### 1AC – Hauntology

#### **The medical industrial complex is rooted in using disease as a way to reify different modes of colonial and class violence – That make it impossible to imagine medicine as life sustaining because it is haunted by spectres of the past**

Street 18 [Alice Street, School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Edinburgh 12-12-2018, "Ghostly Ethics," Taylor & Francis, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01459740.2018.1521400]/ISEE

The hospital ghosts that feature in this issue do not only make the past visible in the present. They also portend the affective and structural uncertainties inherent in how anthropology’s interlocutors engage with hospital infrastructures, and make sense of medical outcomes, in the future. These ghosts disrupt the very notion of the hospital as a site of life-sustaining care. The ghosts we meet in these pages are not external agents that force their way into the institution from outside; they are the progeny of hospital biomedicine. The hospital jinns described by Varley and Varma, for example, are “neither alien to nor separable from medicine, but inextricably bound up with its local practice and outcomes.” What these ghosts make visible, then, are the excesses, harm, and suffering that are integral to hospital medicine, but are commonly excluded from formal accounts (and the accounts that medical practitioners tell themselves) of Hippocratic biomedical ethics. It is apt that many of the articles explicitly attend to iatrogenic suffering. In the public hospital in Cameroon described by Chabrol, haunting takes a pathological form. Irresponsible and racist colonial medical campaigns resulted in widespread infection with viral hepatitis. The patients diagnosed in the hospital today often only find out they have the disease when they attend the blood bank to donate blood for relatives who have been admitted to the hospital with more acute conditions. Here, viral hepatitis appears as a “ghost” from a violent colonial past. But, importantly, Chabrol also employs the concept of haunting to question the ethics of diagnosing people with a disease in the present, for which there is little prospect of treatment, when knowledge of that diagnosis can itself disrupt kinship relationships and affect social and mental wellbeing in the future. In Gilgit Town in Pakistan-controlled Kashmir, sectarian violence frequently threatens to erupt inside the hospital and patients voice their concerns that the exclusions generated by everyday triaging and staff neglect follow sectarian lines. Here stories about jinn articulate the precariousness of hospital living in a setting where strangers cannot automatically be trusted to care. In both papers, jinns or ghost-diseases draw attention to the disjuncture of dominant narratives about biomedical ethics, which emphasize the life-sustaining capacities of medicine, and actual practices of biomedical care, which can be disruptive and damaging to social and biological life, in many hospital settings. The effect of bringing these different articles together under the figure of “haunting” is that iatrogenic suffering does not figure as a rare exception to biomedical norms, but is a constant “ghostly” presence that challenges the very notion of the hospital as a site of care. The Papua New Guinea example is a case in point. What, for example, would it mean to understand wori as an iatrogenic disease? In these tragic accounts of iatrogenic suffering, the trope of haunting – especially in fraught postcolonial settings or medical modes – serves as a means for anthropologists to introspectively engage with local understandings and criticisms of hospital medicine, and to scrutinize its intrinsic shortcomings and failures. Even when ghosts themselves do not appear in the articles, haunting is employed as a form of ethical critique. Krauss interprets women’s collective expressions of pain in Mexican abortion clinics as the forced embodiment of the moral paradoxes that lie at the heart of Mexican abortion law, which simultaneously criminalizes all abortion and grants exceptions from prosecution for morally acceptable cases. Krauss conjures pain as a ghost that haunts the law (and anthropological preoccupations with the law) with fundamental ethical questions about the ways in which the moral ambiguity of (Catholic) legal codes affect the wellbeing of women. Kehr employs the concept of “haunting” to describe physicians’ discomfort with the racialized medicine that they practice in the hospital and to capture their desire for a “medicine otherwise”, which might be understood as a desire to build a racially attuned hospital ethics. In Srinagar, the long-term mental health patients that are left behind in the hospital ward in the wake of a policy shift toward care in the community are described as jinn-like, “both their physical existence and the fact of their incarceration are disruptive to the social order, embodying the limited reach of current totalizing projects.” In her recent article on the hauntings of shipyards on the Hoogly River, India, Laura (Bear 2018) argues that the frequent appearances of ghosts – in the form of jinns – help workers to articulate the limitations and exclusions of a labor ethics premised on perpetual growth. Stories about jinns express an alternative ethics of labor, in which work leads to death and suffering as well as growth. In a workplace where horrific accidents and minor injuries alike are daily occurrences, ghosts “draw attention to the excluded element” of a capitalist ethics premised on productivity, growth and vitality – “individual suffering, decay and death” (Bear 2018). The ghosts of popular working class Hinduism “do not manifest a traumatic collective memory—an unacknowledged past does not emerge through their agency. Instead… they allow hidden individual suffering in the present to return as a collective tangible visceral experience” (Bear 2018). I suggest that ghosts fulfill a similar purpose in the hospital environment, giving voice to counter-narratives that challenge the medicine:disease oppositional dyad and making visible the ways in which hospital medicine, precisely because of its embeddedness in colonial institutional histories and social inequalities, may be generative of disease, death and suffering.

#### Intellectual property protections on medicines are haunted by the same specters of the ruptured medical industrial complex

TWAIL 21 [Third World Approaches to International Law, 3-23-2021, "On Intellectual Property Rights, Access to Medicines and Vaccine Imperialism," TWAILR, https://twailr.com/on-intellectual-property-rights-access-to-medicines-and-vaccine-imperialism/]/ISEE

