all, or only tangentially (for some mind-altering ideas about the organisation of care, see such innovators as Lutz, 2011, on the new maids of the transnational economy; Parrenas, 2015, on migrant domestic workers). One outcome of this innovation is that there is a considerable literature describing the role of poor and migrant women in enabling the entry of middle-class women into the workforce (for some examples, see Lutz, 2016; Triandafyllidou, 2016; Giles, Preston and Romero, 2014).

In brief, this debate posits the paid work of (relatively) class-privileged women from the affluent world as sufficiently lucrative to warrant the subsidy of bought-in domestic labour. In an internalisation of market rhetoric, such women are considered to have been bought out of domestic work in order to be free to engage in better-paid and higher-status work. Other women with lesser status then undertake the domestic labour necessary to maintain the households of the more privileged women—and receive a (low) wage for this.

Descriptively, this has indeed been the pattern for some affluent households, in both the global North and the global South (Yeates, 2004).

This work on global care chains has taught us to see the outsourcing of domestic and care-work that underlies the shift into higher-status paid work for some women in affluent economies. Here racialised divisions play a role in positioning women differently and enabling a kind of naturalised order of status and entitlement that hardens the devaluing of care and domestic work. As with some other 'dirty and dangerous' work associated with migrants and minorities, care and domestic work may be the paid work that is available to such disenfranchised groups. At the same time, in ever racialised cultures, the concentration of such lesser beings in this area of work also serves to confirm the low status of this form of work (for a discussion of Zimbabwean care-workers in the United Kingdom and the increasingly racialised status of care-work, see McGregor, 2007).

The allegation has been that migrant domestic work subsidises the first world household, creating the basis on which (some) more affluent women can enter elite labour markets. However, we know that this direct subsidy involves relatively few households. There may be an increase in the numbers of migrant women performing childcare and domestic work for non-migrant women in affluent economies, but the more usual outcome for women of all racialised statuses when engaging in paid work is the double/triple shift of waged work/housework/care-work (for an account that shows women in all ethnic and class groups performing a significantly greater portion of housework than men, but with greater contributions from Caribbean and Asian men, see Kan and Laurie, 2016).

Although the dynamics and characterisations accompanying the domestic work of migrant women may offer a kind of exemplary text of the racialised outsourcing of reproductive labour, this is a text exemplary in its symbolism. The particular dynamic of this chain of care, organised around a series of wage contracts and other transactions—first-world employer employing first-world woman, first-world woman employing third-world woman, third-world woman sending remittances and/or employing another third-world woman—is explicit in the payment for each component of caring work. The supplementary role of migrant and/or racialised labour in the day-to-day collective remaking of the workforce, whether that be first-world proletariat or elite high-flyers, is less easy to chart. The direct contribution to remaking a household is easily visible, but the more diffuse supplementarity that occurs through the subordination of some in the workforce, that is far harder to assess.

And yet. It is hard to witness the myriad processes that work to siphon value, wealth, resources, human worth away from the poor world to the rich and not feel that somehow this multiple theft is not also a factor in remaking life and consigning to death.

To consider what the process of indirect supplementation might be, we need to remember again why reproductive labour has remained an awkward mystery in accounts of the 'productive' economy. Proponents of feminist political economy have offered a framework for thinking that

also extends to an analysis of racial capitalism. Among these contributions is the important conceptual building block represented by reframing economy as occurring through 'productive-reproductive' relationships. Writing in relation to the Malaysian experience of so-called market reforms, Elias summarises this framing:

Bringing a concern with gender into discussions of the labour market necessitates that we appreciate more thoroughly how market reforms are embedded within 'productive-reproductive' relationships—those social relations of reproduction centred on the household that are ignored in conventional economic analysis. An awareness of the centrality of both gender and social relations of reproduction to the functioning of the market economy is a key feature of feminist (or 'gendered') political economy. (Elias, 2009, 470)

There is a more particular insight here—hidden in the throwaway phrase 'market economy'. The practices undertaken in the name of economic development, so often a matter of encouraging and enhancing this thing 'the market economy', should be understood as a helpful demonstration of how capitalist formation may be pursued wilfully and with some consciousness. Unlike the less overtly coordinated actions of other representatives of capital, states pursuing development agendas declare their commitment to creating the circumstances and conditions for capitalism to enter, embed and flourish. This, after all, is what development has come to mean. It is with this awareness that we must hear the observations on how 'productive-reproductive' relations are embedded in market relations and of how such relations are embedded in 'market reforms'.

For those spaces in the throes of ongoing development, the injunction to families to become creators of productive labour is explicit. This call is less explicit in other spaces, but can be discerned in the celebration of particular patterns of family (two parent, dual income) and the push to tie family policy to the objective of fostering greater employment among women (Thévenon, 2011). Although the manner in which households are organised may adapt, the imperative of the 'productive-reproductive' coupling remains. The 'good' state-sanctioned family is the one that plays its role in the emerging economic context effectively. This claim makes sense in spaces where (waged) work is expanding, for some.

However, we know also that for many other spaces there is little encouragement or opportunity to become productive labour. For some, this is an outcome of falling beyond the imagined landscape of development in what Sanyal calls the postcolonial wasteland. For others, it is a reflection of the variously managed economic decline of spaces of former affluence (for an indication of this decline in parts of Europe, see Ballas, Dorling and Hennig, 2017). What can we make of the productive-reproductive relations of these other spaces where productivity has been deferred or bypassed altogether as a logic of social organisation?

To assist our thinking, we might turn our attention to spaces where the capacity for social reproduction has been named explicitly in processes of economic planning. Writing of Malaysia, Elias makes a succinct and convincing case for understanding some recent Asian models of economic liberalisation as exemplars of the state mobilisation of 'productive-reproductive' relations.

The Malaysian developmental state must . . . be viewed as a capitalist develop- mental state in which multinational capital played a central role in the disciplining and depoliticising of (feminised) labour. This experience, however, has come to be regarded as a 'model' example of how to build successful labour market competitiveness in ways that generate benefits for women. Thus Asian states are presented as a paradigm case of 'pro-poor' employment expansion which brought large numbers of women into that labour force, with important consequences for poverty reduction and the status of women. (Elias, 2009, 470)

While the practice of state-led or institution-led development in this instance makes explicit the demands on families, households and affective relations, in other contexts reproductive labour is referenced less openly. However, the insight that international institutions and national governments seek to organise reproductive labour as an aspect of managing the formal economy should come as no surprise. As Eisenstein has argued (2015), one ironic victory of international feminism has been the take-up of feminist-influenced ideas and language in the arenas of

economic development and international politics. In this context, state attention to the production-reproduction nexus can masquerade as pro-women and pro-poor policy, and state techniques of economic management can extend to include interventions into the everyday lives of women, including their 'non-work' lives. To be clear, although in relation to development-speak I wish to borrow the insight that economic policy spans the productive and reproductive spheres and, more than this, imagines interventions as influencing this combined entity with each reflecting and reinforcing the other, this is not to claim that 'Capitalism' represents a conspiracy to colonise the spaces of the reproductive.

Instead, I am seeking to make the more modest and more messy point that the manner in which the production-reproduction nexus is imagined and the manner in which economic agents emerge from such a nexus both serve as key components in the construction of a racial capitalism. As must be increasingly apparent, the discussion of racial capitalism in this volume centres on the manner in which people are constituted as different kinds of participants in capitalist formations, both of production and consumption. In relation to questions of production, the interplay between reproductive and productive spheres constructs different kinds of creatures —from fully serviced ready-for-workers to hybrid beings who survive through a combination of 'productive' work and other forms of economic activity to those who exist at the edges or in the crevices of capitalist life-worlds. In each case, the degree and character of the reproductive work that makes such lives possible becomes a marker of racialised difference. The production-reproduction nexus, in its variation, offers a naturalised rationale for the racialised differentiation of workers and even for a racialised understanding of uneven development.

One key lesson, then, is that reproductive labour is the input that enables workers to be highly differentiated and differently constituted as workers, sometime workers and non-workers.

For our purposes, rather than reproductive work supplementing the real economy of productive work, it might be better to think of productive work as a variable supplement to the reproductive economy. The differing character and intensity of such supplementation is reflected in the variation of engagement with or integration into capitalist formations. The upshot is that those who work are variably and differentially rendered proletarian. This is another recurrent theme of this work, the contention that racially marked populations are differently and perhaps 'improperly' proletarianised.

In part, such impropriety is read as arising from variations in the relations of reproductive work. The barely submerged heteronormativity of standard accounts of reproductive labour, with its working daddies and caring mummies, fits poorly with the affective and domestic arrangements of many and of many parts of the world. As Mies and others have taught us, capitalist-patriarchy positions us as highly differentiated economic actors, with not all escaping the category of 'nature' to occupy recognised human status.

CONCEIVING OF 'PRODUCTION-REPRODUCTION'
AND PROCESSES OF RACIALISATION

Both the differentiating choices made by states and the meanings read from different configurations of production-reproduction fold into processes of racialisation. The perceived capacity to produce and reproduce productive workers becomes a marker of racial status and temperament.

This can encompass:

- Demonising the domestic arrangements of some groups because they are seen to fail in the encouragement and re-creation of productive workers (Champlin, 2016; Hancock, 2004);
- Seeking to mobilise allegedly distinct patterns of reproductive labour in differential manners, again in the name of enhancing or enabling productivity;
- Regarding variations in patterns of everyday reproductive labour as akin to variations in the fauna and flora of differing geographies, with some (more interesting) accounts proposing some symbiotic relationship between possibilities of reproduction and

possibilities of production in particular locations (for a discussion of the racialising and dehumanising work performed by myths of misgendering, see Weheliye, 2014).

Of course, in common with other racialising processes there is movement within these demarcations. Yet the murmur of race-thinking remains in both official and popular articulations of what makes the difference in the production-reproduction nexus. More recent writing on reproductive labour has pointed to the crisis of social reproduction that arises with globalised capitalism. This crisis spans a number of elements: the attack on welfare (Fraser, 2016b); the disruption of ways of life that enabled sharing of reproductive labour without centring waged work (Federici, 2012); population movement initiated by war, economic crisis and climate change (Environmental Justice Foundation, 2009).

In this literature, reproductive labour appears as a marker of differentiated ways of life and being human (Weheliye, 2014; for a ground-breaking account, see Spillers, 1987). While modes and practices of reproductive labour remain invisible or marked as an empty category of supplementary value in economic accounting, there are patterns of differential positioning in relation to capitalist production, and this differential patterning also implies some different ways of thinking about the place of reproductive work, an insight confirmed by every expression of disgust ever made about 'how these people live'.

In one sense I want to argue that modes of reproductive labour become translated into racialised conceptions of the economy. The positioning of reproductive activity and of reproductive potential acts as a scale of humanness. Some modes serve as models of humanness in the ability to direct resources to making participants in the formal economy. Other modes open communities to interventions to enhance economic participation, that is to reorient reproductive processes towards the formal economy. Other modes still are admonished for their alleged economic and/or social consequences and presented as deficits in the capacities of those pursuing such ways of life. The recent repackaging of varied processes of social reproduction as 'resilience' does not disturb the implied racialised categorisation.

One indication of this racialised conception is the manner in which enabling entry into waged work is presented as a moral endeavour, akin to other civilising/civilisational quests. When the World Bank seeks to quantify the contribution of unpaid work to the size of a national economy, a major impetus behind such an endeavour is the belief that women must be enabled to enter paid work and the 'real' economy. In this, we are still stuck in the assumption that reproductive labour serves waged work(ers) as opposed to thinking of reproductive labour as serving life. The drive to encourage waged work is linked to a way of thinking that regards only waged work as productive in a world where productivity has become a civilisational test (see Weeks, 2011, for a gripping account of the moral imperatives tied to productive work). However, whatever the World Bank or others may say and think, for most of humanity the object is to stay alive. Waged work and reproductive labour come together as possible strategies for enabling life. We might argue (as some have done) that the relationship should be seen in reverse, in fact it is waged work that serves reproductive labour and reproductive labour that is the over-arching mode of all economic activity.

This rethinking of economic activity as the activity undertaken to sustain life helps us to see reproductive labour as the model of all economic life. Waged work may be undertaken, particularly in the absence of other options of survival as we know, but it is in service to the larger and ongoing goal of reproduction. Human beings must surely be understood as working to live, it is only in the asides of economic planning that it is suggested that we live only to (one day, aided by suitable planning and state interventions) work.

The world of human economic endeavour might be rethought as a whole array of ways in which communities organise their collective efforts to stay alive, a suggestion contained in the framing of the production-reproduction nexus but requiring in addition a conscious decentring of the formal economy and a recentring of the effort to remake the means of life. The various survival techniques of fostering and maintaining (some) mutuality or of diversifying economic activity or of inhabiting a more symbiotic relationship with nature all act as racialising markers indicating lesser

ways of being human, subordinated to a conception of human belonging that has been collapsed into economic productivity.

REPRODUCTIVE CRISIS

Whereas conforming to a particular reproductive formation consolidated the relative privilege of some groups until recently, most famously in the (temporary) accommodations of Fordism and accompanying Keynesian compromises, such certainties of production-reproduction are decomposing. Instead, the restructuring of the world economy in a manner that displaces some previous privileges without, apparently, elevating anyone or anything in their place destabilises the ability to remake life for many. In a highly influential account of the centrality of social reproduction to any analysis of neoliberal degradation, Cindi Katz argues that an analytic focus on social reproduction can enable a different kind of understanding of how populations are remade. She writes,

Focusing on social reproduction allows us to address questions of the making, maintenance, and exploitation of a fluidly differentiated labor force, the productions (and destructions) of nature, and the means to create alternative geographies of opposition to globalized capitalism. (Katz, 2001, 709)

Of course, this is in part no more than a claim of the importance of one research agenda. Yet the larger point that is suggested here sews together some important concerns. One is the easy acknowledgement of a 'fluidly differentiated labor force'. Another is the recognition of the production/destruction of nature as an element of social reproduction—and the third is the suggestion that it is the spaces of social reproduction that offer the possibility of resisting the forces of global capitalism. All three of these fleeting suggestions illuminate an aspect of our understanding of racial capitalism. Our discussion of what might constitute racial capitalism has centred around the differentiation of the workforce and the placing of the boundary of the 'natural' or the not(yet)productive. Katz's formulation suggests ways of understanding the processes that appear to discard some populations while encircling others in processes of pauperisation through work. Katz herself proposes this connection,

At worst, this disengagement hurls certain people into forms of vagabondage; at best, it leaves people in all parts of the world struggling to secure the material goods and social practices associated with social reproduction. (Katz, 2001, 710)

This, again, is another formulation of the wide-ranging processes of accumulation by dispossession that are reshaping our world. Vagabondage recalls the account of proletarianisation in Volume I of *Capital*, where people are thrown off land to scavenge for life as they can. We will go on to see that where there are battles to secure the 'goods and practices associated with social reproduction', racialised violence may be deployed in an attempt to force vagabondage for some as the (supposed) price of (relative) stability for others. As Katz implies, such attempts may be doomed, but racialised logics of human value ensure their continuation.

To understand this point further, it is helpful to revisit Katz's formulation of the variation in social reproduction.

Social reproduction is the fleshy, messy, and indeterminate stuff of everyday life. It is also a set of structured practices that unfold in dialectical relation with production, with which it is mutually constitutive and in tension . . . it also encompasses the reproduction of the labor force at a certain (and fluid) level of differentiation and expertise. . . . Apart from the need to secure the means of existence, the production and reproduction of the labor force calls forth a range of cultural forms and practices that are also geographically and historically specific, including those associated with knowledge and learning, social justice and its apparatus, and the media. (Katz, 2001, 711)

Human life is never undifferentiated, social reproduction is precisely social and must fulfil the terms of remaking society in particular contexts. Equally, the terms of social reproduction are an outcome of 'ongoing struggle', that is, battles for more than bare life and other battles for rights and resources reshape the terms of social reproduction. For those who have benefited from the temporary gains of welfare capitalism in recent memory, this might indicate a terrain of social reproduction in which a variety of earlier gains become sites of struggle in the face of increasing

depletion (Rai, Hoskyns and Thomas, 2013). For others, however, the cumulative impact of dispossession—colonial, neocolonial and neoliberal—may lead to a contracted space of negotiation in relation to the terms of life. In the global crisis of reproduction, these differentiated ways of life signal the differential value attributed to human lives. For those seeking to preserve the partial privileges of a decomposing welfare capitalism, the depleted lives of those deemed less worthy serve as both a warning and an incentive to preserve racialised privilege. This folds into the suggestion social reproduction cannot be 'revolutionary' because it remakes 'the very social relations and material forms that are so problematic' (Katz, 2001, 718).

It is worth for a moment considering whether reproduction of the means of life must necessarily lead to the reproduction of the social relations of exploitation. This may be the case when thinking about the reproduction of the waged worker, but that process does not exhaust the range of work undertaken in social reproduction. Arguably, the range of reproductive practices that go beyond merely remaking the waged worker also represent something beyond any simple reproduction of capitalist relations. Admittedly, this may be some way from the demand to be 'revolutionary' but it is an indication of the other ways of being that exist at the edge of or alongside capitalist formations.

If we think about the positioning of those who move in and out of the terms of waged work or who inhabit the spaces that seem resistant to 'development', we might imagine social reproduction in a manner that retains some autonomy. Precisely because capitalist formations of production have not fully entered such terrain, the business of social reproduction may remain closer to the objective of remaking the terms of life.

Some accounts of proletarianisation have suggested that the forced entry into waged work transforms the households and communities of the proletariat so that all social reproduction becomes an adjunct to the waged work. In this telling proletarianisation signals the moment when the reproduction of dominant social relations and the reproduction of life itself become indistinguishable. The correction suggested by the concept of racial capitalism, following insights from feminist scholars revealing struggles over the relation of reproduction to production, is the reminder that proletarianisation in this form has been uneven and unstable. As a result, we see all kinds of practices of social reproduction that may not be capitalocentric. This is not to say that such non-capitalocentric reproduction is not constrained by the disciplines of capitalism or that people can escape the depredations of capitalist life. More often, the emergency survival tactics of sustaining human lives alongside uncertain or non-existent access to waged work manage only the most strained forms of survival, with no more than precarious access to the essentials of life. However, it is a confirmation that the requirements of production do not own all possibilities of remaking life.

Racial capitalism is about this 'fluidly differentiated labour force' described by Katz and, I would like to argue, the differentiation also includes some variations in extent of immersion in the 'labour force'. This is a key aspect of the formulation of racial capitalism as a concept—that the differentiation of populations also occurs in their differentiation as a labour force and also in the differentiation of whether and to what extent they may be part of any formal labour force. This is the claim at the heart of Cedric Robinson's formulation and in the discussion of this work, that proletarianisation is not, or not only, a flattening process of non-differentiation but also that the contexts of racism create a terrain where proletarianisation occurs differentially and in mixture with other forms of economic identity.

There are two moments in this account. One is the view that processes of proletarianisation inhabit terrains that already have been shaped by racialised (and other differentiating) histories. As a result, economic choices and opportunities, including the double-edged opportunity to be subject to exploitation, fragment populations. Some ascend to the status of 'worker', others work for remuneration sometimes but with a less settled or stable status, still others engage in economic activity that contributes to social reproduction but registers rarely in accounts of the formal economy. The patterns of activity that go into the pursuit of maintaining life reveal both the economic and the social opportunities and barriers available to populations. At the most simple

and obvious, capitalism makes us differently and those differences include the histories of social privilege and exclusion that run alongside the economy.

The existence of a parallel life, neither in thrall to the world of work or of enslavement nor designed to remake bodies for some other instrumental reason beyond living, is already registered in a range of important scholarship, including in accounts of explicitly racial capitalism. Our understanding of survival, community and love in the face of unimaginable brutality has been reshaped by the insights of works such as George Rawick's *From Sundown to Sunup* (1973) and the recognition that, for the enslaved, practices of social reproduction can represent the spaces of maintaining autonomy and a self-defined humanness, not a supplement to the return to the most oppressive of working conditions in the morning.

The related but different violence of apartheid South Africa identified the additional 'value' of African modes of social reproduction when instituting lower wage rates for black populations. In Wolpe's early but still influential account, the establishment of the South African capitalism that is reworked into apartheid relies on the non-centrality of the wage to African communities who retain other practices to sustain life (Wolpe, 1972). The indirect utilisation and depletion of extended networks for social reproduction is embedded in the establishment of capitalist relations that simultaneously enforce an explicit inequality on the grounds of race.

More generally, the rediscovery of 'proletarian nights' as an aspect of decentring the identities given through work opens the way to think again about what we mean by social reproduction and its relation to increasingly insecure and insufficient modes of waged work (Ranciere, 2012).

To understand how deeply embedded is this other consciousness of the role of social reproduction as a space of resistance to the coercions of the productive economy and also as an indication that the anxiety that is occasioned by the grudging recognition that another sphere may exist, we need only think briefly of the demonisation of those groups deemed insufficiently attached to 'productive' work. In well-known American discussions of the 'welfare queen', we see not only the mechanisms of delegitimising state support for all but also an inadvertent acknowledgement of the role of non-marketised modes of social reproduction for low-income families in the heart of the capitalist beast. Yet less well known, perhaps, are the parallel denunciations of Roma as at once criminal and unable to bow down to the disciplines of waged work (Pogány, 2006; Halasz, 2009). Or of the alleged cultural inability of Aboriginal peoples of Australia to enter the formal economy without a whitening up of their consciousness and a relinquishment of other understandings of time (for some discussions of the particular formation of racism towards Aboriginal Australians, see Hickey, 2016; Faulkner, 2015).

In each instance, the allegation of being unfit for productive work, and, by implication, for full humanness relates to the suggestion that these are people who retain modes of social reproduction that do not serve the market. It is an allegation that reasserts those old colonial tropes of people made less through improper ways of gendering, improper ways of being embodied and improper ways of relating to nature. Of people who seek to live in ways that refuse the total disciplines of productive labour.

HOW WIDELY SHOULD WE DRAW THE REPRODUCTIVE NETWORK?

What are the factors and relationships that make a human life liveable? What are the consolations necessary to enable us to survive the alienation of waged work?

The attempts to register the role of domestic work in producing value have been focused, with good reason, on the materiality of reproductive practices. If the worker is a kind of machine, then reproductive labour ensures that fuel and maintenance and cleaning and minor rebuilding can be completed in the allocated times outside of the hours of the working day. This is a way of conceiving of the household as primarily a productive unit. Whatever else happens in this set of relationships, there is a tacit agreement that the primary objective is to prepare the wage-earner for return to the workplace. The other activity of household members, including activity that adds to the well-being of household members but which cannot easily be linked to the remaking of the

wage-earning members of the household or to the reproduction of the next generation of workers, falls outside the conception of the economic in this telling.

This prioritising of the waged economy, without attention to the other facets of economic activity that might be part of the life of a household, has been criticised by scholars of development (Agarwal, 1997). This, in fact, has been one of the central shifts in understanding that arises from the efforts of feminist and other scholars of development. Conceiving of the household as always in service to the waged (or market) economy erases much of what is valuable about the work of women of the world and this occurs, to a large extent, as a result of too narrow (or technical) a conception of 'value'.

We understand that this erasure is a by-product of a fixation with waged work. Waged work has been central to the thinking of economy. The wage brings labour into the machineries of accounting and quantification. The abstraction of the wage allows us to see the abstraction of economic relations that are stretched beyond direct barter—it is the abstraction of money and all that is paid in money that allows us to comprehend the network of connections that links diverse actors across time and space in the name of a thing of recent historical invention, the economy. However, in our time of econocentrism, where 'the economy' is made to stand in for all existence, it can be hard to recall that non-work encompasses most of human life.

The emergence of economics as the science of money ensures that it is the paying of a wage, as opposed to the sustenance of a household, that comes to be highlighted in accounts of what and where economic activity resides. Yet despite this erasure, an understanding of reproductive labour is central to how we can imagine the ordering and differential valuing of different forms and locations of work. This is the debate that illuminates the question of work as a route to political agency and the one that reminds us why a fixation on the wage relation and capitalist production continues to miss out on such enormous swathes of human existence. Feminist discussions focused for a time on the question of the wage (for formative writings in the movement for wages for housework, see Dalla Costa and James, 1972; Federici, 1975). This, it seemed, was the key distinction between the (partially) valued and visible work of the wage earner and the economically invisible work of the non-wage earner. For our purposes, however, it may not be the payment of a wage that is the central factor in determining the susceptibility or otherwise of work to be documented.

It is not only housework that is erased from the calculation of value. The work, mainly waged, conducted in the shadow economy represents another failure of accounting. The precarious 'self-employment' of so much of the world pays no wages but generates income and positions these most disrespected of entrepreneurs in the shadows of capitalist relations but not as producers of value. The halfway house economic lives of those termed 'urban outcasts' (Wacquant, 2008) sew together insecure waged work and other forms of economic behaviour including small-scale 'businesses' designed to allow survival for those without and with no hope of access to regular and stable work.

If racial capitalism is a process that sifts people into different categories, sometimes with an economic purpose, but always with an economic outcome, then the visibility and value accorded to types and locations of work, therefore, becomes a central question.

THE ECOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF LABOUR POWER

While the focus of feminist scholars on the undervalued and often unconsidered place of domestic labour in creating the possibility of waged labour and surplus value has been invaluable, framing the domestic labour debate as the business of households alone reveals again the androcentrism of debates about the economy. Against this, thinkers influenced by ecofeminism have striven to reinsert a consciousness of human dependency on nature and of the implications of understanding the reproduction of human life through this frame of necessary dependency (Shiva, 2014; Mies and Shiva, 1993; Adams and Gruen, 2014).

The conception of labour as transformative action reflects a longer history that views human impact on our surroundings as greater and of a different magnitude to that of other species. At the most obvious, this approach makes it difficult to register the additional value of working

animals. In its wider implication, this is a revisioning of what holds and makes value that decentres human agency and replaces us all in the contexts of the biospheres that have made us. The boundary between raw material, local climate and human survival techniques becomes less certain, because this amalgamation of forces comes together to make the possibility of human life in any location.

In his wide-ranging account of capitalism's dependence on nature, Jason Moore argues that remembering this deep interdependency helps us to comprehend the magnitude of economic crisis in our time.

Today, however, it is increasingly difficult to get nature—including human nature—to yield its 'free gifts' on the cheap. This indicates we may be experiencing not merely a transition from one phase of capitalism to another, but something more epochal: the breakdown of the strategies and relations that have sustained capital accumulation over the past five centuries. (Moore, 2015, 1)

For Moore, the crisis of reproduction and the crisis of capitalism as a whole arises from this end of 'cheap nature'. The whole history of capitalism has contained this hidden dependency and nothing in the system can offer a fix for the finitude of nature. Whereas previously crises of accumulation might have been met by the spatial fix of expansion elsewhere or by dispossessing vulnerable populations, no amount of violence can replenish the world's depleted resources. As Moore explains, this lack of access to natural resources without end signals the opening of a new era, unlike any previous phase of capitalism.

Early capitalism mobilized technical innovation, systemic violence, and symbolic innovation to lengthen the working day as well as to produce and appropriate Cheap Nature so as to reduce de facto unit labor costs. . . . Appropriated nature becomes a productive force. . . . The appropriation of global natures and the accumulation of capital are closely joined through the production of surplus value. . . . Does the ongoing closure of frontiers today signal an exhaustion of capitalism's Cheap Nature strategy, with its prodigious history of appropriating uncommodified nature as a way to advance labor productivity? (Moore, 2015, 16)

Whatever advances are achieved through technology and the replacement of labour by capital, none of this can overcome the impending limit of natural resources. Without cheap nature, the accumulation strategies of capitalism that have characterised the entire history of capitalism come to a halt. This is the larger factor underlying the crisis of reproduction. Moore suggests a more-than-human conception of social reproduction to indicate the contribution of what he calls 'extra-human natures', 'a zone of reproduction that transcends any neat and tidy separation of sociality and biology' as it 'also involves the unpaid work of extra-human natures' (Moore, 2015, 17).

Moore both presents a way of understanding sociality and biology as aspects of one web, each entwined in the other and a reminder that 'appropriated nature' has included the expropriation of the land, habitat and bodies. The coding of such resources as 'natural' has formed a central thread in racialising divisions of the world. When transposed to more recent instances of the expropriation of supposedly natural resources without regard for the human populations intertwined with and in such resources, appropriating nature folds into the creation and/or exacerbation of racialised differentiation and dispossession.

In her scathing critique of India's so-called Green Revolution—a period when industrialised methods of agriculture were imposed on rural communities in an attempt to increase food production—Vandana Shiva argues that such methods of ecological degradation also led to the ethnicised conflicts of the last hundred years.

The ecological and ethnic crises in Punjab can be viewed as arising from a basic and unresolved conflict between the demands of diversity, decentralisation and democracy on the one hand and the demands of uniformity, centralisation, and militarisation on the other. Control over nature and control over people were essential elements of the centralised and centralising strategy of the Green Revolution. (Shiva, 1992, 15)

Shiva's critique is of the simultaneous degradation of natural resources and displacement or eradication of the peoples who 'husbanded' these resources in a manner that has remained

invisible and/or valueless in accounts of economic productivity. Racial capitalism also has functioned through the attribution of a lesser status to the arena of nature, including through collapsing some human populations into the category of nature and through this marking their lives, livelihoods and social practices as an absence to be colonised and exploited. In this process, the complex network of resources that enables life to be remade, including human life, becomes no more than territory or open land. In this way the asset-stripping interventions of humanity weaponised into agents of capitalist expansion erode practices of mutual sustainability and replace them with the extractive practices of capitalist exploitation.

For 10,000 years, farmers and peasants had produced their own seeds, on their own land, selecting the best seeds, storing them, replanting them, and letting nature take its course in the renewal and enrichment of life. With the Green Revolution, peasants were no longer to be custodians of the common genetic heritage through the storage and preservation of grain. The 'miracle seeds' of the Green Revolution transformed this common genetic heritage into private property, protected by patents and intellectual property rights. (Shiva, 1992, 63)

Shiva's account suggests some larger insights into the role of indigenous practices of farming in the reproduction of local populations. She critiques the Green Revolution as being 'anthropomorphic', but in this she is also putting forward a very different conception of human agency in relation to our surroundings. By describing peasant farmers as custodians of biodiversity, Shiva forces us to reconceive agricultural labour as a coming to terms with nature, both transformative and preserving. In this less heroically individual but more communally useful version of work, the value that contributes to the reproduction of the community comes from the interaction of human activity and the renewal of natural resources through non-human processes. It is these factors together that enable the maintenance of a particular biosphere and liveable life. Shiva is speaking specifically of crop cultivation, but we might take her account as an insight into the resources that enable all reproduction. Not only housework but also water. Not only care but also air. This need for this expansion in conceptualisation is presented persuasively by the authors of *Gens: A Feminist Manifesto for the Study of Capitalism* (Bear et al., 2015) in their challenge to 'the boundedness of the domain of "the economic" in order to examine "the full range of productive powers and practices"'. By this, they mean both the varied range of human activity and the non-human materialities and processes that intersect with human activity to remake human and other lives.

It may seem misplaced to suggest that the resources that remake human life include both human and non-human input in all instances, as if talking about race necessitates a move beyond the human. For non-land-based ways of life, the interdependence of the social and the biological is less obvious. Yet without a more inclusive consideration of how life is enabled and remade, we are left repeating the lonely individualisation implied in reproduction through households alone. By re-imagining (social) reproduction as arising from the web of life, we can see how that which is deemed non-work becomes 'nature'.

THE DANGERS OF TALKING ABOUT NATURE

Modern conservation science is shaped by a biopolitical logic that emphasizes distinctions between biological kinds and develops interventions based on these distinctions—a logic that also informs racial, biological distinctions among humans. Ideas of abnormality and normality are produced and reproduced through racial projects, most of which are not racist per se but nonetheless engage in racial signification. (Biermann and Mansfield, 2014, 258)

Even as I begin to write that processes of colonisation and the capitalist penetration that such colonisation later (sometimes much later) enabled erased a previous symbiosis between human activity and environmental resources, I have a sense of nervousness. The collapsing together of darker-skinned people and nature appears so frequently in racialised depictions of the world, from the earliest European travelogues to the handbooks of colonial management to the asset-hungry blueprints for development. No alert reader could pretend not to notice the risks of confusing some people/s with 'nature'. This, after all, has been a key racist tactic in denying the humanity of some populations. In response, some recent discussions have sought to interrogate

the work done through this racialised erection of ideas of animacy (see Chen, 2012). My suggestion here is not that some human beings can be folded into their 'natural' habitats, to either be saved by the civilisational progress of economic development or protected by the benevolent interventions of conservation. Instead, following Moore and Shiva, I want to argue that another technique of racial capitalism has been to render invisible symbiotic relationships of reproduction between people and 'nature', while simultaneously relegating some populations to less than human status due to their (alleged) inability to escape nature. Whereas we might previously have considered this process as historically bounded, indicating the cultural and political processes accompanying a particular past moment of colonial expansion, our collective recognition of accumulation by dispossession as ongoing and possibly endless returns us to the question of populations identified as 'nature' (for an example of the collapsing of some racialised communities into the status of nature as disaster, see Faulkner, 2015).

In a time when access to 'cheap nature' may be at an end, racial capitalism might come to describe the processes by which some populations are forcibly 're-naturalised', as the boundaries between humans and nature are redrawn again in an attempt to preserve status, stability and access to resources for some.

Much of the later discussion of this volume will centre around the question of 'surplus populations'. Does capitalism need to replenish its workforce or not? Are we entering a time when an increasing proportion of the world's population is unable to enter waged work? If yes, then our understanding of the role of waged work in extending and perpetuating capitalist formations needs to be revisited. We need to comprehend what it means to enter a world in which our labour is neither valued nor needed. Being outside the social relations of the wage, with little prospect of ever entering such relations, is a scary and harsh existence. The fact that it is a form of existence that is spreading and extending, not diminishing to the point of extinction as we may once have predicted, should give us all pause for thought.

In a time of contracting and precarious paid employment, the role of the unpaid labours of reproduction become more essential than ever. While we see an affluent world encouraging mothers to prepare for paid work that never becomes stable, across other parts of the world, paid work has exited many households altogether. And yet the poor do not die, at least, not all of them and not immediately. Our task here is to understand the economic construction of the household in these spaces alongside capitalist production and to understand what replenishment means in such circumstances. This interest arises from a conceptualisation of racial capitalism as the arbitrary exclusion of some (marked) groups from full participation in the labour market, either in a global demarcation of productive and unproductive spaces or in the internally divided spaces of the metropoles of the capitalist world.

REPLENISHING CONSUMERS

One part of our rethinking may include considering the work needed to create and replenish a population of consumers. As has been noted, perhaps capitalism dreams of abolishing the workers, but consumers cannot be written out of the equations of accumulation. Where will the transactions leading to profit come from without them?

The term *racial capitalism* is an attempt to understand why and how racialised differentiation is operationalised as an aspect of capitalist development (and continuation). If capital seeks to homogenise, making human life undifferentiated and interchangeable for the purposes of reducing labour to just another commodity on the market, then what is going on when racialised divisions continue to both animate and shape local economic dynamics? Why has capitalism not made us all the same in the face of exploitation and commodification?

This apparently foolish question arises from the longstanding analysis that suggests that the process of capitalist incorporation is one of deskilling and increasing exploitation. This is an account of de-differentiation downwards, not an improvement into equal rights but a degradation into equal levels of exploitation and disenfranchisement. In later chapters we will consider the tactics that have been taken to defend against this equality in degradation. For now our interest is in the manner in which any of us might come to be viewed as human in capitalist times.

When I say 'viewed as human', I begin from the assumption that capitalism of whatever flavour is a process of dehumanisation that seeks to reconstitute all human life as a tool of accumulation. Capitalism as a system and as a magic show seeks to fill up the space of human society until it becomes coterminous with 'all human life'. Yet the human life that can be registered, valued and continued under capitalism is that shaped by the demands of economic activity. Others may eke out an existence, but to become fully human you must participate in the rapturous rituals of capitalist existence. In our time, arguably more even than work, this requires an active participation in the fantasies and practices of consumption. Only some will come to be constituted as 'workers', but all must endeavour to become 'consumers'. However, at the same time, the allocation of value to different forms of (economic) activity determines one kind of status. This is the status that makes people and populations visible: visible to capital, visible to those with political power, visible in the calculations of economic planning.

