services at low or near zero marginal cost. Accordingly, this global 'Collaborative Commons' can potentially transform the economy, argues Rifkin.

While there are gains from Rifkin's research, he operates with a rather structural analysis of power, one where the everyday relations and embodied subjectivities of consumers are under theorised. To remedy this, the paper draws on Foucauldian conceptions of power relations and subjectivisation, arguing that the potential of collaborative consumption as resistance does not lie in its capacity to change existing economic structures, but in its capacity to transform the existing consumer subjectivities integral to the economic, political and cultural structures of the capitalist market society.

This paper considers how collaborative consumption exercises consumer subjectivities based on ideas of ownership and institutional trust that encompass liberal ideologies of the self and private property born out of Enlightenment philosophies of John Lock by comparing it to Anarchist-orientated anti-cunsumption practices. Consequently, this paper will address the following question: by moving from consumption based on ownership to practising consumption based on sharing and peer-to-peer trust, can the consent to the political and cultural system of liberalism be dissolved "from below" (Foucault, 1980, p. 95), therefore challenging the economic system of the capitalist free market?

The aim of this paper is not to assess the impact collaborative consumption has had on the capitalist system, but rather theorize and locate its potential as a form of resistance. Therefore, I will not speculate about its future, but rather give a theoretical account that can provide a foundation for future studies. By looking at David Graeber's theories of debt, trust, social ties and currencies, this paper identifies theoretical synergies between what he calls "human economies" (2011, p.130) and what Botsman describes is the economic interaction like between the collaboratists. Rifkin calls these interactions "collaborative economies" (2014a). Therefore I suggest that future studies should embody long term ethnographic fieldwork on those practising collaborative consumption to analyse the formation of their consumer subjectivities with respect to ownership, imagination, trust, currencies and the everyday embodied relations to capital and technology; seeking to discover to what extent collaborative consumption economies are a form of human economies of the 21st century?

Alise Viba, Sussex University,

marked by the consumer ability to connect, produce and share their own energy, physical products, and services globally at a near zero marginal cost thus becoming 'prosumers' and disrupting the workings of capitalist markets (Rifkin, 2014b).

According to Rifkin, its success lies in the internal contradictions of capitalism, namely, the dynamics of competitive markets that drive the productivity up and marginal costs down, making some goods and services nearly free and no longer subjected to market forces (*Ibid*.). To illustrate, the rise in online music sharing and the decrease in profit for the record industry has not been accidental. He also points out to the current 'underlying cultural conflict' and power struggles 'between the capitalists and collaboratists,' characterized in a dialectic of 'monopolization vs. democratization of everything' (Rifkin, 2014c), and predicts that by 2050 the sharing economy and 'prosumer' collaborative approach will be "the primary arbiter of economic life in most of the world" dominating the current economic system and capitalist approach (Rifkin, 2014b).

To sum up, Rifkin views collaborative consumption as economic resistance to global capitalism that has born out of its inherent contradictions. Furthermore, the power struggles are located in the economic domain signalling a structural approach to power and to a dialectic relationship between capitalism and the sharing economy, which is seen to be more democratic. Another way to investigate this relationship and consider the sharing economy as part of anti-capitalist resistance is by way of Karl Polanyi and his concept of the 'double movement,' considered in the following section.

1.2 Capitalism and collaborative consumption: Polanyi's countermovement and resistance.

In Polanyi's (1944) analysis of how markets became disembedded from the rest of society, in *The Great Transformation* and after, he identifies the historical dialectic or ' á ^ ˘ ⁎ c

starting point to establish the motivations of collaborative consumers. They

technology to shift and rearrange social priorities needed to support itself and perhaps to dominate the capitalist logic.

