

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF SUBJECT: THE COMMODIFICATION OF HUMANITY

O DESAPARECIMENTO DO SUJEITO: A MERCANTILIZAÇÃO DA HUMANIDADE

Eduardo Barbosa Vergolino ¹

ABSTRACT: The disappearance of subject or the subjectivity of the subject is a theme that interweave philosophical universes like Marx, Sartre and Althusser. The present paper has the objective of to present a perspective of the disappearance of the subject's subjectivity in front of the capitalistic model which oppresses the human individualities. The commodification of human subjectivities is one of the main points of this paper and also brings up the debate of the oppression of the capitalistic system. We used a bibliographic review centered on the authors Marx, Althusser and Sartre, as well as Thompson and Jameson. Despite the strong economic appeal of the capitalist system, we believe that the process of commodification of human beings is still something to be discussed and debated in social universes as a way to rescue the humanity of humans exploited by an inhuman system. In this way, the disappearance of the subject's subjectivity is at the same time the disappearance of the subject itself in the world.

Key words: Subjectivity, Capitalism, Commodification of subject.

RESUMO: O desaparecimento do sujeito ou da subjetividade do sujeito é um tema que entrelaça os universos filosóficos de pensadores tais como Marx, Sartre e Althusser. O presente trabalho tem como objetivo apresentar uma perspectiva do desaparecimento da subjetividade do sujeito frente ao modelo capitalista opressor das individualidades humanas. A mercantilização das subjetividades humanas é um dos pontos centrais deste texto que busca fomentar o debate e a discussão acerca da opressão do sistema capitalista. Utilizou-se de uma pesquisa bibliográfica centrada nos autores Marx, Althusser e Sartre, bem como Thompson e Jameson. Apesar do forte apelo econômico do sistema capitalista, acredita-se que o processo de mercantilização do ser humano é algo ainda a ser discutido e debatido nos universos sociais como forma de resgatar a humanidade dos humanos explorados por um sistema desumano. Desta forma, o desaparecimento da subjetividade do sujeito é ao mesmo tempo o desaparecimento do próprio sujeito no mundo.

Palavras-chave: Subjetividade, Capitalismo, Mercantilização do sujeito.

INTRODUCTION

Since the Greek philosophy with Plato, the duality of an ontological view of the world has been discussed and is the central point in many discussions inside the academy. After Plato's argument of the dualistic dimension of worlds as an idea and illusion much of our knowledge has been based on this dualistic way of thinking. According to Marx, the duality after the Industrial Revolution became based on a relationship between bourgeois and laborers; the people who own

¹ Bacharel e Licenciado em Filosofia (Doutorando em Estudos Nativos na University of Manitoba – Canadá) – Professor do Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia do Sertão Pernambucano – Campus Floresta.

their forms of production and the majority of people who only own their own labor force. Dualism and capitalism as a force of oppression against the subjectivity and the disappearance of subject can be the way for a new discussion of ontology in a postmodernist era. Marx (1867) argues that, “The general form of value is the reduction of all kinds of actual labor to their common character of being human labor generally, of being the expenditure of human labor power” (p. 45). A new perspective was being focused after Marx’s theory of Capitalism and the oppression performed by the capital over society. Despite this oppression, most of the time, it is performed from the bourgeois to the peasant. The commodification of the human being after the Industrial Revolution is a *sine qua non* condition to understand why the subjectivity has changed and become lost in an environment where self-consciousness does not recognize itself as an important center of discussion. It is very important for our discussion to follow the path of Sartre's idea of totality and Jameson’s argument about the postmodernist era as a radical change in the way we see ourselves inside a hyperspace. A hyperspace produced by Capitalism and as a consequence oppresses the subjectivity of individuality.