Intellectual property rights (IPRs) are time-limited legal rights granted to inventors and creators. IPRs include copyrights, trademarks, patents, trade secrets, and geographical indications, while protected subject-matters include, but are not limited to, brands, inventions, designs, and biological materials. Importantly, IPRs overlap as a product may be covered by a series of rights. For example, a pharmaceutical medicine, defined by Britannica as a ‘substance used in the diagnosis, treatment, or prevention of disease’, is protected by patents, trademarks, and trade secrets. Patents are the most common form of IPR used for the protection of innovation in pharmaceuticals. Patents grant inventors limited market exclusivity for their inventions, and, in exchange, the inventor must disclose sufficient information such that competitors will be able to step into the market. This disclosure allows a competitor to make preparation to enter the market at the end of the monopoly period. Due to this legally-mandated exclusivity, patent owners – usually multinational corporations – have the right to prevent others from making, using, or selling a patented invention. The TRIPS Agreement, concluded as part of the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiation and in force since 1995, provides a minimum of 20 years patent protection. The belief is that the duration allows corporations to recoup the expenses of developing, testing and upscaling an innovative pharmaceutical product. From the onset, the TRIPS IP regime created imbalance between innovation, market monopoly, and medicines access, because it failed to take into consideration the health burden, development needs and local conditions of the various countries that make up the WTO. This has led to several issues. First, the market monopoly of IP rights, which allows the corporation to set the market for drugs, has created a privileged societal class with access to lifesaving medication distinguishing them from those excluded from access to available medications. This phenomenon is vividly illustrated in the HIV/AIDS crisis of the 1990s and early 2000s. While HIV/AIDS patients in developed countries were able to afford antiretroviral (ARVs) treatments, which had been developed, approved and patented as early as 1987, many patients in Africa and other parts of the developing world could not afford the approximately USD 12,000 per annum treatment at that time. By 2001, approximately 2.4 million people in the region had died of AIDS. The South African government intervened to reduce the cost of ARVs by amending its domestic patent laws to allow the authorization of parallel imports of patented pharmaceuticals and to encourage the use of generic drugs, but it was sued by the US industry group Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA). Though the lawsuit was eventually dropped, it highlights the measures pharmaceutical corporations, backed by some national governments, are willing to take to protect their profits at the cost of human lives. Significantly, we see how law (or the threat of legal action) is used not only to protect and expand the profitability of a certain kind of property but, as Anjali Vats and Deidré Keller have taught us, also reveals IP law’s racial investments in whiteness and its continuing implications for racial (in)equality, particularly in the way it informs systems of ownership, circulation, and distribution of knowledge. Similarly, Natsu Saito takes up the analysis of IP, race and capitalism by theorizing some of the ways in which ‘value’ in IP law concentrated in the hands of large corporations is calculated in terms of its profitability rather than what it contributes to the well-being of society. However, the proverbial chickens have come home to roost as even rich countries are beginning to feel the bite of the dysfunctional IP system. The issue of excessive pricing for medicines is a growing problem in developed countries as well and has now become the single biggest category of healthcare spending in these states, particularly the US. An empirical report by I-MAK reveals how excessive pharmaceutical patenting is extending monopolies and driving up drug prices. The report, for example, notes that over half of the top twelve drugs in the US have more than 100 attempted patents per drug. Specifically, the report revealed that Humira® by AbbVie (used in the treatment of Crohn’s disease and the US’s highest grossing drug) has been issued 130 patents. The drug costs USD 44,000 annually and generated more than USD 19.2 billion for the company in 2019 alone. The Report also notes that the first patent filed for Herceptin® – used in the treatment for certain breast and stomach cancers – was in 1985 but currently has pending patent applications that could extend its market monopoly for 48 more years. Meanwhile, Celgene has over 105 patents for its oral cancer drug Revlimid® (used in the treatment of multiple myeloma) extending its monopoly until the end of 2036 – a patent lifespan of 40 years. In addition to excessive patenting and pricing, we have also come to understand the power of data in this context. Health inequity and inequalities in vaccine access are not unfortunate outcomes of the global IP regime; they are part of its central architecture. The system is functioning exactly as it is set up to do. Second, regulatory agencies worldwide require drugs to undergo safety and efficacy testing to ensure they are harmless before approval. These tests, known as clinical trials, involve human subjects and are costly because they can run up to three separate phases. The data collected during these clinical trials are the proprietary materials of the company conducting the tests. Because it is expensive and time-consuming, generic drug companies usually rely on the safety and efficacy data of brand name companies to seek regulatory approval as long as they can prove their generic version is chemically and biologically equivalent to the original. Relying on the test data of brand name companies reduces the production cost for generic medicines and allows for quicker market entry. However, recent years have seen a promotion of time-limited, legally mandated protection against the non-proprietary use of such data by generic companies. This is known as data exclusivity. Put differently, data exclusivity is a period when a generic company cannot use the clinical trial data of an innovator pharmaceutical company to receive regulatory approval for a generic medicine. In so doing, data exclusivity provides a layer of protection in addition to patent protection to further delay market entry of generic medicines. Data exclusivity periods vary depending on the jurisdiction. For example, it is twelve years in US and ten years in the EU. While the TRIPS Agreement does not create property rights over registration data, the US and the EU have continued to champion and export data exclusivity through free trade agreements, particularly for biologics. For example, the US Affordable Health Care for America Act in 2009 extended a 12-year exclusivity period for biologics. This US interpretation for registration data was also included in the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), which sought a 10-year data exclusivity for new biologics. However, after intense negotiations, the data exclusivity protection was reduced to 5 years for new pharmaceuticals. In this instance, we see a crystallising of Euro-American ideas of property and a willingness to promote those property interests through the law, both domestic and international. In fact, certain scholars assert that this pursuit of higher TRIPS standards is driven, in part, by the US desire to achieve levels of protection it anticipated from the TRIPS Agreement but failed to secure. Given the influence of the industry and its representative group, PhRMA, in seeking stronger protection on a global scale, it is not surprising that the US’s post-TRIPS policies continue to rachet up standards in ways that undermine access to affordable medicines, and perpetuate social hierarchy and subordination. Third, patent practices in recent decades have seen pharmaceutical companies engaging in trivial and cosmetic tweaking of a drug whilst still reaping the benefit of 20 years of patent protection. This tweaking sometimes involves making minor changes to patented drugs, such as changes in mode of administration, new dosages, extended release, or change in color of the drug. These changes normally do not offer any significant therapeutic advantage even though pharmaceutical companies argue they provide improved health outcomes to patients. These additional patents on small changes to existing drugs, known as evergreening or patent thickets, block the early entry of competitive, generic medicines that drive medicine prices down. For example, while not mandated by TRIPS, many US led TRIPS-plus free trade agreements have expanded the scope for evergreening. These include the US-Jordan FTA (2000), US-Australia FTA (2004) as well as the US-Korea FTA (2007), which allow for the patenting of new forms, uses, or methods of using existing products. The development discourse often touted by developed nations to help countries in the Global South ‘catch up’ is empty when the essential medicines needed to stay alive are deliberately denied and weaponised. The cancer drug Gleevec®, owned by Novartis, is another example of how pharmaceutical companies often secure patents on new, more convenient versions with marginal therapeutic benefit to patients whilst blocking the entry of generic medicines. In 2013, Novartis’ patent application for Gleevec®– the β crystalline form of the salt imatinib mesylate – was rejected by the Indian Supreme Court because it lacked novelty. However, the company has secured patents for this product in other jurisdictions such as the US and has maintained a high price of Gleevec there. But in India the price of Gleevec® was reduced from approximately USD 2,200 to USD 88 for one month’s treatment in the generic drugs market as a result of the 2013 Indian Supreme Court judgement. Novartis is not the only culprit. The depression drug Effexor® by Pfizer was granted an evergreen patent when the company introduced an extended-release version, Efexor-XR®, even though there was no additional benefit to patients. Eventually, the patent was declared invalid, but by then it had already cost an estimated USD 209 million to Australian taxpayers and kept generic competition off the market for two and a half years. In another instance, Pfizer went on to secure an additional patent for the Pristiq®, which contained identical chemical compound as Efexor-XR®,and again with no added therapeutic benefit. These evergreening practices, of course, have material effects. Apart from delaying the entry of generic versions, they give brand-name pharmaceutical companies free reign in the market, which allows them to set the market price. Recent years have seen monopoly prices rise exorbitantly causing significant financial strain to patients, domestic healthcare services and even insurance companies in developed countries. A notorious example is Martin Shkreli, who in 2015 bought the rights to an anti-malarial drug, then raised the price by 5,000 per cent from a cost of USD 13.50 to USD 750. Similarly, a white paper by I-MAK shows how excessive patenting and related strategies are driving families to overspend on lifesaving medicines. Celgene, the makers of Revlimid® raised the price of the drug by more than 50 per cent since 2012 to over USD 125,000 per year of treatment. Using the example of Solvadi® by Gilead, which costs USD 84,000 per treatment, Feldman notes the drug would cost the US Department of Defense more than USD 12 billion to treat all hepatitis-infected patients in US Veterans Affairs. But the US is not alone. In Europe, expensive drugs have prompted a growing backlash against pharmaceutical corporations. Reacting to these price hikes, Dutch pharmacies are bypassing these exorbitant prices by preparing medicines in-house for individual patients. The broken IP system ranging from an extraordinarily low standard for granting patents to permissions of patent thickets around a single molecule has not only severely distorted the system of innovation, but they have also skewed access to life-saving drugs. As a result, prices for new and existing medicines are constantly rising, making essential medicines inaccessible for millions of people around the world.

#### Embracing these specters is key to solve for nationalist and authoritarian violence – anything other method justifies erasing all traces that disturb the self-enclosure of the present and turns all impacts.

Papastephanou 11 – Associate Professor in the Department of Education at the University of Cyprus (Marianna, “Material Specters: International Conflicts, Disaster Management, and Educational Projects,” *Educational Theory*, Volume 61, Number 1, 2011, pgs. 113-114)//DD

It often appears that a prolonged conflict unsettles the present. Although this is psychologically true,44 politically it is mostly the other way round. According to Derrida, ‘‘every authoritarian regime wants to eternalize its present in order to rule out the possibility of its future disintegration and to erase the barbarity from which it sprang. Such regimes fear ghosts.’’45 Settlers — such as the Turkish settlers in the occupied part of Cyprus46 — have been used by their authorities as a means to an end (against Immanuel Kant’s Categorical Imperative, of course): to effect and consolidate demographic alterations that will erase the past relation of space and rightful (co)habitation. Settlement as a crime against humanity according to international law and settlement as arrangement of situations for purposes of realpolitik create a new, modern space that is disconnected from the past and hostile to a just future. The new ontology of space is haunted only by the memory of those who are in a position to know how the landscape once appeared. If the ‘‘present is unsettled no less by the return of the past than by the imminence of the future,’’47 then educational theory must defend a qualified preservation of memories and a preparation for the revival of unsettling futurity. ‘‘The founders of Israel spoke of making ‘facts on the ground.’ This term refers to shaping material reality in ways that institutionalize and make solid that which is, in fact, a recent innovation’’ (CD, 159). As facts on the ground, authoritarian strategies settle the present and block the advent of a desirable future perhaps far more than the emotional effects of any direct, personal loss (raising barriers to reconciliation) could ever do. ‘‘To reassure and perpetuate themselves, [authoritarian regimes] efface any spectral traces that threaten to disturb the self-enclosure of the present.’’48 As Saltman writes, ‘‘Israel eradicated Palestinian towns, removing all traces, all physical markers from which public memory of the history of the place could be conjured, invoked or referenced’’ (CD, 159). Such material production of faits accomplis creates ‘‘institutional and public memory while also working to conceal that which was there before. The longer it takes to rebuild schools and communities in New Orleans, the more powerful that wreckage becomes as new facts on the ground’’ (CD, 160). In turn, ‘‘the longer [created realities] become facts on the ground, the harder it becomes to remember what was there before’’ (CD, 160). This gives a new meaning to the Greek-Cypriot educational slogan ‘‘I do not forget and I struggle’’ that Zembylas unequivocally disparages as nationalism, pure and simple (PTE, 7). The educational demand for memory and for struggle to reclaim the rights that have been denied cannot be sweepingly dismissed without significant loss of commitment to international justice.

#### It outweighs, Authoritarianism causes mass death via nationalist wars, climate, military robots and makes all impacts more probable.

**Orts ’18** [Eric; June 27; Guardsmark Professor in the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania; LinkedIn Pulse, “Foreign Affairs: Six Future Scenarios (and a Seventh),” https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/foreign-affairs-six-future-scenarios-seventh-eric-orts]

7. Fascist Nationalism. There is another possible future that the Foreign Affairs scenarios do not contemplate, and it’s a dark world in which Trump, Putin, Xi, Erdogan, and others construct regimes that are **authoritarian and nationalist**. Fascism is possible in the United States and elsewhere if big business can be seduced by promises of riches in return for the institutional keys to democracy. Perhaps Foreign Affairs editors are right to leave this dark world out, for it would be very dark: **nationalist wars** with risks of **escalation into global nuclear conflict**, further digital militarization (even Terminator-style scenarios of smart **military robots**), and **unchecked climate disasters**.

The global challenges are quite large – and the six pieces do an outstanding job of presenting them. One must remain optimistic and engaged, hopeful that we can overcome the serious dangers of tribalism, nationalism, and new fascism. These "isms” of our time stand in the way of solving some of our biggest global problems, such as the risks of **thermonuclear war** and **global climate catastrophe**.

