

Citizenship in times of capital. A critique from the Marxian tradition

Ciudadanía en tiempos del Capital. Una crítica desde la tradición marxiana

Paula Vidal-Molina  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9036-3766>

Universidad de Chile, Chile, pvidal@u.uchile.cl

Roberto Vargas-Muñoz  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6041-9351>

Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Chile, robertovmu@gmail.com

Original article
language: spanish

Translated by
Luis Cejudo Espinosa

Abstract: This article offers an analysis of the notion of liberal-Marshallian citizenship in the light of the impact that neoliberalization processes have. We describe an approach to the hypothesis that neoliberalism does not allow the realization of the notion of Liberal-Marshallian citizenship due to the dispossession of social rights, indebtedness and growing precariousness of work, and wealth concentration. For that, it addresses two levels of analysis: a conceptual one, about the notion of citizenship, focused on the liberal idea; and, a second, which identifies the determinations of contemporary dependent capitalism and the limits of the kind of citizenship that can be built within those parameters in a neoliberal context. Methodologically, the article tries to develop a heuristic interpretation of the work of several authors, as primary and secondary sources.

Key words: citizenship, liberalism, capitalism, neoliberalism, Marx.

Resumen: El artículo se propone indagar en la noción de ciudadanía liberal-marshalliana a la luz del impacto que tienen los procesos de neoliberalización en curso. Los hallazgos dan cuenta de que no se permite realizar la noción de ciudadanía, producto de los procesos de desposesión de derechos sociales, el endeudamiento y la creciente precarización del trabajo y la concentración de la riqueza. Para ello, aborda dos niveles de análisis: uno de orden conceptual acerca del concepto de ciudadanía, centrándose en la noción liberal, y un segundo nivel, que identifica las determinaciones del capitalismo dependiente contemporáneo y los límites del tipo de ciudadanía que es posible construir bajo esos parámetros en el contexto neoliberal. Metodológicamente se realiza una aproximación heurística de la obra de varios autores, en tanto fuentes primarias y secundarias.

Palabras clave: ciudadanía, liberalismo, capitalismo, neoliberalismo, Marx.

Received:
May 15th, 2018

Approved:
January 11th, 2019



Introduction

Citizenship seems to be a fixed concept—at least discursively—everywhere and in common sense. It is said we find this notion, since ancient Greece, in the flag of the French Revolution, in the use of global think tanks such as the World Bank, ECLAC, UN Programme, in the press, in the politicians' vocabulary and the justifications utilized to threaten peoples and to wage "fair" wars, or in the demands of social movements; that is to say, it is resorted to referring and signifying a notion still anchored to the limits of liberal visions.

The article puts forward two spheres or levels to address the topic: one conceptual regarding the concept of citizenship, focusing on the liberal notion for the purpose of contrasting it with the Marxian critique; the other—more concrete—which identifies the determinations of contemporary dependent capitalism—in the Latin American region—and the sort of citizenship possible to build under these parameters in the neoliberal context.

For the first analysis level, we resort to the classics of philosophical-social thinking, trying to identify the main ideas at play in to understand citizenship in its liberal form to later—from Marx's work—base the critique upon this vision. For the second analysis level, based on several authors, we disclose some of the particularities of neoliberalism at a more concrete abstraction level such as the relationship utilized by capitalism subordinated to central capitalist economies, which helps understand its impact on the sort of possible liberal-Marshallian citizenship, a product—among other things—of the processes of dispossession of social rights, super-exploitation and the increasing pauperization of labor in concurrence with wealth concentration.

Even if in the capitalism developed in Latin America, a Marshallian civil and political citizenship may be realized, social citizenship has always been a pending task in the regions ever since the creation of the republics. This delay has grown in the subaltern classes over the neoliberal phase. From this, we state that substantive citizenship is only possible if it is carried out in the overcoming of capitalism.

Owing to the above, there was a methodological interpretation of various authors' works. The article was divided into four sections. In the first, there is a historical-conceptual sketch of the notion of citizenship supported on Adela Cortina and Derek Heather. In the second section, modern and liberal perspectives are approached to later revisit Marx's critical perspective and critical Marxism. The third section, some of

the central categories of the Marxist theory of dependence, from which we intersect the profile of neoliberal citizenship, focusing on social dispossession, indebtedness, pauperization of labor, and individuation as constituent elements of the neoliberalization process. In the final section, we close with some conclusions that pose a number of challenges to produce a citizenship that goes beyond capitalism in its neoliberal phase.

Historic-conceptual approaches to citizenship

There exists a variety of meanings for the concept of citizenship, for example: *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española* [Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy] indicates citizenship is: a quality and right of a citizen. A set of citizens of a people or nation. A behavior that corresponds to a good citizen (RAE, 2017). Moreover, in a revision of the political vocabulary of *Fondo de Cultura Económica*, we notice it points at the idea of citizenship as a historical construction

that rests upon a peculiar definition of the relationship between the individual and the State. Owing to this, the discussion on this topic is closely linked to the reflection on nature and the limits of political participation, rights, obligations and legitimacy in the political sphere (Bobes, 2000: 50).

Other authors, from political sociology, expose their definitions. For Janoski (1998), it is “passive and active membership of individuals in a Nation-State with certain universal rights and obligations in a certain level of quality”. Cortina (1999: 40) will state —quoting Heather— that citizenship is a “political relationship between an individual and a political community, by virtue of which the individual is a member with full rights of such community and owes it permanent loyalty”.

According to Heather (2007: 175), citizenship is a sort of historically constructed sociopolitical identity and understood “as a status held by an individual in a direct relationship with a political or administratively united either in a city-state, municipality, or Nation-state”.

