The Politics of Accelerationism: Future, Modernity, Technology, and Subjectivity in the Late Capitalism[*]

Chyatat Supachalasai[**]

Abstract

This article highlights the politics of accelerationism as a political antagonism in cyberspace. Social and economic conditions which are structurally shaped by digital technology can produce at least two scenarios in consequences; maintaining a current condition or disrupting it. On the first scenario, accelerationism is meant to rapidly produce things, images, and products in cyberspace in concord with a requirement of the late capitalism. This, in effect, culminates in consolidating a status quo of the late capitalism. Accelerationism in this scenario is substantiated as an unchanged image for the future. It can be termed succinctly as 'modernity in linearity'. In contrast, the politics of accelerationism in the second scenario is inspired by Karl Marx's 'Fragment on machines' and other prominent thinkers such as Gilles Deleuze and Jean-Francois Lyotard. Therefore, the second scenario shows a very nature of antipathy and difference that contributes to a disruption of the linearity. In terms of its antagonism, this initially marks recalcitrance to the late capitalism in favour of different futures and imaginations. Given a significance of the second scenario, the article examines subjectivity of the accelerationists who are in compliance with this setting in a Lacanian psychoanalytic perspective coupled with a philosophy of technology. The inquiry is that what would be the image of the subjectivity of those whose aim is to disrupt the late capitalism, for a revolutionary direction, but does not necessarily progress towards post-capitalism?

Keywords

บทคัดย่อ

บทความนำเสนอการเมืองเร่งสภาพการณ์นิยม โดยพินิจที่ความขัดแย้งในโลกไซเบอร์
สเปซ   สมมติฐานคือถ้าหากดิจิตอลเทคโนโลยีมีบทบาทสำคัญในการกำหนดแนวทางแก่ภาวะทาง
เศรษฐกิจและสังคมแล้วนั้น ประเด็นนี้ก็จะนำไปสู่ผลลัพธ์สำคัญเป็นอย่างน้อยสองผลลัพธ์ คือ (1)
ดิจิตอลเทคโนโลยีที่มีบทบาทต่อการคงสถานะภาวะเศรษฐกิจและสังคมที่เป็นอยู่ และ (2) ดิจิตอล
เทคโนโลยีที่มีบทบาทต่อการทลายภาวะทางเศรษฐกิจและสังคมที่เป็นอยู่   เช่นนั้นแล้ว   การเร่ง
สภาพการณ์นิยมในรูปการณ์แรก   ก็คือการเร่งผลิตสร้างสิ่งต่างๆ เช่น ภาพลักษณ์และสินค้าในโลก
ไซเบอร์สเปซในทิศทางที่สอดรับกับความต้องการของโลกทุนนิยมตอนปลาย   ซึ่งนำไปสู่การคง
สถานะของโลกทุนนิยมตอนปลายไว้โดยดุษฎี

การเร่งสภาพการณ์นิยมนี้ไม่ได้นำไปสู่การเปลี่ยนแปลงภาพลักษณ์เพื่ออนาคต แต่เป็นสิ่งที่
อาจเรียกได้โดยย่อว่าเป็น 'ภาวะสมัยใหม่แบบคงที่'   ในทางตรงกันข้าม   การเร่งสภาพการณ์
นิยมในรูปการณ์ที่สองได้รับอิทธิพลจากงานเขียนเรื่อง **Fragment on Machines'** ของ
คาร์ล มาร์กซ์ พ่วงด้วยอิทธิพลของนักคิดอื่นสำคัญ เช่น จิล เดอเลิซ และ ฌ็อง-ฟร็องซัว เลียว
ทาร์ด ด้วยเหตุนี้ รูปการณ์ที่สองของเร่งสภาพการณ์นิยมจึงแสดงให้เห็นถึงธรรมชาติอย่างเต็มตัวของ
ความเป็นปรปักษ์และความแตกต่าง   เหตุการณ์ดังกล่าวเป็นการฝืนขัดต่อสภาพที่เป็นอยู่ของทุนนิยม
ตอนปลาย   เพื่อยังความชอบธรรมแก่อนาคตและจินตนาการที่แตกต่างออกไปจากที่เห็นหรือเป็นอยู่
การเมืองเร่งสภาพการณ์นิยมในรูปลักษณ์ที่ขบถนี้อาศัยดิจิตอลเทคโนโลยีและไซเบอร์สเปซเป็น
เครื่องมือเพื่อปรับทิศทางทุนนิยมจากที่มันเป็นภาวะสมัยใหม่แบบคงที่   สู่อีกทิศทางหนึ่งที่ค่อนไป
ทางการปฏิวัติสภาพการณ์ที่เป็นอยู่ ทว่า แนวทางดังกล่าวก็ไม่จำเป็นต้องคล้อยสู่โลกหลังทุนนิยม
ทันทีแต่อย่างใด   ด้วยความสำคัญของการเมืองเร่งสภาพการณ์นิยมในรูปการณ์ที่สองเป็นเหตุปัจจัย
บทความจึงตรวจสอบอัตวิสัยภาวะของนักเร่งสภาพการณ์นิยมแนวปฏิวัติด้วยอาศัยความคิดแบบจิต
วิเคราะห์ของลาก็องร่วมกับปรัชญาเทคโนโลยี โดยตั้งคำถามว่า นักเร่งสภาพการณ์นิยมที่คิดทลาย
ทุนนิยมตอนปลายนี้มีภาพลักษณ์เชิงอัตวิสัยภาวะอย่างไร   ทั้งนี้การเร่งสภาพการณ์ดังกล่าวแม้เป็นไป
ในแนวทางปฏิวัติ แต่ไม่จำเป็นต้องเคลื่อนไปยังโลกหลังทุนนิยม

คำสำคัญ

การเมืองเร่งสภาพการณ์นิยมแบบขวา การเมืองเร่งสภาพการณ์นิยมแบบซ้าย อัตวิสัยภาวะ ทุนนิยม
ตอนปลาย หลังทุนนิยม

Introduction

The politics of accelerationism is twofold. On the one hand, it shows political attitude that helps resume the status quo of the late capitalism, in my words, 'modernity in linearity'. On the other, it self-manifests as 'a spirit of Marx' as political ideology noncompliance with the late capitalism. From this consideration, this article proposes that there are two scenarios for the politics of accelerationism. The first scenario is the Right Accelerationism. This scenario shows the usage of digital technology in order to intensify social and economic conditions within the late capitalism in which modernity remains unchanged. The second scenario is the Left Accelerationism. This scenario reflects digital technology in different directions to the former. The aim of the second scenario is to redirect the condition of the late capitalism to other more egalitarian visions of social and economic conditions. Some may view that Left Accelerationism strives to unsettle a current situation of the late capitalism and reshape it with the ideological effigy of the so-called post-capitalism.

