**A dialectical approach to technology and its relationship to society.**

You take the blue pill - the story ends, you wake up in your bed and believe whatever you want to believe. You take the red pill - you stay in Wonderland, and I show you how deep the rabbit hole goes.
Morpheus to Neo in “The Matrix” (Wachowski 1999)

**Introduction**

In this essay I look to the dialectical theories of Marx and Adorno in an attempt to perceive a larger holistic world system in which technology operates whilst also examining the effects of technology upon society. We are living in a seductive and supportive matrix of capitalism and technology, so ubiquitous and deeply engrained, it is almost impossible to get a clear picture or understanding of its structure or how it operates. It appears that we have created a complex technology dependent society such that there is no option to extricate ourselves, nor some argue, any options for change without revolution and cataclysmic consequences.

If the breakdown is sudden, many people will die, since the world’s population

has become so overblown that it cannot even feed itself any longer without advanced technology.

(Kaczynski 1995:167)

However there is the possibility of the red pill, an awakening and an understanding of our situation and ironically, but perhaps in a dialectical fashion, the answer lies within technology mediated society itself.

I suggest that the potential enlightenment promised by the red pill might be found in Marxist theory and there are numerous proponents who argue that Marxism still has relevance to the socio-economic and cultural conditions we found ourselves in modern technological society.

Marxism Derrida insists, will manifest a continuing spectrality an uncanny refusal to stay dead and buried, that is profoundly linked to the increasingly spectral immaterial, virtual nature of contemporary techno-capitalism.
(Dyer-Witheford 1999:6)

The machines may have evolved from the steam engine and the mill, yet the modes and means of production – the power structures, notions of capital, the social struggle of class systems and divisions of labour have not changed, but have become more entrenched. Further, the complex systems of power and finance enhanced by global electronic communications result in systems where people have little understanding or control of the myriad interdependent processes that govern the value and transfer of capital.

Marx’s recognition of a holistic system and his collaborative development of the dialectic with Engels gave rise to an understanding of an invisible control system behind the capitalist system, which impacted on the power relationships between the workers and the capitalist controllers and set into motion political movements world-wide.
Is such an awakening possible in modern technological society?

To the isolated, isolation seems an indubitable certainty; they are bewitched on pain of losing their existence, not to perceive how mediated their isolation is.
(Adorno 1973:1)

Adorno (1973) draws upon the work of Marx, and suggests that we are subject to an invisible yet malevolent spell - the Bane, analogous to The Matrix. The Bane is the capitalist world system that we participate in, though its underlying principles and mechanisms remain hidden, its influences subtle - conditioning behaviour, culture, society and is inextricably bound with the development, production and consumption of technology. Adorno’s notion of the Bane coupled with the concept of negative dialectics offer a way of conceiving and understanding the conflicting bi-polar tensions of the technologically mediated world we find ourselves in, and perhaps offers us a way out, towards enlightenment, the red pill.

 **The Dialectic**

The original meaning of the term dialectic stems from the Ancient Greek, to arrive at a truth through the process of argument through dialogue. In more recent times, the dialectic is associated with Hegel and the arrival of a truth through the synthesis of thesis and antithesis.

It is of the highest importance to ascertain and understand rightly the nature of Dialectics. Wherever there is movement, wherever there is life, wherever anything is carried into effect in the actual world, there Dialectic is at work. It is also the soul of all knowledge which is truly scientific.
(Hegel 1812)

Marx took issue with Hegel’s dialectic with the view that it only related to ideas and not the real world, Marx working with Engels, grounded the dialectic on the material world and created the method of dialectical materialism.

Dialectical materialism takes into account the contradicting inter-relationships between materials, processes of production and society, culminating with the recognition of divisions of labour and class struggle. Marx believed that the economic growth of capitalism would eventually fail as a result of internal processes of contradiction.

Every economic order grows to a state of maximum efficiency, while simultaneously developing internal contradictions and weaknesses that contribute to its systemic decay. (Dialectical materialism)

Dialectical materialism can be expressed as four key principles; in the following summary I include examples to illustrate how these principles can be applied to the relationship of technology and society.