As regards the historical construction of citizenship, in the literature it is agreed that the first reference is Ancient Greece.¹ Following Heather

1 In Athens, Aristotle is acknowledged as its best representative; for him: Man is by definition a political animal; owing to this, even if men do not need the mutual help of men, they do look for coexistence [...] A citizen, in general, is the one that can command and be commanded, and it is different in each regime; however, the best of them is the one that can and decides to be commanded and command leading a life according to virtue” (Aristóteles, 2005: 128 and 144). Command and be commanded indicate the individuals’ involvement

(2007), one of the most useful sources on the functioning and history of Athenian citizenship is the constitution and practice of its democracy, which supported on three basic principles: 1) the idea of equality that reflects in the participation in the Assembly and in the sortition; 2) enjoyment of freedom, of thought, of expression and action, which allows the Assembly to operate democratically; and, 3) confidence in participating directly in the Assembly, in public debates in the agora on the political issues of the day, participate with obligations by means of government and justice institutions.

Even if this model was based on confidence relationships within a very cohesive community, not all the population was considered citizenry: women and children, Metics or temporary or permanent legally free migrants and slaves were denied such quality as individuals. At once, not all the men were homogeneous, there were differenced on the basis of class, age, etc. in this model, citizenship was related to property. For Aristotle:

A man with no properties lacks free time to involve in public affairs and, besides, the probability to give in to bribery was lessened by having personal properties. As these were a symbol of “virtue”, in the sense of having full disposition (Heather; 2007: 126).

In this way, citizenship in the Greek tradition sets the basis for both the liberal tradition such as the republican, associated to rights and property, and democracy and participation as well.

Modern and liberal citizenship: the Marxist critique

The change from feudal society to modernity enables the construction of modern citizenship, as we know it today, in which the discovery of the individuals as a basic social reality will be central for its theoretical-practical dimension, and the standpoint of power and authority, there is a transformation of power from authoritarian into self-regulated which rests on the idea of “people’s sovereignty” or “general will”. The Modern State becomes the relationship between citizen-State, unlike the previous, centered on servants and their sovereign.

For Bobbio (1993), this expresses change from an organic conception (Aristotelian), in which society precedes the individual toward one

in the affairs of the city for the benefit of all, which includes political participation and the creation and existence of a special sort of civil friendship, which is the link that ensures that citizens work together with mutual good will.

individualistic, which considers this prior to society with inviolable natural rights (linked to *Ius naturale*). Also, the issue of property will be retaken in the light of modern citizenship by liberal thinkers such as John Locke, who would bring rights regarding life, liberty and assets—property—to light in the XVII century in England and its colonies in the American continent.

If XVI century “deconstructed the geopolitical visions of the ancient system”, according to Dussel (2007: 246) early in the XVII, “the new model of modernity was conceived” by René Descartes in ontology, Galileo Galilei in astronomy, and Isaac Newton in physics. However, Thomas Hobbes² and Adam Smith would build the architectonics of the defining modernity of individual and citizenship; though the former at a larger extent than the latter.

In *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1751) and then in *The Wealth of Nations* (*An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*) (1776), Smith would devise the modern economic science along with the character of “*Homo economicus*”, subject of interchange and the market. For Smith, the economic order and its corresponding wealth are formulated because of the division of labor, property and the fulfillment of contracts that are assured from the market institution due to the power of the State (Dussel, 2007: 339).

The division of labor, a gradual condition of human nature to permutate one thing into another (Smith, 1984), that is to say, interchange, even if it is based on communication, it comes from the division of labor and private property; this is, some are proprietors of the money, and others, of labor.

As we will expose further in the text, private property in Smith is an antisocial model, as individuals interconnect from disconnection (social interdependence); this is, human beings are individuals who experience their subjectivity as something isolated and alien regarding the others; the link that connects them to egotism, the proper interest in satisfying a necessity.

The individual finds the satisfaction of their interests offering their services from the interchange of the products of their work; it is their own interests that drives them and conditions the progress of society according to Smith.

2 Hobbes (2000), author of *De cive*, in 1642 (his first political work), would define the expression of the new model of modernity as he built an ontological substantiation of politics and by establishing the individual as a starting point in his classic work *Leviathan*, in 1651 (Hobbes, 1998).

However, not only did economic processes influenced the configuration of modern citizenship, also social processes took part; it is agreed in the literature that citizenship comes mainly from the centuries XVII and XVIII with the English, American, French Revolutions and also the birth of capitalism. In this regard, the protection of natural rights demands the creation of a sort of political community —the modern Nation-state—, which is committed to defending life, integrity, and the property of its members (Cortina, 1999; Heather, 2007).

Well into the XX century, when it is systematically conceptualized and turns the notion of citizenship into the canonical concept of social citizenship. The responsible was Thomas Humphrey Marshall (born in 1893), Sociology professor of the London School, gave a series of lectures published in 1950 entitled: *Citizenship and social class*. Here, he puts forward two large ideas based on English history as a referent: the equality inherent to citizenship may be compatible with the inequality consubstantial to class structure; and, secondly, it exposes that citizens' rights comprise three aspects that evolved, historically, in civil, political and social order. These aspects are pointed out as:

The civil element is composed of the rights necessary for individual freedom: the freedom of the individual, expression, thinking, and religion, right to property and establish legal agreements, and right to justice [...]. By political element, I understand the right to partake of the exercise of political power as a member of a group invested with political authority, or as an elector of the members [...] The social element comprises all the range, from right to security and to a minimum economic welfare to fully sharing the social inheritance and lead the life of a civilized being abiding by the prevailing standards in society (Marshall and Bottomore, 1998: 22-23).

From a historical analysis of English society, it is stated that civil rights were granted in the XVII century, political in XIX, while social and economic in the XX century. It is noticed that political and civil rights may be perfectly recognized, though social rights involve quality of life, and because of this, they are not as clear as regards their implications, nevertheless Marshall (Marshall and Bottomore, 1998) considers that social rights are basic for the effective enjoyment of civil and political rights.