However, I argue that we should keep image for the future inconsistent and make it more optional. With its revolutionary vision in cyberspace assisted by digital technology, the future falls neither to trajectories of the late capitalism nor post-capitalism. It is believed that cyberspace is a space in flux where association, disassociation, assemblage, disassemblage, imaginary, and reimaginary of social and human relations are naturalised. This space in flux suggests abundance of inputs, passions, and desires that can both reproduce and negate the image of the present. The latter in particular redirects modernity to the unknown, non-representable futures (Land, 1992). To be more precise, I oppose the current trajectory of modernity ruled by the late capitalism with a firm belief that the future has no fix image. Assuming that the future is in elusive image leads to a conjecture that future remains open; in a sense that all of us can be the inputs for the future; and the future in this sense of political assemblage and disassemblage is contentious; some may even add that it is unevenly, digitally post-modernised.

Therefore, this article proceeds in three considerable sections. The first section engages with the classical texts of Marx, Lyotard, Deleuze, and Guattari. The aim in revisiting those texts is to point out a theoretical foundation of the politics of accelerationism in a revolutionary vision. The second section reiterates differences between Right Accelerationism and Left Accelerationism. By adopting psychoanalytic theory of Jacques Lacan to unravel subjectivity of the Left Accelerationism, the third section highlights how subjectivity of the Left accelerationism is configured. The conclusion addresses a distinction between the late capitalism and post-capitalism. Initially, it comes with my suspicion whether post-capitalism is our future. I believe that the image of the future is fragmentary; it is subjected neither to the late capitalism nor post-capitalism. I add that in the present there are agencies that represent Left Accelerationism's ideology but in a less radical kind than that some expect it to be. Although my argument is debatable, those agencies can be viewed as a 'less radical Left Accelerationism' as 'digital socialists'.

I: Theorising Politics of Accelerationism

Karl Marx stresses that "capital absorbs labour into itself" (Marx, 1993). His criticism is on the production process of capitalism. The process that transforms human subjects, intellects, emotions, potentials, and efforts into a material force readied to be placed in a circle of capitalism. Labour is vital to the process of production and in its relation to capitalism is miserably transformed into automatic machine to manufacture things. This explains that capitalism is a social and economic condition that has transformed labour, or a human force, into a resource for production. Capitalism sustains itself by absorbing labour into a production process and by preventing a contradiction to this relationship between labour and capitalism. To reiterate, labours are "a fixed capital" (Marx, 1993) means into which that their energies, forces, endurances, and intellects are reified as machines capable of generating and regenerating benefits for the capitalist.

By highlighting labour as a fixed capital, this logic of labour is twofold. The first aspect is that capitalism is

influential in orchestrating 'objectification of labour'. In this sense, capitalism absorbs labours into itself, making them as objects, and treating them as lifeless entities that have no other feelings, except to mechanically manufacturing things to supply the market. Meanwhile, the second aspect is 'temporisation of labour'. In this regard, capitalism determines a temporal structure to labours, by assuming that they will create a great mass product, and by making those mass products logistical to consumers in a short period of time. Capitalism becomes a description to why labours hate Monday morning and why labours have short bedtime per day. It is by this convergence of objectification of labour and temporisation of labour in which labours become a fix cost for productions, by sustaining, and by stimulating capitalism's production process.

Juxtaposed with this, we must begin to take labours into account as beings that are reified as 'a pure abstraction'. The term 'pure abstraction' highlights that labours are the forces that form themselves as an oppositional force to capitalism (Marx, 1993), particularly when labours are placed outside the context of capitalism. Pure abstraction seeks to reorient labours from subordinating to a system of capitalism to another possible character of labours. It suggests another possibility in which labours are materialised as a mode of pure being outside a domain of capitalism. Precisely, labours are not only situated within a confinement of capitalism. They are vital as a dominant force in determining and reshaping future insofar as their forces are spent outside capitalism and sometimes are exercised to oppose capitalism. In brief, 'a pure abstraction' highlights the combination of labour forces placed within (labours are employed to work in the factory) and outside capitalism (labour spending disposable time outside the factory). To some extent, pure abstraction is a useful Marxist theory that highlights a particular kind of existence that seeks to emancipate from the current setting to other, unforeseeable futures, yet intentional in creating a contradictory stream to the late capitalism itself. Pure abstraction is symptomatic to capitalism in a sense that there are labour forces that are abstracted from capitalism; but such abstraction is a being that remains unknown to capitalism. It is a certain kind of force that transcends capitalism but dismissed by capitalism.

When capitalism does not know the existence of those subtractions, the unaccountable, and 'the part of no-part' (Rancière, 1999), this means that capitalism fails to encounter its own lack. There is no such thing as a master signifier that can signify everything which moves within and beyond capitalism because capitalism is a lack in itself.

Our postmodern condition becomes an implication that capitalism produces a cascading reality and itself is not a fantasy. If capitalism is economic condition, it will be economic condition that generates multiple realities. Examples are diverse; the flow of money, the commodification of the industrial, creative, and natural products such as arts, sciences, trades, sports, words and images, air, water, and heat. These examples suggest that capitalism is a reality that reproduces endless desire. In consequence, capitalism is 'a libidinal economy', an economic system that keeps reproducing endless desires, new tastes, and temptations to customers. Libidinal economy is different from a military-industrial complex (e.g. the US government), the Oriental despotisms (e.g. Mao, Stalin, and Lenin), and a surveillance over the civilians' privacy (e.g. the Middle Eastern and the Asian governments).