1. The world view is that of a holistic system where everything is connected and interrelated, rather than separate independent fragments. This is counter to the rather naive view of technological determinism, where technology is viewed as a separate autonomous system with a life of its own, taking into no account factors such as economics or the role of politics.
2. The natural state of the world system is that of flux, everything is continually dynamic and changing. The rate of change of technology has been accelerated by the effect of technology upon itself, the development of discrete transistors in the 1950’s to integrated circuits to the high density chips of today has been actualised through previous generations of technology.
In a positive feedback loop, technological development is increasing the rate of change not only of technology itself, but also on society as its effects becoming more prevalent as technology increasingly becomes ubiquitous.
3. Quantitative changes result in qualitative effects. A simple example being the critical rise of the distribution of and access to personal computers, from a few to its current ubiquity with the resultant changes in societal behaviour and working patterns. This concept reflects the S-shaped technology take up curve, where qualitative effects begin after approximately 10% of the market has taken up a technology, acceleration of take up parallels the qualitative effect of the acceptance and use of a technology, thereafter the curve flattens off as qualitative effects predominate.
4. Elements within a system contain internal dialectical contradictions which through processes of feedback over time result in changes to those elements. Marx believed that capitalism through its successful method of economic growth also carries the seeds for its eventual downfall.
In the technological debate, the anti-technology movement makes use of the technology of the internet to distribute its idealisms. Some may view this as a contradiction in terms, but from a dialectical perspective, the system is sowing its own seeds of critique, self-modification or possibly self-destruction.

It would be hopeless for revolutionaries to try to attack the system without using SOME modern technology. If nothing else they must use the communications media to spread their message. But they should use modern technology for only ONE purpose: to attack the technological system.
(Kaczynski 1995:202)

Individuals who are incorporated into new types of technical networks have learned to resist through the net itself in order to influence the powers that control it.

(Feenberg 1992:319)

I now refer to the work of Adorno, who from the principles of dialectics developed the philosophy of Negative Dialectics (Adorno 1973).

**Negative Dialectics**

..is a restless form of thinking which does not proceed from, or expect to arrive at a transcendental or transcendent ground or principle. Negative dialectics directs philosophy to confront the interfaces between concepts, objects, ideas, and the material world.
(Oxford Index)

Negative dialectics acts a methodology that serves as a continual way of analysing without trying to synthesise a solution, the opposite or negative of Hegel based dialectics with its aim of synthesising a higher truth through thesis and antithesis. Using this technique Adorno criticised many aspects of modern western civilisation, especially the industry of mass culture (Adorno 1994).
His thinking and approach have a direct relevance to the relationships between technology and society as I hope to demonstrate in the following discussion which engages with two key theoretical terms used by Adorno, Appearance and Bane.

 **Appearance [Schein]**

Adorno’s use of the term ‘Schein’ - appearance or semblance, is associated with late capitalism having the tendency to advertise and publicise almost everything (Redmond 2001).

This has a deep resonance for we live in a media saturated world, where life style branding is ubiquitous and inescapable in modern day technology enhanced life. Technological consumer products are continually sold through global branding and advertising, without this constant push, the capitalist mechanism of supply and production would break down.

Without constant enticement by advertising, production would slow down and level off to normal replacement demand.
(Mumford 1970)

Advertising seduces customers into buying new, better, faster, slicker and sexier consumer items.

Dichter understood that every product has an image, even a soul, and is bought not merely for the purpose it serves but for the values it seems to embody. Our possessions are extensions of our own personalities, which serve as a kind of mirror which reflects our own image.
(Dichter 1939)

Apple used lifestyle branding in its famous “Get A Mac” campaign series of adverts (Apple 2006), with the implications of the Apple consumer being a more hip, trendier and a less geeky person than the average boring looking PC customer.

The primary purpose of advertising technique is the creation of a certain way of life. And here it is much less important to convince the individual rationally than to implant in him a certain conception of life.
(Ellul 1973:406)

As consumers become aware of advertising techniques, the adverts in a dialectical sense, mirror this awareness, playing once again into the manipulation of the customer by making them feel clever that they recognise the manipulation, but this imagined sense of superiority means the advert has succeeded in the manipulation of the consumers state of mind.

The triumph of advertising in the culture industry is that consumers feel compelled to buy and use its products even though they see through them.
(Adorno 1994)

Advertising moves with the times, from the television soap adverts of the 1950’s it is now ubiquitous, subliminal and almost invisible. We are bombarded with images, slogans and branding in everyday life, on hoardings, clothes, subtle product placements in films, trademarks such as Sony, Apple, Nike and Prada are associated with perceived values and associated lifestyles.