We notice that Marshall's definition (Marshall and Bottomore, 1998) allows understanding the function it fulfilled, in the inception of capitalism, to ensure the civil rights of individuals, for the freedom of expression, to come and go, of beliefs, freedom to choose a job, acquire properties, access to justice and protect contracts by means of legal

authorities are the minimal conditions to compete in the market and acquire property by means of purchases among peers in the market.

Marx's critique: the social interdependence problem

In his earliest writings, Marx criticizes and displays the limits of the State as a representative of general interests. In his article, "On the Jewish Question", 1844, he denounces the hypocrisy of the State as it suppresses birth, affiliation, culture, and asks every individual takes part in equal conditions of the "people's" sovereignty (Marx, 2005). It is equality that masks the existing inequality between individuals, while it hides the determination of social relationships and structures.

The bourgeoisie, or emerging civil society, shelters in a universalizing discourse to maintain its legitimacy above the tiered society of the feudal world. That is to say, it speaks on behalf of the most delayed sectors and it is instituted in power. The rights enunciated by the bourgeois revolution, for Marx, are nothing more than egotistic rights (in the sense that they only benefit the bourgeoisie).

In this way, the right to freedom is nothing but the right to be separated from other individuals, the right to this dissociation, to the limited individual. Then, the right to equality exists without ever becoming a political community on the basis of substantive equality, but it ensures that all the individuals will be equally treated at a formal level, as if they were isolated individuals.

For its part, the right to security is interpreted as warranting the privileges of a class. Well now, even with these limitations, for Marx, political emancipation that entails the separation of the State from religion is seen as a great qualitative leap. In his own words: "political emancipation is indeed great progress. It is not, truly, the ultimate frontier of human emancipation in the sphere of the global order thus far matured" (Marx, 2005: 74).

Even if to a large extent, Marx's work faces liberal individualism, it is in *Capital and Foundations of a Critique of Political Economy (Grundrisse)* 1857-1858, in which he developed its harshest criticism to the political economy of his time, that is to say, Adam Smith and David Ricardo. While in these classic economists the starting point is the division of labor, in Marx, conversely, the starting point for the analysis would be commodities, considered the fundamental form of the capitalist social relationship. To understand Marx's critique to political economy,

liberal in nature, it is relevant to remember that according to the author himself, material production has to be placed first. In *Grundrisse*, he would put forward that “individuals... produce in society... (and) the production of individuals [is] socially defined” (Marx, 2007: 4), not the isolated individuals as considered Smith and Ricardo, who immersed in their time and interests, fail to notice that “[...] society free from competence each individual seems—that is to say, manifests— as devoid of natural bonds” (Marx, 2007: 3). The main modern economists do not make a difference between historic production and a naturalized conception of human nature; therefore, they characterize the isolated individual as placed by nature, disregarding the individual depends and is part of a larger whole.

In the modern society that produces commodities, we find a specific social relationship that structures a social practice, and at once, it “structures the actions, dispositions, and world views of the people”: the domination of commodities as a mode of social subjectivity and objectivity (Postone, 2007: 38). The commodity form characterizes by being constituted by labor under an objectified form of dual nature, concrete labor and abstract labor. Marx was the first to analyze the dual nature of labor in commodities. Neither scientific economics nor people’s economics understood that the duality of labor—which produces commodities—is the foundation of central categories in political economy, namely: money and capital.

In *Capital*, Marx (2012) put forward that use values are produced by concrete labor, this is, private labor of isolated individuals, an activity that mediates between human beings and nature. The heterogeneity of concrete labor allows for interchange and the social division of labor, as the use value of commodities comprises a certain productive activity, from which these can be compared with one another, though

The use values cannot be seen as commodities if they do not encompass qualitatively different useful labor. In a society whose producers by and large adopt the general form of commodity, this is, a society of producers of commodities, this qualitative difference between useful labor—which are organized independently from one another such as private occupations of autonomous producers— unfolds up to becoming a multimember system, a social division of labor (Marx, 2012: 52).

The social division of labor is necessary for mercantile production, though it is not enough, as private producers of labor have to be contrasted with one another as commodities, i.e., labor has to be spent on private independent labor. In this way, Marx presents the fundamental contradiction of capitalism not criticized by political economy. The contradiction between the use value and value; that is to say, only in

interchange the products of labor that are produced independently can be compared.

Being use values a combination between nature and labor, Marx distinguishes between wealth (use values at the disposal of an individual) and value (product of abstract labor). Use values are the product of useful labor, regardless of the social forms, though only in capitalist society individual labor lose its cultural, social and other references to serve as mere means of social equivalence.

The contradiction between use value and value expresses in the interchange process: while nature is the base for use value, value is nothing but an exclusively social property. “The social” and “the natural” appear in opposition in the capitalist society precisely because in the interchange process nature cannot produce value- Marx’s abstraction is to receive the value of a merchandise as a representation of pure and simple labor, waste of general human labor.³

This is what Marx would call abstract labor, and which Postone (2007) defines with a single social function as “mediating a new sort of social interdependency”. With this concept, Marx reflects an abstraction produced by the generalization of interchanges of commodities in modern world, which is the clearest expression of anomia, abstraction and isolation that modern society produces by dissolving social bonds. This absolute disconnection that prevails in modern society is the clear expression of individualism, which configures citizenship for capital. In *Grundrisse*, Marx (2007) states that

The social nature of this activity, as well as the social form of the product and the participation of individuals in production, here appear as something alien and with the character of a thing before the individuals; not as their reciprocally being related, but being subordinate to relations that subsist independently from them and come from the clash of reciprocally indifferent individuals (Marx, 2007: 84).

Indeed, the unfolding of capitalist modernization, including peripheral countries, is an economic system disaffected regarding any substantive reference, whose only form of mediation is interchange. From here, Marx considers it fundamental to explain the origin of money, or else, the form of money.

3 Value appears as unit of simple abstract labor, even it changes according to country or time, however, in a given society it is taken for granted. The abstract (homogeneous) and concrete (heterogeneous) aspect of labor unify in the act itself, unitary of labor (Harvey, 2014).

