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This thesis, through an application of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s theory of Empire, argues that a manifestation of the multitude is occurring through the Arab Spring, where the multitude attempts to create an alternative to the biopolitical production of Empire. Empire is apparent in the decline of sovereignty of the nation state and the transformation of sovereignty to global power networks. With the use of the concept of biopower, according to which control is exercised by entering into the consciousness and bodies of the population and all social relationships, I investigate whether societies of control are manifested in the Middle East. In particular, I inquire whether biopower, following Hardt and Negri, has become the foundation of life in some of the societies in the Middle East by way of influencing all social relationships. I argue that the Arab Spring and subsequent protests represent a manifestation of the multitude, which challenges this biopolitical production of social control that is characteristic of Empire. I, further, argue that the multitude manifests itself by entering into the terrain of biopower where, with the use of democratic uses of violence such as social media, effectively creates an alternative to the current global order of Empire.
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CHAPTER 1: EMPIRE THEORY

An Overview of the Arab Spring

The Arab region has experienced tremendous turmoil recently, resulting in a state of transition. In December 2010, a Tunisian twenty-six-year-old fruit and vegetable vendor Mohamed Bouazizi set himself on fire after the police confiscated his cart because he did not have a permit. His injuries lead to his death. Bouazizi will never be able to find out that his protest created movements that spread from his nation to other Arab nations. A month later Tunisian President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali fled to Saudi Arabia, ending his more than two-decade authoritarian rule. Mass demonstrations that began in Egypt in January 2011, initiated global awareness of these protest movements that spread throughout the Arab region. These upheavals have lead to dictators being overthrown in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen, creating an atmosphere where new political and economic systems are crucial to continuance of the demands of the populist movements. Civil resistance is the main technique used by the protestors. Resistance has been campaigned through demonstrations, rallies and social media to increase awareness. The people of these nations want to end the decades long authoritarian regimes that has completely disregarded their wellbeing. However the overthrow of authoritarian regimes is not the only motivating issue for these populations. In addition, the many human rights violations and extreme poverty/concentration of wealth are also some factors that have led to dissatisfied populations. The movements within the various countries share “a
common call for personal dignity and responsive government”, while also including economic and social dynamics.¹

Tunisia initiated the wave of demonstrations that spread throughout the Arab region. The demonstrations “spiraled toward the capital from the neglected rural areas, finding common cause with a once powerful but much repressed labor movement”.² President Zine el Abidine Ben Ali thus was the first Arab dictator to fall because of the protests. Ben Ali’s government was tremendously corrupt and at the same time strictly restricted free expression and political parties.³ When Mohamed Bouazizi set himself ablaze, he created an act that was beyond the understanding of most people. His self-immolation initiated an idea that resonated throughout the Arab region – citizens no longer need to live in a society of control where their lives are controlled though the machinery of biopower. The success of the Tunisian revolution generated the sense of empowerment that resonated through the following demonstrations throughout the Arab region.

The uprising that occurred in Tunisian empowered “urbane and cosmopolitan young people”⁴ in Egypt to organize mass demonstrations. Hosni Mubarak’s government included many of the difficulties that Tunisians faced from their government. The Mubarak government was incapable or unwilling to provide basic services to their people, where a majority was unemployed and living in poverty. In addition, like the

² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid.
Tunisian government, Mubarak’s government was corrupt and business elites that were connected to his family were gaining while the population was dwindling. The police in Egypt were completely distrusted by the population, “everything in Egypt – from obtaining a driver’s license to getting an education – is formally very cheap but in practice very expensive”. Egyptians were caught in a trap of bribing police officers to receive rights they are formally guaranteed. This is similar to the situation of Mohamed Bouazizi; he set himself on fire to essentially protest the police abuse and unwarranted taking away of his fruit cart. Likewise, the beating to death of Khaled Said by two police officers set off the Egyptian revolution. Libya is much the same as these other two nations developed here. Muammar al-Qaddafi’s regime encompassed prevalent corruption and brutality. The regime prohibited private ownership and forbidden free press/expression. In addition, like the other nations explained, Libya’s anti-government protest was prompted by the arrest of a human rights lawyer in Benghazi. Within each of these nations and the Arab region in general, there is a common call among the population for personal self-worth and open and active governments.

The Arab Spring has illuminated the theoretical discourse of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s Empire. Through the discussion of Empire and the multitude, it can be argued that the Arab Spring represents a manifestation of the multitude that is challenging the biopolitical production of Empire.

Empire and the Creation of the Multitude

Globalization has initiated an irreversible change to economic and cultural relations. A new global order has emerged encompassing a new form of sovereignty. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri call this new global order, Empire. Within this new order, nation-states have experienced a decline in sovereignty. Presently money, technology, people and goods are able to move with ease across national boundaries. The ease in transition has lead to nation-states losing regulation of their boundaries and thus their economies. However sovereignty in general has not declined, instead it has taken a new form “composed of a series of national and supranational organisms united under a single logic of rule” or Empire. According to Hardt and Negri, Empire establishes no territorial center of power, no reliance on fixed boundaries or barriers, with hybrid identities, flexible hierarchies and plural exchanges. Empire thus encompasses “spatial totality”. The authors introduce Empire as a concept, not a metaphor, and approach the concept theoretically. In addition, Empire does not have sequential order – “this is the way things will always be and they way there were meant to be”, the concept operates outside of historical records. Operating on a biopolitical level, Empire encompasses eminent power of oppression. Conversely the authors do not argue for a reversal - back to old domination. Rather, “the creative forces of the multitude that sustain Empire are also capable of autonomously constructing a counter-Empire, an alternative political

---

7 Ibid., xii.
8 Ibid., xiv.
9 Ibid., xv.
organization of global flows and exchanges”.\textsuperscript{10} The multitude will create something that will take us beyond Empire, something new entirely. Is the Arab Spring then a manifestation of the multitude in action and could the Arab Spring present a challenge to the biopolitical production of Empire? I will discuss the Empire theory more thoroughly because its presence creates this multitude, which can ultimately be its negation.

The constitution of Empire is “what use to be conflict or competition among several imperialist powers has in important respects been replaced by the idea of a single power that over determines them all, structures them in a unitary way, and treats them under one common notion of right that is decidedly postcolonial and post imperialist”, in essence it is “governance without government”.\textsuperscript{11} The constitution of Empire directly or indirectly remodels nation state law and initiates a new supranational law. To establish this constitution Empire is not formed by force alone, it enlarges its entire accord to include rights and peace to support its power. Fluidity is common within globalization; to control the fluidity Empire establishes the function of intervention. The right of the police is created from this situation, “the formation of a new right is inscribed in the deployment of prevention, repression and rhetorical force aimed at the reconstruction of social equilibrium”\textsuperscript{12}, and thus the police are created to maintain order among the population. The right of intervention is a significant outcome of Empire, creating a sustained state of exception. Interventions are all legitimated in the sense of universal values that the supranational law generates. In essence, “the external morality of every

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 9-13.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 17.
human being and citizen is by now commensurable only in the framework of Empire”.\textsuperscript{13}

The authors point out though, that the Empire framework seems to be inferior to police action, “Empire is emerging today at the center that supports the globalization of productive networks and casts its widely inclusive net to try and envelop all power relations within its world order – and yet at the same time it deploys a power police function against the new barbarians and the rebellious slaves who threaten its order”.\textsuperscript{14}

The same force that empowers Empire can ultimately cause its decline.

\textbf{Empire and Biopower}

Disciplinary institutions enforce and create obedience, “disciplinary power rules in effect by structuring the parameters and limits of thought and practice, sanctioning and prescribing normal and/or deviant behavior”.\textsuperscript{15} Biopower attempts to completely control life itself. In a disciplinary society relationships between power and the individual remain fixed. In a society of control power becomes completely biopolitical, “the whole social body is comprised by power’s machine and developed in its virtuality”.\textsuperscript{16}

Essentially society becomes a single body, allowing resistances that are “no longer marginal but active in the center of a society that opens up in networks; the individual points are singularized in a thousand plateaus”.\textsuperscript{17} Yet, as mentioned earlier Empire’s intervention function is essential to its legitimacy. The state of exception that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, \textit{Empire} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 19.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 20.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 24.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 25.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
encompasses Empire creates a situation that allows Empire to intervene when breakdowns occur within the system.

The concept of biopower according to Hardt and Negri is “a form of power that regulates social life from its interior, following it, interpreting it, absorbing it – every individual embraces and reactivates this power of his or her own accord”.\(^\text{18}\) Therefore, the management of life is the principal mission of biopower.\(^\text{19}\) Biopower is expressed through the control of life, entering into the consciousness and bodies of the population and all social relationships. Within this biopolitical production we live in a society of control – bypassing the traditional society of discipline. In a society of discipline, compliance is managed through disciplinary institutions such as hospitals and schools. In a society of control biopower is not confined solely to these disciplinary institutions. Rather, biopower becomes the foundation of life; it has entered into the entire realm of social relations. Within a society of control power is exercised within every aspect of life through the machines that directly dictate the consciousness and bodies of society, alienating any chance of creative constituent practices.\(^\text{20}\) Therefore, in a biopolitical setting money and capital are concentrated. The immaterial labor force is divided to where those who have particular aptitudes are valued more highly than those who do the actual labor. In this instance, biopower is controlling those talented individuals as much as those who are undervalued. To effectively combat the network like structure of Empire, the multitude must use this biopower. The multitude must utilize these


\(^{19}\) Ibid.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 23.
biopolitical machines, such as communication systems like Facebook and Twitter, in a liberatory fashion. Biopower engages within the interior of our lives, therefore, using this power in a liberatory fashion the repressive means of biopower may vanish.

