



12th Summer School in Political Philosophy and Public Policy

*The Workings of Capital: Perspectives on
Exploitation in Law, Labor, and Distribution*

July 15-17, 2021

University of Minho, Braga

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

CONTENTS

Nicholas Vrousalis (Erasmus University Rotterdam)	4
Lecture #1 – “Exploitation as Domination”	4
Lecture #3 – “What is Structural Exploitation?”	4
Martin O’Neill (University of York)	4
Lecture #2 – “The Meidner Approach to Rewiring Work: The Case for Collective Capital Institutions (co-authored paper with Markus Furendal)”	4
Lecture #5 – “Justice, Power, and Participatory Socialism: On Piketty’s Capital and Ideology”	5
Bruno Lamas (University of Lisbon – ISEG)	5
Lecture #4 – “Worse than Exploitation: Superfluity and Expulsion in the Decomposition of Capitalism”	5
Katharina Pistor (Columbia Law School)	6
Lecture #6 – “Theorizing beyond the Code of Capital”	6
Panel A – Exploitation: Issues in Freedom and Justice	7
Kai-li Cheng (University of Warwick)	7
Callum MacRae (The Graduate Center, CUNY)	7
Omar Bachour (Queen’s University, Canada)	8
Panel B – Exploitation in the Urban Space	10
Alessandro Falconieri (Université de Paris)	10
Guillermo López Morlanes (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)	10
Panel C – Exploitation in Reproductive Labor	12
Belén Liedo (IFS-CSIC and Universidad Complutense de Madrid)	12
Lavender McKittrick-Sweitzer (Butler University)	12
Panel D – Exploitation in the Digital Sphere	14
Luna Morcillo Gómez (Université Libre de Bruxelles)	14
Jamie Kelly (Vassar College)	14
Panel E – Exploitation, Autonomy and Suffering in Neoliberal Labour Management	16
Pablo López Álvarez (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)	16
Clara Navarro Ruiz (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)	16
Sergio Vega Jiménez (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)	16
Panel F – Expanding the Boundaries of Exploitation	18
Balam Nedim Kenter (Concordia University, Montréal)	18
Nicola Mulkeen (University of Warwick)	18
Panel G – Exploitation in and beyond the Market	20
Katerina Psaroudaki (University of Cyprus)	20
Amy Thompson (University of Oxford)	20

LECTURES

NICHOLAS VROUSALIS (ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM)

E-mail: vrousalis@esphil.eur.nl

LECTURE #1 – “EXPLOITATION AS DOMINATION”

Thursday 15, 9:45 – 11:15

Abstract: *This paper argues that domination is violation of the requirements of rightful individual freedom: subjection of purposiveness to the choices of others. Applied to work, such subjection entails unjust unilateral control over the productive purposiveness of others. The paper introduces the Non-Servitude Proviso, which grounds the subjected-purposiveness idea on a number of possible justifications: Kantian, republican, and recognitional. Exploitation is what happens when unilateral control over labour translates into unreciprocated labour flow. The paper applies the Proviso to capital with the help of a simple economic model and discusses its implications for ‘clean’ capitalist accumulation. Capital, I argue, is monetized title to unilateral control over the labour of others.*

LECTURE #3 – “WHAT IS STRUCTURAL EXPLOITATION?”

Friday 16, 9:30 – 11:00

Abstract: *This paper draws upon the feminist and republican literature to argue for the cogency of the idea of structural domination. It then applies that idea to capitalist economic structure. The paper defends a definition of structural domination as regulated domination: any given instance of domination is structural just when it involves a triadic relation between dominator, dominated and regulator—any social role or norm that contributes non-contingently to the reproduction of the dominator-dominated dyad. The paper then illustrates two general ways in which capitalist transactions manifest structural exploitation. The first involves vertical authority relations between capitalists and workers—the standard labour-market case. The second involves horizontal market relations between workers in different (and possibly democratic) firms. These two cases illustrate the difference between a hired and an unhired servitude, the dividends to which constitute exploitation.*

Biographical note: Nicholas Vrousalis is Associate Professor at the Erasmus School of Philosophy of Erasmus University Rotterdam. He read economics at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he received the Harcourt Prize in Economics. He subsequently migrated to political philosophy, receiving a doctorate from Oxford, where he was supervised by G.A. Cohen. Before coming to Rotterdam, Vrousalis taught moral and political philosophy at Cambridge, as a University Lecturer, at Leiden, as Assistant Professor, and at KU Leuven, as a Postdoctoral Fellow. He has held fellowships at UC Louvain, as an ARC Fellow, at Princeton University, where he was a Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Fellow, and at Aarhus University, where he held a EURIAS/COFUND Fellowship. His research focuses on distributive ethics, democratic theory, and the history of political thought, with emphasis on Kant, Hegel, and Marx.

MARTIN O’NEILL (UNIVERSITY OF YORK)

E-mail: martin.oneill@york.ac.uk

LECTURE #2 – “THE MEIDNER APPROACH TO REWIRING WORK: THE CASE FOR COLLECTIVE CAPITAL INSTITUTIONS (CO-AUTHORED PAPER WITH MARKUS FURENDAL)”

Thursday 15, 16:30 – 18:00

Abstract: *Thomas Piketty's empirical work has shown that over time the returns to different factors of production are likely increasingly to favour the owners of capital over those who earn their income through selling their labour. The question therefore arises as to what kinds*

of economic institutions can socialise increasing returns to capital, so that this shift in factor shares does not continue to accelerate overall income inequality. This article examines the case for at least a partial solution to this problem via the exploration of a road not taken: development of the kind of 'wage-earner funds' that were initially proposed by Rudolf Meidner in the 1970, and which have recently come to be viewed as a potential institutional suggestion by democratic socialists on both sides of the Atlantic.

LECTURE #5 – “JUSTICE, POWER, AND PARTICIPATORY SOCIALISM: ON PIKETTY’S CAPITAL AND IDEOLOGY”

Saturday 17, 10:30 – 12:00

Abstract: *Thomas Piketty’s Capital and Ideology constitutes a landmark achievement in furthering our understanding of the history of inequality, and presents valuable proposals for constructing a future economic system that would allow us to transcend and move beyond contemporary forms of capitalism. In my lecture I discuss Piketty’s conceptions of ideology, property, and ‘inequality regimes’, and analys his approach to social justice and its relation to the work of John Rawls. I examine how Piketty’s proposals for ‘participatory socialism’ would function not only to redistribute income and wealth, but also to disperse economic power within society, and I discuss the complementary roles of redistribution and predistribution in his proposals, and Piketty’s place in a tradition of egalitarian political economy associated with James Meade and Anthony Atkinson. Having elaborated on Piketty’s account of the relationship between economic policy and ideational change, and his important idea of the ‘desacralization’ of private property, I develop ‘seven theses’ on his proposals for participatory socialism, examining areas in which his approach could be enhanced or extended, so as to create a viable twenty-first century version of democratic socialism.*

Biographical note: Martin O’Neill is Senior Lecturer in Political Philosophy at the University of York. He works on social justice and inequality, and on various issues at the intersection of political philosophy, political economy, and public policy. Martin has published in journals such as *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, *Ethics*, the *Journal of Political Philosophy*, and the *Journal of Social Philosophy*. He is co-editor of *Property-Owning Democracy: Rawls and Beyond* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), and of *Taxation and Political Philosophy* (OUP, forthcoming).