Money dissimulates and covers the social character of labor, that is, it hides the social interconnection that exists between the owners of commodities. This is what Marx conceptualizes as fetishism. Bourgeoisie political economy started its analysis with the functions of money. It assumes the existence of money, to the extent that without it, it is not possible to organize commodity interchange. Classic economists do not manage to connect value with form of value, that is, to explain the logical position of the form of money. All in all, they are incapable of understanding that modern individuals become dominated by abstractions, when they used to depend on one another.

In Capital, the contradiction between use value and value expresses in a contradictory relationship between capital and waged labor, which reduces exploitation and social inequality, proper to the capitalist mode of production:

An *antinomy* takes place here: right v. right, uniformly marked by the law of mercantile interchange. Among equal rights force decides. And this way, in the history of capitalist production, the *regulation of the working shift* is presented as struggle around the *limits of such shift*, a struggle between collective capitalist, this is, the class of *capitalists* and the working collective, i.e., the *working class* (Marx, 2012: 282).

However, modernity has made the market the place where —freely and on equal conditions— men and women can concur to sell their workforce with the owners of the production means or capitalists.

Capitalism, as a specific mode of production, does not intend to produce commodities to meet needs, but to advance the valorization of value, in order to increase money, that is produce capital. In this way, what drives capitalism is surplus: produce an increase in commodities regarding the previous stock by means of a valorization process, an increase in the value obtained from the addition of value as capital. Hence, a capitalist is the one who makes “the movement of capital as an end in itself a subjective aim” (Heinrich, 2008: 99), following the logic and movement of capital, searching for a process where the initial money M is smaller than the final M' .

The key concept does not exist in modern economic science, and enables Marx to argue that capitalists increase their revenue to modernize their production installations be effectively more competitive. In the logic of capital, value becomes autonomous from money, the beginning and end of the process of valorization.

For the capital to appear, a historical money accumulation process was necessary in certain groups of individuals with an intermediate development of commodity production; moreover, the production of “free” workers was necessary. Free to sell their labor force and free from any production means, striped of any sort of material property; however, they are not juridically free, they do not have more than their labor force, “they are a class of individuals forced to turn their physical and intellectual capacities into commodities so that they can reproduce their lives’ material base” (Mezzadra, 2014: 84). “Free workers” are the supposition and rationality of capitalist production.

The relationship between proprietors and non-proprietors in capitalism is a class relationship, or proprietors and workers, who lack property. Surplus has its origin in the labor force commodity which, as any merchandise, as we have noticed, has a use value (usefulness or application in concrete labor) and value, which was defined by the necessary time of labor to produce the product but also for their class reproduction.

Workers sell their labor force to capitalists and receive from them lower values (expressed as wages) than those produced. Then, there are paid and nonpaid labors, this is what Marx calls exploitation, and that is related to the part of value produced by the direct producer and that it is not received but appropriated by capitalists, as they do not pay the value created by producers, but the value of the labor force (Heinrich, 2008).

The fiction of considering citizens with autonomy to enter into agreements only those able to sell their force of labor is an excision: “Potency (force of labor) opposes power (money)” (Mezzadra, 2014: 89), and social power depends on the amount of money, that is to say, of the exchange values of which these are proprietors. Those who are only able to sell their labor force do not have civil independence, they do not have sufficient material conditions for autonomous doing. Then, how is citizenship possible? At least, in the interchange, it suffices that the individuals are able to offer their potency.

In this way, labor turns into the interdependence and/or social mediation mechanism in modern times, supported on the interchange production value. Modern liberty, according to Žižek, is thus revealed as an ideological universal, as there is “a specific case that breaks its unity, which reveals its falseness” (Žižek, 2009: 47), as the content of the act of selling labor force becomes, at once, slavery to capital, when the worker “freely” sells their freedom. This phenomenon is not exclusive to central

economies, as in spite of being strictly modern, it acquires specific forms of dependent Capitalism, configuring citizenship and its relationship with the State.

Citizenship within dependent Capitalism; for a critique to Citizenship in neoliberalism

In order to tackle the logic of neoliberalization processes from a critical standpoint and analyze citizenship, in the previous section, the theoretical Marx of the capitalist mode of production and critical of the abstract laws that regulate such production mode, which theoretically exposes “the anatomy of the modern bourgeoisie society”. Now, we are able to advance a more specific analysis of the capitalist economic-social formations such as the organic relationship between capital and State⁴, which corresponds to a specific form of the capitalist mode of production, divergent as compared with pre-modern societies:

Everything takes place as though the relation between sovereignty and dependence dissociated. The former embodies in the “separate political State” [...] does not mean the State severs ties with relations of capitalist production. It means that the relation of sovereignty crystallizes as a particular institution: the modern State [...] takes the form of a representative State founded upon the sentence -real and imaginary at once- of egalitarian citizenship (Artous, 2016: 29).

Furthermore, the capitalist mode of production historically consolidates as an accumulation process at global scale, “which simultaneously operates with the constitution of the peripheral Nation/states and their articulation with central Nation/states [...] the contemporary Nation/state is at once previous condition and result of the unfolding of capital in the historic phase of the “constituted global economy” (Solís, 2016: 120). Osorio (2018) points out that in the global capitalist system:

Becomes an identity differenced from various forms of capitalism, interdependent, being developed and dependent capitalism the fundamental forms, where the luck of some defines that of others. In this way, the reproduction patterns in these or other

⁴ The issue of a theory of State in Marx, or the treatment of capitalist production relations, is a topic long debated among Marxists. Distinguishable are, among others, are the works of the renowned Gramscian Marxist Coutinho (2011), adding to Poulantzas’ classics: *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism* (1998) and *State, power, socialism* (1986). Also, from the derivationist tradition works by Artous: *Nature and form of the Capitalist State. Contemporary Marxists Analyses* (2016), and *Marx, State and Politics* (2016). Adding to Bonnet and Piva’s *State and Capital. The German debate on the State derivation* (2016).

forms of capitalism have their own originalities conferred by specific connotations. For example, the importance of scientific and technologic development, and the weight of surplus in the former; the rupture of the capital cycle and the generation of a production structure far from the needs of the general working population in the latter (Osorio, 2018: 166).