Within the Arab region biopower is evident. Not only is it evident within the communication systems being used as democratic uses of violence, such as Facebook, but also within the social activities of the population – always being monitored. What is occurring throughout the region can be seen where it all began – Tunisia. Antonio Negri in a letter to a Tunisian friend stated, “twenty years ago we could barely comprehend the transformation from industrial work into immaterial/cognitive work, and today Tunisia has an overabundance of this cutting edge labor power”.21 It is these people, who have been involved in the biopolitical machine, which encompasses the means to transcend the frustration of the representational structure of society within biopower. It is this nonlinear relationship that allows biopower to enter into our social relationships. The Arab region can be seen as transcending into a cosmopolitan region where immaterial labor thrives, thus transcending further into the biopolitical machine of Empire. In addition, within these dictatorial regimes, “the problem is not so much that politicians are corrupt (although in many cases this is also true) but rather that the constitutional structure isolates the mechanisms of political decision-making from the power and desires of the multitude”.22 Therefore, Empire has constructed this desire within the multitude to develop an alternative to the regime because of the biopolitical control, “the

revolting masses, their desire for liberation, their experiments to construct alternatives, and their instances of constituent power have all at their best moments pointed toward the internationalization and globalization of relationships, beyond the divisions of national, colonial and imperialist rule”.

Through Empire a production of locality occurs, identities are constructed and reconstructed at the local. The locality is not immune to Empire’s influence. Hardt and Negri argue that, “this strategy of defending the local is damaging because it obscures and even negates the real alternatives and the potential for liberation that exist within Empire”. It is better then to enter into the terrain of Empire to effectively combat it. In addition, the new figure and subjectivities produced by the multitude are not solely negative – these subjectivities are not just against the biopolitical production. The subjectivities also “express, nourish, and develop positively their own constituent projects”. Thus, “the deterritorializing power of the multitude is the productive force that sustains Empire and at the same time the force that calls for and makes necessary its destruction”.

The inquiry into the concept of Empire contains two perspectives. In one perspective, Empire establishes a clear biopolitical rule over the multitude. In the other perspective the hierarchy is reversed where Empire is a “mere apparatus of capture that

24 Ibid., 46.
25 Ibid., 61.
26 Ibid.
lives only off the vitality of the multitude”.

The second perspective exemplifies the importance of resistances by the multitude to keep Empire from becoming completely biopolitical, creating a society of control. When the hierarchy is reversed the biopolitical power of Empire is empty. The alternative paradigm created by the multitude can become a positive force – challenging the biopolitical machine to where it appears as only a distant alternative, not the norm. By struggling against a norm, the multitude proves its power and relentlessness.

Empire creates an arena where political transcendence is seen instantly as “tyranny and barbarism”.

The multitude must use its essential powers – “being, loving, transforming, creating” – to engage in reality and create change. When the multitude transforms the movement into reality what is created is a common thing. Thus, what is occurring is that what became common is singularized; these commons are transformed into the new constituent power. Consequently then, “Empire creates a greater potential for revolution than did the modern regimes of power because it presents us, alongside the machine of command, within an alternative: the set of all the exploited and the subjugated, a multitude that is directly opposed to Empire, with no mediation between them”.

After discussing the constitution of Empire the multitude can be seen as created by Empire. However, the multitude can be transformed into a new political subjectivity,

---

28 Ibid., 355.
29 Ibid., 357.
30 Ibid., 358.
31 Ibid., 393.
“an insurgent multitude against imperial power”\textsuperscript{32} Therefore from this standpoint the constitution of Empire is the outcome of these new constituent powers that are formed by the common singularities of the multitude. The multitude exemplifies a singularity establishing “a new place in the non-place of Empire”; these singularities are defined through the biopolitical production\textsuperscript{33} The multitude therefore is not created by just blending nations and people uncaringly\textsuperscript{34} The multiplicity of feelings and cultural flairs allows the revolution to take hold and invites more individuality to join. The right to global citizenship can be constituted through the vast movement of the multitude. Globalization allows populations to move and establish new spaces. Soon enough, “passports or legal documents” will be unable “to regulate our movements across borders”; therefore the multitude also establishes a “new geography”\textsuperscript{35} The constant movement of the multitude creates an active population, “these movements often cost terrible suffering, but there is also in them a desire of liberation that is not satisfied except by reappropriating new spaces, around which we are constructed new freedoms”\textsuperscript{36} The movement of the multitude is difficult for Empire to contain, criminalizing those who do not abide by their boundaries is the most Empire can do. This flow of the multitude helps create their political power, “Empire must restrict and isolate the spatial movements of

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 395. 
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid. 
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 397. 
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
the multitude to stop them from gaining political legitimacy”\textsuperscript{37} Empire can attempt to subdue these movements by utilizing its military and police powers, yet these powers “can only isolate, divide, and segregate”\textsuperscript{38} These utilities still remain outside the multitude and its movement and if Empire restricts the multitude too much it can decrease its own power at the same time. The multitude, according the Hardt and Negri, should demand global citizenship. To limit the multitude’s movement is to limit its global citizenship. Global citizenship is necessary within the current social arrangement where fluidity of populations is made with ease. Also, because the multitude establishes a new geography, where passports and such will no longer be needed, global citizenship is necessary for the multitude to continue creating singularities and creating alternatives to the biopolitical production of Empire. A “collective existence”\textsuperscript{39} of the multitude is important to further its political demands.

Relevance of Empire and its Critiques

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri seek to make a theoretical explanation of the transformation that has been culminating in this global society. One cannot argue that Hardt and Negri offer a compelling theoretical explanation to the emerging globalization studies. Accordingly, there are many criticisms of the Empire theory. Many critics seek to criticize the theory of being soft on terrorism and “collapse politics and the state too

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 399.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 401.
readily into the economy”. Also, some scholars question whether the multitude has this overwhelming desire for democracy. Terrell Carver, in his review of the multitude and Empire, argue that if such an overwhelming desire for democracy is present, why haven’t the American people revolted for more democratic representation? It can be argued against this assumption that the American people have in fact revolted – the Occupy Movement. Furthermore, while Occupy began in the United States of America it spread to Western European countries – furthering Hardt and Negri’s discussion of a global multitude forming. In addition, scholars wonder if the attacks on September 11, 2001 have seen a reemergence of an imperialist United States of America, stronger boundaries and a resurgent central state power. Hardt and Negri’s account then has trouble explaining the resurgent patriotic dialogue that has taken place since the terrorist attacks in the United States and Western Europe. The nation state’s reemergence as a central authority in defending its populations against outside threats undermines the network like structure of Empire and the plurality of sovereignty. Thus, the question that can be debated is whether the Empire theory is a glimpse of the recent past rather than a futuristic account. Accordingly is the Empire theory relevant then in globalization studies?

Globalization Studies and Empire

Globalization is quickly reshaping traditional theories within the social sciences. Globalization is a multidimensional discourse that includes many different theoretical

41 Ibid., 210.
explanations. In recent decades academia has seen a rise in globalization studies, “global political processes, the rise of new transnational institutions and concomitantly the spread of global governance and authority structures of diverse sorts”. These new relations have increased observation of scholars who attempt to explain this new global order. Globalization is itself an extremely contested topic, those who think that globalization has led to additional inequalities and authority structures and those who believe that globalization has created a more equal and a freer world. People are more connected than ever before because of globalization, leading to quick social change and transformation among populations. The contested topic of globalization and the quickness of change have lead to many theoretical discourses within globalization; there is not one single theory of globalization.

The world-system theoretical discussion relates to theories of global capitalism that encompasses Empire. Both critique capitalism as expansionary, encompassing the entire world. The difference between Empire and the world-system theory is the transcendence of the nation state. Empire exemplifies the reorder of power globally through different network structures – thus the transcendence of the nation state is evident. Global capitalism theories engage in discussion about the supranational political organizations “as signs of an incipient transnational or global governance structure”. Thus, these theorists seek to explain the transcendence of national economies and states within a global system. In addition to these globalization discourses, Empire is made

43 Ibid., 131.
relevant within the network society dialogue. This approach to globalization revolves around the expansion of technology and the informational capacity that is now at our fingertips. This theoretical approach is similar to Hardt and Negri’s discussion because the multitude utilizes this new technology as a democratic use of violence through social media and other technological outlets. The Arab Spring and Occupy initiated this democratic use of violence to support its leaderless organizational structure. Social media allows activists a forum for discussion, engagement and the ability to organize efficiently – “the Internet, in this regard, constructs a new symbolic environment, global in its reach, which makes virtuality a reality”.\textsuperscript{44} Manuel Castell’s network society is more optimistic than the world systems and global capitalism approach because it exemplifies the open space that globalization initiates. Furthermore theories of space, place and globalization are relevant within Empire. Local contexts are influenced by global occurrences because of the social relations that globalization encompasses. Saskia Sassen in \textit{The Global City} diverts from Hardt and Negri, where global cities are seen as important structures of power. However, one could argue that these major global cities are just one of many network structures of Empire. Sassen views these global cities central to the global economy. Hardt and Negri would argue that there is not a central being within Empire; these global cities are just an extension of the all-encompassing sovereign power that is Empire. The umbrella that holds all this dialogue together is theories on transnationalism. The network society has initiated this mass integration of

our localities and thus transnationalism. A discussion of transnationalism is important for Empire because the multitude must engage different localities to achieve adequate influence to adopt an alternative to Empire. While we can see many similarities between globalization discourses and Empire there are many criticisms of Hardt and Negri’s Empire.

Hardt and Negri side with “hyperglobalizers” within globalization studies. These scholars “argue that globalization defines a new epoch of human history, a fundamental reconfiguration of the framework of human action in which nation-states are becoming increasingly less important actors”.45 Scholars argue that Hardt and Negri’s theory do not empirically engage other globalization studies discourses. Hardt and Negri do not fully engage then in globalization discourse according to some scholars. Rather the authors engage in a new globalization narrative that includes “Marxism, anarchism, existentialism, post structuralism, critical theory, critical race theory, subaltern studies, and feminist theory”.46 The multitude can be seen as a direct response to the transnational nature of today’s society and the mass migration taking place. While Hardt and Negri’s Empire may be irrelevant to certain globalization scholars, it is difficult not to accept their logic of the current global order and all the similarities to today’s society.