BRUNO LAMAS (UNIVERSITY OF LISBON – ISEG)

E-mail: bl.urban@gmail.com

LECTURE #4 – “WORSE THAN EXPLOITATION: SUPERFLUITY AND EXPULSION IN THE DECOMPOSITION OF CAPITALISM”

Friday 16, 16:30 – 18:00

Abstract: *Karl Marx uses the term “exploitation” with two distinct meanings: as a general abstraction, whose content is not entirely determined and which even today is often interpreted transhistorically or as a moral category; and a second meaning, developed in the works of his more mature phase dedicated to the critique of political economy, associated with the theoretical clarification of the social production of “surplus value”. Although much more precise, this second meaning is not entirely free from ambiguities, some of which have ended up being aggravated by successive interpretations that are based on a general or indeterminate notion of exploitation. In this lecture, at first, I will try to overcome these ambiguities around the concept of exploitation by highlighting some of the fundamental aspects of the Marxian critique of the capitalist social form, namely that capital is a contradictory form of “abstract wealth” (Marx), socially and historically specific to modern society, based on the undifferentiated combustion of human energy socially represented in the fetisibistic forms of commodities and money. In a second moment, I would like to illustrate the disastrous effects of current objective tendencies of social superfluity and expulsion immanent to the historical trajectory of capitalism, considering one of the contemporary problems increasingly interpreted with a vague and moralistic notion of “exploitation”, the so-called “modern slavery”.*

Biographical note: Bruno Lamas is currently a PhD student in Economic and Organizational Sociology in UL-ISEG, Lisbon School of Economics and Management, where he is working on his dissertation on “The Metamorphoses of Modern Slavery: Labour, Self-ownership and the Problem of Slavery in the History of Capitalism.” He is currently an FCT Fellow (Portuguese Science and Technology Foundation). From 2004 to 2017 Bruno Lamas worked in the fields of urbanism and urban and regional planning.

KATHARINA PISTOR (COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL)

E-mail: kpisto@law.columbia.edu

LECTURE #6 – “THEORIZING BEYOND THE *CODE OF CAPITAL*”

Saturday 17, 18.30 – 20:00

Abstract: *Capital, I argue in “The Code of Capital”, is coded in law. The legal coding ensure that holders of capital enjoy legally enforceable rights that give them a comparative advantage over others. This is the source of wealth, and because access to these coding strategies is uneven, also the cause for inequality. Law, not a personified state, is foregrounded in this story. Law derives its power from how societies configure access to the centralized means of coercion. This, I will argue is where one can locate, reform and reconfigure “the state”.*

Biographical note: Katharina Pistor is Edwin B. Parker Professor of Comparative Law at the Columbia Law School (Columbia University, New York). She is a leading scholar and writer on corporate governance, money and finance, property rights, and comparative law and legal institutions. Pistor is the author or co-author of nine books. Her most recent book, *The Code of Capital: How the Law Creates Wealth and Inequality* examines how assets such as land, private debt, business organizations, or knowledge are transformed into capital through contract law, property rights, collateral law, and trust, corporate, and bankruptcy law.

PANELS

PANEL A – EXPLOITATION: ISSUES IN FREEDOM AND JUSTICE

Thursday 15, 11:30 – 13:15

KAI-LI CHENG (UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK)

Why Exploitation is Unjust for Egalitarians: Two Approaches

Abstract: This paper explores why exploitation is unjust for egalitarians. For contemporary egalitarians, exploitation represents a specific category worthy of their attention because a society of equals cannot be exploitative. Thus, contemporary egalitarians must be able to deal properly with exploitation; otherwise, their egalitarian proposal is incomplete. To be complete, any theory of egalitarian justice has to pass what I shall call the exploitation objection, which asserts that an account of egalitarian justice that fails to include a plausible account of the injustice of exploitation is inadequate.

I start by formulating two distinct ways to perceive the injustice of exploitation, namely, the Derivative approach and the Free-standing approach. Roughly stated, the Derivative approach holds that exploitation is unjust so long as it stems from a prior background injustice; the Free-standing approach holds that exploitation is unjust on its own, regardless of its history. Each approach consists of three sub-claims: the causal claim, the normative claim, and the egalitarian claim. The causal claim is about whether exploitation must stem from a prior background injustice; the normative claim concerns whether exploitation is a distinct injustice irreducible to other injustice; the egalitarian claim contests that whether the source of B's disadvantage (and A's advantage) is relevant for assessing whether or not A's advantage-taking behavior is just or unjust. Leading luck egalitarians, such as G. A. Cohen (1995), John Roemer (1982b, 1998), Richard Arneson (2013) and Hillel Steiner (1984, 1987, 1994), endorse the Derivative approach. On the contrary, Karl Marx (1875, 1990) and Mark Reiff (2013) adopt the Free-standing approach.

Having formulated two distinct ways to perceive the injustice of exploitation, I object to the Derivative approach because exploitation can arise even under just background conditions, via just steps. In other words, exploitation is ahistorical in character, which means exploitation need not stem from background injustice. More importantly, contra the Derivative approach, I argue that the source of B's disadvantage (and A's advantage) is irrelevant for assessing whether or not A's advantage-taking behavior is just or unjust. The Derivative approach, thus, fails to notice what I term: option-luck exploitation, that is, exploitation stems from people's purely option luck (good or bad).

The implausibility of the Derivative approach has two implications. First, luck egalitarians who endorse the Derivative approach fail to deal with option-luck exploitation. Therefore, the luck egalitarian treatment of exploitation is incomplete. Luck egalitarianism remains an incomplete theory of egalitarian justice. Second, the Free-standing approach offers a better understanding of the injustice of exploitation, namely, exploitation is unjust on its own regardless of its history.

Biographical note: I studied my PhD degree at the department of Politics and International Studies in the University of Warwick, UK. I passed my thesis viva last December and received my PhD this February. My thesis was supervised by Adam Swift, Matthew Clayton, and Simon Caney. It answers three distinct but related questions: what is exploitation, why exploitation is unjust for egalitarians, and why sweatshop labor is all-things-considered morally impermissible.

