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#### The first anticompetitive business practice was the imposition of “competition” and “business” as practices and properties that define the human. For with the invention of the self-possessed body came the inauguration of the diabolical regime of logistics, the white science of loss prevention. The idea of a strike and labor is tied to racial capitalism are two sides of the same coin—both are driven by the compulsive feedback loop of individuated labor. Premising politics on either “merging” or “breaking up” corporate entities first require accepting the ontological status of personhood-as-property which ensures the omnicidal eradication of the flesh and the earth
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**The first theft shows up as rightful ownership**. This is **the theft of fleshly, earth(l)y life**, which is then **incarcerated in the body**. But the body, it turns out, is just the first principal-agent problem. **The body is just an overseer**, a factor, a superintendent for **the real landlord**, the real owner, **the individual**, in his noxious, heavy-handed conceptuality. The legal term for this principal-agent problem is mind. In this regard, the designation ‘mind/body problem’ is a synecdochal redundancy in abstraction rather than an entanglement, or even an opposition, of *anima* and matter, mama and soul. There’s this formulation that Robert Duncan gets from Erwin Schrödinger that helps a certain disordering along. Schrödinger says “living matter evades the decay to equilibrium.” Well, if Proudhon is right, and slavery, murder, robbery, and property are a unit; if **the general regime of private property is most accurately understood as social death**; then what if death/private property is that equilibrium of which Schrödinger speaks? What John Donne speaks of by way of God’s sovereign capacity to preserve is a problem that will have been meant to solve a problem; and when Schrödinger speaks of evading the decay to equilibrium, he isn’t saying that all decay is bad. **Corruption is our (accursed) share, our antological practice, our eccentric centering**, as M.C. Richards might say. How we evade ownership/equilibrium is given precisely in that **refusal to prevent loss** that we call **sharing**, **rubbing**, **empathy**, **hapticality**: **the undercommon love of flesh**, our **essential omnicentric or anacentric eccentricity**. **Every thing, in the wake of such disordering, is loss prevention**. John Locke creates the tabula rasa as a container for properties – properties of the mind, and properties owned by the propertied mind. Self-knowledge is self-possession and self-positioning in Locke. His accumulation process is auto-location, because one can’t help but settle for that. From the first moment, which appears to keep happening all the time, all property is posited, **beginning with the positing/positioning of a body for locating ownership, and the owned, and a mind for owning**. The posit and the deposit inaugurate ownership as incorporation, whose inevitable end, given in continual withdrawal, is loss. This requires the production of **a science of loss**, which is to say **the science of whiteness**, or, **logistics**. **Every acquisition, every improvement, is an ossification of sharing**. This ossification is given in and as **containment**. The first odious vessel produced by and for logistics is **not the slave ship, but the body** – **flesh conceptualized – which bears the individual-in-subjection**. **A profound viciousness** begins with this **colonization of the posited body**, the **appointment of the posited mind**, and the **manipulation – in various modalities of brutality – of their mutually enveloping redundancy, given in the dead perpetual motion of the will to colonize**. This enclosure, this settlement, will be repeated because it must be repeated. Every slave will have been every time the mirror in which the self, in seeing itself, comes into existence in and as itself, which is an **omnicidal fantasy**. Locke invents **the derivative** here, a degraded part of the accursed share that is poised to **draw on the power of this share, but only to create more derivatives**, to **create more zones of dispossession by positing possession, in the denial of loss that prepares for loss**. **All property is loss because all property is the loss of sharing**. In its willfulness, **property is theft**; but beyond the murderousness that would attend theft-in-acquisition one mind/body at a time, the theft in question here is **absolute serial murder**, which **we survive only insofar as all property remains vulnerable to sharing**. This is to say nothing other than that **all property is fugitive**. It flees from its own positing, runs from being-deposited. **All (property) jumps bail**. Sharing, exhaustion, expending, derivation will have been contained and congealed in the measurable and accountable individual unit of the derivative. But sharing is our means, the earth’s means in us and our means in earth. Logistics would seem to value means over ends – everything is how to get it there, not what it is – but logistics is really the degradation of means, the general devaluation of means through **individuation and privatization, which are the same thing**. It is the science of lost means advanced with every act of **loss prevention**. If Locke invents the derivative, then Immanuel Kant’s innovation is high frequency trading. And when Kant reverses the fortunes of logistics by announcing that it is the ends (of man) and not the means that are important, **the human, the ultimate derivative, is fully logistically installed**. The human is held up, not by Kant, but by logistics, a logistics that **gives the illusion of a free-standing subject**. A human universe appears to Kant, full of what he posits as human properties. Kant walks the docks, traversing the seven bridges of Königsberg, surveying the logistical world from a point of view he never needs to leave. From there, his ship come in with each new travel log and ethnographic treatise, he is witness to the humanization of the flesh. **Logistics now has a subject and it is race**. **The humanization of the flesh is the racialization of the flesh**. It is **the catastrophe** that befalls the species-being, one **not even Marx can reverse**. This is why **logistics is the science of whiteness in/as the science of loss**. Such is the peril to flesh/earth by the time of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, as Denise Ferreira da Silva teaches. **Surveillance**. **Access**. **Transparency**. **Resilience**. **The globalized, generalized fear of loss is everywhere logistics sees the need to straighten out our tangled flesh**. And **everywhere logistics finds monstrosity, it humanizes it**. Now, to be obscure, as Saidiya Hartman instructs, is to be entangled; it **is to be hunted**, to be subject to the subject of the grasp. Sub-subjected thus, **how can you say that we are persons?** **Flesh/Earth is assaulted by global improvement, worldly usufruct**. With improvement, Hegel produces the **regulatory framework called deregulation**. **Nothing will get in the way of the development of the race**, or in the way of **the race of developers**. Arrayed before and through this is our opacity, given in and as our *otium*, that **ante-programmatic disorder** R. A. Judy speaks of as our speech, arrayed, as Fumi Okiji does and says, with mouths agape, in **the curse, the damnation, the incompleteness that we share**. 2. In Zen Buddhist philosophy the goal of the Heart Doctrine is *ji ji muge*, which can be translated as *no block*. Nothing prevents the path, the way, from flowing. The heart travels freely. But when the heart travels freely it must not imagine it is free. That is why we must also translate *ji ji muge as non non block*. The difference between no block and non non block is both infinitely small and infinite. But where to look for this distinction? We have sought this distinction in the difference between diversity and the general antagonism or between touch and hapticality or indeed perhaps most explicitly between logistics and logisticality. Because what are we to make of the fact that today it is the science of logistics that most *seems* to have realized the Heart Doctrine of Zen Buddhism? It is the science of logistics that dreams of **flow without blockage**, and tries to turn these dreams into reality. **Hard logistics and soft logistics work together**. **The yang of the Belt and Road** and **the yin of the algorithm** fantasize together of *no block*. If this is true, we should be worried. In its origins, and its contemporary mutations, logistics is a regulatory force **standing against us, standing against the earth**. Logistics begins in loss and emptiness. And it begins in a fundamental misapprehension called spacetime. The loss that marks ownership, specifically the ownership of private property, the **loss of sharing**, the **loss of the earth and the consequent making of the world**, is simultaneously the **misapprehension that what is privatized is empty and will be filled by ownership itself**, by properties, by properties placed into it. This emptiness will be filled with an interior. This emptiness is confirmed by logistics, by the mobilization, the colonizing drive, of this interior – where properties are imported into empty space. This begins, again, with Locke or, at least, we can begin again through him. His concept of the mind as tabula rasa – often portrayed as an Enlightenment move away from predetermination – is a projection of this emptiness that must be owned and filled. For this emptiness to become private property it must be filled with and located in the **coordinates of space and time**. Space emerges as the **delimitation of what is mine**, and time begins with **the theft and imposition when it became mine**. The individual mind and its coming to maturity out of the tabula rasa mark this **first conquest**. **Enlightenment interiority emerged from this *emplotment* of time and space** – to borrow from Hayden White – this separation from what is shared. But interiority is only for the owning mind. Because what allows this mind to take possession of itself is its ability to grasp property, which is something it now posits as beyond itself. It takes what it is taken from for what it needs to create itself, and not just needs but **compulsively, interminably, voraciously seeks without end**. In other words, the emplotment of time and space in the mind takes place through the emplotment of time and space on earth, in a **conversion of emptiness into world**, and is simultaneously taken as a fulfilment of mind, its interior appointment in and of what can now be conceptualized as body. Is it a leap to say **logic and logistics start here inseparably**? This is why there is no separating Locke the Enlightenment thinker from Locke **the writer on race**, the **author of the notorious colonial constitution of the Carolinas**. **Ownership was a feedback loop – the more you own the more you own yourself**. **The more logistics you apply the more logic you acquire**; **the more logic you deploy the more logistics you require**. **As Hortense Spillers says, the transatlantic slave trade was the supply chain of Enlightenment**. It was **never-ending quest and conquest, because ownership is perpetual loss**. Gilles Deleuze said that he would rather **call power “sad.”** We might say **the same of ownership**, where lies the most direct sense of loss of sharing. This feeling of loss translates into a **diabolical obsession with loss prevention**. Logistics emerges as much as the science of loss prevention as **the science of moving property through the emptiness**, of **making the world as it travels by filling it**. This is not making the road as we walk, in the anarchist tradition. This is **converting everything in its path into a coordinated time and space for ownership**. Such seizing, such grasping, and such loss prevention is **the mode of operation for the wickedness of the Atlantic slave trade, the first massive, diabolic, commercial logistics**. Already this feedback loop of ownership experiences amplified loss, the loss of sharing, with each emplotment. But now, in taking up **the European heritage of race and slavery** that Robinson identifies as emerging in the class struggle in Europe in the centuries directly before Locke and extending into Locke’s own time, a double loss is experienced, an **intensification of the ownership feedback loop** (and what we call **the subject reaction**). This **evil emplotment of Africans** is experienced as **the potential loss of property that can flee**. It is in this **double loss of sharing** – given in **owning** and in **the imposition of being-owned** – that **the most deadly, planet-threatening, disease of the species-being emerges: whiteness**. And it is for this reason that we can say **logistics is the white science**. (This is what many white people – who are the people, as James Baldwin says, **who think they are white or that they ought to be** – are doing when you see them **walk straight past a queue of people** and take a seat, or **move to the center of a crowded room**, or **speak more loudly** than those around them, or **block a sidewalk** while discussing ‘choices’ with their toddler. Making theory out of practice, they are emplotted, as they’ve been taught to do, **establishing the spacetime of possession and self-possession in ownership**. **Every step they take is a standing of ground, a stomping of the world out of earthly existence and into racial capitalist human being**. **It grows more pronounced the more it is threatened**, consumed by its own **feedback loop**, and it produces **sharper and sharper subject reactions in the face of this threat**. **This is the old/new fascism:** not the anonymity of following the leader, but **the subject reaction to leadership**, which can **just as easily imagine itself to be liberal dissent from, as supposedly opposed to a lock(e)-step repetition of, its call**. In emplotted time and space, the shortest distance between two abstract and dimensionless points – the empty spaces that are conjured to be (ful)filled as world, or worlds, or parts of world – is a straight and dimensionless line. Given imaginary extension, nature’s nest of boxes is a **supply chain**, a **partnership of trade**, a **progress of henchmen in the wake of imaginal sovereignty**. The basic building blocks of the science of logistics emerge from this narrow geometry as brutalist geography. The Traveling Salesman Problem is the problem of how to extend this idea – that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line – when there are multiple destinations and stops. Of course, logistics has often found this empty earth contains blocks and denies access. But the science builds itself up to **overcome these blocks and achieve this access**. Logistics aims to **straighten us out**, **untangle us**, and open us to its usufruct, its **improving use**; such access to us, in its turn, improves the flow line, the straight line. And what logistics takes to be the shortest distance between us **requires emplotting us as bodies in space where interiority can be imposed even as the capacity for interiority can be denied, in the constant measure and regulation of flesh and earth.** Despite the pressure Deming and other American overseers placed on Japanese workers in industry, productivity in Japan, contrary to the received storyline, did not improve at all in those years. But if the experiment was a failure as a productivity tool, this is not to say it failed as a management tool deployed amidst the **intense labor strikes** and worker solidarity that characterized Japan in the 1950s. Meanwhile, the Americans still managing Japan indirectly were already **shifting** to the tried and true American **industrial strategy**: government intervention and market distortion. First, they demanded that all their Asian post-War client states, inherited from the British, French, and Dutch, start to give Japanese imports preferential treatment, even at the expense of American products. Then, with the onset of war in Korea, the Americans increasingly put Japanese industry back on a war footing in order to supply their imperial belligerence. As a result, the Japanese economy took off in the direction of its post-War miracle and, with the same distortion later applied by way of the American war on Vietnam, Japan’s economy became legend. Deming and company had nothing demonstrable to do with this miracle. But they were in the right place at the right time, when American business needed its own ‘productivity solution.’