#### Thus I affirm that the member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines as a form of ghostly ethic.

Street 18 [Alice Street, School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Edinburgh 12-12-2018, "Ghostly Ethics," Taylor & Francis, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01459740.2018.1521400]/ISEE

Hospital futures Ghosts have fulfilled a dual analytic function in the articles that feature in this special issue. In one mode, often dubbed “hauntology” (following Derrida 1994), and influenced by psychoanalytic and postcolonial theory, they make affectively present the unextinguishable, deferred remnants of repressed violence and wrongdoing that took place in the past. The contributing articles show hauntology to be a singularly productive means of drawing attention to the “multidimensional and multiply temporal” nature of hospital space (Varley and Varma, this issue). In the second mode, which I term “ghostly ethics”, they reveal the excesses, limitations, and impossibilities of a biomedical ethics that is premised on care, trust, and medicine as a life-sustaining force, when it is embedded in hospital infrastructures. Ghostly ethics reveal the abusive relationships that shadow hospital care in places of sectarian conflict, the fruitless pursuit of diagnostic knowledge in places without therapeutic resources, the uncertainty and unpredictability that perpetually haunts medical claims to authority, and the moral ambiguities that saturate medical law. In all these instances, ghosts give voice to people’s experience of hospital medicine as the cause of suffering, uncertainty and death, as well as their amelioration. From the perspective of ghostly ethics, hospitals are haunted because hospital medicine is always shadowed by unresolved ethical questions about the good or harm that institutional care can do. In Papua New Guinea spirits frantically travel through hospital corridors because people die in the wrong place: institutional relationships between patients, doctors, nurses, and kin are experienced as prohibiting the production of healthy bodies. As ethical critique, haunting gives voice to concerns about the intrinsic failings of hospital medicine and generates conversation about what “medicine otherwise” (as Kehr puts it, this issue) might look like for the future.

#### The aff is spectrality – only a critical interrogation of the present and the past as singular, totalizing, and complete can prevent the obstruction of possibility.

Zembylas 13 – Associate Professor of Educational Theory and Curriculum Studies at the Open University of Cyprus (Michalinos, “Pedagogies of Hauntology In History Education: Learning to Live with the Ghosts of Disappeared Victims of War and Dictatorship,” DOI: 10.1111/edth.12010, February 2013)//DD

One way of addressing the past and its representations is through the concept of the specter. In Specters of Marx, a book that initiates the perceived ‘‘ethical turn’’ in his work, Derrida argued that any rethinking of the past and any possibility of a just future depends on whether we can ‘‘learn to live with ghosts’’ (SM, xviii), the specters of the past, particularly the ghosts of victims of atrocities. The spectral is what haunts and returns in a society because the ghosts have unfinished business, something that needs to be corrected. However, the resolution of this unfinished business is not to abolish the specters — for example, through (uncritical) spectacle pedagogies — because, as Derrida warned, this would amount to eliminating the possibility of a different future.32 In addressing the issue of spectrality, Derrida introduced the term hauntology — a near homophone of ‘‘ontology’’ in French — to interrogate and replace the priority of being and presence with the figure of the ghost. Unlike ontology, which is fixed to the present and to what is representable (the traditional Western ontological and epistemological position), hauntology draws attention to specters that are neither present nor absent, neither dead nor alive.33 Hauntology, then, occupies a peculiar ‘‘in-between’’ space that ‘‘reclaims the unspoken and neglected.’’34 For Derrida, specters are both ‘‘revenants’’ and ‘‘arrivants’’ (SM, xix), that is, spirits that come back and spirits that are to come, respectively; both of these temporal dimensions, as Ross Benjamin and Heesok Chang observe, are essential to spectrality.35 ‘‘Spectrality,’’ Fredric Jameson explains in his reaction to Derrida’s book, does not involve the conviction that ghosts exist or that the past (and maybe even the future they offer to prophesy) is still very much alive and at work, within the living present: all it says, if it can be thought to speak, is that the living present is scarcely as self-sufficient as it claims to be; that we would do well not to count on its destiny and solidity, which might under exceptional circumstances betray us.36 Spectrality denotes what is no longer or not yet living, which is not something present or absent, but something that is possibly everywhere, ‘‘bear[ing] traces of a lingering past and hover[ing] in suspense of an unforeseeable future.’’37 Being neither fully present nor fully absent, ghosts do not have an ontological status, but rather exceed all ontological oppositions between presence and absence, visible and invisible, living and dead.38 The concept of the spectral, then, has much to do with the concept of ‘‘trace’’ and thus time is always already spectral;39 in this sense, hauntology abolishes the concept of linear time as an ontological category of historical understanding. A society that has experienced disappearances — such as Argentina or Cyprus, for example — must come to terms with the specters of the disappeared, the traces left by them in the stories and images that are circulated, the societal habits of remembering and forgetting that are no longer noticed, and the public or private rituals that still take place to recognize the victims. The disappeared are ghosts whose stories and images reach from memory and absence; this is to say that ‘‘disappearance’’ as such — as a particular form of relationality between individuals within a society — reaches from a place and time that was and is no longer and records, recalls, and reinscribes remembrance in the aporetic of memory.40 A commonsense yet ideological response to the ghosts of the disappeared, as noted earlier, is a desire to remember and simultaneously a wish to ontologize the ghosts of the disappeared by categorizing them within what is representable — an action that aims at abolishing or reducing them to spectacles. Derrida argued, however, that a society can come to terms with specters without abolishing or reducing them to a spectacle, that is, to a kind of ontology. As he explained in a paragraph that concerns schools and educators in particular, The last one to whom a specter can appear, address itself, or pay attention is a spectator as such. At the theater or at school. The reasons for this are essential. As theoreticians or witnesses, spectators, observers, and intellectuals, scholars believe that looking is sufficient. Therefore, they are not always in the most competent position to do what is necessary: speak to the specter. (SM, 11) To come to terms with the specters of the past, there needs to be an engagement with the past that is not reduced to its totalizing representation and that does not fall into the delusion of a timeless understanding that is ever present. Derrida called on us to speak and listen to the specter not because the specter will reveal some kind of a secret; rather, speaking with and listening to the specter may open us to the experience of unknowing that underlies a productive engagement and a turning away from that which is supposedly determined content to be uncovered by representational practices.41 The ghost of the disappeared, then, pushes at the boundaries of language, thought, and emotion to open new possibilities for the future, possibilities that do not reduce the ghost’s ethical injunction to an object of knowledge.42 The specter signifies, therefore, a critical interrogation of the present and the past as singular, totalizing, and complete; the specter reminds us that the past is incomplete because there are always elusive remnants that cannot be articulated in the languages available to us. This is why it is suggested, for example, that commemorative or justice projects that rely too heavily on epistemological accounts or seek merely redemption become too totalizing to be open to the view that specters can be anything other than obscure forms of representation. Finally, it is important to point out how Derrida linked the specter to the theme of justice and advocated a politics of memory and responsibility that is directed not only to the living, but also to the dead and to the not yet born: No justice ... seems possible or thinkable without the principle of some responsibility, beyond all living present, within that which disjoins the living present, before the ghosts of those who are not yet born or who are already dead, be they victims of wars, political or other kinds of violence, nationalist, racist, colonialist, sexist, or other kinds of exterminations, victims of the oppressions of capitalist imperialism or any of the forms of totalitarianism. (SM, xix) Derrida chose, as noted earlier, to speak about ghosts in the name of justice because, he observed, ‘‘one cannot speak directly about justice, thematize or objectivize justice, say ‘this is just’ and even less ‘I am just,’ without immediately betraying justice.’’43 Since justice entails ‘‘an experience of the impossible’’ and thus is aporetic — because it is implicated with law, although it cannot be reduced to it44 — spectrality becomes valuable in determining how to address justice demands. It is in this spectral sense that justice is the ‘‘experience of absolute alterity,’’45 an openness toward a radical otherness, to ‘‘the coming of the other, the absolute and unpredictable singularity of the arrivant as justice’’ (SM, 28). The specter’s ethical injunction is that we remain open to the radical otherness of the arrivant as arrivant, what remains to come — for example, a ‘‘democracy to come,’’ ‘‘hospitality without reserve,’’ and ‘‘alterity that cannot be anticipated’’ (SM, 65–66). As Derrida pointed out, ‘‘without this experience of the impossible, one might as well give up on both justice and the event’’ (SM, 65) — that is, the event to come. The responsibility of the haunted is this, then: to be open to justice as unrepresentable, as always to come, as a trace of directionality rather than as a fixed destination.46 Hence justice for disappeared victims, for example, is not a calculable and distributive justice that ends with trials and punishments but an agonistic justice that contests legalistic settlements. In this sense, justice is a critical force that helps to articulate an alternative vision that is motivated by the infinite obligation to the other — in this case, the ghost of a disappeared victim who cannot be assessed by a finite set of qualities, representations, or legal arguments.

#### The role of the ballot is to frontline reconciling with the past and the present

Auchter 12 [Jessica Auchter “Ghostly Politics: Statecraft, Monumentalization, and a Logic of Haunting” Jessica Auchter teaches UHON 3550/3590—Topics in Behavioral and Social Science and Topics in Non-Western Cultures: Global Humanitarianism. Her main research and teaching interests lie in the field of International Relations. She has published articles in Review of International Studies, International Feminist Journal of Politics, Journal of Global Security Studies, Hyperrhiz, Ethnicity Studies, Journal for Cultural Research, andCritical Studies on Security, and several chapters in edited volume projects. Her book, The Politics of Haunting and Memory in International Relations, was published by Routledge in 2014.]