My suggestion is that one aspect of what we might understand as racial capitalism—and this aspect follows directly from the work of Cedric Robinson—is that the attribution of the status non-worker has been central to erasing and/or subordinating some populations. It is not the only way and we will go on to consider the manner in which racialised division operates among a workforce. However, in both historical accounts of the formation of capitalism and in more recent debates about the reach and rewards of capitalism, this issue of being a 'worker' matters.

For Robinson, the glaring and enraging point is the failure to register the struggles and hopes of the black radical tradition, because key events in this tradition appear to bypass the role of the proletariat. My point builds on this insight but with a slightly different emphasis. It seems to me that there is something in the status of 'worker' and perhaps, 'potential worker' that slides into the demarcation of the human under capitalism. In part, this is all stated openly in the peppy propaganda of the system—be all that you can be, find the job you love, engage in social networks where acquaintances can rate your work-related skills. The potentiality to be productive is up there with the quest for romantic love, and in the publicity materials the two are closely interrelated.

Relinquishing the quest to become productive, as productive as you possibly can and in manners that endlessly extend, becomes an abdication of full human status. For those who are made other in response to disability—productive work will save them and let them re-enter society (where else have they been in the meantime, we may ask?). For those hated foreigners moving across the world, only the benefits of their economic contribution can elevate them from the status of insects. Productive work is defence against any slur, an assertion that respect is due. Those not able to show their productivity are viewed, variously, as parasites, dependents and objects of charity. In each case, it is the imagined worker that is the norm.

However, those who face exclusion or diminishment due to alleged non-productivity may re-enter the spaces of capitalist civilisation as consumers. Energetic engagement in consumer practices may be presented as a possible alternative route to full humanness. Those who somehow are excluded from the disciplines of productive work may be corralled into the differently disciplining processes of consumer society. Even without access to work, there may be access to debt and through this, a kind of integration into the global economy. The edge populations of capitalism may not be subject to exploitation or direct expropriation, because they lack resources to expropriate. However, edge populations may experience indirect expropriation through the depletion of the resources previously allocated to the reproduction of daily life and exclusion through expulsion from the spaces of economic opportunity, political recognition or meaningful access to resources. Proletarianisation through consumption can operate as a means of levering value from populations in such settings, but even this possibility may be deferred. At the same time, the ecological crisis of capitalism heralds a new era of battles to access and secure the necessary resources of life, battles to contain and immobilise or to contain and displace some populations in an attempt to safeguard the position of some others.

WHAT ARE THE TECHNIQUES THAT RELEGATE SOME WORK TO THE STATUS OF NON-VALUE?

The conception of reproductive labour as centred around a heteronormative household arose in the period of an imagined male breadwinner. Women wage-workers, on the other hand, have tended to be considered as bearers of the double-shift not as recipients of any supplement of reproductive care. Perhaps hidden within the debates about reproductive labour and the value of domestic work, there is an implication that the day-to-day reproduction of the household includes the self-reproduction of the female carer/worker—her efforts must reproduce the household unit for tomorrow's work, both productive and reproductive. Although reproductive labour has been discussed all too often as a supplement to waged work, in fact the conceptualisation of reproductive labour as remaking of the household, including but not limited to the waged labourer/s, indicates a complex of dependencies. Different members of the household may participate in the activity required to sustain life and in the sets of relations that are needed to remain human, most of all in the face of dehumanising forces. Despite the well-deserved critique of the commodification of emotional labour, we do well to remember that emotional 'non-work' is a necessary and multidirectional aspect of social reproduction. None of us can remake our humanity without these non-economic interactions with others, not only love but also laughs and small-talk and recognition and irritation. The whole range of human mutuality and emotional sustenance that is erased in accounts of the reproduction and households where domesticated women service wage-earning men.

Of course, another uncomfortable aspect of such heteronormative accounts is the collapsing of sexuality into the constrains of productivity. Sex and desire become extensions of the labours of care, a kind of mechanical but necessary R and R for the dispirited and dehumanised worker. Non-productive sex—not only the dangerous/exciting sex for pleasure of same-sex encounters but all sex that cannot or will not be contained within the terms of recuperation to enable economic productivity—symbolises an alternative universe of value and meaning. Most of all, unruly desires indicate the possibility that other forces militate against the remaking of productive workers and the battle of everyday reproduction is a constant struggle between the demands of survival and the calls of pleasure. This accusation of ill-discipline in the space of recuperation is also familiar from the racialised vilification of those deemed to be making themselves unfit for work (for a discussion of the racialised and heteronormative construction of 'improper intimacies', see Olund, 2010).

We might consider this alleged imbalance between replenishing but not necessarily 'reproductive' non-work and work as an outcome of the cruelties of racial capitalism, so that subordinated populations also are seen to confuse (or refuse) the boundary between pleasure and reproduction and between reproduction for production and survival.

Revisiting considerations of reproductive labour in the interests of unpacking the divisions of racial capitalism and the role of the designation as 'worker' returns us to the question of class formation. The renewed interest in histories of class formation and the insistence of scholars in this field that we must think of workers of the world, not merely rhetorically but in the detail of our analysis, offers a formulation that can accommodate racialised division as a component of class formations. Van Der Linden suggests the following formulation:

There is a large class of people within capitalism, whose labour power is commodified in various ways. I would like to call this class the extended or subaltern working class. Its members make up a very varied group: it includes chattel slaves, sharecroppers, small artisans and wage earners. It is the historic dynamics of this 'multitude' that we should try to understand. We have to consider that in capitalism there always existed, and probably will continue to exist, several forms of commodified labour subsisting side by side. (Van Der Linden, 2008, 79)

The framing of the 'extended or subaltern working class' alters the emphasis of our discussion. In this formulation, there is no interdependent complementarity between 'work' and 'non-work', but this is because this is a formulation that largely forgets reproductive labour in the family or household. However, despite this oversight, the widening of conceptions of commodified labour power allows us to think about a range of economic positionings as outcomes of the capitalist

formations of particular times and places and also to think of a diversity of statuses as part of a constellation of commodified labour,

Capitalism could and can chose whatever form of commodified labour it thinks fit in a given historical context: one variant seems most profitable today, another tomorrow. If this argument is correct, then it behoves us to conceptualise the wage-earning class as one (important) kind of commodified labour among others. Consequently, so-called 'free' labour cannot be seen as the only form of exploitation suitable for modern capitalism but as one alternative among several. (Van Der Linden, 2008, 80)

Although we might question the phrasing of this account that makes 'Capitalism' into a subject who chooses, the larger point is instructive. Labour can be commodified in various ways, not always or only through an ascent into the status of waged worker. The various forms of commodified labour may move in and out of the place of the most profitable and, we might add, different forms of commodified labour may exist alongside each other. The variation in status among these forms of labour itself may represent an opportunity to increase profitability, that is, to exploit more effectively.

Such a suggestion has considerable implications, far beyond the too-repeated invocation of divide-and-rule. The mapping of variation among commodified labour is not, or not simply, an account of how we are set against each other. Importantly for us, different modes of commodified labour may not be in competition. Instead, variously commodified labour may exist alongside each other in broader formations, with each acting as supplement to the other. Therefore we see 'new' forms of slavery integrated into production chains that also utilise waged labour, with the addition of enslaved elements contributing lowered costs or easily expendable labour or disciplinary control. The conditions of waged workers need not be eroded by this insertion of slave labour, in some instances the conditions of more privileged workers may be safeguarded. Equally, industries may be demarcated through different patterns of commodified labour, and these mixtures of worker-status may become another facet of racialised categorisation. By extending our understanding of the variety of the workers of the world, we can begin to imagine the chains of supplementarity between differently constituted, perhaps differently racialised, forms of labour.

RETHINKING REPRODUCTION

FROM A PLANETARY PERSPECTIVE

My claim is that if Marxist theory is to speak to twenty-first-century anti-capitalist movements, it must rethink the question of 'reproduction' from a planetary perspective. (Federici, 2014, 86)

That colonies might be ruled over in absolute lawlessness stems from the racial denial of any common bond between the conqueror and the native. In the eyes of the conqueror, savage life is just another form of animal life, a horrifying experience, something alien beyond imagination or comprehension. (Mbembe, 2003, 24)

Relegating some populations to the status of 'surplus' might also be understood as returning such groups to the status of 'nature'. This, also, has a long and racialised history and the work of critical historians of science and of anthropology have taught us the racist tactics that have been embedded in the demarcation of the natural and how closely this has related to boundary-marking of the 'human'.

In a time when we are painfully conscious of the end of 'cheap nature', in Moore's terms, the expulsion of some from the terms of productive work, where productivity has been transformed into a central test of civilisation and, perhaps, humanness, could be regarded as a (hopeless) attempt to shore up the space of nature. This is a space of nature preserved as an opportunity for unlimited exploitation, not conservation, and it is not hard to recognise how closely the attribution of 'nature' relates to the practices of accumulation by dispossession.

Wolfe and others have reminded us of the supremacist fantasies that enabled the violent appropriations of indigenous lands—the many 'lands without people' that have been sequestered through ethnic cleansing, forced movement and genocide, all alongside the pretence that

previous inhabitants were incapable of 'cultivation' of land and self and therefore less than human and/or did not exist at all.

The explicitly racial capitalism of apartheid South Africa relied on the supplement of pre-capitalist forms of social reproduction as a means of accessing cheap African labour. If we agree with Wolpe, and consider the emergence of a violent state-imposed apartheid as a response to the depletion of such pre-capitalist formations and, with them, the depletion of the means of life among the African population, we might consider the outsourcing or outright refusal of aspects of the social reproduction of workers as one possible characteristic of racial capitalism.

Equally, the warehousing of migrant workers and/or the control of worker movement in a manner that prevents/disrupts family life operate to fragment processes of social reproduction. Day-to-day reproduction is stripped back to the machinic, squeezing resources until workers expend the most minimal of resources to maintain themselves. In instances where workers are divided from their affective networks, as is the case for many migrant workers across Asia, Africa, Europe and North America, the reproduction of the next generation is relegated to another space, often with lower costs. The sociality that might accompany living in families and communities, and the resources that such sociality might entail, are cut away. Workers learn to save everything they can for remittance payments and to live in the most frugal manner possible. Splitting workers from their affective networks has proved highly effective for employers—either weaponising worker's own affective relations against them, so that the fear of not sending enough home leads to a degradation of the day-to-day life of the worker or immersing the worker so totally in the (often painful) world of work that emotional ties become difficult to maintain and working life is reduced to a focus on day-to-day survival.

In the crisis of social reproduction arising from capitalist restructuring, but rendered more intense in a time of ecological limit, some populations are cast back into the status of nature and this gesture is, in itself, racialising. This may not be the expropriation that Nancy Fraser identifies as the parallel process to exploitation. For some, there may be little or nothing to expropriate. Some populations represent neither (immediate) opportunities for exploitation and nor for expropriation as they have been dispossessed long ago. Instead, their 'value' can be imagined as that of future territory. In the next chapter we consider how this relegation to the less than human might be understood as a continuation of histories of violent dispossession.

Chapter 4
What Racial Capitalism Is and What It Is Not

From the outset I have been anxious about how and where to demarcate the boundaries of this project. Didn't the title imply that this would be a rip-roaring and riveting tale of capitalism down the ages, revealing in each age the ugly but submerged face of racism? The kind of transhistorical horror movie that has taught us that the devil lives in every era but can take a new face in each age?

But it is not so easy to pin down a portrait of the devil. Where does the devil end and human weakness begin?

WHAT RACIAL CAPITALISM IS NOT

This work is an attempt to chart one particular axis of coincidence, that of the development of capitalism and of modern racism. This is not an argument to say that only this and no other coincidence of histories is significant. The account developed here is heavily indebted to the analyses of patriarchy and capitalist development offered by theorists of reproductive labour, and I have no doubt that there are other important and overlapping histories of exclusion through capitalist development to be written, particularly in relation to the emergence of 'disability' and through the differential regulation of sexual behaviour (for a suggestive account of disability living as a mode of ethical existence beyond the imperatives of the productive economy, see Mitchell and Snyder, 2015; for discussions of a queer economics, see Jacobsen and Zeller, 2013). These matters, however, are not the central focus of this work.

My point here is not to suggest that capitalism is inevitably racialised. All we can know is that capitalism as we have known it has had only this trajectory of global development, in coincidence with the period of racialised demarcation of the world. My interest in this project stems also from the belief that contemporary capitalism continues to operate through and alongside processes of racialised expropriation and that challenging these more recent technologies of dehumanisation requires a renewed attention to the manner in which economic exploitation and racist othering reinforce and sometimes amplify each other.

What this is not is a call to diversify corporate representation or to create a consumer culture that reflects us all in our multifarious differences. We can see that capitalism, and by this I mean racial capitalism, is quite capable of presenting 'diversity' as a business good (for an excellent account of the deployment of ideas of diversity for the purposes of capital accumulation, see Melamed, 2014). In a later chapter I will argue that this veneer of diversity represents a distinctive practice of racial capitalism in our time. For now, it is enough to note that what follows is not an argument for the need to construct a more inclusive or a more multicultural capitalism. My argument is quite different to this. What I am arguing is that techniques of racialised exclusion, division and differentiation have played and continue to play a central role in the practices of capitalist exploitation. Such racialised practices operate on a number of scales, both within national boundaries and as a mechanism of entrenching and continuing patterns of uneven development across the world. These processes need not be tied to any particular group and the object of racialisation may change across time or be articulated variously across space. So, for example, the emergence of national bourgeoisies in former European colonies does not alter the logic and continuation of racial capitalism. Equally, the ascendance of Asia does not represent some new 'brown/yellow' capitalism that erases previous practices of racialised expropriation or that prevents the continuation of such practices in the capitalist formations of our time. Perhaps some groups or sections of populations can change status, perhaps some populations may include local elites who enjoy disproportionate wealth and privilege. We know all of this already from insightful analyses of neo-colonialism (Nkrumah, 1966; Sartre, 2001). Such shifts do not signal the advent of a post-racial capitalism.

Instead, as this work goes on to argue, we should understand racial capitalism as the mode of capitalist development that has occurred through the coincidence of the emergence of modern racism alongside key phases of capitalist expansion. The historical traces of earlier phases of racialised expropriation continue to shape access to resources and levels of economic development and, through this, continue to have repercussions in the economic formations of today. At the same time, techniques of racialised expropriation, exclusion and differentiation can come into play in unexpected ways and in relation to unexpected populations. The world can be riven by new or heightened racial wounds even as the old wounds continue to fester.

IS ALL CAPITALISM 'RACIAL'?

Despite the assertions of some across the revolutionary (and less than revolutionary) left, it is difficult to make the case that racism is a symptom of capitalism (for an unresolved attempt to navigate out of this cul-de-sac, see the interchange between Kundnani and Kumar, 2015, and Bhattacharya and Selfa, 2015). Whatever our misgivings, it is difficult to claim that racism begins only with capitalism. Untidily and inconveniently, racism and capitalism have their own distinct histories. At the most obvious, systems of racialised hierarchy, exclusion and privilege are not coterminous with the arrival and embedding of capitalism (see Fredrickson, 2002). Racial capitalism is not the history of all racism.

In their influential and much-cited work, *Racecraft*, Karen and Barbara Fields make the case that the discursive and social activity required to conjure up the fiction of 'race' should be considered analogous to witchcraft. Instead of expending any further energy on 'explaining' racialised injustices, particularly in terms that serve to solidify the fictions of 'race', we should turn our collective attentions to the processes that let the superstitions of racial thinking survive.

By using the framing term of racial capitalism, this work runs the risk of reproducing the naturalisation of superstition that is critiqued by the authors of *Racecraft*. The very term, 'racial capitalism', falls dangerously close to a mode of racecraft itself. What is this 'racial' in 'racial capitalism'? And how can we begin any discussion of racial capitalism without assuming a reality and constancy to the racial that does not bear scrutiny?

If we accept the proposition that 'race' does not do things in the world, but racism does, the object of racial capitalism becomes more distinct. Racial capitalism is not an account of how capitalism treats different 'racial groups', but it is an account of how the world made through racism shapes patterns of capitalist development. In this, racial capitalism is better understood as a variety of racecraft in the economic realm. This includes both the manner in which some actors can and do invoke the witchcraft of race to protect or defend their economic interests and the ways in which the differentiating tendencies of capitalism become racialising processes. Broadly, then, this is a tale of how capitalism makes difference and, in response and sometimes desperation, particular actors or formations arising from a range of actions make these differences into the business of race.

IN WHICH WE REVISIT THE QUESTION OF WHY 'RACIAL'?

We began from the acceptance that 'racial' may be a clumsy formulation for the discussion of the mobilisation or inhabitance of differential status that takes central place in this work. However, there remains something in the invocation of the 'racial' that lets us understand the arbitrary attribution of statuses that then become apparently unchanging and inescapable. The combination of rigid hierarchisation and boundaries between groups of people with a hailing of what is natural or given seems to go to the heart of what has been named 'raciality', however elastic and variable we admit that process to be. So, racial capitalism it remains.

In part, my argument has been that modes of exclusion and disentitlement have served to create racialised attribution that links some economic statuses to a kind of racial categorisation. These are the various 'surplus' populations of the twenty-first century—slum-dwellers and displaced people, the undocumented and the 'new' slaves (for discussions of slums and the hidden populations of cities in the global South, see Parnell and Oldfield, 2014; for discussions of 'new' slavery, see Gupta, 2007; LeBaron and Ayers, 2013). With good reason, it is these shadow

populations who haunt many attempts to give an account of our particular bloody moment in history.

The other central questions of this work include an enquiry (if not an assertion) about the place and extent of reproductive labour and a return to the vexed question of who is (or might be/ become) the proletariat. In both instances, this work leans heavily on longstanding debates. Yet the question of the 'racial' has not been central to these discussions, in the main. This is not a critique, but it is a point of departure. What if these two sets of questions can be seen differently if approached through the lens of raciality?

There is a tension between the two sets of questions here. On the one hand, the question regarding reproductive labour implies the existence of a 'labour' to be reproduced and the division (if not relegation) of other activity to the realm of the reproductive. On the other, the heated debate about the identity of the proletariat posits proletarianisation as a far more encompassing process than the mere spitting out of wage labourers. While the two literatures have some commonality politically—seeking to expand proletarian membership to those whose toil has been unseen—the rallying call that we are all proletarians now misses the impact of differentiation of populations.

In the previous pages I have sought to argue that reproductive labour might be regarded in an expanded form to encompass both the domestic work that remakes everyday human life and the larger terrain of inputs, human and non-human, that create the conditions of life for those who become 'workers'. This expanded understanding of the factors that make up social reproduction allows a more collective conception of human mutuality and also makes space to acknowledge the non-human inputs that contribute to the remaking of everyday human life.

At the same time, conceiving of reproductive labour as both within and beyond the household opens the possibility of thinking more widely about the manner in which productive work is supplemented by other activities and inputs. At a local level, we might understand this to entail a more collective process of maintaining life, alongside waged work but also enabling some actors to be remade for waged labour, in the manner of the African traditions of mutual support that provided the supplement for South African capitalism to develop and perhaps also in the survival networks of populations cast into the in-between spaces of global capitalism (for a framework to think about such collective survival activities, see Federici and Caffentzis, 2013).

Embedded in this argument is the suggestion that populations relegated to the margins, including as 'surplus' to economic requirements, may contribute a reproductive role in relation to those deemed to be economically productive. This might be quite direct, in the sense of households where the combined activity of non-waged, informal and formally waged work all contribute to the collective survival of members. However, it may also be envisaged through a more stretched out set of relations, whereby the categorisation and management of so-called surplus populations operates to enable the functioning of waged labour, sometimes in another place altogether.

In previous generations, we might have understood this process through the lens of neo-colonialism and point to the undervalued production/excavation of raw materials in the periphery for production in the metropolis (for a seminal account of this process, see Nkrumah, 1966; for a discussion of the emergence of a corporate-led neo-colonialism, see Parenti, 2011). This well-established hierarchy of labour, however, is not the erasure of non-waged work that constitutes the reproductive periphery. Instead, 'reproduction', in this expanded conception, has been regarded as activity and/or inputs that are deemed not to produce value. Instead of recognition as an element of economy, this has been regarded as the stuff of 'nature' (for a discussion of the manner in which this collapsing together contributes to the 'genocide-ecocide nexus', see Short, 2016). This has included the survival tactics of populations considered beyond the reach of the formal economy. Whatever people do to sustain life in spaces that cannot be integrated into capitalist production, due to war or natural disaster, or as an outcome of political violence or environmental degradation, or because they belong to groups who are considered less than human and without the capacity to contribute to 'productivity', this activity is rarely included in

considerations of the economy (for a discussion that shows the challenges of capturing the activity of 'vulnerable' populations, see Usamah et al., 2014).

Vandana Shiva suggests that human populations have worked within and alongside natural resources in order to build sustainable systems of interdependence. In this telling, nature is not a pristine and separate sphere that humanity acts upon. Instead, human life is recreated in a network of interconnections, in the 'web of life'. As Jason Moore argues, capitalism is also in this web, but with more depleting impacts.

The maintenance of spaces of lesser or no 'productivity', spaces that may be deemed 'nature' although they are saturated in human activity, has formed an important resource for capital accumulation. These are the spaces of accumulation by dispossession, where 'free' injections of resource are found. But they are also the parallel segment of the world and of life necessary to sustain the fiction that there is a nature apart from humanity (for a now canonical account of the construction of 'nature', see Haraway, 2013).

The discussion about the conceptualisation of proletarianisation has a different emphasis. Here the account of the manner in which populations are stripped of livelihoods, leaving them standing naked in marketplaces that may or may not regard them as embodiments of labour power, is designed to reveal a commonality of purpose. These are populations with nothing to lose, even if some/many are without the chains of the wage relation. As must be apparent to any reader who has continued this far, this work also arises from a similar sentiment. Those made marginal or surplus have as much to gain from the dismantling of capitalism as the 'formal' proletariat. However, what is lost in this expansion of proletarian identity is both the conceptualisation of agency and a registering of the work of differential status in understanding capitalist formations. At the very least, there is a benefit to registering a range of proletarianisations. Just as an attention to early capitalist formations might register the distinctions between the emergence of productive forces and a proletarian class in different locations and perhaps point to such distinctions as an explanation for 'the birth' of capitalism, care in registering important distinctions between modes or circumstances of proletarianisation today might illuminate something about how capitalism keeps working (against us). Which is no more than to suggest that while we may be together ultimately, we need also to understand why we seem to be separated today.

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT RACIALISED DIVISIONS OF LABOUR?

If racialised divisions of labour and racialised boundaries delineating 'work' and 'non-work' are two creatures that make up racial capitalism, then this brings the question of what kinds of divisions and boundaries we mean. Even the shorthand of division/boundary can become a naturalisation of race, as can be seen from the myriad of work that speaks of such divisions as being 'hard-wired' in humans (for a discussion of the coverage on this issue in UK newspapers, see Seymour, 2012). At its broadest, a (flexibly) Marxist encounter with capitalism relieves us of such explanations based in timeless human nature and re-orients us to matters of resources and location. Capitalism positions us as objects to each other and objects who are reduced to their potential price in the form of the value that they might yield (or perhaps give access to). In such corroded social relations, the market for labour, supposedly, becomes no different from other markets. Workers are reduced in meaning to their price, buyers of labour contract their view of the worker down into the purely instrumental—no other human attributes beyond the promise of value creation and, conversely, no reason for differential treatment or status beyond this 'pricing' of potential labour power.

It is the failure of capitalism to flatten out all differences between workers that lies at the heart of this project. If we did not know it already, a key lesson of recent decades of scholarship has been the excavation of racialised exploitation based in differentiation and the role of such exploitation in capitalist development. This goes beyond the horrific insight that the abduction and enslavement of Africans provides the 'free' injection of economic value that enables the world-conquering growth of Europe and America (for exemplary recent work in this field, see Beckert and Rockman, 2016; Baptist, 2014). Or the realisation that the expropriation of resources and

labour under the auspices of colonialism provided the needed competitive advantage that translates into the ascendancy of the west as we have known it (for another breath-taking work, see Beckert, 2014; for an influential account of US empire, see Panitch and Gindin, 2012).

While this work builds on this important scholarship about early formations of capitalism and the route into industrialisation, the key focus is on the continuing mobilisation of racialised categories and divisions in more recent phases of capitalist development. The question here is not 'how is capitalism built on legacies of racist violence?' (because we know very well) but 'how and why do new phases of capitalist development continue to remake practices of racist violence and division and to what gain?' In framing one part of our question in this way, I am refusing the suggestion that racism under capitalism is some kind of unfortunate relic of pre-modern (or hard-wired?) prejudices and that there is no economic benefit to such outworn practices. There is a literature that seeks to argue such a point, but it is not one that takes a critical stance towards capitalism, apart from a critique of 'inefficiency' (for discussion of the business benefits of diversity, see Özbilgin and Chanlat, 2017). Against this, this work begins from a different stance, that capitalism cannot be reformed in some way that comes to value human life. Understanding racial capitalism is an attempt to see more clearly the varieties of dehumanisation that can be mobilised in the name of capital.

To this end, it is helpful to review briefly (some of) what is already known about broad patterns of racialised disadvantage. We know that those marked as racially 'lesser' are likely:

- To have higher levels of unemployment than the racially privileged group/s. This may be exacerbated at times of economic crisis but is likely to continue also in times of supposed boom (see Phong, 2011, on the failure of New Labour to ameliorate labour market disadvantage for minoritised groups during a time of economic buoyancy). The association with unemployment can serve to amplify demeaning racial mythologies and can slide into associations with crime and antisocial behaviour. Both the high levels of unemployment and the accumulated association as a group likely to be unemployed can be seen in relation to Gypsy and Roma communities across Europe, African American and (some) Latino communities in the United States, African Caribbean and, increasingly, Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities in Britain (Khattab and Johnson, 2013), refugees (Bloch, 2004), Muslims in India, Uighur in China (Béller-Hann, 2002), 'Indians' in Hong Kong (Erni and Leung, 2014).
- To have greater levels of underemployment than racially privileged groups. The groups marked as 'lesser' come to this status through differing routes. For some, generations of exclusion and dispossession have impeded access to education, and this characterisation as uneducated becomes an aspect of the racialised mythologies adhering to the group. For others, most often those displaced in some way or other, their education is not recognised and may be questioned or regarded as irrelevant for a member of a subordinated group (a contemporary echo of the allegation of 'uppityness'). In both instances, individuals may be forced to take work below their qualifications or skills, and perhaps to work less than they would like, or than they need (Rafferty, 2012). This may include forms of work with irregular or changing hours.
- To be concentrated in particular sectors and forms of work, often those that are less desirable or those that have steep barriers to entry. In the early chapters of *Black Marxism*, Cedric Robinson suggests that something like ethnic segregation among job types enabled the specialisation of occupation necessary to escalate productivity and wealth formation.
- To be engaged in varieties of 'self-employment', including in the so-called gig economy (Jones et al., 2012; Virdee, 2006; Inal et al., 2013).
- To face precarity, an experience that Sean Hill II argues predates neoliberalism for African American communities (Hill II, 2017). In a parallel argument, Barchiesi (2016) argues that enforced precarity in (coerced) waged work operated as a central technique of racialised state violence for apartheid South Africa. For our purposes, the deployment of racially

targeted enforced precarity deserves further attention as a still emerging practice of racial capitalism (for an important attempt to begin this task, see Waite et al., 2016).

- To face high levels of harassment and discrimination at work, including violence and in all sectors including in supposedly higher status forms of work (Trades Union Congress, 2017).
- To be more vulnerable to job loss, both in times of economic uncertainty and as an outcome of discrimination from colleagues and/or managers.

Let us take each and all of these experiences as indications of racial capitalism. Perhaps as accidental by-products of uneven development and the manner in which the divisions of uneven development have been mobilised to differentiate populations, but nevertheless as outcomes of racial capitalism. Let us imagine also that each and every instance reflects some set of interests. Again, the act may be poorly designed to safeguard or pursue the interest, so that, for example, engaging in workplace bullying may do little to guard against the threat of job insecurity. However, the impetus behind the actions that lead to these outcomes of racialised subordination arise from someone's understanding of their interests. Perhaps not any one actor or as a unified plan, but, nevertheless, as an expression of interest.

HAS PRECARITISATION REPLACED RACIALITY IN THE WORKPLACE?

Much if not all of what we describe as instances of racial capitalism as it is enacted in the workplace overlaps with a more wide-ranging erosion of working conditions and a growing insecurity and deregulation of employment. In regions where there remains some memory of workplace regulation, this process of loss may be termed precaritisation (Standing, 2016). However, for much of the world, this employment uncertainty is no more than business as usual. At the same time, precarity can heighten racialised divisions in some contexts, while pulling increasing numbers into the category of 'unprotected labour' in others.

Precaritisation can reveal processes through which labour markets and workers are divided, and this division can be racialised. Sometimes such racialisation occurs through formal segregation in racist states, sometimes through a more coded segregation in the name of border control. Sometimes the division between a regulated and a precaritised labour market is not racialised, but ordered through other terms, including age. Yet more often it seems that precarity has entered all forms of work and all populations of workers and would-be workers. While Standing and others have pointed to the presence of migrants and racially subordinated groups among the precariat, there are many other routes to this identity. Precaritisation is a process of labour exploitation, not a technique of racialising exclusion. In some instances, precaritisation may become an outcome of racialised exclusion, as in the case of those with irregular immigration status. In others, the erosion of workplace protections may strip formerly privileged groups of their differential status on the grounds of race, as in the outsourcing of low-paid elements of public sector work. Vulnerability to precarity can itself become an experience associated with particular racialised statuses, particularly when tied to particular sectors (in the United Kingdom, both restaurants and security have been examples of informally racialised work in the recent past). Simultaneously at a more general level, the rapid extension of precarity to diverse forms of work also extends the status of edge community to more and more of the population. For our interest in contemporary formations of racial capitalism, we might consider precarity as the back-drop that places workers in imagined competition without end, in the process encouraging the deployment of any and every racialised defence available in the struggle to retain some remnant of security at work.

WORKPLACE RACISMS

The more informal processes of workplace racism that infect so many lives are less easy to categorise. There are, of course, the myriad of everyday slights and assaults that come from co-workers or clients or the public. Is this intrusion of everyday racism into the place of work also an aspect of racial capitalism?

There is a longstanding account that portrays everyday workplace racism as a kind of false consciousness in action. The racially privileged worker displaces their (legitimate) dissatisfaction with their lot onto the racialised others nearby. This displacement mutes class antagonism and works to form an uneasy alliance across classes convinced, even if only momentarily, of their shared racial identity and interest (for a more nuanced discussion of the re-articulation of white working-class racisms in times of economic crisis, see Gillborn, 2010).

What is there to say about this story? There have been times where the call of race or of nation can be seen to have disrupted potential alliances on the basis of class or economic interest. Yet as an account it veers dangerously close to another conspiracy theory. In this telling, devious bosses present a gullible (white) working class with the prize of differential status and in return ask only that the working class exercise their racialised privilege. How this process might occur remains less than clear. Through what agency can employers as a class offer such tactical bribes? Perhaps in moments of imperial crisis past, the machinery of the state might be deployed to bribe the working classes into racial allegiance (for accounts of the role of popular culture, including the British Broadcasting Corporation, in securing everyday imperial consciousness, see MacKenzie, 1986). But this tells us little about the continuing and varied instances of workplace racism in the interests of racialised privilege. What happens to convince some people not only that they embody racialised privilege but also that defence of that position over-rides the possibilities of change that could arise from mobilising alliances of class?

To think about how people might come to imagine their self-preservation in racialised terms and pursue their (perceived) self-interest accordingly, we must revisit David Roediger's influential interventions to refocus attention on the wages of whiteness and the concept of racial capital (Roediger, 1994, 1999), but with a caveat. Roediger writes, in the main, of the explicitly racialised politics of the United States. The emergence of an attachment to white identity, even in circumstances when the material interests served by such an attachment are uncertain, and the process of disciplining life for work and the accompanying projection of pre-industrial physicality onto black (and perhaps 'red') populations are stories about the construction of the white worker in the United States. This is a space in which the terms of racial identification have been established in law and the terms of everyday citizenship and, as we have seen from the conceptualisation of whiteness as property, racial identification, misidentification and misinterpretation can be a matter of legal dispute in such contexts. For much of the world, however, the terms of racialised institutional privilege have operated through more coded means. In particular, whiteness is not spoken explicitly in all structures of white privilege. Equally, not all racialised privilege is coded as 'white'.

Roediger's ground-breaking work exemplifies a strand of labour history that seeks to uncover the dynamics of race alongside class formations. We might remember here that *The Wages of Whiteness* was met with some hostility on publication, yet this attention to racial identification in accounts of working-class life has reinvented one strand of labour history. Other illuminating examples include Satnam Virdee on the English working class and the role of racialised outsiders in working-class mobilisations (2014), Marvin Surkin's ground-breaking *Detroit: I Do Mind Dying* (1975) and Michael Innis-Jiménez on Mexican workers in Chicago (2013).

These are works that document the manner in which a racialised consciousness grips the working class, ruining some in the diversion from class unity. Arising from labour history approaches, sometimes combined with accounts of popular culture or industrial history, this is a body of work that is highly detailed and deeply located. Through this lens, we understand better the manner in which racial affiliation arises, mobilises and is sustained. We learn to recognise the manner in which racial claims come to cut across class affiliation. We see that racialised divisions can be mobilised by employers, but also by leaders of the labour movement and, most of all, by and among workers themselves. We can learn that the aversion to being associated with those deemed less than human may be so strong that it over-rides every other political claim. Without the care of this scholarship, we cannot think clearly about the texture of racialised divisions or about opportunities for other ways of being together. What cannot be learned through these

approaches is the extent to which the mobilisation of something like racialised division might be a recurrent event or whether we might be living through some adaptations of such mobilisations in the face of changes in how we work, live and imagine ourselves.

The wages of whiteness or something very similar may accrue to those who do not think of themselves as 'white' or who are not 'white' at all. In relation to Britain, this process has been examined most thoroughly in relation to ideas of national belonging—with a submerged but largely unspoken whiteness as an entry requirement into such belonging. Yet in other spaces, racialised advantage can be a matter of national belonging without whiteness (for a discussion of racism in Hong Kong, see Sautman and Kneehans, 2002) or something attached to a bundle of other supposed attributes such as language, religion or ancestral status.

In addition, the wages of whiteness trajectory revolves around the active forsaking of transracial solidarity by racially privileged workers—an unhappy state of affairs that has been identified as central to the failures of progressive and redistributive politics in the United States. In other locations, we can discern particular forms of allegiance to the state and/or ruling elite that are cemented by the additional pull of racialised affinity (for an argument suggesting that Myanmar's majority population benefits from systematic privilege that is similar to the wages of whiteness, see Walton, 2013). Perhaps the explicit choice to be 'not-slave' that has been seen to animate the allegiances of white workers in the United States is not available to other groups whose racialised advantage is constructed differently, perhaps in more fleeting ways. The more insistent focus of progressive labour history examining racial mobilisation and boundary-marking is the manner in which capitalism cannot remake itself without reinstituting differences between populations. Particular histories then inform the manner in which such differentiation comes to be articulated as interests, with such local interests suggesting how and why some differentiations become amplified while others do not.

My interest is not so much the manner in which the racism of the racially advantaged militates against class solidarity—although that is an urgent and important matter to address. Instead, this work considers the manner through which capitalism continually fragments and differentiates populations and is remade through these processes. Whatever the costs and inefficiencies of such differentiation without end, this is also an aspect of what remakes capitalism. The re-igniting of something like racialised differentiation may be likened to a pre-capitalist shadow, but nevertheless it is a phenomenon that we should recognise as recurrent in the histories of capitalist remaking.

EMPLOYER RACISMS

This is more interesting for our purposes. How does the exercise of racist techniques benefit employers? And is this an aspect of racial capitalism, when considered at this micro scale? We might imagine that workplace racisms reflect the uneven movement into a machinic capitalism that proliferates the range of fragmented locations, in the process displacing some previously privileged identities. The dynamic of exploitation through differential treatment alters in relation to these shifting statuses, but perhaps not always in predictable ways.

The day-to-day tussles about treatment and status and incivility and (sometimes) threatened or actual violence reveal an anxiety about the maintenance of racial privilege. If in previous eras the symbolic and actual racial violence of the workplace was designed to warn blacks or natives or foreigners to keep to their place and to understand their 'rights' as assured only if never claimed, more often now the workplace racist lashes out to say 'do not collapse the difference between me and you, because that difference is my only solace and source of status'. As the terms of employment become more punishing and less secure, including in public service and professional sectors, the defence of racialised privilege takes on a renewed urgency.