Jean-Francois Lyotard explains libidinal economy as "a gap which excludes all significations and strictly speaking must even exclude the use of the term 'signifier'" (Lyotard, 1993). Lyotard's libidinal economy is resonated with Marx's pure abstraction because of its implication of the labour forces that are external to capitalism such as moods, enjoyments, and affects. Those moods, enjoyments, and affects are the uncanny. Capitalism is incapable of noting or recognising them all. Lyotard highlights libidinal economy as "the libido withdrawing from the capitalist apparatus. Desire is finding other ways of spreading itself out. One that is formless and ramified in a thousand ventures throughout the world" (Lyotard, 2014b). For the revolutionary platform beyond a calculation and circulation of capitalism, he even continues that "the libido can be distributed in another figure, and therefore it is this viscosity that all revolutionary potential lies" (Lyotard, 2014a). More to the point, Lyotard's libidinal economy signals that it is possible to overturn a current trajectory of capitalism by resetting capitalism into another direction.

That is to say, there are other dimensions of enjoyment, affect, passion, emotion, force, drive, and mood aim at negating capitalism but capitalism does not aware of them. One can think about *jouissance*, which is obtained from consuming industrial products that by now must give way to *jouissance* in the alternative meaning of endeavouring to redirect capitalism. To tilt the meaning of *jouissance* towards the field of resistance to capitalism affirms that there is no master signifier that could gaze everything moving inside and outside capitalism. By this logic of the inexistence of a master-signifier, *jouissance* has received an extensive meaning; *jouissance* is meant to be a surplus enjoyment in trying to reshape capitalism to another destiny.

Lyotard's libidinal economy goes hand in hand with a particular concern on capitalism and a problem of desire noted in a seminal work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. In *Anti-Oedipus*, both thinkers urge the subjects to imagine "how far does desire go beyond so-called objective interests [e.g. a monetary system], when it is a question of flows to set in motion and to break? (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004)." At this point made by Deleuze and Guattari, capitalism is forced to encounter the lack in itself and confront with the unrepresentable aspect of it. Both thinkers insist that the true revolutionary path is "to go in the opposite direction to the capitalism's desire based on the viewpoint of schizophrenic character. (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004)". Both even continue that the future that is rendered possible is not to devolve capitalism and not by calling for a change of political regime as presupposed by a classical Marxism. To accelerate the process requires more an engagement with capitalism, by understanding well how capitalism functions, and then displacing the current trajectory of capitalism to another egalitarian direction. To accelerate the process and to move a current trend of capitalism to another direction is essential to the revolutionary aspect of accelerationism. Thus, Lyotard's libidinal economy is compatible with Deleuze's and Guattari's critiques of capitalism in a way that it alarms a political practice that aims to cause a fissure to capitalism, and by promptly offering a space of resistance.

In short, to accelerate is the will to go to the opposite direction, to identify with a crack that threatens to overthrow capitalism.

Going into the opposite direction without demanding a regime change by depending only on accelerating process reveals sentiments in negating capitalism. It affirms the ground of thought that libidinal economy can be associated with a contradictory account to capitalism. In this sense, it is certain that capitalism has no master-signifier that can indicate everything moving within it, beyond it, even resisting to it. It exposes that labours are engaging in redirecting the current tendency of capitalism, perhaps, to make happen a reality of socialism in cyberspace for a social well-being and for the broad accumulation of collective knowledge(s), enjoyments, products, and services not for a few but for many.

II: The two scenarios of the politics of accelerationism

In this section, the argument is mainly about a conceptual distinction of the two scenarios of the politics of accelerationism; the Right Accelerationism and the Left Accelerationism. This section will begin with Right Accelerationism. In relation to the late capitalism in which a society of consumerism has involved with a dissemination of information run by corporates and factories such as the advertisements, the marketing of the new products, the use of machine in packaging a product, the use of vendor machine, and so on; accelerationism in this specific sense is about all-encompassing operations of technologies, sciences, inhuman automations, including the robotic machines to serve the late capitalism. The outcome of this is that only a few, who have possessed of these computational and technological modes of production, are only a small group of people who gain benefits and prosperities.

A clear example of the Right Accelerationism is the movement of money from one place to another with the use of a digital machine, yet such a deterritorialising movement shows no sign of disrupting a continuity of the capital. It can be suggested that accelerationism in this sense is to shed light on a salient feature of the late capitalism. An abundance of digital machine, algorithm, and artificial intelligence is only to favour the late capitalism and for the net profits of the business enterprises; a minority of people in the economic system.

Another example is 'teleoplexy'. A British philosopher, Nick Land, proposes the term 'Teleoplexy' by highlighting it as 'a self-reinforcing cybernetic intensification' (Land, 2014) as an abstract machine omnipotent in the social, economic, and political condition. Teleoplexy works in abstraction and in obscure process of complexity, connectivity, and operational capability that helps accelerate up things. To clarify, one can imagine a digitalisation of things such as a data-record, a data-dissemination, and a data-procession, showing up to customers/consumers with incredible speed and precisions.

According to Land, teleoplexy has been used to speed up, to standardise products, to measure productivities, to enhance competitive capabilities, to visualise things, and to evaluate the capital asset values that hence become essential to the mechanism of a digital market (Land, 2014). For Land, it remains ideal for one who expects to understand digital capitalism without understanding the function of teleoplexy. Land writes that "accelerationism has a real object only insofar as there is a teleoplexic thing, which is to say: insofar as capitalisation is a natural historical reality" (Land, 2014). Land believes that teleoplexy accelerates the late capitalism towards the future of what he calls 'Techonomic Singularity' (Land, 2014). Techonomic Singularity is an absolute control over the economic and political process. Land gives examples of Techonomic Singularity by pointing out to prominent candidates such as the large digital networks, the business corporations, the business consultants, and the research institutions (Land, 2014). For Land, there is no alternative to Techonomic Singularity except to fund it. Land's teleoplexy is a cornerstone of the Right of accelerationism by its focussing on a performance of the digital technology that aids in maintaining, sustaining, facilitating, and accelerating the late capitalism; hence this is the origin of the so-called 'Right Accelerationism'.