#### This is an inscription of markets for their demand for complete access to life by institutions of global governance and development. Logistics targets the ungovernable who require imperial domination to secure national security in the name of God

#### A critical point that marked this was Flint Michigan strikes which began using forms of labor against itself proving a need to radically decentralize communication because the iterative desire for self-improvement with the same communicative spaces enabled the cost benefit analysis of black flesh that was only enabled by the privatization of touch – this same protocol has forced us to view informatic production as something untouched, but every strike or demand in the post labor sphere is marked by executive force with branding and colonial erasure

#### The resolution is an antisocial contract—a brutal edict that demands endless iterative self-improvement in the name of perfecting market conditions. This stokes the fantasy of “ethical” or “managed” capitalism, and at the level of debate, requires that participants internalize the logistical mandates of “argument refinement” in and as endless accumulation. The topic mystifies the blurring of individual and unionized sectors so that both may be weaponized against the social life of the undercommons only a Kaizen can solve
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The moment you say **it is mine** because I worked on it and improved it, or you say that **I am me** because I worked on myself and improved myself, **you start a war**. And by misattributing the initiation of this war to nature, you then codify this war as the (anti)social contract.

It is said that the (anti)social contract and the public sphere it creates is a reaction to feudalism and absolutism. But this is only half the story, and an inaccurate half at that. Perhaps it’s better to think of the (anti)social contract as emerging, as Angela Mitropoulos says, not in opposition to absolutism but as the democratization of sovereignty. Even that might have had an inadvertently anarchic quality, as every man considered himself a king. But **the (anti) social contract** not only reacts to, while also reflecting, absolutism, making every home/castle/hovel a hall of mirrors, it also emerges as a way to explain and justify the violence of European man. Everyone from Adam Ferguson to Immanuel Kant tries to explain **why the Africans, Asians, and indigenous people being exterminated and enslaved are so much less warlike than Europeans**. The Crusades **misled Europeans into believing their brutality was part of humanity rather than an exception**, even as religious war gave them a taste for blood that they could not ignore. So the (anti)social contract emerges less to confront absolutism than to **contain the obvious historical exceptionalism of European savagery**. Clearly the world could not be ordered around good and evil without some dire consequences for Europe. Those who conceive of the (anti)social contract mistake the wars it instigates: wars of sovereigns against contractors, and of contractors against each other, and of contractors against those whom Bryan Wagner describes as “**being subject to exchange without being a party to exchange**,” **the ones who are not one** who are **innumerable** and **un(ac)countable** even in having been **accumulated**, even in having been **financialized**.12 Perhaps, in this regard, it would be even better to think of the (anti)social contract as **emerging against a history of revolt**: the **peasant revolts** that buried European feudalism, and which Robinson understands as “the socialist exchange” comprising **Marxism’s anthropological (under)ground**, is **the revolt of nature**, prosecuted by those who are **made to stand in for nature**, having been **philosophically relegated to some essentially paradoxical state of nature** by the ones who seek to **engineer nature’s subordination to and within the socioecological disaster of improvement**.

This is to say, again, that the political half of the story, in which the social contract is understood as improvement rather than its **ge(n)ocidal imposition**, is wrong and incomplete. The (anti)social contract is not only a political theory but also **an economic practice**: the practice of the **juridical regulation and antisocialization of exchange** in the imposition of improvement. In particular, the social contract specified the **individuation of its parties**. Individuals now must be formed in order to enter into contract. And **the economic contract emerges** not in exchange but **from the idea that ownership derives from improvement**. As a result, it is not simply the individual, but rather **the individual capable of self-improvement**, who must and can enter into the contract. **The self-improving individual** can also be thought of as the **self-accumulating individual**: not possessive (this is stasis without movement), not acquiring (this still bears the trace of anarchic exchange), but self-accumulating – that is, property-gathering in order to **put property to work**, including and most especially the **properties of the self** that can be deployed and improved while being posited as eternal and absolute. “Properties of the self” is not a pun here. Properties that can be accumulated and put to work include **race**, **religion**, and **gender** but also **class**, **standing**, **trust**, **thrift**, **reliability**, and **punctuality**. These can all be used to improve where **to improve is to own, and own more**, and thus set in motion **further accumulation of self, others, and nature that all might be put to work**.