For employers, this sense among some workers that a previously assured status of privilege may be eroded opens possibilities of workplace management. When jobs are under threat, the employer can imply that those lesser people will be at risk first. When new and more punitive systems of work are introduced, the lesser people can be presented as trialling this newly differentiated form of work. The most astute of employers can smooth the introduction of more

dehumanising and depleting modes of work with the implied promise that this restructuring will work to reinstate and safeguard racialised hierarchies. There will be unregulated hours, cuts in rates of pay, removal of pension rights, insecure contracts—because this is what business demands—but these burdens will be shouldered by the racially subordinated. Not being the first target for employer attacks becomes, by default, a mark of racialised privilege. Of course, this fiction cannot be sustained for long, but a temporary postponement of such erosions continues to offer a semblance of the wages of whiteness for some.

WORKERS' RACISM IN TIMES OF RACIAL CONFIDENCE

The examples of apartheid South Africa and Rhodesia and of a segregated United States serve as a benchmark of worker participation in systems of racialised privilege. We understand why. These are situations where the wages of whiteness, far from remaining symbolic, were explicit and written into the formal arrangements of state and employers.

These are circumstances where the differential between the wages of white workers and others is systematised and protected. The protection is in the name of order, both racial and societal. Differential privilege ties white workers to more affluent strata of white society, up to and including employers. The implication is that all sectors of white society benefit from the subjugation of racialised groups, until they don't and then formal segregation ends.

The explicitly and avowedly racist ideas informing the societies of some spaces of racial capitalism—America, South Africa—can lead to a too-easy sense that these processes are peculiarities of these locations. Certainly, some discussions of apartheid South Africa presented that country's racist divisions as an anomaly, a cultural oddity that hampered the development of capitalism. Inevitably, this very particular account of racial capitalism sought to understand the workings of capitalism in an explicitly racial state and the manner in which capitalist development is enhanced or impeded by the racist practices of the apartheid state.

The most recognised use of the term 'racial capitalism' has arisen in relation to apartheid South Africa and analyses of this incarnation of racial capitalism have pointed to the active deployment of racist divisions as a means of tying white workers into an alliance with the state and white business. We have learned of state interventions acting to constrain the economic, social and political options available to black, 'coloured' and 'Indian' populations, leading, in effect, to state-sponsored hyperexploitation of black communities and a siphoning into sanctioned professions and activities for coloured and Indian communities. This tight interdependence between a racist state and a racist business class, with each confirming the actions of the other and with an overlapping membership, has been seen to characterise explicit racial capitalism. The underlying implication of such accounts is that racial segregation and hyperexploitation will end when the real (non-racial, interested only in profit) capitalists come to town. As an example, in the well-known work, *Capitalism and Apartheid*, Merle Lipton summarises the shift in thinking of apartheid South Africa 'in terms of whether economic forces, usually described as "rational", would prevail over 'irrational' political and ideological forces such as race prejudice and Afrikaaner nationalism' to become an issue that 'is now widely perceived as being a political struggle between different sets of economic interests, rather than a battle between archaic political and progressive economic forces' (Lipman, 1986, 5).

To move away from this depiction of the rationality of economic forces, it is helpful to think about another ground-breaking and highly influential summary. Harold Wolpe argues that the emergence of apartheid-era South African racial capitalism should be understood as 'the means for the reproduction of a particular mode of production' (Wolpe, 1972, 429)—that is, as the outcome of economic forces and the particularities of capitalist development in that location. To explain, Wolpe describes two central aspects of this development: the use of legal instruments to develop a capitalist infrastructure under state sponsorship and the deployment of state violence to defend property relations including through the use of overt racist repression (Wolpe, 1972, 430).

Wolpe describes the emergence of an economy that retains 'pre-capitalist' relations in some sectors, with this remnant of pre-capitalist distributive systems serving to subsidise the

inadequate wages of black workers. He describes the process through which the pre-capitalist sector is increasingly depleted as the arena of capitalist production absorbs the resources of the nation and squeezes living standards in the space of pre-capitalist distributive relations. This, Wolpe argues, is the trigger for South Africa to move from segregation to apartheid.

Apartheid represents the attempt to maintain the rate of surplus value and accumulation in the face of the disintegration of the pre-capitalist economy . . . apartheid, including separate development, can best be understood as the *mechanism specific to South Africa* in a period of secondary industrialisation, of maintaining a high rate of capitalist exploitation through a system which guarantees a cheap and controlled labour-force, under circumstances in which the conditions of reproduction . . . of that labour-force is rapidly disintegrating. (Wolpe, 1972, 432)

Wolpe is arguing that, for all its repression and apparent disregard for (black) human life, apartheid emerges as a technique to maintain the availability of black labour at an artificially depressed price. He offers an account that is astute about the requirement that this labour pool be kept both cheap and controlled: repression is required to crush collective mobilisation and to enforce the machinery of exclusion that can keep black labour cheap.

Yet what was most ground-breaking about Wolpe's account was the suggestion that apartheid emerges not as an expression of racism but as a technique to safeguard the structure of racist exploitation. Although the entire logic of apartheid is based around highly policed boundary-marking—the literal process of making apart—here we are told that white supremacism in this context is not an eliminationist project and cannot afford to be. What apartheid presents is a structure that assures access to a subjugated labour force and the ability to maintain conditions of extreme control over that labour force. Whereas other more recent accounts have excavated the continuing racist imaginaries that have informed apartheid and that continue to infect post-apartheid societies, Wolpe offers an (perhaps the definitive) account of why apartheid should not be considered as a distortion or diversion from the path of capitalist development. Instead, the work of Wolpe and others enables an understanding of the accommodation between nationalism or racism and capital, but not as a necessary or universal process. In a later piece, Wolpe reflects on the impact of his own earlier formulation and the continuing battle between those who see only capital and those who see only white domination in their analysis of the dynamics of apartheid South Africa.

The relationship between capitalism and white domination must be seen as a historically contingent, not necessary one. Moreover, that relationship will be both functional and contradictory at the same time (Wolpe, 1990, 8).

If we continue to reference South African apartheid as the exemplar of racism capitalism, we seem to agree that only this overt racism could distort the workings of capitalism. In warning against this, Wolpe argues for an understanding of the racialised and racist formations of capitalism as arising from particular dynamics of negotiation and accommodation. The end of apartheid has not ushered in a period of post-racial capitalism. Instead, there are extensive critiques of neoliberal policies which do not disrupt the economic inequalities of apartheid (Clark, 2014), embed neoliberalism through violence towards the population (Satgar, 2012) and fail to achieve the gains promised during the anti-apartheid struggle (Bond, 2000).

WORKERS' RACISM IN TIMES OF RACIAL DECLINE

Whatever the resilience of racism, in both state and popular incarnations, economic expansion and development have ceased to be so tightly linked to a sense of racial destiny. The narratives of racial belonging and shared responsibility that animated the moment of high empire makes less sense in a time of neoliberal fragmentation and the notion of a combined national/racial/economic destiny has become more a matter of nostalgia than policy.

Without wishing to underplay the drastic and continuing impact of racisms or the variously troubling promises to 'make America great again' or to 'take back control [of Britain]', I suggest that the narratives of economic expansion have abandoned explicitly racialised logics (although it might be argued that they live on in the register of civilisation, marketisation and participation in the global economy) in favour of a multiculturalised model of the perfect economic actor. In this

time of excessive celebration of the entrepreneur as a deculturalised yet cosmopolitan figure who can save lives by building businesses (for a sober appraisal of the need for entrepreneurship education in Nigeria, see Awogbenle and Iwuamadi, 2010; for an example of discussions of entrepreneurship as a goal for poverty reduction programmes, see Naudé, 2010), the wages of racialised privilege for workers become somewhat different. In part, we might consider this phase as a period of understandable panic as the terms of racialised privilege are rewritten. It is in this context of uncertain (but longed-for) racialised privilege that the renewed anxiety about the so-called white working class should be understood. The reinvigoration of racist rage in our time, often articulated explicitly in defence of differential privileges that are seen to be eroding, might be understood as this kind of desperate claim to maintain what is in the process of being lost. In the previous chapter we outlined some ways of thinking about the legacies of racialised dispossessions. This legacy shapes the positioning, the resources and the possibilities of differently racialised actors and groups. Whereas the framework of racialised privilege that anchored some lives during welfare capitalism is in disarray, displacing some of those who had relied on racial destiny or national identity or affinity with the captains of industry to secure their status and livelihoods, no alternative hierarchy of being has come into view (for accounts of changing and contracting welfare systems in Europe, see Andreotti and Mingione, 2016; Hermann, 2017). Those who have suffered racial subordination and disprivilege are offered no means of compensation and they, too, enter the terrain of post-welfare but without the legacies of previous racialised privilege. For those entering a phase where explicitly racialised privilege is dismantled in favour of differently coded or allocated status, the fear of becoming indistinguishable from the racially subordinated—and of living lives of no more security or privilege than them—resurrects the most extreme forms of racial protectionism, forms of rage that can collude with employers or that can disrupt businesses. Some racial capitalisms can be disrupted, ironically, by racism. The racism of some actors can confound demands for reconfigured terms of alliance or can become a populist call against 'economic progress' associated with differently racialised actors (for an earlier account of these issues, see Chua, 2002). Forms of 'antiracism' can be incorporated in shifting capitalist cultures, without disturbing longstanding patterns of racialised dispossession. Most troubling of all, battles for ascendancy within capitalist cultures can pit one form of (perhaps coded) racism against another (perhaps more open). The contestation between forms of racism confirms the illusion that an antiracist capitalism already exists and works to tie antiracists into variously misplaced defences of capitalist ways of life.

OTHER WAYS OF IMAGINING CAPITALISM

A large part of more recent anticapitalist debate can be characterised as either in the tradition of bodies and machines or in emerging from the critique of capitalocentrism. Inevitably, this work is indebted to both approaches, despite the realisation that these may be irreconcilable ways of thinking about our capitalist world.

In our consideration of the role of reproductive labour in any structure of racial capitalism, the work of feminist scholars who have argued that the erasure of women's (non-waged) work is central to capitalist formations has opened the way to think about how and why some populations can be placed as partially integrated into capitalist modes of production, that is, partially in paid work in the formal economy, yet also be partially excluded.

Does this make any sense? Partial exclusion is a nonsense concept, surely? Yet we know from a range of detailed studies that social barriers can create a limited entry into the formal economy, effectively barring some groups from particular occupations or places of work and also, through some additional but poorly understood set of practices, unable to access the protections available to other workers, but characterised by some as an outcome of social death (Cacho, 2012).

Systematic barriers to full participation in the formal economy or ability to access legal entitlements create populations who may have very high levels of economic underactivity (when thinking of waged work as the marker of economic activity); are excluded, absolutely or relatively,

from higher status and more highly paid forms of work; and who may be associated with particular forms of work or activity that is not favoured by other groups, such as care-work, cleaning or, perhaps, money-lending.

We might speculate that these structures of partial exclusion can be bolstered by the systems of discrimination that cut across all forms of work, so that the racially marked worker can experience acts designed (it seems) to confirm her vulnerability to partial exclusion no matter what form of work she is in (for an account of racialised barriers experienced by highly qualified migrant workers in Canada, see Peña Muñoz, 2016).

This assumes that there is a continuing symbolic connection between the partially integrated/partially excluded and those vulnerable to discrimination on the grounds of (any fiction of) race—and that this symbolic connection is narrated as an issue of race. Something like this suggestion is made by Roediger (1991, 1994). Others have suggested that the continuing vulnerability of the racially marked in positions of relative privilege arises from the reactions of others who view such individuals as out of place (Tate, 2014). The operation of racial capitalism perpetuates patterns of discrimination that result in forms of (partial) economic exclusion, often across generations and in sufficiently systematic a manner to cement the association between racialised attribution and economic positioning.

This whole discussion, however, rests on the suggestion that noncapitalist spaces exist both alongside and within capitalism and that we must refuse the totalising claims of capitalism in order to see and comprehend such differentiation. At heart, this is a way of thinking that seeks to see possibility in economic marginalisation and to retrieve the human as a residue beyond the colonisation of capital.

In relation to the role of reproductive labour, this way of thinking is invaluable. Without this framework, it is almost impossible to understand economically 'excluded' populations as anything other than victims of a kind of living death, endlessly waiting for an opportunity to become 'productive'. However, the implication that spaces of solace exist alongside and within capitalism sits uncomfortably with any discussion of consumer culture. While racialised populations may be integrated imperfectly or partially into the framework of production, forcing the innovation of non-capitalocentric modes of survival, circuits of capitalist consumption are all but inescapable. How can the injunctions to consumption without end be so unstoppable and embedded in everyday consciousness unless we understand the manner in which capitalist logics colonise our life-worlds?

These two modes of analysis run in parallel, and there is considerable disagreement between the accounts. However, both offer something to a discussion of racial capitalism.

The influential work of Lazzarato and others, following Deleuze and Guattari, has led to an explosion of interest in the machinic as a mode of capitalist subjection. Yet is machinic enslavement any better a framework for comprehending the overwhelming force of consumerism and, through this, the dispersal of populations into racialised categories?

We might understand the framework of machinic enslavement to point to the manner in which human beings are made machinic through material and symbolic processes, bypassing the linguistic spaces of subject formation and individuation. Instead of corroborating the fictions of personhood, wholeness and subjectivity (in the name of hegemonic ordering), machinic enslavement operates by dispersing, fragmenting and undoing such fictions of wholeness. In this set of processes the scripts of the social become secondary. Who knows or cares if I am mother, comrade or worker? The moment of my economic functionality has no need of such all-encompassing characterisations. Equally, my functionality in this moment may not require adherence to larger social disciplines of sexuality or status, the dispersal of the machine may offer some temporary release.

For our purposes, the challenge is to think about the mechanisms of consumer culture without resorting to invocations of the language-led identity-full subject. That creature may have had an existence in a former moment of welfare capitalism, for some, but it is hard to see where or how she lives today. Our discussion of racialised differentiation in status and exclusion has focused

on forms of work. Yet alongside the varying relations to 'the wage', we are also integrated into the capitalist economy and its accompanying cultural formations through processes of consumption. This is not the pleasurably creative consumption of branded identity-making (although the desire to actualise self through consumption practices plays its role and circulates through the edge spaces of the formal economy). Instead, consumption practices refer to the process of obtaining what is necessary for life, often via corporate production that takes place only in the (new) metropoles (for some thoughts on how to understand consumption practices among the urban poor, see Huat, 2016). The inescapability of this set of machinic processes, even for those rendered marginal as producers, ensures that 'non-productive' populations are also subject to machinic enslavement and all that this entails.

In fact, the dispersals of edge economies reveal starkly the fragmentation that characterises subjectivation in the machinic economy. Writing in 1986, Mies already identifies the manner in which poor women become enslaved by debt under cover of poverty-reduction policies based on gaining access to disposable income, that is, by gaining access to the consumer economy. The fragmented being of indebted milk producer, a side industry that operates to create greater debt and further deplete the space of subsistence, represents integration into the machinic economy serving capital without any of the benefits of actual consumption. A similar argument has informed the critique of microfinance initiatives (see Roy, 2010). The incorporation of poor women as debtors creates new forms of bonded 'labour', ensuring that the housewifised work of this population can be mined for the purposes of accumulation under cover of encouraging entrepreneurship.

MANY RACIAL CAPITALISMS

Throughout this work I have tried to keep reminding the reader that this is not a total theory. Racial capitalism is not a replacement theory of capitalism. In fact we should understand from the outset that we are speaking of racial capitalisms. It is not the racial logics of particular formations that inform the economic arrangements, rather different economic arrangements are punctuated by racial logics.

There are two ways to see this problem. One is to regard all capitalism as racial, which although plausible is too banal to enable further understanding. The other option is to attempt to test the 'racialness' of capitalism through some examination of raciality in different settings. If capitalism is uneven, shifting, fragmented, then surely racial capitalism cannot escape this variation and multiplicity. We cannot sustain an understanding of capitalism as complex and evolving alongside an account of racial capitalism as monolithic and frozen across time and space. Although it pains me to say so, something like this second problem arises in Robinson's incredible account of racial capitalism in *Black Marxism*. In part, this is a disciplinary matter. It is not the task of historians to track the current or emergent forms of a phenomenon. However, and despite the extreme prescience of his central observations, Robinson does imply a racial logic that has been present since the pre-history of capitalism and that informs both the emergence of capitalism and the underlying character of capitalism throughout time.

For Robinson the opportunistic mobilisation of ethnic difference in early capitalism, enabling an easier sifting of populations into occupational categories, in its turn enables the racialisation of forced labour that runs deep in the formation of American capitalism and society. As Robinson's interest is the emergence of a black radical tradition in response to these violences, little of his discussion focuses on the parallel dispossessions of Native populations or of the place of American racial capitalism in a contemporary global frame.

In what follows I do not seek to persuade those who tend towards Robinson's (admittedly compelling) view to abandon this perspective. All that I ask is a moment's pause. However much you may be personally convinced of the 'racial truth' of capitalism, I ask that you mute such deeply held opinions temporarily. Imagine that it is only by adopting an approach that regards the continuance of any form of racial capitalism as surprising and demanding examination that we have any chance of dismantling such formations. Think of the possible avenues that could be opened to change if we feigned ignorance momentarily and pretended that racism was

unexpected. Just try for an instance to be uncynical, to embrace naivety, most of all to imagine a world that pre-dated racial logics in order to imagine a world that will truly post-date such inhumanities. This is the starting point of this book's project. Let us begin by trying to see with clarity what happens now that we might designate as racial capitalism.

In the first iteration of this work, a phase that took many hours of apparently fruitless worrying, I was convinced that 'reproductive labour' must be considered in a far broader vein, far beyond the household or the family, to encompass the networks of relationships and contact that enable some to be, however momentarily, functioning producers of exchange value. I was transfixed by this possibility, in large part, due to the head-expanding insights of Sanyal (2007), who forced me to understand, belatedly, that much human life takes place alongside capitalism formations of production. Not in waiting to enter and not as a feeder of anything, but just alongside—and this alongsideness has its own impact on capitalist and noncapitalist spaces and politics.

In the second and third iterations that have become this book, I have sought to uncover the manner in which a varied terrain of diverse human and non-human contacts that 'reproduce' labour power, including the space alongside capitalist formations, might be considered as necessary components of what we think of as capitalism. The central term, of course, is 'necessary'—is there something integral and irreplaceable that is contributed by this array of sustenance, entertainment and just dull co-existence? Would the wheels come off capitalism if some or all of this additional activity became inaccessible?

As time has gone on I have become less and less certain of the terms of the 'necessary'. Perhaps this is not at all how to approach the mysteries of contemporary capitalism. Perhaps the very suggestion of the 'necessary' falls back hopelessly into the deterministic. Certainly, my attempts to identify what is 'necessary' and what is merely coincidental or actually 'non-economic' have led to little insight. Whereas the model of reproductive labour that focuses on the household has the benefit of narrowing consideration to day-to-day reproduction of the body and its work-facing faculties, once we extend our interest to the wider sets of activity and sustenance that go in to making any person, what is necessary, as opposed to merely sustaining or pleasurable, becomes unclear.

For a long time I was also fixated on the place of 'disposable' populations in the landscape of capitalism. In this, I was influenced by the reinvigorated debates about primitive accumulation of recent years but also by the sense that entry into a waged working class seemed beyond the life possibilities of many. While Marx teaches us that labour is endlessly substitutable and that the push to replace labour constitutes a central logic of accumulation, it was a challenge to me to see the people of the world as anything other than actual or would-be workers (Marx and Engels, 1969). Although I admit freely that this is a weakness in my own conceptual habits, I also think that something like this weakness haunts a range of ways of thinking and the minds formed in these conceptual frameworks. The discourse of economic development, for example, rests heavily on the assumption that everyone will be brought into economic activity and waged labour will play a central role in such economic building (World Bank, 2012). There may be an acceptance of other roles, including the much-celebrated micro-entrepreneurship, but economic participation circles back to work most of the time. There is little appetite for rebuilding local economies through creating large numbers of rent-seekers (although one critique of mainstream development has been that this can be an unplanned outcome of development-orientated intervention).

Once the realisation that some populations may be deemed to be surplus to the requirements of capitalist development has been digested, a range of other (very interesting) questions arise. Firstly, what influences the status of populations in this regard? Geographical luck? For the purposes of this work, I have pursued the idea that accrued histories of racialised belief influence what can be tolerated in terms of disposability. Therefore the manner in which we know and accept the vast gap in life expectancy and quality of life between different parts of the globe reflects sedimented beliefs about which lives matter and such beliefs include elements of racialised hierarchy (for an upsetting reminder of the huge disparity in numbers of under-five

deaths both between 'developed' and 'less developed' nations and within less-developed nations, see Amouzou, Kozuki and Gwatkin, 2014). Of course, there are adaptations—lives worth living have become 'multicultural', and this can be taken as an overcoming of racialised thinking. Yet at the same time, disposable lives continue to be concentrated overwhelmingly in the global south and continue to reflect the attribution of human worth of another (imperial) era.

Although the concept of disposability is hugely suggestive, it has some descriptive limitations. Some have sought to employ this term as a catch-all for the various exclusions and disadvantages imposed by the workings of neoliberal economics (Giroux and Evans, 2015). Yet the collapsing of the experiences of the urban poor of the global north with those lives ravaged by climate crisis and war in the south seems too ambitious to be helpful. So instead of a divide between the useful and disposable, perhaps it is more productive to consider degrees of disposability under twenty-first-century capitalism. This captures something of the crisis of reproduction that erupts across locations, but also retains enough flexibility to distinguish between the city that is left to die and the populations who continue to work in employment that cannot sustain a decent life because they have no other options. Both examples exemplify something about disposability, but not at the same intensity.

This, then, is one aspect of the many racial capitalisms. The sorting of global and local populations into hierarchies of disposability is assisted by practices of racialisation, including longstanding attributions of social status associated with racialised categorisation. 'Racism' does not initiate this process, although it lives alongside it. At the same time, there is something 'useful' to capitalism in the ability to sort populations in this way, although this usefulness may be no more than an opportunity to become embedded in practices of status attribution that already exist.

The other factor of significance when thinking about the making of disposable populations is the suggestion that we are witnessing a contraction of the global labour market—whether in the face of technological innovation or limited resources. Despite the continuing rhetoric of economic growth and development through expansion, and despite the endless injunctions to enter the workforce, to be work-ready and to increase productivity, it seems increasingly unlikely that the majority of the world's population will enter the standard labour force (Kapsos et al., 2015). Increasing automation threatens to erase the need for human input in many roles (for an analysis that suggests that automation threatens a minority of jobs but should be considered alongside digitalisation, see Arntz, Gregory and Zierahn, 2016). We are learning, painfully, that there is a limit to economic growth in a world of finite resources. In such a time, disposability becomes a more, not less, likely experience.

CAPITALISM'S DIVERSE LIFESTYLES

Throughout this work, the nagging doubt creeps back again and again—perhaps there is no systematic connection to be charted between racisms and capitalism(s?). Apart from the established moments of historical interdependence, what is there that can be charted across time and space? The expression of racisms is so varied and changeable, how could it be argued that all of these incidents constitute aspects of capitalist processes, in all their depressingly mundane everyday detail as well as their extensive and systematic reach? Surely some racisms are outside any easy reference to the workings of capitalism? Maybe it is capitalism that creates the context of rage that emerges in racist outbursts, but does every racist outburst 'serve' capitalism in any meaningful sense?

What seems more plausible is to think of the terrain of social life as highly varied and with a variety of logics in play, but to concede that some aspects of these autonomous logics (including such deep-rooted habits as 'race' or 'sexuality') can loop back to play a role in capitalist reproduction. Leaving us with the banal point that some casual racisms may be part of racial capitalism while others are not.

For our purposes—the shared attempt to comprehend what is happening around us and what may be distinctive or significant about the capitalism of our time—what matters is the role of racist expropriation or categorisation in remaking populations in the service of capital *now*. As

part of such a quest, there must be consideration of what has gone before and the continuing impact of what has gone before, but the primary focus is on today and tomorrow. This is not to say that there is no attention to the past, only that this is not (primarily) a historical project. That work is being done elsewhere and with far greater expertise. Racial capitalism today continues some practices of the past and builds on some key histories of expropriation and continuing inequality. However, it is not a formation that can be read as linear narrative from then to now. Other processes of expropriation enter the equation. Different populations become entangled in the terms of racialised exploitation. The benefits of analysing the workings of racial capitalism include the possibility of finding ways of showing that none of this is inevitable and could and should be changed.

In the end, and perhaps unexpectedly, this is a work of optimism and hope. Each aspect of differentiation and division in the name of exploitation is so fragile, so precarious—at any moment one or other aspect of this edifice could fall. In fact, aspects fall every day. The tiny cracks and crumbling don't make the change we need, but they let us see each other more clearly. Collectivity becomes sometimes more possible, suddenly we can become a mass, a movement, an unstoppable force. But it must be us, not some other whom we have designated as our agent of history. In the final two chapters we will consider some ways of thinking about collectivity and division in the face of diminishing resources, in the hope that such deliberations may reveal forms of connectedness that do not rely on similarity.

Chapter 5
Territory and Borders, Racial Capitalism and Sovereignty in Crisis

Michel Agier opens his account of the era of the refugee camp with a story about 'the world' and the other places where the 'remnants' live.

This world seems to include all available space, the whole breadth of the terrestrial globe, as it were. But this totality is no more than a mirage. . . . The other reality remains invisible, even though its existence is not totally unknown: large parts of the planet are separated off, behind high walls and barriers or across long stretches of sand or water, at the heart of deserts and forests. Other human beings live there. The world's 'Remnants'. (Agier, 2011, 1)

Agier narrates the most gripping of tales, of these other semi-hidden spaces of the remnants. He writes of the emerging spaces of the camps without end and raises the all too urgent question of what such spaces might be, what they might become. This question resurfaces in other recent research: the impact of enclosure and enforced immobility on the politics of the city (Diken, 2004), the possibility that over time longstanding refugee camps will take on the status of cities (Montclos and Kagwanja, 2000) and the tensions that arise when attempts at 'development' in camp settings are seen to threaten claims to return by ameliorating the impact of displacement (Gabiam, 2012). We, too, will return to such questions as the chapter goes on, informed by Agier's suggestion that we are witnessing 'the experimentation of the large-scale segregations that are being established on a planetary scale' (Agier, 2002, 320).

But to start we must begin with much more mundane and obvious matters.

Against the images of drowning families, corpses dead from dehydration, lips sewed shut and bodies bundled onto planes, the casual suggestion that we have entered a 'new' era of migration has been all too easy to accept (for a formative account, see Castles and Miller, 1998). Who could doubt that the movement of people is one of the central challenges of our time?

Yet in this easy acceptance of migration as a challenge, there is also a tacit assertion that human beings should be and usually are static. Movement is presented as the anomaly and the push to contain movement is offered as no more than human nature, as if all people throughout all history have been waiting to complain about the incursion of the newly arrived foreign neighbours. Instead, let us think of our time not as the era of migration but as the era of bordering—that time when the machineries of border control became so multiplied and integrated into everyday life that bordering becomes our everyday in 'the world' (that place that appears to take up all available space).

Bordering arises as this developed technology of government only in relatively recent times (for an overview of the strange histories of UK immigration controls, see Hayter, 2000; for an unforgettable account of the work that must be done to enact and legitimise immigration controls, see Cohen, 2006). This is a set of practices that relies on the assumption of traceability, of identification, of data management and of the ability of the state to collect, collate and manage this array of information (for an account of policing techniques developed and deployed to 'manage' migrants, see Rosenberg, 2006; for more on the development of methods of documenting individual identity, see Caplan and Torpey, 2001; for an illuminating account of one history of the passport, see Robertson, 2010). It does not matter that the realities of bordering fall far short of this imagined masterful overview. The assumption of what is knowable and how such knowability can come about remains an underlying logic in these endeavours.

These matters have become more fraught again, as the world is returning again to a phase of extreme and ongoing population movement. Nations may attempt to erect borders in a manner that controls such movement, but this is no more than an attempt. The most wealthy and powerful nations expend countless resources on the policing of their borders and yet are unable to halt the movement (to understand the escalating costs of ineffectual border control in the

United States, although only until 2007, see Hagan and Phillips, 2008; for an instructive unpacking of what we mean by effective immigration control, with the conclusion that other state policies shape the terrain of population movement, see Czaika and De Haas, 2013). Poorer parts of the world may mimic the gestures of border control but, in fact, such border policing is largely symbolic. The flow of refugees and establishment of near-permanent camps becomes part of the geography of new wars (Münckler, 2005). Whatever threat or surveillance is deployed, other greater and often more threatening forces keep pushing people to move and to move regardless of borders.

In this moment when movement is unstoppable and a major characteristic of our time and for the foreseeable time to come, the barriers that are erected and the patterns of attempted border control become a central technique of racial capitalism.

What I mean by this is that the processes of sorting, rationing, slowing up, holding up, and then on entry the processes of becoming irregular, undocumented, in the informal economy, all serve as methods of differentiating populations and their entry into economic activity. Bordering concocts a whole host of status-identities, most of them unstable, but in a manner that positions moving populations in a net of economic (im)possibility (for a discussion of the logics of such differential positioning through bordering, see Anderson, 2013). Although this process of being positioned as this or that and then finding that access to economic goods including work is determined by the manner of the positioning can seem to be fixing in the moment, there is also something endlessly undecided about this process of differential dispossession. In part, this uncertainty arises from the rise of everyday bordering and an increasingly mobile process of bordering activity. The analysis of 'everyday bordering' comes from my colleagues, Nira Yuval-Davis, Georgie Wemyss and Kathryn Cassidy.

Everyday 'bordering and ordering' practices create and recreate new social-cultural boundaries and borders which are also spatial in nature . . . de- and re-bordering processes involve the territorial displacement and relocation of borders and border controls that are, in principle, being carried out by anyone anywhere—government agencies, private companies and individual citizens. (Yuval-Davis, Wemyss and Cassidy, 2017, 2)

The institution of border control is a machinery that seeks to monitor and control the movement of people across the nation's borders, it is not, in the main, a machinery that is designed to prevent all mobility. Embedded in the logic of border control is the suggestion that populations and perhaps even individuals should have differential access to movement (to understand the manner in which everyday bordering impacts on those with settled immigration status, see Yuval-Davis, Wemyss and Cassidy, 2017).

In a parallel with the war on drugs, bordering itself creates a myriad of opportunities for those willing to take on the risks of operating in an illicit arena. Yet equally, and again in common with other illicit business sectors, there is a symbiotic relationship between the licit and illicit in the economies of the border. The innovation of the actors in the shadow economy demands ever more innovation among those offering the services of securitisation and of monitoring (for an account of the manner in which those with irregular immigration status can become 'camouflaged' and therefore integrated, see Chauvin and Garcés-Mascareñas, 2014). These two arenas of activity demarcate the spaces of economic life, with the illicit worlds that open up with the intensification of bordering coming to overlap with and overtake other elements of the shadow economy and the securitised business of monitoring increasingly infecting all aspects of policing/monitoring/regulation as well as moving into other areas of state-run business (for a discussion of Blackwater's move from militarised security machine in war to militarised policing at borders, see Koulish, 2007, and his account of the immigration-industrial complex; for a discussion of the use of biometrics in bordering and the creep of this technology into aspects of securitisation, see Zureik and Hindle, 2004; for an intriguing but scary account of technical cooperation and innovation in the pursuit of immigration control and the unintended consequences of these endeavours, see Andersson, 2016a).

While there is an interesting question to consider in relation to the formation of capitalist states, it is more pertinent to consider the role of bordering in the *maintenance* of capitalist states. While we may posit the role of sovereignty as central to the self-realisation of the capitalist state and the claim to rule a territory through the discipline enacted on and through its population, for our purposes the question of why well-established capitalist states have entered the downward spiral towards absolute bordering in each and every public and near public space that can be reached is more urgent.

MONEY AND WALLS

Every barrier is a business opportunity to someone. The rise of the security business reveals the erection, policing and monitoring of barriers as among the most lucrative of transnational businesses. It is also a form of business that is expanding—with spin-offs including a whole range of replacement services as states become less able or less willing to undertake the roles of policing, fighting, guarding and imprisoning (for a discussion of the cooperation between children's charities and corporations in the provision of immigration detention, including of children, see Tyler et al., 2014; for more on the incursion of the private sector into all aspects of immigration control and the policy challenges raised by this, see Bloom, 2015).

Bordering may continue to be initiated by 'states'—yet increasingly, this initiation is in order to buy in assistance with the administration of such border claims. The assertion and sometimes erection of the border may be included in our ideas of claiming sovereignty, but the practices of inscribing and maintaining the border may reveal the weaknesses of many modern states. Perhaps it was always so—after all, the border is also an acceptance of the point where the authority of the state ends. It is both an assertion that power is wielded up until this line and also an admittance that beyond this point power disappears or belongs to someone or something else.

Whereas for much of human history, movement has yielded economic opportunities and the chance of profit, the border as an entity that hampers movement and conjures up a machinery of surveillance is a relatively new phenomenon. Whereas the powerful may have fought over territory for centuries, the border as a marker to disallow the inward movement of people is, largely, a product of the twentieth century (for an account of the different formations of border control in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Britain and Prussia, see Reinecke, 2009; for an account of the emergence of immigration controls in early twentieth-century France, see Rosenberg, 2006). Therefore, and although the militarised border has spawned its own economic formations throughout human history, it is the border as barrier to population movement that is the focus of this chapter.

The segmentation of space and the erection of borders has become a central aspect of political organisation in our time. Controlling and shaping population movement is among the most consistently racialised practices of most contemporary states. In addition, the establishment and policing of borders has entered governmentality as the most omnipresent tactic of power. Taken together, this means that attention to the concept, construction and disciplining of borders demands the serious attention of anyone seeking to understand processes of expulsion and dispossession.

In particular, here we try to understand the following:

- How the border as barrier demands its own machinery and the economics of establishing and maintaining such a machinery;
- How the assertion of the border as barrier serves to sort people into different categories of entitlement and economic possibility and with what consequences for the shape of the economy as a whole;
- How the erection of barriers is itself productive and becomes the occasion of entrepreneurial innovation in the face of walls.

Taken together, these three aspects could be understood as an outline of the economy of the border.

The first aspect is the most straightforward in many ways. As a complex and resource-intensive area of state practice, the establishment and maintenance of the border can become another standing cost of government. Alongside the police and the prison service, border control is absorbed into the overtly disciplinary arm of the state. As such, its costs are rarely questioned.

More interestingly, for our purposes, is the manner in which the machinery of the border has extended to infect 'domestic' spaces so that the internal business of the nation becomes intertwined with an ongoing and endless process of bordering and border control. This means that resources must be allocated not only to the contained activity of the physical border but also to the far more dispersed processes of everyday bordering. This extension of the reach of the border alters the shape of the economy of the border. While the policing of the physical border may retain the characteristics of a Keynesian public work, injecting state spending into the economy in a relatively defined and limited way, the more dispersed extension of the border has other impacts.

In common with other surveillance practices, the dispersed border adds additional burdens to state services and, increasingly, to private actors (for one example, private transport firms, see Scholton, 2015). In this the extension of the border resembles the imposition of unfair taxes, it becomes a cost that must be borne by the population. Yet creating barriers to movement also has its own economic productivity. While we have become accustomed to registering productivity at the level of meaning, and practices of bordering have also been analysed extensively for the cultural meanings that they generate (for an illuminating account of the interplay between cultural representations and material practices of bordering, see Brambilla et al., 2016), there is also an economic productivity to the border. At the most obvious, the erection and policing of borders requires its own state machinery with organisations, the creation of material sites of bordering, the development of policy and administrators, the construction of a whole bureaucracy with all of its many parts. In his gripping account, *Illegality, Inc, Clandestine Migration and the Business of Bordering Europe*, Ruben Andersson refers to this as the 'illegality industry', a term that

foregounds productivity, or how the multifarious agencies purportedly working on 'managing' illegality in fact produce more of it. (Andersson, 2014, 15)

The productivity that Andersson identifies attaches primarily to state-sponsored activities, including the provision of bordering services to states by private corporations. However, the industry also describes the symbiotic relationship between the businesses of 'border control' and those of 'border crossing', spanning state violence and criminal entrepreneurship. These endeavours are productive in the sense that they create what they seek to contain, but they are also productive in the sense of igniting economic activity. As we will go on to discuss, this is a productivity that both erects an increasingly vast machinery of (attempted) control and that leads to a redistribution of population that brings its own uncontainable productivity.