In contrast to Right Accelerationism, the Left Accelerationism is shared with what Antonio Negri may term as 'a time of revolution'. By illustrating a drastic movement of human and inhuman actors in service of socialist ideology in the area of cyberspace, accelerationism in this second scenario is recalcitrant to the late capitalism. This specific sense of accelerationism highlights a collective effort in sharing information, science, technology, and knowledge by

which it is expected that no one is marginalised from this sharing community. If the first scenario of accelerationism has been described in terms of the relationship between digital technology and the continuity of capitalism, it will be the second scenario of accelerationism that is preoccupied with the socialist ideology, which leads to disruption and reorientation of the late capitalism, and which relatively shows dialectic to the first system. Precisely, it is a dialectic of the second to the first system of accelerationism that reveals how capitalism is forced in a showdown against the militant socialists, spanning across the area of cyberspace, with which the intention of those digitalised socialists are to summon capitalism to confront its symptom and discontent.

Another clear example that can illustrate how digital technology is colonised by the late capitalism is the use of algorithms. Algorithms – a mode of computational technique processing with a calculation of the receiving information and which becomes a structurally computational mode of producing and operating a very set of accurate data e.g. price data for users – is utilised by giant companies such as Google and Facebook. Google has PageRank, which can sort all results of search queries, whereas Facebook has Edgerrank, an automation processing data and filtering information in order to decide for Facebook users to which information they should know for their news feeds. Then, from the point of view of the late capitalism, as long as algorithms are constitutive of production, circulation, and informationalisation under a corporate direction, it is clear in this sense that algorithms are a fixed capital. Utilising algorithms in the context of the late capitalism helps accelerate a flood of information to customers, to ease them to make a choice of consumption.

No doubt, such acceleration of consumption is useful for a huge benefit of a giant company. If algorithms are maintained as a fixed capital, it will be a mode of computational production that helps enlarge capital domain, which serves only a few (Terranova, 2014). This informs a customary practice of the late capitalism in which values of aesthetics, attractions, spectaculars, and enchantments are eminent and digital technologies are operating all with veracities. But it will be argued from the perspective of the left accelerationism that it is necessary to have an interrogation to algorithms whether algorithms can be

decolonised from being a digital mode of capitalism production.

Therefore, how one is to displace a practice of algorithms from the context of the late capitalism in order to direct it into another direction? Algorithms has possessed of a self-capability beyond the fix capital. It must be decontextualized to meet with another social and ethical value (Terranova, 2014). One can imagine anonymous internet users uploading various expensive products in cyberspaces in order to reach strangers; the unknown others. To accelerate, in this sense, means to displace from exercising a mode of computational technique only in consumption, circulation, and advertisement of products controlled by the late capitalism to meet with socialist ideology in which access to information and knowledge is ethically and technically democratised for others. Linking to the second scenario of accelerationism, the Left one, the prominent question on how to stop algorithms from absorbing and reabsorbing in a cycle of production that leads to accumulation of wealth by a few at the expense of many has now flared across the mind of the digital socialists.

Under this condition, freedom can also be material. Derivation of freedom is imaginable by way of alienating from being entrapped in the current situation by anticipating another. This project must omit fear as a priority, that is, to escape from a perspective that has a tendency to dismiss reconstructing future and to disdain a perspective that despises a political transformation enacted by agents who are in pursuit of a revisionary reconstruction (Brassier, 2014; Singleton, 2014; Negarestani, 2014). Striving to escape from a present condition is possible through an utilisation of every available technological means by ways of introducing and recommending speculative images for the future. The goal is different from Derrida's to come (à venir) since the Derriddean conjecture towards the future is indeterminate and less taking into account that future can emerge through another postulation. That is to say, freedom is obtainable through means of reorienting material and technical objects that govern the situation in the present in service of socialism in a cyberspace. If the image of the future can be carried out by a reorientation of the present, the key words for the future will be less 'a deconstruction' than (a) 'a deceleration' of the technical objects that sustain the

capital movement and (b) 'an acceleration' of the image for the future that makes the present evanescent.

To put the analysis in a political philosophy, the left accelerationist is a demos, who makes the image for the future possible, and, who simultaneously manifests a generic will in warding off the shadow of techno-dictatorial prescription (Reed, 2014). In its withdrawal from a centrism of capitalism that governs techno-dictatorial prescription, accelerationism is the politics that constitutes rationality, technology, fictionalisation, and reorientation of the current situation for the future. With a passion in crying out a collective will in fabricating a cyberspace to serve many, the meaning of demos has refashioned from equating it in its orthodoxy that produces its meaning only as a universal suffrage, to the soul of death drives in fictionalising the rewriting of reality based on a will of a collective passion (Reed, 2014), thereby affirming a rationality that politics is by nature a negation of the consensual bloc dominated by the current system of the late capitalism aligning with a parliamentary democracy.

With the possibility of thought that demos is equated with a fictional soul in generating new connections (Reed, 2014), a system of thought based on rationality in serving many by uprooting the technological and digital utilisations that currently facilitate the late capitalism has become self-evidence. But the left accelerationism in particular is driven by a quest to break off the giant walls in order to transgress a limitation bounded to the late capitalism, and in so doing will not only overcoming a current constraints, but will also be heading towards a more rational global society in the future (Williams and Srnicek, 2013). In general view, the late capitalism is imaginatively a world in which almost everyone is expecting that all small communicative devices are highly upgraded and sent directly to them from Silicon Valley, thereby culminating in a post-modernisation way of collapsing a geographical distance and of a temporal difference thanks to the interference of Facebook, LINE, and Instagram. This curtails a potential in cracking a linear time of it. In their refusal to surrender to such linearity of time, the Left Accelerationism rather has sought to transgress such temporal illusion by endeavouring to open different temporalities and by elevating such possibility onto the political, multiple horizons.