Empire Theory Relevant to Globalization?

Globalization, as can be seen from this discussion, does not have one specific definition. It is a culmination of all these theoretical discourses and discussions. Empire

46 Ibid., 265.
captures, in my opinion, the current global order of society. As discussed one can see how the Empire theory is similar to many other globalization discourses. Empire encompasses globalization to the fullest extent, illumining this plurality of power that exists today.

Empire encompasses the fact that imperialism is long gone and a plurality of power has emerged with no territorial boundaries. Sovereignty is not disappearing, rather it is transcending from a nation state phenomena to encompass the many network structures of Empire – such as supranational organizations and multinational corporations. The Empire theory is relevant because it exemplifies the current phenomena where economic, political and cultural issues are being intertwined with each other. Consequently, “the production and reproduction of power also produces subjectivity and material and immaterial commodities”. Empire incorporates all space, relying not on a territorial center or fixed boundaries but rather a network of hierarchies and exchanges. The relevance of Empire can be seen through the supranational institutions that now are involved in nation state decisions. For example, it is difficult for a single nation state to invade and go to war with another nation state without international backlash through other nations and supranational organizations. The Empire theory illuminates the lack of military intervention that is occurring presently, UN Resolutions and other international affairs are debated internationally through these institutions. Therefore, it is difficult for a hegemonic power to succeed and rather a plurality of exchanges exists in its place.

Globalization has redefined human interaction and history. The transnational nature of today’s society has enlarged the scope of influence of the individual. Hardt and Negri’s multitude captures this new political subject. These populations that have been marginalized and exploited can creatively come together and create an alternative to Empire. Using democratic uses of violence such as social media and mass demonstrations these populations can gather different singularities to increase the influence of the multitude. These singularities are created through biopolitical resistance, “corporal resistance produces subjectivity, not in an isolated or independent way but in the complex dynamic with the resistances of other bodies”.

Historically, struggles that have incorporated these singularities can be seen where there was no single figure of labor. Rather, many different labor forces participated in creating, “a multiplicity of social singularities defined more or less by their culture or ethnicity or labor position coordinate their struggles together in the multitude.” It is these singularities produced within the resistance that allow for a liberation alternative to develop among the multitude. It is the differences that the multitude comprises that increase its dominance to counteract Empire. Globalization has created an atmosphere where increased mobility and migration can lead to a true revolutionary potential in effort for global citizenship and equality. Therefore, when discussing globalization and Empire, it is not how they are different, rather it is how they are similar and build off of each other. Globalization has initiated ease in communicating with a plurality of individuals; thus, a global multitude

49 Ibid., 111.
50 Ibid.
has the ability to form. I will now discuss the multitude and its creation through this biopolitical production of Empire and globalization.
CHAPTER 2: THE MULTITUDE

The Multitude and its Mobilization

Democracy “appears to be entirely irretrievable, buried deep beneath the weapons and security regimes of our constant state of conflict”\(^5\) within the Empire regime. The notion of Empire dismays those who think the only alternatives are unilateralism and multilateralism or pro-Americanism and anti-Americanism. Hardt and Negri’s claim is that democracy is unreachable within the current global order, a “new form of sovereignty, is now emerging and it includes as its primary elements, or nodes, the dominant nation-states along with supranational institutions, major capitalist corporations, and other powers”.\(^5\) Thus, the project of the multitude provides the necessary tools for achieving a democratic global society. The multitude is the “living alternative that grows within Empire”.\(^5\) The multitude, in accordance with Empire, can be expressed as a network too, however differences are expressed equally and freely. The multitude cannot be reduced to a single identity, “different cultures, races, ethnicities, genders, and sexual orientations; different forms of labor; different ways of living; different views of the world; and different desires”.\(^5\) The multitude challenges the notion of Empire through this open network of singularities able to communicate and act in common while remaining a multiplicity of ideas and backgrounds. Hardt and Negri describe the multitude as “a distributed network such as the Internet is a good initial

---

\(^5\) Ibid.
\(^5\) Ibid., xiii.
\(^5\) Ibid., xiv.
image or model for the multitude because; first, the various nodes remain different but are all connected in the Web, and, second, the external boundaries of the network are open such that new nodes and new relationships can always be added”\textsuperscript{55} Revolution movements allow the multitude to create democratic relationships internally within Empire and consequently attempt to create an alternative to the current global society.

Historically, resistances have followed at least one of the three guiding principles or criteria that Hardt and Negri lay out. The first principle involves grasping “the opportunity and the historical occasion offered by the current arrangement of forces in order to maximize its ability to resist, contest, and/or overthrow the ruling forms of power”\textsuperscript{56}, creating an atmosphere of efficient resistance. Secondly, the movements must evolve or correspond to the current social production and economy. The necessities of democracy and freedom for the development of resistances are key guiding principles. We are presently living in a society where these three principles are overlapping. “The form of organization needed must deploy the full power of today’s biopolitical production and also fully realize the promise of a democratic society”.\textsuperscript{57} The multitude has the ability to use its characteristics of “mobility, flexibility, and capacity to adapt to and challenge changing forms of repression in a radical way”.\textsuperscript{58} In today’s society the legitimating of power rests upon unleashing war through a state of exception. Therefore,

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 87.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 90.
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.
resisting war is also resisting the legitimation of the global order, when Empire utilizes war as its legitimation, the multitude can utilize democracy and its multiplicities.59

“Political action aimed at transformation and liberation today can only be conducted on the basis of the multitude”,60 thus resistances must be able to incorporate multiplicities of its subjects. Plurality exists within the multitude, a set of singularities where “differences cannot be reduced to sameness, a difference that remains different”.61 The multitude differs from that of masses, mobs and crowds because it does not need to be led, rather the multitude acts by themselves. The multitude acts upon what it has in common rather than a singular identity. Consequently, sovereign power can be challenged by the multitude’s ability to act in common and rule itself. Therefore, “the multitude is the only social subject capable of realizing democracy, that is, the rule of everyone by everyone”.62 A world where hierarchical power structures do not exist within classification categories is the ultimate desire of the multitude.

Mobilization of the common is what allows the multitude to sufficiently challenge Empire, “this commonality and singularity defines what we called the flesh of the multitude”.63 Revolutions arise when the production of the common has surplus that cannot be contained by capital or the regime – “surplus of intelligence, experience, knowledge and desires”.64 Revolutions mobilize the common, “this common surplus is
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the first pillar on which are built struggles against the global political body and for the multitude” \(^{65}\) and it intensifies current struggles and extends to other struggles. Hardt and Negri explain that entering a region where a resistance is forming, one can be stricken by the commonality of the population – “dress, gestures, and modes of relating and communicating” \(^{66}\). However, common appearances aren’t all that is mobilized in the movement – commonality among internal characteristics can been felt and mobilized by resistances. By forming resistances and creating direct conflict with Empire or the power structure, heightens the intensity of the common even more, “the acrid smell of tear gas focuses your senses and street clashes with police make your blood boil with rage, raising intensity to the point of explosion” \(^{67}\). Once the common is mobilized it can engage one local struggle after the next or nation to nation, “the geographical expansion of movements takes the form of an international cycle of struggles in which revolts spread from one local context to another like a contagious disease through the communication of common practices and desires” \(^{68}\). The multiplicity of feelings, created during mobilization, of feelings and cultural flairs allows the movement to take hold and invites more individuals to its cause. It should come as no surprise that each mobilization of the common is seen as atrocious. Each struggle creates an atmosphere that where those who do not share the common feel threatened because traditional political and social arrangements are contested. The forces that mobilize do not just have a common enemy,
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but also “common practices, languages, conduct, habits, forms of life and desires for a better future”. However, we must realize that although this struggle becomes global, the local context is not overlooked because the singularity of each struggle within the multitude is what helps create the common that helps negate Empire and its power. It is these singularities created within resistances that “not only resists power but also seeks autonomy from it”. These resistances allow for the production of new singularities through the disruption of the structure of biopower. The network structure of the struggle enlists other local struggles to join and develop more singularities within the multitude, thus enlarging the common. “The mobilization of the common demonstrates, finally, that the movements that form part of this global cycle of struggles are not merely protest movements (although this is the face that appears most clearly in the media) but also positive and creative”, these struggles attempt to create a freer and more equal society.

Therefore, through these societal disruptions, new singularities can be established that have the ability to create autonomous alternatives of the current biopolitical production of Empire.

Creating a freer and more equal society are not the only grievances demanded within the current struggles. The lists of grievances that are present today are “chaotic, bizarre, unending collection of volumes on everything in the world”. Thus the multitude arises when these grievances align with the common creating an explosion of surplus and
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coordination of ideas among the populous. Presently there are four grievances that are exemplified to the highest degree – representation, rights and justice, economic and biopolitical. These grievances enlist struggles to form. As mentioned earlier, these local struggles or resistances help create the singularities that can create an autonomous alternative to the biopolitical production of Empire. Grievances of representation range from the domestic institutional system to major corporations to the leaders themselves. Major corporations in this globalized society have begun to indirectly represent national interests, “what is good for General Motors is good for America”.\footnote{Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, \textit{Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire} (New York: Penguin Books, 2004), 270.} In addition, globalization has created an atmosphere where particular national leaders, whether elected officials or unelected, have the ability to initiate power over populations outside their own nations. Thus, “these protests highlight not only a crisis of democratic representation but also the corruption of our political vocabulary”, political meanings are being blended together – no power without representation, the separation of powers and the freedom of expression.\footnote{Ibid., 273.} This corruption of political vocabulary leads to grievances of rights and justice. In countries where the nation-state does not respond to local population’s grievances they look to international authorities, “shifting the discussion from ‘civil rights’ to ‘human rights’”.\footnote{Ibid., 273.} These grievances create further obstacles for the multitude by acknowledging local mistreatments and also the “lack of international legal structures that guarantee rights but also more fundamentally the emergence of global
legal structures that function against such rights”. 76 Obviously economic grievances corresponds to the lack of rights and human rights – “hunger and poverty have always been and continue to be today the world’s most powerful grievances”. 77 Finally, biopolitical grievances demonstrate how all these grievances are implicated within and by each other. These grievances illuminate “the political powers that decide without representation of those primarily affected to privatize the common, enriching the few and exacerbating the misery of the many”. 78 Through the privatization of the common why and how these other grievances erupt is exemplified. The police presence at demonstrations since 9/11 has hindered resistances creating an atmosphere where “the ultimate biopolitical grievance is against destruction and death”. 79 Within this context against destruction and death, the grievance of war is illuminated which becomes the “summary of all the grievances: global poverty and inequality, for example, are exacerbated by war and war prevents any possible solutions”. 80 A call for peace among the multitude becomes a necessary demand for negating this global influence of war and intervention.