 In today’s mode of communication we have moved beyond the one way broadcasting channel to a multiplicity of interactive internet channels, Amazon, Ebay and Google target advertising based on consumer activity. The end game is still the same, to shift product. Through advertising, Google has generated its 250$ Billion capital value (Google 2012) - its search engine has ensured the propaganda of advertising is firmly embedded within internet culture.

The driving force behind the development of consumer technology is that of profit. Without advertising, products would only be replaced when they were broken, rather than being superseded by the latest, new, faster, better, must-have product.

 **Bane [Bann]**

The Bane is akin to a malevolent yet invisible spell - the inescapable and enclosing capitalist world-system (Redmond 2001), we cannot see it, we are barely aware of its existence and yet we are trapped, entranced, conditioned and manipulated by it.

In human experience, the bane is the equivalent of the fetish-character of the commodity.
(Adorno 1973:346)

Adorno suggests we have a fetishistic relationship with the commodity, this I believe is made more so with the design of desirable technologies, especially that which is designed to be sexy, beautiful, finely made, minimalistic – objects such as the Bang and Olufsen Hifi and undoubtedly, Apple products.

The Bane hides from the consumers any negative impacts of its products, how it was made, the working conditions of the employees, the amount of raw materials that went into the product, the effect of the processes of manufacture on the environment. These are hidden from view, the message is to consume blindly and with ignorance. Any negativity is seen as Luddite, halting the force of technological progress or damaging the all-important economy.

Never before have people been so infantalized, made so dependent on the machine for everything; as the earth rapidly approaches its extinction due to technology, our souls are shrunk and flattened by its pervasive rule.
(Zerzan 1994)

Another element of the invisible Bane is the concept of exchange value, where objects are valued through cultural exchange. Adorno uses the term *Identity* to represent this idea, where objects are given an artificial symbolic exchange value relative to other objects, all of which are inextricably connected with systems of production and distribution of commodities (Redmond 2001).
Money, banking and commodities are all related through artificial yet culturally accepted systems of exchange. For most working people the concept of money is generally taken at face value – what you earn, what you have in in the bank, or in your pocket or purse, rather than viewed as an artificial system of exchange. Money is a symbolic and magical trusted spell, which can be transmuted into other material forms, or indeed to cause others to work for you under its baleful influence.

The money spell has magical power in that the more of it then the greater its power, it can make more of itself. In the technological age it is not only invisible but travels at the speed of light in secret and highly protected coded form – the spells are encrypted and indecipherable. The mass majority have to work for their meagre spells, to enable them to participate in the consuming of essentials and the products necessary to socially participate in the Bane - the television, the mobile phone, the automobile and the computer.

The few elitist magicians at the top of the pile are indeed a minority – the one percent, where the magical power of their extreme self-perpetuating wealth means everything is essentially free:

A paradoxical truth about that global elite we have learned to call the one percent is that, while they are defined by their control of a huge swathe of the world’s monetary wealth, they are at the same time the fragment of humanity whose daily lives are least dominated by money. As Charles Stross has written, the very richest inhabit an existence in which most worldly goods are, in effect, free. That is, their wealth is so great relative to the cost of food, housing, travel, and other amenities that they rarely have to consider the cost of anything. Whatever they want, they can have.
(Frase 2011)

In any analysis of society and technology the fundamental relationships of money, consumerism, production and capital must be addressed. Reductionist concepts such as technological determinism are not only woefully inadequate, but suggest that believers of such ideologies have fallen under the spell of the Bane. Two such perpetrators of Bane induced visions are Kevin Kelly and Kurzveil.

In “What Technology Wants” by Kevin Kelly (2010), Kelly likens the development of technology, the technium as he calls it, to a form of evolution and then declares the technium as the Seventh Kingdom of Life.

The technium also wants what every living system wants: to perpetuate itself, to keep itself going.
(Kelly 2010:15)

Kelly appears to be taking poetic license suggesting that the rise of technology is a natural phase of evolution - technology does not possess any of the qualities of autonomous life – it does not self-reproduce, nor pass on its genes – technology is created by people, who form part of a complex social, cultural and economic system – concepts he makes no reference to.