In the case of capitalist development of peripheral countries —as Latin America— the “State does not come from national capital, as in central economies, but global as an economic form of the global capitalist system, that is to say, of the constituted global economy” (Solís, 2016: 121).⁵ For Salama (2016: 132), domination relationships between center and periphery “are class relationships mediatized by the States, guarantors of capitalist production relationships”, which does not affect —in Latin American countries— the “relative autonomy of the State” regarding social class,⁶ between the 1930 and 1970 decades.

The Keynesian policies (which in Latin America took the conceptual and economic form of developmentalism) fostered full employment to promote the purchase capacity of workers, making room for the Welfare state and consumption society, which in the middle of the third and fourth decades of XX century, by means of public expenditure, produced a fixed capital sufficient to take up the labor force and maintain mean capital return, via the increase of labor productivity (Lagos, 2017).

However, union organization, benefits and social rights, paradoxically, allowed the crisis of commodity excess recompose the general capital formula ($D-M-D'$), and this way, the citizenship will be realized that in terms of Marshall integrates social rights, though restating the logic of capital. In this way, heavy pressure and union organization, at once, absorbed the offer crisis.

As of the middle of the 1970's, particularly after the oil crisis (1973), there has been a change in the Keynesian accumulation pattern toward one that focuses on the withdrawal of the State from the economic, and a growing wave of privatizations of services and public enterprises, which has been called neoliberalism.

5 The scientific literature gives an account of what Latin American countries of the periphery, ever since Colonial times, and particularly after the constitution of Nation states, produce and export raw materials toward central countries, from which later they buy manufactured products. It is the so-called international division and specialization, which leads to domination processes.

6 Salama (2016) shows as an instance the processes experienced in the Latin American region between the 1930 and 1970 decades, in which State intervention, particularly in economy, in an attempt to re-appropriate national sovereignty.

Neoliberalization is a process whereby the conditions to accumulate capital are restored, while the restoration of the class power of dominant elites (Harvey, 2007). This restoration process before the “social State” (of central countries) in XX century configures as a transformation of the accumulation pattern from which the accumulation and valorization of capital is made concrete transforming the relationship State, society and market. Labor flexibilization and pauperization such as the financialization of economy, extractivism of environmental resources such as dispossession, will be some of the modes utilized by capitalism in its neoliberal phase, to restore accumulation and domination.

To establish the implications and transformations of citizenship in neoliberalism, it is relevant to complement some of the notable elements of the neoliberalization process of dependent capitalism. According to Garretón (2013), some of the main characteristics of this process are extreme individualism, where the citizens’ basic rights are private property and consumption; the primacy of liberty, it is worth saying, liberty and economic autonomy as supports for political freedom; the market appears as the best expression for the realization of freedom, and thereby, by exclusion any other space where the realization of liberty is possible is denied; inequality is defended as a natural issue, in this way, social justice is dangerous and destructive, plus it will only be applicable to individuals, not to social groups (social classes) or the State.

A distribution model would be incongruent for none controls the market; capitalism would become the driver of history, i.e., the modernization process is considered a stage and undiscussable, and what politics has to do, regardless of “party interests”, is to conduct development and progress from the free market as the only road to process social conflicts —by the way, indissoluble from modern society—; There is a defense of a minimal State, this is, a subsidiary State and restricted for subaltern sectors, though strong in meeting the interests of the Capital; and, finally, the submission of the political regime to the economic dynamic.⁷

However, the specific way of historic-spatial concretion of capitalism in the region is not linear and is characterized by cyclic crises as part of the contractions of capitalism as a whole (Carcanholo, 2017).

7 According to Anderson (2003), for Hayek, liberty and democracy can perfectly be incompatible, if the majority democratically interferes with the unconditional rights of economic agents, that is to say, disposes of their returns and properties as it pleases.

In this way, without disregarding the contributions from the aforementioned derivationist theory, and from the specific form it takes in Latin America, particularly in the XXI century, the aggravation of the dependent condition of peripheral economies is maintained in function of the intensive and massive neoliberal implementation of development” (Carcanholo, 2017: 60).

Even if historically, Latin American dependent economies have inserted in a subordinated way into capitalism, whose characteristic is that a part of the surplus produced by a dependent economy is taken by central economies and becomes part of their accumulation process;⁸ such process exacerbates in the neoliberal phase, after the progressive depletion of the “growth model characterized by import substitution, insufficient competitiveness of national industries, the governments’ incapability to behead hyperinflation, and the strong increase of neoliberal ideology promoted by Thatcher in Great Britain and Reagan in the United States” (Salama, 2016: 139).

Osorio (2018: 169) stresses that in dependent capitalism there exist “objective conditions for super-exploitation become fundamental exploitation mechanisms of the capital”. For his part, Carcanholo (2017) points at the structural condition of dependence —expressed in the uneven interchange mechanisms between economies at global trade level— forces dependent economies to compensate the surplus transferred to central economies, by means of the *superexploitation* of the labor force, mainly via three mechanisms: a) the increase of shifts; b) increase in labor intensity to realize a larger production of the value in the same time or working shift; and, c) expropriation of part of the necessary labor to recompose the labor force by the capital.⁹

He also points at other two mechanisms and have to do with the class struggle; it means that, at the moments when the struggle increases and with

8 The dependency of an economy means a conditioning in favor of “development and expansion of the other, which is subordinate and would express as the fact that the dominant economy may expand in a self-sustaining manner —with dialectical contradictions, as a characteristic of capitalism— while the dependent would only do as a reflection of said expansion, or in a constrained manner, by the dependency itself, having positive and negative effects on its development” (Carcanholo, 2017: 72).