Consequently, military force is the weakest form of power that Empire and nation-states encompass. Military might is useful for conquest and short-term control; however, it does give the sovereign the power over the life and death of its subjects. 81
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The tradition of political theory is that only “the one” can rule, however, this in essence negates the concept of democracy creating an atmosphere where there is only sovereignty or anarchy.\(^8^2\) “Multitude is not a social body for precisely this reason: that the multitude cannot be reduced to a unity and does not submit to the rule of one. The multitude cannot be sovereign”.\(^8^3\) Therefore, the multitude is an alternative to Empire, not a new concept altogether. The multitude is attempting to negate the biopolitical control of present society. Empire creates this atmosphere where biopower is necessary for it to retain global superiority; sovereignty within Empire has “become power over life itself”.\(^8^4\) Empire incorporates political, economic, social and cultural control by blurring the boundaries that separate them from the effect of sovereign power.\(^8^5\) However, the essence of this complete control is also the demise of Empire itself. Empire is completely dependent upon the social agents under its control. In addition, because Empire is a global force, its dependency does not end at the production level. Subjects consuming, using, and participating within the global network are also extremely important for Empire to retain power.\(^8^6\) Thus, “the power of the multitude to create social relationships in common stands between sovereignty and anarchy, that it thus presents a new possibility for politics”.\(^8^7\) It now is possible to see that while traditional political theory
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states only “the one” can rule, Empire exemplifies the “fact that the one never rules”.  

To completely mobilize the multitude against Empire, we must realize this fact that individuality does not accomplish anything, especially when attempting to negate the Empire network. The multitude arises when singularities arise out of local resistances, not individual ideas. The organization of singularities is necessary for political action to occur. The cooperation and interaction of these singularities allow for the organization of the multitude to form out of the common. The multitude “produces cooperation, communication, forms of life, and social relationships”; in essence the multitude helps in forming a new political decision-making tool. Fundamentally then the multitude must use “the right to disobedience and the right to difference” to counteract the biopower of Empire.

Challenge to Empire – The Multitude’s use of Democratic Violence

The sovereign biopower entity will utilize war as a means to counteract disobedience and contain its subjects. However, war not only suspends any hope of democracy but at the same time it hinders new possibilities of democracy through war. War legitimizes the sovereign’s power through total containment of new inspirations for society, “the exodus and emergence of democracy is thus a war against a war”. The multitude must devise a democratic use of force to combat Empire. This democratic use of force should only be used in defensive means and in accordance to political goals.
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Thus, “a democratic use of force and violence is neither the same nor the opposite of the war of sovereignty; it is different”. Democratic violence, in essence, does not initiate the revolution, rather the “democratic use of violence in a revolutionary context is not really different than an act of resistance”. The challenge of this democratic violence becomes what means should be used to meet an end. To defend the multitude properly, new weapons are obviously needed that differ from traditional weapons of Empire. The democratic use of violence must engage the multitude in an analysis of current weapons to determine what varieties are efficient and new weapons must be proposed in accordance. For example, “simply having millions of people in the streets for a demonstration is a kind of weapon”. Weapons can come in many forms – peaceful demonstrations, labor strikes, disobeying social norms and the like. The intensity of cooperation and communication can help breakdown the biopolitical atmosphere and destroy its possibility of future power. Hence, “we can imagine the day when the multitude will invent a weapon that will not only allow it to defend itself but will also be constructive, expansive, and constituent. It is not a matter of taking power and commanding the armies but destroying their very possibility”. It should be noted however, that the ultimate negation of Empire and biopower is what occurred right before the Arab Spring movement in the Middle East was initiated, “when life itself is negated
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in the struggle to challenge sovereignty, the power over life and death that the sovereign exercises becomes useless”. The Tunisian man who set himself ablaze initiated a new weapon against biopower, he helped initiate a movement where singularities have arose and a multitude is forming that can potentially challenge Empire and the current global order.

Empire and the Multitude Today

Empire is manifesting today more than ever. Nation states are extremely compelled to interest supranational organizations and multinational corporations. What is seen today is that this new structure of power created is limiting nation state sovereignty and spreading it to these transnational organizations. Thus, the nation state begins to disregard its population and instead interest those globally. This theory is convincing in today’s society because intervention does not occur militarily as it did in the past. Instead, we see interventions occurring through these supranational organizations and alliance networks. The new hierarchy has created a more unequal society, which does not only have the state to revolt against, but the entire single logic rule of Empire. The role of the individual is ever more important than and thus a multitude has the potential to be created. The grievances of today’s global society are instituting a new common of frustration with representation and the privatization of the common; therefore a need for new democratic structures to emerge is resonating. The multitude is created out of these shared commons globally. The multitude can be seen as a new political thought – participation and knowledge create the singularities that

encompass the multitude and help it challenge the biopolitical production of Empire. These singularities are essentially the differences of the multitude. The power comes from how the multitude is different, not similar. What is created is a population that is mobile, fluid, and deterritorialized. It is a new social class without a particular nation, a class that wants to dismantle the entirety of Empire. It is a positive force dedicated to a true democratic society – rule of everyone by everyone.
CHAPTER 3: THE ARAB SPRING

Middle Eastern Regimes as a Structure of Empire

The Arab Spring represents a failure of legitimacy on the regimes, “corruption, mismanagement, suppression of dissent, inattention to public needs, and kleptocratic entrenchment of military officers, their families, and their cronies at all levels.”\(^{100}\) The regimes and their populations have established a social contract, a contract kept together under fear and suspicion. Socio-economic hardship and inequality run rampant in these Middle Eastern nations. The lack of freedom of expression and organization leaves these populations destitute to leaders that prize state security instead of human security. Citizens are unable to express themselves because of this Empire power network through the weapon of the police, “in many Arab nations, freedoms of expression, organization, and belief are met with police brutality, societal expulsion, gratuitous jail sentences and kidnapping.”\(^{101}\) Another tactic available to the Arab regimes, like that of Empire, are the NGOs’ regulations that inhibit free organization from forming by constraining their operations and demanding governmental oversight. Governmental oversight is instituted in the media within these regions as well, limiting opposition views and dictating what is shown. The plurality of Empire is established within this structure, the population is constrained by more than one sovereign entity. Biopower is manifesting within these nations, the regimes structuring their societies to where a society of control overtaking the disciplinary society. The manifestation of biopower produces a society of control and


creates complete obedience within the population not only through the many institutions within a disciplinary society but rather through complete control of social relationships. The power of exception through the use of a brutal police force further emphasizes this obedience that is necessary for this power structure of Empire to exist. The self-immolation of Mohamed Bouazizi created a new subjectivity among the Arab populations, exemplifying a complete and utter rebuttal to Empire, “when life itself is negated in the struggle to challenge sovereignty, the power over life and death that the sovereign exercises becomes useless”.\(^{102}\) Thus, because of the single body nature of society, as a result of biopower and Empire, allowed the Tunisian revolution to enter into the realm of biopower and to create a wave of libratory demonstrations throughout the Arab region. Mohamed Bouazizi’s actions flourished a revolutionary spirit within the “youth bulge” that is present in Middle Eastern societies, “60 percent of the population is under 25 years old, with a median age of 24”.\(^{103}\) Young people within these nations have been unable to achieve their potential because of the rising unemployment and poverty. This has lead to an enormous dissatisfied young population eager to create change. The new subjectivity created by Bouazizi ignited the flame that was waiting to be lit, “with their freedoms continuously thwarted and confused, their socio-economic states declining, and their education lacking the necessary facets for progressive social action, it took only a spark to ignite the masses”.\(^{104}\)
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Guiding principles of revolt are that of democracy and freedom, the street chants throughout the Arab region called for participation, freedom and an end to dictatorial regimes. However, these revolutions are not ideologically driven. Essentially the populations are fed up with the misallocation of resources causing high unemployment and corruption. The large youth population that resides in these Arab nations are highly educated and fed up with not living up to their potential as citizens. Thus, these revolutions are not made up of a single idea but rather they are comprised of many singularities. The multitude is a “social subject whose differences cannot be reduced to sameness, a difference that remains different”.105 It is these differences that empower the population and allow them to create new social power relations. These populations are creating a refurbished common within the Arab region – a shared feeling of frustration and a need for democratic political structures. By mobilizing the common, the intensification of the revolution occurs – “what is needed to turn a million people’s grumbling discontent into a crowd on the streets is a spark to electrify them”.106

Arab Spring Representing the Multitude

“These revolts has immediately performed a kind of ideological house-cleaning, sweeping away the racist conceptions of a clash of civilizations that consign Arab politics to the past”.107 People must see that these uprisings are not repetitions of the past but