In chapter 10, “The Unabomber was Right”, Kelly appears to sympathise with the views of Kaczynski who believes that technology exerts a malevolent influence on humanity

The Unabomber is right that technology is a holistic self-perpetuating machine. He is also right that the selfish nature of this system causes specific harms. Certain aspects of the technium are detrimental to the human self, because they defuse our identity.
(Kelly 2010:212)

Later Kelly dismisses these views on the basis that the benefits of more freedom of choice far outweigh any potential downsides:

The machine of civilisation offers us more freedoms than the alternative.. so far the gains from this ever-enlarging technium outweigh the alternative of no machine at all.
(Kelly 2010:213)

Kelly’s logic appears to be bi-polar, we either fully embrace technology or we do not have it at all. Perhaps his reasoning is in reaction to the radical Luddite views of Kaczynski, who was very adamant both on the impact of technology on society and what should be done about it.

Assuming that industrial society survives, it is likely that technology will eventually acquire something approaching complete control over human behaviour.
 (Kaczynski 1995:153)

And

Until the industrial system has been thoroughly wrecked the destruction of that system must be the revolutionaries’ ONLY goal.
(Kaczynski 1995:200)

In the final chapter of his book Kelly brings God into the equation – with the suggestion that technology is part of the cosmos and our relationship to it is almost pre-ordained, it is dance of infinity. Kelly, it turns out has a secret Bane, he is a God Fearing Christian and appears to take the stance that the control of technology is out of our hands and in God we must trust.

Kelly, who describes himself as a devout Christian, declared that technology is actually a divine phenomenon that is a reflection of God.
(Coyne 2010)

Ray Kurzweil suffers from a different religious fervour, believing in reincarnation through the machine, that there will be a singularity (Kurzweil 2009) and machines will become not only intelligent but conscious. The next step is to then transplant human consciousness into the machine, so as to transform into a cyborg and thereafter live for ever with no human frailty. The website 2045.com serves as a platform for his techno-utopian disciples, 2045 being the prophesied year of the Great Singularity.

The 2045 website offers the chance to participate in its technological vision of immortality with its forthcoming social online network *Immortal.me.*

The denial of mortality appears to be a rejection of what it is to be human, to acknowledge death and decay is part of life - to try and deny it is to deny natural life. The denial of death is a primitive reaction generated by fear, with the subsequent overcompensation of the will to use science and technology as a means of control and power over nature.

A technology based concept of immortality should perhaps be unsurprising when conceived under the guise of science - God is dead and religion no longer offers a chance of life beyond the grave, so science is stepping in its place with a future technologically mediated heaven on earth.
The admission price is likely to be far excessive than proverbial camel trying to get through the eye of a needle.

Kelly to his credit dismisses Kurzweil’s techno-utopian fantasies, through perhaps because of his religious beliefs he feels Kurzweil is treading on contested ground.

Kevin Kelly, founding editor of future-thinking magazine Wired, labels Kurzweil a deluded dreamer who is performing the services of a prophet.
(Kurzweil 2009)

In the articles on the internet promoting Kurzweil’s vision, there is no mention of any consequences, problems or negative aspects with his vision – it is a typical technology dominant way of thinking. There are no issues to be overcome; the singularity will simply happen because of the rapid advancement and convergence of nano, biological and digital technology. This vision parallels the wishful thinking of researchers in the 1960’s who believed that Artificial Intelligence was just round the corner, which to this day has still not materialised. Apart from the technical issues, there are the financial and economic implications, let alone the societal impact of any independent technological intelligence. I doubt whether Kurzweil is aware of any critique of technical utopias, and suspect he would simply dismiss them as irrelevant to the unstoppable march of technology in which he has a vested interest.

Those who feel most comfortable in Technopoly are those who are convinced that technical progress is humanity's superhuman achievement and the instrument by which our most profound dilemmas may be solved.
(Postman 1993:71)

Kurzweil appears to be blinded and possessed by a techno-utopian Bane, that technology can and indeed must solve any problem facing humanity, even though many of these are caused by the rampant advance of technology itself. This logic is flawed, it is spiralling positive feedback loop, the more technology is used, the more problems it creates and the more technology is required.