9 All these mechanisms are pointed out by Marx in *Capital*. In the case of the last mechanism, “it also implies a growth of the exploitation rate, as it is composed of the relation between surplus labor and necessary labor. When the later falls, and the two added parts are the working shift, given this, surplus labor increases” (Carcanholo, 2017: 84).

improvements for the workers, so does the value of labor force, “however, if such increase does not become wage growth, or at least, in the same proportion” (Carcanholo, 2017: 84) is another form of super-exploitation. Finally, the elevation of the industrial reservoir army tends to press wages downward and increases exploitation.

Despite what is specific to a dependent economy (such as the Chilean) *is not the ways to increase the surplus rate*, but that in order to face the transference of values, such an economy “does not have the alternative to increase productivity slowing down such transference”, as “in general terms, the organic composition of capital is inferior to that of central economies” (Carcanholo, 2017: 85), displaying technologic dependence, since the development of the productive forces tends to be poorer in dependent economies. In this way, paying wages below the value of labor force is an instance of what is pinpointed as super-exploitation of the labor force, as a characteristic of dependent economies, which not only generates *a more concentrated distribution of wealth and incomes*, but also the *aggravation of social problems*.

From this stand point, neoliberalism, as a development “strategy” that intends to recompose the rate of return, subjecting labor to capital at global level, has as an effect the worsening and deepening of the dependent condition of the economies (and their evils) in the Latin American region because:

deepens the mechanisms to transfer value that structurally characterize the dependent insertion of those economies into the global capitalism (because) it entails privatization processes, transferring the productive apparatus abroad (liberalizing the actuation of transnational capitals) and external aperture, both commercial and financial (Carcanholo, 2017: 133-134).

The above translates as growing *financialization*, *transnationalization*, *deindustrialization* and *reprimarization* processes of dependent economies, leaving them exposed to great external vulnerability, since the value produced by them is “increasingly” accumulated by central capitalisms, which forces dependent capitalisms —to oppose this dynamic of value transference— to deepen the super-exploitation of the labor force in Latin American countries, for instance as the growing flexibilization and pauperization levels of labor and employment, adding to low wages.¹⁰ Even of paying

10 In 2016, ILO —in its studies on labor conditions— pointed out that in Latin America, over the last decade, in spite of having experienced an improvement process in labor market, there were shortcomings and deficits in income distribution as well as regarding labor such as the permanent informality and atypical forms of employment (part time, seasonal,

wages below value is something generalized at global scale, as pointed out by Osorio (2018):

Super-exploitation is fundamental in capital reproduction in dependent capitalism because, among other reasons, restricts the productivist spur and weakens the tendency to produce technologies and equipment in this capitalism, at once it subsumes most of the working population to predatory conditions of labor and life marked by the appropriation of part of the consumption fund (Osorio, 2018: 179-180).

The limits of the emerging citizenship with capitalism find a new form of realization impossibility in dependent and peripheral economies in the neoliberal context, disclosing the very internal limits of capitalist society.

By incorporating these general features of the neoliberalization process into the analysis, we notice they are cumbersome to build substantive citizenship —one that goes beyond the limits of liberal Marshallian citizenship— reproducer of capital. neoliberalization is at once the implementation process of certain economic policies ([pre]conditions for capital and its logic enter into every sphere of life), mechanisms which place some economies at varying levels of subordination at global level; and a transformation that encompasses the political, social, and cultural spheres, that is to say, it is a new civilization model.

In the context of citizenship, this new civility characterizes by the construction of a citizen profile, configured from the spoliation of social rights, stimulation of debt and credit, the promotion of individuation as a social phenomenon, thus turning subjects into entrepreneurs of themselves. Particularly, as regards spoliation, Harvey (2005: 100) points out that “the impossibility of accumulating by means of the continual expansion of reproduction has been compensated with an increase in the attempts to accumulate via dispossession. In this way, the State experiences a transformation of its character, as a *guarantor* of social rights to that of a *subsidiary*. This advances the commoditization of social life, at once it broadens the market scope from the privatization of basic social rights.

Furthermore, in relation with the creation of a subjectively disposed citizen profile, Marx, in *Grundrisse*, characterized “the production of capitalists and waged workers” as a fundamental product from the process of capital valorization, which Mezzadra (2014) conceptualizes from the

outsourcing). See ILO (2016) for details. Moreover, Latin American countries have a lengthy labor shift, as demonstrated by OECD studies, where Mexico and Chile surpass 44 hours a week (bbc.com, 2018).

subjectivity production formula, which has the double meaning of subjection and subjectivation.

Marx analyzed the subjection devices (State's and capital's) —which literally are actual “factories of the subject”— when he dealt with the great industry, cooperation and working shift as the literal creation of the productive disciplined subject, who constitute the resistance of the worker's body. In like manner, in neoliberal capitalism, debt is the ethical creation of indebted citizen (privately, sovereignly and socially), which is a transversal power relation that knows no boundaries nor State, dualisms of production (active /inactive, employment/unemployment, productive/unproductive) or distances between the economic, political and social” (Lazzarato, 2013: 103).

For Lazzarato (2013), the class struggle concentrates in debt, regardless of the distinction worker/unemployed, “everyone is a debtor” before capital. In this way, class struggle updates in what gave it life: property. The relationship creditor/debtor is the relationship between the proprietors and non-proprietors of capital, an issue that paradoxically takes us once again to the debate of XVIII and XIX centuries on the relationship between citizenship and property, previously commented. On the other side, debt and credit are the integration mechanisms by means of discipline (Lazzarato, 2013), but also with the clashing —of the impoverished and subaltern sectors— with the absolute and relative poverty situations they live in.

Finally, individuation responds to the very core of liberal lineage that comes from Hobbes and onward, and which as we already pointed out, responds to aspects of autonomy and freedom, of an isolated individual capable of agenting their own life, without the weight of tradition or religion.