107 Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, “Arabs are Democracy’s New Pioneers,” The Guardian, last modified February 24, 2011,
rather new political experiments that are opening up new possibilities that are no only relevant to the Arab region. Obviously, the Arab region can boast in their uprisings – shattering stereotypes that these Arab populations can only be ruled by authoritarian regimes. While these uprisings center on an end to authoritarian rule, beneath the surface one can also see the multiplicity of social demands from unemployment to poverty – “give power and autonomy to an intelligent, highly capable population”. Therefore, the overthrow of the governments is only the beginning; this multitude is demanding ultimately full democracies. The organization of these uprisings concurs with Hardt and Negri’s definition of the multitude – a leaderless coalition of horizontal structure. If leadership were to enter into the realm of the uprising it would undermine its power and force it to become a traditional organization. However, this is not traditional; it is politically new. The leaderless resistance must constituent the demands to encompass the needs of the entire population. It is weapons such as social media and the Internet that allow the leaderless organization structure to succeed, constitutional recognition of freedom of expression “represented by the common experiences of network relations”. These online tools not only mobilize the multitude but they also avoid direct surveillance from the government and cross class lines to allow more individuality to join. The embracement of pluralism within these uprisings captures the essence that is the multitude. The multitude is empowered by the differences that enter into it. The differences end up encompassing thoughts, strategies and motivations that have the
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ability to become transnational through the use of the Internet and art, “think how much the Internet can empower you, you have the world at the tip of your fingers”\textsuperscript{110}

Democratic Use of Violence within the Arab Spring and Occupy

“We can imagine the day when the multitude will invent a weapon that will not only allow it to defend itself but will also be constructive, expansive, and constituent”\textsuperscript{111}

The Arab populations utilize modern means of communication such as social media to increase awareness and gather more multiplicities to join the demonstrations. Social media, as a weapon of the multitude, is vital for the organizational structure of the revolution and the spread of the demonstrations across the Arab region. This weapon of the multitude allows the protests to sustain and assemble. In addition, the government is limited in interfering with this communication because they are limited within cyberspace. Social media networks allow the different singularities to be expressed and ideas to be shared quickly. Tunisians, like Ben Gharbia, revealed the Tunisian first lady’s shopping sprees in Paris, using the president’s private jet to get there\textsuperscript{112}

Bahrainis, using Google Earth, illustrated the enormous amount of land that has been expropriated by the royal family for private use\textsuperscript{113}. Egyptians, like Wael Abbas, posted videos of police brutality and informed the populations of the individual names of the

\textsuperscript{112} Mark Lynch, “The Big Think Behind the Arab Spring,” \textit{Foreign Policy}, (2011): 47.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., 47.
The convenient utility of the Internet allows the multitude to exemplify the biopolitical power that resides upon them and opens up discussions and frustrations to further intensify the revolutions. The horizontal organizational network structure of the multitude, leaderless, allows social media tools to be extremely innovative and useful. Not only are these tools useful for announcing demonstrations but also they are useful in gathering the opinion of the entire populous for decision-making. These tools of the organizational structure allow the multitude to organize without leadership.

In Jordan an organization called Hiber, trains people to use social media effectively and has a blog to discuss the uprisings. Staff of the organization will travel to small villages and empower the youth that reside there. Social media helps empower the differences that the multitude can include, “social media allowed young women in the village to bypass the men – fathers, brothers, husbands – who circumscribed their worlds and their ability to communicate”. Allowing youthful women to join the uprisings brings more multiplicity to the multitude that would not be there if social media and blogging was not involved, these women add more differences and thus more empowerment. In Bahrain, a man named Mr. Maskati, operates through his Blackberry to empower the population, “he sees his role as informing the world through Facebook, Twitter and his extensive email list”. Once again developing more multiplicities.
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However, the Internet is not the only organizational feature or weapon of these revolutions.

The airwaves of Al-Jazeera assisted in “liberating the Arab mind” and creating “the idea in the Arab mind that when you have a right, you should fight for it”.[117]

Liberating the mind and introducing new subjectivities allows for a common to be established and a multitude to be created. Music can also liberate the mind and introduce new subjectivities to the global realm. Syrian-American Omar Offendum created a hip-hop anthem titled “#Syria”, the song has resonated throughout the Arab region reiterating the demands of the millions of protestors. His lyrics echo the crisis that is occurring in Syria and the rest of the Arab region – “Stand in solidarity with all your fellow citizens/ Peacefully protesting for an end to all the militance/ Torture & imprisonment/ Murdering of innocence/ Proving that this lying lion leader’s rule is illegitimate”. [118]

The video that accompanies the song shows the horrendous crackdowns on protestors and has photos of the demonstrations. Offendum lives in the United States and posts his songs and videos on Facebook, YouTube and Twitter. In Syria, songs like Offendum’s have heightened the awareness of the protests and have gathered more individuals to the spirited demonstrations. Protestors have followed the lead of people like Offendum and have created revolutionary songs from national songs that transcend from town to town, nation to nation. Artists in other Arab nations have created songs for their nation’s demonstrations; it has become a subculture of the revolution. Hishaam Aidi, a fellow at
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Open Society Foundations in New York explain that these hip-hop songs are “a medium that allowed youth to communicate across borders, to tell their side of the story and perhaps spread the protest contagion”. Hip-hop is a useful tool of the multitude because songs can be written quickly and posted to social media sites to increase awareness and allow for more subjectivity to join the demonstrations. Offendum’s lyrics resonate this, “I heard the revolution won’t be televised/ Al Jazeera proved them wrong/ Twitter has them paralyzed/ 80 million strong/ And ain’t no longer gonna be terrorized/ Organized – Mobilized – Vocalized”. The intensity of cooperation and communication can help break down the biopolitical atmosphere and destroy its possibility of a future.

Many Arabs are using the voice of art to educate and sustain the uprisings as well. Jordan journalist and writer Ahmad al Zoubi created a play titled “Al’aan Fhmtekom” (Now I Understand You), which was motivated by the Arab Spring. The play has been seen by more than seventy-five thousand people and its message concurs with the uprisings – “if Arab leaders and governments don’t change and move with the times they will be sacked”. The play exemplifies the recent sensation that has been resonating among the Arab region – breaking through the self-censorship and fear that has plagued the society for so long. This artistic expression has influenced many different artists
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from coming out and expressing themselves and the Arab Spring, from cartoons
depicting police brutality to graffiti signifying demands of the multitude on the streets to
photography exhibits chronologically depicting the wave of demonstrations that has erupted. These various artworks have reached global significance. A new exhibition at
the Casa Arabe in Madrid called “Revolution Paintings: Graffiti and Arab Public Places”
depicts photographs gathered by various people of the graffiti that has spread across the region in the wake of the demonstrations and frustration. Many graffiti artists have
ignited the populations to go out and illuminate their frustrations via graffiti. Various artists have created Facebook groups to mobilize more people to graffiti, such as artist Faten Rouissi who mobilized artists and students “to paint cares burned during the revolution”. The wave of demonstrations ignited by the self-immolation of Bouazizi, sustained by social media networking and brought globally through these networks, hip-hop songs, art and the airwaves of al-Jazeera demonstrate that democratic violence is possible and new weapons created by the multitude can challenge the biopolitical power of Empire - “many art forms born as a result of the Arab Spring, including this play, are an invitation for leaders and citizens to reflect and have an honest conversation between ourselves about where we are today and where we may be going”.
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Twitter, one of the weapons of the multitude, has changed its censorship policy to allow country-specific censorship of tweets. The company, based in San Francisco and created in 2006, believes that this new system of censoring is a step forward. The new policy allows an erased Tweet to still be available after being taken down from the country that banished it. The policy previously was that when a tweet was erased, it was erased completely. In addition, Twitter has stated that when a censorship notice comes from a country or organization, the company will “post the removal request it receives from governments, companies and individuals at the website chillingeffects.org.” What critics of this new policy don’t realize is that Twitter is actually increasing accountability and transparency by initiating this new policy. Twitter is allowing for a global multitude to emerge by not limiting outspokenness and creating a space where people can see when and what network of Empire is attempting to squash their expression. Instead of allowing this censoring to occur in secret, Twitter is creating an awareness of not only who wants the tweet censored but also posting a censorship notice allowing the population to be aware that a censorship is taking place. In addition, Twitter is not removing a tweet directly after a removal request is established. The company is making sure that it violates the law first. Twitter is not the only social media that has employed a “geo-filtering” – “blocking content in a specific jurisdiction for legal reasons while making it

available elsewhere”. However, the multitude has been able to develop methods to get around the trapped censorship in their respective nations. For example, China’s Communist Party has cracked down on social media networks since the Arab Spring, scared that a revolution will occur within their boundaries. Yet, their citizens have found a way around the firewall that is supposedly blocking sites such as Facebook. The multitude is entering into the realm of biopower to effectively combat Empire, “Twitter has become this huge social force and people view it as some sort of digital town square, where people can say whatever they want”, rather than the repressive biopower function in the way Arab regimes used these tactics.

Establishing Global Multitude

Ultimately a global multitude will emerge from the many localities of uprisings. The wave of demonstrations across the Arab region is testament to this occurrence. The Occupy Movements that occurred in the United States and European countries shares the same sense of a need for more democratic structures of power that the Arab Spring has resonated - “Demonstrations under the banner of Occupy Wall Street resonate with so many people not only because they give voice to a widespread sense of economic injustice but also, and perhaps more important because they express political grievances and aspirations”. These protests spread from major metropolitan cities to small towns

129 Ibid.
to different continents. In Syria recently, protestors have been seen holding signs that read, “if you wanna get rid of the terrorism worldwide, hit Assad regime to save the world thousands of dirty minds, occupied Kafranbel”. Speaking to others worldwide, the protestors in Syria are attempting to create a global multitude. Occupy Wall Street seems to be an expansion of the resistances that have been at large recently.