Maybe it can be stated this way: **ownership emerges in Europe as usufruct**, in the improvement of land that grants and justifies it. It is **extended and diffused throughout the regime the social contract defines in the self-ownership that will have taken its completed form in the individual** – that **brutal, brittle crystallization of an always and necessarily incomplete melding of subject and object**. Ceaselessly at work in the task of **making everything, including himself, subject to being put to work**, the European is the usufruct of man. Man’s endless improvement, in which necessity is enforced as an absolute contingency, is fixed in European thought as the **vicious grasping of its objects**, including itself. The historical unfolding of this **fixation on fixing**, the **murderous interplay of capture and improvement**, is given in and as *self*-improvement-in-*self*-accumulation’s **violence towards whatever shows up at the rendezvous of differentiation, incompletion, and affection**. The constantly changing activity of what appears to what appears as the self as the continual undoing of the very idea of the self and its eternally prospective completion-in-improvement can only be met, from the self’s myopic and impossible perspective, with **a nasty combination of regulation and accumulation**. The one who accumulates does so at the expense of what it takes to be its others – **women, slaves, peasants, beasts, the earth itself**. Thus, the social contract, as a contract between the improving and accumulating ones, is **inscribed upon the flesh of those who cannot be, and** in any case **refuse to be, a party to antisocial exchange under the terms of the (anti)social contract**. Meanwhile, as much as the contractors are united in a strategy to subject to usufruction whatever cannot or will not be a (numerable, individuated) party to antisocial exchange, they are also **dedicated to killing each other**, to **war in and as their beloved public** carried out **in the name of the improvement** of that public and its problems – that is, its denizens. The self-accumulating individual’s war, his total mobilization against the innumerable and against his fellows under the sign of ownership as improvement, carried out in order to prevent the recrudescence of the natural, **renders irredeemable the very premise of the (anti)social contract**.

And every subcontract within the (anti)social contract must result in improvement. It’s not a matter of both parties being satisfied with what they have exchanged. Such a contract was not just badly made but at odds with the desired identity of the contractors. And here we can put it the other way around: the social contract is conceived by the political theorists also as a contract amongst those capable of self-improvement, or what they called **progress**, and this is why it was essentially **destructive of the notions of exchange encountered amongst feudal rebels** (Robinson’s *An Anthropology of Marxism* is instructive here) **or of exchange encountered amongst Africans who would rather move elsewhere than enter into conflict to gain improvement** (Robinson’s *Black Marxism* is instructive here).13 Ferguson and Kant both say **war is about improvement of the European race**. And Robinson teaches us that this is carried out as a **violent intra-European racialization of difference**, a continually **barbaric festival** in which incursion and the instantiation of improvement as **militarily enforced externalities** produce Europe, and then the globe, as **dead and deadly bodies politic**, **monsters whose mechanized, drone-like simulations of spirit regulate the social** with the kind of latex affability and latent menace commonly associated with **police commissioners and university provosts**. **Antisocial sociability is the basis of the social contract**. In the end, **improvement is war**, which is why **the public sphere is war**, and why the private – in its **anti- and ante-individual impurity**, as **refuge even under constant pressure** – is **a porch**.

**The (anti)social contract is haunted by the economic contract**, which is not a contract of exchange like one might find in friendship, but a contract based on **the claim to ownership of oneself, others, and nature** that is always tied to **what more one can make of**, which is to say **accumulate** in and through, oneself, others, and nature. In other words, the expanding universe of ownership took a contractual form that was **not limited**, as is sometimes supposed, **to free individuals** – that is, to the European subject imagined by the European theorist; it is a contractual form, rather, that requires **broad-spectrum contact** as the material ground of its exclusive and exclusionary network. What makes it truly dangerous is that it could never get free of that from which it wished to distinguish itself; what is truly dangerous to it is that what is forced to grant its exception can **refuse the contract** to which it is a third (or an innumerable or a non-)party. **Exchange**, on the other hand, is a practice that **prevents accumulation at, and as the elimination of, its source – the self-improving individual**. Instead, exchange, given in and as **the differential and differentiating entanglement of social life**, even **under the most powerful forms of constraint and regulation**, is about a **social optimum**. How can we make a monstrous distortion, a spreading bullwhip through the flow? How can hapticality step out on criticality, that brutal, Delphicoracular imperative to ‘know thyself’? How can we join and intensify a general strike against calculation, against valuation? Such a strike wouldn’t be an event so much as the emergence of a general condition of exhaustion and radically impure generativity. It would be a crooked blow, with a curved and curling stick picked up on the run in afformative, depositional black repose. How can our study live in the flesh as a refusal (out) of mind, in the break of the flow? Let’s re-route Kafka through a passage in Spillers and see if we can refuse to adapt. This capacity to think and represent the inability to stave off errancy in the human, to regulate and manage black and inhuman flaw, is what makes us want to think Van Peebles and his ante-hero Jeff Gerber as a precursor to the Kafka we propose, who offers us a picture of Gregor’s anti-heroic condition as, in part, an inability to claim a certain monstrosity, an accession rather than a resistance to or refusal of total access. Is there a difference between Gregor and that sassy, all but sapphirically watermelon mannishness – in which one wakes up and realizes that he is not insofar as he is black, which blackness he has been trying to allay in a strenuous regime of constant improvement, so that Gerber is revealed as someone who’s been passing all along? Watermelon Man, whose self-improvement breaks down seemingly under its own weight, as if he literally sweated away his own makeup, his own capacity to keep (self-)making up for something, given in and as a whiteface that practically teases us with its audacious visual failure, doesn’t die alone in the room that is no longer, but has also never been, his own; rather, he enters into black sociality, walking into the blues with a drink in his hand. In The Metamorphosis we propose, Gregor will have realized he was a monster all along thereby claiming, which is to say radicalizing, the status of the shipped, the sold, in a general refusal and suspension of, a general strike against, calculation. The brain, in/and its synapses, is just another bad concept, a brutal conceptualization – by way of body, its spatiotemporal constitution, and its attendant metaphysics of the possessive individual self in networked relationality – of held flesh. What is valued is work directed toward the improvement of the flow, and in the social factory the flow of the line can run anywhere, and we must enter its streams. The pathway to the lived experience of impossible individuation goes through rigid conformity, whose severed, separate performances are strictly accounted for. School is where the social contract is taken out on kids. In good schools, network’s eclipse of contact is enacted with great efficiency; in bad schools, an experiment might happen, either accidentally, where networks and the networked don’t apply, or under the protection of an idea of the alternative. The loss of empathy in the submission of the social to the contractual ought only ever make us want to ask, can there be cybernetic bruise? Cybernetic caress? Cybernetic sensation? This we do in remembrance of the general antagonism and the general strike we keep all but enacting, recognizing that these questions arise not from the fact of new computational hardware but rather from the values that animate old computational software – a spiritless theory of mind/hand coordination manifest most clearly in the reduction of reverent touch to instrumental grasp. It’s not that touch is nonviolent. It’s that we need lovingly to return such violence from resource improvement back to its multiple sources. We want to intensify our thoughtful feel of bad complicity in the interest of its brush against the good so that no one can ever say, ‘Watch me make my own way through this bullshit.’ The record shows, no one can take the blows and remain intact in the effort to remain intact, which is only given in the taking of the blows. If we want to fight for the good, we have to overturn the bad rather than navigate it by ourselves in crowded loneliness. It’s all nappy and out of all compass – dread, naught, knotty, naughty, dred as worn cover and rent vessel. The oldness, the oldheadedness of the people, is given in their recognition and refusal of this turbulence we go through. There, they study what also can’t be there. It’s like a band straining against development, trying to make a music that studies it while avoiding it. Is there a point where you can’t go on indefinitely? Is that space limited or unlimited? The broken document of a workshop that breaks out into poetry by breaking from the crafting of poems is a concert film. The record of thoughtful play becomes a play. By the 1980s – as logistics and the performance metric extended and dispersed the interests of the factory, connecting the flow of its production line past the blurred boundaries of input and output – operations management had ‘left the factory‘ and taken kaizen with it. More importantly, operations management and logistics helped business to see how the line could overflow or flow everywhere. In defiance of the regulation and containment that strict linearity implies, the assembly line has not disappeared but become ubiquitous. Today, it is a flow plane, a flood plain, an uncharted dispersal of sovereign impositions with their attendant and incidental subject reactions. General and incalculable communicability is virtualized as total communication, total connectivity. This is capital’s algorithmic attempt to dematerialize, conceptualize and regulate an essential and essentially sensual communism; this is capital’s determination to gain total access to the means to live beyond means. At stake is that double operation of the degradation of means that the algorithm seeks and seeks to regulate. Taken together as contemporary phenomena and in their long, braided historical trajectories, these two shifts in operations management – kaizen and logistics – lead us to a different understanding of what is extracted from labor today. Rather than displaying individual labor power, workers must manifest synaptic labor, a capacity for composition given in having been entered, as it were, into the flow of assembly upon command. And with every email, with every text or post, the command is given. One is, at once, instantiated and called upon as data and as syntactic unit. This is logistical capitalism, where what is valued is work directed toward the improvement of the flow, which flows everywhere and over everybody. Workers – if that is the right term for those who are called upon to assemble or asked to operationalize these non-linear, infinite lines of assembly – must connect the flow while also improving it, pass on the data while also enhancing and augmenting and embodying it, enter a given affective zone while providing passage to a new zone, read what is sent while also commenting on what they send. The language of operations management is the language of synaptic labor at work. The terms of operations management have become the terms of our common sense: lead time, flexibility, availability, resources, scheduling, and resource allocation. Synaptic labor plugs in anywhere, translates anything, and one must devise one’s own forms of “queue theory” for the flow of lines that run in every direction, like a sea. Workers themselves are responsible for the forms of conditioning that render and maintain their accountability. The importance of the commodity pales in comparison to that of the quality of the flow along which it travels, which is the infrastructure workers make and make better, more resilient.