In his writing *Totality and Totalization*, Sartre observes that the totality is not just some parts together, but the entirety, the complete reason and relationship between parts. It suggests that the Metaphysics presented by Aristotle where the sum of its parts is not the sum because the sum has a different spectrum of meaning. Those parts will always be parts and the total will not have the totality. Moreover, Sartre (1960) shows that, “The ontological status to which it lays claim by its very definition is that of the in-itself, the inert”. The subject now becomes fragmented after the imposition of a new structure and a new way of the human being’s thinking. The essence of the human being as Sartre (1960) pointed out is now a relationship between praxis and its products in which the human being turns into an object produced inside the industry. Totality becomes a commodity - like a product – dissociable from its reproduction. This is the main goal of colonizer capitalism which forces the colonized to be inside the totality because it only will be considered a part of the system when the individual subject is collectivized. There are no spaces to identify the subject as an individual, but only as collective, as a part of the sum. The totality has an important function in understanding the new world and the new relationship between individuals as the main purpose of society. Sartre calls our attention to this process which oppresses individual subjectivity, moreover this process of totalizing the subject will open a way to commodify the subject, i. e. totality has the role inside capitalism of commodifying the individuals making them lose their subject.

From the time where the individuals have become dissociable from the reproduction system of the capitalist era, it is important to point out that the ontological chains which connect

each individual to his/her self-consciousness has worked to atomize the worker until his/her individuality disappears inside the collective. The collective is not a unity anymore, but a conglomerate of atomized humans. “[...] the passive totality is, in fact, eroded by infinite divisibility” (Sartre, 1960, p. 2). The humanity is extinguished or changed to objectivity. The capitalist system now turned the totality of human beings into objects with which it is possible to play the game of market. The commodification of the atomized individuals now is the totality commodified. There is no longer recognition of subject because it has become an object. The activity of production, being a synthetic part of a unity called capitalism makes us a unification of labor power, a power that has become a commodity. Sartre (1960) affirms, “These human objects are worthy of attention in the human world, for it is there that they attain their practice-inert statute; that is to say, they lie heavy on our destiny because of the contradiction which opposes praxis (the labor which made them and the labor which utilizes them) and the inertia, within them” (p. 2). So, it is with the atomization and commodification of individualities of subjectivities that the totality turns itself into a commodity where the human being is the final product to be alienated and consumed as an object.

The process of Totalization which Sartre points out is the negation of a self-consciousness intrinsically connected with the movement of capitalism through individuals. The negation that starts with the decreasing subject inside a society is inside the collective. The subject reduction to a part of the whole turns it into a disposable cell of the body of society. The process of totalization is in itself the negation of individuality and subjectivity as a unique individual, despite that, totalization became the affirmation of this subject only in a collective manner, in which the whole subject is now the whole collective. Sartre (1960) argues that the multiplicity of individuals is interconnected to create one big unity made by the multiplicity and in this manner, what is in fact visible is the whole, but the subject is diluted through this multiplication. Sartre remonstrates that, “On this basis, it is easy to establish the intelligibility of dialectical reason; it is the very movement of totalization. Thus, to give only one example, it is within the framework of totalization that the negation of the negation becomes an affirmation” (Sartre, 1960). This dialectical movement of being and not being, a part and a whole at the same time is in itself the dual relationship of making society and individual subject the main purpose of totalization. Totalizing the infinite parts is the movement to “melt” the individual subjectivity giving space only to the collective. For instance, one circle is made by 360 degrees but before it becomes a circle it is 360 individual degrees. Notwithstanding, the individual degree loses its individuality, but when together and tied with others it becomes a complex totality called circle. Therefore, this process of totalization is the negation of the negation to turn something into a totality, and this totality becomes an affirmation of others.