Occupy is a movement without a specific demand. A group of New Yorkers dissatisfied with governments and agencies putting profits above people lead to an occupation movement spanning the entire United States and the globe. The new common, or business as usual, according to the multitude needs to be replaced. The Occupy Movement encompasses Hardt and Negri’s definition of multitude wholly; “I’ve also followed the camps in cities across the world – noting that each has its own local flair and culture. And in each city with a camp, there are a wide range of feelings about Occupy”. This multiplicity of feelings and cultural flairs allows the movement to take hold and invites more individuality to join. The occupies are doing something that isn’t a norm set up by Empire – setting up camps and sleeping in public places, occupying an area. By struggling against a norm, the multitude proves its power and relentlessness. Nonetheless, the Empire seeks to disturb the camps by initiating a judicial statement

Ibid.
criticizing the multitude’s use of the Zuccotti Park (Occupy Wall Street), which coincidentally is privately owned.\textsuperscript{134} However, it is not the camps that are the goal, the camps are a tactic used by the multitude to gather more attention and resources of multiplicity. The more multiplicity the multitude receives the more powerful the rebellion against the Empire will be. The Occupy Movement understands that “there is no return to the American dream world of the 1950s and early 1960s”, rather the multitude seeks “specific demands for the new rather than a return to the old: clearer than ever separation of commercial and investment banking, genuine restriction on lobbying, stronger consumer protections, and possibly legislated pay caps on executive salaries”.\textsuperscript{135} Rebellions such as Occupy seek to create new subjectivities rather than harp off an old traditional world that no longer can exist in this emerging Empire. These internal developments are now in over 100 cities around the United States. Individuals are holding signs stating, “we hold these truths to be self evident, we are the change, we are the precedent”\textsuperscript{136} recognizing the power the multitude can boast and the new subjectivities that can be achieved. Placing power in the multiplicity of each other through faith and hope is encountering the singularities of love and creating new assemblages from which the common can derive from. All the individuals involved in the


Occupy Movement are creating their own subjectivities but they are linked by a larger nucleus, the multitude. It is the power of all those subjectivities that is fueling the movement is keeping its power relevant. “This protest movement could, and perhaps must, transform into a genuine, democratic constituent process”, 137 this quote resonates from Hardt and Negri’s view on Occupy in a recent Foreign Affairs article. The multitude structure of Occupy will not encompass a leader, but rather it “will express itself through the horizontal participatory structures”. 138 Occupy is emerging as a powerful movement illustrating that the emerging Empire structure that is resonating globally is obsolete. Thus for a new global order to emerge, “the only possible basis resides in the global movements of populations and their refusal of the global norms and rules of exploitation”, 139 only then will a new common emerge out of the multitude. As a result, in January 2012 Occupy Detroit protestors decided to join Middle Eastern community members on the anniversary of the Egyptian uprising. The Occupy Detroit protestors demanded that the United States stop providing aid to Egypt’s military
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leaders. According to one Detroit protestor, “without the Arab Spring there would likely be no Occupy movement”.

The Arab Spring and Occupy the Only Recent Manifestations of the Multitude?

During the 1960’s western countries experienced popular upheaval, thus why are these not categorized as manifestations of the multitude, why now? The many social movements that encompassed the 1960’s regarding the war in Vietnam, women’s rights, race, the environment and sexual orientation can be argued are also manifestations of the multitude. However, I believe that these movements did not have the potential that the Arab Spring and Occupy has today. While these movements resemble a lot of the features of the multitude, the Arab Spring and Occupy encompass a new concept entirely.

The multitude through its differences expresses a plurality of multiplicities through its democratic use of violence. A significant shift that has occurred within the multitude today rather than in the 1960’s is the organizational and deployment structure. The 1960’s movement originated on the periphery of the system, revolutionary movements allow the multitude to create democratic relationships internally within Empire rather than on the periphery of the system. It is this internal development that eventually allows the multitude the ability to construct a viable alternative. Hardt and Negri arranged three guiding principles or criteria that past protests have followed, they
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state that today there is an overlap of each of these criteria – signaling more potential of creating an alternative than in the past. The 1960’s movements resemble specifically the first principle, grasping the “opportunity and the historical occasion offered by the current arraignment of forces in order to maximize its ability to resist, contest, and/or overthrow the ruling forms of power”. The youthful unrest of the 1960’s was evident, taking advantage of that situation protests involved youth activism. The baby boomers were rethinking the direction of American society, and that direction resonated with many other western countries, allowing these mass popular movements to take hold. However, where these movements faltered and the Arab Spring and Occupy prospered was in relation to the second guiding principle – the movements must evolve or correspond to the current social production and economy. The 1960’s were a turbulent time period where new cultural and social changes were forming. These movements were not evolving or corresponding to existing social structures rather they were radicalizing and creating generational divides among the populations. The Arab Spring and Occupy, while extremely youthfully oriented, include entire populations of all ages and backgrounds. It is these differences that allow these later movements to create further potential than the popular movements that preceded them.

The hierarchical structure of some of the 1960’s popular movements also, according to the concept of the multitude, inhibited the potentiality of creating an alternative. The most apparent case of this hierarchical structure is within the civil rights movement. While this movement did break down boundaries and help diminish Jim
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Crow laws, an alternative was never fully created – racial divides are still apparent today. When discussing the civil rights movement, one will always think of Martin Luther King Jr. or any number of the other black leadership that was present within the movement. While collective action was established, there was still a figurehead – “a young Black minister, Martin Luther King Jr., who came to personify the role of charismatic leader”. The current movements participate in a horizontal network structure, thus the multitude. Hardt and Negri believe that leaderless revolutions provide much more potential for alternatives to the current regime, by “powerfully expressing the aspiration for a real democracy.” Thus, the participatory structure of the modern protests resemble this everyone is ruled by everyone rhetoric of Hardt and Negri’s true democracy repertoire.

However, there are similarities between the two time periods in relation to the multitude’s use of democratic violence – the organizational structure just did not correspond, providing the 1960’s with less potential. The 1960’s saw many cultural and social forms of expression being utilized to increase awareness and support of the movements. Like the Arab Spring, these popular movements used music for impact. However, rather than hip hop, the 1960’s used rock and pop music from artists such as the Beatles, to express their sentiments. In addition, while the Internet and social media are highly influential today, the 1960’s saw a rise in underground newspapers and the use

of the FM radio to broadcast their messages. The point where divergence again occurred was that cooperation and coordination weren’t necessarily apparent between the various social movements in the 1960’s. Like I mentioned previously, Occupy has begun to resonate feelings of support for the Arab Spring and within Detroit protests are forming in support of the Arab Spring. This intensity of cooperation and coordination is what effectively breaks down the biopolitical atmosphere and helps create this global multitude.

What we can deduce from the 1960’s popular movements is that they had the beginning of a multitude like structure. The new technologies bolstered the awareness and sentiments, just as the new technologies of the modern era have influence and have created these democratic uses of violence that help breakdown the biopolitical atmosphere.

Empire Challenging the Multitude

“The policy of unconvincing concessions combined with the murder of a handful of people at a time neither offers a peaceful road to change nor scares people out of demonstrating”. The plurality of Empire is a challenge for the multitude. Empire will fight back within every avenue of its structure. The multitude is viewed as dangerous and monstrous. Industries who support the war on terror, nation-states, and various contractors and consultants are attempting to use their power networks to stop this uprising. The media is a huge culprit of this phenomenon. Western societies are shown images in the media that attempt to show these Arab protestors as outrageous and
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undemocratic, “virtually all we heard about were the ubiquitous terrorists, the omnipresent bearded radicals and their veiled companions trying to impose Sharia and the corrupt, brutal depots who were the only option for control of such undesirables”.147 The “experts” or talking heads within these mediums persuade Western populations that these Middle Eastern protestors are unworthy of dignity and deserve the regimes that brutalize them. In addition to these talking heads, the leaders in Western nations have completely undermined any democratic reform in the Middle East. Western nation-states would rather manipulate dictatorial regimes that will listen their commands, than instill more democracy and conversation to the international arena. The dictatorial regimes must reinstate a society of control by rebuilding their military and police to maintain order. During the rebuilding of their forces of control, the regimes would have to incorporate outside intervention because disorder during the rebuilding period is a potential. The issue for Empire and the dictatorial regimes becomes from whom will intervention come.

The uprisings in Syria exemplify a broken Empire and hindered multitude. Bashar al-Assad is desperately hanging onto his significance in Syria. Assad has been relying on allied countries such as Iran and Russia to halt international invention, “if Lebanon and Iran are our economic lungs, as one Syrian official recently put it, then Russia is our political shield”.148 Recently during a UN Security Council meeting, Russia

blocked a resolution that would impose sanctions on Syria. In addition, Russia has condemned the Arab League for suspending Syria. Moscow has been a menace for UN intervention and “announced that it would continue to honor all arms contracts with the Syrian government and would be sending warships to make port call in Syria this summer”.

However, countries that do want to intervene cannot come to a single intervention conclusion – another sign of Empire’s breaking. NATO cannot come to one single decision. France would like humanitarian intervention, by creating a secure zone for Syrian citizens. The United States has called for “dispatching international monitors and deepening economic and political pressure”, instead of direct intervention.

Thus, Assad’s dilemma is utilizing enough violence to control the demonstrations, however, he must control his violence if he doesn’t want international intervention. There is no defection within the military because Assad keeps watch over his forces through the Fourth Division – they are essentially the police for the military. In addition, the regime regulates how many people should be killed each day so international intervention will not occur. Assad knows that a full out massacre will result in international intervention. Yet with all these control functions, Assad cannot topple the demonstrators, “more than 10,000 people have been killed, but there are millions of Syrians participating directly or indirectly in the revolt”.

Those participating in the revolution are not only guaranteed
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death, they are also guaranteed torture, including children. Since the uprisings have begun many protestors have been imprisoned and tortured. The regime targets children as well because they believe that children will provide them with relevant information quicker than adults. Amnesty International has announced that there are at least thirty-one different torture methods being used by the regime.\(^\text{152}\) However, to refer Syrian leaders to the International Criminal Court (ICC) a referral from the UN Security Council must be established. That will be a difficult task since China and Russia have vetoed resolutions twice. Thus, while killing and torturing continues the revolution will not be hindered. The Syrian support of allies has made uprisings by the multitude within Syria difficult as compared to other Arab nations. If Assad were to fall the opposition could take control and finally attempt to establish a democratic nation.