SEPARATING 'SURPLUS' POPULATIONS FROM ACCESS TO 'SCARCE' RESOURCES

This is a complex of processes that brings together both bordering and war, and which might also allow us to think about the interests at work in siphoning people around the world and yet forcibly stalling movement at particular junctures. This may take the form of very old-fashioned annexation or siege, as we have seen in Syria with devastating outcomes (Power, 2016). It may take the form of the forcibly halted journeys of hundreds of thousands in a manner that must create a new settlement in the harshest of environments, as we have seen in Kenya (Jansen, 2016). It may take the form of militarised segregation creating a parallel but informal 'city' alongside or within and between the capitalist city, as we have seen in Lagos or in Mumbai (for a discussion of state violence in Mumbai slums, see Weinstein, 2013; for an account of the emergence of such 'fragile cities', see Muggah, 2014). At the same time, this forcible warehousing of dispossessed populations, in spaces and in a manner that must seriously limit their access to necessary resources, creates thin and dangerous lines of passage into better-resourced spaces. Those able to move through these narrow routes of escape may enter the economy of the better-resourced, but retain a marker of disadvantage from their journey. The

mark of having escaped, even temporarily, from any of the new wastelands of global capitalism limits the economic possibilities of the escapee.

The era of accelerating accumulation by dispossession is also the era in which there is a widespread consciousness of the limits to capitalist expansion. Such an awareness is signalled explicitly in corporate pronouncements and in the official statements of international bodies. The World Bank's assessment of the impact of climate change on poverty reveals both a high level of concern, if not panic, alongside a continued adherence to (quite recently established) tenets of poverty reduction such as financial inclusion for the poor (Hallegatte et al., 2016). Despite the implication that it might be possible to continue business as usual, if only the appropriate economic infrastructure could be made/found, this consciousness of limit can be discerned as a recurrent theme in talk and in planning. We might suggest that it is this, more than any other single factor, that distinguishes our moment. This is the context in which there is an intensification of bordering. As the realisation of scarcity impacts on battles over resources, this extends to the actions of local elites (for discussion of the manner in which domestic politics and 'national' interest has informed engagement with international climate change talks, see Harrison and Sundstrom, 2010).

In the absence of (supposedly) empty spaces that can be 'integrated' into the global economy, the push to expand is diverted to other spaces. Importantly here, we might remind ourselves that earlier phases of expansion into supposedly open spaces in fact represented a displacement of the original inhabitants of these places. These histories of settler-colonialism reveal that the fiction of empty spaces has been central to the free injection of resources for colonising nations. With the benefit of decolonial insights, we might understand that none of these spaces of free resources have been empty and that the precedent of rendering territory 'empty' in order to dispossess existing inhabitants is well established. We might speculate that the active creating of 'empty territory' through violent means (as a technique of accumulation by dispossession) is returning as a response to a consciousness of limit.

Against this background and the threatening precedents of colonising nations themselves, the intensification of bordering can be seen as an attempted defence against being made 'native' or the danger that more powerful actors will render your home 'empty' and available. The border, then, may be designed to protect local economic interests against the threat of being usurped by incomers, whether this is in response to fantasy or to the experience of changing status and circumstances.

Much of this work has attempted to describe and comprehend the processes of racialised division that occur through capitalist expansion and intensification, and due to the diffuseness of these processes, the attempt has been to describe broad trends while seeking to avoid conspiracy-style accounts that posit a master subject of Capital or, even less plausibly, The Capitalist Class. Bordering, however, is unlike other themes in our discussion. Bordering is a state practice and as such it must be decided, agreed, planned, resourced and sustained. It may not indicate a unified class view, but it does require a plan and that plan emerges from actors who have some belief in what can be achieved through the ever-extending processes of immigration control.

Of course, the policy choice of heightened bordering must reflect something of the local political landscape. These are not the decisions of univocal or unified actors. As Eric Williams reminds us, there are material interests at stake and some actors will be invested in projects or formations that are in decline or whose time has past (Williams, 1994). Yet in each instance of bordering there is an actor in the form of the state and the 'interests' of the state, here, inform the construction of the complex and extensive machinery of bordering. While it is true that many aspects of everyday bordering appear to be designed to embed immigration control in the practices of everyday life to such an extent that bordering becomes our collective common sense and takes on its own momentum, independently of state resourcing and monitoring, only states can initiate border-regimes. Other actors may colonise these practices, extend them or run alongside them, but the initial marking and policing of the border remains a privilege of the state.

An inability to manage borders is regarded as one indication of a weak or potentially failing state (Rotberg, 2002).

This, then, is a discussion that must return to some consideration of the capitalist state. Through most of this work, the state has been a muted presence. Much of what has been under discussion in these pages occurs across and between state boundaries. Some arises from the interplay of global economic forces and national-level politics (this is Sanyal's account of the postcolonial wasteland in Indian incarnation, with some encouragement from international development agencies). Some reflects the attempts of states to name legacies of dispossession and to address historical injuries, whether as representatives of claimants or of perpetrators. In a narrow set of instances, state actions have been planned and operationalised as part of an explicit project of racial subjugation. More generally, state actions to smooth the path of capital intersect with processes of racial subordination unevenly and sometimes unexpectedly. As will have been apparent, the discussion of racial capitalism here does not focus on the conduct of the racial state. However, when considering the business of bordering, the will to sovereignty must enter our consideration. Immigration control must be, necessarily, an indication of the manner in which states seek to demonstrate their sovereignty through the management of their boundaries. As John Torpey has argued, seeking to monopolise control over the movement of people has become a central component of asserting authority as a state.

Passports and other documentary controls on movement and identification have been essential to states' monopolization of the legitimate means of movement since the French Revolution, and that this process of monopolization has been a central feature of their development as states during that period. (Torpey, 2000, 3)

Yet, at the same time, what we are witnessing increasingly is a cooperation or struggle between states to institute and maintain the discipline of the border. For some, the inability to assert the location of their borders becomes a central question against their statehood (for a warning of the threat to sovereignty for those bordering more powerful states, see Longo, 2017). For others, it is the ability to operate with others to demarcate some spaces as in-between and as holding spaces for the displaced that demonstrates an entry into the grown-up world of twenty-first-century international politics (for a discussion of Indonesia's diplomatic gains arising from border cooperation with Australia, see Nethery and Gordyn, 2014). In some instances, engaging in such negotiations and the ugly practices that are agreed becomes a new form of civilisational test (for an evaluation of the agreement between Turkey and the European Union, see Kirişci, 2014). After the years in which the echo of clashing civilisations rippled into every public debate about global relations, the heightened (and seemingly ever heightening) anxiety about borders promises to remake the lines of alliance. The shared project of repelling and containing the mobile and needy populations of the world creates a different kind of civilisational alliance and opens a different kind of cooperation and/or outsourcing when it comes to the marking and maintenance of (external) borders.

This offers another way to think about the interests that are served through bordering. While bordering in one country represents an act of old-fashioned assertion of sovereignty, making a display of the establishment and policing of borders *even when no-one believes that such bordering can be effective*, cooperation between national governments to create a transnational network of bordering implies a different logic. Allying with other states reveals the limitations of state sovereignty in relation to the 'challenge' of the movement of people.

The logic of cooperative bordering moves beyond the simple sovereignty-inside/exclusion-outside model. Most obviously, the move to cooperative arrangements reveals that the assertion of sovereignty in these old-fashioned terms is a fiction. The gesture of exclusion is precisely that, no more than a gesture and in no way an indication that the 'undesirables' (in Agier's blunt but unarguable term) can be repelled or expelled through the actions of one state. Instead the cooperative arrangements that have emerged reveal a more variegated system where some bordering is broken down into a number of aspects and these are distributed and/or shared across spaces and authorities.

For ease of discussion, we might consider the types of cooperation as:

- Agreements attributing 'responsibility' for particular routes and populations in movement. Andersson argues that Morocco has embraced this role, claiming a kind of 'geographical rent' arising from its position as a potential entry point to Europe (Andersson, 2016);
- Agreements that seek to prevent populations in movement from reaching particular significant points of transit, such as the borders of members of the European Union. This is exemplified by the EU 'deal' with Turkey that tasks Turkey with accepting the return of all 'new irregular migrants' arriving in Greece via the Aegean Sea after 16 March 2016 (see http://www.migrationpolicy.org/news/paradox-eu-turkey-refugee-deal);
- Agreements that some nations/governments will warehouse populations in movement, sometimes for direct payment, sometimes as part of wider negotiations relating to international agreements. Australia's offshoring of immigration detention to Nauru and Papua New Guinea represents the most infamous example (Nethery and Holman, 2016);
- Outcomes that arise not due to agreement, but as a result of power differentials that enable some states to expel populations in movement into spaces/nations without such authority. For example, although Libya previously enjoyed trade and other incentives as an outcome of border cooperation with Italy (the 2008 'Friendship Pact'), post-Gaddafi Libya has become a dangerous default location for many desperate migrants (Amnesty International, 2015).

As bordering processes often reflect local and regional political arrangements and/or conflicts, we may consider patterns of border control as outcomes of cartel practices. Border control, at one basic level, represents the processes by which particular networks of power seek to regulate the extent of the labour movement. I am aware that this sounds so breath-takingly obvious that it is barely worth saying. However, the point to note is not the most obvious deduction that border controls are an attempt to control borders. Instead, the beginning of our discussion must consider what kind of control bordering is designed to achieve. From this we may move on to consider the forms of control or intervention that are achieved through the techniques of the border, and only then we may venture some guesses into why such control is deemed desirable and in whose interests.

BORDERING, PRODUCTIVITY AND WAREHOUSING

While it is important to understand bordering as an economically productive activity, it is also important to consider the variety of activity that is undertaken in the name of maintaining borders and to comprehend the different kinds of economic formation that arise around or as a result of these differing activities.

We might consider the business of security as an extension of the arms trade. Of course, the erection and policing of borders represents a central aspect of securitisation (see Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015). Arguably, it is the techniques of everyday bordering that inform much of the securitisation of everyday life that we witness across the globe. This is not to say that such a move to reorganising state interventions according to the logics of security is a response to the challenges of bordering. Sometimes it is and sometimes it isn't. What it is to say is that the diffusion of bordering practices into so many realms of life has offered a model to institute securitisation and also to enmesh populations into participation.

There is, however, some benefit to regarding bordering as an aspect of securitisation as opposed to a precursor. Securitisation may describe a set of techniques but it may also indicate the power of particular logics of violence coupled with particular bundles of corporate interest in our time. It is what the military-industrial complex grows up to be. Securitisation in this sense is a parallel process to militarisation and there is an overlap between the technologies, the companies and the workforces engaged in these practices (for an approving account of the extension of US military practices into international security cooperation, see Reveron, 2016). Just as war has shaped and enabled the trialling of the most scarily innovative of technologies, border control also serves as a platform to test emerging techniques of monitoring, preventing and punishing. Someone has been getting rich by offering techniques and technologies to make and maintain

borders (for an insight into the trade press discussions of such issues, see Caldwell, 2015). Ironically, given the centrality of immigration control to the performance of statehood, the securitised border represents one of the most highly profitable opportunities for private corporations this century. The ambition of bordering is beyond the capabilities of most states. Both the muscle and the tracking are resource-heavy in a time when many states are shedding large-scale public projects. The assertion of borders by states undergoing a rapid reshaping away from varieties of welfare capitalism towards versions of securitisation has resulted in (another) enlargement of the private security business. We have learned already that the remilitarisation of the globe has made private security into an additional wing of the twenty-first-century military-industrial complex, with many parts of the world with more private security guards than police officers (Provost, 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/2017/may/12/industry-of-inequality-why-world-is-obsessed-with-private-security). Bordering represents an important area where such private security becomes enmeshed in the activities of states.

A consideration of the business of one major security company reveals the enlargement of this industry. G4S presents itself as a 'the leading global integrated security company' with, we are told, 'operations on six continents and 623,000 employees'. It is a corporation that provides various private policing and immigration control services, including infamously immigration detention, and it has been implicated in the abuse of migrants in custody and in the death of Jimmy Mubenga in the United Kingdom and Mr Ward, an aboriginal elder, in Australia (https://corporatewatch.org/company-profiles/g4s-immigration).

Famously, G4S is a company that anticipated the business opportunities of privatised security operations and the possibility of an additional wing of coercive practices existing alongside the business of states. The company has an extensive network of longstanding business in areas such as providing security personnel and transporting cash. However, the company is clear through its website that it conceives of the business of security in far wider terms.

This is echoed in the phrase chosen to describe an area of work that comprises more than 10 per cent of the security business of G4S, 'care and justice services'.

Reviewing the areas of work that are included under this slightly chilling heading allows us to see the manner in which the business of states has been outsourced to global corporations. G4S promise a range of services in this category, every one of them an aspect of the coercive powers previously regarded as the remit of states. These include juvenile and adult custody, described as 'all aspects of a facility and those held within the facility'; prisoner escorting between courts, places of custody and places of detention; asylum services, which includes housing and other 'services' for those navigating the asylum system; electronic monitoring of offenders; police services, ranging from back office roles to 'support for front-line policing including the provision of custody suite services and forensic medical services' (www.G4S.com, accessed 24 February 2017).

When such practices are conducted by states, they can be lost in considerations of public spending. It is only when states begin to outsource such practices that we are able to see the monetary price of such activity. G4S state their revenue in 2016 at 3.1 billion GBP—with 11 per cent now arising from technology systems. The care and justice heading outlines a range of securitised practices that go beyond simple 'guarding'. G4S continue to provide this kind of basic security, including for events and on behalf of governments. However, the company narrative also makes clear that old-fashioned security morphs into newer practices of securitisation and a track record in the former should be considered as a qualification for the latter.

Market and StrategyCare and justice delivers more than 10% of secure solutions revenue. While the care and justice services market is concentrated primarily in the UK, US, Australia and New Zealand, we see a number of countries exploring the possibility of outsourcing these services to the private sector.

The market structure is typically consolidated on the supply side with a small number of providers. Larger companies are usually better equipped to deliver such highly specialised services'. (www.G4S.com, accessed 24 February 2017)

The corporate self-narration of G4S offers an insight into the emerging markets of racialised security services for but not by states. While we understand from the website headlines that this is a company that has built its customer base on one hundred years of hired muscle, the notes on growing areas of business reveal the shifting focus of the business of global security. Technological systems and care and justice systems—these are areas that are growing rapidly as components of the overall business of G4S. In relation to privatised incarceration and policing functions, we learn that 'a number of countries' are exploring the similar possibilities.

As the business of the nation-state changes, and if not contracts at the very least adapts, emergence of an increasingly powerful and extensive network of private businesses designed to mop up the additional violence that states seek to outsource is something to understand. We should note, with concern, the normalisation of this level of violence, at the physical border and in the fictional staging of the border within domestic spaces, enacted by those who are, strictly speaking, non-state actors. Yet more than note, we should understand that something has enabled and legitimised a resurrection of non-state violence if conducted by registered corporations and packaged as a private service.

What is it that has allowed such an outsourcing of violence? Reece Jones identifies the militarisation of borders and the incursion of militarised approaches and technologies into the business of border control as a central characteristic of what he considers to be an 'emerging security state'.

The historic distinction between the internal and external roles of the police and military has blurred, and the border is a key site where the emerging security state is visible and where privileges are maintained by restricting movement through violence. (Jones, 2016, 47)

The distinction described here has held as a demarcation of duties in relation to state coercion. However, the use of the terms 'internal' and 'external' imply a spatial certainty that does not exist in relation to contemporary border control. Without the implication that the border constitutes an actual spatial zone, if not an actual line, the suggestion of blurred roles between police and military becomes less certain. Clearly, there is some collapse and overlap between the two functions in twenty-first-century border control but there is also a significant shift towards a security machinery that encompasses a range of functions, including aspects of policing and militarisation.

The most developed account of the economic organisation of the security state refers to mass incarceration and the increasingly overt economic exploitation of the prison population—primarily of the United States but with some other key points of reference. Prison populations have been deemed 'surplus': both in accounts that seek to explain the increasing numbers of the incarcerated and in celebrations of the role of imprisonment. In both accounts, it is implied that there is little or no loss to wider society arising from the extraction of this population from day-to-day life.

If we consider forcible containment of racialised bodies as a process targeting 'surplus' populations—both in terms of defining trajectories of movement and place of forced (if temporary) settlement and as a means to contain segments of the population within national borders—the continuity between modes of carcerality and other modes of warehousing and containing those deemed surplus becomes apparent.

US scholarship has focused intensively and understandably on the racialised violence of mass incarceration. This includes both the machinery of what Michelle Alexander has termed 'the new Jim Crow', her scarily evocative term to describe the manner in which a highly punitive and racially targeted criminal justice system works to systematically disenfranchise African American and (some other) racialised communities. It also includes, in parallel, the emergence of a large immigration detention system that operates alongside the formal prison system. In addition, we

know that systems of mass incarceration are being employed to provide very low-paid and highly constrained labour for some industries.

Batista (2014) argues that, within the United States, the increased and increasing brutality of immigration control should be regarded as another aspect of the punitive turn towards populations regarded as problematic. The United States, as has been well-established, has a prison population far in excess of other parts of the world and such highly racialised structures of incarceration that it has been suggested that any progress achieved through the Civil Rights movement has been erased by the impact of mass imprisonment. For the rest of the world, those suffering racialised disprivilege are represented disproportionately among prison populations. Symbolically and actually, those deemed as 'surplus' within national boundaries are subjected to the punishment of the security state and others learn the logic of securitisation through witnessing this racialised display. Systems of mass incarceration operate alongside systems of exclusion and containment in the name of bordering. Taken together, the two act to confirm the resurrection of racialised entitlement and disentitlement and the relegation of some to the less-than-human status of surplus. We might consider this racialised display as providing a kind of psychic 'wage' for racialised privilege and a warning of the danger of becoming surplus. Yet at the same time these practices are more than symbolic. The warehousing of prison systems can be, and has been, tied to measures designed to discipline both labour forces and communities. The containment of populations in movement, on the other hand, may serve as a warning to others but works by seeking to separate targeted populations from the productive economy. The carceral state may represent a model of repression in the pursuit of (differentiated) exploitation, but carcerality in the in-between spaces of the remnants is an attempt to prevent escape from the living-death of exclusion.

BORDER REGIMES AS AN OUTCOME OF
OLIGARCHIC PATTERNS OF CONTROL

Not all borders are the same and not all borders are the same for all people. Although the common-sense account of immigration control can present the issue of controlling a nation's borders as a universal and necessary element of sovereignty, this depiction hides the diversity of border regimes that exist. As we have learned, border regimes are designed not to keep out all strangers but instead are targeted to the keeping out of particular strangers. They are also mechanisms that reflect regional geopolitics and the relationships or lack of relationships between neighbouring nations and more generally within geographical blocs (for a collection indicating the range of such negotiations across the European Union and the Southern Caucasus, see Ergun and Isaxanli, 2013; for an account that appears tragic in hindsight, based on the hope that greater democratisation might ameliorate the plight of the Rohingya, see Parnini, Othman and Ghazali, 2013).

When considering the economic impact of bordering, this acknowledgement of the more local political negotiations that lead to regional patterns of immigration control allows us to move away from the metaconspiracy of borders in the service of capital. This echoes the recurrent theme of this volume—that racism may arise as a result of contextual factors including more local histories, but that the integration of the outcomes of such racisms into capitalist formations reveals something about the relationship/s between racisms and capitalism. Key to this understanding of the operation of border regimes is the realisation that there is no unified governing class. Whatever the characteristics of the capitalist state, those identified with/as the state in different locations do not operate as if in thrall to a generalised capitalism. Instead, far more particular interests tend to animate their attitudes towards such matters as borders and sovereignty.

The objective, it seems, is to manage borders in such a way as to maintain and protect the position of that political elite—although such plans may come to nothing, the role of such aspirations in shaping policy decisions should not be overlooked. A cursory review of border regimes in different regions of the world reveals a logic of the migratory neighbourhood at work in the particular choices and targets of each state or alliance of states (for an account of the

European Union's varied and apparently contradictory approach to its eastern boundaries, see Liikanen, Scott and Sotkasiira, 2016). The outcome of these varied negotiations and battles for ascendancy is another highly variegated economic terrain. We might consider at least two arenas which run alongside each other: the informal or shadow economy that arises in response to bordering and the extension or emergence of formal businesses who enter the bordering business. Neither of these developments are planned by any one bordering agency. Yet the actions of bordering across space creates the terrain on which these parallel economic opportunities arise. The overall outcome is a network of bordering practices across the world that create points of forced immobility, trapping populations in movement, and creating a map of global migration that is characterised by well-known holding areas for populations unable to move freely to their chosen destinations. Agier summarises this spatial arrangement:

Frontier spaces and even 'temporary extra-territorial residence' are thus needed for the application of this strategy of categorization and special treatment of undesirable foreigners. These spaces no longer follow—at least not only—the lines of the geographical territories of nation-states. The border is everywhere that an undesirable is identified and must be kept apart, 'detained' and then 'expelled'. The space that connects the undesirable individual with the border is the camp in the form of airlock or sorting centre. (Agier, 2011, 2016, 50)

This, then, has been one major outcome for the global distribution of populations, the creation through bordering of new holding spaces that become new population centres. Whereas the impetus behind bordering is to contain and expel, the consequence of increasingly co-ordinated efforts by states to narrow the spaces and possibility of movement has been a redistribution of human populations. In terms of mapping, this can appear as some new phase of urbanisation and it has been suggested that, with time, holding spaces are becoming new cities (for an account of the active place-making undertaken by those living in camps and a counter to the repeated assertion that camps are spaces of bare life, see Sanyal, 2014). Beehner (2015) suggests that the models of spatial control based in modernist paradigms of order and visuality clash with the desire of camp residents to create unregimented environments as an approximation of (temporary) home. The concentration of settlement, albeit forced, inevitably gives rise to city-like activity. However, whereas cities have arisen in proximity to resources or routes to resources, holding spaces are the settlements that arise by default as an outcome of the combined forces cooperating to halt and contain populations in movement. To understand how we come to this state of affairs, we need to revisit accounts of the interests involved in the quest to erect borders.

THE ERA OF GLOBAL CAPITALISM THAT ARISES IN A TIME OF CONSCIOUSNESS OF SCARCITY AND LIMIT

Whereas earlier moments of expansion and (racialised) dispossession were narrated as times of adventurous possibility enabled by fictions of empty territories waiting to be conquered and cultivated, the explicit consciousness of limitation informs the changing shape of global capitalism in our time. This consciousness of limits runs through our discussion. It is the story underlying the discussion of accumulation by dispossession, it is the unspoken (or rarely spoken) context of the crisis in reproduction, it is the manner in which a knowledge of ecological insecurity becomes entwined in the economic and it is the logic of scarcity that underpins the practices of bordering.

Bordering in our time might be considered as a set of tactics to maintain differential privilege and to sew working populations into a version of 'national' or 'economic' interests (however, for a collection revealing the variation in anti-immigrant politics on state policies in Europe, see Sandelind, 2014). Yet the nationalisms of bordering adopt some flexible and occasionally unexpected elements. Instead of the supposedly clear-cut division between belonging and unbelonging denoted by blood and birth, bordering nationalisms must be flexible enough to accommodate other demarcations, including those already 'here' and those entrants deemed desirable or useful. Perhaps most significantly, bordering nationalisms mobilise terms of belonging across nations. The relevant demarcation is not between national citizen and foreigner but between 'deserving' and 'undeserving'.

Although the exercise of the border and the xenoracisms that accompany these practices are diffuse and often embedded in everyday life and popular belief, the border itself remains an act of (attempted) political sovereignty (for an account of the erection of visible borders as a response to waning sovereignty, see Brown, 2010). In this, bordering continues to belong to the state even in places where the state seems to have retreated from all other arenas of life and even in spaces where popular policing of the border appears to confound state authority. In more recent years, as states become increasingly dependent on cross-state cooperation, we might guess that the assertive proclamations of bordering are designed to distract from the limitations of state power and also to redirect popular attention from the abandoned domestic space of civil society to the increasingly securitised border (on the self-perpetuating character of the security-immigration nexus, see Andersson, 2016b). Importantly, we must remember here that this is less a spatial distinction than a shift from the state as (potential) provider of social goods to state as security machine pre-emptively weeding out threat.

We have become accustomed to accounts of the 'migration crisis' which imply that it is the movement of people in itself that occasions the crisis; however, I prefer here to approach the question of bordering and its impetus from a different starting point. The hardening of bordering activity is not only a 'response' to people in movement. As has become painfully apparent in recent years, border regimes have been established already. This may have been presented as a preventative measure in the anticipation of unwanted population movement. It may have been undertaken as part of the machinery of display that constitutes so much of state activity in our time. What it cannot be seen to be is a 'response' to the crisis of population movement.

Histories of bordering in Europe point to the earlier racisms that led to the construction of immigration controls as we know them (for an account of changing techniques of governing population movement, see Dowty, 1987). Often this narrative has suggested a kind of responsiveness to the perceived threat of populations in movement or has been presented as an explicitly pre-emptive measure to exclude those fleeing persecution. However, as we learn from John Torpey, the first motivation in the development of the machinery of documenting immigration status arises from the drive to document information about populations within borders and to monitor and control movement. This is not a defensive border against external incursions, but rather an attempt to control movement across and importantly *out* of national territory.

As a localised practice in our time, albeit often enacted in dialogue with other states, bordering may be better understood as a defensive practice undertaken by local elites in the face of global movement. It is not, after all, the most mobile and far-reaching of corporate interests that argue for border control. There may be political alliances made between global masters of mobile capital and local elites fearful of a loss of status, wealth and power, but these are coalitions built on the hoof and vulnerable to being swept away by more deep-rooted interests in any party.

At the same time, bordering is offered to local populations as a form of protection against the erosion of living conditions and, all too often, of local cultures. In this, the state offer of bordering cannot be seen apart from nationalist or ethnicist claims—although the claim of competing economic interest marks the incomer as no more than someone who is not here yet, and the addition of cultural, national or religious claims places the newcomer in the space of the other who is not like us. Something like this folding together of economic interests and cultural identities can be seen in antimigrant and antiminority discourses across the world (Sandelind, 2014).

Common to this discourse has been the implication that it is the general population who are protected by the regulation of borders. What if, for a moment, we consider bordering as a practice instigated to protect the position and status of local elites? In saying this, I do not wish to imply that global capital is univocally against practices of bordering, let alone on the side of the world's migrants. Framing discussion as a battle between border-erecting local elites and border-destroying global capital reduces the various accommodations of convenience that occur everywhere and contribute to the oddly strict yet porous systems of bordering in many parts of the world. Some border-erectors may be invested in modes of racism that are waning in influence

and seek to exclude in an attempt to postpone the (inevitable) end of their period of ascendancy. Some may argue for cross-border mobility in the pursuit of racialised exploitation, seeking to remake the boundaries of exploitation and expropriation in a changing economic terrain. The tensions and accommodations between competing racisms reveal the machinations that must occur for every fleeting consolidation of race/class power to be put together. However, the attempted immigration controls of any nation reveal most of all about the internal politics of that national space, and probably very little about the migration routes leading to that national space or of the populations on that route.

Bordering has become one of the very few arenas of government policy that can be explicitly racialised and openly differentialising and no or little comment be made. In this, bordering becomes the cover for one prominent form of the racial state in our time (for the definitive discussion of the terms of the racial state, see Goldberg, 2002). In fact, we might argue that it is the state of everyday bordering that most exemplifies the continuing racial character of many states. Whereas explicit racial naming in policy has fallen away (with racial dispossession marked in policy by differently coded terms or by wilful exclusion), the intensive marking of belonging and entitlement through bordering has become an increasingly important element of state practices. These are practices that overlap with other racial histories—so that those most subjected to scrutiny also may be those most vulnerable to old-fashioned racisms (see the manner in which the construction of 'sham marriages' combines everyday bordering practices with encouragement of old-fashioned 'colour-coded' racism in Wemyss, Yuval-Davis and Cassidy, 2017). But they may also be practices that conjure up a renewed raciology, in the process adding the figure of the migrant to popular repertoires of everyday racialisation and racism.

The normalisation of violent racist practices under cover of 'bordering' inevitably infects social and political space, most of all through the incursion of threatening and sometimes violent border control activities, such as immigration raids, into 'civilian' space (for an account of the impact of securitised bordering on Latina/o migrants in the United States, see Sampaio, 2015; for the manner in which security concerns were attached to the bodies of migrants after 9/11, see Golash-Boza, 2015). When it is argued that antiborders politics is the antiracist politics of our time, this is not a displacement of the experiences of long-racialised groups. It is a warning that what is done in the name of the border reveals the repertoire of state violence against any or all of us. Techniques of bordering represent the tendency of racial capitalism towards expulsion and offers a repertoire of expelling and containing techniques that enjoy political legitimacy and render racialised exclusion unremarkable. One aspect of this performance centres around the construction and communication of emergency, an emergency where people in movement represent only one symptom in a wider panoply of signals of danger.

DISASTER CAPITALISM AND BORDERING REGIMES

The highly productive and suggestive concept of 'disaster capitalism' has helped us to think about the almost gleeful pursuit of profit that has accompanied some (perhaps all) of the most upsetting events of recent years. This has included populations displaced by conflict, the impact of climate change on human life, the movement of people fleeing persecution or war and persecution or climate change and war or flight from any combination of the above. Naomi Klein has explained how this shock doctrine operates to enable the transfer of public assets into private hands.

That is how the shock doctrine works: the original disaster—the coup, the terrorist attack, the market meltdown, the war, the tsunami, the hurricane—puts the entire population into a state of collective shock. . . . Like the terrorized prisoner who gives up the names of comrades and renounces his faith, shocked societies often give up things they would otherwise fiercely protect. (Klein, 2007, 17)

One aspect of this process is the implication that the exploitation is no more than a response to terrible events. The effectivity of such tactics arises from the revalidation of the already powerful, able to impose their vision of the world in response to events too terrible for democracy, reason

or planning to deal with. Within Klein's account is a reminder of the bloody logics of military industrialism (for another account of militarism and economic crisis, see Kurz, 2014). Concocting or enabling crisis, or simply allowing crisis to unfold, becomes another tactic of accumulation. If there has been any previous democratic oversight, the horror of events allows regulatory measures to be bypassed. The events happen—as a kind of act of god or nature—and the vultures descend. What we learn from this is that in the practices of bordering it is the border itself that renders people vulnerable. It is not the fleeing alone that opens people to the excesses of disaster capitalism, it is the barriers that are erected in the path of their flight. I write this sentence and pause for a moment. That is a big claim—that it is bordering not war and pestilence that delivers people into the hands of disaster capitalists. Of course, it cannot be so absolute. War racketeers pre-date bordering regimes, those who move within so-called borders also suffer this vulnerability to excessive and targeted exploitation. So let me try again.

The excesses of disaster capitalism exemplify the exploitative practices of a particular moment. This is not a catch-all term for all opportunistic targeting of those rendered vulnerable by war or disaster, a theoried-up euphemism for human weakness and evil. Disaster capitalism belongs to the moment of capitalist history where we have passed through one set of accommodations reached through the capitalist state and now witness both a proliferation of business activity around something like 'human need' and a restructuring of economic space that is characterised by the partial or total retreat of the state. The state, in its absence or compromise or ineffectuality, is the partner term to our understandings of disaster capitalism (for an account of the violence of inaction, see Davies, Isakjee and Dhesi, 2017). This is the political order referenced by Fraser as a necessary component of the machinery dividing populations into the exploitable and the expropriable. As we have seen, the states of emergency instigated by natural disaster or war have created some of the most lucrative business opportunities of recent times (see Loewenstein, 2015). Not only that, the retreat of regulatory institutions, including a dismantling of any meaningful democratic oversight, creates populations who do not regain legal or civil protections, or at least not easily (Adams, Van Hattum and English, 2009). What is enabled is not only the smash and grab of immediate dispossession but also the creation of a political space in which it is all but impossible to make justice claims (Harvey, 2016). In a time of dwindling nature, some instances of disaster capitalism promise to initiate a kind of desertification of economic space, creating empty territory again.

The expulsion and containment of some populations through the emergence of transnational bordering agreements presents another strand of desertification. However, bordering does not evacuate space, it traps people. The desert here is not land expropriated from former residents, it is the forcible containment of populations without access to resources. Those who have no apparent utility, who are beyond exploitation or expropriation, are relegated to this status as human desert.

GLOBAL ECONOMIES OF STUCK POPULATIONS

Instead of attempting to chart one over-arching logic, it might be helpful to think of the map of bordering outcomes as arising from the battles for ascendancy and/or survival between local elites. Each actor seeks to safeguard their own privilege, yet the battle over such matters is played out with the lives and bodies of migrants. The outcome reveals the uneven authority in play, the shifting balance in power between actors and the patterns of friction-ful and frictionless movement that come about from these negotiations.

We might consider the emerging map of forcibly abbreviated journeys and the new concentrations of population that arise from this as another aspect of the remapping of the world in the era of the Anthropocene. The funnelling of people into particular routes and containment in particular locations of blockage reflects the extent to which human intervention overrides (or augments) physical features of the landscape.

The concept of 'resource wars' has been well-established in both popular and policy accounts, so we have become accustomed to thinking of ecological limit as a matter of security concern. Michael Klare, in the work that brings the analysis of resource wars to a wider audience,

describes the militarised battle for scarce resources as representing an 'econocentric' approach to national security (Klare, 2002). Building on Klare's framework, Le Billon has argued that since the end of Cold War systems of patronage 'local resources have become the mainstay of most war economies' (Le Billon, 2001, 1), going on to summarise the key triggers of resource wars as 'a combination of population and economic growth leading to a relentless expansion in the demand for raw materials, expected resource shortages, and contested resource ownership' (Le Billon, 2001, 4).

Violence in pursuit or in defence of access to scarce resources has characterised the era of new wars and has been a significant factor in triggering population movement. In this light, bordering might be better understood as a set of techniques that arises most forcibly in an era of knowing ecological limit. Whereas the spatial fixes of previous moments of capitalist crisis relied on fictions of empty space and varieties of the pretence of lands without people, the realisation that the most essential resources of life are limited and depleting has altered understandings of territorial possibility.

Throughout this work I have argued that capital works to divide and differentiate populations and this differentiation has been a central feature of the history of capitalism. In this process, some groups are relegated to a precarious or threatened or excluded status in the labour market and marked by the necessity of relying on noncapitalist means to enable social reproduction. This variation in the degree of subsidy from noncapitalist activity required by different groups—read as degrees of exclusion and/or insecurity in the labour market—is understood as a process of racialisation. Whether read as a trace of unmarketised nature or as a mark of the uncivilised inability to become (sufficiently) productive, mythologies of race serve to naturalise such labour market exclusion for some. For others, we might argue that the persistence of labour market exclusion or precarity in new times is becoming a new process of racialisation (and something like this anxiety is expressed in accounts of the undeserving and/or feral underclass; for a discussion of racial feralisation, see Valayden, 2016).

At the same time as this differentiation within metropolitan (and other) spaces reaffirms racialised divisions between populations, more violent processes of exclusion are employed to mark and police borders. One aspect of this operates as an additional technology of differentiation cutting across metropolitan spaces and intertwining with and infecting the racialisation of labour markets. The other acts as a series of barriers, siphoning people into parallel spaces or bottlenecks of limited mobility, with movement into metropolitan spaces.

This creation of new maps of forcibly stuck populations arises from the combined but not necessarily coordinated actions of states seeking to maintain access to increasingly scarce resources and in the process construct refreshed techniques of ordering the world's population into human and less-than-human, destined to live and to achieve no more than living death. Localised adjustments to this process enable some flexibility. Both individuals and groups change status, the terms of humanness are not wholly determined by racialised pasts. However, these redrawn lines of deservingness operate, in our time, as a form of racialisation that makes or breaks lives even as we appear to leave behind the physiological preoccupations of previous eras of racialised dispossession.