CALLUM MACRAE (THE GRADUATE CENTER, CUNY)

Exploitation, Equality, and Solidarity

Abstract: Recent philosophical work on the wrongness of exploitation has coalesced around a central divide – between distributional accounts of the wrongness of exploitation on the one hand, and relational accounts on the other. According to the former, exploitation is wrong when and because of facts about the distribution of a particular good between the relevant parties. According to the latter, exploitation is wrong when and because of facts about the character of the social relations that obtain between the relevant parties. This divide parallels a strikingly similar divide in recent work on the nature of egalitarianism, which has likewise featured an ongoing dispute between those who

take equality to be fundamentally a matter of distributions, and those who take it to be fundamentally a matter of the character of social relations.

This parallel creates a natural alliance between the relational accounts of the wrongness of exploitation and relational accounts of the nature of equality. Although this kinship has been noted in the literature (e.g., Phillips, 2017, and Arneson, 2016), it has not been explored in great detail. (Most relational accounts of the wrongness of exploitation couch their arguments in terms of freedom rather than equality (e.g., Vrousalis, 2018).) Nevertheless, whether it be vulnerability-based views that emphasise that exploitation involves a failure of respect (Wood, 1995; Vrousalis 2013), or domination-based views that emphasise that exploitation involves relations of subordination and servitude (Vrousalis 2016, 2018) – relational accounts of the wrongness of exploitation lend themselves well to being cast in the terms of relational or social egalitarianism.

In this paper I take up the broad parameters of this relational approach to the wrongness of exploitation and extend it in a novel direction by examining exploitation's relationship with a different relational ideal: solidarity. (In this regard I follow Gilabert, 2020.) In particular, I argue that we can fruitfully understand the wrongness of exploitation as residing not just in its incompatibility with egalitarian social relationships, but also with its incompatibility with solidaristic social relationships. Further still, I argue that although exploitation's connection to equality seems to account for the weightiness of more morally grave instances of exploitation, the contra-solidaristic account seems to apply in a broader range of cases. Though the most morally serious instances of exploitation involve inequalitarian social relations, not all morally troubling instances do; and the relational ideal account of solidarity can explain what's wrong with exploitation in those equality-consistent cases.

The account that emerges paves the way for a pluralistic, relational account of the wrongness of exploitation. When it is wrong, exploitation is wrong by virtue of its constituting social relationships that are incompatible with various relational ideals – equality and solidarity are two such ideals and reflecting on the value of each helps to highlight different aspects of what is wrong with exploitation. I conclude by showing how this sort of view can be used to defuse the apparent power of a series of counterexamples, due to Arneson (2016), which have been taken to be decisive against the vulnerability-account of the wrongness of exploitation.

Biographical note: I am a doctoral student, working with Professor Carol Gould, at the Graduate Center, CUNY. I received a BA in PPE from Oxford University in 2015, and an MPhil in Philosophy from the Graduate Center, CUNY, in 2020. I have worked at the Journal of Social Philosophy since early 2020 and took over as Managing Editor in January of 2021. My research is in political and social philosophy, and particularly the philosophical foundations of socialism. Though I have ongoing research interests in the history of political thought – particularly Marx, Marxism and socialist thought – my doctoral thesis will be on more contemporary issues in political philosophy. In my dissertation, I defend the idea that solidarity can be conceived of as a relational ideal, in structurally analogous terms to the way in which relational egalitarians have argued that we should understand equality.

OMAR BACHOUR (QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, CANADA)

Exploitation, Human Flourishing, and the Limits of Moral Critique

Abstract: Critiques of capitalism as a social formation that undermines human flourishing can be divided into three categories or clusters: (i) functionalist critique, (ii) moral critique, and (iii) ethical critique. Functionalist critique is based on the idea that capitalism will, in the process of reproducing itself, give rise to internal contradictions that undermine it. Being intrinsically dysfunctional, capitalism is crisis-prone and self-destabilizing in the long run. Traditionally, however, the concept of exploitation has been formulated in the language of moral critique. Moral critique is based on the notion of justice in which a social formation is evaluated in terms of the fairness of its distribution of opportunities, privileges, resources, etc. For example, in traditional Marxism, exploitation is the result of the private ownership of the means of production and the appropriation of surplus-value (which eventually gives rise to a functionalist contradiction in which the relations of production become impediments to the full development of productive forces). And in contemporary political philosophy, the assertion that a social formation is unfair or unjust is often formulated in terms of an unequal distribution which is the result of morally arbitrary differences in people's circumstances.

My central contention in this paper is twofold. First, I argue that the moral critique of exploitation, while important in its own right, is incomplete and hence limited in both diagnostic and emancipatory potential. The idea is not that justice is irrelevant to an account of exploitation, or that the "good" takes priority over the "right," but that the moral critique of exploitation under-describes the ways in which it undermines human flourishing—which takes us to the

second point. The advantage of ethical critique is that it allows for a “thicker” form of social critique than its moral counterpart. Ethical critique evaluates a social formation based on whether it enables or hinders human flourishing. Rather than focusing solely on distribution and employing the language of fair/unfair, just/unjust, right/wrong, etc., ethical critique targets the general character and development of capitalist social formations, including pathogenic features of capitalist exploitation, which function as a source of alienation, commodification, and a ruptured self-world relation. These concepts enable ethical critique to diagnose a host of social ills that its moral counterpart is constitutively incapable of disclosing.

It follows from this that ethical critique is intended to supplement (rather than supplant) the functionalist and moral critiques of exploitation. I argue that it accomplishes this in two ways: (i) it points to lacunae in the terrain of contemporary political philosophy and traditional moral critiques of exploitation that undermine human flourishing without necessarily being immoral or unjust; and (ii) it ensures that the values undergirding the moral critique—equality, fairness, justice, etc.—are realized in practice, since the limits of the moral critique of exploitation will occlude a full analysis of the socially produced obstacles that undermine them.

Biographical note: Omar Bachour's current research focuses on the concepts of alienation, labour, and work in late modernity. His PhD explores how an ethical-formal account of of alienation in political theory can diagnose a host of social pathologies missed by current theories of justice and pave the way for a post-work society that challenges the naturalization of work.

PANEL B – EXPLOITATION IN THE URBAN SPACE

Thursday 15, 15:00 – 16:15

ALESSANDRO FALCONIERI (UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS)

The Role of Urbanisation in the Production of (Surplus) Value: Rethinking Exploitation and Anti-capitalist Struggles in the Space of “Metropolis”

Abstract: The aim of this proposal is to question the concept of exploitation within the process of global urbanisation and its links with the contemporary transformations of the world of labour since the structural crisis of industrial capitalist mode of production. While Marx’s analysis developed in “Capital” offers a lucid theory of the modern capitalist production in a factory-based system, the current socio-economic context demands to rethink our philosophical and political categories for a better understanding of the new forms of exploitation and, consequently, of the new type of struggles to be organised. In this regard, we would like to consider some reflexions of the Marxist geographer David Harvey and the Operaist thinking of Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt to open a discussion about the close relation between contemporary urbanisation, capitalist exploitation and anti-capitalist movements. The fundamental question we will work on is the following one: should we look at the phenomenon of urbanisation as a simple and contingent expression of the capitalist mode of production, or should we rather take it into account as a necessary component for the capitalist system and its reproducibility?