However, in a neoliberal context, of growing inequality and lack of social protection, such individuation in terms of citizenship reduces to the negative freedom (of no interference) and the self-responsibility for actions citizens carry out to justify the place they have in society, which neither the market nor the State are responsible for; that is to say, it is what it is because of the proper capabilities, abilities and individual elections.

From the above, we find that the neoliberal stage tensions, even, the tripartite thesis of (restricted) liberal citizenship by Marshall, previously described. For in this last conception, class differences are accepted, and (civil, political, and social) rights take a form, abstract though, that configures the notion of citizenship.

The regression —of this Marshallian conception— from neoliberalism is evident. Since the consequences for the citizens are paradoxically and crudely expressed: precarious labor, reduction of social rights (universal health care, education, housing, public security, and social security, labor, wage rights, etc.) produce marginality, segregation wealth concentration and structural inequality. If we consider civil and political rights as formal and abstract (for it is difficult to choose/be chosen and struggle for the power of elites if basic social rights are not realized for the whole of society in equal conditions), we have the *impossibility* of creating substantial citizenship, i.e., a citizenship beyond the boundaries of liberal citizenship based on individuals, private property, negative liberty, and inequality-class exploitation.

Conclusion

The notion of citizenship, paradoxically, is assumed in the discourse of political, economic authorities and international agencies. And as they have fostered processes of neoliberalization and accumulation for capital at global scale, with the same movement (and discourse) generate and reproduce deep and increasing inequalities, wealth concentration, exploitation and super-exploitation of the working class —which is paid below the value of their labor force— oppression, marginalization, misery, poverty, individualism, wars, and degradation of ecosystems.

It seems that the society of capital is incompatible even with the notion of liberal citizenship and less a substitutive notion of it, more so, in the context of dependent economies, for not only does it transfigure this status, as it is defined as an action exclusive of the individual as a consumer in the market sphere —as a new public sphere— which they can access in times of social pauperization and labor flexibility from indebtedness and credit, but leaves entire regions at the disposition of central economies and the need to valorize capital.

As we have pointed out, States in dependent economies, instead of assuming autonomy regarding this dynamic, are part of such accumulation gearing, by means of two central mechanisms: generate the social, material and juridical conditions to accumulate, and grant certain civil, political and social rights for sectors without certain quality life conditions, via recognition policies, based on assistance and compensation, which help lessen discontent and social indignation, delivering vital conditions for the reproduction of life, but which also foment individualism and consumption.

In this way, citizenship forged in neoliberalism produces individuals who find means to carry out and satisfy their own interests in the world, producing indifferent subjectivity regarding their environments, and with this regarding themselves. A citizenship for capital has unsurmountable restrictions; that is to say, anticitizenship as annulation, even, of the liberal ideal Marshall theorizes after the English experience, in which the development of capitalism has not reached the voracity it presently has at global level. To the extent in which social citizenship (social rights) is still pending not only in peripheral and dependent economies, but also in central economies, civil and political rights —as Marx stated— are still formal and abstract for most of society, at planetary level.

Therefore, substantive citizenship, within the limits and logic of the capital, is impossible. Accomplishing substantive citizenship before the capital is think and unfold new forms of social interdependence outside the capitalist interchange logics, looking for other forms of social relationships focused on the common. It does not seem an easy task, even in the XX century there were no alternative projects based on the common, instead, critical projects, though supported on logics of state property, or subsumed in the basic categories of capitalism.

The return to Marx —to his critique to economy— invites us to rethink the critical categories to analyze the society of capital and places us before the challenge of also rethinking new forms of social relations from the south, but mainly, invites us to transform society and prevent the collapse which the global capitalism is leading us to, and with this, realize a substantive citizenship. Which are these roads? We shall —as a society— find them.

References

- Anderson, Perry (2003), “Neoliberalismo: un balance provisorio”, en Sader, Emir y Gentili, Pablo [comps.], *La trama del neoliberalismo. Mercado crisis y exclusión social*, Argentina: CLACSO.
- Aristóteles (2005), *Política*, España: Alianza.
- Artous, Antoine (2016), “Retorno sobre algunas dificultades y discusiones”, en Artous, A. et al. [comps.], *Naturaleza y forma del Estado Capitalista. Análisis marxistas contemporáneos*, Argentina: Herramienta.
- Artous, Antoine (2016a), *Marx, el Estado y la Política*, España: Sylone.
- bbc.com (2018), *Los países del mundo en los que se trabaja más horas (y los dos primeros son de América Latina)*. Disponible en: <https://www.bbc.com/mundo/institucional-43872427> [22 de mayo de 2018].
- Bobes, Velia Cecilia (2000), “Ciudadanía”, en Bacca, Laura et al., *Léxico de la Política*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