At the same time, new concentrations of population in unexpected and often inhospitable places create their own economic dynamics. Inevitably, practices arise that mimic city formations. There is entrepreneurship and there is business. No doubt when the World Bank dreams of harnessing the purchasing power of the bottom billion, those stuck in the bottlenecks of a bordered world must be among the targeted populations. We might speculate that, as camps become more established and a version of settlement is achieved, the routes of economic life will alter to accommodate these market opportunities (for an account that suggests there is an economic benefit for communities adjacent to refugee camps, see Alix-Garcia et al., 2018). Expanding into such uncharted territory will become someone's business opportunity. Shadow cities will be acknowledged in our understanding of urban economies. Despite intentions, practices of bordering remake the patterning of the world's population and, through this, ignite new forms of

economic activity. We may be entering another phase of parallel urbanism, initiated inadvertently by the push to exclude some from access to scarce resources. In the process, new articulations of racialised affinity emerge, appearing to allow membership to some who were previously subordinated while instituting new and brutal barriers to the terms of life for many more. In this time of realignment, there are confusions. Old racisms are not wiped away and populations continue to carry the burdens of previous dispossessions. However, the consequences of expulsion from the terms of newly framed modes of racialised belonging are shown to be truly terrifying and it should come as no surprise that so many settle into these uncomfortable and cruel new affinities in the interests of survival. Racial capitalism changes a little, but does not go away.

The new maps of racial capitalism that arise from multiple and overlapping processes of bordering distribute populations differently across the world. The concentrated settlements of the displaced become a part of the (almost) fixed landscape, certainly no longer temporary emergencies. Those who are able deploy combinations of political, economic and militarised power to contain the threat of possible proximity to those in movement. Together the combined but highly varied acts of containment and exclusion across the world create an alternative network of passage and non-passage, the increasing narrow confines within which the displaced can move or pause.

There is no overall plan that leads to this outcome. However, the assertion of racialised privilege through the curtailment of the movement of desperate others works to remake the map of the world's population. This, then, is an important lesson about racial capitalism. Raciality is a technique, among other things, by which relative privilege is defended.

The shunting, containing and enclosing of populations in movement has become a significant arena of transnational deal-making. The ability to halt, redirect or siphon the movement of such populations has become both a business opportunity and akin to a commodity to be traded. This is not (immediately) a matter of exploitation or expropriation, the desire to contain and warehouse troublesomely displaced populations has become a point of connection and opportunity for national governments seeking, respectively, to outsource the uncertain business of border control or to capitalise on geographical proximity to migrant-repelling nations. The outcome of these negotiations has been to contain populations in movement, both through formal systems of detention and in the official or inadvertent emergence of longstanding camps.

States with little other leverage in the international arena gain significant bargaining power through accidents of geography—adjacency to the nations most committed to bordering enables new agreements relating to trade, political recognition or tacit acceptance of local priorities. As a result, we witness a remapping of the world where new concentrations of population arise as the by-product of prevented journeys. Unlike any previous era of human history, this is a map arising not from the values arising from the exploitation or expropriation of populations but from the will and the ability to constrain and shape their movement. These human beings are regarded as valuable inasmuch as more powerful actors are willing to invest in limiting their movement. Although a larger proportion of the displaced populations of the world have entered one or other mainstream society (albeit with racialised status, a situation of non-encampment but marginalisation discussed by Turner, 2015), those consigned to camps have been siphoned into a new set of 'empty spaces', those spaces deemed too lacking in economic potential to be claimed by more powerful actors. This is an echo of the postcolonial wasteland, but without the leverage of political representation in the decolonised nation. Containment as expulsion seems to reduce some populations to empty space, to desert, to pasture—to surplus. It is a kind of remaking of humanity as territory or nature that reflects the anxieties of our time and it extends the possibilities of racial capitalism from exploitation and expropriation to include the previously muted horrors of expulsion.

Chapter 6
Consumption and Indebtedness

The strength of capitalism lies in its ability to integrate desire as an 'economy of possibilities' into its own functioning in order to promote and solicit a new subjective figure: the economic subject as 'human capital' or entrepreneur of the self. (Lazzarato, 2014, 52)

What does capitalism feel like? Not one thing, maybe so many things that its story can never be told.

Capitalism is like the moment of anticipation when you turn the first page of a menu and the flavours to come are all laid out in anticipation.

Capitalism is the teenage outfit that you have been dreaming about all year, because you just know that when you put it on you will be someone else entirely and never have to be your inconsequential loser self again.

Capitalism is looking forward to sinking into a hot bath and letting the steam slough off all memories of hardship and humiliation.

Capitalism makes you believe that this is the least bad you could ever possibly feel.

This final chapter examines the contours of the commodification of diversity and of a range of racialised typologies and considers how we might think about racial capitalism in a world that appears to reduce human lives to series of fragmented functions and responses.

Much of this work has sought to understand how populations are divided through processes of production. Different kinds of (economic) activity and different locations of activity have been regarded as intrinsically different and differently valuable and value-producing, regardless of the role played by such labours in sustaining human life. However, we know that alongside these intensive processes of differentiation there is another set of energies animating global capitalism —the push to make us all into capitalist consumers. This push includes those who seem to have been excluded from work in the formal economy, or from any work with monetary reward. This push to include everyone in consumer culture runs alongside the processes of expulsion and exclusion that have formed our central interest in earlier sections of this work.

The status of the consumer does not rely upon the ability to demonstrate productivity. Part of the magical property of money is that it holds no trace of previous transactions (for a famous exposition of money as a universal equivalent, see Lapavitsas, 2005). Much of the world does not fulfil the demand to be productive in terms that are registered by the accounting of capitalist production. However, even these populations can be of interest as consumers and potential consumers (for a discussion of marketing as a tool for poverty reduction, see Achrol and Kotler, 2016). We see this clearly in the rapid expansion of consumer markets across the global South and in the slightly alarming call to develop consumer markets for the poorest four billion of the earth's population, the so-called base of the economic pyramid who have less than three thousand dollars in local purchasing power (see Hammond et al., 2007, for an account, sponsored in part by the Inter-American Development Bank).

The narratives surrounding the global consumer are very different from those attached to the global worker. As we have seen, the intensification of global capitalist networks has created a range of unhappiness and insecurity for workers, including new forms of dangerous and deadly work. The story of the global worker is a tale of escalating and diversifying forms of exploitation, immiserating workforces in many locations—and even the term 'global worker' signals that this range of misery is in play. The global consumer, on the other hand, is a far more optimistic figure. This is the character who inhabits the most upbeat accounts of the global economy, the one who reaps the benefits of mobility and global reach. Whether it is a promise of global toothpaste or global technology, we all understand that this is an opportunity, and one that promises to flatten out the differences and inequalities between us.

If a global corporate antiracism exists at all, it is centred around this imagined figure of the global consumer (for an account of competing conceptions of the cosmopolitan global consumer, see Cannon and Yaprak, 2002). If there are attempts to create a diverse workforce, it is to enable this claim to be passed on to potential consumers. If the public face of a company seeks to represent local communities or adapt itself to mirror the population of its markets, then this is an extension of its marketing strategy. When global corporations seek to export concepts of diversity and antiracism as part of their global brand, then we must remember to understand this as an exercise in branding, whatever else may be desired or achieved (for an insight into debates about multicultural marketing, see Rugimbana and Nwankwo, 2003).

In this chapter, this concept of the global consumer as beneficiary of corporate antiracism is explored. Populations which are excluded from inclusion in capitalist formations of production may find themselves included in capitalist fantasies of consumption. They may seek to insert themselves into such fantasies, including through consumer acts funded by the activities of the noncapitalist edge-worlds. Following the suggestions of important work outlining the role of language (Marazzi), signs (Lazzarato) and/or the loss of knowledge (Stiegler), we will go on to consider such consumerist participation as a mode of proletarianisation.

IN WHICH WE CONSIDER THE MANNER IN WHICH CAPITALISM INFECTS OUR DREAMS

Much of this work focuses, necessarily, on the most extreme violences of capitalist systems. For every (temporarily) affluent worker, there is the living death of the economically marginal. For every entry to consumerist pleasures, another is trapped in modern-day slavery. Nothing that I write here seeks to elide or minimise these pains.

Yet there is something missing in any account of capitalism in our time that does not seek to understand the emotional investment that capitalism, and even the suggestion of capitalism, brings. Not only the Ayn Rand school of market celebration, but also the many many everyday dreams that are articulated through the frameworks of capitalist living. And among these dreams are also the dreams of escape—from poverty and from forced labour, from precarity and from the limited opportunities of so many lives. There is something in this that should be included in our consideration of racial capitalism. When people are marginalised or excluded from the workings of capitalist production, they express a desire to leap into, not out of, capitalist relations (for a narrative account of slum-dwellers in Mumbai and their aspirations, see Boo, 2013; for an innovative discussion of [im]mobility in Senegal and the aspirations of poor city residents, see Melly, 2017).

The reach of global capitalism has remade our collective consciousness, with a myriad of local variations but still in a manner that introduces the concept of the global economy to the bulk of the world's population. This reach, alongside a changing media landscape that can saturate the consciousness of those inhabiting unexpected cracks and corners of the global economy, has made the experience of living under capitalism one of intensive and endless self-making. Despite ourselves, narrations of self-actualisation and fulfilment are enmeshed hopelessly with economised terms of value (for a discussion of the enmeshing of neoliberal processes in the construction of self, see McGuigan, 2014). While being rich may not be the only way to think of happiness (and for much of the world, it remains the shorthand for life's aspirations), a life of value is hard to speak outside of the terms that assign value to life.

Despite the many injunctions to enter the formal economy, to become 'work-ready' and the virtue seen to be derived by engaging in economic activity that can be monetised, the population of the world has not been transformed into an army of interchangeable workers with interchangeable lives. Where capitalism has colonised everyday life is in the realm of consumption. While much of the world is not integrated into what we might understand as capitalist forms of production, neither is there much possibility of avoiding commodified goods or, even, the outputs of mass production (for a discussion of the range of consumer practices across the world, see Stillerman, 2015). At the same time, other accounts of changing capitalism point to the manner in which our non-work lives increasingly come to service capital, either through performing activity that can be

folded back into strategies of accumulation or by engaging in interactions that deepen the hold of consumer cultures, including by providing increasingly detailed data profiles of ourselves. Taken together, the accounts of the unavoidability of cultures of consumption and the accounts of our subjugation to the machinic processes of a colonising culture of post-Fordism seem to suggest that we are, at last, entering the phase of capitalism where we become disembodied and interchangeable, a phase when racial capitalism has no more work to do.

THINKING ABOUT RACIAL CAPITALISM AND CONSUMPTION

It seems perverse to suggest that racial capitalism, with its connotations of extreme violence and dispossession, also might be remade by consumer cultures. Yet the anchoring experience of capitalist experience has become the enthralment to the consumer market to meet most if not all of our material needs. Patterns of dispossession may lead to uneven processes of proletarianisation, with some ejected from the means of life but never integrated into circuits of waged work—but the demand that things be bought falls on the dispossessed and displaced regardless of status as worker, sometime worker or non-worker. We might, therefore, imagine households across the world where waged work is absent or is occasional or partial, but participation in local consumer markets occurs nevertheless (for discussions of some variations on this occasional or inconsistent participation in consumer markets, see Dunaway, 2014).

Throughout this work, we have sought to understand both the processes through which capitalism differentiates populations, including through segmenting access routes to economic activity and resources, and the manner in which such differentiation creates or utilises variations in social reproduction between spaces and groups. Our discussion has assumed that the differentiation of populations arises from processes of uneven development, but also from the deployment of political power to limit access to scarce resources—and that such differentiation is productive, in the sense that it has enabled strategies of accumulation at the same time as legitimising the dispossession of some. In the discussion in the previous chapters, we have imagined this differentiation as arising from varying levels of integration into the supposedly productive economy as a worker.

However, recent attempts to understand the central place of signs, communication or the reworking of the libidinal economy for the ends of consumption all appear to assume a total penetration of capital across our life-worlds. Without this being discussed explicitly, these influential accounts assume a flattening out of economic space by the processes of capitalist development and intensification. The other account of increasingly differentiation does not appear in these ways of thinking about an emerging capitalism of signs.

In this chapter, we will consider the implications of these accounts of new or adapted modes of capitalism for our earlier discussion. This is not at all to argue that the arena of knowledge work or of communication technologies are beyond the realm of racial capitalism, as if the depletions of racial capitalism occur only in the spaces of hard labour and dangerous street work. The point here is not to make the banal point that many people, most of all those deemed lesser in the positionings of racial capitalism, continue to hustle their livings in spheres seemingly untouched by the digital revolution. This is well-known by everyone and anticipated in Boutang's summary of the cognitive capitalism,

which is now beginning to appear and which produces and domesticates the living on a scale never before seen, in no sense eliminates the world of material industrial production. Rather it re-arranges it, reorganises it and alters the positioning of its nerve centres. (Boutang, 2011, 48)

The emergence of cognitive capitalism re-arranges the range of production practices, extending the extractive possibilities of capital. Our interest is in understanding how the reach of communications technologies and the integration of communicative action into capitalist productivity impacts on the differentiating processes of racial capitalism. It is also to remember that the account of communicative or cognitive capitalism describes a mode of subjugation under capitalism, not the manner in which populations access particular communications technologies. The suggestion is that we have entered a phase when capital has learned to extract value from

thought itself. Our question is whether racialised differentiation continues to play a part in this process.

COMMODIFYING DIFFERENCE

Through much of this work, I portray racial capitalism as an aspect of the workings of capitalist development, perhaps a side development, perhaps a supplement, but in the main as something that contributes to the direction of capitalist development, something that is an aspect of accumulation, something that remakes capitalism (even when it does so through occupying the space of noncapitalism or not-yet-capitalism). There is another tradition of analysing the place of (consumer) culture in capitalist development—but this is one that views the formations of capitalist production as a backdrop to larger and less containable historical formations. This other suggestion, well established, portrays the racism of capitalism as a kind of disturbance, not one that can be avoided, because it is a disturbance that reveals the very core of capitalist logics, but one that should be seen as a disruption.

This is the work that reminds us of the dehumanisation at the heart of the capitalist project, the erasure of the value of life in itself and the reduction of human potential to economic potential. Most popularised in *The Dialectic of the Enlightenment*, but evident in the work of Walter Benjamin and in Arendt's ground-breaking discussion of the racism that lays the ground for totalitarianism, this is work that understands that rationality morphs all too easily into rationalisation and rationalisation enables disposability. As a mode of thinking, these are debates that lead to quite different trajectories. Here the racisms of capitalism may not be 'productive' but, nevertheless, arise as an unavoidable by-product of the pursuit of productivity.

Although this is a discussion of ideas and cultural formations, these matters are seen to be closely tied to economic formations. Unlike some discussions of racism that dwell on aspects of aversion or in-group identity, the key figures of the Frankfurt School sought to explain why and how the most repressive and murderous of racisms could emerge as an outcome of capitalist development (see Fromm, 2001; Benjamin, 2002; Horkheimer, 2013; Adorno, 2005). Unlike accounts that suggest that racism can lubricate a kind of capitalist order, making the business of exploitation appear rational and discriminating and, through this, enabling a bifurcation of the working class, the implication of this work is that capitalist development leads to murder and mayhem. The making stupid of the population, through increasingly removing all practices of judgement and discernment in the interests of the efficiencies of rationalisation, serves to nurture racist violence. Writing of the seeming absurdity of racist violence that expropriated Jewish goods and property, they write that, 'antisemitism has proved immune to the charge of inadequate profitability. It is a luxury for the masses' (Horkheimer and Adorno, 1989, 170).

Writing of an earlier period of crisis, depletion and pacification, Adorno and Horkheimer argue that there is no rational economic interest motivating the racist hatreds of antisemitism. The sense that such hatred has the support of the collective is prize enough, and this reassurance acts as consolation in times of hardship (and as entertainment in times of plenty). The point is hard to swallow. All of the extensive violence, theft, dispossession, forced labour, none of it adds up to enough to represent a meaningful gain for the aggressors. Instead, antisemitism represented a recurrent weakness in (European) society, the Jews a scapegoat who were always available in any time of crisis or unrest.

This danger, of an always-present and barely submerged racist rage that acted as a consolation in the face of other privations, runs alongside the ongoing threat of greater and greater stupification of the population. Adorno and Horkheimer are writing of the moment when mass culture truly comes to colonise the popular consciousness of much of the globe. The enormity of this shift into a global imagination underlies the palpable unease and disgust that can be felt in Frankfurt School critiques of popular culture (Adorno, 2001). It is this monster that we somehow wish to consume that has emptied out and hollowed out human agency and potential. The fact that we want it, a fact that in more recent times has been used to celebrate all manner of things popular, for Adorno and Horkheimer is yet another indication of the deleterious impact of popular culture on critical faculties. It is this analysis of the evacuation of critical faculties that offers a

precursor to thinking about processes of exploitation that seep into all arenas of life. As Adorno and Horkheimer point out, presciently, 'amusement under late capitalism is the prolongation of work' (1989, 109). Their point is not only that popular culture works to pacify consumers for work (although they also think this) but that the practices of mass culture constitute a site of exploitation, a place where value can be extracted.

For our purposes the question is not whether the encounter with popular advertising wrecks the formation of a revolutionary subject. For what it is worth, that debate seems to have long passed and in our times of accelerating and ugly dispossession alongside proliferating media use, the accusation that any consumer practice is pacifying seems out of time. For better or worse, media use is so intensively productive of subjectivities under global capitalism that the concept of pacification cannot hold. Yet, for our project, there is a slightly different interest in how the fantasy selves of global advertising serve to bolster a kind of consciousness that makes people rush towards the particular dispossessions of racial capitalism. In the next sections, we will think again about how racialised identities might be deployed for economic gain and the commodification of racialised difference.

RACIALISED IDENTITY AS PROPERTY AGAIN

There is a well-known account of racial capitalism that focuses exclusively on the commodification of difference, albeit in very particular circumstances. Nancy Leong's much-cited article, titled 'Racial Capitalism', outlines a framework through which to understand the potential economic value that can be gathered through the tactical display of 'racial identity'. Leong explains her conceptualisation as follows:

Racial capitalism necessarily involves deriving value from the racial identity of another person. . . . While individuals may also derive value from their own racial identities, this practice is not racial capitalism. (Leong, 2013, 2153)

The phenomenon that Leong describes is a limited tactical deployment of identity. This is a way of being within particular market formations and can come into play only in contexts where these modes of ethnic staging are regarded as indicators of value. In fairness, Leong is explicit in her interests. Her use of the term 'racial capitalism' refers to a context in which the explicit staging of particular forms of institutional or business diversity can be deployed to enhance the reputation and/or business opportunities of that entity. Leong's key target is the (mis)use of racialised display while maintaining racialised privilege.

Problems with racial capitalism arise when white individuals and predominantly white institutions seek and achieve racial diversity without examining their motives and practices. . . . This superficial view of diversity consequently leads white individuals and predominantly white institutions to treat nonwhiteness as a prized commodity rather than as a cherished and personal manifestation of identity. Affiliation with nonwhite individuals thus becomes merely a useful means for white individuals and predominantly white institutions to acquire social and economic benefits while deflecting potential charges of racism and avoiding more difficult questions of racial equality. (Leong, 2013, 2155)

Leong describes an 'irony' arising from a 'legal and social emphasis on diversity', leading to the commodification of what she terms 'nonwhiteness' that does not benefit those subjugated or exploited or excluded through racialised means while reducing some populations to the status of signs of diversity, no more than symbols to be exchanged in the effort to accrue the benefits flowing to institutions perceived to be diverse. In the absence of any magic capable of seeing into the inner consciousness or soul of another, racial capitalism is a means of demonstrating an affiliation to a positive diversity and all that such an affiliation entails, such as, presumably, a commitment to pursue profit without regard for the colour or creed of any customer, competitor or share-holder. Here,

a white person's affiliation with a nonwhite individual serves as a proxy for making independent judgments along those axes. (Leong, 2013, 2179)

Demonstrating such affiliation serves as a method of maintaining white privilege and relegating others to the status of exchangeable (symbolic) object. Not only does this process bypass any

attempt to address the impact of racism, it also relegates the 'nonwhite individual' to the status of prop in a drama of white subjectivities enhanced by the demonstration of tolerance or appreciation of diversity.

We have learned to accept that the frisson of racialised difference can become a consumer experience. Such diversity of representation can assist and enable global sales, in the manner of the ethnic-matching of global ad campaigns. However, in addition to this assumption that consumers need to be reflected in advertising for products that they come to consume, there is also a tacit understanding that among the many fantasies of consumption, there is a fantasy of race. The globally exchanged fantasy of race for consumer purposes can have more than one incarnation. Perhaps more familiarly, global audiences may be invited to re-imagine themselves through a fantasy of global whiteness or Westernness. This might occur through an idealised representation of 'local' identity, refracted through the desire to be tall/light-skinned/'Western' looking or whatever trope is used there to indicate unlike my immediate neighbours and like some other fantasy of what must be considered 'racial superiority' (for a discussion of the impact of 'Western' beauty ideals on young Indian women, see Das and Sharma, 2016; for an analysis of men's 'lifestyle' advertising and the emergence of a figure of a global hegemonic masculinity based around commodity consumption, perhaps with locally inflected embodiment, see Tan et al., 2013). The retort that such preferences among global consumers are no more than an aesthetic matter, in the manner of preferring red over blue, glosses over the centrality of ideas of the (racially) perfect body in the development of global racisms (for an insightful discussion of the continuing prevalence of skin lightening, see Tate, 2016).

For our purposes, it is worth taking a moment to consider whether the idealised self to be constructed through consumer practices is a racialised fantasy. Certainly the implication of physical perfectibility runs close to mythologies of degeneration and regeneration, and of the idea that the intrinsically spoilt body can be remade through external intervention but remade, importantly, in the image of an other. Against this suggestion, Rosi Braidotti argues that global capitalism has learned to inhabit and exploit ever-proliferating forms of difference.

The political economy of global capitalism consists in multiplying and distributing differences for the sake of profit. It produces ever-shifting waves of genderisation and sexualisation, racialisation and naturalisation of multiple 'others'. . . . advanced capitalism looks like a system that promotes feminism without women, racism without races, natural laws without nature, reproduction without sex, sexuality without genders, multiculturalism without ending racism, economic growth without development, and cash flow without money. (Braidotti, 2006)

Of course, in one sense Braidotti is correct. Every resistance, individualisation, personalisation and assertion of humanity can and has been colonised in the name of global capitalism. Nothing remains that can be seen as apart from the voracious appetite of commodification and nothing is so intrinsically challenging to the logic of capital that it cannot be accommodated. However, at the same time, a parallel push towards standardisation in the name of perfection continues.

We act as if we have moved beyond standardisation, into a differently constrained world of endless choice and self-expression through more and more precisely delimited differences. Yet we know also that standardisation in the most brutal of forms continues and continues to shape the desire to be human. From the continuing and relentless disciplining of women's bodies to the racialised fantasies of transformation through eye surgery or skin lightening to the quest to create the perfect (and no doubt endlessly clean) vagina, the fantasy of the perfectible racialised and sexualised body continues to animate consumer desires alongside the dispersals of self that come with the remaking of work (for a discussion of so-called Greco-Roman ideals and contemporary male bodies, see Stocking, 2014; for thoughts on choice and perfectible bodies, including those of babies, see Williams, 2016). When people desire solace or confirmation or a fantasy of a different and more pleasurable life, this desire also references racialised hierarchies of being. Regardless of any fragmentation of such frames of reference in the arena of the economic, the representational world of mobilising and inhabiting consumer desires continues to replay the racialised fantasies of more certain times.

The other strand of commodified difference, however, brings up less easily understood matters. Much as the world seeks to buy themselves a part in the fantasy of racial superiority, there are also considerable and global consumer markets for product experiences promising an affiliation with a racialised underclass. To be clear, such affiliation is an aspect of a global fantasy of Americanness and the associations of products with non-dominant racialised identities takes place, as far as I can tell, through an overwhelmingly American frame of reference. It is the subordinated categories of urban America who people the consumer fantasies of global youth and the cultural references of an idea of what urban America thinks, looks and sounds like (for examples of the global take-up of hip-hop cultures see Motley and Henderson, 2008; Mitchell, 2001). To be clear, this sense of affinity, however imaginary, is not the tactical deployment of ethnic identity described by Leong.

Across the globe, consumers of all hues, both those with a strong sense of their own racialised identity and those who narrate their own selves in quite different registers, rush to participate in the particular pleasures of global multiculturalism via consumption (for a discussion of the 'multicultural marketplace', see Demangeot, Broderick and Craig, 2015). Some, if not the majority, of this participation takes place through imaginative means, through images and music, through film and television, through imagined acts of wider consumption that may never come to fruition (for a discussion of the complexities of media consumption and aspiration in the global South, see Iqani, 2016). Yet take place it does, even if we may struggle to put a price on the added value of all of this marketed difference in a global economy where 'knowledge' has become one aspect of domination.

Earlier accounts of transnational marketing have pointed to the cynical ethnicisation of generic marketing materials in the pursuit of regional markets. In this telling, we see the insertion of Asian or African figures into advertising landscapes that signify a (whitened) West in all other regards (for a discussion of Indian television advertising and differently racialised bodies, see Dash, 2014). Yet this apparent nod to local identities may not indicate anything about the marketing of diversity and difference. Audiences in other parts of the world do not experience themselves as 'difference', or, at least, do not do so from the simple reading of a film or an advertisement (for some intriguing examples of repurposing that most unpromising of genres, the Western, to articulate global identities, see Higgins, Keresztesi and Oscherwitz, 2015).

What seems more plausible and is confirmed by the framing of international marketing in more recent times is the suggestion that the display of particular stagings of (Western) multiculture work as symbolic stand-ins for Western consumer lifestyles. The spectacle of, say, clear-skinned, white-toothed, multi-ethnic young people enjoying jumpers, fizzy pop or technology stands in for a lifestyle in which such interactions signal wealth and leisure (for an analysis of Vietnamese youth and their construction of self through branded consumption, see Pham and Richards, 2015; for an account of the adaptation, and also the success, of Western fast-food chains in the spaces of the Chinese city, see Zhang et al., 2014). Without the context of racialised relations of that other Western consumer space, the odd promises of Western multi-culture can come to refer to all manner of sensational experience. If the central sensation is one of potential comfort, pleasure and excitement, so much the better for sales of all associated products.

We know that in some (actually quite a lot of) places, stylistic references to African America, and increasingly other minoritised urban cultures of America, are claimed by the young as a register through which to express their own sense of alienation (Ibrahim, 2017). In part, this may include an active claiming of the terms of multi-culture, although these may be adapted to better fit local circumstances so that both the favela and the Arab Spring speak in the register of hip-hop.

We also know that wealthy lifestyles are mirrored in advertising across the world, but these wealthy lifestyles are represented as experiences of multi-ethnic spending only in the representations emanating from the West. Therefore, we might conclude that this form of lifestyle-selling, when it includes markers of multi-culture, works as a shorthand for happy consumer living in the West. This is the old-fashioned transnational marketing of Coca-Cola (teaching the world to sing in an earlier moment of American expansionism) or of Benetton's

more knowing poking fun at the tropes of multi-culturalism in what we can understand now with hindsight to be the last throws of a Western consumer culture that felt sufficient security to extend a benevolent hand to the the rest of the world, those unfortunates yet to benefit from access to block-coloured casual wear. Now, embedded as we are in the long night of a so-called clash of civilisations due to continue until the end of the world—revealed to recent generations as an event that is far closer than we think—the fantasy fulfilment of achieving a life of sugar, fat and sportswear is no longer believable, if it ever was. But, as Adorno and Horkheimer point out at a much much earlier juncture of mass culture and advertising, the hopefulness on which mass consumerism rests is inevitably fragile.

It has become increasingly difficult to keep people in this condition. The rate at which they are reduced to stupidity must not fall behind the rate at which their intelligence is increasing. (Horkheimer and Adorno, 1989, 145)

Capitalism can promise us the perfect object. The object that will fill our lack, make us whole, satisfy our niggling yet unspecific want. Even in the spaces where people face extreme hardship and exclusion, that promise can take hold. Yet, at the same time, the manner in which we are immersed in capitalist culture (including the manner in which we may learn to sort and assess large amounts of data while simultaneously losing other skills such as spelling and a sense of direction to mechanisation) reveals the emptiness of such promises. Adorno and Horkheimer link the awareness of statistical probability and the wish to become one of the wealthy to reveal this tension. On the one hand, we learn to view all interactions through a lens of basic calculability, including learning to shop around for best prices, shared interests and numbers of likes or followers, in the process generating ever greater amounts of personal data that can be used to enmesh us more completely in ever more personalised direct marketing. On the other, our ability to reduce our interactions with others to a calculation confirms the mammoth gap between dreams of wealth and influence and our own poor resources. For Adorno and Horkheimer, mass culture works to keep us just stupid enough, always struggling to keep pace with the rate at which mass culture also trains us in skills for work and leisure. We can see this tension in the world-wide desire of younger people for the products of Americanised culture, while expressing a critical opinion of America itself (Wike et al., 2017).

For spaces which have not undergone explicit battles against racism, not least because the hierarchisation of humanity may not be told as a matter of race in those places, the spectacle of corporatised multi-culturalism is an odd display. The cynical deployment of ethnic display outlined by Nancy Leong makes little sense beyond a US context which has been shaped by affirmative action. At the time of writing, this space may be unravelling all too quickly and even these cynical displays may become sources of nostalgia. However, for other places, diversity with an American flavour maps awkwardly onto the preoccupations and divisions arising from other histories. At the most crass, this can lead to an enthusiastic embrace of branding embodied by African American celebrities at the same time that people of African descent face hostility and danger in the streets where this same advertised lifestyle is displayed. We might guess that the racialised hostility signals the success of becoming stupid and identifying, however fantastically, with forms of white privilege. The imagined identification with the most famous global others of/within American wealth, on the other hand, signals something else. Perhaps a submerged memory of anticolonial hopes, perhaps a rerouted half-recognition of racial capitalism's damage to us all (for an excellent account of this history of 'third-world' solidarity, see Prashad, 2008). Either way, we can see that becoming a mixture of stupidly pacified and/or incited to violence while also trained in forms of intelligence that seek to delimit thought creates capitalist subjects who may simultaneously crave and fear 'difference'.

My suggestion is that the fantasy of diverse living in the imagined manner of America serves as a particular kind of consumer fantasy. At its most enticing, this is an image of capitalism without pain. Yet simultaneously, the identification with racial privilege offers a different and parallel fantasy of expelling the less than human, including the dangerous trace of the less than human within. The promises of consumer culture combine these utopian and dystopian moments,

hedging bets so that somewhere between our (imaginations of our) best and worst selves, there is always money to be made.

WHO TREADS ON OUR DREAMS?

My interest here is the manner in which consumer practices engage those who may be disadvantaged or excluded from other arenas of economic activity, most of all in the arena of waged work. This is not an assessment of consumer practices as resistance, although that moment of painstakingly charting resistant readings also has its place in our shared and constantly emerging understanding. However, as readers will have understood, this is not the focus of this work and the debates about creativity and oppositional consciousness through consumption are of limited relevance to our discussion.

Instead our interest is in the tension between the ongoing experience of depletion and fragmentation of most people attempting to survive in capitalist spaces and the pull towards reconstructing a sense of self through consumption. The suggestion that consumption is presented as an opportunity to reconstruct self, including in the face of capitalist dehumanisation and/or fragmentation, has been a powerful and persuasive theme in the scholarship (for an account of the symbolic role of conspicuous consumption in signifying freedom in post-apartheid South Africa, see Kistner, 2015).

Although the practices of capitalism are necessarily contradictory and parasitic on other modes of social being, mixing itself up in the business of our everyday lives and feelings in ways that can make capitalism as close to us as family and as natural as air, it is not and never can be empowering. No matter what creative and resistant readings are mounted or the manner in which the modes of consumption are utilised to construct a momentary sense of self in the face of exclusionary or oppressive or downright exploitative circumstances, there is no individual mode of engagement with capitalism that can free a person from the discomforts of capitalist living.

Yet when we forget the promise and pleasure and expectation that capitalism signals, however misleadingly, we fail in our attempt to grasp this beast that we inhabit. Although our discussion has been overwhelmingly focused on the most extreme excesses of capitalism, we must understand that racial capitalism is also contained in these dreams of fulfilment through capitalism.

The outcome of this is that all sorts of people rush towards indignity, often knowingly, sometimes because this indignity represents the least bad option in their eyes, but also sometimes because this indignity appears as the least unlikely vehicle for their dreams. The bearing of indignity in the name of economic inclusion or productivity or simply making ends meet can combine a recognition of constraint and injustice and, simultaneously, an imaginative leap beyond the degradations of today. This form of wishing as a tactic of survival has been scorned, on the whole, by theorists of the left. This is the debased consciousness of a consumer society lubricated by mass culture—and although the phrase has been out of fashion forever, it is the kind of consciousness that many still regard as 'false'. Yet the dream of self-actualisation through participation in capitalism remains a powerful hook and no attempt to comprehend the workings of racial capitalism in the twenty-first century can proceed without giving some thought to this matter.

What is distinctive about the capitalist re-makings of our time is the bringing together of coercion and desire, and the constant playing off of one against the other, so that fear and the wish to escape become so intertwined and mutually confirming that they often cannot be distinguished. Unlike the wayward pre-capitalist workers of Capital, forcibly being tied to land and masters with the most brutal violence, those undergoing proletarianisation today may consider this to be inescapable, as certain as death. Or as a fate that can be avoided but where avoidance leads to even greater pain and hardship. Thus we see that while some battle fiercely for their way of life and right to life on their own terms, others find themselves already without the means of daily life and in no position to do anything other than rush towards any opportunity for waged work or small-scale commerce.

Capitalism offers itself as the best cure and consolation for the injuries that it has inflicted. Many of the dreams of consumerism, either standardised or personalised, are barely hidden codes for the antidote to the ravages of capitalism. It does this remarkably effectively, to the extent that it is difficult to imagine or articulate ways of feeling and living better that are not couched in the terms of capitalist culture. Perhaps we are smart enough to resist the lure of empty consumerism (but perhaps not its trickier cousin, the consumerism that is good for us, or good for our health, or good for the environment), but it is far harder to resist the framing of one's self as a precious object of property (for a discussion of the neoliberal self as a treasured property, see Rustin, 2014). In a world of constant depletion, every resistance revolves around the belief that I at least own my self and my own life. When every other mode of productivity is barred or escaped, we are mocked by the inescapable injunction to take productive stewardship of our own selves.

This bottom-line of desiring to own oneself is also racialised, but in ways that excite pleasure or offer consolation. Instead of the herding from without of degrees of exclusion in the labour market, where larger forces put us in our place, we buy our own racialised selves as a dream of fulfilment. In this mode of racialising differentiation, we are offered the consolation of projected communities of shared identity, differentiated in an echo of the racialised hierarchies of the productive, the sometimes productive and the non-productive, but free from the punishment of exploitation.

WHAT IF CAPITALISM HAS CHANGED?

This work is inspired by the rush to think again about how capitalism shapes lives in our time. This is the work that is addressed to the most urgent of contemporary challenges and the work that persists in asserting that knowing about the world might have some role in how we come to change it. And yet so much of this exemplary endeavour flattens out the challenges of racialised division or implies (again) that capitalist development will erase such differentials, eventually.

I raise this point not in order to berate the authors of these works for their failure to address matters of racism. There is little to be gained from this kind of ritual berating, and, of course, there are far more guilty parties than the dedicated leftists who focus their energies on understanding and dismantling the ills of capitalism in our time, not the particularities of capitalist ills for any one or other section of the world.

Instead, my reason for pointing out such omissions is to explain the need for such speculative discussion within these pages. The available templates through which to comprehend the shifts of contemporary capitalism, particularly as they relate to the structuring of the proletariat, arise from other interests. These are not works steeped in the sociologies of racism, and their shaping preoccupations reflect these other interests and influences. And yet, there is something in the push to identify what is happening to constructions of class and of agency that circles back to the terms of racial capitalism.

In the opening chapter, we considered the implications of moving away from the figure of the proletariat and towards an analysis of proletarianisation as a process, a shift suggested by Bernard Stiegler. Stiegler distinguishes between overlapping phases of proletarianisation, including the two key phases of the proletarianisation of the producer and the proletarianisation of the consumer. Whereas the first is the process described by Marx and Engels, the second is the more recent analysis of Stiegler, following Baudrillard, that posits the loss of 'savoir-faire' and 'savoir-vivre' as outcomes of mass consumption and the colonisation of the libidinal economy by capital. For Stiegler, we are entering a third phase when the hybrid processes of proletarianisation of producers and of consumers intensify and come together in the generalised proletarianisation that has led to the crises of capitalism in our time.