**The task** here, then**, is to trace the political effects of haunting** and hauntings**, and acknowledge that** there may be **some bodies** and some ghosts that **are unknowable,** but that **this is** itself **a hauntological status with** political **significance and disrupts the** previously **accepted order of knowledge.** It is **an ethical practice** undertakenhere**: to find ghosts without rendering them visible** and knowable **within a logic that replicates the subjugation and marginalization** of specters and the construction of certain lives and bodies as ungrievable. Why Bodies? Bodies are not themselves exclusive from ghosts. As Kas Saghafi writes, ‘a “ghost” is a spectral apparition, a magic appearance. Yet, it is a body—the most abstract of bodies. It is a becoming-body, a prosthetic body, an artifactual body, a body without body, a spectral body. **This phantomatic body,** animproperbody **without property or flesh, has the most intangible tangibility.**’85 Derrida’s own work on spectrality similarly gestures to a focus on the body. He states, ‘for there to be a ghost, there must be a return to the body, but to a body that is more abstract than ever. The spectrogenic process corresponds therefore to a paradoxical incorporation.’86 Here we begin to see the role of corporeality in spectrality, the importance of the ‘corps’ in Derrida’s gesturing to ‘incorporation.’ In this sense, understanding corporeality, or a focus on bodies in memorialization, can help us understanding the logic of haunting. **A focus on bodies has** perhaps **come to the attention of scholars** ofpolitics through the work of Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, and Giorgio Agamben, largely centered on the emergence of the concept of biopolitics. Agamben explores the centrality of the body in modern political thought through **the idea that democracy has come to be** considered **the presentation of the body**: hence the term ‘habeas corpus ad subjiciendum, “you will have to have a body to show”’.87 Corpus, he says, is **the bearer** both **of individual liberties and the ultimate subject of sovereign power.**88 This is also why we see the centrality of the body in philosophy and science of the Baroque age. He reads the emergence of the body in Leviathan through Hobbes’s distinction between man’s natural body and his political body: ‘the great metaphor of the Leviathan, whose body is formed out of all the bodies of individuals, must be read in this light. The absolute capacity of the subjects’ bodies to be killed forms the new political body of the West.’89 Foucault similarly has discussed the way in which the emergence of biopolitical technologies have placed the body at the center of political life, focused on ensuring the spatial distribution of individual bodies through separation, alignment, serialization, and surveillance.90 Foucault is one of the most influential thinkers in terms of theorizing how sovereign power acts on bodies, particularly in the form of disciplinary practices. As Foucault states, ‘**the body is** also **directly involved in a political field; power relations** have an immediate hold upon it; they **invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks,** to perform ceremonies, to emit signs.’91 Foucault emphasizes the importance of techniques of visibility in control over bodies, including his key theorization of the panopticon. One of the key features of this project as a whole will be in exploring the politics of visibility: what it might mean to display certain bodies in certain contexts and not others, why some spaces are rendered invisible and others hyper-visible. Monica Casper and Lisa Moore also emphasize the importance of visibility when it comes to bodies, arguing that not all bodies are equally visible. Some bodies are hyperexposed and magnified, others hidden or missing.92 Judith Butler has similarly focused on the body, specifically in terms of the relationships between gender and sex and bodies. She acknowledges that the body is material. But it is how some bodies and parts of bodies come to matter that renders bodies a focal point of an analysis based on social construction.93 As Lauren Wilcox characterizes Butler’s perspective: ‘the materialization of bodies is theorized as a product of discursive practices of gender, rather than gender being a social formation that is applied to pre-existing sexed bodies.’94 What she gestures at here is that while we can view bodies as material, this materiality is in fact produced by discourse in an iterative performative process. Bodies matter not simply because things happen to them, but also because they are themselves coconstitutive of the discourses within which they circulate. Like Butler, Casper and Moore argue that bodies are material entities, but ‘our interpretations and explanations of bodily processes give meaning to their materiality.’95 Butler thus explores the materialization of bodies, and how this is productive of a ‘domain of abjected bodies’ which sustains the normalization of other bodies. This articulation of bodies is productive of norms that qualify some bodies as ‘bodies that matter, ways of living that count as ‘life,’ lives worth protecting, lives worth saving, lives worth grieving.’96 It bears exploring here why political inscription on the body is so important for understanding the politics of memory in the instances I explore, and how this relates to the field of international relations. Why the body? Why dead bodies? ‘Dead Bodies have enjoyed political life the world over’97, and embodied practices have recently come to the attention of scholars of international politics as well. Rosemary Shinko theorizes embodied practices by looking at the body as a surface for resisting power in the framework of autonomy. She theorizes bodily enactments as way to challenge ‘sovereign powers’ efforts to render certain forms of suffering invisible, meaningless and not worth troubling over’.98 She critiques the way in which International Relations has failed to theorize the body, specifically in ignoring the relational autonomy of bodies. By paying attention to relational autonomy, we can look at both the physiological materiality of bodies and the discursive materiality of bodies. Her emphasis on the way in which power is both inscribed on bodies, yet bodies can also offer resistance to power, emphasizes the way in which the body is not a fixed referent, but rather is both shaped by and shapes discourses of power and materiality.99 Lauren Wilcox identifies the body as the constituent outside to International Relations, in that it is not explicitly theorized yet it at the same time functions to define the parameters of the discipline in the sense that excluding the body from our theorizations maintains the status quo operations of international relations.100 She similarly explores the role of the body in international relations in a variety of contexts, including the force-feeding of prisoners at Guantanamo as a literal instantiation of a biopolitical ‘make live’ exercise of power. As she argues, ‘the production of bodies by regimes of sovereign/discipline/governmentality are never total—there may be no outside of power, but bodies are also capable of exceeding their production.’101 In this way, Wilcox emphasizes the way in which bodies are not simply to be considered as sites for political inscription of sovereign power; they are not simply victims of power, rather we can theorize bodily resistance and bodies as resistance as well. Anna Agathangelou has also explored the role of bodies in terms of the war in Iraq. She argues that liberal theory presupposes that the West is the subject of reason and those outside are considered to be mere corporeality.102 The strategy in Iraq was thus to decapitate the head while leaving the body in place. She focuses on the ways certain bodies are deemed structurally impossible and ontologically dead in order to sustain a certain (re)construction of the liberal order focused on these racial and gendered corporeal reconstructions. By doing so, she offers a framework for considering marginalized bodies through this notion of ontological death, those bodies that are not biologically dead but do not count as politically viable lives. I argue that by using the framework of hauntology we can start to consider the politics of visibility that render the ontologically dead as such. Renee Marlin-Bennett, Marieke Wilson, and Jason Walton specifically discuss the role of dead bodies by exploring commodified bodies and the politics of display.103 They explore the exhibition of plasticized human cadavers in museums for educational purposes, arguing that in these exhibits, dead bodies are being depoliticized and commodified in a morally troubling way. Though regulations exist for dead bodies and body parts, plasticized bodies are couched in discourses of specimens rather than human beings. The spectacle of their display in often provocative positions invokes scientific authority to legitimate a specific representation of these bodies which silences and depoliticizes their histories. Spectators walk through scenes in which the plasticized bodies enact a particular moral economy which is only possible with the base assumption that they are no longer considered to be human. Viewers are instructed not to engage emotionally with the bodies, and this, coupled with the disbelief that what is being exhibited is actually a human body, creates a cognitive dissonance which is coopted by the exhibit to condone objectification of things whose difference we cannot understand.104 Their analysis of the objectification and commodification of corpses gestures to the political importance governance of bodies, even dead ones, has in the contemporary biopolitical era. My project takes this basis as a starting point, and draws on this notion of a politics of display to look at bodies displayed for the purposes of memorialization rather than science or education. **All** of these international relations **scholars demonstrate in various ways and contexts the role bodies play** both **in being inscribed with sovereign power and in acting as resistance.** But they also all share the sentiment that the body is an under-theorized part of international politics and should be brought in to explore how power works. In short, bodies matter! Indeed, as Casper and Moore argue, ‘we live in an age of proliferating human bodies…bodies are made visible and seen…via a range of globalized practices.’105 They explore the emergence of globalized technologies such as MRIs and sonograms which render bodies both enhanced and amplified. But there are also ways in which traditional bodily and embodied practices such as death and burial are enhanced in a globalized age, not by emergent technologies, but by existent and emergent political and social practices which render these bodies a complex part of social and political identities and identity practices. This makes sense when we consider that bodies often serve as symbols of political order, where political transformation is symbolized by what is done to bodies, as in the expression ‘cutting off the head of the king’, pomp and circumstance regarding burial and reburial of political leaders, and even the idiom ‘body politic’.106 Dead bodies themselves are significant for politics, especially since as Henry Giroux lays out, ‘cadavers have a way of insinuating themselves on consciousness, demanding answers tto questions that aren’t often asked’.107 The idea here is that what is done with dead bodies is a key part of our identity, whatever that may be. In the case of Rwanda, dignified burial of the corpses of the victims of the genocide becomes essential to memorialization and reconciliation. Rwandan identity becomes dependent on the way they treat these dead bodies: the products of the genocide, and what they do with society: the other product of the genocide. In the case of undocumented immigrants who die crossing the US-Mexico border, their bodies themselves becomes sites of political practices and political contestation. Many believe that their bodies should not be buried on US soil, and thus their bodies themselves become the locus of contestation over the meaning of citizenship. This scenario also results from the increased mobility of bodies in the contemporary age.108 And in the case of 9/11, the disappearance of bodies and the creation of rubble and ruin become key to imagining national identity and concepts of power.