Firstly, by following Harvey’s topic we will argue that urbanisation processes have always been crucial in the history of capitalism – since at least the Hausmann’s architectural revolution in Paris during the second half of the 19th century –, and they have become increasingly significant with the most recent role of financial speculations in cities’ modernisation since the 80’s. Secondly, the Operaist approach of Negri and Hardt will allow to consider and complete Harvey’s point through an original theory of the post-Fordist model of exploitation : while factories and more generally industrial production have essentially lost their centrality in late-life capitalism, their thesis is that our “metropolises” are today the principal space of capitalist and biopolitical extraction of surplus value. In that sense, metropolises and the differential multiplicity of subjects inhabiting them would replace Fordist factories and their traditional workers as respectively the main place and the main subjectivity of the Marxist anti-capitalist critique.

These two arguments will deserve more insights, but if we share their logical structure and their goals, Harvey’s and the Operaist reflexions will allow us to supplement this proposal with a further question : how can we conceptualise the most recent radical groups such as “Occupy Wall Street”, the “Indignados” or the “Gilets jaunes” ? Do they emerge as street movements that aim to contrast the same forms of late-capitalist exploitation ? Our hypothesis is that interpreting their struggles in terms of a general critique of neoliberal system, the European Union’s “austerity” or the economy’s financialization would be too simplistic. Considering contemporary exploitation as a peculiar form of urban life’s exploitation, we would then propose a critical reading of the Operaist concept of “metropolis”, in order to problematise how urban spaces can be considered as one of the most important forms of extraction of surplus value and, at the same time, a potential reorganisation of the “common good”.

Biographical note: Alessandro is a master student in Sociology and Political Philosophy at the University of Paris, where he is writing his thesis under the supervision of Professor Patrick Cingolani. In his thesis he focuses on the relations between platform capitalism and the new forms of urban spaces’ exploitation, from both a Foucauldian and an Operaist perspective. He holds a master’s degree in political philosophy from the Université Paris 8 Vincennes (2018-2020) and a bachelor’s degree from the University of Padua (2014-2017). His research interests cross several fields, from political philosophy to sociology of work and urban theory.

GUILLERMO LÓPEZ MORLANES (UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID)

Basic Health Zones in Madrid during the Pandemic. Mobility and Urban Exploitation

Abstract: The exploitation of the territory is fundamental to understand the way neoliberalism produces space and the consequent uneven geographical development (Harvey, 2019). The new neoliberal order, after the financial crisis of 2007-2008, also requires reconsidering the role of cities in the production and perpetuation of those inequalities (Merrifield, 2014), understanding at the same time the specificity of urban space production in current capitalism. However, the classic concept of exploitation of labor is not sufficient to correctly explain the precise way in which the exploitation of urban territory takes place. A broader analytical framework is needed to comprehend the

reproduction of general living conditions (Gago, 2015). The production of urban space, as well as the different ways of interacting within it, is an important aspect of these conditions (Rodó, 2021).

This presentation aims to focus on the concept of ‘mobility’ and the theoretical opportunities that the introduction of this category offers for the analysis of labor exploitation in urban environments. For this purpose, we will examine the mobility restrictions in Madrid during COVID-19 pandemic. Particularly important here is the delimitation of the city in the so-called ‘basic health zones’. These demarcations indicate clear frontiers between neighborhoods to easily control the spread of disease. They could not be crossed during leisure time permitted by local authorities during lockdown. Nevertheless, workpeople could move to another basic health zone to go to work. These displacements usually involve long journeys, and time spent in public transport is not taken into account in work schedules. Especially within pandemic, these journeys were made frequently on crowded public transport, and many times from more precarious and poorer areas to others with higher economic incomes. This example of spatial segregation is related to deeper trends of ‘urban deconcentration’ and inequality and, at the same time, connects with social demands that seek for ‘spatial justice’ trying to bring closer places of work and dwell (Soja, 2010).

Biographical note: Guillermo López Morlanes is a predoctoral researcher and PhD Candidate at the Complutense University of Madrid. He is a member of the research project «Precaritylab: Labour precarity, body and damaged life. A research on social philosophy» and his main investigation interests are aesthetic and social philosophy of classic and contemporary Critical Theory and urban studies.

PANEL C – EXPLOITATION IN REPRODUCTIVE LABOR

Friday 16, 11:15 – 12:30

BELÉN LIEDO (IFS-CSIC AND UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID)

Extractivism and Exploitation of Reproductive Labor: A Conversation between Nancy Fraser and Silvia Federici

Abstract: Reproductive labor can be understood as the network of life-sustaining activities that made possible both the preserving of human life and the creation of dignity-enabling conditions for that life. Care, parallelly, involves a certain kind of subjectivity, understanding the self as an open, connected and intrinsically dependent being (Butler 2021). The forms in which capitalism appropriates reproductive labor and care are variable and complex.

In this presentation, we aim to analyze the dual character of reproductive labor. In a sense, life-sustaining activities and the social bonds resulting of them have been understood as a fundamental resistance to neoliberalism ideology, both as a practice and as ethico-political discourse. Feminism have largely entrusted this transformation capacity in recent years. But, on the other hand, neoliberalism seems to phagocytize reproductive activities in new and specific forms of appropriation (Fraser 2020).

Particularly, we can identify the appropriation and invisibilization of reproductive work by the neoliberal ideology as extractivism practices. To explore this approach, we will compare the analysis of Nancy Fraser and Silvia Federici about reproductive labor in neoliberalism. Special attention will be paid to the role played by debt as a key extractive strategy inflicted to subjugated/feminized population (Cavallero & Gago 2019).

Biographical note: Belén Liedo is a predoctoral researcher and Ph.D. Candidate at Institute of Philosophy of the National Spanish Research Council and the Complutense University of Madrid. Her work focuses on care, vulnerability, applied ethics, and disruptive technologies, with special attention to gender perspective and feminist theory as a transversal concern. She is part of several research projects at a national and international level.

LAVENDER MCKITTRICK-SWEITZER (BUTLER UNIVERSITY)

The Conditions of Care Exploitation

Abstract: Care exploitation pervades our lives. Consider the public-school teachers that care about helping children achieve their goals by providing them with a proper education and are expected to do so by parents, administrators, or legislators – even with abysmal pay and little appreciation. Perhaps the most common case of care exploitation (CE) is the expectation of a mother to make great (and disproportionate) sacrifices in her life for the well-being of her child, which mothers often meet because they bear a caring orientation towards their child. You likely do not have to think for long to find examples that resonate with your personal experiences.