Stiegler's account has captured imaginations, not least through the suggestive invocation of some key aspects of contemporary fragmented experience. Who does not identify with his question/statement: 'What makes life worth living'? The call to reintegrate 'care' into the economic, including care for the planet, resonates easily and deeply with a twenty-first-century audience that witnesses a constant (twenty-four-hour) display of disposability, suffering and lack

of care in a manner that fills us with endless sources of information but empties us of any possible agency for change.

In our discussion of racial capitalism as a set of processes that divide particular populations from access to resources and establish differential access to economic activity, the account of a resulting space apart from or alongside the spaces of capital has returned again and again. Whether it is Sanyal's postcolonial wasteland or the camps of the undesirables or the necropolis (outside or inside the metropolis), the suggestion that capital works to segment spaces and populations, relegating some to the status of outside, has been a recurring thread. These spaces apart or alongside have been characterised by an incomplete or sporadic proletarianisation of producers and could be regarded as offering an equally sporadic proletarianisation of consumers. Ironically, the amateurism that Stiegler celebrates as a potential retrieval of savour-vivre has had a continuing and occasionally vibrant existence in the innovations of the slum, the camp, the shadow economy and the ghetto. Those without the means or the access to enter the worlds of producer or consumer fully or consistently must retain elements of amateurism as part of their repertoire of survival.

The world suggested by Stiegler is one that privileges cognitive labour or knowledge workers as prospective revolutionary agents. He celebrates the creation of open-source software as one instance where '"workers of the spirit" are engaged in the age of de-proletarianisation—which is a kind of disintoxication' (Stiegler, 2013, 55). As it is the arena of knowledge and knowledge of life that is regarded as the frontier of proletarianisation, struggles over control of this knowledge of life is framed as a key site of class struggle. Yet this is an account of the struggles of contemporary capitalism that appears removed from our interest in the racialised edges of the formal economy.

We might understand, then, that the incursion of commodifying 'savoir-vivre' extends to all forms of work and perhaps also to all forms of consumption. The underlying implication of Stiegler's assertions about the loss of savoir-vivre is precisely this, that the knowledges of life, of taste, of sensation, have been extracted and sold back to us as experiences that we no longer have the ability to make ourselves. The extension of consumer logics into every facet of life indicates an alienation from our own experience of self; as a result, we must purchase experience as a commodity in an attempt to plug this lack.

At first glance, this account appears to echo other stories of the flattening out of human diversity by capitalism. In the loss of savoir-vivre, or equally in the no longer meaningfully outside noise of communicative capitalism, we are all equally lacking it seems. Being a productive worker or a citizen or an inhabitant of the biopolis will not save you. These previously privileged statuses do not guard against the diminishment of consumer cultures that strip us of every basic knowledge needed for life.

Alongside this dispersal of the terms of human value, the apparent fixing of status through the body of racialised power seems out of place. Perhaps hierarchies of race could be dismantled as we enter a time of diminishment and fragmentation for all? Lazzarato does raise this optimistic hope, when he suggests that asignifying semiotics and 'revolutionary processes of deterritorialization'

constitute the propitious conditions for doing away with the humanist, familialist, and personological modes of representation, the nationalist, racist, and classist modes of subjectivation, according to which capital is territorialized and in which individual subjects become alienated. (Lazzarato, 2014, 94)

The fragmentation of the identity-based investments that have anchored the segregation and hierarchisation of populations, including the boundaries between 'work' and 'non-work' and the various racialised hierarchies of 'productivity', opens the possibility for building another set of relations to each other.

To consider this possibility, we need to return to some other aspects of debates about capitalism and language. *Capitalism and Language*, the first of Christian Marazzi's works to be published in English, presents an account of the linguistic workings of post-Fordism, both through the financial

economy and through what Michael Hardt describes in the introduction to the English translation as 'the newly dominant forms of labour'. However, the larger argument concerns the manner in which post-Fordism signals an erosion of the distinction between work and nonwork.

Contrary to theories of the end of work, which actually were about the end of Fordist-Taylorist work, post-Fordism brought on a sizable increase in work time and an equally substantial reduction of wages and salaries. (Marazzi, 2008, 41)

The account offered of cognitive capitalism by Christian Marazzi can help us to refocus debates about language, signification and capitalism towards the questions raised by racial capitalism. Marazzi argues that the fragile agreements about living standards and subsidy for social reproduction through the 'breadwinner' wage are being eroded through the processes of post-Fordism, with post-Fordism signalling a phase where capitalism itself seeks to move beyond wage relations. He identifies two strands in this movement. The first is the process of colonising what might once have been called 'the life world', so that there is little or no boundary between the spaces of work and the spaces of life, and the extraction of surplus value can move into any aspect of life. Alongside this, and anticipating Lazzarato, Marazzi argues that we are witnessing a move to a rent economy, with a widespread squeeze on wages translating into increases in personal debt.

The linking theme across these accounts is the implication that our consumer practices and supposedly private spaces have become sites for the extraction of surplus value. This is taking place both through a fragmentation of wage relations, so that workers are paid for increasingly poorly specified tasks or outcomes (and equally are docked 'pay' for increasingly unpredictable and/or uncontrollable reasons) and the monetisation of non-work activities, including 'leisure'. If we have understood racial capitalism as the relegation of some populations and spaces to non-inclusion in formal capitalist development, then this shifting of the boundaries between work and non-work also unsettles these racialised hierarchies of economic inclusion. However, to unsettle is not to dismantle.

The relative certainties of welfare capitalism (for some) created a period of apparently knowable and stable hierarchies of belonging and status, including significant gains for a section of the working class. We know already that the contract of welfare was located in only some regions of the world and also that exclusion from the terms of deserving citizenship blighted the lives of others and that such exclusion could be understood as a racialised and racialising exercise (Cohen, 2014).

To return to the beginning of our discussion, the concept of housewifisation presents a framework for thinking about the collapsing together of work and consumption. As we might expect, Mies does not accept that the colonisation of consumption is a form on 'non-work'. Instead, she continues her analysis of the processes through which increasing proportions of 'housewifised labour' is forcibly integrated into the service of capital, including through the greater levels of technology that can be located within private homes.

More and more 'free wage-labour' is being transformed into non-free housewifized labour, and the 'free' consumer is increasingly forced into a coercive structure which makes her/him not only buy the commodities, but also do more consumption work than before if she/he wants to survive. (Mies, 1986, 126)

In the formulation offered by Mies, the transformation of 'leisure' into a form of work—that is, into activity that serves accumulation—does not transform the character of the proletariat. Instead, this represents an enlargement of the segment of the world's population engaged in activity deemed as 'non-work' and a contraction of those who can ascend to the celebrated status of 'free wage-labour'. Mies has argued that this segmentation of working populations lies at the heart of capitalism. This is not some new development arising from financialisation or from new communications technologies. Instead, the technologisation of increasing aspects of communication forms only one element of a shift towards expelling people from 'free wage-labour' as part of a process of diversifying the machineries of exploitation. In a more recent piece, Mies summarises this with the suggestion,

One could even say that in the globalised economy, this form of exploitation has become the model for the exploitation of labour in general. Today, the standard employment relationship is no longer a relationship between capital and a (male) 'free wage-worker' but one that involves 'flexible', 'atypical', 'third-world-ified' and 'unprotected'—in brief: 'housewifed'—male and female workers. (Mies, 2014, 221)

Both the identification of a changing pattern of global employment (International Labour Organization, 2015) and the move towards conceiving of an extended or subaltern global working class (Van der Linden, 2008) echo this point. Mies, however, is making a larger point. Not only is she arguing that these other forms of work are becoming more prevalent but also that this status of consumer/housewifed worker is becoming what she terms 'the model for the exploitation of labour in general', meaning that this is the form of subjectivation that characterises capitalism in our time. Instead of fixating on the possible re-emergence of a proletariat constituted through industrial labour, we should learn to understand the combined processes of dispossession that make us, increasingly, into those who work unseen but who must consume, into 'workers' who do not have the trappings of proletarian status and consumers who lack the means of consumption. This double depletion signals a shift in techniques of exploitation and an erosion of the accommodation of the needs of social reproduction established as an adjunct to welfare capitalism.

The processes that increase the time required by work while also splitting the contract of the salary, so that more and more of this endless work is valued through the highly unpredictable processes of retrospective assessment (for an account of 'just-in-time' working, see De Stefano, 2016), point to a form of housewifisation. Marazzi uses the term 'post-Fordism' to indicate a shift that goes beyond a re-arrangement of 'production'—this is far more than the new work practices that engaged the minds of business analysts at the end of the last century. What he outlines is a process that, through the dismantling of regular wages and the state subsidies of welfare capitalism, transforms work into an endless quest to demonstrate value. In this process, what was the business of social reproduction—what we might consider the business of life—also comes to be integrated into the circuits of what might be exploited. This is no longer the second-hand exploitation that occurs through the servicing of the waged worker, but instead is a move into the grabbing of value from a range of activity that is undertaken to sustain life itself. As Mies has explained, this is a depletion of the resources needed to sustain life, including the time of non-work required to recuperate and to remake the life that does not belong to work.

WHAT HAPPENS TO RACIALISED DIVISIONS
IN A TIME OF ASIGNIFICATION?

The account of asignifying processes offered by Lazzarato registers the machinic ordering of (aspects of) human bodies in the service of economy that characterises post-Fordism. We should remember here also that post-Fordism does not signal a stage—in the manner of stages of production—and that the whole world may be considered post-Fordist without passing through any recognisable moment of industrialisation. As we come to learn that the tendency to replace labour with machines can emerge as the making machinic of some aspects of labour, including through the fragmentation of working lives and the abandonment of 'subsidy' to social reproduction, the terms of post-Fordism come to describe much of the world. This is that other space of debate, seemingly untouched by the preoccupations of those seeking to comprehend racial capitalism, that argues for the centrality of subjectivity and 'subjectivation' in any analysis of capitalism. Maurizio Lazzarato summarises some central aspects of this debate succinctly. Lazzarato, following Deleuze and Guattari, identifies two modes of the production of subjectivity, 'social subjection and machinic enslavement' (Lazzarato, 2014, 12). The process of social subjection refers to the processes of subjectivation that we might understand as social reproduction, the matters that construct us as social beings that play their role in social relations that have been collapsed in economic imperatives.

Social subjection equips us with a subjectivity, assigning us an identity, a sex, a body, a profession, a nationality and so on. In response to the needs of the social division of labor, it in

this way manufactures individuated subjects, their consciousness, representations and behavior. (Lazzarato, 2014, 12)

This is the business of social reproduction described as (more or less) coherent and workable—whatever the contradictions and challenges, people become themselves through such processes and they recognise and embrace the selves that they become. It is in the other mode of subjectivation that we see more clearly the irreconcilable contradictions of becoming subject under capitalism. While the terms of social reproduction suggest a naturalness to the experience of finding yourself in the social, 'machinic enslavement' is another order of experience altogether. The production of the individuated subject is coupled with a completely different process and a completely different hold on subjectivity that proceeds through desubjectivation. Machinic enslavement dismantles the individuated subject, consciousness, and representations, acting on both the pre-individual and supra-individual levels. (Lazzarato, 2014, 12)

The process of becoming machinic, and of being forcibly contained in this space of the machinic, continues against all dreams and promises of self-realisation and human wholeness that spin through the fantastical representations of capitalist living. Thinking back to Cedric Robinson, I have been struck by the parallels between Lazzarato's accounts of a need for a new subjectivity and Robinson's celebration of the oppositional consciousness forged in resistance by those facing the harshest aspects of racial capitalism. The element of alleged voluntarism is there in both sets of accounts—and has remained a point of contention in relation to conceptions of political agency. However, the possibility of political agency forged in the process of resistance that Robinson identifies has not been considered as a plausible beginning for any wider rewriting of the terms of political subjectivity. We might consider this to be another aspect of racial capitalism—the manner in which racialised structures of division serve to isolate possibilities of resistance and to racialise the emergence of resistant subjectivities in a manner that limits their translatability.

Whereas some accounts of the rise of consumer society have focused on the construction of a sense of investment and identity through consumption, these have been accounts, on the whole, of social reproduction. This is the work that unpacks the creation of the fiction of the consuming household and the gendered subjectivities that are interpellated as discerning consumers. However, such work has focused overwhelmingly on those populations (and locations) who have been addressed as 'consumer citizens', and it is a telling that relies on the role of consumer seeping into other more established social scripts. Consumption as discernment or consumption as pleasurable self-realisation both signal a kind of becoming in and through capitalism. This is not capitalism as an experience of endless fragmentation and dispersal—or, at least, it is also a way of thinking about capitalism that regards consumption as a balm for the wounds caused by capitalism.

And this is the thing, the culture of consumer capitalism has operated as a compensation for the dehumanisation of capitalism. Once we might have viewed this as a misplaced belief in the possibility of self-making through ownership. This is the account of consumer culture that describes the adornment of a fragile (but existent) self with a stream of commodities, each promising to enhance and secure the identity of the hollowed-out capitalist subject (de Castro, 2016).

What we learn from Lazzarato is that this underlying if muted and empty self does not exist. Instead, we emerge sporadically as machinic elements, including in our positioning as consumers. The narratives of self-making belonged to previous generations and their loss can provide a rare moment of exhilaration.

For some, consumer practices might offer a sense of being able to enact the promise of the social script. However disappointing and unsustainable the identities of capitalist social reproduction are revealed to be, there is the hope that the practice of consumption itself can transform and consolidate identities that are in a constant process of being dismantled. In part, the attempt to cling to aspects of fictional identity may represent a response to the rush of fragmentation. The desire to build a fantastical and fully present self through consumption arises

from anxiety and nostalgia, much of what is desired cannot be returned, much of the sense of loss reflects the lost and ultimately empty promises of a welfare capitalism that if not dead is dying. The desperate attempt to cling to the reference points of a social and economic arrangement that is passing away reveals the lag between changes in the economic and what we might call 'culture'. The disjuncture between these two—and the painful and jarring manner in which such disjunctures are felt—can cause disorientation, irrationality, rage, violence. Ironically, this rage and disorientation also can be re-integrated into circuits of commodification, both as an element in the disciplining of labour and of non-labour and as another targeted promise of consumer culture.

INDEBTEDNESS AND THE REMAKING OF RACIAL CAPITALISM

In his widely praised and gripping account of the transformation of the capitalist 'subject' under neoliberalism, *The Making of the Indebted Man*, Lazzarato is generously candid about the development of his analysis.

For a long time I thought that the subjective implication resulted mainly from changes in the organization of labor. I would like to qualify that position with a complementary hypothesis. It is debt and the creditor-debtor relationship that make up the subjective paradigm of modern-day capitalism, in which 'labor' is coupled with 'work on the self', in which economic activity and the ethico-political activity of producing the subject go hand in hand. (Lazzarato, 2012, 38)

For our interests in the range of human activity that is not classed as work but which, nevertheless, contributes to processes of accumulation, this formulation is illuminating. We will pass over for a moment the continuing quest to uncover 'the subjective paradigm' and return later to the differentiations that constitute racial capitalism. What Lazzarato describes, as well as the coupling of the economic and ethico-political (another coupling that may not be open to all or that may position people very differently), is the manner in which the framework of indebtedness comes to constitute an economic status that sews human lives into processes of capital accumulation regardless of their (other) status as 'labour'. We know already from Mies and from Roy that the poor may be coerced into market participation through so-called poverty reduction initiatives that teach indebtedness. What matters here is not so much the extent of the loan, although there are loans that crush life, but the sale of the future. Entering into the loan relationship presents a route for capital to extract value from the spaces of social reproduction directly, without the mediation of the waged worker. In order to become self-managing and entrepreneurial, that is, in order to gain access to the consumer economy and move beyond subsistence, the debtor of the poor world must mine practices of social reproduction to provide payments to service the loan. One part of what previously was undertaken to keep families alive must be diverted to loan payment. In Mies's example, this process depleted the would-be milk producer still further, taking away from the activity that had sustained life. In non-agricultural settings, we might consider indebtedness as a less coercive structure, but Lazzarato points us to the crux of the matter. Indebtedness is a sale of the future and through indebtedness we become bonded, unable to act as 'free labour' or 'non-labour' of our own volition because our future creation of value has been signed away to our debts. One account of this process has argued that the move to a debt economy represents a new fix for capitalist crises: with the narrowing possibilities for spatial fixes, even with the assistance of the violences of accumulation by dispossession, capital looks to a temporal fix to absorb over-accumulation (Federici, 2014). In the absence of new territories or new populations to invade, our future selves become the new colony, owned before we arrive at ourselves. Lazzarato describes this as a taking on of the costs, subsidising the accumulation strategies of the present through our commitments to continue repayment in the future.

In the debt economy, to become human capital or an entrepreneur of the self means assuming the costs as well as the risks of a flexible and financialized economy, costs and risks which are not only—far from it—those of innovation, but also and especially those of precariousness, poverty, unemployment, a failing health system, housing shortages, etc. To make an enterprise of oneself (Foucault)—that means taking responsibility for poverty, unemployment, precariousness,

welfare benefits, low wages, reduced pensions, etc., as if these were the individual's 'resources' and 'investments' to manage as capital, as 'his' capital. (Lazzarato, 2012, 51)

Unlike Stiegler, the focus on debt allows us to understand how people continue to be placed by capitalist formations even when they are not or cannot be engaged in capitalist forms of production. In fact, the analytic apparatus that Lazzarato builds around the concept of indebtedness offers a way of thinking about those who are excluded from inclusion in wage relations and yet continue to be positioned as adjuncts to capitalism and as adjuncts who are disprivileged due to their marginal status. The focus on the construction and costs, both individual and group, of indebtedness opens up a conceptual terrain that can allow us to see more clearly how practices of consumption could form part of the process of proletarianisation. The suggestion that indebtedness has become the defining characteristic of populations under capitalism opens the possibility of thinking again about a range of positionings that extend beyond a privileging of the wage relation. As Lazzarato outlines, wagedness is increasingly overtaken by indebtedness as the defining feature of capitalist living. However, instead of conceiving of this as a flattening downwards that reduces all to the status of the formerly subjugated, we might consider indebtedness as another differentiating process.

When we think of the escalating depletions of post-Fordism, it is helpful to remember that there are distinctions within these processes of depletion. The account offered by Lazzarato is of the displaced and formerly salaried member of an imploding welfare society. Indebtedness for these groups falls differentially, revealing the maps of personal assets, credit ratings and access to financial services that arise from histories of racialised inclusion and dispossession. Elsewhere, indebtedness occurs but through different institutional frameworks.

Indebtedness is itself a highly variegated condition. The balance between what can be allowed for the life of the present and what has been relinquished already to the payments of the future reveals the histories of racialised and other dispossessions (for a discussion of wealth gaps among ethnic groups in the United States, see Kocchar and Fry, 2014; for a famous account of the 'underdevelopment' of black America, see Marable, 2000). For some, this leads to a depletion of the terms of life in the present, leading to the living death suffered by too many this century. For others, it represents a means to asset-strip the necropolitans of the metropolis, ensuring that future generations will continue to repay bonds taken to sustain life today. For others still, the terms of life remain available and, to the uneducated eye, life appears to continue 'as normal', yet indebtedness of the individual and of the society opens a new terrain of exploitation and creates the indebted subjects who have learned to take on the risks and costs of capital as part of the intoxicating promise of flexibility and self-management. This is not to say that this is some sort of 'choice' (although it is sold back to us as a choice we have made). My point is that the terms of indebtedness are folded into the terms of economic participation, until one cannot be distinguished from the other. Equally, the terms of ethico-political activity include the internalisation of the mob mentality implied by the debt economy. One aspect of inhabiting this ethico-political terrain is the acceptance (the celebration?) of the racialised punishment of bad debtors.

The debate about new modes of proletarianisation reflects a widely held belief that the techniques of capitalism have been shifting, not into another creature but into regimes of accumulation that demand/create altered economic actors. The landscape of economic positioning arises from both the fragmentation of subjects under machinic modes of capitalism and simultaneously the attempt to fix and order bodies under the gaze of securitising processes. While this division has been described as one between the extraction of value and the anticipation and containment of threat, we might consider these two tendencies as moments in a regime of power that includes, but may not be exhausted by, processes of (attempted) racial domination.

Whatever the potentiality that might be opened by asignifying practices, there seems little indication that these propitious circumstances have translated into a leap into a post-racist future. Across the world, competition for a variety of scarce resources is narrated as a matter of

racialised rivalry. From the varieties of populist politics that speak to (misplaced) feelings of beleaguerment (not only Trump but also Modi, the UK Independence Party and Israel) to the unleashing of racialised rage in the face of uncertainty (not only against the Roma and the Rohingya, but also the Ahmadiyyas) to the erasure of inconvenient populations who may unsettle the national/ethnic story or stand in the path of resources or territory (Uighur, 'Tribals', 'natives'), it seems that we have become both more conscious of our machinic enslavement and also more resentful of the loss or impending loss of racial statuses that are imagined as coherent and meaningful identities.

Racial capitalism is characterised, in all its variety, by the manner in which powerful actors seek to requisition the means of life and value and to gain benefit from the mobilisation of racialised distinctions. Differentiation may occur 'without politics', but the social organisation of this differentiated (potential) workforce into racialised patterns occurs with the actions of the powerful. This is not the same as claiming that such things are planned and then enacted—much of the business of racial capitalism occurs incidentally alongside initiatives and practices designed to safeguard elite access to resources. We might remind ourselves that social reproduction is also a way of understanding the tendency of social classes to seek to reproduce themselves, not only at the level of bare life but also in their ways of life. For the 1 per cent of the super-rich to reproduce their ways of life, which may be considered to include the rapacious accumulation of wealth, it is helpful for the world to become increasingly differentiated, with a contracting population engaged in the formal economies that service the very wealthy (including by continuing the 'productive sphere') and a growing population that is rendered as indebted to some extent or other.

In 'To Our Enemies' (2016), Lazzarato and Alliez suggest that, with the returned hegemony of the extreme right, we have entered a period of racial class warfare. I take this as an indirect acknowledgement of the power of racial capitalism to shape the terrains of our lives. Racial class warfare names the battles that can arise when we are divided from each other. My hope is that learning to see the workings of racial capitalism can prepare us against the attacks on the terms of life, not as a racialised struggle but as a fight for life.

Chapter 7

Ending

On Not Being Part of the Industrial Reserve Army

For a long time, analyses of capitalism operated on the assumption that all human life would and could be absorbed into capitalist production eventually. Both those interested in the overthrow of capitalism and those committed to the capitalist project seemed to share this underlying assumption. Tom Brass summarises this assumption as including three elements in relation to accounts of rural economies and development:

First, that labour market imperfections are always the fault of peasants resisting the attempts of capital to proletarianize them; second, that capitalist penetration of agriculture always transforms peasants into proletarians, in the full meaning of the latter term; and third, that where these exist (non-urban contexts, backward agriculture, and/or underdeveloped countries), unfree relations are always unproblematically pre-capitalist forms of production destined to be eliminated in the course of this process. (Brass, 1994, 255)

In these first decades of the twenty-first century, such beliefs, however muted, seem fantastical. Whatever the productivist hopefulness of some accounts of capitalist development, the world has seen not a gradual (or even a bloody) extension of capitalist forces of production in the sense that all humanity becomes absorbed into a proletariat still imagined as industrial. Instead we have lived through a period of extreme violence and turbulence in which many are dispossessed and displaced, but the route to absorption into capitalist formations remains unclear or, at least, unorthodox.

None of this signals an end to or stalling of capitalism. What it does suggest is a different narrative about the place of labour in capitalist development. Again, from right to left, the realisation that opportunities for employment may be contracting and not extending is reshaping policy debates. The suggestion of a universal basic income—an idea that was all but unspeakable only a little while ago—has entered the mainstream of policy debate, as a possible response to the projected decline of work. At the same time, we might consider the active attempt to push some populations out of 'work', and to limit or bar their access to resources while also relegating their status to a form of 'nature' again as a tactic to safeguard the status of some populations by subordinating others. Whereas an earlier phase of racial capitalism employed similar tactics of differential privilege to enable parallel forms of exploitation that siphoned the world's resources into particular geographical centres and presented proximity to centres of capital as a form of racialised destiny that demanded racialised affiliation, now a rewritten framing of racialised destiny is deployed to consign some to living death or death in the name of safeguarding the necessary resources of life for others. Consignment to living death operates also as a technique to differentiate and discipline labour in a process that Brass terms 'deproletarianization'. Brass summarises this as

diminishing or eliminating altogether the freedom of wage labour . . . the ability of owners of the commodity labour-power to exchange it as they choose . . . it is precisely by means of deproletarianization that capital is able to effect a double dispossession of its workforce: both from the means of labour, and also from the means of commodifying labour-power itself. (Brass, 1994, 259)

Deproletarianisation here is not the deproletarianisation proposed by Stiegler. Instead this is a model where capital retains power over the day-to-day lives of the population, both labour and 'non-labour', including importantly in the ability to manage and restrict the processes of recruiting workers, something that Brass names as 'the ability of capital to engineer unfreedom in labour markets' (1994, 259).

In my previous work on the project of austerity, I have argued that the retreat from welfare and also from the wider infrastructure that has enabled day-to-day survival for many working communities should be understood as a form of abandonment, although it is not yet decided

whether this is a temporary tactic or a long-term shift in practice. Whereas the analysis of liberal democracies in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries seemed to confirm a level of interdependence between labour and capitalist (state), with concessions and clawbacks revealing an ongoing struggle for ascendance, the unhappy experience of twenty-first-century austerity revealed a shift away from any sense that capital required the population to be remade. Whether as a misleading performance or as a genuine shift in the organisation of production, increasing proportions of the population have been cast out of the contract of social reproduction for capital. Variously, this can lead to a return of social reproduction for life, social reproduction for consumption with some monetisation of consumer practices and one or other form of indebtedness. All are outcomes that may occur alongside deproletarianisation and the desperations that arise from such economic exclusion can operate as a form of coercion, of engineered unfreedom. Now I think we are living through a phase of capitalism characterised by an ongoing dynamic of proletarianisation and deproletarianisation, enabled through techniques of the racial, and rendering some populations into the empty territory in preparation for some later spatial fix in an over-accumulation crisis to come. None of this requires a metaintentionality but, instead, arises from the manner in which raciality can be deployed at moments and locations of crisis by those seeking to postpone their own immiseration in a world of diminishing resources.

This work started life as a revisiting of Cedric Robinson's suggestive conceptualisation of 'racial capitalism'. His account of the anticapitalist agency that has arisen from a black radical tradition that cannot be theorised through the figure of the proletarian alone, coupled with his account of capitalist development as a process of differentiating populations, provides the questions that underlie this work.

In an attempt to understand more recent and similar processes of differentiation, chapter 1 considers Saskia Sassen's suggestion that expulsion is an underlying movement of our time, linking this idea to earlier discussions of the subordination of women and others in the birth of capitalism and Kalyan Sanyal's detailed account of the emergence and place of the postcolonial wasteland. Together these accounts propose a way of thinking that stresses the ongoing dispossession and displacement that characterises the workings of capital, raising the possibility of thinking of a space alongside or at the edge of capitalist formations.

In chapter 2, we revisited discussions of social reproduction and the manner in which some human activity has been deemed 'productive', while much of the activity that is necessary to sustain human life is not. In identifying the association between the 'non-productive' and nature, we can understand better how the activity of some people can be rendered invisible and deemed part of the natural, where nature is determined as what is not part of the business of productivity. This division has worked to erase the work of women and of the colonised. In this time of ecological crisis and the end of access to 'cheap nature', the expulsion of populations from the sphere of the productive economy operates to render them 'nature' again (or still). The space of nature is considered a space of necessary emptiness to offer free resources to the productive economy when needed but also to serve as a necessary space of adaptation and expansion.

It is this long history of dispossession of those deemed less than human because part of nature that shapes the terrain of contemporary racial capitalism, and chapters 3 and 4 revisit the legacies of such histories. The debate about the continuing impact of past dispossessions has re-erupted in recent times, in part in response to the limits of capitalist expansion. Whereas once decolonisation was imagined as an opportunity to modernise, industrialise and expand, now the ecological crisis of capitalism reveals an absence of fresh spaces of exploitation. Without cheap nature, there is no leap into capitalist modernity imagined as affluence for all. Instead, redistribution of the stolen resources of previous racialised dispossessions becomes an important claim in a world of contracting resources. Equally, the manner in which resources have been expropriated through the imposition of subordinate racialised status continues to shape economic relations.

Chapter 5 proposes that we understand global processes of bordering as an incarnation of racial capitalism that seeks to siphon populations in movement away from access to scarce resources

and fix them in spaces where they come to create an alternative geography of human settlement by force. Chapter 6 returns to questions of consumption and of debt, in order to consider how the framework of racial capitalism can illuminate our understandings of the debt economy. Overall, each chapter tries to outline an aspect of racial capitalism in our present moment of crisis and to indicate how this racialised division of the world inhabits the economic for us.

Chapter 6 returned to questions of consumption in order to explore the implications of a capitalism of signs and of debt for the racialised differentiation of populations. Although such processes might be regarded as homogenising in one sense, the experience of living through such fragmentation and indebtedness also destabilises and enrages those who, until recently, could rely on the differential privilege arising from the hierarchies of racial capitalism. New modes of differentiation continue to appear, alongside processes that seem to disperse the identity categories of Fordism and of welfare capitalism, of Keynesianism and of the reproduction of the labour force. Who we can be next and to each other is still to be decided, but there is no inevitable trajectory to class unity.

CREATING NEW NATURES IN TIMES OF ECOLOGICAL LIMIT

In a time of consciousness of ecological crisis and limit, we might consider deproletarianisation as a process that reflects battles over increasingly scarce finite resources. Instead of (only) the tendency to intensify capitalist extraction, there is also an ongoing parallel push to expel or exclude (some) populations from participation in waged work. More than this, these populations appear irrelevant to the progress of capitalism. No more than 'parked' at the edge of a (fantastical) economy which they cannot join. This is not to say that such expulsion is achieved or that those inhabiting 'edge' populations do not move in and out of the formal 'economy'. What it is is a reminder that we are living in times where the economic potential of some groups of people can become absolutely disposable—no-one cares to exploit them through the mechanics of the wage and their dispossessive potential is already exhausted.

Before we rush into another account of a strange new world, let us remember that this form of being made disposable has been at the heart of colonial expansion and the peculiar terms of settler-colonialism. There, too, (some) human populations were made irrelevant to the processes of economic development, displaced physically and symbolically, allowed only a sub-human existence at the edge of worlds built on expropriated lands. The central point to note here is that the history of racial capitalism shows us already that racialised expropriation can be excessive exploitation or displacement and genocide. It can be hyperexploitation through force or enforced differential status, or it can be relegation beyond the terms of everyday exploitation, including to such extremes of dispossession that life cannot be sustained.

So, nothing new. Racial capitalism might be a name for the extraction of additional value from subordinated groups or it might be a name for the racialised expropriation of resources from populations deemed disposable or it might point to processes of expulsion—and it might, most likely, be a name for the world that emerges from these combined processes.

What changes, then, in a time of consciousness of ecological limit?

First, let us remember again that no one unified actor decides these things. The invisible hand is no more in charge than the hand of god—no divine creations for any of us. Instead, the multiple and non-unified actions of many, informed by class interests but also refracted through the workings of race and gender and sexuality and disability and faith and region and age and language and, no doubt, other factors that have been less written about, combine in a global machine that is itself the outcome of many tussles and struggles and contradictions. In this global machine, racialised opportunities and barriers inform the actions of different actors—the terrain of the economic is already marked by these differentiations—and the pursuit of material interest by many different (and often competing) actors leads to a remaking of racialised injustice across the globe.

The additional factor of consciousness (for some) of ecological limit raises the possibility of the deployment of techniques of racialised exclusion or subordination as an attempt to safeguard access to scarce resources. This might include apparently illogical actions, such as mass

incarceration, securitisation, bordering, underdevelopment. It might include the seemingly contradictory choice of excluding some from the possibility of being exploited (as workers) in order to prioritise the enclosure of one or other valuable resource.

With the addition of ecological consciousness, accumulation by dispossession can become not an enforced route to proletarianisation (and what other route is there), but a route to dispossession and nothing else, in service to a capitalism that requires the access to resources but must limit expansion of productive forces in response to the limits of the world. Racial capitalism, then, can describe differential modes of exploitation, and/or varieties of expropriation and/or expulsion of some populations without any (immediate) transfer of value. Raciality enters these processes as the technique that enables these differential statuses to be spoken and to be allocated. Sometimes, as Nancy Fraser suggests, this will rely on the framework of the political, particularly when such processes operate within the boundaries of a still-functioning state. Sometimes there is no formal process of allocating lesser status—no interpellation by government, no distinction in law—but the sedimented expectations of centuries (or mere months in times of extreme crisis such as war) of dispossession open the possibility of differential exploitation/expropriation/expulsion as tactics. Some populations become subject to these processes because some other actors attribute lesser racialised status to them, and this attribution becomes part of the calculation of possibility and tolerability. In a return to the insights of *Racecraft* (Fields and Fields, 2012), categories and practices of race enter the story of economic life because people create, believe and deploy such fictions, here in the pursuit or defence of their own interests. In an attempt to take heed of the warnings of the authors of *Racecraft*, my argument is that processes of differential exploitation, expropriation and expulsion become racialising processes. Race does not organise human bodies into types of vulnerability— varying histories and presents of vulnerability work to sustain fictions of race and to confirm the adherence of such fictions to particular bodies. The terms of the 'economic' do not operate alone in this racialising project, and varieties of racist technique combine. However, human bodies do not come already categorised and sorted for capital to do its differentialising work. The differentiation is itself part of the process of economic racecraft; this is what remakes race in the realm of the economic.

We can imagine a capitalism that produces the category of race differently. We see glimpses of such a thing in the corporate celebration of diversity. However, it is hard to imagine a capitalism that moves beyond the imperatives of differential exploitation, expropriation and expulsion, particularly as we move into a phase of increasingly scarce resources and the turbulence of escalating climate change. If, as I suggest, to be subject to these three often interlocking processes is to become racialised as lesser, then we may be entering a period of proliferating racialisations and new patterns of overlap and intensification between old and new racisms.

Just as the Irish once became 'white', others may change their racialised status according to circumstance. Some may enter the realm of celebratory diversity. Perhaps a few may find themselves adjusted upwards, joining the heady ranks of the global consumer class, but for most of us things look pretty bleak. And all the time, someone somewhere will continue to be relegated to the status of lesser or less-than-human and, in this, capitalism cannot help but be racial.

THE POSSIBILITY OF AN ANTIRACIST CAPITALISM

As we should have understood by now, all inflections of being can be re-conditioned to become accessories to commodification. Disposable products that seek to save the environment? Of course, it is green consumerism which will save capitalism and let us ride out the crisis of scarce resources. Women's rights? What could be more central to models of economic development in our time than the aspiration to empower women, yes as consumers, but also as actual people? It is not the conception of women's rights that is problematic here, any more than rights-based conceptions of human worth may bring their usual problems. What is uncomfortable is that the honest attempt to persuade international institutions and national governments of the importance of women and their rights has become indistinguishable from an argument about economic development. Women's rights also have become weaponised as a tool of capitalist expansion.

Why, then, should we imagine that antiracism should fall outside the purview of a capitalism eager to swallow any or all social vehicles that may enable an extension of capitalist relations or an expansion of capitalist production?

Of course, it is not plausible to deny the possibility of an antiracist capitalism of a sort. Just as there are capitalisms that promote the rights of women, there must also be the possibility of capitalisms that seek to combat racism. In fact, we know this to be the case. The proposition that racism is a waste of human capital and therefore a hindrance to proper capitalism is well established and continues to be taught in business schools across the world. The point to note, of course, is that such expressions of distaste and practices designed to eradicate one irrational discrimination may exist alongside practices that rely upon continuing inequality and division between populations. We may achieve a version of liberal antiracism in one country, perhaps, but all the troubling caveats about who can be included in this framework will continue. The ever-extending techniques of the border will continue to mark and exclude some unlucky souls. Other tests of belonging will continue to ration access to justice. Variegated regimes of racism will continue to pit us against each other until we can learn to refuse the terms of these corrupted partial freedoms.