Commodification and subject

It is well known that the commodification of human subjectivity as a product that is made inside the relation capital-labor has an intrinsic relation with the process of alienation. Sartre (1960) pointed out that, “In other words, the intensity of isolation, as a relation of exteriority between the members of a temporary and contingent gathering, expresses the degree of massification of the social ensemble, in so far as it is produced on the basis of given conditions” (p. 2). While at the same time that the member of a community is just a part of a totality, he/she would be able to recognize himself/herself as an individual separate from the group. However, it is during this separation that the creation of a plurality begins where it is possible for individuals to create independent projects of self-consciousness. The process of alienation forced through the forms of production where the individuality is compromised to one small part of a sequence, where the individual does not recognize him/herself has changed. Sartre uses the example of a bus stop to point his argument of grouping, where even though the people are at the same place with the same purpose each individual is isolated from each other. “Finally, in our example, isolation becomes, for and through everyone, for him/her and for others, the real, social product of cities” (Sartre, 1960, p. 3). Being one and being all at the same time is a product that can lead to being nothing. It is in this process of alienation that we are able to recognize the plurality of individualities and at the moment when this recognition is possible is when the individual is confronted by him/herself through the exploitation of a capitalist process. Marx (1867) stated that, “Human labor power in motion, or human labor, creates value, but is not in itself value. It becomes value only in its congealed state, when embodied in the form of some object” (p. 35). The connection between Marx and Sartre which we are trying to present is that the individuality of subjectivity became a mere product of the capital. The subjectivity is dissipated in a vicious circle similar and influenced by capitalism.

During the development of capitalism after the Industrial Revolution and with the increasing writings about the commodification of workers in a production line, the mode of production of Capitalism became the center of the alienation process. In his writings, Marx regarded the capital as an instrument of transformation of the individual from self-conscious to object Marx (1857) suggested that, “With the abstract universality of wealth-creating activity we now have the universality of the object defined as wealth, the product as such or again labor as such, but labor as past, objectified labor” (p. 18). The main point here is how the Capital and the idea of wealth-creating can develop to an individual alienation? The Capital negates the possibility

of the subjectivity being exposed because as far as the industrialization begins, there is no space to be unique, but the only opportunity is being an object or an objectified subjectivity. It is in this process of alienation that the relationship between Master and slave occur. This oppression is a *sine qua non* condition to understand the disappearance of subjectivity inside the capitalist era. There is no opportunity for worker to run in a different way whereas the oppression of capital imposes to him/her the consequence of a commodification of its labor force.

According with Hegel (1806), “Self-consciousness exists in itself and for itself, in that, and the fact that it exists for self-consciousness; that is to say, it is only by being acknowledged or ‘recognized’”(p. 178). Although self-consciousness needs another to be recognized is in this complex recognition process that the Master oppresses the Slave and the Slave transfers its self-consciousness to the Master. In Marx (1857) words, “Each reproduces itself, by reproducing its other, its negation. The capitalist produces labor as alien; labor produces the product as alien. The capitalist produces the worker, and the worker the capitalist etc.” (p. 8). So, the relation between Master and Slave at the same time that it is a self-recognition it is also a problem of the oppression and disappearance of individuality. When the Master needs a Slave to recognize himself as an individual there is no subjectivity in the Master, but the reflection of the Slave. The ontological issue of being and self-being, the oppression of the other self-consciousness is a methodological standard of Master/Slave relationship, As Althusser (1970) pointed out,

To put it more scientifically, I shall say that the reproduction of labor power requires not only a reproduction of its skills, but also, at the same time, a reproduction of its submission to the rules of the established order, i.e. a reproduction of submission to the ruling ideology for the workers, and a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression, so that they, too, will provide for the domination of the ruling class ‘in words’. (p. 5)

So, this relationship runs through not only a work relation between Master/Slave, but also the main ontological discrimination between being and self-being. We would not be radical in affirming that the focus point of Master is the annihilation of Slave’s subjectivity, so the model of self-consciousness became his own self. This leads us to the negation of self-consciousness as a product of the Capitalist era and Post-modernist view of society.