#### This logistical imperative to improve yields a racialized speciation of all planetary existence which culminates in the destruction of the earth
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What does it mean to stand for improvement? Or worse, to stand for what business calls **a ‘commitment to continuous improvement‘?** It **means** to stand for **the brutal speciation of all**. To take a stand for speciation is the beginning of a **diabolical usufruct**. **Improvement comes to us by way of an innovation in land tenure**, where **individuated ownership, derived from increasing the land’s productivity, is given in the perpetual**, and thus arrested, becoming of exception’s miniature. This is to say that from the outset, **the ability to own** – and that ability’s first derivative, **self-possession** – **is entwined with the ability to make more productive**. In order to be improved, to be rendered more productive, **land must be violently reduced to its productivity**, which is the **regulatory diminishment and management of earthly generativity**. Speciation is this general **reduction of the earth to productivity** and **submission of the earth to techniques of domination** that isolate and enforce particular increases in and accelerations of **productivity**. In this regard, (necessarily European) man, in and as the exception, imposes speciation upon himself, in an operation that **extracts and excepts himself from the earth** in order to confirm his supposed **dominion over it**. And just as **the earth must be forcefully speciated to be possessed**, man must **forcefully speciate himself** in order to enact this kind of possession. This is to say that **racialization is present in the very idea of dominion over the earth**; in the very idea and enactment of the exception; **in the very nuts and bolts of possession-by-improvement**. Forms of racialization that both Michel Foucault and, especially and most vividly, Robinson identify in medieval Europe become *usufructed* with modern possession through improvement. Speciated humans are **endlessly improved** through the **endless work** they do on their **endless way to becoming Man**. This is the usufruct of man. In early modern England, establishing title to land by making it more productive meant **eliminating biodiversity** and isolating and breeding a species – barley or rye or pigs. Localized ecosystems were aggressively transformed so that **monocultural productivity smothers anacultural generativity**. **The emergent relation between speciation and racialization is the very conception and conceptualization of the settler**. Maintenance of that relation is his vigil and his eve. For the encloser, possession is established through improvement – this is true for the possession of land and for the possession of self. **The Enlightenment is the universalization/ globalization of the imperative to possess and its corollary, the imperative to improve**. However, this productivity must always confront its contradictory impoverishment: the **destruction of its biosphere** and its **estrangement in, if not from, entanglement**, both of which combine to ensure **the liquidation of the human differential that is already present in the very idea of man, the exception**. To stand for such improvement is to **invoke policy**, which attributes depletion to the difference, which is to say the wealth, **whose simultaneous destruction and accumulation policy is meant to operationalize**. **This attribution of a supposedly essential lack**, an inevitable and supposedly natural diminution, is achieved alongside **the imposition of possession-by-improvement**. **To make policy is to impose speciation upon everybody and everything, to inflict impoverishment in the name of improvement, to invoke the universal law of the usufruct of man**. In this context, continuous improvement, as it emerged with decolonization and particularly with the defeat of national capitalism in the 1970s, is the continuous crisis of speciation in the surround of the general antagonism. This is the contradiction Robinson constantly invoked and analyzed with the kind of profound and solemn optimism that comes from being with, and being of service to, your friends.

#### Thus, we defend that a just government is not one of policy but rather one for the social life of the under commons ought to recognize the universal right of workers to engage in communicative strikes. As a response to the communicative nature of racial capitalism, the 1AC seeks a radical constellation found in a strike against communicative labor – This is articulated via a refusal to engage in the social remix of life, and instead dare to imagine new ways of being, one that builds counter logistics by weaponizing the affective technologies of communicative spaces against executive management.

**Beller ‘21** (Jonathan Beller is Adjunct Professor of English, Film Studies, and Women’s Gender and Sexuality Studies at Barnard.  
Jonathan Beller, “The World Computer: Derivative Conditions of Racial Capitalism”, Duke University Press, 2021)//Joey