On the contrary, Gulf nations are establishing a counterrevolution. These regimes are introducing democratic reforms within their nations and supporting the uprisings in neighboring nations to counteract a revolution occurring within their own territory. The Kings in Morocco and Jordan have initiated democratic reforms, which they say may lead to constitutional monarchies. There have been minor scuffles within these nations, however no big revolution has occurred yet. The leaders within these nations are attempting to introduce reforms that will appease the multitude – creating a common that the multitude concurs with.

Recently, Jordan has seen dramatic political shifts. The third prime minister has resigned in the past eighteen months, signaling a turbulent relationship between King Abdullah and the population demanding reform. Awn Khasawneh, the resigned prime minister, was only in office six months before submitting a surprising resignation. King Abdullah has responded to the discontent of the population with news on possible reforms within Jordan but has failed to create a sufficient “timetable to allow the formation of governments based on parliamentary majority”.

Jordanians, like other uprisings, are demanding more accountability, an end to corruption and obviously political changes, therefore, joining and adding more individuality to the multitude and its growing discontent. The resignation of the prime minister can effectively force more pressure on the king to bring about reforms. King Abdullah has been using prime ministers as a buffer between his monarchy and the uprisings. Bloggers have increased awareness on the Internet about the Jordanian situation and thus have initiated the weapon the Internet for the multitude. King Abdullah will eventually be met with the full force of the multitude if reforms aren’t implemented. The short-term prime minister changes cannot buffer the situation forever.

Empire is utilizing the public opinion of those not participating in the multitude to create this buffer between the protestors and the administrations. Creating a sense of reform without actually implementing is a tactic that Empire is utilizing to shield uprisings. In Bahrain, Empire is exploiting a weapon of the multitude to keep the
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multitude at bay. Activist Abdullhadi al-Khawaja is imprisoned and it has been speculated that his is dead. His family and lawyer have been denied visits and he has been on a hunger strike for about seventy-nine days. It is rumored that he has been force-fed. Amid all this speculation, “the interior ministry tweeted on Wednesday that Khawaja was in good health despite rumors and in hospital receiving full medical care”.\textsuperscript{155} Empire exploiting a weapon used by the multitude exemplifies the interconnectedness of the two concepts. What is interesting about this situation is how the global multitude is reinforced, “the Irish rights group, Front Line Defenders called on the interior minister to provide proof of life”\textsuperscript{156} of Abdulhadi al-Khawaja.

**Arab Spring a Failure?**

Many critics do not see the horizontal organizational structure of empowerment and the democratic uses of violence that the multitude within the Arab Spring has developed. Rather, criticisms are beginning to enlighten populations that democratic change is not occurring and that the Arab Spring could in fact be a failure. Civil war has taken over Syria and it seems that Libya may be next. Turmoil resulting from the protests looms in Yemen and Bahrain and Tunisia is at risk of adjoining with extreme political Islam.\textsuperscript{157} The visible power that the Muslim Brotherhood and Sharia Law are imposing on these countries is significant. The multitude is at threat of being marginalized. People within these Arab regions who fought relentlessly to gather support
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and dignity in their cause believe that these conservative Islamists are being “financed by regional actors, such as the Arab Gulf states and Saudi Arabia, and are pushing ideological agenda that counters Tunisia’s more tolerant history”. 158 Essentially, the networks of Empire are taking advantage of these uprisings to insert dominance within the open space that has been created by the multitude. Thus, emphasizing Hardt and Negri’s theoretical concept that Empire has dependence on the multitude and the multitude on Empire. The challenge then is for the multitude to reinsert itself within the realm of Empire to further counteract these other tyrannical networks that are now taking advantage of the open space.

Egyptians have begun demonstrating once again in Tahrir Square against the military rule that now dictates their lives, “accusing the generals of manipulating upcoming presidential elections to preserve their power”. 159 The elections, which will be Egyptians first time to chose their own candidate, are set to begin May 23. However, it seems that the ruling military does not want to relinquish power and seeks to push a candidate they favor into the presidency. In this instance the multitude must use its power of resistance to war to delegitimatize the rule. In addition, what is seen in the military take over after the crumbling of the authoritarian regime is Empire utilizing its function of exception to control the situation, “the formation of a new right is inscribed in the deployment of prevention, repression and rhetorical force aimed at the reconstruction

of social equilibrium”. The right of intervention is one of the more significant outcomes of Empire, thus, the multitude must retain his democratic use of force and delegitimate the use of war to gain influence. It is this subordinate power of the military and the police though that can cause Empire’s decline. Empire depends upon this power of intervention to keep its dominance, if the multitude can effectively bypass this order, then the multitude can gather more influence and begin to attempt to create a more democratic society. Thus, the Egyptians must continue “blaring slogans and speeches by loudspeaker” to dominant the political agenda. Strong words with action can effectively defeat the muscle of the military network that Empire is attempting to deploy.

The scary alternative to this is when protestors stop protesting out of fear and return to a society of control. In Syria, demonstrations have begun to shrink in size because of fear. Analysts have suggested that if large demonstrations take place in Aleppo and the capital Damascus the Assad regime could be tackled. However, what is occurring is that while about ten percent support the regime and thirty percent oppose it, which leaves sixty percent doing nothing. It is those sixty percent that can create a more efficient multitude. Yet, the tipping point to join the demonstrations is “do I got out and commit suicide”. This fear instilled within the population could represent a failure
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of the multitude in accomplishing reform. Fear of being arrested or killed at demonstrations is a strong tactic of Empire and could effectively thwart a true multitude from forming. However, the many differences that empower the multitude allow it to survive. “Most of the demonstrations I went out on were 500 to 700 if we were lucky. The purpose was to get a three-minute YouTube video clip. If we had been allowed to stand out ground we would have grown to thousands, but we weren’t”.164 This experience exemplifies the fact that while there is fear, a global multitude can still be established through the use of social media. The violence of the Syrian regime has increased the violence of the multitude thus creating an atmosphere where the regime can legitimate the use of violence upon the population. Therefore, it is extremely important for the multitude to use democratic uses of violence to counteract Empire and the various regimes.

An Alternative to Empire

If the multitude is dissatisfied with the current political structures and representation, what do they offer as an alternative to Empire? “The clearest clues lie in the internal organization of the movements themselves – specifically, the way the encampments experiment with new democratic practices”.165 All these movements have advanced this multitude form that Hardt and Negri deduce, distinguished by “frequent

assemblies and participatory decision-making structures”.

The way these movements have utilized social media such as Facebook and Twitter has been extremely innovative and in accordance with the distinguished multitude form. These networks did not create the movements, rather they were instruments to accompany the movements and increase the influence of their horizontal organizational structure. These instruments also correspond to the new democratic practices that the multitude is experimenting with. Thus, Twitter is not solely used for a forum of grievances and announcements on demonstrations, but it is also useful for gathering a participatory decision-making decision quickly.

The democratic experiments incorporated by the multitude will not allow for leaders to develop among the multitude. While these movements will carry on without representation through their horizontal organizational structure, it is still hard to say whether this certain democratic experiment could be an alternative to the current structure. However, according to Hardt and Negri, “they are already powerfully expressing the aspiration for a real democracy” and that itself is an accomplishment.

These youthful demonstrations are posing a significant question to the current regime – if the current democratic structures are dwindling to global interests and cannot accommodate the multitude anymore, isn’t it time for us to consider a new democratic structure and deem the current outdated? Hence the hope of these struggles is not
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whether or not new democratic structures are established but rather that these struggles illuminate aspirations for freedom, expression and true democracy. While these movements may fail in establishing legitimate democratic government, what they will succeed in is unleashing the political demands that have been resonating throughout the demonstrations and allowing new struggles to be engaged. A sense of empowerment has been established within these movements. The Internet has engaged the multitude and public opinion to where governments can no longer ignore the dissatisfactions of the population. Thus, what has occurred is a precursor to an alternative. The Arab Spring and the Occupy Movement have initiated this empowerment and have engaged populations in creative instruments that enable them to procure more power and thus more vocalists. It is this horizontal organizational structure of the multitude form that has allowed the empowerment and dedication to the cause to exist and prosper.

Is the Arab Spring a Manifestation of the Multitude?

The Arab Spring represents the organizational structure of Hardt and Negri’s multitude. Empire creates a single body society, allowing resistances that are “no longer marginal but active in the center of society that opens up in networks; the individual points are singularized in a thousand plateaus”. ¹⁷⁰ The Arab revolts that spread across the region expresses the network structure of the multitude and encompasses the many singularities that the multitude can possess. However, scholars, such as Lisa Anderson, believe that the Arab revolts do not represent globalization or “how activists used

technology to share ideas and tactics”.171 Rather, Anderson believes that we should be looking at the local contexts and their divergences. She believes that each regime is unique and their past European encounters altered each nation differently. In addition, she believes that each nation will encounter different challenges moving onward. What is amusing is that while she doesn’t believe we should look at the uprisings as a single entity, she is still relating the uprising to Hardt and Negri’s multitude. It is the different localities that help create the multitude. The multitude is in essence a multiplicity of feelings and cultural flairs, thus the multitude cannot be reduced to a single identity – concurring with Anderson’s thesis. The multitude challenges the notion of Empire through this open network of singularities able to communicate and act in common while remaining a multiplicity of ideas and backgrounds. Anderson’s thesis that the revolts are operating in different contexts supports the multitude theory because it is these different contexts that allow individuality to join and the multitude to flourish. The multitude doesn’t discourage the different local contexts, it is the plurality that allows this leaderless resistance to form and be sustained. While the multitude is seen as a global actor, the local contexts are not overlooked because the singularity of each struggle within the multitude is what helps create the common that helps negate Empire and its sovereignty. The network structure enlists more local contexts to join and develop more singularities thus creating a larger common to be mobilized. Therefore, Anderson’s thesis is supported in essence by the multitude. The theory enables us to look at the awakening as a single movement while also incorporating the differences that enable it to

sustained and gain power. The multitude allows us to look at the Arab Spring as a single movement that incorporates different local contexts and acknowledges the tactics used as innovative and powerful.
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

The Arab Spring alongside the other protests that have occurred in the last few years all form an emerging cycle of struggles. Each of these struggles could be accomplished because of common elements that have resonated from the struggle before it – allowing it to introduce these commons and adequately unleash their own situation into the mix. Thus, a global multitude is emerging out of the Empire structure that encompasses our modern lives.