The negation of self-consciousness is one of the principal ideas of capitalism. The process of alienation is in itself the idea of the negation of self-consciousness. There is no space in a capitalist culture for the exposure subjectivity because it has turned itself in a commodity where someone has the power to manipulate and decide for others. Hegel (1806) shows us that the Master recognizes himself in the Slave’s representation of the master, the slave works as a mirror where there is no subject but only in an objectified function offering the master a self-image of his

“superiority”². Capitalism found a possible way to oppress by using the power of the economic system. The importance of Hegel in this fact is to show the annihilation of self-consciousness as a process that begins way back in history. Hegel (1806) argues that,

The representation of itself, however, as pure abstraction of self-consciousness consists in showing itself as a pure negation of its objective form, or in showing that it is fettered to no determinate existence, that it is not bound at all by the particularity everywhere characteristic of existence as such, and is not tied up with life (p. 187).

Therefore, as Modernism, Postmodernism started to look at society based on its changes, however the focus of Postmodernism is the culture as a product of society that can be explored and changed. The dialectical process of Postmodernism is focused on the struggle of classes that recognize themselves as aliens after the modernist movement; and the theorization of themselves as a form and movement of being the reflex of the present observation. According to Jameson (1991), “I have pretended to believe that the postmodern is as unusual as it thinks it is and that it constitutes a cultural and experimental break worth exploring in greater detail” (p. XII). The Postmodernism view opened many different perspectives of culture and subjectivity. Nevertheless, as much as it is open to discussion and projects itself in society, it also fuses the subject into a culture where it can turn become unrecognizable. As a consequence of capitalism and the view of postmodernism the new era turns out to be a fragmented perception of history. The fragmentation became visible in many different aspects like intellectual production, paintings, music, arts in general; fragmentation became a reflex of society that is pluralized in a collective while at the same time it has now an infinity of individualities.

The disappearance of the individual in the postmodernist society is the consequence of a brutal work of capitalism to commodify the subject. The necessity of capitalist accumulation to increase its power employed took advantage of the exchange between human value to exchange value. Morris (2001) pointed out that the disappearance of subject is not ontological but an indicator of this process of commodification of the subject that created a global collectiveness manipulated by multinational companies (p. 9). Morris also argues that the subject is losing space in the process of commodification to brands. The consumerism opened a new spectrum where the subject is re-presented as a brand or a product with which it appears. Nevertheless, Jameson goes further in this content presenting inside a realm of architecture the reflex of a new concept of space where the subject does not recognize itself as a part of the whole. New buildings hold in itself the projection of dissolution of subject based on the argument of progress where those buildings don't open space to individuality. The imposition of the postmodernist architecture according to

² Superiority here doesn't mean it is better, but the general idea of historical sense.

Jameson forces the individuals to feel lost inside their own space of community. Jameson (1991) argues that, “My implication is that we ourselves, the human subjects who happen into this new space, have not kept pace with that evolution; there has been a mutation in the object unaccompanied as yet by any equivalent mutation in the subject” (p. 37). Since the Industrial Revolution different aspects and forms were created to annihilate the individual and any chance that the Capital had to embrace this it does not lose the opportunity. As the capital uses its power to oppress the individual, then the individual lose him/herself in a “collective melting” where it can be recognized only as complete, not as an individual anymore. This leads us to see how the subject became fragmented in a postmodernist era.

Jameson shows us the fragmentation of subject through the analyses of Munch’s painting ‘The Scream’ where in his interpretation of a distorted landscape, and the circling traces impress in the viewer the delusion of a series of feelings even though it does not transcend the modern space of the subject. According to Jameson, the postmodern fragmentation goes further, and the space of aesthetics has an important relevance in this new era. The era where buildings reflect the city and extrude the subject, turning it into an alien inside its own space. The subject’s fragmentation is the personal result of a commodification forced by the capital, and the relationship that the subject created with the time-money turning itself into a product overlapping the subject. The subject is a mere product of its own labor and its own representation; the subject recognize itself inside a marketplace where brands, and today’s social media forces the subject to be not him/herself, but only a representation inside a lost space. Jameson (1991) points that, “This shift in the dynamics of cultural pathology can be characterized as one in which the alienation of the subject is displaced by the latter’s fragmentation” (p. 13). This fragmentation however is more exposed in a commodified society where the product occupied the space where it used to be the subjectivity. The subject’s fragmentation opened the scenario to underscore the importance of commodification as alienation in the process of the disappearance of the subject in the postmodernist era.