Despite willingly assenting, there is something morally problematic about the treatment of these individuals. I argue that an injustice has been perpetrated against them. Despite their assent, they are being exploited, having their caring dispositions unfairly taken advantage of.

I argue that the unique wrong of CE is the failure to respect one's dignity by taking advantage of their vulnerability of caring about. In this work I elucidate the five necessary and jointly sufficient conditions of instances of CE. But here, in the interest of space, I will focus on how one's caring disposition makes one susceptible to CE. For an individual to have their care exploited, they must care about the subject they are called to aid. When one cares about someone or something, they have a belief-desire pair: a belief about the status of the subject's flourishing, and a desire to aid in that flourishing. I argue that caring about another in this way makes one vulnerable.

Vulnerability as openness is required so that one can be receptive to the cared about entity's perspective. In the case of caring about something (e.g., the climate), openness as deference to those with relevant expertise (like climate scientists) is required for proper care. For both individuals and projects, the caring individual's flourishing becomes wrapped up with the successful flourishing of the subject of care. Without this vulnerability, one simply could not care about. But this vulnerability ought not be understood as a weakness, or the lack of something essential, as vulnerabilities are typically characterized (Goodin 1985; Jaggar 2014). Instead, I take vulnerability as openness to be a virtue.

Unfortunately, this vulnerability is a double-edged sword, or a burdened virtue (Tessman 2005). By being open, a caring individual can have their own flourishing strongly negatively impacted as a result of having their dignity undermined – of having their care, which openness is essential to, exploited. Openness makes a caring individual susceptible to exploitation precisely because one is invested in the flourishing of another – affected by another – and so feels the need to aid in their flourishing. When a caring individual is called to aid or relied upon by another in the way articulated in the first condition, there is already a pull to help felt. Despite this, there ought not to be the presumption that the caring individual will inevitably help. To make this presumption undermines their dignity, ultimately amounting to care exploitation.

Biographical note: Lavender McKittrick-Sweitzer has just completed her PhD in philosophy at Ohio State University and will be an instructor at Butler University this fall. She is primarily interested in political philosophy, with a focus on feminist perspectives, public reason, and global justice.

PANEL D – EXPLOITATION IN THE DIGITAL SPHERE

Friday 16, 15:00 – 16:15

LUNA MORCILLO GÓMEZ (UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES)

Self-ownership versus Social Property: An Analysis of the Exploitation of App Workers

Abstract: We propose here an analysis of the tension between social property and self-ownership as it is concretised in the new forms of so-called atypical work, and mainly among app workers. This tension, leading to a questioning of social property, results in the appearance of situations of exploitation in work through the 'decollectivisation' of individuals.

Indeed, these workers, in addition to being dispossessed of their organisational capacities and their knowledge, are placed in a situation of economic, technological, and organisational dependence (Coutrot, 2018; Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). This objective situation of exploitation is therefore correlated with a precariousness of workers (Bernard, 2020). Moreover, because they evolve in a grey area between self-employment and salaried work (de Nanteuil-Miribel & Zune, 2016) made possible by the conceptual vagueness surrounding collaborative work (Lambrecht, 2016), these workers are beyond the reach of the protections offered by the welfare state, the institutional realisation of the idea of social property.

Derived from the Lockean theory of appropriation, the idea of social property comes from the principle that it is the condition of ownership that ensures non-dependence (Castel, 2001). In contrast to private property, social property acts as a collective support for existence, not from a patrimony but from systems of protections built on the basis of work. In concrete terms, social property consists of a right of access to collective goods and services with a social purpose and thus makes it possible to ensure the security of its members by creating social unity and interdependence (Delruelle, 2020, p.86). Social property is thus not opposed to individual property. So that, for Jaurès (1933, p.366-367), social property makes it possible to ensure what he called self-ownership as the true individual property that humans have and must have over themselves.

However, through the development of these emerging categories of workers, a new relationship to the social protection system and a new vision of the independence of the individual are being formed. The questioning of the rules surrounding work is moreover analogous to a critique of wage labour and a promotion of self-employment (Abdelnour & Méda, 2019, Dardot & Laval, 2009) fed by a discourse on autonomy as the only relationship to oneself specific to a new entrepreneurial ethos (Ravenelle, 2017). The discourses promoting self-ownership also include the idea of the worker's reappropriation of the product of his or her work while asserting to overcome the aporia of subordination in wage labour (Abdelnour & Méda, 2019). Thus, we can understand the critique of traditional wage labour and the regulations offered by the welfare state as a questioning of social property.

Consequently, exploitation here would come from the retreat of social property in favour of self-ownership. Whereas the notion of social property has established within our society the organisation of social interdependence through the socialisation of the risks of existence and the financing of non-productive jobs, challenging it would provoke a 're-individualisation', a 'decollectivisation', of workers in the sense understood by Castel (1995, 2009) comparable to Durkheimian anomie.

Biographical note: I am a teaching assistant in the Political Science Department at the Université Libre de Bruxelles since autumn 2019. I am currently working on my doctoral thesis in political theory on issues related to autonomy in the atypical forms of work. As an assistant, I am in charge of leading several seminars in history of political thought, notably on the thought of Cornelius Castoriadis or theories of work. Regarding my topics of research, exploitation and alienation are some of the main concepts structuring my research. I am interested in the redefinition of the articulation between autonomy and exploitation in the transformations of work where autonomy is defined only on an individual base.

JAMIE KELLY (VASSAR COLLEGE)

Exploitation and Artificial Labour

Abstract: In this paper, I evaluate the possibility of exploiting artificial labour. Drawing upon Marx's trans-historical account of labour in Chapter 7 of *Capital* (Volume One), I argue that AI is capable of "purposeful activity aimed at the production of use-values" (Fowkes translation, 290), and so artificial labour is already a reality. This results in difficult and pressing questions about how artificial labour fits into existing, capitalist relations of production. In particular, we need to determine whether artificial labour is or can be exploited.

In the first part of this paper, I 1) explore how the exploitation of artificial labour would differ from Marx's standard account of automation (focusing on Chapter 15 of *Capital* (Volume One), especially his claims on Fowkes 530), 2) evaluate what kind of agency is required for exploitability on various definitions of exploitation, and 3) evaluate whether AI is likely to satisfy those various requirements. I conclude that AI is not currently exploitable but may be so in the near future.

In the second part of this paper, I draw upon Marx's account of Primitive Accumulation to speculate about how and why we could arrive at the exploitation of artificial labour. I argue that exploitation would require that a) artificial laborers become increasingly distinct from the rest of the means of production b) begin to resist their own domination, and c) and gain independent legal standing.