Given the sea change in the nature of languages and images themselves—their wholesale transposition and transformation from a means of representation to a means of production— the difficulty here is both with the substrate of communication (its bits) and with the us-versus-them perspective:, we want to ban advertisers but today we must also confront the disturbing possibility that we are them. Remember, “they” program “our” language and “our” imagination, “we” speak “their” thought—indeed, that is our work, or rather our labor. What to do with the fact that “we have seen the enemy and he is us?” One could say, one could want to say, “I don’t care who you are: if you live in the first world, if you live in the Global North, then fuck you! You ain’t no victim, even if you’re sick.” But who would be saying that? Probably some other Northerner, writing about how culture or the Venice Biennale, as if it were, could or should be more than a lavish spectacle of global suffering staged for a cosmopolitan elite. As capital’s nations, banks, armies, schools, languages, newspapers, and films did to its colonies and colonial subjects, the current institutions from states to computer-media companies do to “us”: they command us to make ourselves over in capital’s image for their own profit through networked strategies of expropriation and dispossession. “We” do it to ourselves, and our representations of self and other are designed to sell a version of ourselves back to ourselves so that we can perform further work on what is now the raw material for the next iteration of images. Therein lies our ontological lack, an ontological lack of solidarity and of even the possibility for solidarity. Therein lies the desire for and indeed necessity to become a plantation manager—the word is overseer. Though it is beyond the scope of this essay, this digital neocolonialism that practically commands global Northerners to in one way or another accept Nazism and genocide with their cappuccino could be understood as being on a continuum with the internal colonization of Europe by the German banks—which depends of course on the distributed production of a kind of neoliberal “realism” that Mark Fisher (2009) called “capitalist realism,” and was only ever a hair’s breadth away from fascism. This fact of our investment in and by advertising, the conversion of the sign to what I call the “advertisign,” poses a genuine problem for theory— indeed an unprecedented one. This problem is particularly evident considering the material conditions (class, nationality, education, race, language, etc.) of the participants in the would-be counterhegemonic theoretical discussions of culture and policy that presuppose the books, computers, schools, and institutions that sustain these. Those within the circuit of these discussions have already passed through a homogenization process which programs them in compatible systems languages. Without submitting ourselves and our own aspirations to radical critique, without conducting a Gramscian inventory of our ostensibly internal constitutions, we run the risk of merely trying to set up a competing corporation with a new business model. The revolution will not be televised; decolonization will not be a brand. Any would-be anticapitalist “we” runs this risk of coopting and cooptation from the get-go, particularly if it does not think about the materiality of social production from top to bottom: class, yes, but also race, nation, gender, sexuality, ability, geolocation, historical stratification. The world’s postmodern poor, the two billion–plus living on two dollars a day, also labor to survive in the material landscape organized by the post-Fordist social factory its anti-Blackness, its Islamophobia, its endless and mutating racism and imperialism. However, from the standpoint of capital, the role of those at the bottom is to serve as substrate for image-production and semiosis; not only in factories, cottage-industries, subsistence farming, and informal economies, but also as starving hordes; “irrational,” criminalized or surplused populations; subject-objects for policing, encampment, and bombing; desperate refugees; and even as voids in the idea of the world—as sites of social death. Forgive me, but I’d wager that no one capable of understanding these words can claim full exemption from the indictment they issue regarding structural complicity with the production and reproduction of everyday life. Humans are troped (via discourse and the screen) to organize military production, national policy, internment camps and prisons, bourgeois imaginations, museum shows, corporate strategy, and market projections. Let us clearly state here that any program that does not admit this excluded planet into dialogues that vitiate the monologues imposed by capitalist informatics and advertisigns is still floating in the realm of the ruling ideas and therefore participant in murder. These ruling ideas are the ones whose density and weight, whose material support and very machinery, threaten to further crush the late-capitalist poor out of not just representation but out of existence. This erasure and disposability, imposed by systems of informatic inscription designed to absorb every output of sense, is the achievement of the advertisarial relations endemic to computational racial capitalism. When information is an advertisement for itself that presupposes the operating system of the world computer as virtual machine, banning what we recognize as advertising on the internet, even if an excellent beginning, is just not adequate to address these issues of representation, social justice, planetary and climate racism, and emancipation. To summarize: the forms of sociality which are the conditions of possibility for the online, informatically organized relations—best characterized as advertisarial—run through every sector and register of planetary life. The internet, while recognizable as an effect and a cause of the current form of planetary production and reproduction, cannot be considered in isolation as a merely technical platform or set of platforms if its historical role is to be properly understood. To take the internet as an autonomous technological force results in a species of platform fetishism that disavows both the histories and material conditions of its emergence, conditions that are, in short, those of screen culture and racial capitalism; this is to say that it, the internet, is the very means by which the capitalist suppression of global democracy (which is emphatically, economic democracy as well) has been accomplished and continues. If the internet is autonomous, it is because it expresses the autonomization of the value form. As noted previously, with the hijacking of communications and semiotic infrastructures by racial capitalism, the medium is the message and the message is murder. To ban advertising on the internet would be a good start —but what if the whole thing is advertising? One reading of what I have said thus far might suggest that, given the expropriation of the cognitive-linguistic, our volition is overtaken by capital logic; and given our inability to cogitate in any way that is genuinely resistant to capitalist expropriation, coercion, strictly speaking, is no longer necessary to impose cooperation for capitalist production. We “want” to cooperate productively, our desire—which, from the dispossession of even language and mind constitutes ourselves as subjects in the media ecology of the capitalist technical image, that is, in and through the organization of digital information—is itself an iteration of capital, a script of becoming predestined to become capital. The old language scored by the new image machines and their extractive algorithms locally organizes cooperative subjects who want to cooperate with vectoral capitalization. We want to provide content in order to derive currency and survive. Our solidarity on the internet produces more internet. Thus, in a certain way—and particularly since we no longer properly have any thoughts of our own—we all collaborate in a world organized by images and screens, thereby participating more or less mindlessly in the seamless realization and triumphant apotheosis of the programming business. However, I am sorry to have to report that the dystopian vision here is not quite as bucolic as even this already dreary picture of unwitting and irredeemable pulverization and servitude. While I do see that representation and semiotics have been increasingly flattened à la Orwell and Marcuse by a vast internalization of the apparatuses of oppression (in which “thought” is the [productive] thought of the [capitalist] Party and “repressive desublimation” is an engine of capitalist-fascist production) the “old problems” like the hierarchy of class have not gone away; neither have racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, and fascist nationalisms ceased playing their roles to create vectors of privilege for white male–identifying aspiration. Indeed, most thought today, such that it is, is all about maintaining hierarchical society. The thinking runs thus: capital is nature, capital is eternal, capital is information is nature. Or, in a more pedestrian mode: human beings are naturally acquisitive and competitive, economic growth and technological advancement mean progress, this tech provides, or almost provides, a color-, gender-, and religion-blind society, and so on—and one must advance one’s place in it by any (crypto- or not-so-cryptofascist) means necessary. Of course, there exists better thinking out there. Mia Mingus: “As organizers, we need to think of access with an understanding of disability justice, moving away from an equality based model of sameness and ‘we are just like you’ to a model of disability that embraces difference, confronts privilege and challenges what is considered ‘normal’ on every front. We don’t want to simply join the ranks of the privileged; we want to dismantle those ranks and the systems that maintain them” (Mingus 2011, cited in Puar 2017: 16). However, there is broad-band, ambient programming that facilitates assuming neo-liberal and full-on fascist subjective sovereignty. This programming seeks triumphant brushes with plenitude (communion with the big Other, as distinct from the racial or otherwise other, becomes the ego-ideal), and this same programming is violent, competitive, hateful, mean-spirited, and alienating when embraced —at the same time that it is also cooperative, simpering, and abject. Servitude, even when automatic and mostly unconscious, is unhappy and, as we can see any day from the daily news, utterly pathological and sick. Of course, this diagnosis represents a huge generalization, but despite its broad-brushing lack of subtlety we may find that such a schizoid oscillation between entitled adjudicator and abject supplicant sums up the contours of your average reality television show or comments section on YouTube. It is Bateson’s (2000) and Deleuze and Guattari’s (1977) schizophrenic, caught in the double-bind, who has become the capitalist norm—the one who struggles to negotiate in the form of contradictory signals the aporias of hierarchical society, while reproducing it, and all the while experiencing their own psychic dissolution as an injunction to create.3 With this schizoid capture in mind, let me then develop my question about the internet—“What if it is all advertising?”