#### State and ontology is the only route because critical praxis is actively being censored.

[Siddique](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42330-021-00153-7#auth-Siddique-Motala) Motala and Kristian D. Stewart ’21 Motala is in the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Cape Town. Stewart is at the University of Michigan-Dearborn. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42330-021-00153-7> “Hauntings Across the Divide: Transdisciplinary Activism, Dualisms, and the Ghosts of Racism in Engineering and Humanities Education" //lrl

We have found the concept of hauntology to be useful in analysing silences. Additionally, we rely on Plumwood’s ([1993](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42330-021-00153-7#ref-CR46)) theorization of dualisms to uncover and to critique dualisms that appear in our context. Derrida ([1994](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42330-021-00153-7#ref-CR24)) coined the term “hauntology”—a play on the words “ontology” and “haunting”. Hauntology refers to the presence of things from the past found in the present, such as the persistence of settler colonial logics in higher education. Tuck and Ree ([2013](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42330-021-00153-7#ref-CR60)) point out that a haunting “is the relentless remembering and reminding that will not be appeased by settler society’s assurances of innocence and reconciliation” (p. 642). These hauntings trouble established binaries such as then/now, presence/absence, and being/non-being (Zembylas et al., [2020](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42330-021-00153-7#ref-CR64)). Hauntology aids our understanding about how painful ancestral, historical, and lived experiences reveal themselves in the present day. As Barad ([2017](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42330-021-00153-7#ref-CR7)) articulates, “Hauntings are not immaterial, and they are not mere recollections or reverberations of what was. Hauntings are an integral part of existing material conditions” (p. 74). Hence, hauntology is a useful tool to analyse hegemonic hauntings that have re-surfaced recently, such as anti-Black and anti-Muslim prejudice. Feminist scholarship teaches us that where there is a focus on something, there is a concomitant exclusion of other things. We wondered if a typical learning experience in South African engineering education, with its exclusions of humanities-related knowledge and ethics, serves to promote a tacit environment that could amplify racisms. Are the ghosts of prejudice emboldened in such an environment? Relatedly, we wondered if our micro-instance of transdisciplinary activism could encourage our students to become more open minded, to see the world as connected, and to interrogate entanglements.Where Writing/Humanities Curriculum and STEM Converge University writing courses and curriculum, housed within the broader humanities discipline, instruct students in a variety of writing styles and genres meant to encourage students’ exploration of ideas central to the human experience. Creative, expository, and academic writing assignments sit adjacent to students reading critical and narrative texts that facilitate their rhetorical awareness, independent thought, and critical thinking. Writing instruction (in Kristi’s class) is foregrounded by a posthumanist theoretical approach. Posthumanism theory, in the context of this work, follows Bradiotti’s (as cited in Veronese, 2016) articulation that rejects universalism and hierarchical placement of “man” as a class and culture specifc entity, thereby politicizing and negating otherness that exists outside of this paradigm. Braidiotti describes how this conceptualization sits in opposition to anti-racist and post-colonial thinkers, both pedagogical and ideological perspectives that frame this paper. Writing students in the US classroom (Kristi’s) are both consumers and producers of course material. They write as they are written upon, and they do not separate themselves from the pen, the computer, or the stories they share. Barad (2003) notes that all things are marked by material-discursive practices. Students are “marked” by the continuous and reciprocal activity of refection, revision, and thinking anew, as they interrogate how phenomena are entangled by human and non-human entities shaped by historical, political, and social forces. Instruction, knowledge production, and classroom activities are intertwined, ongoing, and have both ethical and lasting consequences. A pedagogy inspired by posthumanism provides a space for abstract ideas to become visible, ripe for analysis, and is a perfect complement for discerning how students exist outside of classroom environments. Students are allowed to probe their own social and cultural positionality in relation to alterity and material conditions of the global world. Classroom practice is also foregrounded around the “afective turn” in social justice education (Clough, 2007). Student voices and their lived experiences reveal themselves through critical and counter-storytelling, which are central components of writing instruction. This is a classroom approach that disavows the logics of “Western industrial capitalist societies, bringing forth ghosted bodies, and the traumatized remains of erased histories” (Clough, 2007, p. 4). Instruction encourages students to read Can. J. Sci. Math. Techn. Educ. 1 3 the world before the word, as Freire (1970) expressed, thereby investigating how humans are connected to the world, their personal histories, each other, and the work writers produce. A humanities education, according to Strauss (2017), stresses tackling twenty-frst century problems through the lenses of creativity, fexibility, and clear thinking and writing skills. Twenty-frst century problems require out of the box thinkers and skills the humanities promote. In fact, guiding principles in university writing instruction, namely, the “Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing” (2011), advocate college readiness through students developing rhetorical and twenty-frst century skills, adjacent to what the authors term “habits of mind” (p. 1) in order to support students’ college success. The “habits” refer to skills such as openness (described as new ways to consider thinking about the world), responsibility, fexibility, and engagement, to name a few. Instructing students to form these habits is meant to take them from the classroom to the world and to nurture success in a variety of felds and disciplines. A humanities education, more broadly, provides students a thoughtful and intellectual means to examine products of the human experience like music, art, and literature (Struass, 2017). In fact, a case has been made for a humanities curriculum that reaches across disciplines, particularly into STEM felds. In “Why STEM Students Need Humanities Courses” (Horgan, 2018) and “At MIT the Humanities are Just as Important as STEM” (Fitzgerald, 2014), the humanities are presented as vital to a STEM education. The STEM curriculum at MIT stresses the importance of an arts and humanities education as they believe the world’s largest problems, like climate change, poverty, and disease, are embedded in human experience (Fitzgerald, 2014). Horgan (2018) outlined the exigency for a humanities education that teaches students to probe and to challenge the very certainties that a science-based education promotes. Horgan describes the need for the humanities in a science education because the world depends upon both to move society forward. Mullen (2019) has articulated why STEM graduates beneft from an integrated humanities approach in “Behind the Scenes at the STEM-Humanities Culture War”. Mullen pointed out that STEM programs cannot view university curriculum as merely a means to a job as students may choose to alter career paths later in life and the workforce, largely, depends upon the skills that students may fnd in writing, ethics, or history courses (to name a few) that are found in a liberal arts education. Mullen further cites the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine’s report that due to varied student backgrounds and curricular approaches, students could beneft from an integrated curriculum that views the sciences and humanities as “branches from the same tree” (para. 1). This coincides with Plumwood’s (1993) advice on countering radical exclusion by afrming continuity between the branches. Strauss (2017) has argued similar points. She expressed how the humanities provide an education that depends upon a “cohesive collection of experiences” (para. 9) that prepares students to explore varied ways of thinking and questioning adjacent to learning languages or even how culture operates, which in turn might alter a worldly point of view. However, and taking the USA as an example, and the combination of budget cuts and universities that are cancelling and defunding humanities programs, coupled with the increase of graduates with STEM degrees (CAA, 2018; Schmidt, 2018), there is a struggle to prove that studying the humanities is a relevant, worthy endeavour—a struggle that STEM does not have (Dix, 2018; Dutt-Ballerstadt, 2019; Marowski, 2020). In South Africa, too, it has been noted that the corporatization of academia has resulted in a “symbiotic, mutually reinforcing, relationship between university researchers, especially in the STEM disciplines, and trans-national corporations” (Alexander, 2014, p. 50). South African scholars relay the importance of responsibility that afrms diference and eschews binary thinking. Bozalek et al. (2018) focus on the entangled nature of the educational setting and how students and teachers are becoming—with each other through processes that render each other capable. As Bozalek (2017) notes, the “corporatization of the academy has meant that market principles such as competitiveness, efciency, excellence, consumerism, individualism and productivity now dominate all aspects of the university” (p. 43). The economic imperative has privileged the hard sciences and now haunts Can. J. Sci. Math. Techn. Educ. 1 3 and marginalizes the humanities, setting up a dualism (hard science/soft science) that is detrimental to an understanding of the complexity of the world. This fosters an attitude that views people and things as exploitable resources. It further alienates disciplines and instead of diference being harnessed for celebrating diversity, diference “becomes a springboard for xenophobic stereotyping and latent social confict” (Alexander, 2014, p. 53). In thinking about combining our distinct disciplines, we turned to Braidotti (2013b) who has written about the link between humanism and Eurocentrism and the exigency to decouple these terms for the humanities to progress. Braidotti argues for the humanities to “become an adventure in diference and alternative cultural traditions” (p. 4). At the onset of our collaboration, we viewed our endeavour as such an “adventure in diference” where our two worlds could become entangled, embodied, and appreciated. Our work and scholarship in this regard rest in support of a larger global humanities conversation as written by Mintz (2020). Mintz emphasizes the value of “cross-cultural contacts, infuences and exchanges, syncretism and cultural appropriation, colonial and borderland encounters, migrations and diasporas, colonial and postcolonial cultures, and local, regional and hemispheric linkages” (para. 21). In our case, we needed to be acutely aware of our positionalities within this inter-continental and transdisciplinary encounter, which was embedded in power relations. Enacting positionalities responsibly required us to be aware of our and our students’ embodied locations, as well as, the racisms and prejudices that haunt our classrooms. Our collaboration was intended to bring elements of both disciplines to our student cohorts—and for each of them to meet in the middle. The Collaboration Barad’s (2003) notion of performativity “that allows matter its due as an active participant in the world’s becoming, in its ongoing ‘intra-activity’” (p. 803) foregrounds the collaboration between the writing and geomatics students. As reported in Stewart and Motala (in press), we experimented