Biographical note: I am an Associate Professor at Vassar College in the United States. Currently, I am working on a book manuscript entitled "Marx and Robots: Capital and the Future of Artificial Labour."

PANEL E – EXPLOITATION, AUTONOMY AND SUFFERING IN NEOLIBERAL LABOUR MANAGEMENT

Saturday 17, 12:15 – 14:00

PABLO LÓPEZ ÁLVAREZ (UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID)

The Individualization of Work. Exploitation, Autonomy and Suffering in Neoliberal Labour Management

Abstract: Permanent transformation of the organization of work has been a core feature of the neoliberal agenda since the 1980s. Reform and restructuring processes are justified by the need to flexibilize and diversify production, ensure economic growth and enhance workers' autonomy and initiative. The new management models incorporate criticisms of the Fordist labour system and the bureaucracy of the Welfare State and develop specific patterns of freedom and subjectivity (human capital, worker as entrepreneur, self-appreciation).

Drawing on the evolution of present neoliberal societies, this presentation aims to: (1) identify the specific forms of exploitation resulting from the increase of autonomy, individualization and psychologization in the management of labour relations; (2) raise the difficulties that this mode of exploitation poses for its perception as social injustice; (3) assess the possibilities of combating the new labour exploitation without proposing a return to traditional forms of work organization. Rather than the proposals of «cooperative management» (Dejours, Deranty, 2018) or the «alternative use of human capital» (Feher, 2009), we take into consideration the increasing blurring of the boundaries between exploitation and expropriation in financialized capitalism (Fraser, 2018) and the political possibilities that it enables.

Biographical note: Pablo López Álvarez is Associate Professor of Philosophy at the Complutense University of Madrid. His research focuses in areas of history of modern philosophy, critical theory and contemporary philosophy. In the latest years he has studied the problem of neoliberal rationality –State, work, body, exclusion– from an interdisciplinary perspective. Along with Professor Nuria Sánchez Madrid (UCM) he leads the research project «Labour precarity, body and damaged life. A research on social philosophy».

CLARA NAVARRO RUIZ (UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID)

Accumulation and Exploitation in the Digital Economy. Brief Remarks about the GAFSA Companies, Output Growth and ICT Workers.

Abstract: Robotization and digitalization are claimed to be a radical solution for the capitalist economy, which has been growing at a slow pace for decades. In our presentation we will tackle whether this affirmation is excessively optimistic, when not completely false. First, we will present how the structure of the present digital economy concentrates profits on few companies and forecloses the path to possible competitors, thanks to Staab's concept of «owner's markets» and his thoughts on the link between the so-called New Economy and the finance industry (Staab, 2019). We will afterwards contextualize these phenomena in a more general picture of a global deceleration of the economy, pictured in the decline of output growth in most capitalist economies (Benanav, 2020), and its consequences in the extension of non-specialized labor (Caffentzis, 2013). We will conclude investigating how «alienation» pervades on the work sector related to digital economy, the ICT-Industry, often perceived as offering an environment where workers can develop their creative skills (Healy, 2020). Our final aim is to show that Marxist theory understood in a broader sense can be used fruitfully to analyze the present, and so how concepts as «exploitation», «alienation» and «accumulation» are essential to today's social philosophy.

Biographical note: Clara Navarro Ruiz works as a postdoctoral researcher at the Complutense University. Her main investigation interests are contemporary Marxism and the intersectional critique of capitalism, focusing on the critique of value-dissociation (Wertabspaltungskritik). She is an author in diverse academic journals; her latest published work is an edition of Roswitha Scholz's writings published by Ediciones Mímesis and Pepitas de Calabaza (2020).

SERGIO VEGA JIMÉNEZ (UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID)

Precarity, Work-life Imbalance and Labour Suffering: Time Conflicts as Key Logics of Exploitation

Abstract: Contemporary discussions on precarity are showing this phenomenon as a process of degradation of working conditions and living standards for most of the population. Both social sciences and humanities have pointed out the new forms of poverty and the changes in the relationship between work and ways of life, underlining the tensions between the demands of labour, the needs of life and the erosion of social rights. In philosophy, a line of discussion has been constituted that approaches this problem in an ontological sense, as the precariousness of life itself and the constitutive vulnerability of bodies on the one hand and, on the other hand, as the degradation of social and economic conditions of life, which brings questions about the political use of precarity as a disciplinary device (Lorey, 2015).

In this presentation the dual problem of precarity and precariousness will be related to the employment crisis and the new forms of work organization. Following these debates, the scope of precarity will be discussed as a multidimensional phenomenon that overflows the workspace and disrupts the material conditions of life. As a result, the presentation aims to show three consequences of precarity in relation to new logics of exploitation: 1) The intensification of work pace and the changes in temporary contracting, which result in an imbalance between work and life (Apostolidis, 2019; Woodcock, 2016). 2) Conflicts between worktime and private time that these processes inaugurate: length of the working day, the intensity of work and the amount of time we devote to reproductive work. 3) The structural precarity of both self-employment (Bologna, 2018) and salaried work, which force intense self-exploitation and the adoption of forms of symbolic retribution to increase the visibility and employability of the working subject.

Finally, distress caused by work-life imbalance will be approached from the perspective of labour suffering (Dejours, Deranty), which will be shown as an analytical tool that emphasizes the subjective damage produced by the adaptation to competitive imperatives, affecting equally manual and service sector jobs (Woodcock, 2016).

Biographical note: Sergio Vega Jiménez is a predoctoral researcher and Ph.D. Candidate at the Complutense University of Madrid. He is a member of the research project «Precaritylab: Labour precarity, body and damaged life. A research on social philosophy» and his investigation has focused on contemporary transformations of work, precarity, labour suffering and its effects on corporeal subjectivity.

PANEL F – EXPANDING THE BOUNDARIES OF EXPLOITATION

Saturday 17, 15:00 – 16:15

BALAM NEDIM KENTER (CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY, MONTRÉAL)

Exploitation that does not look like Exploitation: Superfluity, Disability, Animality

Abstract: Surplus populations, disabled people, and non-human animals are rarely considered to be exploited. The concept of exploitation is closely associated with (human) labour—to take Marx’s definition, exploitation consists in the forceful appropriation by capitalists of the unpaid portion of wage-labour. As Michael Denning says, however, "under capitalism, the only thing worse than being exploited is not being exploited" (2010, p. 79). In a system of complete market-dependency, where one is obligated to sell their labour to survive, exclusion from labour can be as oppressive and violent as the exploitation thereof. Even so, the predicament of surplus populations, disabled people, and animals under late capitalism is not strictly non-exploitative oppression but also a non-labour-centric form of exploitation which requires a widening of the concept. In this paper, I look at the animal rendering industry and surplus populations together through the lenses of Critical Animal Studies and Critical Disability Studies to complicate current understandings of capitalist exploitation.