We have cultivated a special relationship to technology wherein needs and conflicts are almost invariably formulated as technical problems requiring technical solutions' [what are usually called 'technical fixes'].
(Mowshowitz 1976:256)

Kurzweil’s Bane is that of the technological imperative:

Arnold Pacey suggests that the technological imperative is commonly taken to be 'the lure of always pushing toward the greatest feat of technical performance or complexity which is currently available'.
(Pacey 1983:79)

The complex *constellation* (Redmond 2001) in which Kurzweil is situated embraces financial institutions and mega corporations such as Google, who have a vested interest in the development and distribution of technology, the motives are profit and global domination. It would not make any sense for any of these concerns to question any advance in technology, it is their fuel and their snake oil, faster brighter, more ubiquitous, intelligent, pervasive, global and all encompassing. The constellation is a myriad set of actors and networks, each reinforcing the drives and ambitions of all of the other related elements. Profit is technology and technology is profit. Advances in technology give a cutting edge over any competition, the global consumer market is its lifeblood and the passive players who are made to feel that they have freedom of choice, that they are pro-active consumers.
The Bane is a complex masterful and magical spell entrapping us all.

In the next section I argue that our interactions with technology are addictive and impact on how we think and behave, forming another aspect of the socially entrancing Bane.

 **Techno-Addiction**

Research suggests that people are experiencing psychological problems associated with addictive behaviour to mobile phones, the internet, computer games and social media sites, below are a few example citations.

A 2010 survey found that 61 percent of Americans (even higher among young people) say they are addicted to the Internet. Another survey reported that addicted was the word most commonly used by people to describe their relationship to technology.  One study found that people had a harder time resisting the allure of social media than they did for sex, sleep, cigarettes, and alcohol. young adults spend up to seven hours a day interacting with communication technology and their behaviour can spill over into a problem.
(Hirschhorn 2013)

Chinese researchers recently compared the brain scans of average Internet users to the brain scans of Internet obsessives.  The small study found changes in the areas responsible for decision-making, emotions, and self-control – the same areas that are affected in substance abusers.
(Hopper & Schmitz 2012)

Withdrawal symptoms experienced by young people deprived of gadgets and technology is compared to those felt by drug addicts or smokers going cold turkey, a study has concluded.
(Hough 2011)

Is addiction to technology really an issue? Yes. We're talking about people feeling out of control in relation to some behaviour or stimulus or substance, and compelled to use it more than is good for them. They recognize that it is interfering with the quality of their lives; that is a basic definition of an addiction.
(Snyder 2012)

In his manifesto, Kaczynski also makes the link to addiction

Never forget that the human race with technology is just like an alcoholic with a barrel of wine.
(Kaczynski 1995:203)

In 2012, technology addiction became the subject of the first International Congress of its type.

The aim of the Congress is to raise awareness about technology addiction - spread quickly in our country and around the world and known as a disease of our age.
http://www.congressoftechnologyaddiction.org/

Others argue that having technology always ready at hand means we are continuously distracted and our attention spans have become limited.

We are creating and encouraging a culture of distraction where we are increasingly disconnected from the people and events around us and increasingly unable to engage in long-form thinking. People now feel anxious when their brains are unstimulated.
(Kraus 2012)

Our addiction to ubiquitous media technology causes us to continually multitask - text, email, twitter, post, search, watch, listen.

People aren't taking time for mental reflection anymore. We are continually responding to incoming stimuli and feel tremendous pressure to be in touch which interferes with our ability to slow down and calm down. We are often multi-tasking, so it's very difficult to restrict ourselves to a single point of focus and think creatively.
(Case 2012)

Information overload and multitasking is affecting our ability to think and concentrate, especially in the young.

Our research has shown that multitasking can have an insidious effect on learning, changing the brain systems that are involved so that even if one can learn while multitasking, the nature of that learning is altered to be less flexible. This effect is of particular concern given the increasing use of devices by children during studying.
(Poldrack 2010)

It appears that not only have we created a rapidly advancing technological world system that has captivated us entirely, and as a species we would not be able to survive without its support, but that the technical systems of mediation, information and networking are dulling our abilities to think and recognise the problems. We have created a mind numbing and addictive drug-like soma world of technology fetishism.

 **Conclusion**

In this essay I have attempted to portray a picture of how technology is deeply embedded within the capitalist system of consumerism and its associated self-perpetuating mechanisms of advertising and product fetishism. I have also suggested that we cannot extricate ourselves from the embrace of technology, that it is addictive and effects the way we behave and think.

Ironically, or perhaps dialectically, in a self-reflective fashion, it is the technological matrix of communications that presents to us theories and debates on the impact of technology on society. Without the internet or the computer, this essay and the wide ranging research of its subject matter would not have been possible.