with forging relations between our classes, situated in very diferent disciplines and contexts. As encouraged by posthumanist theorists such as Braidotti (2013a), our aim was to expose our students to the positivity of diference— in terms of culture, language, attitude and more broadly, lived material reality. We deliberately chose to group students together in ways that were intended to subvert or trouble dualistic power relations. To kick of our collaboration, students were placed in WhatsApp chat groups. In the South African class (N=22), students were paired across diferences: gender, race, and cultural or religious diferences, as examples. In the American class, students (N=67) were placed in groups that mixed them across the lines of race, gender, and language, keeping their South African partners in mind. With the large numbers of American students, we decided to appoint a group leader that would facilitate conversation and keep the students on track. Leaders were purposefully selected to decentre Whiteness with mainly women of colour placed in charge. Additionally, based on classroom conversations and activities preceding the pairings that explored issues of race, white privilege, and topics like “America First”, students who had opposing views were grouped together. As instructors, we did not join the groups; we desired communication to unfold organically as much as possible in the context of a classroom assignment. Creating an extended, virtual classroom via WhatsApp required us to problematize conventional constructions of race, gender, and religion that exist in the world. As part of their assignment, the South African students were asked to produce two maps of houses of their American colleagues, as well as two maps of their own houses. Thus, in one group, they were potentially asked to represent four very diferent lived realities. Springgay and Truman (2018) point out that “mapping and normalized geographic understandings continue the erasure and segregation of Black subjects” (p. 99), so this task was an attempt at resisting the hegemonic politics implicit in traditional maps. Hence, it was an exercise in counter-mapping and counter-storytelling. American students were tasked with “writing the world” of their South African colleagues. The American students were enrolled in a theme-based writing section that explored the topic “What Does it Mean to Be a Global Citizen?” Students started the term by taking a world knowledge and geography quiz. They then explored global challenges and issues facing the world as articulated by the United Nations Foundation and Global Citizen (www.globalcitizen.org), and they watched TED Talks, wrote issue papers, and explored course themes with their South African colleagues in the WhatsApp chat. Together, both American and South African student cohorts had to answer questions in the WhatsApp chat to aid them in completing their assignments. Unique to this assignment was that the students depended upon each other to conclude their assignments, and both student groups submitted projects that included the maps and/or writing of their international colleagues. The American students created StoryMaps, which is a web-based application that can be used to integrate text and graphics, maps, or images.1 At the end of our collaboration, students submitted transcripts (11 groups; average length 22 printed pages) of their WhatsApp pairings for our analysis. We specifcally sought out passages where hauntings shaped the transaction.2 Data, Findings, and Analysis In this section, we present examples drawn from WhatsApp chat communications, the StoryMap writing assignment the US students submitted, and the cartography reports the South African students submitted to illustrate the hauntings and/or dualisms that emerged. We analyse several South African and American reports difractively (Barad, 2007), looking at examples of resonances and dissonances that emerged. Example 1: Altering Views of the Self and the Other What follows is an excerpt from a South African cartographic report written by Luniko (Black male) and Mathys (White male), followed by an excerpt from an American student’s StoryMap. SA Cartography Example “Our frst thoughts were that ... the Americans would not understand our way of doing things like how we handle the assignment and how we go about accomplishing the work. We thought they would undermine us and would be self-centred due to the fact that they have a better education system in their country. We also thought they would not want to communicate with us and if they did, they would ask stupid questions i.e., do we have lions, do we ride elephants to school, do we have cars in South Africa etc. As we began to communicate with them and getting to know them, where they live and what they do on a daily basis, we had the understanding that their day to day lives are quite similar to ours e.g. working while studying, taking vacations with family, watching movies etc. We also found out that they are also positive and trying to make a success in life through education just like us with ambition and goals. We also learned that there are also quite a few diferent races and cultures we never knew about in America, some is in [sic] our group so that was an amazing thing to fnd out”. “When I was frst introduced to this project, I was skeptical about how I was going to collaborate with the South Africans. Before learning about South Africa, I did not [sic] even know it was a country. I just thought that we were going to be texting random people from the South part of Africa. Once I was introduced to the country, I then found out that it is its own country. My initial assumptions about the people of South Africa was [sic] that they would be way less technologically advanced than us and that they wouldn’t speak English. I also thought that there is only one dialect of African language, but I was wrong, Sinokuhle told me that there are 11 ofcial languages and that he speaks 5 of them; Zulu, Xhosa, SiSwati, SiSotho, and English. There are many dialects of African just like there are Arabic but it varies from tribe to tribe. Before this project my vision was that South Africa was very rural with no city, just a bunch of villages that were basically “shack towns”. My group and I asked for pictures of where they live and Sinokuhle sent us a picture that showed a vast area with only one very little house in the picture. I was stunned by the vibrant colours that are seen in their surroundings. It looks so peaceful and calming. The weather looked beautiful, with the sun shining, blue skies and open grassland which was the opposite of what I was expected [sic] Africa. I did not think there would be a city or a suburb like environment” (Moroun, Arabic-speaking male). Analysis The South African content reveals that students entered the collaboration with suspicion and initially took a condescending tone toward their American counterparts, expecting them to “ask stupid questions”. Yet, they simultaneously assumed that their South African education was inferior to that of their American colleagues. Another important point of resonance found within most of the assignments was that students were surprised at the similarities they had with their international counterparts. Radical exclusion was countered because similarities were emphasized. The perception of South African students of their American counterparts is resonant with Black South African perception of Whites during apartheid, and these are permeated within power relations. During apartheid, Steve Biko (2004) noted the Black perception of White scientifc scholarship: Celebrated achievements by whites in the feld of science – which he understands only hazily – serve to make him rather convinced of the futility of resistance and to throw away any hopes that change may ever come. All in all the black man has become a shell, a shadow of man, completely defeated, drowning in his own misery, a slave, an ox bearing the yoke of oppression with sheepish timidity (p. 31). The dualistic tactic of relational defnition is seen and criticized here with clarity by Biko. This focusing on technical excellence was one of the contingencies that led to the subjectifcation of both sides of the Black/White dualism. In addition to the representation of White knowledge as superior, Indigenous knowledge was systematically erased due to the imposition of Western modes of being on Black people. We observe the hauntings of Western superiority in both the South African and American students’ writings above. American views of Africa are also dualistic in nature. Adichie (2009) articulated the lack of American knowledge about the African continent in her TED Talk, The Danger of a Single Story. She notes that Americans have a “single story” of Africa due its portrayal in Western literature combined with a scarcity of African content (music and TV) transmitted to the world. Therefore, an American understanding of Africa stems from aid-based need commercials, or we add, “We Are the World” type events. Adichie (2009) states,If all I knew about Africa were from popular images, I too would think that Africa was a place of beautiful landscapes, beautiful animals, and incomprehensible people, fghting senseless wars, dying of poverty and AIDS, unable to speak for themselves and waiting to be saved by a kind, white foreigner (5:48). Data from this project stands in agreement with this sentiment as the American students, at the onset, had little knowledge of the global world, its issues, languages, or people. This is evidenced by their stunning lack of worldly and geographic knowledge stemming from the quizzes they took at the beginning of the semester. Returning to the American example, this student reported that he had no idea South Africa was a country. He just thought when classroom discussion was centred on South Africa that we were literally talking about the southern part of the African continent. We mitigated against several dualisms in terms of student perception of each other. Homogenization is normally used to promote the civilized/primitive and rich/poor dualism, and after the encounter, homogenization was countered because the complexity and diversity of African society was recognized. There is evidence of American students becoming more aware of diferences—in this case, there is a diference between what they expected Africans to be like, and what they encountered. This is simultaneously a troubling of radical exclusion and homogenization because there is continuity between American and South African life that is being afrmed (countering radical exclusion) and the diversity of African society is recognized (countering homogenization). Positioning a counter-story in direct contact with a majoritarian narrative situates students in a position to alter their point of view. Stories that put a “face” on the lack of material resources or gendered, cultural, or socio-political issues are no longer abstract. They sit in the classroom; they share the space. If students decide to “see” the stories of their colleagues, they begin to carry them (Stewart, 2016, 2019; Stewart & Ivala, 2017, 2019). By joining our classes and course design, we positioned our students to encounter stories of place through authentic engagement and dialogue. We view our work as overcoming dualisms in this regard as both incorporation and instrumentalism took place. Example 2: Anti‑Muslim Prejudice In this example, we focus on anti-Muslim prejudice that was interrogated within the students’ responses from both cohorts. We pull this quote from a South African cartography report submitted by Chad (White male) and Mthobeli (Black male): “It is this [sic] unclear whether or not American citizens fear Muslims or not. It was a difcult and sensitive topic to introduce when interacting with the American Students, since some of them were Muslims”. Another South African cartography report, submitted by Grace (coloured3 female) and Bonga (Black male) reported on the following information that they gleaned from their American colleagues: “Even though our campus is diverse regarding the races of the students, parts of Michigan are still experiencing racism towards Arabs, Asians, Latins, Indians and African Americans”. Analysis