The animal rendering industry and surplus populations are two features of capitalism that are both invisibilized as by-products, subject to logics of waste-management and recycling rather than exploitation. Shukin's (2014) genealogy of how animal life gets symbolically and carnally rendered capital, demonstrates the central role of animals in the reproduction of capitalist hegemony. Similarly, the paradox of surplus populations, another kind of bare life, is that they are redundant to capital while being absolutely essential to, and created by, it (Marx, 2000; Endnotes, 2010). 40 percent of the global workforce is currently rendered superfluous (Benanav, 2014). Most of this global surplus population is disabled (WHO, 2011; UN, 2015), showing capitalism to be a disabling power in material (impairment) as well as social (exclusion/disablement) senses. Appreciating the centrality of rendering and surplus populations necessitates astute attention to aspects of late capitalism that bank on pathologized and non-laboring bodies, both animal and disabled.

The figure of human labor and production has dominated both immanent and biopolitical critiques of capitalism to the exclusion of the material history of the subsumption of non-human animal labor and bodies into capital (Shukin, 2014). Marxist critiques of capitalism feature narrow definitions of labor that exclude many forms of human as well as non-human labor. Further, the conflation of human with labor, not only denies non-human labor but also signals the exclusion of the non-laborer from the category of human. A focus on the material processes of rendering and surplusization might offer a more robust assessment of exploitation under late capitalism.

In this paper, I will first explain the logic of rendering followed by the logic of surplus populations. In making the connection between rendering superfluous and rendering flesh, I wish to point out how both heavily involve non-labour exploitation (i.e., exploitation that doesn't look like exploitation); how in both processes purportedly non-productive bodies (redundant to capital, disabled, and/or animal) are subsumed into capital as bodies (dead or alive) through a general paradigm of waste-management/recycling/disposability; and how both processes are invisibilized although they are pivotal to capitalist production and accumulation.

Biographical note: I am a PhD candidate at Concordia’s Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies in Society and Culture’s Humanities PhD Program, working in the fields of Critical Disability Studies, Critical Animal Studies, and Political Philosophy. My interest in exploitation goes back to my master’s degree in Philosophy from Boğaziçi University where I explored the concepts of exploitation and oppression through disability. In my MA thesis, I suggested that the way a theory defines exploitation and oppression may determine its scope and emancipatory potential. In my dissertation work, I seek to continue this line of research particularly by focusing on the intersections between ableism and anthropocentrism under late capitalism.

NICOLA MULKEEN (UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK)

Intergenerational Exploitation

Abstract: Intergenerational Exploitation Earlier generations can jeopardise the opportunities, resources, and wellbeing of their successors. Indeed, there is a growing unease with high levels of youth unemployment and governments accruing large-scale public debts on a long-term basis (e.g., COVID-19), with the repayments falling on

subsequent generations. Many worry that our policies and institutions are being shaped to advantage the interests of older generations at the expense of the young. Where young adults are accruing debt and have worse access to employment and state services than other generations, a distinct form of economic inequality is created. There is also an important sense in which these inequalities leave young adults vulnerable to specific forms of exploitation. However, much more needs to be done to explore the idea that exploitation is a threat to intergenerational relations. It does seem exploitative for one generation to design public policies and to maintain institutions that neglect the interests of its successors. It also seems morally troubling for institutions to distribute essential resources and opportunities (such as employment opportunities and debt) in a way that creates important imbalances of power between generations. Such actions seem to have the capacity both to constitute forms of exploitation in themselves, and to create the preconditions for further exploitative relationships. The aim of this paper is to make a case for intergenerational exploitation. I focus primarily on two questions: (1) What exactly is intergenerational exploitation? (2) What makes this type of exploitation wrong? The concept of intergenerational exploitation is relatively unexplored. Accounts of intergenerational injustice offer important insights that explain why deep inequalities between generations matter, but they don't conceptualise exploitation between generations. In the paper, I put forward a structural account of exploitation and argue that just as our background institutions cross national boundaries, so that people face a limited set of options (such as entering sweatshop contracts), they can also cross intergenerational boundaries, so that succeeding generations face a limited and disreputable set of options. I argue that the intergenerational account provides a philosophically satisfying explanation of exploitation across time and explains how exploitation between generations is not only possible, but in our world is likely to arise. To make this case, I examine key contexts involving long-term public debt and employment. In the former context, I show how exploitation between generations is possible, where the earlier generation do the exploiting. However, in the latter context of employment, I show how earlier generations can give rise to preconditions that facilitate the exploitation of later generations.

Biographical note: I am a teaching fellow in political philosophy at the University of Warwick. Before that, I was a Lecturer in moral and political philosophy at the University of Manchester. My research is divided between equality, self-ownership, intergenerational justice, and exploitation. I'm particularly interested in the places where these topics overlap. My current research is concerned with threats that emerge from politics and society that are faced by young adults as a vulnerable social group. I am writing a book on *Exploitation and Time: A Theory of Intergenerational Exploitation*. The book develops a structural account of intergenerational exploitation, and explores its implications for policy debates, using tools from political philosophy as well as public policy.

PANEL G – EXPLOITATION IN AND BEYOND THE MARKET

Saturday 17, 16:30 – 18:15

KATERINA PSAROUDAKI (UNIVERSITY OF CYPRUS)

The Paradox of Sweatshop Exploitation

Abstract: In the absence of a fair transaction between a multi-national company and a local worker in a developing country, which outcome is morally better: engaging in an exploitative transaction or failing to transact altogether? According to the Non-Worseness Principle, a sweatshop transaction is morally better than no transaction, given that it is mutually beneficial and fully voluntary. According to the Betterness of Permissibility Principle, no transaction is morally better than a sweatshop transaction, given that it is morally permissible (there is no duty to engage in mutually beneficial transactions) whereas the latter – being exploitative – is not. The conjunction of the above principles gives rise to a logical paradox. I begin my analysis by demonstrating that the paradox is plausible, interesting, and non-trivial. First off, the relation “morally better than” ought to be interpreted in a comprehensive fashion as “morally better than all things considered” on pain of action inertia. Secondly, to be able to rank different moral outcomes, or, at least, make binary moral comparisons, we ought to assume that the relation “morally better than all things considered” is asymmetric (if $A > B$, then it is not the case that $B > A$). Lastly, the normative description of a sweatshop transaction is coherent to the extent that all its moral properties align perfectly with one another. In the light of the aforementioned, it becomes evident that the implications of Non-Worseness and Betterness of Permissibility in the case of sweatshop transactions are logically inconsistent and jointly form a genuine paradox. Having examined the existing solutions to the paradox and shown them to be inadequate, I embark on presenting my unique solution. Of the two normative principles at stake, we ought to reject Betterness of Permissibility: a morally permissible transaction is not necessarily “morally better all things considered” than a morally impermissible transaction. If “morally better than all things considered” is construed as “having stronger moral reason to perform”, the comparison between a morally permissible and a morally impermissible transaction cannot plausibly and intelligibly ensue. For one thing, morally neutral actions (such as eating ice-cream) are morally permissible but not clearly accompanied by a strong moral reason to perform them. For another, “having a strong moral reason in favor of” and “being morally permissible” can vary inversely in the case of supererogatory actions; the stronger moral reason one has to rescue another at great cost, the more permissible it gets to refrain from doing so. Since the relation “morally better than all things considered” fails to make sense when comparing morally permissible and morally impermissible transactions, the rejection of Betterness of Permissibility – along with its prescription in the case of sweatshop exploitation – follows. The advantages of my solution acquire their clearest expression in the resolution of another couple of logical paradoxes, namely, the “All or Nothing” paradox and the “Paradox of Existence”, which both arise from an application of the Betterness of Permissibility Principle.