To conclude, there are two sides to collaborative consumption as a form of resistance. Firstly, it is, as identified by Rifkin, a platform of 'collaboratists' operating as a countermovement to economic violence disrupting the self-regulating market and current patterns of recourse distribution. Secondly, it is a platform for practising exchange forms based on the logic of sharing and for negotiation of social priorities and values seen to be in opposition to the prevailing capitalist free market logic. In what follows, this paper will investigate the prevailing social priorities and values in liberal capitalist societies such as the US and the UK, examine their shift by collaborative consumption, and assess the implications of this for anti-capitalist resistance and formation of alternatives.

2. The Liberal Self and social priorities in liberal capitalist societies.

In this paper the 'Liberal Self' is taken to mean the social identity composed of values and virtues necessary for a functioning global civil society (Hopgood, 2000, p. 20). The examination of the formation of 'the hegemonic ideological coordinates' (Žižek, 2010, p. 194) of the Liberal Self will be offered in this section. As these coordinates govern state systems and market structures, shape individuals participating in institutionalized exchange systems, they also pre-determine the possible modes of resistance.

2. 1 Locke: private property, liberalism and capitalism.

Doyle defines liberal states by the legal equality of citizens, a representative government, private property, and a market economy (Doyle in Jahn, 2005, p. 180). These qualities of liberal democracies have their origins in the European Enlightenment philosophy of John Locke. "His influence on the way we think about ourselves and our relation to the world we live in, to God, nature and society, has been

Locke sees the environment as ‘God-given’ and describes its alteration as follows: “His labour hath

internalizing its values, virtues, rights and expectations. In the case of a Liberal Self they are ownership, citizenship and the logic of appropriating.

This is exemplified in the liberal encounter with the 'North American Indians'. For the Indians the 'natural' rights were non-automatic, they were congruent with US citizenship. They were entitled to these rights *only after* meeting the entry criteria of citizenship which encapsulated the notion of 'civilisation' and liberal virtues (Hopgood, 2000, p. 15) [Original emphasis]. Their culture, virtues, logic and priorities had to change before joining the US liberal civil society. In other words, they had to internalize the logic of a liberal civil society's citizen and only then they could enjoy their 'natural' rights. For Michel Foucault (1982) this categorization of the individual, marking him by hi

'New Labour' politicians would frequently diagnose a 'poverty of aspiration' in working-class schools to explain poor school results or generational poverty, blaming underconsuming classes for the effects that the collapse of industry, lack of jobs and other socio-economic factors have had on the population (*Ibid.,* p.91). As a consequence some of the targeted class are increasing consumption to acheive the promised illusory escape from their class circumstances.

The cases illuminate how what appears to be a natural process - autonomous individuals pursuing their freely chosen self-interests - is a result of aggressive social construction aimed at deconstruction of diverse identities and construction of a particular one. A self, that is compatible with the state and the economic system (Hopgood, 2000, p. 15). Consequently, 'actually-existing identities' and heterogeneity are endangered (*Ibid*.); and production of 'own to consume' subjectivities that correspond to the political and economic institution is achieved.

The liberal self holds the idea of private property central to its legal, economic and cultural life. It represents the force of government, the logic of appropriation and the ideas of consumption as progress. In short, the logic of "consuming via acquiring" supports a larger economic structure, namely, capitalism, and consent Consequentl0tionand legat

but from the largeness, solidity, and heaviness of the objects themselves." (Graeber, 2007, p. 5) In other words, the 'market logic' is internalized by people under the constant threat of structural violence.

Moreover, the 'reality effect' identified by Graeber is the imposed "law of truth," that Foucault describes as "ensembles of rules according to which the true and the false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true." (Foucault, 1980, p. 132). One of the important traits of the "political economy of truth in societies like ours" is that "it is produced and transmitted under the control of a few great political and economic apparatuses," for example, university, army, media, government, that establish "regimes of truth" (*Ibid*. p.131-3) Although there are struggles for production of truth, these authorities often stay unchallenged. The 'reality effect' or "truth" in cases similar to the DAN's car, prevent people from reimagining ownership, consumption and society all together, which constrains the possibility of direct democracy or other alternative economic or social organization.