This work started life as an imagined tribute to Cedric Robinson and the project of *Black Marxism*. Inevitably, what emerged reflects my own location and formation far more than Robinson's close engagement with the black radical tradition in the United States. However, it is important to remember that Robinson himself did not propose that this particular trajectory of the tradition could provide a universal blueprint for all oppressed peoples. In the final paragraph of *Black Marxism*, he reasserts his commitment to diverse radical traditions and the importance of many routes to change.

It is not the province of one people to be the solution or the problem. But a civilization maddened by its own perverse assumptions and contradictions is loose in the world. A Black radical tradition formed in opposition to that civilization and conscious of itself is one part of the solution. Whether the other oppositions generated from within Western society and without will mature remains problematical. But for now we must be as one. (Robinson, 1983, 318)

After all the energies he had expended on outlining a black radical tradition that springs up in resistance to racial capitalism, Robinson has the generosity and foresight to remind us that no one people can be 'the solution or the problem'. No-one anointed as revolutionary subject through blood. No-one inevitably a devil. The shape-changing variety of racial capitalisms demands our own multiplicities of resistance in response, but none of this is assured. We have to build the traditions that can respond and resist, and not at each other's expense.

'But for now we must be as one'.

Hold that thought.

Bibliography

Abramovitz, M., and J. Albrecht. 2013. 'The Community Loss Index: A New Social Indicator'. *Social Service Review* 87 (4): 677–724.

Achrol, R., and P. Kotler. 2016. 'Marketing's Lost Frontier: The Poor'. *Markets, Globalization and Development Review* 1 (1): 1–39.

Adams, C. J., and L. Gruen, eds. 2014. *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals and the Earth*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Adams, Vincanne, Taslim Van Hattum and Diana English. 2009. 'Chronic Disaster Syndrome: Displacement, Disaster Capitalism, and the Eviction of the Poor from New Orleans'. *American Ethnologist* 36: 615–36.

Adorno, Theodor W. 2001. *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. London: Routledge.

———. 2005. *Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life*. London: Verso.

Adorno, T. W., and S. H. Flowerman. 1964. *The Authoritarian Personality: Studies in Prejudice*. Volume 2. New York: Wiley.

Agarwal, B. 1997. '"Bargaining" and Gender Relations: Within and Beyond the Household'. *Feminist Economics* 3 (1): 1–51.

Agier, M. 2002. 'Between War and City: Towards an Urban Anthropology of Refugee Camps'. *Ethnography* 3 (3): 317–41.

———. 2011. *Managing the Undesirables*. Cambridge: Polity.

Aguiar, Luis L., and Andrew Herod. 2006. *The Dirty Work of Neoliberalism: Cleaners in the Global Economy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Aguiar, W., and R. Halseth. 2015. *Aboriginal Peoples and Historic Trauma: The Processes of Intergenerational Transmission*. National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health (Centre de collaboration nationale de la santé autochtone).

Akaka, Melissa Archpru, and Dana L. Alden. 2010. 'Global Brand Positioning and Perceptions'. *International Journal of Advertising* 29 (1): 37–56.

Alexander, M. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.

Alix-Garcia, J., S. Walker, A. Bartlett, H. Onder and A. Sanghi. 2018. 'Do Refugee Camps Help or Hurt Hosts? The Case of Kakuma, Kenya'. *Journal of Development Economics* 130: 66–83.

Alonso-Villar, O., C. Del Rio and C. Gradín. 2012. 'The Extent of Occupational Segregation in the United States: Differences by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender'. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 51 (2): 179–212.

Amnesty International. 2015. '"Libya Is Full of Cruelty": Stories of Abduction, Sexual Violence and Abuse from Migrants and Refugees'. Amnesty International Report, May 2014. London: Amnesty International.

Amouzou, A., N. Kozuki and D. R. Gwatkin. 2014. 'Where Is the Gap? The Contribution of Disparities within Developing Countries to Global Inequalities in Under-Five Mortality'. *BMC Public Health* 14 (1): 216.

Anderson, B. 2000. *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labor*. London and New York: Zed Books.

———. 2010. 'Migration, Immigration Controls and the Fashioning of Precarious Workers'. *Work, Employment and Society* 24 (2): 300–17.

———. 2013. *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Andersson, R. 2014. *Illegality, Inc.: Clandestine Migration and the Business of Bordering Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2016a. 'Europe's Failed "Fight" against Irregular Migration: Ethnographic Notes on a Counterproductive Industry'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (7): 1055–075.

———. 2016b. 'Hardwiring the Frontier? The Politics of Security Technology in Europe's "Fight against Illegal Migration"'. *Security Dialogue* 47 (1): 22–39.

Andreotti, A., and Mingione, E. 2016. 'Local Welfare Systems in Europe and the Economic Crisis'. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 23 (3): 252–66.

Anievas, A., and K. Nisancioglu. 2015. *How the West Came to Rule: The Geopolitical Origins of Capitalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press Economics Books.

Arango J., and M. Baldwin-Edwards, eds. 2014. *Immigrants and the Informal Economy in Southern Europe*. New York and London: Routledge.

Arendt, Hannah. 1968. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. London: Penguin

Arntz, M., T. Gregory and U. Zierahn. 2016. 'The Risk of Automation for Jobs in OECD Countries: A Comparative Analysis'. *OECD Social, Employment, and Migration Working Papers* 189.

Arrow, Kenneth J. 1998. 'What Has Economics to Say about Racial Discrimination?' *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 12 (2): 91–100.

Autonomies. 2017. 'What Is To Be Done? The Question of a Proletarian Revolution'. http://autonomies.org/2017/10/what-is-to-be-done-the-question-of-a-proletarian-revolution/.

Awogbenle, A. C., and K. C. Iwuamadi. 2010. 'Youth Unemployment: Entrepreneurship Development Programme as an Intervention Mechanism'. *African Journal of Business Management* 4 (6): 831.

Bakker, I. 2007. 'Social Reproduction and the Constitution of a Gendered Political Economy'. *New Political Economy* 12 (4): 541–56.

Bakker, I., and R. Silvey, eds. 2012. *Beyond States and Markets: The Challenges of Social Reproduction*. New York: Routledge.

Ballas, D., D. Dorling and B. Hennig. 2017. 'Analysing the Regional Geography of Poverty, Austerity and Inequality in Europe: A Human Cartographic Perspective'. *Regional Studies* 51 (1): 174–85.

Baptist, E. E. 2016. *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books.

Barchiesi, F. 2016. 'The Violence of Work: Revisiting South Africa's "Labour Question" through Precarity and Anti-Blackness'. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 42 (5): 875–91.

Batista, E. 2014. 'Immigration Control and the Punitive Turn'. *Themis: Research Journal of Justice Studies and Forensic Science* 2 (1): 1–27. http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/themis/vol2/iss1/1.

Bayat, A. 2000. 'From "Dangerous Classes" to "Quiet Rebels": Politics of the Urban Subaltern in the Global South'. *International Sociology* 15 (3): 533–57.

Bear, Laura, Karen Ho, Anna Tsing and Sylvia Yanagisako. 2015. 'Gens: A Feminist Manifesto for the Study of Capitalism'. Theorizing the Contemporary, *Cultural Anthropology* website, 30 March 2015. https://culanth.org/fieldsights/652-gens-a-feminist-manifesto-for-the-study-of-capitalism.

Beckert, Sven. 2014. *Empire of Cotton: A New History of Global Capitalism*. London: Penguin.

Beckert, S., and S. Rockman, eds. 2016. *Slavery's Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Beehner, L. 2015. 'Are Syria's Do-It-Yourself Refugees Outliers or Examples of a New Norm?' *Journal of International Affairs* 68 (2): 157.

Bell, C. D. 2013. '*Grey's Anatomy* Goes South: Global Racism and Suspect Identities in the Colonial Present'. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* (Online) 38 (4): 465. http://www
.jstor.org/stable/pdf/canajsocicahican.38.4.465.pdf?casa_token=_K_70bbikhs
AAAAA:PlUSfEy3FEDicLVh8jMP8bc2qEqyO7zJMs96ttRxQpNufM_7p86ff
KAYcQ9aI-iuEuIIZj8KnVC-tQe7Vr8_tZsV3KLsfZBusKdBz9oHoLZWFw
_M1rg.

Bellér-Hann, I. 2002. 'Temperamental Neighbours: Uighur-Han Relations in Xinjiang, Northwest China'. In *Imagined Differences: Hatred and the Construction of Identity*, edited by Gunther Schlee, 57–81. Munchen: Verlag Lit.

Benjamin, Walter. 2002. *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. New York: Random House.

Bernhardt, A., R. Milkman, N. Theodore, D. Heckathorn, M. Auer, J. DeFilippis, A. L. Gonzalez, V. Narro, J. Perelshteyn, D. Polson and M. Spiller. 2009. 'Broken Laws, Unprotected Workers'. New York: National Employment Law Project .

Betts, Alexander, Louise Bloom, Josiah Kaplan and Naohiko Omatsa. 2017. *Refugee Economies, Forced Displacement and Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bhattacharya, Tithi. 2017. *Social Reproduction Theory, Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*. London: Pluto

Bhattacharya, Tithi, and Lance Selfa. 2015. 'Race, Class and Capitalism'. *International Socialist Review* 98. https://isreview.org/issue/98/race-class-and-capitalism.

Bhattacharyya, Gargi. 2015. *Crisis, Austerity and Everyday Life: Living in a Time of Diminishing Expectations*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Biermann, C., and B. Mansfield. 2014. 'Biodiversity, Purity and Death: Conservation Biology as Biopolitics'. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32 (2): 257–73.

Blacker, D. 2013. *The Falling Rate of Learning and the Neoliberal Endgame*. Alresford, UK: John Hunt Publishing.

Bloch, Alice. 2004. 'Labour Market Participation and Conditions of Employment: A Comparison of Minority Ethnic Groups and Refugees in Britain'. *Sociological Research* (Online) 9 (2): 1–19.

———. 2007. 'Refugees in the UK Labour Market: The Conflict between Economic Integration and Policy-Led Labour Market Restriction'. *Journal of Social Policy* 37: 21–36.

Bloom, T. 2015. 'The Business of Migration Control: Delegating Migration Control Functions to Private Actors'. *Global Policy* 6 (2): 151–57.

Bond, Patrick. 2000. *Elite Transition: From Apartheid to Neoliberalism in South Africa*. London: Pluto.

———. 2008. 'Global Uneven Development, Primitive Accumulation and Political-Economic Conflict in Africa: The Return of the Theory of Imperialism'. *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development* 4 (1): 1–15.

Boo, Katherine. 2013. *Behind the Beautiful Forever: Life, Death and Hope in a Mumbai Slum*. London: Portobello.

Booth, A. L., A. Leigh and E. Varganova. 2012. 'Does Ethnic Discrimination Vary Across Minority Groups? Evidence from a Field Experiment'. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 74 (4): 547–73.

Bosworth, M., and M. Guild. 2008. 'Governing through Migration Control: Security and Citizenship in Britain'. *The British Journal of Criminology* 48 (6): 703–19.

Boutang, Yann Moulier. 2011. *Cognitive Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2006. "Affirming the affirmative: On Nomadic Affectivity." *Rhizomes* 11–12. http://www.rhizomes.net/issue11/braidotti.html.

Brambilla, Chiara, Jussi Laine, James W. Scott and Gianluca Bocchi. 2016. *Borderscaping: Imaginations and Practices of Border Making*. London: Routledge.

Brass, Tom. 1994. 'Some Observations on Unfree Labour, Capitalist Restructuring, and Deproletarianization'. *International Review of Social History* 39: 255–75.

Braudel, F. 1982. *Civilization and Capitalism, 15th–18th Centuries*, Vol. 3: *The Perspective of the World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brave Heart, Y. H. M., and L. Debruyn. 1998. 'The American Indian Holocaust: Healing Historical Unresolved Grief'. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research* 8: 56–78.

Brenner, N., and N. Theodore. 2002. 'Cities and the Geographies of "Actually Existing Neoliberalism"'. *Antipode* 34 (3): 349–79.

Brewer, T. 2002. *Marxist Theories of Imperialism: A Critical Survey*. London: Routledge.

Broeck, S., and C. Junker, eds. 2014. *Postcoloniality-Decoloniality-Black Critique: Joints and Fissures*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Brophy, A. L. 2006. *Reparations: Pro and Con*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2014. 'The Case for Reparations for Slavery in the Caribbean'. *Slavery and Abolition* 35 (1): 165–69.

Brown, Wendy. 2010. *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*. New York: Zone.

Bryant-Davis, T. 2007. 'Healing Requires Recognition: The Case for Race-Based Traumatic Stress'. *The Counseling Psychologist* 35: 135–43.

Burkett, M. 2009. 'Climate Reparations'. *Melbourne Journal of International Law* 10: 509–42.

Burrows, K., and P. L. Kinney. 2016. "Exploring the Climate Change, Migration and Conflict Nexus." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 13 (4): 443.

Cacho, L. M. 2012. *Social Death: Racialized Rightlessness and the Criminalization of the Unprotected*. New York: New York University Press.

Caffentzis, G. 1999. 'On the Notion of a Crisis of Social Reproduction: A Theoretical Review'. In *Women, Development and Labor of Reproduction: Struggles and Movements*, edited by Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Giovanna F. Dalla Costa, 153–87. Lawrenceville, NJ: Africa World Press.

Caldwell, T. 2015. 'Market Report: Border Biometrics'. *Biometric Technology Today* 5: 5–11.

Cannon, H. M., and A. Yaprak. 2002. 'Will the Real-World Citizen Please Stand Up! The Many Faces of Cosmopolitan Consumer Behavior'. *Journal of International Marketing* 10 (4): 30–52.

Caplan, J., and J. C. Torpey, eds. 2001. *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carr, M. 2006. 'You Are Now Entering Eurabia'. *Race and Class* 48 (1): 1–22.

Castles, S., and M. J. Miller. 1998. *The Age of Migration*. London: Palgrave.

Catney, G., and A. Sabater. 2015. *Ethnic Minority Disadvantage in the Labour Market*. York, UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/ethnicminority-dis advantage-labour-market.

Cekota, Jaromir, and Claudia Trentini. 2015. 'The Educational Achievement and Employment of Young Roma in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania: Increasing Gaps and Policy Challenges'. *Europe-Asia Studies* 67 (4): 540–78.

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. 1982. *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in the Seventies Britain*. London: Routledge.

Champlin, Emily R. 2016. 'The Myth of the "Welfare Queen": Reproductive Oppression in the Welfare System'. Poverty Law Conference. Paper 6. http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/povlaw/6.

Chaudhuri, A. 2016. 'The Real Meaning of "Rhodes Must Fall"'. *The Guardian*, March 16. http://www.kooriweb.org/foley/resources/history/newstuff2016/the%20real%20meaning%20of%20rhodes%20must%20fall.pdf.

Chauvin, S., and B. Garcés-Mascareñas. 2014. 'Becoming Less Illegal: Deservingness Frames and Undocumented Migrant Incorporation'. *Sociology Compass* 8 (4): 422–32.

Chen, M. A. 2007. *Rethinking the Informal Economy: Linkages with the Formal Economy and the Formal Regulatory Environment*. Volume 10. United Nations University, World Institute for Development Economics Research.

Chen, Mel Y. 2012. *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering and Queer Affect*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Chua, Amy. 2002. *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability*. New York: Random House.

Clark, K., and S. Drinkwater. 2000. 'Pushed Out or Pulled In? Self-Employment among Ethnic Minorities in England and Wales'. *Labour Economics* 7 (5): 603–28.

Clark, N. L. 2014. 'Structured Inequality: Historical Realities of the Post-Apartheid Economy'. *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies* 38 (1): 93–118.

Coates, Ta-Nehisi. 2014. 'The Case for Reparations'. *The Atlantic*, June 2014. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/06/the-case-for-reparations/361631.

Cohen, S. 2006. *Deportation Is Freedom! The Orwellian World of Immigration Controls*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

———. 2014. *From Immigration Controls to Welfare Controls*. London: Routledge.

Colic-Peisker, Val, and Farida Tilbury. 2006. 'Employment Niches for Recent Refugees: Segmented Labour Market in Twenty-First-Century Australia'. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 19 (2): 203–29.

Conley, D. 2002. 'Forty Acres and a Mule: What if America Pays Reparations?' *Contexts* 1 (3): 13–20.

Cornell, S. 2006. *Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Self-Determination in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States*. The Native Nations Institute for Leadership, Management and Policy.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Mask: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2015. 'Colonialism of the Present: Interview with Andrew Bard Epstein'. *Jacobin Magazine*. https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/01/indigenous-left-glen-coulthard-interview/.

Craemer, T. 2009. 'Framing Reparations'. *Policy Studies Journal* 37 (2): 275–98.

———. 2015. 'Estimating Slavery Reparations: Present Value Comparisons of Historical Multigenerational Reparations Policies'. *Social Science Quarterly* 96 (2): 639–55.

Crawford, J. J., W. W. Nobles and J. DeGruy Leary. 2003. *Should America Pay? Slavery and the Raging Debate on Reparations*. New York: HarperCollins Publishing.

Cunningham, Stuart. 2015. 'The New Screen Ecology: A New Wave of Media Globalisation?' *Communication Research and Practice* 1 (3): 275–82.

Czaika, M., and H. De Haas. 2013. 'The Effectiveness of Immigration Policies'. *Population and Development Review* 39 (3): 487–508.

Dalla Costa, Mariarosa, and Selma James. 1972. 'The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community'. https://libcom.org/library/power-women-subversion-community-della-costa-selma-james.

Dam, K. W. 2007. *The Law-Growth Nexus: The Rule of Law and Economic Development*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Das, Madhusmita, and Sangeeta Sharma. 2016. 'Fetishizing Women: Advertising in Indian Television and Its Effects on Target Audiences'. *Journal of International Women's Studies* 18 (1): 114.

Das, Maitreyi Bordia. 2013. 'Exclusion and Discrimination in the Labor Market'. Background paper for the World Development Report. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Dash, A. K. 2014. 'Globalisation and the Indian Face of TV Advertising'. *International Journal of Communication* 24 (2): 5–29.

Davies, T., A. Isakjee and S. Dhesi. 2017. 'Violent Inaction: The Necropolitical Experience of Refugees in Europe'. *Antipode* 49: 1263–84.

Davis, Angela Y. 1998. 'Globalism and the Prison Industrial Complex: An Interview with Angela Davis'. *Race and Class* 40 (2–3): 145–57.

Davis, Mike. 2007. *Planet of Slums*. London: Verso.

De Angelis, M. 2001. 'Marx and Primitive Accumulation: The Continuous Character of Capital's Enclosures'. *The Commoner* 2: 1–22.

De Castro, J. C. L. 2016. 'The Discourse of Hysteria as the Logic of Mass Consumption'. *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society* 21 (4): 403–21.

De Loughrey, Elizabeth, Jill Didur and Anthony Cardigan. 2015. *Global Ecologies and the Environmental Humanities: Postcolonial Approaches*. London: Routledge.

De Stefano, Valerio. 2016. *The Rise of the 'Just-in-Time Workforce': On-Demand Work, Crowdwork and Labour Protection in the 'Gig-Economy'*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Dean, Jodi. 2012. *The Communist Horizon*. London: Verso.

DeGruy Leary, J. 2005. *Post Traumatic Slavery Syndrome*. Milwaukie, OR: Uptone Press.

Delgado, R., and J. Stefancic. 2017. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: NYU Press.

Demangeot, C., A. J. Broderick and C. S. Craig. 2015. 'Multicultural Marketplaces: New Territory for International Marketing and Consumer Research'. *International Marketing Review* 32 (2): 118–40.

Desai, Vandana, and Robert B. Potter, eds. 2014. *The Companion to Development Studies*. Second edition. New York: Routledge.

Di Chiro, G. 2008. 'Living Environmentalisms: Coalition Politics, Social Reproduction, and Environmental Justice'. *Environmental Politics* 17 (2): 276–98.

Diken, B. 2004. 'From Refugee Camps to Gated Communities: Biopolitics and the End of the City'. *Citizenship Studies* 8 (1): 83–106.

Doezema, Marie. 2016. 'Rethinking the Refugee Camp'. September 22, 2016. https://www.citylab.com/equity/2016/09/rethinking-the-refugee-camp/500804/.

Dowty, Alan. 1987. *Closed Borders: The Contemporary Assault on Freedom of Movement*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dreyer Lassen, D. 2003. 'Ethnic Divisions and the Size of the Informal Sector'. EPRU Working Paper Series, No. 2003-01.

Du Gay, P., S. Hall, L. Janes, A. K. Madsen, H. Mackay and K. Negus. 2013. *Doing Cultural Studies: The Story of the Sony Walkman*. London: Sage.

Dunaway, Wilma A. 2014. *Gendered Commodity Chains: Seeing Women's Work and Households in Global Production*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Dunford, Michael, and Weindong Liu. 2017. 'Uneven and Combined Development'. *Regional Studies* 51 (1): 69–85.

Duran, E., and B. Duran. 1995. *Native American Postcolonial Psychology*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ehrenreich, B., and A. R. Hochschild, eds. 2002. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the Global Economy*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.

Eisenstein, H. 2015. *Feminism Seduced: How Global Elites Use Women's Labor and Ideas to Exploit the World*. New York: Routledge.

Elias, J. 2009. 'Gendering Liberalisation and Labour Reform in Malaysia: Fostering "Competitiveness" in the Productive and Reproductive Economies'. *Third World Quarterly* 30 (3): 469–83.

Environmental Justice Foundation. 2009. *No Place Like Home – Where Next for Climate Refugees?* London: Environmental Justice Foundation.

Ergun, A., and H. Isaxanli, eds. 2013. *Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in the EU, the Black Sea Region and Southern Caucasus*. Volume 107. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Erni, J. N., and L. Y. M. Leung. 2014. *Understanding South Asian Minorities in Hong Kong*. Volume 1. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Escobar, A. 2000. 'Beyond the Search for a Paradigm? Post-Development and Beyond'. *Development* 43 (4): 11–14.

Eversole, R., J. A. McNeish and A. D. Cimadamore, eds. 2013. *Indigenous Peoples and Poverty: An International Perspective*. London: Zed Books.

Faulkner, Joanne. 2015. '"Our Own Hurricane Katrina": Aboriginal Disadvantage and Australian National Identity'. *National Identities* 17 (2): 117–35.

Feagin, J. R. 2014. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations*. New York: Routledge.

Federici, Silvia. 1975. *Wages against Housework*. Bristol, UK: Falling Wall Press.

———. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia.

———. 2010. 'The Reproduction of Labour Power in the Global Economy and the Unfinished Feminist Revolution'. In *Workers and Labour in a Globalised Capitalism: Contemporary Themes and Theoretical Issues*, edited by Maurizio Atzeni, 85–107. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2012. *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction and Feminist Struggle*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

———. 2014. 'From Commoning to Debt: Financialization, Microcredit, and the Changing Architecture of Capital Accumulation'. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 113 (2): 231–44.

Federici, Silvia, and George Caffentzis. 2013. 'Commons Against and Beyond Capitalism'. *Upping the Anti* 15: 83–91.

Ferguson, Susan. 2008. 'Canadian Contributions to Social Reproduction Feminism, Race and Embodied Labor'. *Race, Gender and Class* 15 (1–2): 42–57.

Fields, B. J., and K. Fields. 2012. *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life*. London: Verso Books.

Flynn, Michael. 2014. 'There and Back Again: On the Diffusion of Immigration Detention'. *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 2 (3): 165–97.

Frank, Andre Gunder. 1970. 'The Development of Underdevelopment'. In *Imperialism and Underdevelopment*, edited by R. I. Rhodes, 4–17. New York: Monthly Review Press.

———. 2011. *World Accumulation*. New York: NYU Press.

Fraser, Nancy. 2016a. 'Contradictions of Capital and Care'. *New Left Review* 100: 99–117.

———. 2016b. 'Expropriation and Exploitation in Racialized Capitalisms: A Reply to Michael Dawson'. *Critical History Studies* 3 (1): 163–78.

Fredrickson, George M. 2002. *Racism: A Short History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fromm, Eric. 2001. *The Fear of Freedom*. London: Routledge.

Gabiam, N. 2012. 'When "Humanitarianism" Becomes "Development": The Politics of International Aid in Syria's Palestinian Refugee Camps'. *American Anthropologist* 114 (1): 95–107.

Gabriel, Y., and T. Lang. 2015. *The Unmanageable Consumer*. London: Sage.

Gallaher, C. M., A. M. WinklerPrins, M. Njenga and N. K. Karanja. 2015. 'Creating Space: Sack Gardening as a Livelihood Strategy in the Kibera Slums of Nairobi, Kenya'. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems and Community Development* 5 (2): 155–73.

Gallin, D. 2001. 'Propositions on Trade Unions and Informal Employment in Times of Globalisation'. *Antipode* 33 (3): 531–49.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. 1996. *The End of Capitalism as We Knew It: A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. London: Blackwell.

———. 2006. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. London and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Giles, W., V. Preston and M. Romero, eds. 2014. *When Care Work Goes Global: Locating the Social Relations of Domestic Work*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing

Gill, R., and A. Kanai. 2017. 'Mediating Neoliberal Capitalism: Affect, Subjectivity and Inequality'. *Journal of Communication*. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1460-2466.

Gillborn, D. 2010. 'The White Working Class, Racism and Respectability: Victims, Degenerates and Interest-Convergence'. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 58 (1): 3–25.

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 2007. *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Giroux, H. 2017. 'Authoritarianism, Class Warfare, and the Advance of Neoliberal Austerity Policies'. *Knowledge Cultures* 5: 13–20.

Giroux, H. A., and B. Evans. 2015. *Disposable Futures: The Seduction of Violence in the Age of Spectacle*. New York: City Lights Publishers

Glassman, Jim. 2006. 'Primitive Accumulation, Accumulation by Dispossession, Accumulation by "Extra-Economic" Means'. *Progress in Human Geography* 30 (5): 608–25.

Glenn, E. N. 1992. 'From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor'. *Signs* 18 (1): 1–43.

Golash-Boza, T. M. 2015. *Immigration Nation: Raids, Detentions, and Deportations in Post-9/11 America*. New York: Routledge.

Goldberg, David Theo. 2002. *The Racial State*. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2009. *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Goner, O., and J. T. Rebello. 2017. 'State Violence, Nature, and Primitive Accumulation: Dispossession in Dersim'. *Dialectical Anthropology* 41 (1): 33–54.

Graham, Stephen. 2010. *Cities under Siege: The New Military Urbanism*. London: Verso.

Gržinić, M., and Š. Tatlić. 2014. *Necropolitics, Racialization, and Global Capitalism: Historicization of Biopolitics and Forensics of Politics, Art, and Life*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Gupta, Rahila. 2007. *Enslaved: The New British Slavery*. London: Portabello.

Hagan, J., and S. Phillips. 2008. 'Border Blunders: The Unanticipated Human and Economic Costs of the US Approach to Immigration Control, 1986–2007'. *Criminology and Public Policy* 7 (1): 83–94.

Hakak, Yohai. 2015. '"Undesirable Relationships" between Jewish Women and Arab Men: Representation and Discourse in Contemporary Israel'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39 (6): 976–93.

Halasz, K. 2009. 'The Rise of the Radical Right in Europe and the Case of Hungary: "Gypsy Crime" Defines National Identity?' *Development* 52 (4): 490–94.

Hall, Derek. 2013. 'Primitive Accumulation, Accumulation by Dispossession and the Global Land Grab'. *Third World Quarterly* 34 (9): 1582–604.

Hallegatte, Stephanie, Mook Bangalore, Laura Bonzanigo, Marianne Fay, Tamaro Kane, Ulf Narloch, Julie Rosenberg, David Treguer and Adrian Vogt-Schilb. 2016. *Shock Waves: Managing the Impacts of Climate Change on Poverty*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Hamber, B. 2000. 'Repairing the Irreparable: Dealing with the Double-Binds of Making Reparations for Crimes of the Past'. *Ethnicity and Health* 5 (3–4): 215–26.

Hamilton, R., ed. 2012. *The Liberation of Women (RLE Feminist Theory): A Study of Patriarchy and Capitalism*. London: Routledge.

Hamilton, T. G. 2014. 'Selection, Language Heritage, and the Earnings Trajectories of Black Immigrants in the United States'. *Demography* 51 (3): 975–1002.

Hammond, Allen L., William J. Kramer, Robert S. Katz, Julia T. Tran and Courtland Walker. 2007. *The Next 4 Billion: Market Size and Business Strategy at the Base of the Pyramid*. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.

Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2004. *The Politics of Disgust: The Public Identity of the Welfare Queen*. New York: New York University Press.

Harari, Y. N. 2016. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*. New York: Random House.

Haraway, D. 2013. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

Harris, C. I. 1993. 'Whiteness as Property'. *Harvard Law Review* 106 (8): 1707–91.

Harrison, K., and L. M. Sundstrom. 2010. *Global Commons, Domestic Decisions: The Comparative Politics of Climate Change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hartley, John. 2003. *A Short History of Cultural Studies*. London: Sage.

Harvey, Daina Cheyenne. 2016. 'Social Policy as Secondary Violence in the Aftermath of a Disaster'. *Humanity and Society* 4 (3): 333–54.

Harvey, David. 2003. *The New Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hayter, T. 2000. *Open Borders: The Case against Immigration Controls*. London: Pluto Press.

Helgard, Kramer. 2011. 'The Epistemological Fate of the Authoritarian Character Studies of the Frankfurt School: A Legacy for the Study of Racism, Antisemitism, and Fascism?' In *The Diversity of Social Theories: Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, Volume 29, edited by Harry F. Dahms, 3–31. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Hermann, C. 2017. 'Crisis, Structural Reform and the Dismantling of the European Social Model(s)'. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 38 (1): 51–68.

Hickey, Sophie D. 2016. '"They Say I'm Not a Typical Black Fella": Experiences of Racism and Ontological Insecurity in Urban Australia'. *Journal of Sociology* 52 (4): 725–40.

Higgins, M., R. Keresztesi and D. Oscherwitz, eds. 2015. *The Western in the Global South*. Volume 34. London: Routledge.

Hill II, S. 2017. 'Precarity in the Era of #BlackLivesMatter'. *Women's Studies Quarterly* 45 (3): 94–109.

Hixson, W. 2013. *American Settler Colonialism: A History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

hooks, bell. 1990. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press.

Hoppania, Hanna-Kaisa, and Tiina Vaittinen. 2015. 'A Household Full of Bodies: Neoliberalism, Care and "The Political"'. *Global Society* 29 (1): 70–88.

Horkheimer, Max. 1974. *Eclipse of Reason*. Volume 1. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

———. 2013. *Eclipse of Reason*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Horkheimer, M., and T. W. Adorno. 1989. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Translated by John Cumming. New York: Herder and Herder.

Howard-Haussmann, Rhoda, with Anthony P. Lombardo. 2011. *Reparations to Africa*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hoxie, Frederick E. 2008. 'Retrieving the Red Continent: Settler Colonialism and the History of American Indians in the US'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31 (6): 1153–67.

Huat, C. B. 2016. 'Foreword: Rethinking Consumption in Economic Recessionary East Asia'. In *Lifestyle Media in Asia: Consumption, Aspiration and Identity*, edited by Fran Martin and Tania Lewis, 1–12. London: Routledge.

Huffman, M. L., and P. N. Cohen. 2004. 'Racial Wage Inequality: Job Segregation and Devaluation across US Labor Markets'. *American Journal of Sociology* 109 (4): 902–36.

Hung, H. F. 2013. 'Labor Politics under Three Stages of Chinese Capitalism'. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 112 (1): 203–12.

Huyser, K. R., A. Sakamoto and I. Takei. 2010. 'The Persistence of Racial Disadvantage: The Socioeconomic Attainments of Single-Race and Multi-Race Native Americans'. *Population Research and Policy Review* 29 (4): 541–68.

Ibrahim, A. 2017. 'Arab Spring, Favelas, Borders, and the Artistic Transnational Migration: Toward a Curriculum for a Global Hip-Hop Nation'. *Curriculum Inquiry* 47 (1): 103–111.

Inal, Gozde, Akram Al Ariss and Cynthia Forson. 2013. 'Self-Employment as a Career Strategy for Ethnic Minorities'. *Journal of Management Development* 32 (2): 166–81.

Inayatullah, Nadeem, and David L. Blakey. 2016. 'The Costs of Weaponising Emancipatory Politics: Constituting What Is Constitutive of Capitalism'. *Spectrum: Journal of Global Studies* 8 (1): 46–69.

Innis-Jiménez, M. 2013. *Steel Barrio: The Great Mexican Migration to South Chicago, 1915–1940*. New York: NYU Press.

International Labour Organization. 2015. *World Employment and Social Outlook 2015: The Changing Nature of Jobs*. Geneva, Switzerland, May 2015.

Iqani, M. 2016. *Consumption, Media and the Global South: Aspiration Contested*. Houndmills and Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jacobsen, J., and A. Zeller, eds. 2013. *Queer Economics: A Reader*. London: Routledge.

Jameson, Fredric, and Masao Miyoshi. 2003. *The Cultures of Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Jansen, B. J. 2016. 'The Refugee Camp as Warscape: Violent Cosmologies, "Rebelization", and Humanitarian Governance in Kakuma, Kenya'. *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 7 (3): 429–41.

Jarvis, H., A. C. Pratt and P. C. C. Wu. 2016. *The Secret Life of Cities: Social Reproduction of Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.

Jeffrey, Patricia, and Roger Jeffrey. 2002. 'A Population Out of Control? Myths about Muslim Fertility in Contemporary India'. *World Development* 30 (10): 1805–822.

Jiraj, S., and L. Simpson. 2015. *Ethnic Identity and Inequalities in Britain: The Dynamics of Diversity*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Johnson, Gaye Theresa and Alex Lubin. 2017. *Futures of Black Radicalism*. London: Verso.

Johnson, Lindgren. 2017. *Race Matters, Animal Matters: Fugitive Humanism in African America, 1834–1934*. New York: Routledge.

Jones, H., Y. Gunaratnam, G. Bhattacharyya, W. Davies, S. Dhaliwal, K. Forkert, E. Jackson and R. Saltus. 2017. *Go Home? The Politics of Immigration Controversies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Jones, R. 2016. *Violent Borders: Refugees and the Right to Move*. London: Verso Books.

Jones, Trevor, Stella Mascarenhas-Keyes and Monder Ram. 2012. 'The Ethnic Entrepreneurial Transition: Recent Trends in British Indian Self-Employment'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38 (1): 93–109.

Junankar, P. R. 2016. *Economics of the Labour Market: Unemployment, Long-Term Unemployment and the Costs of Unemployment*. Houndmills and Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kan, Man-Yee, and Heather Laurie. 2016. 'Gender, Ethnicity and Household Labour in Married and Cohabiting couples in the UK'. *Institute for Social and Economic Research* 2016 (1): 1–22.

Kapadia, D., J. Nazroo and K. Clark. 2015. 'Have Ethnic Inequalities in the Labour Market Persisted?' In *Ethnic Identity and Inequalities in Britain: The Dynamics of Ethnicity*, edited by Stephen Jivaro and Ludi Simpson, 161–80. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Kapsos, S., R. Torres, F. Bonnet and R. Horne. 2015. 'Emerging Patterns of Employment: Global and Regional Trends'. *World Employment and Social Outlook* 2015 (2): 17–37.

Katz, C. 2001 'Vagabond Capitalism and the Necessity of Social Reproduction'. *Antipode* 33 (4): 709–28.

———. 2006. 'Power, Space, and Terror: Social Reproduction and the Public Environment'. *The Politics of Public Space* 185: 105–10.

———. 2008. 'Bad Elements: Katrina and the Scoured Landscape of Social Reproduction'. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 15 (1): 15–29.

Katz, M. B. 2013. *The Undeserving Poor: America's Enduring Confrontation with Poverty*. Revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kellerman, Nathan P. F. 2001. 'Transmission of Holocaust Trauma – An Integrative View'. *Psychiatry* 64 (3): 256–67.

Kelley, Nancy, Omar Khan and Sarah Sharrock. 2017. *Racial Prejudice in Britain Today*. London: NatCen and Runnymede Trust.

Kelly, P. 2016. *The Self as Enterprise: Foucault and the Spirit of 21st Century Capitalism*. London: Routledge.

Khattab, Nabil, and Ron Johnston. 2013. 'Ethnic and Religious Penalties in a Changing British Labour Market from 2002 to 2010'. *Environment and Planning A* 45 (6): 1358–71.