—in the framework of post-Fordist production. The argument is that, in the context of virtuosity and the expropriation of the cognitive-linguistic by computational racial capital, sociality itself has become advertisarial, a ceaseless waging of capitalized exploits designed to garner attention and value for oneself and one’s capitalists. This situation represents—indeed imposes—a derivative logic, a logic in which every action is a hedge, a kind of risk management devoted to maximize a return. In addition to the fractalization of fascism, in which agency is manifest as a profile that has aggregated the attention of others, advertising has worked its way into the sign itself, into the image, and into data visualization, and it has generated the advertisign. All signs become points of potential cathexis, derivative positions on the underlier that is social currency and ultimately value. This new type of sign is not simply the brand but also an element of vectoral language (Wark 2007): functionalized words in a production channel, engaging in the micromanagement of desire, the production of new needs, and the capturing of the imagination, all in order to induce linguistic and behavioral shifts in the attention of others while aggregating their attention for oneself—turning their heads with an interface. This combination of the manipulation of market conditions (that is, everyday life) through techniques of risk management is no longer merely the province of advertising but of so- called human interactivity (what was once just communication and before that culture), now become advertisarial through and through. From Smythe’s claim in the “Blindspot” essay (1977) that all leisure time has become labor time, to Virno’s (2004) notion of virtuosity, we have seen aspects of this model for the capitalist overdetermination of apparently unremunerated time before. However, here—with the financialization of expression—we clearly grasp that the financialization of everyday life means also the convergence of semiotics and financial derivatives. Given the thoroughgoing intensification of vectoral, and in fact matrixial, signs, we need to investigate its implications in the context of a discussion of radical media practice. I will make two additional points here before shifting gears and turning at the end of this chapter to what I identify as an aesthetics of survival—an aesthetics that emerges from within the matrix of advertisarial, schizoid capture. The final chapter of this volume will endeavor to extend aspects of such socioaesthetic forms, those resistant to computational racial capitalism, to new notions of radical finance and the possibility of platform communism. If, as was already becoming true in the cinematic mode of production, the dominant means of representation have become the dominant means of production, the questions of and models for political agency are radically transformed, and the urgent need to decolonize communication and decolonize finance presents itself. Future communication will require a cybernetic approach, and, as we shall argue, this cybernetic approach will necessarily be financial, though it will be reaching toward a different order and different mode of production. Like communism, because it will need to be communist, it will see economic transformation of the material relations of production and reproduction as essential to the revolution. It will draw on the repressed and extracted cognitive-linguistic resource of the racialized and otherwise marginalized and configure ways to make our voices matter both as meaning and as tools for the reorganization of the material world and the social relations therein prescribed. Language and images are neither inside nor outside; they are part of the general intellect—currently they are at once media of thought and of capital. We also know that languages and images are not isolable, meaning that they are not and have never been stand-alone entities but rather exist in relation to their media, their platforms, which are again inseparable from society and its institutions. Furthermore, each platform relates to another platform. Paraphrasing McLuhan, we could even say that the “content” of a media platform is another platform. Thusly the general intellect is inseparable from its media platforms and their financials. We see that the general intellect, once largely held in common, is increasingly being privatized; the very media of our thought belong to someone else. This expropriation of the media commons is precisely the precondition of the real subsumption of society by capital. It is an extension of the ongoing expropriation begun by primitive accumulation and money as capital, and it has been accomplished through the financialization of media as platforms of extraction. The ramification of mediation by computation and information has resulted in its convergence into formats offering derivative exposure to underliers that are the expressive vitality and futurity of our communication. We therefore no longer have any organic relation to the materials for thought itself (sincerity has become a myth, at least in the medium-term of most circles)—the words, images, and machines we require to think, to express ourselves, to interact, and to know have been ripped from the species and privatized via the longue durée of dissymmetrical exchange. We work on the words and images, but as numbers they belong to someone else. The media themselves have become forms of capital—forms of racial capital—and our usage of these media means that we work to add value that valorizes capital, for the capitalist and within a relation designed as much as possible to guarantee that our creative acts necessarily occur as dissymmetrical exchange with capital. I write this book in a discourse that does not just not belong to me because it is shared, but in a discourse that is increasingly the property of a set of institutions— publishers, journals, universities—that all have their eye on the bottom line. The means by which we most intimately know the world, ourselves, and our desires (our images and words) are themselves vectors of capitalization intent upon converting our very life-process into surplus value (which is to say value for capital). We need strategies that will seize the means of production and create a reverse subsumption of affect, intellect, knowledge, capability, communication, and community. When all media have converged as economic media, it is economic media that must be re- engineered. Again, I think this subsumption of cognitive and affective capacity, the quasi-automating (scripting) of productive labor for capital, is what Stiegler means by the proletarianization of the nervous system—which would include the proletarianization of the pathways of feeling and thought. Our affective capacities are put to alienated and alienating work in the social factory, and their product too is alienated, producing ever-intensifying and ever-accumulating dispossession and disempowerment as the dialectical antithesis of its simultaneous production of unprecedented wealth and power for the cyborg avatars of the great media conglomerates. Intellect and emotional intelligence, the product of thousands of years of species- becoming, is being strip-mined so that extraction machines may continue their furious innovation to further discount people. I write this book aware of the pressure to think it just right, to at once extend thinking in order to command attention and produce new needs, but also to delimit it, to control myself, and to put the reins on whatever counterpower may rage within my body, because academia can tolerate only so much “bullshit” and no more. Yes sir, I’ll be careful not to cross that line, but a word to the woke: the bullshit is the best part. From a historical perspective, this encroachment on the means of representation—that Banksy and I and a billion others join the silenced majority in opposing—indicates that the individual subjective agent, itself a platform for sociality that developed with the rise of capitalism (as the subject who relates to other subjects in the market, the bearer of the commodity and thus its thought), is nearly defunct. As has been noted previously, in a world where life processes are stripped, ripped apart, rebundled, and sold as derivative exposures, the individual subject is an outmoded technology despite the fact that it still appears as a skeuomorph in certain updated technosocial apparatuses—like the latest forms of films, games, influencers, and versions of national politics that proffer invitations to momentary individualistic identification for the dividual purpose of providing a sense of familiarity and orientation. While palliative for some in small doses, such individuality is no longer a viable (which is to say, sustainable) fantasy. The real thought is that of the infrastructure, of the AI that codes our meat and scripts our sheets. Sure I take up the mantle for a few moments each day to appear as the agent of this text, suiting up as the operator of an intellect that might be adequate to the informatic shit-storm of racist, capitalist, imperialist, patriarchal, for-profit assaults, but then I drop off into an ocean of petty concerns, food shopping, and home repairs. And even when I say “I,” to perform as the nexus of all this insight, I also know that it’s hardly me talking. I’m just curating at the gates of shit that needs to be said, and hopefully titrating to let the right stuff through. That’s part of my politics though Dog knows that I could create a more lucrative named-professor type profile with just a little more discipline, a bit more self-interested adherence to the protocols of the academy’s factory code. Instead, there is the effort to overturn, to be or at least to live something beyond being the scribe of the world computer, to at once witness the drama of the emergence of the intelligence of commodification, testify to its outrage, and intimate the possibility of its overthrow. Such would be the art of this text, practiced at the limits of disciplinarity and of subjectivity, guaranteed by nothing and no one. The expiration of the subject form, imminent since the subject’s first intimation of mortality—and made structurally mandatory by Freud and especially, with the full-blown rise of the sign at the moment of it radical marginalization by visuality, by Lacan—is not necessarily a cause for lament, despite the increasingly intense fading of its incalculable beauty, its sad reduction to cliché. From a political perspective, it means that within each concrete individual body the presumed continuity of the individual is riddled with contradictory and indeed unassimilable indicators; it means also that there exists in differing quantities and qualities capitalist and noncapitalist striations or sectors. Hallways of emptiness, but also hallways of love. Like bundled assets, the mind-body is tranched by executable logics organized by a calculus of risk available to investors. There are, to be a bit simplistic, aspects of desire that are programmed (indeed farmed) to produce practices that function in perfect accord with capitalist accumulation strategies (individualizing or schizoid) and aspects of desire that are atavistic or collectivist, utopian, communist, or maybe even just plain lonely, and, in short, subprime. In reality, of course, desire is more singular than even such formalizations might indicate. Insert your favorite snippet of poetry here. Hortense Spillers in “All the Things You Could Be by Now If Sigmund Freud’s Wife Was Your Mother” (1997) invokes “the Dozens” and the music of and like that of Charles Mingus (152–3), to make present an “interior intersubjectivity”(140) testifying to the rich unaudited psychic life of what might today be called Blackness. There are vast resources beyond the easy resolution of hegemonic hermeneutics whether deployed by institutionally validated psychoanalysis or compressed by current systems of informatic extraction. In agreeing with Freud that consciousness makes up a small part of mental life when compared to the preconscious, the unconscious, dreams, and so on, but in rejecting the normative assumptions and disavowals (including his own Jewishness) that situate Freud and the psychoanalytic discourse that will become part of European and U.S. bourgeois society, Spillers recognizes a vast store of mental life and the possibility of listening anew. However, when speaking of politics now, we therefore necessarily speak of the abstract forms available for the conceptualization and deployment of concrete emergences whether referring to haecceities that are innumerable or collective forms of existence and psychic life actively mediating between “the one” and “the ‘masses’ ” (141). Let us listen anew. Acknowledging that we ultimately and if possible immediately want to “marry our thought” (Wynter 1994b: 65) to the wealth of subaltern forms of life and the care of the bios, allow me then to put the situation of the post- Fordist subject thusly: in Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Lenin (1939) showed how imperialist dividends complicated class issues in England, since many people, otherwise part of the working class, got a share of the dividends of imperialism by clipping the coupons of their investments in racist, exploitative British enterprises across the globe. Today this race-based class fractionalization is fully internalized in the Global North; on our iPads built by Chinese slaves from blood metals extracted from the Congo, we may momentarily feel like biomorphically unmarked nobles in the global cosmopolis; while on the job market or when simply seen in our raced and gendered embodiments, we are abjects. Materially and intellectually we are nodal points on a global network. The signal oscillates between narcissistic megalomania and utter abjection and can be affected by