The commodification as alienation as we said before has an intrinsic relation with the capitalism process where the individual becomes a labor power. The subject suffers a weakening losing the power of self-identity turning itself into a collectiveness that is appropriate by the capitalist. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that in a postmodernist context according to Jameson (1991), “Postmodernism is the consumption of sheer commodification as a process” (p. 9). The new machines assembly line and exploitation of labor force transform the subject in a piece expendable to the system. There are countless impositions from the Capital to the Subject making the self-recognition a hard way to be achieved. Jameson indicates that the architecture impresses a

new order in the space where the individual subjectivity positions itself in society. However, it is the new order of capitalism transforming the subject through commodification. For instance, when an actress/actor is turned into a product that is most of the time associated with a side product the subject loses his/her subjectivity to become a mere existence of the representation of the product. As Sartre (1960) remonstrated, this is a violent exploitation against the subject made by the capitalist system. Furthermore, the transformation of the subject in a commodity is in itself the subject alienation. E. P. Thompson (1967) presents to us in his writing *Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism* the importance of clock time to industrialization as a beginning of alienation inside the workshop transforming the interaction between labor and product no more as a product of its skills, but a product of the time as a condition to produce. Thompson (1967) observes that, "In mature capitalist society all time must be consumed, marketed, put to use; it is offensive for the labor force merely to 'pass the time'" (p. 90). To the capitalist process of production, the commodification of the subject is important because the labor force can be manipulated, and the alienation works to turn it into a collective capable of manipulation. Alienation is the pure reason and consequence of the commodification of the subject. Moreover, it is important to point out how the subject is included inside a postmodernist space.

It is important to notice that the subject in the postmodernist space is losing its representation towards the city. The commodification of subject is to go beyond and exert a strong influence in its reference inside the city. The postmodernist space transforms the subject into an alien inside its own city making his/her consciousness to get lost through disorientation, which is necessary to its alienation, to turn the collective a huge mass manipulated by the capital. Jameson gives the example of alienation as a process in which the individuals in society lose their representation of mapping the world where they live, consequently, since the individuals are not able to recognize their space and position inside the society; the capital overpowers and oppresses in all different ways. The subject in the postmodernist space suffers the oppression of the development and progress of capitalism which works to separate as far as it is able to the individuals from their own city. In addition, Jameson (1991) notes that the architecture has an important paper in this process of positioning the subject as an object alienated inside the city. "Architecture therefore remains in this sense the privileged aesthetic language; and the distorting and fragmenting reflections of one enormous glass surface to the other can be taken as paradigmatic of the central role of process and reproduction in postmodernist culture" (p. 36). So, the development of architecture as a new representation of capital and its representation of society turns the space into logic where it will constitute a new concept of space, the hyperspace that confronts the subject in everyday life. There is now a hyperspace where the subject is influenced and oppressed by and it,

the subject, has to confront it to find him/herself and his/her self-consciousness inside “the melting pot” of the collective.