It must be recognized that some aspects of consumption are, in fact, regulated and determined by the state or other institution; nonetheless, if we see power as embedded in the very structure of society, it becomes difficult to see how social forces can escape the inherent tendencies imposed by structures (Knafo, 2010, p. 493). Besides the State and the market, there are many other points in society where power is exercised such as the formation of identities and subjectivities, as pointed out by Foucault (1982) in *the Subject and Power*. Consequently, if Foucault's understanding of power is right, one can argue that collaborative consumption is a social force that tries to escape the inherent tendency of 'acquire to consume' logic, and the 'reality effect' by allowing its participants to negotiate their values and priorities, constructing new consumer subjectivities and, perhaps, regimes of truth. Thus, it encompasses power struggle against forces of subjection and enables heterogeneity, direct democracy, and new channels of distribution of resources.

If Foucault's understanding of power is not correct, then perhaps the potential power of collaborative consumption must be understood in a different manner. If that is so, then this data presented here will be usefully employed therein. There are other sources where the transformative potential of collaborative consumption has been sought, such as, the market structure, as Rifkin suggests. However, as a result of

the function of consumption as it is central to the formation of consumer subjectivities. However, I will initially discuss production and distribution briefly.

3.1.1 Production.

Regarding the production of goods and services, an analysis of collaborative consumption can be

people are now using social media sites and networks to share not only cars but also homes, clothes, tools, toys and other items (Rifkin, 2014a).

Collaborative consumption enthusiasts are forming online-based groups and communities like *peers.org* and *collaborativeconsumption.com* to promote these practices, organize workshops to improve their operation and negotiate their aims and values. Subsequently, the main objectives of collaborative consumption as a movement have now been framed. For example, *peers.org* claim that "the sharing economy is not only helping us pay the bills and work flexible hours, but meet new people and spend more time with our families. Additionally, consuming directly from people we can trust is more affordable, more social and less wasteful." (Unknown, 2014c) Moreover, they identify collaborative consumption as a shift

discarded goods, enabling consumption without providing financial support to capitalist corporations while protesting against the wastefulness of the commercial retail system (Portwood-Stacer, 2012, p. 94). Collaborative consumers engage in similar practices, but with strangers. People are motivated to establish social ties with the use of things, engaging in what might initially be considered "risky business." Sydney-

her/him in the first place. "Money" as we understand it today is an institutionalized 'accounting tool' verified by the state and a

and ownership “from below” (Foucault, 1980, p. 94) and by strengthening the imaginative capacities for building a future of “truly human economies” (Maurer, 2013, p.10).

However, to what extent is sharing

of high quality living; if it grows, the sharing economy may prove that ownership isn't everything, and share and share-a-like is another way of looking at the whole world." (Day, 2014)

Against this background, I argue that, by challenging the fundamental principles upon which consumption is based, resistance to the prevailing economic, political and cultural systems is performed by creating collaborative commons in which the new consumer subjectivities and social identities can be exercised. These identities and collaborative subjectivities adhere to values that contrast with those of liberalism, thereby empowering people to imagine and form new countermovements to the structural and economic violence of the free-market capitalism. This revitalizes the creative capacities of individuals necessary for building a 'new world.'

Bibliography

Botsman, R. & Rogers, R., 2010. *What's Mine Is Yours: The Rise of Collaborative Consumption.* New York: Harper Collins e-books.

Carrier, J. G., 2012. Introduction. In: J. G. Carrier & P. Luetchford, eds. *Ethical Consumption: Social value and economic practise.* Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1-36.

Collaborative Consumption, 2014a. *About: Collaborative Consumption.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.collaborativeconsumption.com/about/
[Accessed 7 May 2014].