- Bobbio, Norberto (1993), *Liberalismo y democracia*, Colombia: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Bonnet, Alberto y Piva, Adrián [comps.], *Estado y capital. El debate alemán sobre la derivación del Estado*, Argentina: Herramienta.
- Carcanholo, Marcelo (2017), *Dependencia, superexplotación del trabajo y crisis. Una interpretación desde Marx*, España: Maia ediciones.
- Cortina, Adela (1999), *Ciudadanos del mundo. Hacia una teoría de la ciudadanía*, España: Alianza.
- Coutinho, Carlos Nelson (2011), *Marxismo y política*, Chile: LOM.
- Diccionario de la Real Academia Española. Disponible en: <http://dle.rae.es/?id=9NbSsL7> [7 de agosto de 2017].
- Dussel, Enrique (2007), *Política de la liberación. Historia mundial y crítica*, España: Trotta.
- Garretón, Manuel (2013), *Neoliberalismo corregido y progresismo limitado. Los gobiernos de la Concertación en Chile, 1990-2010*, Chile: Arcis, CLACSO y El Desconcierto.
- Harvey, David (2005), "El 'nuevo' imperialismo: acumulación por desposesión", en Socialist register, Argentina: CLACSO.
- Harvey, David (2014), *Guía para leer El Capital*, España: Akal.
- Harvey, David (2007), *Breve historia del neoliberalismo*, España: Akal.
- Heather, Derek (2007), *Ciudadanía, Una breve historia*, España: Alianza.
- Heinrich, Michael (2008), *Crítica de la economía política. Una introducción a El Capital de Marx*, España: Escolar y Mayo.
- Hobbes, Thomas (1998), *Leviatán o la materia, forma y poder de una república eclesiástica y civil*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Hobbes, Thomas (2000), *De Cive*, España: Alianza.
- Janoski, Thomas (1998), *Citizenship and Civil Society: A Framework of Rights and Obligations in Liberal, Traditional, and Social Democratic Regimes*, Estados Unidos: Cambridge University Press.
- Lagos, Felipe (2017), "Neoliberalismo como patrón de acumulación", en *El neoliberalismo y el nuevo sujeto político social en el Chile posnoventas*, Chile: Fundación CREA.
- Lazzarato, Mauricio (2013), *La fábrica del hombre endeudado. Ensayo sobre la condición neoliberal*, Argentina: Amorrortu.
- Marshall, Thomas y Bottomore, Tom (1998), *Ciudadanía y Clase Social*, España: Alianza.
- Marx, Karl (2005), *A Questao Judaica*, Brasil: Centauro editora.
- Marx, Karl (2012), *El Capital. Crítica de la Economía Política*, México: Siglo XXI.
- Marx, Karl (2007), *Elementos fundamentales para la crítica de la economía política (Grundrisse) 1857-1858*, España: Siglo XXI.
- Mezzadra, Sandro (2014), *La cocina de Marx. El sujeto y su producción*, Argentina: Tinta Limón.
- OIT (2016), "Formas atípicas de empleo en América Latina: incidencia, características e impactos en la determinación salarial", en *Serie Condiciones de Trabajo y Empleo*, núm. 76. Disponible en: http://www.ilo.org/travail/whatwedo/publications/WCMS_492723/lang-es/index.htm [20 de diciembre de 2017].
- Osorio, Jaime (2018), "Acerca de la superexplotación y el capitalismo dependiente", en *Cuadernos de Economía Crítica*, año 4, núm. 8, Argentina. Disponible en: <https://www.redalyc.org/toc.oa?id=5123&numero=57697> [18 de junio de 2018].
- Postone, Moishe (2007), *Marx Reloaded. Repensar la teoría crítica del capitalismo*, España: Traficantes de sueños.

- Poulantzas, Nicos (1998), *Las clases sociales en el capitalismo actual*, México: Siglo XXI.
- Poulantzas, Nicos (1986), *Estado, poder y socialismo*, México: Siglo XXI.
- Salama, Pierre (2016), “El Estado y sus particularidades en los países emergentes latinoamericanos: un enfoque teórico a partir de la Escuela de la Derivación”, en Artous *et al.* [comp.], *Naturaleza y forma del Estado Capitalista. Análisis marxistas contemporáneos*, Argentina: Herramienta ediciones.
- Smith, Adam (1984), *Una investigación sobre la naturaleza y la causa de la riqueza de las naciones*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Solís, José (2016), “El Estado como categoría de la crítica marxista de la economía política: el debate sobre la derivación”, en Artous *et al.* [comp.], *Naturaleza y forma del Estado Capitalista. Análisis marxistas contemporáneos*, Argentina: Herramienta ediciones.
- Žižek, Slavoj (2009), *El sublime objeto de la ideología*, España: Siglo XXI.

Paula Vidal-Molina. Dr in Social Work from Universidade Federal de Rio de Janeiro. Professor and researcher in the School of Social Sciences, Universidad de Chile, Chile. Main research lines: Marxism, justice and social inequality, labor transformations. Recent publications: Vidal, Paula [Coord.] (2019), *Neoliberalismo, neodesarrollismo y socialismo bolivariano. Modelos de desarrollo y políticas públicas en América Latina*, Chile: Ariadna Ediciones; Vidal, Paula. Grez, Sergio. and Opazo, Daniel. [Coords.] (2018), *Ciudadanías para la Democracia: reflexiones desde la problemática constitucional y constituyente chilena del siglo XXI*, Chile: Ariadna Ediciones; Vidal, Paula [Coord.] (2017), *Las caras del Trabajo Social en el mundo: Per(e)sistencias bajo el capitalismo tardío*, Chile: Ril Ediciones; Vidal, Paula [Coord.] (2016), *Trabajo Social en Chile. Un siglo de Trayectoria*, Chile: Ril Ediciones; Vidal, Paula (2016), “Sergio Grez y Foro por la Asamblea Constituyente, Asamblea Constituyente. La alternativa democrática para Chile”, in *Revista Latinoamericana Polis*, no. 43, Santiago, Chile.

Roberto Vargas-Muñoz. Dr. in Philosophy from Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso. Academician in Universidad Alberto Hurtado. Main research lines: political economy, epistemology of social sciences, and political theory. Recent publications: Narváez, Angelo and Vargas, Roberto (2014), “Prefacio a una historia inconclusa del marxismo en Chile”, in Pérez Soto, Carlos., *Marxismo: Aquí y Ahora*, Chile: Triángulo; Vidal, Paula, Vargas, Roberto, Gonzaloren, Jorge, Lara, Carlos [eds. and comps.] (2014), *Debates sobre marxismo. Continuadores, crisis del capital e izquierda*, Chile: América en Movimiento; Narváez, Ángelo and Vargas, Roberto (2012), “A modo de epílogo. La actualidad de los límites para la filosofía en Hegel”, in Espinoza, Ricardo [comp.], *Hegel. La transformación de los espacios sociales*, Chile: Editorial Midas.