a billion parameters taking us from melancholia to outrage. Thus, even the concrete individual is composed of class fractions, race fractions, gender fractions. In the form of signs, we clip coupons that validate our investments. The language of object-identification, we observe here, cannot really keep up with the fluctuations resulting from the throughput of code as we work to identify and disidentify our agency. Can we audit a different mode of emergence, a different futurity than one inexorably overcoded by capital? Of course this is still somewhat simplistic and also class-specific, as many (billions even) never get to participate as an enfranchised global citizen in any aspect or moment of life, even if the lived experience of these same billions is radically overdetermined by the class(es) from which they are excluded.4 The gilded poverty of the enfranchised, as opposed to the mere poverty of the rest, is now a measure of connectivity. A more complete view is that we are the product of the world system and thus everything we are has been produced vis-à-vis globalization, and therefore everything bears the trace of the system in its entirety (again, in varying proportions). This conceptualization of concrete individuals (bodies) as global communitarian products forced to varying degrees into templates of individualized risk by capitalist states, is not to erase class; however, it suggests that, just as Fanon saw the great European metropoles as the product of third world labor, we are all products of the worst conditions prevailing in the Global South and around the planet. Global inequality is internal to our being. It is us. How then does one (such a one who is relatively enfranchised by the derivative language of texts such as this one) inventory those relations and produce them as formations of solidarity rather than as disavowed residuum? Is there another data-sphere, a communist one? Can we build communist interfaces, networks, and finance? How would we register, track, amplify, and render actionable the communitarian affinities, solidarities, obligations, and debts, the resources in the wake of too many genocides to count, that in actual practice underpin the official economy, collective life, and whatever authentic hope is left to our species? Perhaps we have arrived at a question worthy of theory: Is there, could there be communist algorithms? Communist derivatives? Derivative communism? We are looking for that path. To add to my point about the shifting, distributed character of political actors—that goes so far as to suggest that we can no longer think only of actors but rather must think of vectors and fields in addition to thinking of the resources developed in cultures of survival—I will make a second observation. A political intervention in the advertisarial relations that have this planet heading toward environmental doomsday requires not only revolutionary policy but revolutionary culture. (I defer further discussion of a third requirement, revolutionary finance, to the final chapter.) This culture must take into account that, for many on this planet, Armageddon is not the future but an ongoing constant. My call here (which should not be entirely unfamiliar, as it gives petit bourgeois intellectuals something important to do) is to (**re)politicize** semiotic and **affective structures** and practices, including and perhaps especially those we might control, for example our own utterances—our expression. Of course, to call them “our own” seems to contradict what I’ve said about the expropriation of the cognitive- linguistic and the intensification of aphanisis by visual, verbal, and digital media derivatives, but it is here precisely that we confront one of the significant material contradictions of our time: who or what speaks in us? This question, which I shorthand using the phrase the politics of the utterance and which you can experience palpably right now (as you endeavor to think), seems to me to insist that our idea-making must actively produce its solidarity with the dispossessed. We must struggle for the radical constellation. The question concerning the politics of the utterance, asked here in a strange passage of this text through a beyond-academic terrain, a moonless forest the traversal of which may or may not at this point lead us back to the plot, also raises the question of becoming, as well as the questions of agency and of action within the capitalist image— programmable images, racializing and racist images that, in the terms we have set out, are functionally omnipresent. Continuous media throughput has generated a capitalist imaginary structuring both language function and imaging processes, coordinated at scales and by calculative logics that exceed individual comprehension. Though the occasion is upon us, we must struggle for space and time to think. We must open a spread on which to bet against the dominant order. We glimpse, and we feel, that to insist upon the unremitting relevance of both culture-making and of cross-cultural transnational solidarity helps to avoid platform fetishism because it sees the internet and its machines not as a set or collection of autonomous technologies but as a historically emergent system of value-expropriative communication and organization, built directly upon older but nonetheless contemporaneous forms of inequality, including but not limited to historically emergent techniques of gendering, racialization, and imperialism, and embedded in the living flesh of the world. All of this calculative interconnectivity and networked agency implies, contradictorily, in fact, that the internet is not all advertising—but neither is advertising all advertising. It is also murder and struggle. Banksy knows that. The advertisarial relation is the programmatic relation encrypted in the apparatuses of capital: the war of each against all, taken all the way from finance, computation, and surveillance to the speech act and the imagination in accord with the autopoietic algorithm of the distributed Leviathan. Marx himself saw capitalism as vampiric, and today’s processes of capitalization are even more totalitarian, more widely distributed, and more blood-, life-, and indeed soul-sucking than even in prior eras—though such comparisons don’t do those killed by past iterations of capitalism any good. Despite the disavowals to the contrary, we recognize that capital needs labor, needs metabolic time more desperately and more voraciously than ever before (what else is biopolitics?) and, furthermore, that it wages war on life-time on all fronts, in order to secure labor power, its product and basis, at a discount. The pyramids of inequality become internal fractals, and even as the base broadens, the tip with the all-seeing eye (that is not a subject) ascends ever higher. We do not yet know what can be destroyed or indeed built with the massive appropriation of Banksy’s rocks, but we do know that at present there is total war against our using them to build anticapitalist, nonhierarchical, horizontal, solidary sociality. The refusal or détournement of capital’s encroachment is itself a creative act. Perhaps we have only begun to glimpse what a total refusal might achieve. Cybernetics as the now unavoidable ontology of ontologies must become the ground for anarchocommunist becomings, sociocybernetic becomings. Information as physical process bound to alienated, deracinated labor, is itself a cyborg formation. Janelle Monáe, as if building on the Fanonian analy sis of *the impossibility of Black ontology, makes answer to both the prohibition of all but cyborg ontologies and the violence of abstraction.* With her brilliant musical and video work, most recently, the song “Screwed” and the “emotion picture” Dirty Computer, embodied and desirous, dynamic, assertive, affecting, sexual and creative dirty computing becomes a kind of answer embracing queer, Black, and non-normative alternatives to being constituted and com manded to perform by the deracinated abstractions that colonize bodies. And the emotion picture changes the way we are screwed (together): “You **fucked the world up**, now we’ll **fuck it all back down**.” This détournement of the activity machine that is the body, dancing, musical, thinking sugests that we can and perhaps must occupy computation differently, using the resources of our bodies, of our musics, and of our histories. Since everything runs on us, since we are the substrate at the bottom of the stack, Monáe proposes and actualizes a creative utilization of the immense reserves of capacity in music, dance, movement, song, experience, and embodied knowledge. Such an embarkation is not a total answer but a strategy that sugests alternative kinesthetic ways to process information. One thinks also here of Erin Manning’s (2018) work on neurodiversity and Black life, the living taking place beyond the confines and perceptions of institutions: “The urgency of these undercommons cannot be ignored. We are moving through them, but are we proliferating enough? Are we inventing at the speed, in the duration, of the movements of thought that move us to ask what else it can mean to know?” (5). Virno’s key formulation, “the capture of the cognitive-linguistic by capital,” implies as much: speech, thinking, and image-making all become a wager. It would seem that in this view, however, the wager is always a self- interested one, bent upon keeping things running in return for a modicum of your own survival (Virno 2004). How different it is for **Harney** and **Moten** (2013), for whom expression can be a way of **accessing and sustaining the Undercommons**, a **refusal of policy** and governance, and an embarkation of planning and Black study. But in both the case of the virtuosic command performance and of the artful **fugitivity of the Undercommons**, the consequences of and the conditions for the functioning of a system that imposes such derivative living are, at least as currently configured by the contemporary terms of risk: the two billion– plus persons living on less than two dollars per day; the currently enslaved; those forced into reparations- seeking by migration; those suffering famine, sex- gender discrimination, climate dissolution, genocide, and so on— denizens of the world surviving on and as the material underside of the chaos management undertaken by the military industrial complex, financial markets, the world- media system, and fractal fascism functioning at the behest (or at least to the benefit) of those plutocrats (and their Ai) who are maximally enfranchised by the virtual machine that is the world computer. Among all this shit, people survive, and that’s cool. However, while collectively and communally mourning those harvested by racial capital and while embracing those many who are subject to “premature death” may give some degree of comfort, hope, power, tenderness, beauty, institutional change, or revolutionary fire, these acts of outrage and/or love do not bring children, parents, friends, and lovers back from the dead. Is there a path to “never again?” The autonomization of intentions by fixed capital in the form of apparatuses, and experienced by responsive screeners as searches, clicks, binge watching, forms of knowing, forms of suspense, forms of abjection, and forms of interest, makes this informatic landscape more precarious, the metagame more complex. Our condition of wagering on information is not a choice (just as one does not have a choice but to live and strive on a polluted planet plagued by environmental racism); it is a derivative condition, and my expressing it in these words, words admittedly calibrated and nuanced in alignment with my will to a certain polemical endpoint, is radically overdetermined by the material conditions of our existence, my own existence, and the planetary subjugation of life. I am not alone here in what I call the derivative condition— which is why so many of us are talking about the same things: new economy, anti-racism, decolonization, radical care, refusal. Contemporary media forms are edited compositions that function as a kind of protocolized wager to strategically manage the volatility of living that is imposed by the transnational, transsubjective economy. Films represent a bundling of resources in expectation of a return. Creating non- and postcapitalist returns requires that the under lying protocols of financialization endemic to dominant media are rewritten. We must strike against the mode of abstraction and extraction of our progressive values that currently underlies computationally modulated representation and refuse the conversion into their opposite, that is, into capital.