The frst quote alludes to the existence of the ghosts of anti-Muslim prejudice. The hidden nature of this ghost was surprising to us because of the large Arab-speaking and Muslim population (the largest in North America) in the city where the American campus is located, resulting in a good representation of Muslim students in the class. What is interesting to note is that students have little knowledge about the world outside of their immediate and homogenous groups (as evidenced by their performance on the geography/world knowledge quizzes they took the onset of the course). If South African students wished to know more about the Muslim population, they were in the right place to receive frst-hand information. Yet, they chose to steer clear of what they perceived to be an uncomfortable conversation even though conversations about race were taking place. This was not the case in another group, though—in this chat, Maryam (female American Muslim student) ofered the following comment about the ups and downs of life in the US, “as for the downs because I wear a scarf/hijab sometimes people discriminate”. Further, after the election of Trump in 2016, instances of anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant positionality revealed itself on campus (see Stewart, 2017). Anti-Muslim rhetoric, which brings its own ghosts coupled with Trump’s “America First” agenda and immigration policies, turned a racialized gaze back toward our Muslim population in the same way following September 11th. Chatterjee and Maira (2014) note that since the events of 9/11, there has been a systematic attack against scholars who have challenged, amongst other things, US foreign policy with particular reference to wars and occupations. During the Trump presidency, anti-Muslim prejudice was emboldened by policies such as the “Muslim Ban”. State policing and surveillance serve to propagate racial, gendered, and class practices in the neoliberal academy in the USA. Chatterjee and Maira’s premise is that the US academy is imperial and is an important agent of US global expansion and repression. As academics, we recognize our complicity in this system, yet try to resist from within by micro-political instances of activism. We still question what held students back from the further participation and interrogation of racebased dialogues. We wonder to what extent a few scenarios impacted reticence. First, as this assignment ultimately was graded, how willing were students to invest in uncomfortable conversations? Secondly, incidents of oppression during the Trump years have resulted in many people unwilling to engage in conversations that may turn partisan. We feel that both situations represent a haunting that caused fear: South African students were scared to broach the issue and American students did not want to “see” racial realities as they persisted in real time. As we move forward and reimagine our collaboration, we understand that turning our students’ gaze toward Whiteness, which includes for some their own acknowledgement of White complicity in race-based subjugation is fundamental to our guiding principles of exposure, humanizing course design, and writing the world before the word (Stewart & Burke, 2021, manuscript under review; Stewart & Gachago, 2020). The state of race in America is like a water balloon waiting to pop. Tensions are very high although racism is not a major issue. In America we have achieved racial equality in my opinion, and simply showing statistics among whites and blacks are unequal, it does not mean that there is inequity. In the past, there was much inequity, and being white was a privilege, but that is not the case today. There are no racist laws, such as Jim Crow, if there was, then I would agree. People tend to just say that racism is such a big problem, simply because it must be out there somewhere. Show me a case that is racist, and I will agree, such as a cop shooting a black person without any justifcation. Race has been a barrier for a long time, and it needs to change, and in order to do that we must come together and realize that we aren’t so diferent after all (Mike, White male, excerpt from fnal project). South African and American Example The South African example is taken from a conversation from a WhatsApp group between one South African student (Mathys, White male) and a few of the US students (Fatima and Maryam, both female and Muslim). It starts out with Maryam asking Mathys what life is like in South Africa. He answers that life has its ups and downs like anywhere in the world. Maryam responds with the “ups and downs” in America, one being the discrimination she has faced in the USA against Muslim women who wear the hijab. She also mentions the unequal access to education that people of colour endure. Fatima chimes in to ask Mathys for specifc examples of South African life, akin to Maryam’s examples. Mathys responds by being overly vague, stating, “Weather simply marvelous”, the “countryside breathtaking”, and “food of the highest quality”. Finally, Fatima gets frustrated and tells Mathys that she shared with him specifc examples and she expects the same in return. Mathys relents and says, “poverty, high crime rates, huge unemployment fgures”. This leads the trio into a real dialogue about material conditions in both America and South Africa. Fatima writes about the disparate living conditions and unemployment fgures between Black and White Americans, which leads Mathys into sharing the same conclusion about life in South Africa. This open and vulnerable dialogue invites the other members in the group to participate in the conversation. In a backand-forth dialogue between all six members, the question, “How has South African history impacted your view of the world?” was posed. The second South African group member, Luniko (Black, male) states, “It’s shaped our world in a way that people are distant to one another specially [sic] Black and Whites. There is a lack of trust and fear or betrayal against most people. Our history has also created a lot of violence and hate” There is an exigency to interrogate the dualisms we encounter in our classroom teaching now more than ever. From the US perspective in 2021, antiracism work has taken a new turn. The #BlackLivesMatter movement gained momentum that was sparked by an influx of White interest after the murder of George Floyd. However, Trump’s administration continued to highlight the negativity of diference, which became starkly underlined and promoted. In 2021, systemic racism is more than just discursive—it is material and it appears in the skewed US Covid-19 death rates for African Americans in particular. In 2020, online learning in the USA became the status quo and highlighted the diferential precarity of students without monetary means or access to technology. This rings true in South Africa as well. When the switch to online learning happened in early 2020, a small group of poor Black South African students were unable to participate due to various circumstantial reasons such as lack of devices, adequate data, or even electricity. Hence, teaching a technology like GIS (which requires a computer, data, and specialized software) results in exacerbation of inequalities or the creation of new forms of exclusion (Motala, 2020). This is a worry that we have within our continued collaboration as well. How might we combat material inequality between our students in an unequal world? There is room to identify the ghosts of racism and prejudice in the curriculum. The more we look for ghosts, the more easily they are to excavate. What we are finding out is that racialized hauntings are recurring, might reveal themselves as subterfuge, and do not go away. As Tuck and Ree (2013) articulate, “haunting lies precisely in its refusal to stop” (p. 642). We have found spectres that haunt people of colour manifest in “everyday” scenarios. As examples, in the USA there has been an efort on the political right to “Whitewash” the racism that appeared at the Capitol insurrection on 6 January 2021, even though insurrectors were photographed carrying Confederate Flags and noose and gallows were spotted on the Capitol grounds (Associated Press, 2021). During his tenure, President Trump banned racial sensitivity training and with that the academic philosophy of critical race theory (a theory that highlights embedded racism in America’s institutions) in government organizations. Although President Biden has reinstated diversity training, some states have echoed Trump by either banning this theory in public schools and universities (Idaho) or pushing legislation toward this goal (Tennessee and Oklahoma, see Trotter, 2021). In fact, in support of banning critical race theory, a speech was given recently on the foor of the House of Representatives that praised policies during slavery that defned African Americans as three-fifths of a person (Choi, 2021). These ghosts could appear as dualisms and become a means to counter binaries if opportunities are provided. The potential of hauntology for a justice-to-come is explored by Bozalek et al. (2021) who note that, in higher education, working towards a justice-to-come requires openness to possibilities that may emerge in analysing injustices. This is especially important in STEM disciplines where issues of ethics or justice are obfuscated by a focus on technical content. We found that our collaboration, even our continued thinking and scholarship outside of teaching this class, has opened a space for both subjects to combine beautifully toward an antiracist curricular agenda. Partnerships like ours, if material access can be granted to all students, provide an opportunity for students to travel the world without leaving their screens. Our collaboration emphasizes the human experience across continents. Barad (2007) points out: the other is not just in one’s skin, but in one’s bones, in one’s belly, in one’s heart, in one’s nucleus, in one’s past and future. This is as true for electrons as it is for brittlestars as it is for the diferentially constituted human (p. 393). We are not alone; our disciplines do not exist in a vacuum because our worlds are truly interconnected. David Foster Wallace (2005) reminds us that the value of a real education has nothing to do with knowledge and everything to do with being aware of what is around us. Foster Wallace establishes this claim with the story of two young fsh who do not understand that they are swimming in water because it is what they do day to day. His point: “the most obvious, important realities are often the ones that are hardest to see and talk about” (para. 2). Teaching our students to care about their water—and the water of their colleagues—was fundamental to our project. However, this was a lesson that we learned best in our conversations as we Skyped during coronavirus and one that we wish to explore with our future student cohorts. We shared with students that this project was a transdisciplinary exploration and that there were no correct/incorrect answers. Students were informed that it was important to take part in the process. This alludes to a posthumanist orientation which subscribes to a process ontology. However, such experimental work requires a certain amount of bravery in the face of standardized gradings, engineering council requirements, and more generally, the corporate academy. We view our work as transdisciplinary activism that explores antiracism in collaborative endeavours. We feel that this last quote from one of the American students best illustrates both the hope and the goals we had for our shared work: The questions that were answered and stereotypes that were debunked helped me to draw a picture that was more than just a landscape. It helped me view their country and their lives in a broader lens. On the other hand, “writing someone’s world,” gives the author almost too much power. The author must be careful what they say so that they don’t create a single story based on their own biases. People often believe all media without taking into account that it is just the author’s viewpoint. One single human’s opinion should not defne a people or their struggles. Our responsibility as global citizens and humans is to keep an open mind, to explore others’ water.