Khattab, Nabil, and S. Miaari, eds. 2013. *Palestinians in the Israeli Labor Market: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kiely, R. 2007. 'Poverty Reduction through Liberalisation? Neoliberalism and the Myth of Global Convergence'. *Review of International Studies* 33 (3): 415–34.

Kirişci, K. 2014. 'Will the Readmission Agreement Bring the EU and Turkey Together or Pull Them Apart?' *CEPS Commentary* 4 (2). https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/KK%20EU-Tur key%20readmission%20agreement.pdf.

Kistner, U. 2015. 'Trading In Freedom: Rethinking Conspicuous Consumption in Post-Apartheid Political Economy'. *Critical Arts* 29 (2): 240–59.

Klare, M. 2002. *Resource Wars: The New Landscape of Global Conflict*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

Klein, N. 2007. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Macmillan.

Kochhar, R., and R. Fry. 2014. 'Wealth Inequality Has Widened Along Racial, Ethnic Lines Since End of Great Recession'. *Pew Research Center* 12: 1–15.

Kofman, E. 2012. 'Rethinking Care through Social Reproduction: Articulating Circuits of Migration'. *Social Politics* 19 (1): 142–62.

Kolchin, Peter. 1995. *American Slavery: 1619–1877*. London: Penguin.

Koulish, R., 2007. 'Blackwater and the Privatization of Immigration Control'. *Thomas Law Review* 20: 462.

Kubitschko, S. 2012. 'Critical Media Studies in Times of Communicative Capitalism: An Interview with Jodi Dean'. *PLATFORM: Journal of Media and Communication* 4 (1): 39–44.

Kuhn, P., and K. Shen. 2014. 'Do Employers Prefer Undocumented Workers? Evidence from China's Hukou System'. IZA Institute for Labor Economics. Discussion Paper No. 8289.

Kundnani, Arun, and Deepa Kumar. 2015. 'Race, Surveillance and Empire: A Response to Bhattacharya and Selfa'. *International Socialist Review* 98. https://isreview.org/issue/98/race-surveillance-empire.

Kurtz, H. 2009. 'Acknowledging the Racial State: An Agenda for Environmental Justice Research'. *Antipode* 41 (4): 684–704.

Kurz, R. 2014. 'World Power and World-Money: The Economic Function of the US Military-Machine within Global Capitalism and the Background of the New Financial Crisis'. In *Marxism and the Critique of Value*, edited by N. Larsen, M. Nilges, and J. Robinson, 187–200. Chicago: MCM Publishing.

Lapavitsas, C. 2005. 'The Social Relations of Money as Universal Equivalent: A Response to Ingham'. *Economy and Society* 34 (3): 389–403.

Larsson, G. 2012. 'The Fear of Small Numbers: Eurabia Literature and Censuses on Religious Belonging'. *Journal of Muslims in Europe* 1 (2): 142–65.

Latorre, S., K. N. Farrell and J. Martínez-Alier. 2015. 'The Commodification of Nature and Socio-Environmental Resistance in Ecuador: An Inventory of Accumulation by Dispossession Cases, 1980–2013'. *Ecological Economics* 116: 58–69.

Lazaridis, G., and K. Wadia, eds. 2015. *The Securitisation of Migration in the EU: Debates since 9/11*. Houndmills and Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lazzarato, M. 2012. *The Making of the Indebted Man*. Translated by J. D. Jordan. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

———. 2014. *Signs and Machines: Capitalism and the Production of Subjectivity*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Lazzarato, Maurizio, and Eric Alliez. 2016. 'To Our Enemies'. E-flux, journal 78, December 2016. http://www.e-flux.com/journal/78/82697/to-our-enemies/.

LeBaron, G., and A. J. Ayers. 2013. 'The Rise of a "New Slavery"? Understanding African Unfree Labour through Neoliberalism'. *Third World Quarterly* 34 (5): 873–92.

Le Billon, P. 2001. 'The Political Ecology of War: Natural Resources and Armed Conflicts'. *Political Geography* 20 (5): 561–84.

Lebron, Dottie, Laura Morrison, Dan Ferris, Amanda Alcantara, Danielle Cummings, Gary Parker and Mary McKay. 2015. *The Trauma of Racism*. New York: McSilver Institute.

Leong, Nancy. 2013. 'Racial Capitalism'. *Harvard Law Review* 126 (8): 2153–226.

Li, T. M. 2010. 'To Make Live or Let Die? Rural Dispossession and the Protection of Surplus Populations'. *Antipode* 41 (1): 66–93.

Liikanen, I., J. W. Scott and T. Sotkasiira, eds. 2016. *The EU's Eastern Neighbourhood: Migration, Borders and Regional Stability*. Volume 107. London: Routledge.

Linke, U. 2014. 'Racializing Cities, Naturalizing Space: The Seductive Appeal of Iconicities of Dispossession'. *Antipode* 46 (5): 1222–39.

Lipton, M. 1986. *Capitalism and Apartheid: South Africa, 1910–1986*. New Africa Books.

Loewenstein, A. 2015. *Disaster Capitalism*. London: Verso Books.

Longo, M. 2017. 'From Sovereignty to Imperium: Borders, Frontiers and the Specter of Neo-Imperialism'. *Geopolitics* 22(4): 757–71.

Loyd, J. M., M. Mitchelson and A. Burridge, eds. 2013. *Beyond Walls and Cages: Prisons, Borders, and Global Crisis*. Volume 14. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Lutter, Mark. 2016. 'Instead of Temporary Camps, You Should Let Refugees Build Their Own Flourishing Cities'. September 27. https://www.fastcodesign.com/3063890/instead-of-tem

porary-camps-we-should-let-refugees-build-their-own-flourishing-cities.

Lutz, Helma. 2011. *The New Maids: Transnational Women and the Care Economy*. London: Zed.

———, ed. 2016. *Migration and Domestic Work: A European Perspective on a Global Theme*. London: Routledge.

Luxton, M., and K. Bezanson, eds. 2006. *Social Reproduction: Feminist Political Economy Challenges Neo-Liberalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.

MacKenzie, J. M., ed. 1986. *Imperialism and Popular Culture*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Maldonado-Torres, N. 2016. 'Outline of Ten Theses on Coloniality and Decoloniality'. Fondation Frantz Fanon. http://frantzfanonfoundation-fondationfrantzfanon.com/IMG/pdf/maldo nado-torres_outline_of_ten_theses-10.23.16_.pdf.

Mamdani, M. 2015. 'Settler Colonialism: Then and Now'. *Critical Inquiry* 41 (3): 596–614.

Mandel, Ruth. 2008. *Cosmopolitan Anxieties: Turkish Challenges to Citizenship and Belonging in Germany*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mangcu, X. 2017. 'Shattering the Myth of a Post-Racial Consensus in South African Higher Education: "Rhodes Must Fall" and the Struggle for Transformation at the University of Cape Town'. *Critical Philosophy of Race* 5 (2): 243–66.

Marable, M. 1983. *How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America*. Boston: South End Press.

———. 2000. *How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America: Problems in Race, Political Economy, and Society*. Revised edition. New York: South End Press.

Marazzi, C. 2008. *Capital and Language: From the New Economy to the War Economy*. Translated by Gregory Conti, with an introduction by Michael Hardt. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Marshall, D. D. 2014. 'The New World Group of Dependency Scholars: Reflections on a Caribbean Avant-Garde Movement'. In *The Companion to Development Studies*, edited by Vandana Desai and Robert B. Potter, 96–101. London: Arnold.

Marx, K., and F. Engels. 1969. *Wage-Labour and Capital*. New York: International Publishers.

Massey, D. S., and N. A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mawere, M., ed. 2016. *Development Perspectives from the South: Troubling the Metrics of [Under-]development in Africa*. Bamenda: Langaa Research & Publishing.

Mbembe, Achille. 2001. *On the Postcolony*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2003. 'Necropolitics'. *Public Culture* 15 (1): 11–40.

McGregor, Joann. 2007. '"Joining the BBC (British Bottom Cleaners)": Zimbabwean Migrants and the UK Care Industry'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33 (5): 801–24.

McGuigan, J. 2014. 'The Neoliberal Self'. *Culture Unbound: Journal of Current Cultural Research* 6 (1): 223–40.

McIntyre, M., and H. J. Nast. 2011. 'Bio(necro)polis: Marx, Surplus Populations, and the Spatial Dialectics of Reproduction and "Race"'. *Antipode* 43 (5): 1465–488.

Meehan, Katie, and Kendra Strauss. 2015. *Precarious Worlds: Contested Geographies of Social Reproduction*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Melamed, Jodi. 2011. *Represent and Destroy: Rationalizing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2014. 'Diversity'. In *Keywords for American Cultural Studies*. Second edition. edited by Bruce Burge and Glenn Hendler, 84–88. New York: New York University Press.

———. 2015. 'Racial Capitalism'. *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1 (1): 76–85.

Melly, C. 2017. *Bottleneck: Moving, Building, and Belonging in an African City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merskin, D. 2014. 'How Many More Indians? An Argument for a Representational Ethics of Native Americans'. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 38 (3): 184–203.

Mies, Maria. (1986) 2014. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*. London: Zed Books.

———. 2014. 'Housewifisation–Globalisation–Subsistence-Perspective'. In *Beyond Marx: Theorising the Global Labour Relations of the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Marcel Van der Linden and Karl Heinz Roth, 209–37. Leiden: Brill.

Mies, M., and V. Shiva. 1993. *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books.

Mignolo, W. D. 2009. 'Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom'. *Theory, Culture and Society* 26 (7–8): 159–81.

———. 2011a. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2011b. 'Epistemic Disobedience and the Decolonial Option: A Manifesto'. *Transmodernity* 1 (2): 3–23.

Mignolo, W. D., and A. Escobar, eds. 2013. *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*. New York: Routledge.

Miller, D., and D. Miller, eds. 2005. *Acknowledging Consumption*. London: Routledge.

Minority Rights Group International. 2017. 'A Narrowing Space: Violence and Discrimination against India's Religious Minorities'. MRG Briefing, June 2017. http://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/MRG_Rep_India_Jun17-2.pdf.

Mitchell, D. T., and S. L. Snyder. 2015. *The Biopolitics of Disability: Neoliberalism, Ablenationalism, and Peripheral Embodiment*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Mitchell, K., S. A. Marston and C. Katz, eds. 2004. *Life's Work: Geographies of Social Reproduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mitchell, T., ed. 2001. *Global Noise: Rap and Hip Hop Outside the USA*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Molly, Caroline. 2017. *Bottleneck: Moving, Building and Belonging in an African City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Montclos, M. A. P. D., and P. M. Kagwanja. 2000. 'Refugee Camps or Cities? The Socio-Economic Dynamics of the Dadaab and Kakuma Camps in Northern Kenya'. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 13 (2): 205–22.

Moore, Jason W. 2015. *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*. London: Verso Books.

———. 2016. *Anthropocene or Capitalocene? Nature, History and the Crisis of Capitalism*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Mort, F. 1996. *Cultures of Consumption: Masculinities and Social Space in Late Twentieth-Century Britain*. New York: Psychology Press.

Motley, Carol, and Geraldine Henderson. 2008. 'The Global Hip-Hop Diaspora: Understanding the Culture'. *Journal of Business Research* 61: 243–53.

Mountz, A., and J. Loyd. 2014. 'Transnational Productions of Remoteness: Building Onshore and Offshore Carceral Regimes Across Borders'. *Geographica Helvetica* 69 (5): 389.

Muecke, S., and B. Dibley. 2016. 'Five Theses for Reinstituting Economics: Anthropological Lessons'. In *Engaging Indigenous Economy: Debating Diverse Approaches*, edited by Will Sanders, 143–52. Acton: Australian National University Press.

Muggah, R. 2014. 'Deconstructing the Fragile City: Exploring Insecurity, Violence and Resilience'. *Environment and Urbanization* 26 (2): 345–58.

Münkler, H. 2005. *The New Wars*. Cambridge: Polity.

Munslow, B., ed. 2011. *Proletarianisation in the Third World: Studies in the Creation of a Labour Force Under Dependent Capitalism*. Volume 93. London: Routledge.

Naudé, W. 2010. *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. Houndmills and Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Neilson, B., and N. Rossiter. 2005. 'From Precarity to Precariousness and Back Again: Labour, Life and Unstable Networks'. *Fibreculture* 5: 22.

Nethery, A., and C. Gordyn. 2014. 'Australia–Indonesia Cooperation on Asylum-Seekers: A Case of "Incentivised Policy Transfer"'. *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 68 (2): 177–93.

Nethery, A., and R. Holman. 2016. 'Secrecy and Human Rights Abuse in Australia's Offshore Immigration Detention Centres'. *The International Journal of Human Rights* 20 (7): 1018–38.

Nkrumah, K. 1966. *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. New York: International.

Nonini, Donald. 2015. *'Getting By': Class and State Formation among Chinese in Malaysia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Olund, E. 2010. '"Disreputable Life": Race, Sex, and Intimacy'. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28 (1): 142–57.

Ouali, N., and S. Jeffreys. 2015. 'Hard Times for Trade Union Anti-Racism Workplace Strategies'. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research* 21 (1): 99–113.

Özbilgin, M., and J. F. Chanlat, eds. 2017. *Management and Diversity: Perspectives from Different National Contexts*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

Panitch, L., and S. Gindin. 2012. *The Making of Global Capitalism*. London: Verso Books.

Pappé, Ilan. 2011. *The Forgotten Palestinians: A History of the Palestinians in Israel*. London: Yale University Press.

Parenti, Michael. 2011. *The Face of Imperialism*. New York: Routledge.

Parnell, Susan, and Sophie Oldfield. 2014. *The Routledge Handbook on Cities of the Global South*. London: Routledge.

Parnini, S. N., M. R. Othman and A. S. Ghazali. 2013. 'The Rohingya Refugee Crisis and Bangladesh-Myanmar Relations'. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 22 (1): 133–46.

Parrenas, Rhacel. 2015. *Servants of Globalisation, Migration and Domestic Work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Paul-Emile, K. 2014. 'Beyond Title VII: Rethinking Race, Ex-Offender Status, and Employment Discrimination in the Information Age'. *Virginia Law Review* 100: 893–952.

Peet, R. 2011. 'Inequality, Crisis and Austerity in Finance Capitalism'. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 4 (3): 383–99.

Peña Muñoz, J. J. 2016. '"There's No Racism in Canada, But . . ." The Canadian Experience and Labor Integration of the Mexican Creative Class in Toronto'. *Migraciones Internacionales* 8 (3): 10–36.

Peucker, Mario. 2010. *Racism and Ethnic Discrimination in Germany: Update Report 2010*. Bamberg: European Forum for Migration Studies.

Pham, H. C., and B. Richards. 2015. 'The Western Brands in the Minds of Vietnamese Consumers'. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 32 (5): 367–75.

Phong, Viet-Hai. 2011. 'Ethnicity, Migration and Employment Disadvantage under New Labour: Reviewing the Evidence from the United Kingdom'. *Policy Studies* 32 (5): 497–513.

Picchio, A. 1992. *Social Reproduction: The Political Economy of the Labour Market*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pieterse, J. N. 1998. '"My Paradigm or Yours?" Alternative Development, Post-Development, Reflexive Development'. *Development and Change* 29 (2): 343–73.

Pinch, S. 2014. 'Collective Consumption'. In *The Power of Geography: How Territory Shapes Social Life*, edited by J. Welch and M. Dear. London: Routledge.

Pitcher, B. 2014. *Consuming Race*. London and New York: Routledge.

———. 2016. 'Race, Debt and the Welfare State'. *New Formations* 87: 47–63.

Pogány, I. 2006. 'Minority Rights and the Roma of Central and Eastern Europe'. *Human Rights Law Review* 6 (1): 1–25.

Portes, Alejandro. 1989. *The Informal Economy: Studies in Advanced and Less Developed Countries*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Posner, Eric, and Adrian Vermeule. 2003. 'Reparations for Slavery and Other Historical Injustices'. *Columbia Law Review* 103: 689–747.

Poussaint, A. F., and A. Alexander. 2000. *Lay My Burden Down: Unraveling Suicide and the Mental Health Crisis among African-Americans*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Power, S. R. 2016. 'Starvation by Siege: Applying the Law of Armed Conflict in Syria'. *Amsterdam Law Forum* 8 (2): 1–22.

Prashad, Vijay. 2008. *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*. New York: New Press.

Price, G. N., W. A. Darity and A. E. Headen. 2008. 'Does the Stigma of Slavery Explain the Maltreatment of Blacks by Whites? The Case of Lynchings'. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 37: 167–93.

Provost, Claire. 2017. 'The Industry of Inequality: Why the World Is Obsessed with Private Security'. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/2017/may/12/industry-of-inequality-why-world-is-obsessed-with-private-security.

Pulido, Laura. 2017. 'Geographies of Race and Ethnicity II: Environmental Racism, Racial Capitalism and State-Sanctioned Violence'. *Progress in Human Geography* 41 (4): 1–10.

———. 2016. 'Flint, Environmental Racism, and Racial Capitalism'. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 27 (3): 1–16.

Puwar, Nirmal. 2004. *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies Out of Place*. Oxford: Berg.

Qadim, N. E. 2014. 'Postcolonial Challenges to Migration Control: French–Moroccan Cooperation Practices on Forced Returns'. *Security Dialogue* 45 (3): 242–61.

Quijano, A. 2000. 'Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America'. *Nepantla: Views from the South* 1: 533–79.

Rae, M. 2015. 'When Reconciliation Means Reparations: Tasmania's Compensation to the Stolen Generations'. *Griffith Law Review* 24 (4): 640–56.

Rafferty, Anthony. 2012. 'Ethnic Penalties in Graduate Level Over-Education, Unemployment and Wages: Evidence from Britain'. *Work, Employment and Society* 26 (6): 987–1006.

Rai, Shirin, C. Hoskyns and D. Thomas. 2013. 'Depletion: The Cost of Social Reproduction'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 16 (1): 86–105.

Rai, Shirin, and Georgina Waylon. 2013. *New Frontiers in Feminist Political Economy*. London: Routledge.

Ram, M., T. Abbas, B. Sanghera, G. Barlow and T. Jones. 2000. 'Ethnic Minority Business in Comparative Perspective: The Case of the Independent Restaurant Sector'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 26 (3): 495–510.

———. 2001. '"Apprentice Entrepreneurs"? Ethnic Minority Workers in the Independent Restaurant Sector'. *Work, Employment and Society* 15 (2): 353–72.

Ranciere, Jacques. 2012. *Proletarian Nights: The Workers' Dream in Nineteenth-Century France*. London: Verso.

Rawick, George. 1973. *From Sundown to Sun-up: The Making of the Black Community*. Westport: Praeger.

Razack, S. 2015. *Dying from Improvement: Inquests and Inquiries into Indigenous Deaths in Custody*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Reinecke, Christian. 2009. 'Governing Aliens in Times of Upheaval: Immigration Control and Modern State Practice in Early Twentieth-Century Britain, Compared with Prussia'. *International Review of Social History* 54 (1): 39–65.

Reveron, Derek S. 2016. *Exporting Security, International Engagement, Security Cooperation, and the Changing Face of the US Military*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Rhodes, Robert I. 1970. *Imperialism and Underdevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Riedner, Rachel. 2015. *Writing Neocolonial Values*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roberts, A. 2013. 'Financing Social Reproduction: The Gendered Relations of Debt and Mortgage Finance in Twenty-First-Century America'. *New Political Economy* 18 (1): 21–42.

Roberts, Dorothy. 2014. 'Complicating the Triangle of Race, Class and State: The Insights of Black Feminists'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37 (10): 1776–82.

Robertson, C. 2010. *The Passport in America: The History of a Document*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, C. (1983) 2000. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Rodney, W. 1972. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle L'Ouverture.

Roediger, David R. 1991. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. New York: Verso.

———. 1994. *Towards the Abolition of Whiteness: Essays on Race, Politics, and Working Class History*. London: Verso.

———. 2017. *Class, Race and Marxism*. London: Verso.

Rosenberg, Clifford D. 2006. *Policing Paris: The Origins of Modern Immigration Control Between the Wars*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rotberg, R. I. 2002. 'The New Nature of Nation-State Failure'. *Washington Quarterly* 25 (3): 83–96.

Roy, A. 2005. 'Urban Informality: Toward an Epistemology of Planning'. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 71 (2): 147–58.

———. 2010. *Poverty Capital: Microfinance and the Making of Development*. London: Routledge.

Ruef, M., and B. Fletcher. 2004. 'Legacies of American Slavery: Status Attainment among Southern Blacks after Emancipation'. *Social Forces* 82 (2): 445–80.

Rugimbana, R., and S. Nwankwo. 2003. *Cross-Cultural Marketing*. London: Thomson Learning.

Rustin, M. 2014. 'Belonging to Oneself Alone: The Spirit of Neoliberalism'. *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society* 19 (2): 145–60.

Ryabov, Yuri. 2012. 'The Externalisation of Migration Control in the European Union: First Steps towards the External Dimension of the Space of Freedom, Security and Justice'. *Baltic Region* 4 (1): 44–51.

Samers, M. 2004. 'The "Underground Economy", Immigration and Economic Development in the European Union: An Agnostic-Skeptic Perspective'. *International Journal of Economic Development* 6 (2): 199–272.

———. 2005. 'The Myopia of "Diverse Economies", Or a Critique of the "Informal Economy"'. *Antipode* 37 (5): 875–86.

Sampaio, A. 2015. *Terrorizing Latina/o Immigrants: Race, Gender, and Immigration Politics in the Age of Security*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Sampson, R. J., and P. Sharkey. 2008. 'Neighborhood Selection and the Social Reproduction of Concentrated Racial Inequality'. *Demography* 45 (1): 1–29.

Sandelind, Clara, ed. 2014. *European Populism and Winning the Immigration Debate*. Stockholm: FORES.

Sanders, Will. 2016. *Engaging Indigenous Economy: Debating Diverse Approaches*. Acton: ANU Press.

Sanyal, K. 2007. *Rethinking Capitalist Development: Primitive Accumulation, Governmentality and Post-Colonial Capitalism*. London: Routledge.

Sanyal, R. 2014. 'Urbanizing Refuge: Interrogating Spaces of Displacement'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38 (2): 558–72.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. 2001. *Colonialism and Neocolonialism*. London: Routledge.

Sassen, Saskia. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 1996. 'Toward a Feminist Analytics of the Global Economy'. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 4 (1): 7–41.

———. 2006. *Cities in a Global Economy*. London: Sage.

———. 2014. *Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Satgar, V. 2012. 'Beyond Marikana: The Post-Apartheid South African State'. *Africa Spectrum* 47 (2–3): 33–62.

Sautman, B., and E. Kneehans. 2002. 'The Politics of Racial Discrimination in Hong Kong'. *Maryland Series in Contemporary Asian Studies* 2.

Scholten, S. 2015. *The Privatisation of Immigration Control through Carrier Sanctions: The Role of Private Transport Companies in Dutch and British Immigration Control*. Leiden: Brill.

Schwenken, Helen. 2005. '"Domestic Slavery" Versus "Workers' Rights": Political Mobilisations of Migrant Domestic Workers in the European Union'. San Diego, CA. CCIS Working Paper 116.

Seymour, David. 2000. 'Adorno and Horkheimer: Enlightenment and Antisemitism'. *Journal of Jewish Studies* 51 (2): 297–312.

Seymour, Richard. 2012. 'What This "Racism Is Hardwired" Story Says about the Daily Mail'. *The Guardian*, 27 June 2012. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/jun/27/what-racism-hardwired-headline-daily-mail.

Shaheen, Faiza, and Omar Khan. 2017. *Minority Report, Race and Class in Post-Brexit Britain*. London: Runnymede.

Sharma, Nandita, and Cynthia Wright. 2009. 'Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States'. *Social Justice* 35 (3): 120–38.

Shiva, Vandana. 1992. *The Violence of the Green Revolution*. London: Zed.

———. 2014. *The Vandana Shiva Reader*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Short, D. D. 2016. *Redefining Genocide: Settler Colonialism, Social Death and Ecocide*. London: Zed Books.

Singh, Nikhil Pal. 2004. *Black Is a Country*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2016. 'On Race, Violence, and "So-Called Primitive Accumulation"'. *Social Text* 34: 27–50.

Smith, A. 2004. 'Boarding School Abuses, Human Rights, and Reparations'. *Social Justice* 31 (4): 89–102.

Smith, N. 1984. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Soederberg, Susanne. 2012. 'The Mexican Debtfare State: Dispossession, Micro-Lending and the Surplus Population'. *Globalizations* 9 (4): 561–75.

Sokoloff, N. J. 2014. *Black Women and White Women in the Professions: Occupational Segregation by Race and Gender, 1960–1980*. London: Routledge.

Soskice, D. W., and P. A. Hall. 2001. *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sotero, Michelle M. 2006. 'A Conceptual Model of Historical Trauma: Implications for Public Health Practice and Research'. *Journal of Health Disparities Research and Practice* 1 (1): 93–108.

Spillers, Hortense J. 1987. 'Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book'. *Diacritics* 17 (2): 64–81.

Springer, S. 2008. 'The Nonillusory Effects of Neoliberalisation: Linking Geographies of Poverty, Inequality, and Violence'. *Geoforum* 39 (4): 1520–25.

Standing, G. 2016. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Stannard, D. E. 1993. *American Holocaust: The Conquest of the New World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stiegler, Bernard. 2010. *For a New Critique of Political Economy*. Cambridge: Polity.

———. 2013. *What Makes Life Worth Living: On Pharmacology*. Cambridge: Polity.

Stillerman, Joel. 2015. *The Sociology of Consumption: A Global Approach*. Cambridge: Polity.

Stocking, C. H. 2014. 'Greek Ideal as Hyperreal: Greco-Roman Sculpture and the Athletic Male Body'. *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 21 (3): 45–74.

Sundstrom, R. R. 2008. *The Browning of America and the Evasion of Social Justice*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Surkin, Marvin. 1975. *Detroit, I Do Mind Dying: A Study in Urban Revolution*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Tan, Y., P. Shaw, H. Cheng and K. K. Kim. 2013. 'The Construction of Masculinity: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Men's Lifestyle Magazine Advertisements'. *Sex Roles* 69 (5–6): 237–49.

Tate, Shirley Anne. 2014. 'Racial Affective Economies, Disalienation and "Race Made Ordinary"'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37 (13): 2475–90.

———. 2016. *Skin Bleaching in Black Atlantic Zones, Shade Shifters*. Houndmills and Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan

Taylor, P. 2016. 'Frontier Commoditisation in Post-Socialist Southeast Asia'. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 57 (2): 145–53.

Trades Union Congress. 2017. 'Let's Talk About Racism'. Trades Union Congress Interim Report, 7 April 2017. https://www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/LetstalkaboutRacism.pdf.

Trentini, Claudia, and Jaromir Cekota. 2015. 'The Educational Achievement and Employment of Young Roma in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania: Increasing Gaps and Policy Challenges'. *Europe-Asia Studies* 67 (4): 540–78.

Thévenon, O. 2011. 'Family Policies in OECD Countries: A Comparative Analysis'. *Population and Development Review* 37 (1): 57–87.

Tomlinson, John. 1996. 'Cultural Globalisation: Placing and Displacing the West'. *The European Journal of Development Research* 8 (2): 22–35.

Torpey, John C. 2000. *The Invention of the Passport, Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2006. *Making Whole What Has Been Smashed: On Reparations Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Triandafyllidou, A., ed. 2016. *Irregular Migrant Domestic Workers in Europe: Who Cares?* London: Routledge.

Trubek, David M. 1972. 'Max Weber on Law and the Rise of Capitalism'. *Wisconsin Law Review* (3): 720–53.

Turner, L. 2015. 'Explaining the (Non-)Encampment of Syrian Refugees: Security, Class and the Labour Market in Lebanon and Jordan'. *Mediterranean Politics* 20 (3): 386–404.

Tyler, I., N. Gill, D. Conlon, and C. Oeppen. 2014. 'The Business of Child Detention: Charitable Co-Option, Migrant Advocacy and Activist Outrage'. *Race and Class* 56 (1): 3–21.

Tyner, James A. 2016. *Violence in Capitalism: Devaluing Life in an Age of Responsibility*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Usamah, M., J. Handmer, D. Mitchell and I. Ahmed. 2014. 'Can the Vulnerable Be Resilient? Co-Existence of Vulnerability and Disaster Resilience: Informal Settlements in the Philippines'. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 10: 178–89.

Valayden, D. 2016. 'Racial Feralization: Targeting Race in the Age of "Planetary Urbanization"'. *Theory, Culture and Society* 33 (7–8): 159–82.

Van Der Linden, Marcel. 2008. *Workers of the World*. Leiden: Brill.

Veracini, L. 2013. '"Settler Colonialism": Career of a Concept'. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 41 (2): 313–33.

Virdee, Satnam. 2006. '"Race", Employment and Social Change: A Critique of Current Orthodoxies'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29 (4): 605–628.

———. 2014. *Racism, Class and the Racialized Outsider*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vogel, L. 2008. 'Historical-Critical Dictionary of Marxism: Domestic-Labour Debate'. *Historical Materialism* 16: 237–43.

Wacquant, L. 2008. *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Waite, Louise, Gary Craig, Hannah Lewis, and Klara Skrivankova. 2016. *Vulnerability, Exploitation and Migrants: Insecure Work in a Globalised Economy*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wallace, S., N. Nazroo and L. Bécares. 2016. 'Cumulative Effect of Racial Discrimination on the Mental Health of Ethnic Minorities in the United Kingdom'. *American Journal of Public Health* 106 (7): 1294–300.

Wallerstein, I. M. 1979. *The Capitalist World-Economy*. Volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2004. *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2011. *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. Volume 1. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Walsh, J. P. 2014. 'Watchful Citizens: Immigration Control, Surveillance and Societal Participation'. *Social and Legal Studies* 23 (2): 237–59.

Walters, W. 2010. 'Anti-Political Economy: Cartographies of "Illegal Immigration" and the Displacement of the Economy'. In *Cultural Political Economy*, edited by J. Best and M. Paterson, 113–38. London: Routledge.

Walton, M. J. 2013. 'The "Wages of Burman-ness": Ethnicity and Burman Privilege in Contemporary Myanmar'. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 43 (1): 1–27.

Watson, Veronica, Deirdre Howard-Wagner and Lisa Spanierman. 2015. *Unveiling Whiteness in the Twenty-First Century: Global Manifestations, Transdisciplinary Interventions*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Weeks, K. 2011. *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Weheliye, Alexander G. 2014. *Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Weinstein, L. 2013. 'Demolition and Dispossession: Toward an Understanding of State Violence in Millennial Mumbai'. *Studies in Comparative International Development* 48 (3): 285–307.

Wemyss, G., N. Yuval-Davis and K. Cassidy. 2017. '"Beauty and the Beast": Everyday Bordering and "Sham Marriage" Discourse'. *Political Geography*. http://www.sci encedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0962629816300580.

Wiecek, W. M., and J. L. Hamilton. 2013. 'Beyond the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Confronting Structural Racism in the Workplace'. *Louisiana Law Review* 74 (5): 1095–1160. http:// digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/lalrev/vol74/iss4/5.

Wike, R., B. Stokes, J. Poushter and J. Fetterolf. 2017. 'US Image Suffers as Publics around World Question Trump's Leadership'. *Pew Research Center*, June 2017. http://www.pew global.org/2017/06/26/u-s-image-suffers-as-publics-around-world-question-trumps-leadership/.

Wilkins, Erica J., Jason B. Whiting, Marlene F. Watson, Jody M. Russon and Allena M. Moncrief. 2013. 'Residual Effects of Slavery: What Clinicians Need to Know'. *Contemporary Family Therapy* 35: 14–28.

Williams, Eric. 1994. *Capitalism and Slavery*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Williams, P. J. 2016. 'Babies, Bodies and Buyers'. *Columbia Journal of Gender and Law* 33 (1): 11–24.

Wills, Jane, and Kabila Datta. 2009. *Global Cities at Work: New Migrant Divisions of Labour*. London: Pluto Press.

Winbush, R. 2003. *Should America Pay? Slavery and the Raging Debate on Reparations*. New York: Harper-Collins.

Wolfe, P. 2006. 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native'. *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409.

———. 2016. *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race*. London: Verso Books.

Wolpe, H. 1972. 'Capitalism and Cheap Labour-Power in South Africa: From Segregation to Apartheid'. *Economy and Society* 1 (4): 425–56.

———. 1990. *Race, Class and the Apartheid State*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

World Bank. 2012. *World Development Report 2013 Overview: Jobs*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Wright, M. W. 2011. 'Necropolitics, Narcopolitics, and Femicide: Gendered Violence on the Mexico-US Border'. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 36 (3): 707–31.

Yamamoto, E. K. 1998. 'Racial Reparations: Japanese American Redress and African American Claims'. *Boston College Third World Law Journal* 19 (1): 477. http://lawdigital commons.bc.edu/twlj/vol19/iss1/13

Yeates, N. 2004. 'Global Care Chains'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 6 (3): 369–91.

Yeoh, B. S., and W. Lin. 2013. 'Chinese Migration to Singapore: Discourses and Discontents in a Globalizing Nation-State'. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 22 (1): 31–54.

Young, Alford A. Jr. 2006. *The Minds of Marginalized Black Men: Making Sense of Mobility, Opportunity, and Future Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Yuval-Davis, N., G. Wemyss and K. Cassidy. 2017. 'Everyday Bordering, Belonging and the Reorientation of British Immigration Legislation'. *Sociology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038517702599.

Zajonc, Tristan. 2003. 'Black Enterprise and the Legacy of Slavery'. *Review of Black Political Economy* 30: 23–37.

Zechner, Manuela, and Bue Rübner Hansen. 2010. 'Unchained Melodies of the New Proletariat: A Review of *For a New Critique of Political Economy*, by Bernard Stiegler, translated by Daniel Ross. Malden, MA: Polity Press'. http://www.generation-online.org/other/stiegler review.htm.

Zhang, M., W. Wu, L. Yao, Y. Bai and G. Xiong. 2014. 'Transnational Practices in Urban China: Spatiality and Localization of Western Fast Food Chains'. *Habitat International* 43: 22–31.

Zhou, M. 2004. 'Revisiting Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Convergencies, Controversies, and Conceptual Advancements'. *International Migration Review* 38 (3): 1040–74.

Zukin, S. 1998. 'Urban Lifestyles: Diversity and Standardisation in Spaces of Consumption'. *Urban Studies* 35 (5–6): 825–39.

Zureik, E., and K. Hindle. 2004. 'Governance, Security and Technology: The Case of Biometrics'. *Studies in Political Economy* 73 (1): 113–37.

Index

A

accumulation by dispossession, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10

Adorno, Theodor, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

Agier, Michel, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5

American capitalism, 1

Andersson, Ruben, 1.1-1.2 , 2 , 3

B

Black Marxism, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9

bordering, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5.1-5.2 , 6 , 7 , 8.1-8.2 , 9 , 10 , 11 , 12 , 13 , 14 , 15 , 16 , 17 , 18 , 19 , 20 , 21 , 22 , 23 , 24

bordering, cooperation between nations, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5.1-5.2

Brass, Tom, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4

Brophy, Adrian, 1 , 2

'browning' of America, 1

C

capital, 1 , 2 , 3

CARICOM, 1.1-1.2

Cassidy, Kathryn, 1 , 2.1-2.2 , 3

climate justice, 1.1-1.2

cognitive capitalism, 1 , 2 , 3

colour line, 1

Community Loss Index, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

consumer culture, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10

consumption, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9

Coulthard, Glenn, 1 , 2 , 3

Craemer, T., 1 , 2.1-2.2

D

Dean, Jodi, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4

decoloniality, 1 , 2

deproletarianisation, 1 , 2 , 3

T

The Dialectic of the Enlightenment, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

D

disaster capitalism, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4

diversity marketing, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10

DuBois, W. E. B., 1

E

ecological crisis, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10 , 11 , 12 , 13 , 14 , 15 , 16 , 17 , 18

edge populations, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5

Elias, J., 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7

employer racism, 1.1-1.2

Eurabia, 1

F

Federici, Silvia, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

Fields, Karen and Barbara, 1

Frankfurt School, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

Fraser, Nancy, 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

G

About the Author

Gargi Bhattacharyya is Professor of Sociology at the Centre for Migration, Refugees and Belonging, University of East London, United Kingdom.