Some megalopolis around the world, have seen for a while the increasing number of buildings and the transformation of architecture reflected in those constructions. At the same time that buildings with glass surfaces rise in front of the subject and block the opportunity of the individuals to see the line of the horizon, it shows us that we are being oppressed by the overwhelming greyish concrete represented as economic development. Jameson (1991) affirms that, “You are in this hyperspace up to your eyes and your body” (p. 42). However, the principal point is the self-representation of the individual human being inside this new and complex space. The subject is surrounded by oppressive buildings reflecting distorted skies and distorted cities bewildering the human beings that compound it. This postmodern hyperspace has a very important influence in our cultural worldview mutation as far as it is the intrinsic reflection of contemporary capitalism. Jameson (1991) also points out that, “This proposition is, however, substantively quite consistent with the previous diagnosis of a society of the image or the simulacrum and a transformation of the “real” into so many pseudo-events” (p. 47). The hyperspace transforms society in a “melting pot” where there is no space to recognize itself as an individual, the collective overlaps the individuality oppressing it through bewildering his cognition making it difficult for the individual body to appropriate the mapping space around itself. The main issue of postmodern space is the actual possibility of oppressing and bewildering the subject inside the city where it is supposed to be the place where this individual recognizes him/herself as an important part of it. This hyperspace leads us to view the loss of subjectivity in a contemporary world.

As a result of continuum commodification of subjectivity and the development of a new world represented as new megalopolis based in oppressive architecture the subject has been suffering an overwhelming oppression. The space of relationship where individuals exchange their interiority is now transformed into a space where those same individuals are forced to be lost. The architecture of the cities is based in an increasing complexity, indeed, to alienate the individuals and to create a new conceptual imagery which separates the society from its construction. Despite the fact that the city is at the same time a representation of its society and its society is represented by the city, its dialectical relationship is broken or overpowered by the small number of members who own the power to command the city’s aesthetic path. The same aesthetic path that oppresses the society is created by its members. Nevertheless, Jameson gives us an argument of disalienation where it is possible to reconstruct a sense of space where the individual recognize him/herself inside the hyperspace. “Disalienation in the traditional city, then, involves the practical reconquest of a sense of place and the construction or reconstruction of an articulated ensemble which can be

retained in memory and which the individual subject can map and remap along the moments of mobile, alternative trajectories” (Jameson, 1991, p. 51). The disalienation is a long process of recognition and reconstruction of a subject which got lost inside the contemporary world. The appropriation of the subject inside the capitalist mode of production, and all the effects of this brutal relationship between individuals whose compound society and capital owners has an intrinsic connection to operate the logic of making the subject to get lost inside the contemporary world. As a dialectical relationship it can be observed as a new ontological issue of the twentieth first century.

Even though the main project of ontology itself analyzes the human being and its representation, there is a dialectical relation on the human being, and it is not the human being that is important to draw attention to here. The subject representation concept is also dialectical in a postmodernist view since the discussion about subject and its representation inside the collective that come on. It is interesting to this matter of discussion the dialectical issue where the subject is pointed out as a reference of duality during its commodification process based on the capitalist mode of production. The subject’s individuality and self-consciousness is evidenced as a product of its relationship to the collective opening an opportunity to analyze the conjuncture of not being more as the Greeks thought a long time ago, but now as a relationship between the subject and the consciousness of its position in a space called city, or society. However, this is just another point to be worked out at a different time but seems important to note, because what looks as a totally apart discussion appears to be in some cases an interesting line of research.

The main purpose of this work is to show how the sovereignty has a powerful impact to annihilate the subject inside the capitalistic society. The relationship between money and labor worked to create an external appearance making the individual a useless piece of a frame based on exploitation. Marx’s idea ‘between master/slave’ is still actual, even though many others’ modes of domination through new technologies appeared and are being transforming the human beings’ relationships around the world³. It is noticeable that the subject annihilation is a result of sovereignty as a power without limits and ethic behaviors, which superimpose a way of life where the subject is supposed to lose his/her individuality inside the main collectiveness of society. Nevertheless, there is an important point which is the sovereignty of ideology whereas the capital influences all of the social apparatus to manipulate individuals. As Althusser (1970) presents in his text, what the subject means, as a free individual capable of subjectivity and the possibility of

³ I want to make clear that I believe there are different aspects of relationships between the society which is “inside” the technological process and the many others’ societies which do not have access to the same technology. In many communities of the Northeast of Brazil, where technology, for instance, computers and internet are not available the relationship has a different aspect.