Day, P., 2014. *The Sharing Economy. BBC Radio 4: Peter Day's World of Business.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b042ldzy
[Accessed 10 May 2014].

de Lecaros Aquise, X., 2014. *The rise of collaborative consumption and the experience of economy. The Guardian.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/jan/03/collaborative-consumption-experience-economy-startups
[Accessed 1 April 2014].

Farr, C., 2012. *CouchSurfing, now a 'social travel network', gets a $15M boost. Venturebeat.* [Online]
Available at: http://venturebeat.com/2012/08/22/couchsurfing-second-round-funding/
[Accessed 1 April 2014].

Foucault, M., 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writinings 1972-1977.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M., 1982. The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry,* 8(4), pp. 777-795.

Gansky, L., 2014. *Peers: Why We Share.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.peers.org/
[Accessed 1 May 2014].

Graeber, D., 2007. Revolution in Reverse. *The Anarchist Library,* pp. 1-18.

Graeber, D., 2011. *Debt: The First 5,000 Years.* New York: Melville House Publishing.

Haiven, M., 2014. *Crises of Imagination, Crises of Power. Reflections on a Revolution Magazine.* [Online]
Available at: http://roarmag.org/2014/01/max-haiven-crises-of-imagination/
[Accessed 10 April 2014].

Hann, C. M., 1998. *Property relations: Renewing the anthropological tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harmes, A., 2001. Institutional investors and Polanyi's double movement: a model of contemporary currency crises. *Review of International Political Economy,* 8(3), pp. 389-437.

Hart, K. & Ortiz, H., 2008. Anthropology in the Financial Crisis. *Anthropology Today,* 24(6), pp. 1-3.

Hopgood, S., 2000. Reading the Small Print in Global Civil Society: The Inexorable Hegemony of the Liberal Self. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies,* 29(1), pp. 1-25.

society_b_5064767.html
[Accessed 7 May 2014].

Rifkin, J., 2014c. *The Internet of Things: Monopoly Capitalism vs. Collaborative Commons. The Huffington Post.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeremy-rifkin/internet-of-things_b_5104072.html
[Accessed 6 May 2014].

Rifkin, J., 2014. *The Zero Marginal Cost Society: The Internet of Things, the Collaborative Commons, and the Eclipse of Capitalism.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ross, J., 2013. *Everyday communism and the "spirit of Christmas." Reflections on a Revolution Magazine.* [Online]
Available at: http://roarmag.org/2013/12/everyday-communism-christmas-dickens/
[Accessed 26 Desember 2013].

Shah, D. V., McLeod, D. M., Friedland, L. & Nelson, M. R., 2007. The Politics of Consumption/ The Consumption of Politics. *American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Volume 611, pp. 6-15.

Shukaitis, S., 2011. Nobody knows what an insurgent body can do. In: H. J & R. Clementson, eds. *Anarchism & Sexuality: Ethics, Relationships and Power.* London: Routledge, pp. 45-66.

Skarlatos, T., 2013. *Cookisto: A new Greek way of getting dinner. BBC News.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-24163742
[Accessed 29 September 2013].

Sparks, C. & Isaacs, S., 2004. *Political Theorists in Context.* London and New York: Taylor and Francis Group.

Unknown, 2013. All eyes on the sharing economy. *Technology Quarterly,* Issue Q1.

Unknown, 2014b. *About: Collaborative Consumption: What is Collaborative Consumption.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.collaborativeconsumption.com/about/#What is CollaborativeConsumption.com?
[Accessed 1 May 2014].

Unknown, 2014c. *Peers: What is Peers.* [Online]
Available at: http://www.peers.org/
[Accessed 1 May 2014].

Uzgalis, W., 2014. *The Influence of John Locke's Works. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* [Online]
Available at: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke/influence.html
[Accessed 8 May 2014].

Velshi, A., 2014. *Disruptive Innovation Festival Official Website.* [Online]
Available at: http://thinkdif.co/headliners/rachel