If one follows Alain Badiou's account that the truth of politics is a movement to transform and rewrite a particular concept that one is accustomed with, then the movement of Left Accelerationism will be 'an eventual-site', a notable subtraction from the existing circumstance of "the terrain remains unknown" (Badiou, 2005) that leads to a change of the Marxist terms such as the 'surplus labour'. In a conventional Marxism, it is common that a flow of labour forces is a movement within an enclosure of capitalism. Because a movement of labours is determined by capitalism, such movement from one territory to others shows that it is the late capitalism that in effect produces deterritorialisation. However, such concern over surplus labours by way of binding to the late capitalism's contextualisation has been challenged by Deleuze and Guattari, who argue that there are immaterially the surplus labours that flow outside the logic of capitalism, which have yet not been realised by capitalism itself (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972). It seems that Deleuze and Guattari are imagining to a flow and deterritorialisation of labours in an opposite direction to the late capitalism's mode of production. From this viewpoint, it can be said that the politics of Left Accelerationism that is in need of labours for a task of social and political resistances to the late capitalism's mode of production is manifesting itself as the being of the surplus labour as Badiou's eventual-site, which is different from the surplus labour in a convention of the late capitalism. Hence, the concept of the surplus labour will be genuinely meaningful and critically insightful only insofar as the concept also takes into account labour forces that take place outside the late capitalism.

III: Speculating subjectivity for the Left Accelerationism

To recapitulate a significant point from the previous section, the Left Accelerationism assumes that there must be a rationality of thought that urges a modern way of raising production and distribution of wealth. It continues that this new way of organising production for the future is in need of digital and technological developments, repurposing it from serving the late capitalism to the digitalised socialism.

To imagine the future in close tie with a technological evolvement clearly indicates that the unleashing and productive powers of another trajectory.

The Left Accelerationism rests on a faculty of reason that chooses to withdraw from fine attuning with the present in order to anticipate the future. This rationality corresponds to the question of how to orient oneself towards the future (Brassier, 2014) and a response to this is to politically generate disequilibrium within the existing situation of the present. Disequilibrium is associated with a presupposition that subjects are capable of unsettling the existing social condition, and this is constituted as the rationalist legacy of Enlightenment. Disrupting a predominance of the late capitalism for social welfares of many are practices of the reasoning subjects in cyberspaces. Notably, such practices are not the same as a technological anarchism. For the Left Accelerationism, a political and social movement in a digital world in favour of many is in need of a reason to crack the present; neither this political scheme is to confuse with the government's surveillance, nor with a cyber-terrorist. This project of cracking the present in order to open another dimension of thought based on the recognition of the disequilibrium in relation to the formation of such intransigent subjectivity is what Ray Brassier calls 'Prometheanism'.

Prometheanism is compatible with enlarging of a cognitive process that has involved with the exercise of power of negativism, alluding nonetheless to a faculty of reason manifested in the intellects of the subjects. Prometheanism is simply the claim that "there is no reason to assume a predetermined limit to what we can achieve to the ways in which we can transform ourselves and our world" (Brassier, 2014). Prometheanism requires rethinking to the term subjectivity and in this sense subjectivity has no longer been identified with egoism and self-hood. In its denial of the ontology of the finitude and the correlationistic of the present, Prometheanism is inferring instead to a reasoning subjectivity in its creationism of the unique thing that can remove the establishment of the present, making vivid to some eventual incidents, a Badiouian 'eventual-site', to occur in another temporal dimension. Its philosophical project does follow from a realisation that participating in a creation of the world is neither compatible with a divine blueprint nor

with a political revolution nurtured by anarchical disruptions. Disrupting the present will be a happenstance in a digital world bounded by this rule of rationality (Brassier, 2014) in respect to the principle of expanding accesses to many.

In conjugal with a Promethean rationality of expanding the future from within the present, disrupting the present requires a rethinking that the late capitalism is the Freudian pleasure principle in illusion. In effect, disrupting the present is a condition for the subjects to be saturated with a particular kind of enjoyment, the acquisition of a *jouissance* (a surplus enjoyment) as the 'a' (autre) (Lacan, 1999), which does not surrender to a castrating effect of the pleasure principle. In concert with the late capitalism, the acquisition of *jouissance* is compatible with a discrepancy of the pleasure principle governed under the fix trajectory of the late capitalism. On the condition that obtaining *jouissance* is reflexive of the reality principle of the subjects' psyches, therefore, a negation of the pleasure principle becomes a crucial episode in creating discontinuity to the pleasure principle. The pleasure principle veers on an endeavour to keep the quality of pleasure, which in fact has a potential to transgress it, at the minimum level and in fixation (Freud: 1991). As a resisting force, the politics of Left Accelerationism is a practical aspect that reorients technological and digital objects procured by the late capitalism to be accessible for a majority of people who are not capable of obtaining pleasures as others. A road to the utmost pleasure is not entirely castrated, although such supreme pleasure obtained by the subjects will be occurred belatedly.

The Left Accelerationism requires the subjects, who are sacrificing to its cause, to endure with the undesirable for a while, but later they can anticipate that the future whereby the acquisition of *jouissance* can take place by way of deploying utilities to many via cyberspace. The subjects who are in complicity with Left Accelerationism are those who are not going with the current flows but with the light of Promethean rationality which will lead to an explosion of desire to disrupt the present. The subjects under this principle are entering into the path of breaking the wall of the late capitalism that produces fake *jouissance* in a name of finding authentic *jouissance*; "without a transgression there

is no access to *jouissance*, and that is precisely the function of the Law" (Lacan, 1997). The late capitalism appears to establish itself as an all-inclusive image as the privileged place of *jouissance* by maintaining itself in delusion as in the Lacanian formula of the 'a' as the object of fantasy. However, the 'a' or *'the object petite a'* in Lacan significantly contains two oppositional but interlaced meanings. On the one hand, it affirms the relationship between the subject and the object of desire in fixity; in a frozen time, but this 'a' in this formula shows that what is appearing as the object of desire is not all-inclusive, pointing out to the lack and space in which desire can move beyond the existing circumstance, on the other.

Hence the complicated statement that instructs that "the function of desire in the man…sets up dominance in the privileged place of *jouissance*, the object o of the fantasy (object petite a), which he substitutes for the lack" (Lacan, 1997) in fact delineates that the function of desire in man starts from setting up the delusionary-effect place of *jouissance*. Then generating for the subject the object of fantasy by pretending itself as the locus of desire without blemish but which is enacting itself as a castration that prevents the subjects from perceiving what the subjects lack in relation to the object of desire. The scenario of the politics of accelerationism that follows the Law of superego of deploying utilities and pleasures to many as much as possible is compatible with the subjects, who are neglecting the inauthentic *jouissance* produced by the late capitalism, in order to point out to a lack constituted in the pleasure principle, which is generated by the late capitalism. Accelerationism in this sense is the politics that aims at creating disruption in the present. It does not recede from transgressing the condition of the present. It seeks to move beyond a circuit of the present in order to absorb *jouissance*, although in postponement.