acceptance of submission of its subjectivity (p.41). It seems to us that the State, as well as, the Capital uses all possible ways to disfigure the subject in favor of itself as a power to annihilate any trace of subjectivity turning the human being into just a manipulable object of society. Although there are many well-known forces of oppression that search for the power of sovereignty, the capital itself has been overwhelming in its attitude of oppression penetrating all aspects of the subject, since its birth to its death. Moreover, if the capital itself already presupposes in its essence the sovereignty over individuals inside a society, indigenous communities suffer and struggle more and more because in some cases it (the community) is outside the mainstream body of the capitalist system.

The annihilation of Indigenous Subjectivity follows the mainstream society as a Capitalist project. If it is hard to understand the oppression that people who lives inside the cities and urban areas, then to indigenous communities who have a different perspective of sense of community becomes a totally strange world of relationships. As far as the community is from the mainstream society it will be also far away from the capital. In different parts of the world where First Nation communities suffered local changes imposed by the Capital many problems emerged between indigenous⁴ among their communities. There are different aspects that can be used to present the annihilation of the Indigenous subject, although here, it is important since we used Jameson's argument of the hyperspace to point out the subject alienation to introduce the idea where the subject is annihilated by the space where the subject finds itself. In the case of the Indigenous subject which has an intrinsic relationship with land and nature, the city and its development, as a result of Capitalism imposition to overlap the individuals turning them into mere objects usable by capital. Coulthard (2014) argues that,

However, for the state, recognizing and accommodating "the cultural" through the negotiation of land claims would not involve the recognition of alternative Indigenous economies and forms of political authority, as the mode of production/mode of life concept suggests; instead, the state insisted that any institutionalized accommodation of Indigenous cultural difference be reconcilable with one political formation - namely, colonial sovereignty - and one mode of production - namely, capitalism. (p. 66)

Conclusion

In conclusion, as far as society is being manipulated by the colonial system and colonial power of capitalism its result when related with Indigenous communities has an impact that is too

⁴ Even though in Northeastern Brazil there is a case where a community was transferred from one place to another because of a dam construction and today this community is the biggest consumer of antidepressants and has one of the highest suicide indexes. This is not only about Indigenous communities, but everyone that lives and has history linked with land.

large to be calculated or thought to be because of the countless sensibility of subjectivity. Nevertheless, the study and research to open inside the mainstream society an opportunity for the “subaltern speak” is a *sine qua non* condition to dialogue and to understand how the Indigenous subject sees the colonial sovereignty which oppresses them. Can we see through their eyes the world in which we are submerged?

REFERENCES

- Althusser, Louis. (1970) *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*: notes towards an investigation. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm>
- Coulthard, S. G. (2014) *Red Skin, White Masks*: rejecting the colonial politics of recognition. Minneapolis: University of Manitoba Press
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1806) *The phenomenology of Mind*. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/ph/phba.htm>
- Jameson, F. (1991) *Postmodernism, Or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press
- Marx, Karl. (2009) *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. Moscow: Progress Publishers. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Economic-Philosophic-Manuscripts-1844.pdf>
- Marx, Karl. (1857) *Grundrisse*. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1857/grundrisse/ch09.htm#p471>
- Marx, Karl. (1867) *The Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Vol. I. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-I.pdf>
- Morris, Martin. (2001) *Contradictions of Post-modern Consumerism and Resistance*. In *Studies in Political Economy*. Ontario: Carleton University
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. (1960) *Racism and Colonialism as Praxis and Process*. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/sartre/works/critic/racism-algeria.htm>
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. (1960) *Collectives*. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/sartre/works/critic/collectives.htm>
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. (1960) *Totality and Totalisation*. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/sartre/works/critic/praxis.htm>
- Thompson, E. P. (1967) *Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism*. Oxford University Press Retrieved from <https://libcom.org/files/timeworkandindustrialcapitalism.pdf>