#### Progress is possible through legal change – even if the state has the potential to roll back some policies, antiblackness can be deconstructed via policy changes.

Omi & Winant 12 (Michael Omi and Howard Winant, Michael Omi is an American sociologist, Howard Winant is an American sociologist and race theorist, “Resistance is futile?: a response to Feagin and Elias,” SYMPOSIUM ON RETHINKING RACIAL FORMATION THEORY, Ethnic and Racial Studies, Volume 36, 2013, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2012.715177>, accessed on 7/17/18, AB)

In Feagin and Elias’s account, white racist rule in the USA appears unalterable and permanent. There is little sense that the ‘white racial frame’ evoked by systemic racism theory changes in significant ways over historical time. They dismiss important rearrangements and reforms as merely ‘a distraction from more ingrained structural oppressions and deep lying inequalities that continue to define US society’ (Feagin and Elias 2012, p. 21). Feagin and Elias use a concept they call ‘surface flexibility’ to argue that white elites frame racial realities in ways that suggest change, but are merely engineered to reinforce the underlying structure of racial oppression. Feagin and Elias say the phrase ‘racial democracy’ is an oxymoron a word defined in the dictionary as a figure of speech that combines contradictory terms. If they mean the USA is a contradictory and incomplete democracy in respect to race and racism issues, we agree. If they mean that people of colour have no democratic rights or political power in the USA, we disagree. The USA is a racially despotic country in many ways, but in our view it is also in many respects a racial democracy, capable of being influenced towards more or less inclusive and redistributive economic policies, social policies, or for that matter, imperial policies. What is distinctive about our own epoch in the USA (post-Second World War to the present) with respect to race and racism? Over the past decades there has been a steady drumbeat of efforts to contain and neutralize civil rights, to restrict racial democracy, and to maintain or even increase racial inequality. Racial disparities in different institutional sites employment, health, education persist and in many cases have increased. Indeed, the post-2008 period has seen a dramatic increase in racial inequality. The subprime home mortgage crisis, for example, was a major racial event. Black and brown people were disproportionately affected by predatory lending practices; many lost their homes as a result; race-based wealth disparities widened tremendously. It would be easy to conclude, as Feagin and Elias do, that white racial dominance has been continuous and unchanging throughout US history. But such a perspective misses the dramatic twists and turns in racial politics that have occurred since the Second World War and the civil rights era. Feagin and Elias claim that we overly inflate the significance of the changes wrought by the civil rights movement, and that we ‘overlook the serious reversals of racial justice and persistence of huge racial inequalities’ (Feagin and Elias 2012, p. 21) that followed in its wake. We do not. In Racial Formation we wrote about ‘racial reaction’ in a chapter of that name, and elsewhere in the book as well. Feagin and Elias devote little attention to our arguments there; perhaps because they are in substantial agreement with us. While we argue that the right wing was able to ‘rearticulate’ race and racism issues to roll back some of the gains of the civil rights movement, we also believe that there are limits to what the right could achieve in the post-civil rights political landscape. So we agree that the present prospects for racial justice are demoralizing at best. But we do not think that is the whole story. US racial conditions have changed over the post-Second World War period, in ways that Feagin and Elias tend to downplay or neglect. Some of the major reforms of the 1960s have proved irreversible; they have set powerful democratic forces in motion. These racial (trans)formations were the results of unprecedented political mobilizations, led by the black movement, but not confined to blacks alone. Consider the desegregation of the armed forces, as well as key civil rights movement victories of the 1960s: the Voting Rights Act, the Immigration and Naturalization Act (Hart- Celler), as well as important court decisions like Loving v. Virginia that declared antimiscegenation laws unconstitutional. While we have the greatest respect for the late Derrick Bell, we do not believe that his ‘interest convergence hypothesis’ effectively explains all these developments. How does Lyndon Johnson’s famous (and possibly apocryphal) lament upon signing the Civil Rights Act on 2 July 1964 ‘We have lost the South for a generation’ count as ‘convergence’? The US racial regime has been transformed in significant ways. As Antonio Gramsci argues, hegemony proceeds through the incorporation of opposition (Gramsci 1971, p. 182). The civil rights reforms can be seen as a classic example of this process; here the US racial regime under movement pressure was exercising its hegemony. But Gramsci insists that such reforms which he calls ‘passive revolutions’ cannot be merely symbolic if they are to be effective: oppositions must win real gains in the process. Once again, we are in the realm of politics, not absolute rule. So yes, we think there were important if partial victories that shifted the racial state and transformed the significance of race in everyday life. And yes, we think that further victories can take place both on the broad terrain of the state and on the more immediate level of social interaction: in daily interaction, in the human psyche and across civil society. Indeed we have argued that in many ways the most important accomplishment of the anti-racist movement of the 1960s in the USA was the politicization of the social. In the USA and indeed around the globe, race-based movements demanded not only the inclusion of racially defined ‘others’ and the democratization of structurally racist societies, but also the recognition and validation by both the state and civil society of racially-defined experience and identity. These demands broadened and deepened democracy itself. They facilitated not only the democratic gains made in the USA by the black movement and its allies, but also the political advances towards equality, social justice and inclusion accomplished by other ‘new social movements’: secondwave feminism, gay liberation, and the environmentalist and anti-war movements among others. By no means do we think that the post-war movement upsurge was an unmitigated success. Far from it: all the new social movements were subject to the same ‘rearticulation’ (Laclau and Mouffe 2001, p. xii) that produced the racial ideology of ‘colourblindness’ and its variants; indeed all these movements confronted their mirror images in the mobilizations that arose from the political right to counter them. Yet even their incorporation and containment, even their confrontations with the various ‘backlash’ phenomena of the past few decades, even the need to develop the highly contradictory ideology of ‘colourblindness’, reveal the transformative character of the ‘politicization of the social’. While it is not possible here to explore so extensive a subject, it is worth noting that it was the long-delayed eruption of racial subjectivity and self-awareness into the mainstream political arena that set off this transformation, shaping both the democratic and antidemocratic social movements that are evident in US politics today. What are the political implications of contemporary racial trends? Feagin and Elias’s use of racial categories can be imprecise. This is not their problem alone; anyone writing about race and racism needs to frame terms with care and precision, and we undoubtedly get fuzzy too from time to time. The absence of a careful approach leads to ‘racial lumping’ and essentialisms of various kinds. This imprecision is heightened in polemic. In the Feagin and Elias essay the term ‘whites’ at times refers to all whites, white elites, ‘dominant white actors’ and very exceptionally, anti-racist whites, a category in which we presume they would place themselves. Although the terms ‘black’, ‘African American’ and ‘Latino’ appear, the term ‘people of colour’ is emphasized, often in direct substitution for black reference points. In the USA today it is important not to frame race in a bipolar manner. The black/white paradigm made more sense in the past than it does in the twenty-first century. The racial make-up of the nation has now changed dramatically. Since the passage of the Immigration Reform Act of 1965, the USA has become more ‘coloured’. A ‘majorityminority’ national demographic shift is well underway. Predicted to arrive by the mid-twenty-first century, the numerical eclipse of the white population is already in evidence locally and regionally. In California, for example, non-Hispanic whites constitute only 39.7 per cent of the state’s population. While the decline in the white population cannot be correlated with any decline of white racial dominance, the dawning and deepening of racial multipolarity calls into question a sometimes implicit and sometimes explicit black/white racial framework that is evident in Feagin and Elias’s essay. Shifting racial demographics and identities also raise general questions of race and racism in new ways that the ‘systemic racism’ approach is not prepared to explain.3 Class questions and issues of panethnicizing trends, for example, call into question what we mean by race, racial identity and race consciousness. No racially defined group is even remotely uniform; groups that we so glibly refer to as Asian American or Latino are particularly heterogeneous. Some have achieved or exceeded socioeconomic parity with whites, while others are subject to what we might call ‘engineered poverty’ in sweatshops, dirty and dangerous labour settings, or prisons. Tensions within panethnicized racial groups are notably present, and conflicts between racially defined groups (‘black/ brown’ conflict, for example) are evident in both urban and rural settings. A substantial current of social scientific analysis now argues that Asians and Latinos are the ‘new white ethnics’, able to ‘work toward whiteness’ 4 at least in part, and that the black/white bipolarity retains its distinct and foundational qualities as the mainstay of US racism (Alba and Nee 2005; Perlmann 2005; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Waters, Ueda and Marrow 2007). We question that argument in light of the massive demographic shifts taking place in the USA. Globalization, climate change and above all neoliberalism on a global scale, all drive migration. The country’s economic capacity to absorb enormous numbers of immigrants, low-wage workers and their families (including a new, globally based and very female, servant class) without generating the sort of established subaltern groups we associate with the terms race and racism, may be more limited than it was when the ‘whitening’ of Europeans took place in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In other words this argument’s key precedent, the absorption of white immigrants ‘of a different color’ (Jacobson 1998), may no longer apply. Indeed, we might think of the assimilationist model itself as a general theory of immigrant incorporation that was based on a historically specific case study one that might not hold for, or be replicated by, subsequent big waves of immigration. Feagin and Elias’s systemic racism model, while offering numerous important insights, does not inform concrete analysis of these issues. It is important going forward to understand how groups are differentially racialized and relatively positioned in the US racial hierarchy: once again racism must be seen as a shifting racial project. This has important consequences, not only with respect to emerging patterns of inequality, but also in regard to the degree of power available to different racial actors to define, shape or contest the existing racial landscape. Attention to such matters is largely absent in Feagin and Elias’s account. In their view racially identified groups are located in strict reference to the dominant ‘white racial frame’, hammered into place, so to speak. As a consequence, they fail to examine how racially subordinate groups interact and influence each others’ boundaries, conditions and practices. Because they offer so little specific analysis of Asian American, Latino or Native American racial issues, the reader finds her/himself once again in the land (real or imaginary, depending on your racial politics) of bipolar US racial dynamics, in which whites and blacks play the leading roles, and other racially identified groups as well as those ambiguously identified, such as Middle Eastern and South Asian Americans (MEASA) play at best supporting roles, and are sometimes cast as extras or left out of the picture entirely. We still want to acknowledge that blacks have been catching hell and have borne the brunt of the racist reaction of the past several decades. For example, we agree with Feagin and Elias’s critique of the reactionary politics of incarceration in the USA. The ‘new Jim Crow’ (Alexander 2012) or even the ‘new slavery’ that the present system practises is something that was just in its beginning stages when we were writing Racial Formation. It is now recognized as a national and indeed global scandal. How is it to be understood? Of course there are substantial debates on this topic, notably about the nature of the ‘prison-industrial complex’ (Davis 2003, p. 3) and the social and cultural effects of mass incarceration along racial lines. But beyond Feagin and Elias’s denunciation of the ferocious white racism that is operating here, deeper political implications are worth considering. As Alexander (2012), Mauer (2006), Manza and Uggen (2008) and movement groups like Critical Resistance and the Ella Baker Center argue, the upsurge over recent decades in incarceration rates for black (and brown) men expresses the fear-based, law-and-order appeals that have shaped US racial politics since the rise of Nixonland (Perlstein 2008) and the ‘Southern strategy’. Perhaps even more central, racial repression aims at restricting the increasing impact of voters of colour in a demographically shifting electorate. There is a lot more to say about this, but for the present two key points stand out: first, it is not an area where Feagin and Elias and we have any sharp disagreement, and second, for all the horrors and injustices that the ‘new Jim Crow’ represents, incarceration, profiling and similar practices remain political issues. These practices and policies are not ineluctable and unalterable dimensions of the US racial regime. There have been previous waves of reform in these areas. They can be transformed again by mass mobilization, electoral shifts and so on. In other words, resistance is not futile