Accordingly, the politics of accelerationism does not negate a significance of reformulating subjectivity that could make the impact in eroding the circuit of the capital to expand utilities hitherto inaccessible to many without acknowledging much a revolutionary politics in the traditional Marxist sense in which the working class is only a potential agency in making revolution on the basis of a class consciousness.

Sanctioning the present by making the image of socialism visible in cyberspace is a possible task by which individual and the collective individuals assume such a digitalised socialist mission. The politics of Left Accelerationism does not abandon Promethean rationality. It anticipates *jouissance* apart from a guidance of the late capitalism. Subjectivity re-articulated in the parameter of Promethean rationality designates that what the subjects are presented with the object of desire is a lack and such the object is what the subjects do not really want it. A fixation on the object of desire certainly insulates subjects from connecting with another possible desire beyond a presence in which the subjects may want but are unaware of it because the fixation of the presence of desire establishes a trap (Lacan, 1997). Overcoming such *méconnaissance* (the subject's misidentification with desire) allows Prometheanism and a rationality of the individuals to take place. The image of the present that succumbs to the late capitalism needs the rationalised subjects to move beyond the bulwark, which will be a condition in which the acquisition of *jouissance* is palpable for the subjects. The politics of accelerationism prescribes the subjects to be settled in the *Theatre of individuation'* in which subjects are neither corporeally and spiritually passive in being shaped by the relationship with the technical and digital objects, nor the subjects are actively shaping the multiple realities with the technical objects as the tool that offers help. On the presumption that ontology is a constancy of the flux, the *'Theatre of Individuation'* is elucidative of a constant process in which subjects have been assumed to have an individuation emerging tirelessly and possessing of a potential in transcending the stage of individuation developed from the earlier to another in relation to technology.

The *Theatre of Individuation',* a term developed in the philosophy of technology, presupposes that the individual at its core is set in the process of reinventing the selves to be a being-difference. Such process of being-difference shows an ambition to surpass in order to leap into a new process of individuation (Stieger, 2009). The core of this process establishes the relationship between the presence of the already-there of Dasein, the entity with flexibility, and the pre-individuality, a potential of leaping to a new individuation.

The ontology of Being in this postulation sets in motion a dimension of leaping towards a self-difference of the individual and the collective individuals. It hence reflects that the ontology of Being is not a totality but has been characterised in a process that does not recede from endorsing the relationship between Being and Being-striving-towards.

Bernard Stiegler's *'Theatre of Individuation'* designates a dimension of Dasein prompted with Dasein as Being-towards which in effect generates a transforming individual as a Being who is a self-renewal of the self in particular (Stiegler, 2009). The relationship between Dasein as Being-striving-towards and technology has culminated in a constant transformation of the individual; such transforming individual leads to a suggestion to ponder over the relationship between individual and technic as 'deindividuation' as a loss of individuation (Stiegler, 2009). The loss of individuation has different dimension from the complete absence of the subject. Instead, the concept emphasises a regeneration of the subjects following the process of temporarily recession in relation to technology before its re-emergence in a new yet uncanny form. This process by which individuals engage with technics for a self-transformation is in flux. By bounding to no limits, it is in correspondence with *jouissance* as the reality principle of the subjects' mental reality, which transgresses a dominant mode of repression, which is fundamental to the pleasure principle. This process of self-transformation, coupled with a belief in a renewal of the individuation, is prompted with these following four questions.

- Does the meaning of Being as Being-striving-towards or Dasein as Being-striving-towards is a false one if it is only reduced to a change in terms of self-transformation in relation to technology?
- Adjacent to the first question, will the Being as Being-striving-towards be also setting a philosophical thought on the current social setting as having a potential in transcending the pre-given dimension in which the late capitalism is presiding over?
- Will it be probable also to view the second question as the objectivity as also Being-striving-towards in addition to the subjectivity as Being-striving-towards?

- Does this mean eventually that the objectivity that takes place in the process of becoming in a constant flux is to meet in conjunction with the subjectivity as Being-striving-towards as a clear erasure of the division between subjectivity and objectivity to which rearticulating the image for the future is possible with a technology procured by the late capitalism serving as a tool at hand?

CONCLUSION: different imagination to the future; the late capitalism, post-capitalism, and the digital socialists

Difference in terms of ideologies, political practices, and expectations to a dominance of the late capitalism has led to an act in imagining futures in various prospects. For a conclusion, the priority is that the term the late capitalism in this article has been raised and promptly sets into conceptual distinction to post-capitalism. The late capitalism designates the current economic phenomenon in which digital technology has been used in service of profiteering a maximum return for the few and the advent of automation in factories including the development of the robotic machines that has been rapidly used to ensure productivities and a quality of products for customers. The late capitalism is the condition of the economic life whereby information of people is digitally encoded in a form of bio-data and hence readied to be used by the online company for the marketing information. The late capitalism occasionally performs itself as a digital economy that treats individuals as unwilling customers. It has sought to disrupt their times with the intervention from a new kind of technology capable of being used in the industry of the digital economy such as the very short 0.5 seconds advertisement on the YouTube channel that has sought to attract users (the unwilling customers) with in-trend products and services. The late capitalism is the economic and social condition that a prerogative role in shaping the existing realities belong to the companies with assistances from the government in accelerating productivities such as the national scheme that aims a country to be the smartest country in Southeast Asia of the Singapore and also exemplified is the political scheme of

Thailand 4.0 that aims to elevate the level of income from the middle to high level with the help of start-up businesses and innovations imported from the developed countries acting as a catalyst. Capitalism under this technological domination that has digital economy as a basis rests on an experiment of non-human actors as a compensation for human labours. The central performances of the inhuman actors become increasingly dominant in the contemporary of the advanced society such as a future plan to use drones in the fishing industry in the UK, the company's initiation in delivering products to customers by using drones in the US, the driverless cars in the Singapore, the launching of the robot journalist in Beijing, and so on.