Theory however, has little power over the holistic capitalist technological system which has a momentum and inertia that we in the western world are all tied into. It seems impossible to get off the merry-go-round without severe injury.

Kaczynski (1995: 200) tells us that we have to jettison technology completely to find ourselves again, that there is no middle ground:

..because modern technology is a unified, tightly organized system, so that, in order to retain SOME technology, one finds oneself obliged to retain MOST technology, hence one ends up sacrificing only token amounts of technology.
(Kaczynski 1995:200)

Kaczynski believed the only solution was to completely destroy the technological system, recognising that much of humanity would perish in the process. His views resonate with the anarcho-primitivists, who see technology and civilisation as power structures that have to be dismantled.

Primitivists hold that, following the emergence of agriculture, the growing masses of humanity subtly became evermore beholden to technological processes (technoaddiction) and abstract power structures arising from the division of labour and hierarchy.

Civilization is seen as the underlying problem or root of oppression, and must therefore be dismantled or destroyed.
(Anarcho-Primitivism)

In his Marxist analysis of technology and society, Dyer-Witheford offers three alternative perspectives.

Scientific Socialism, which sees techno-science as a central agent in a dialectical drama culminating in the inevitable defeat of capital; neo-Luddism, which focuses on technology as instrument of capitalist domination; and post-Fordist perspectives, which often look to the possibility of a technologically mediated reconciliation between labor and capital.
(Dyer-Witheford 1999:77)

It seems unlikely that the technological civilisation will be destroyed by any anarchic movements, unless it collapses of its own accord through a breakdown of the financial system or the failing supply of energy and raw materials.

Scientific Socialism suggests that Socialism will be the natural outcome after the collapse of Capitalism.

Neo-Luddism represents a set of viewpoints that are distinctly anti-technology, yet serve to bring into awareness social aspects of the technology dominated system we find ourselves in, such as the writings of Adorno.

Post-Fordism represents modern day working methods, conditions and systems beyond the factory production line.

In the UK the overwhelming tendency at present is post-Fordist in the guises of “The Digital Economy” and “The Creative Industries”.

We are still slave to the machine, though our labours are that of creating and participating in digital mediation with all its inherent addictive and psychological effects.

However the Fordist factories of production continue to exist in China where people labour, often poorly paid and in sweatshop conditions, on conveyor belts of automatism to produce the electronic hardware for use by the creative industries.

Workers cannot earn a living wage from normal working hours alone, and must work excessive overtime hours in order to earn enough money to survive.

In all ten factories, the labor intensity is extremely high. For example, workers in an HP production line must complete an action every three seconds, standing for ten consecutive hours each day.
(China Labor Watch 2008)

Can we continue to accept a technologized world where the capitalistic dialectics of technology consumerism produce poverty, pollution and exploitation? Is the modern technology dependent world a fabrication, a surrogate for a more realistic earth bound life? Are we living in the Matrix and rather than changing the status quo, do we simply refuse to take the red pill of enlightenment, or will it be forced upon us by the inevitable collapse of the overburdened techno-capitalist system heading towards a catastrophe that we are powerless to stop?

From a Marxist viewpoint the contradictions revealed through dialectical materialism are the source of productive change within society, the beginnings of struggle, if not revolution.

Nothing comes into being except through struggle; struggle is involved in the development of all things; and it is through struggle that things are negated and pass away. Conflict and contradiction are inevitable. Dialectical materialism does not regard struggle and contradiction with horror. Conflict for it is not merely nullifying. Struggle, and the negativity involved in it, are not merely destructive, but also productive.
(Sayers 2012)

Neo chose to continue to live in the artificial world of the Matrix, acknowledging its implicit contradictions, yet to spread the word and awaken others to their plight, a sentiment echoed by Dyer-Witheford in the conclusion of Cyber-Marx:

Deepening and expanding this process of recomposition depends on interconnection between many and disparate movements at different points along capitalism’s circuits. Ironically, the conversations necessary for creation of the new combination are now being conducted across the world-spanning communication networks that information-age capital has itself created.
(Dyer-Witheford 1999:514)

Working in a dialectical and reflexive manner through the medium of globally connected technologies, it is the exchange and development of contemporary Marxist ideologies that represent the red pill of enlightenment.
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