Biographical note: I am an Adjunct Instructor at the University of Cyprus. My research interests lie at the intersection of political philosophy, applied ethics, and normative ethics. I am currently exploring moral issues related to economic exploitation.

AMY THOMPSON (UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD)

Exploitation in the Market; Exploitation in Society

Abstract: Market transactions in particular commodities are supposed to be exploitative in the sense that they deny market participants some rights and therefore undermine human dignity. For example, Elizabeth Anderson (1993) argues that markets in women’s labour, which is how she chooses to understand surrogacy contracts, are exploitative in the sense that they deny the women who partake in such markets the right to (a) form a relationship with their offspring and (b) conceive of their reproductive labour as they choose. It is in this sense that market transactions in particular commodities are supposed to be exploitative of the women engaged in them, even when they consent to entering into such contracts.

In this paper, I argue that this account of the exploitative nature of market transactions falls victim to an objection: it imprecisely targets market transactions, by both failing to apply to all possible types of market transaction and applying to methods of distributions which are not market transactions. I argue that, according to this rights-based account of market exploitation, it is the “socialisation” of goods, whereby commodities are taken from the producer and redistributed by some overarching authority which could be a market or equally a state actor, which constitutes exploitation, and not only the sale of goods in a marketplace. There are methods of distribution beyond market

transactions which are exploitative in the same way that it has been argued market transactions are. Moreover, I argue that there could be market transactions which were not an example of the denial of rights that this account thinks are central to exploitation and the denial of dignity. Hence, I conclude that while there may be exploitation in some markets, there need not be in all markets, and there could be exploitation of the same species in non-market distributions. I examine Anderson's original example of a market in surrogacy services as well as the case of prostitution and human organ sales, both of which have historically been considered markets affected by exploitation. I apply the socialisation objection that I first applied to the example of surrogacy contracts to both of these examples to argue that an understanding of exploitation in terms of particular rights will fail to precisely target market transactions.

This leaves us with a dilemma – we must have a theory of exploitation which either does not rely on particular rights that are due to market participants, or which applies to methods of distribution and ways of ordering society beyond market transactions. Hence, this paper aims to broaden our understanding of exploitation by concluding that (i) there are additional sites of the same species of exploitation that have been observed of market transactions, and (ii) there could be markets which were not exploitative in this way. My main contribution in this paper is to disentangle the ways in which markets and exploitation are and are not linked.

Biographical note: Amy is a second year BPhil student in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, Oxford. Prior to 2019, she was an undergraduate in Classics, also at St. Anne's. She works primarily on topics in ancient philosophy, ethics, and political theory. Her BPhil thesis in political philosophy explores the moral limit of market transactions. This paper is a portion of her thesis work. In it, she argues that some of the objections levelled against markets in "contested commodities" do not precisely target market transactions; she argues that the same exploitative tropes that are often attributed to market societies are also features of non-market distributions and that this must be considered in any account of exploitation.

JASMINE ELLIOTT (UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG)

The Role of the Corporate Legal Profession in Facilitating Exploitation: Obligations and Opportunities for Collective Action

Abstract: Key issues that facilitate and embed exploitation and inequality have become notably transnational and are enabled by professional services, like corporate lawyers, who work with a variety of standards, regulations and global financial flows that can move capital across the world. These issues range from the various creative ways that law can protect capital to issues of unclear beneficial ownership and money laundering, which have increasingly become topics of public and legislative discussion. My proposed paper will focus on the obligations and opportunities for the corporate legal profession and their regulatory bodies to be incorporated into collective action and supranational multi-stakeholder initiatives to combat exploitation and inequality.

The discussion on business and human rights, for example, continues to push the conversation on what obligations businesses have to the broader community that they may impact. Yet, in this discussion, there should be a specific focus on the corporate legal profession, as an important example of professional services, and their distinct professional role in advising companies. Law firms, like any other business, should be held to account if they engage in exploitive activity or activities that impact human rights. Yet, unlike businesses, law firms have a unique role in connection with their corporate clients and depending on the type of work done for the client, their advice could be integral in enabling or facilitating the client's exploitive conduct. Furthermore, depending on how a lawyer's professional obligations should be applied in a non-adversarial context, these professional obligations may limit or strengthen lawyers' indirect responsibility. This paper aims to contribute to the literature in recognising the corporate legal profession as a relevant actor in collective action against exploitation and inequality.

Drawing from philosophical concepts of complicity and moral taint and an analysis of the professional role of lawyers in society, this paper explores how the corporate legal profession should be considered another key stakeholder in addressing highly complex issues that enable exploitation and developing their own collective action initiatives. For example, the legal profession has a professional, collective obligation to maintain and self-patrol the ethics of the profession, primarily through their regulating authorities, and it should be considered to what extent these authorities are promoting ethical standards or reprimanding lawyers who are complicit in exploitive acts. Furthermore, there is an opportunity for corporate lawyers to use their role in society to develop more collective action initiatives to address issues of exploitation, which may include enforcing a higher collective standard in providing advice or advocating legislators to fix regulations and promote legislation that addresses exploitive practices.

Biographical note: Jasmine Elliott is a PhD student in Practical Philosophy at the University of Gothenburg. She studies business ethics, professional ethics, business and human rights, and corporate and white-collar crime. Her doctoral thesis focuses primarily on the ethical responsibility of corporate lawyers in giving clients advice in relation to implications regarding human rights, corruption and financial crime. Her research is also informed by her previous experience working in business ethics and anti-corruption at an international corporate law firm and as a compliance and ethics officer. Jasmine is funded by and actively involved in the Centre for Collective Action Research at the University of Gothenburg, a research centre focusing on solutions for large scale collective action issues ranging from climate change to tax evasion. Jasmine specifically centers collective action in her thesis by considering potential opportunities for large scale collective action that the corporate legal profession could create and promote at a state, multinational or international level based on the recognition of their moral role in ethical business conduct.