In contrast to the late capitalism, post-capitalism is anticipating the future. Current economic situation will be replaced by society due to emerge in the future in which a number of working hours will be reduced and state will be playing a prominent role in implementing scheme of the universal income (Srnicek, 2014). Treating post-capitalism as ideology of the radical left is ill-advised, and, by the same token, judging post-capitalism as conspiracy of anarchists in disrupting function of capitalism is apparently an unfair verdict to post-capitalism per se. Post-capitalism should be appropriated as the liberating political and economic practices carried out in the state policy. Post-capitalism assumes a rational practice of the economics of the future that seeks independence from the current condition of the late capitalism, by anticipating a full automation, and by providing labours with less working hours while they are expected to possess more free time outside the circuit of capitalism (Srnicek, 2014). Post-capitalism is not a reform. Indeed, it is a practice of revolution, which can be transparent by means of rearticulating the state policy; and by the state implementation of public policy in a new paradigm. Post-capitalism is different from reform insofar as reform is a political adjustment inside the bloc of parliamentary democracy that refuses a structural and legal change of the economic and political patterns, which only culminates in providing a very limited political space of negotiation to the socialists in the parliamentary democracy.

However, despite post-capitalism is a revolution, its consideration on revolution has a different aspect of concerns from a traditional form of revolution executed under the banners of such radical ideologies in the late Twentieth Century as Leninism, Stalinism, Maoism, Pol-Potism, and so on. Post-capitalism is less a revolution against capitalism than a revolution of the state policy itself, anticipating the government to predicate on its self-revolutionary practice in terms of public policy, law, national schemes, and so on. It is the change from within the state that does not need violence. It rather negates state's use of violence against citizens and denizens, and hence advocating the transition to the socialist world without resorting to the means of violence. Post-capitalism is a change in terms of the governmental paradigm that seeks to reorient the current condition of the late capitalism to a society in which labours are not necessarily expending their work forces in excess. The government morally assists in ensuring the level of income sufficiently to every citizen or even philanthropic enough to expand the same liberal and non-nationalistic schemes to the migrants. Post-capitalism urges one to envisage social and economic conditions that are fundamental to the belief in the 'post-work' society in which labours are no longer spending their energies in excess only in the service of the late capitalism while capable of maintaining a sufficiently standard of living and quality of life outside the whirlpool of capitalism.

In between the late capitalism and post-capitalism lies the locus of the politics of accelerationism. The politics of accelerationism is suggested in this article as a political practice that has a firm root in the digital economy and in a technological foundation which can be drawn into trajectories of the late capitalism or post-capitalism as a means to serve an end. Out of its ambiguity in terms of its political concept, the main question is what is precisely the meaning of accelerationism? At a very fundamental level, to accelerate means to pump up in an incredible speed the situations that the accelerationists want the society dominated by digital technology to come true and to produce the reality to meet with the accelerationists' ideals. Ensued from the meaning of accelerationism as the aspirations of the accelerationists to pump up the situation in concord with the accelerationists' ideal types of imaginations, it then comes up with the second

question, that is, what does the politics of accelerationism want to accelerate? The swift response to this question is precisely that the politics of accelerationism has no consensus in terms of ideology and then the politics of accelerationism is not entirely free from antagonisms among the accelerationists.

Specifically, accelerationism is a political practice that can be employed as a strategy as a means to serve an end of either the late capitalism or post-capitalism. That is to say, a choice in accelerating the economic and social situation as a means to maintain the status quo of the late capitalism; or only using of a digital technology to serve the corporate profits in the hand of the few, accelerationism of this kind is the Right Accelerationism. Actors who are performing acceleration for this current economic situation are those who often associate with corporates and states. Some prominent examples of accelerationism that serve the status quo of the late capitalism are the new release of smartphones, the online advertisements in the interval for 0.5 seconds on the YouTube channel for the new products and services, the new models of the PlayStation platforms e.g. PlayStation 1-4, the business advisors for the start-up companies, the Crowfund for the creative businesses, the initiation of Thailand 4.0 by the government that advocates every company with the incentive from the government to enhance productivities and to practice innovations derived from the technicians in the US and in Japan in order to integrate Thailand as part of the high income country.

In contrast, a choice in accelerating economic and social situation with the purpose of averting from the status quo of the late capitalism; or the use of a digital technology to prevent the hegemonic bloc of accumulating the profit for the few but to distribute it to many, the world of post-capitalism that becomes imaginable without depending on a physical violence initiated either by the state vertically or by the outburst of the proletariat revolution horizontally, accelerationism in this presupposition is the origin of the Left Accelerationism. Actors who are performing acceleration by diverting from the late capitalism to post-capitalism in which anticipation to the post-work society is imaginable are the states, the automations, and the robotic machines as the inhuman actors.

Some prominent examples of accelerationism that show the qualities of disrupting the late capitalism are initiations to change a state's governmental paradigm, a change in terms of legal framework and in terms of public policy to cover over the universal income and implement healthcare schemes to every citizen including, perhaps, the denizens, an operation in a factory with full automation, the use of robotic machines, and the labours possessing of freer time outside the circuit of capitalism. Accelerationism in this sense is a demand for the future of the post-capitalist society where economics are engineered by full automation as a compensation for the labour forces, enabling the labours to have a better quality of life, have a part time job, have more time with a family, instead of spending their energies exhaustively in the circuit of the capital.

However, distinguished from a dualism of the late capitalism and post-capitalism is an imagination to the future by the Left Accelerationism in a less radical fashion. Hence, this legitimately leads to the third question, that is to say, will it be a strict condition that politics of accelerationism in the scenario of the Left Accelerationism will lead to a disruption of the late capitalism, eventually replacing the existing condition of the late capitalism instantly with post-capitalism? One of the concerns of this article is that it is not less comprehensible that the politics of accelerationism which is rooted in the paradigm of the Left Accelerationism, yet in a less radical view to it, may lead the subjects to envisage a disruption within the late capitalism. However, it must be noted crucially that such politics of accelerating situations in favour of anti-capitalism milieu does not necessarily culminating in post-capitalism. In other words, although the politics of accelerationism in this article does withdraw from subjecting to the timeless image of the dominant economic condition of the late capitalism and trying to disrupt the steady phase of accelerationism under the guidance of the Right Accelerationism, the politics of Left Accelerationism in some way can be divorced from subjecting its practice to the effigy of post-capitalism.