“Empire is emerging today at the center that supports the globalization of productive networks and casts its widely inclusive net to try and envelop all power relations within its world order – and yet at the same time it deploys a power police function against the new barbarians and the rebellious slave who threaten its order”¹⁷³ – this quote resonates the exact dilemma that the multitude is facing within the Middle East and elsewhere. It is this plurality of Empire that is challenging, especially within Syria. Bashar al-Assad is desperately hanging onto significance through these other network power structures of Empire – especially that of alliances and the military/police. The police function in Syria is being deployed to the fullest extent. Those participating in the revolution are not only guaranteed death, they also face torture and imprisonment. The police function of Empire is increasingly important, however, it is the weakest form of power that Empire has. It is useful for short-term control and that is exactly what is


occurring within Syria. This short-term control leads to the scary alternative of a diminished multitude without the singularities and democratic uses of violence it previously involved. Empire attempts to squash the multitude by labeling it as demonic and enemies of the traditional order. It is through these uses of democratic violence that allow the multitude to “express, nourish, and develop positively their own constituent projects”.\(^{174}\)

The multitude arises when singularities arise out of the common, not individual ideas. Thus, the multitude must attempt to create new political decision making tools to counteract Empire. Fundamentally then the multitude must use “the right to disobedience and the right to difference”\(^{175}\) to overcome the biopower of Empire. Through these rights the multitude must establish democratic uses of violence to delegitimze the power of war and force that is used by Empire. War legitimizes the sovereign’s power through total containment of new inspirations of society. Therefore, devising a democratic use of violence is extremely important for the multitude to sustain and create the possibility of an alternative to Empire. This democratic violence must only be used in defensive means and in accordance to the political goals of the multitude. Also, it is not this violence that initiates the revolution, rather the “democratic use of violence in a revolutionary context is not really difference than an act of resistance”.\(^{176}\) Thus, this violence is the means to meet an end. Democratic uses of violence need new weapons from that of Empire.
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Weapons can come in many forms, “simply having millions of people in the streets for a demonstration is a kind of weapon”. The intensity of cooperation and communication can help breakdown the biopolitical atmosphere and destroy its possibility of future power.

The Arab Spring has created weapons for democratic uses of violence that are sufficient and effective. The Arab population utilized modern means of communication such as social media to increase awareness and gather more singularities to join the wave of demonstrations. Social media provided the Arab Spring multitudes the ability to organize and spread across the region. Social media networks allow the different singularities to be expressed and ideas to be shared quickly. Protesters opened the eyes of the Arab population to the gross misuse of resources that was occurring at the level of Empire. The convenient utility of the Internet allowed the multitude to exemplify the biopolitical power that resides upon them and opened up discussions and frustrations to further intensify the revolutions. This weapon allows the horizontal organizational structure, leaderless, to thrive. The democratic weapon of social media allows more singularities that would otherwise be hindered from making contributions – women. Allowing youthful women to join the uprisings brings more multiplicity to the multitude that would otherwise not be there if social media and blogging was not involved, these women add more differences and thus more empowerment. While the Internet within the Arab Spring provides significance for those marginalized other means of democratic uses of violence allow more liberation and singularities to join the multitude.

Music can liberate the mind and introduce new subjectivities globally. Music, mainly hip-hop, has joined the liberation of the multitude in an effort to create an alternative to Empire. What is interesting is within the 1960’s popular movements music played an important role as well. Thus, we can deduce that the weapon of music is something that has been developed for decades, even when an apparent multitude was not present. Humans have expressed themselves through music throughout history. Lyrics can resonate the demands of the current multitude by reiterating the demands of the multions of protestors. What is beneficial to the Arab Spring, something that was not present during the 1960’s, is the ability to post music videos to social media websites, allowing a visual component to enter into the equation. Most videos created show actual pictures and video of the protests, allowing populations globally the ability to see the crackdowns of the police and the brutality these nonviolent protests are encountering. Music has become a sort of subculture of the revolution, just as it did in the 1960’s, these songs are “a medium that allowed youth to communicate across borders, to tell their side of the story and perhaps spread the protest contagion”. The intensity of communication and cooperation through these weapons are extremely important to sustain the multitude and increase its potential as a manifestation to create an alternative to Empire. The weapons born out of the Arab Spring “are an invitation for leaders and citizens to reflect

and have an honest conversation between ourselves about where we are today and where we may be going”.  

These democratic uses of violence essentially are the heart and soul of the multitude. It is through these weapons that cooperation and communication are valued, thus allowing the multitude the ability to discuss and create alternatives to Empire. The art of democratic uses of violence express the multitude’s ability to be a positive and creative alternative; it does not solely encompass the desire to overthrow authoritarian regimes – as in the case of the Arab Spring. What we can see instead is this creative and positive force that is deterritorializing and “the productive force that sustains Empire and at the same time the force that calls for and makes necessary its destruction”¹⁸⁰, can be larger than just an overthrowing entity. Empire thus creates the illusion that political transcendence is seen as monstrous and barbaric. Through the democratic use of violence the multitude can develop weapons that are not the traditional weapons used by Empire, but rather creative and positive weapons that promote the multitude essential powers of “being, loving, transforming, creating”.¹⁸¹ The Arab Spring through its use of social media, art and music are developing these positive powers that have the ability to create an alternative.

The Arab Spring can be argued as a manifestation of the multitude, not only because of the democratic use of violence and leaderless organizational structure. The
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multitude is not created by just blending nations and people uncaringly, the mobilization of the common creates the atmosphere where these multiplicity of feelings and cultural flairs allow the revolution to take hold and invite more individuality to join. Revolutions arise when the production of the common has surplus that cannot be contained by the capital or the regime. The Arab youth were frustrated that they could not apply their ambitious personalities and education to life because of high unemployment and poverty. Differences are expressed equally and freely and cannot be reduced to a single identity – the Arab Spring while mainly about the overthrow of authoritarian regimes is also about poverty, unemployment, and so on, there is not one single identity apparent within the movement. The use of social media and such increases democratic relationship internally within Empire, one has to enter the terrain of Empire to effectively combat it.

Globalization has initiated an atmosphere where the multitude has the ability to create vast and quick movements around the globe. Therefore, the multitude establishes a “new geography”\(^\text{182}\), where the active population of the multitude can create this desire and positive democratic uses of violence to achieve an alternative to Empire – “the power of the multitude to create social relationships in common stand between sovereignty and anarchy, that it thus presents a new possibility for politics”.\(^\text{183}\)

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri therefore provide a compelling theory to help explain the current global order. The transnational nature of today’s society has enlarged the scope of influence of the individual. Hardt and Negri’s multitude captures this new
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political subject fully. These populations that have been marginalized and exploited can creatively come together and create an alternative to Empire. However, there is criticism upon the Empire theory itself – Hardt and Negri explain that the multitude is created out of Empire, thus if some believe that Empire is not established than the multitude cannot be established as well. Scholars wonder if the attacks on September 11, 2001 have seen a reemergence of an imperialist United States of America and stronger central power of the nation state. Hardt and Negri’s account then has trouble explaining the resurgent patriotic dialogue that has taken place since the terrorist attacks in the United States and Western Europe. The nation state’s reemergence as a central authority in defending its populations against outside threats undermines the network like structure of Empire and the plurality of sovereignty. Yet, we have also seen an emergence of the United Nations – a network structure of power of Empire. In the case of Syria, we do not see nation states directly intervening within Syria. Rather, the power of the UN and the fact that a resolution is needed for intervention exemplifies that this network of power is still relevant. Therefore, while some scholars may argue that the Empire theory is irrelevant, all they have to do is look to the current world order and plurality of sovereignty that exists. In addition, we can see networks of Empire at work within nation states. Occupy resonates this through their movement against the central government but the many banks, companies and people that are hoarding all the money. Therefore, scholars that argue that the Empire theory is irrelevant, not only need to look globally but also domestically within the state to see the many networks of power that exist.
While the Arab Spring and Occupy may not actually create an alternative to Empire, these movements have exemplified the potential of the multitude as a manifestation to effectively challenge the power of Empire. The question we need to ask is if global interests are enthralling the state more than accommodating the multitude, shouldn’t a new democratic structure be created? Hence the hope of these struggles is not whether or not new democratic structures are established but rather that these struggles illuminate aspirations for freedom, expression and true democracy. While these movements may fail in establishing legitimate democratic government, what they will succeed in is unleashing the political demands that have been resonating throughout the demonstrations and allowing new struggles to be engaged. A sense of empowerment has been established within these movements. This empowerment that has been created, especially in the case of the Arab Spring, allows populations that have been marginalized show that they are in fact able to up rise and create societies that they deserve. Therefore, while the Arab Spring and Occupy may not be able to create an alternative to Empire, the uprising have in fact created a common that will be able to resonate within future global struggles that could eventually completely dismantle Empire. One cannot argue that “the idea that the opinions of Arabs matter and can never again be ignored – may be the most potent new idea of all”. The ideas of empowerment that have been created will resonate forever and will continue to be exemplified in waves of local struggles in the future eventually creating a global multitude and establishing a true democracy.
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