Eventually, for the time image of the late capitalism and post-capitalism, despite the two syntheses have possessed of a contradictory image to each other; both are the synthesis that have a tendency to dismiss from envisaging that the

future image does in fact already exist in the present, indicating that the future image is already entrenched in the present; the future is not a future that has yet to arrive. The future image is the image that has been discharged from the present image governed by the late capitalism to which the Right Accelerationism seems to offer the accelerating process to such economic paradigm. It does disrupt the mainstream image of the present, and in particular is not a mainstream image as the same as the late capitalism. By way of thinking that post-capitalism is the challenging aspect of the future, which is supposed to replace the current image of the present dominated by the late capitalism, post-capitalism seems to think about the future that has not yet to arrive. In contrast to this mode of thinking to the future, we can argue that the future is not the future that has not yet to arrive. Rather, it is the image that has already happened in everyday life with the toils of the philanthropic and 'the digitalised socialists'. Providing from the so-called 'digital socialists' are the products and services that everyone can access to, which are obviously presenting in everyday life; such as the e-books downloaded, the free online movies, the free boxing matches without paying the pay-per-view to the HBO, the childhood memories of playing Famicom and Super Famicom video games by using of the ROM databases, and so on. These are the images that have been representing themselves to us. These are the images of the future that already co-exist with the present. These pertain to the political time -image of disrupting the dominant time, the mainstream image of the late capitalism. The time-image of 'the less radical Left Accelerationism' which is not in need of drifting towards post -capitalism insofar as the image of the future does exist here; individuals do not need cease to be a labour force or to quit their jobs for the acquisition of a free time as long as their employments in factories, educational institutions, and others have generated to them a sustained enjoyment. The future image that co-exists with the present and particularly with us does point out to the aspect of everyday life, which nonetheless has manifested itself already in the governing paradigm of the late capitalism in the present.

Acknowledgement

References

Badiou, A. (2005). *Infinite Thought: Truth and the Return to Philosophy* (Feltham, Oliver and Clemens, Justin., Eds. and Trans.) London and New York: Continuum.

Brassier, R. (2014). Prometheanism and its Critics. In Mackay, R. and Avanessian, A. (eds.), *#ACCELERATE: the accelerationist reader*. Falmouth: Urbannomic Media.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2004). The Civilized Capitalist Machine. In Hurley, R., Seem, M. and Lane, H. (eds.), *Anti Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London and New York: Continuum.

Freud, S. (1991). *On Metapsychology - The Theory of Psychoanalysis: "Beyond the Pleasure Principle", "Ego and the Id" and Other Works*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Lacan, J. (1999). *Encore: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book XX* (Miller, Jacques-Alain., Ed. and Fink, B.., Trans.) New York: W.W. Norton Company.

Lacan, J. (1966/1997). *Ecrits : a selection* (Sheridan, Alan., Trans.). London: Routledge.

Land, N. (2011). Circuitries. In Brassier, R. and Mackay, R. (eds.), *Fanged Noumena: Collected Writings 1987-2007*. Falmouth and New York: Urbanomic and Sequence Press.

Land, N. (2014). Teleoplexy: Notes on Acceleration. In Mackay, R. and Avanessian, A. (eds.), *#ACCELERATE: the accelerationist reader*. Falmouth: Urbannomic Media.

Lyotard, Jean-François. (1993). *Libidinal Economy* (Grant, I. H., Trans.) London: Athlone.

Lyotard, Jean- François. (2014a). Desirevolution. In Mackay, R. and Avanessian, A. (eds.), *#ACCELERATE: the accelerationist reader*. Falmouth: Urbannomic Media.

Lyotard, Jean-François. (2014b). Energumen Capitalism. In Mackay, R. and Avanessian, A. (eds.), *#ACCELERATE: the accelerationist reader*. Falmouth: Urbannomic Media.

Marx, K. (1993). Fragment on Machines. *Grundrisse: Foundation
of the Critique of Political Economy* (Nicolaus, M.,
Trans.) New York: Penguin Classics.

Negarestani, R. (2014). *The Labor of the Inhuman*. Retrieved
from http://www.e-flux.com/journal/52/59920/the-labor-of-
the-inhuman-part-i-human/

Plant, S. and Land, N. (1994). Cyberpositive. In Fuller, M. (ed.),
Unnatural: Techno-Theory for a Contaminated Culture.
London: Underground.

Rancière, J. (1999). *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* (Rose,
J., Trans.) London and Minneapolis: University of Min-
nesota Press.

Reed, P. (2014). Seven Prescriptions for Accelerationism. In
Mackay, R. and Avanessian, A. (eds.), *#ACCELERATE: the
accelerationist reader.* Falmouth: Urbannomic Media.

Singleton, B. (2014). Maximum Jailbreak. In Mackay, R. and
Avanessian, A. (eds.), *#ACCELERATE: the accelerationist
reader.* Falmouth: Urbannomic Media.

Srnicek, N. (May 01, 2014) *May Day 2014 w/ Nick Srnicek
(Accelerationist Manifesto).* Retrieved May 02, 2015 from
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6TXIxqrWqLU.

Stiegler B. (2009). The Theatre of Individuation: Phase-Shift
and Resolution in Simondon and Heidegger (Lebedeva, K.,
Trans.) *Parrhesia*, 7: 46-57.

Terranova, T. (March 08, 2014). *Red Stack Attack! Algorithms,
Capital and the Automation of the Common.* Retrieved
from http://www.euronomade.info/?p=2268.

William, A. and Srnicek, N. (May 14, 2013). *#Accelerate: Manifes-
to for an Accelerationist Politics.* Retrieved from
http://criticallegalthinking.com/2013/05/14/accelerate-
manifesto-for-an-accelerationist-politics/.