#### Our affirmative lives in the excesses of the topic where people get by on the black market, where they engage in forms of negotiation with the quotidian violence’s of life in the ways only those intimate with work and the social, we affirm the illicit economies that always subtend The haptic restricts the executive because it refuses to be regulated by the logistics of trade produced by the protocols embodied by management. Instead of regulating the inside and outside of trade, and the inside and outside of debate, we affirm being touched with care rather than the touch which silences survivors and destroys the possibility of true accountability.

#### Debaters should play in fugitive scenario planning indebted to each other---that remixes the social life of debate to the function of competition, which is a prerequisite to organized politics.

**Lestelle ‘16** (Cody, Graduate Student @ University of Hawaii at Manoa in Political Science, Indigenous Politics, and Alternative Futures, “Playing to LIVE, Not Living to Pay: Abolishing/Decolonizing Education and Cultivating (Under)Commons [Preliminary Notes V1.0]”, January 19, 2016)/LRCH Jrhee

[...] It is against this same history that we want to present a proposal: That we form the necessary alternatives to education in small cells to much larger circles and guilds of sorcerers/witches, mages, healers, shamans, thieves and pirates. That instead of maintaining ourselves principally with money, the little papers and imagination of those from above, we capacitate ourselves according to our own so varied and autonomous social fabrics and infrastructures. **We already don't have time to live incarcerated in the classroom**, **being prepared for a future that will not exist**. **There are so many megaprojects destroying the past, present and future that they call us to immediate conflict**, to **the war against the multiverse**. From whichever side of the monster, inside, outside or between the schools, prisons and corporations **we can begin and continue stronger the work of capacitating and caring for ourselves and defending life** and recuperating that which they have stolen from us: everything. DOWN WITH ALL EDUCATION OF THOSE FROM ABOVE! MAY OUR AUTONOMOUS FORMS OF CARING FOR AND CAPACITATING OURSELVES GROW! LONG LIVE MOTHER EARTH AND MAGIC FOREVER! […] LA A3PA (ALIANZA PLANETARIA PIRATA PALETA ANARQUISTA) [The Planetary Pirate Paleta Anarchist Alliance] [Author's translation of excerpt of pamphlet found in Mexico City titled “MANIFIESTO PARA LOS BIENES COMUNALES DEL APRENDIZAJE MÁGICO Y LA A3PA (Manifesto for Commons of Magical Learning and the A3PA)] I imagine by now you, dear reader, should like an explanation of this strange appearance “(Under)Commons” in the title. This is to refer to both commons and/or undercommons. **Undercommons are distinct from that sort of space granted by some authority from above and only under certain select terms** and to certain select entities, such as agreements outlined in the Magna Carta. My use of undercommons is meant to indicate the sort of space forged directly, **from below and in an extralegal manner** (not necessarily illegally, just without regards or respect for law). This work should build on that of Stefano Harney and Fred Moten in Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Studies by suggesting some potential tools and ideas for augmenting and guiding the cultivation of undercommons, which their book unveils the existence of. **In response to being forced to play a game against our will** (capitalism) **why not create our own game(s) and sets of rules which utilize “free play” (gaming the system) against it and our own autonomously structured play for our own purposes**? Living PlayNET is the name I give for just such a type of game, or platform, **that assists in collectively and individually executing the organizational tasks necessary in the fortification and utilization of the undercommons by strategically leveraging varying accesses to a variety of commons and private property regimes within the network of “players**”. Living PlayNET is basically a game, or platform for intentionally organized play, which helps guide us in the creation of something akin to but hardly resembling and far outdoing existing market and state-based social security systems and which is juxtaposed to the system of un-life that is the Empire of Money. **Yet since it is merely a proposal for a type of game, each collectivity of people choosing to play together will be autonomous and selfdetermining amidst a broader community of gamers** of the entire genre which grows in a rhizomatic fashion. Given that “fugitivity is being separate from settling”26, **it makes sense for decolonial games to seek to build on spaces of joint fugitivity, especially joint fugitivities between those otherwise “divided and conquered” by Empire**. In addition, Living PlayNET adheres closely to the practice of autonomy in all of its endeavors: La renovación de la política que hacen los que resisten y luchan en favor de la tuonomía es interrelacionar el ámbito de lo social y el ámbito de lo político, reincorporan la capacidad de creación de los sujectos sociales, potencian cambios sociopolíticos más allá de las reivindicanciones de grupo, desbordan el plano de su propia lucha. [The renovation of politics that those who resist and struggle in favor of autonomy make is to interrelate the social sphere and the political sphere, reincorporating the social subjects' capacity of creation, **they strengthen sociopolitical changes beyond the re vindications of group, they overflow the plane of their own struggle**.]27 For similar reasons, Living PlayNets tend to have strong affinity with Graffiti and things Alien:, ..Graffiti is an Art of the Commons. Graffiti is also an act of insurrection, it creates a crack in the foundation of Empire. It exposes the fallacy in the sacredness promoted by the idea of Private Property. For every act of Graffiti a symbol of wealth is desecrated and a piece of art is created for the Commons. The ability to desecrate Private Property (to attack it sacredness) resides in the artistic creativity in which Graffiti operates. This Artistic Creativity comes from the Soul, or that tiny flame burning within us that stubbornly resists the colonization by Empire. This Artistic Creativity is something alien to Empire. [Empire] can not deal with what seems Alien and attempts to purge it from itself. There is a reason artist are starving…28 **Through such a platform, genre of game, or mode of play as I am describing, we could find ways of better supporting the variously already existing fugitivities as well as best prepare ourselves for the next opportunity for wholesale flight**: The lone fugitive escape is an individualistic form of resistance; fugitive escapes that involved hundreds, sometimes thousands of indentured servants or slaves, enough fugitives to disrupt the daily activities of a county, city or colony can be called wholesale flight. Because of the ubiquitous informer, the ever vigilant overseer and the observant attentive planter and because of the bleary eyed watchman who legged his nightly beat in the local cities and the patrol who trooped through the countryside, wholesale flight could hardly go unnoticed by the local authorities. For mass flight to occur a shift in power had to come about that loosened the planter's reins of authority. Such a shift took place during the colonial wars where the angry face of turmoil, armed conflict and violent disorder undermined the planter's authority.29 Utilizing a certain concept of play guided by a certain Zapatista strategic insight to passing walls, **we may grant a wide range of interdimensional mobility and rapid intelligence to our struggles**. In the introduction of Play: A Theory of Learning and Change, Tara Brabazon hints at the extremely decolonial potential of play, writing “Stuart Brown states that, **'play provides freedom from time**.' This disconnection from the clock is also a dislocation from a map. Space and time merge, blur and transform[…].” This insight into play combined with the following Zapatista method is a grimoire sure to be of much use in even the stickiest of intergalactic crises: If there exists no geographic location for that tomorrow, we start gathering twigs, stones, strips of clothing and meat, bones and clay, and we begin constructing and islet, or better yet, a rowboat planted in the middle of tomorrow, the place where one can still just barely see the storm looming ahead. ...And if there is no hour, day, week, month, or year on the calendar that we recognize, well we begin to gather the fractions of seconds, barely minutes, and filter them through the cracks that we open in the wall of history...And if there’s no crack, well, we’ll make it by scratching, biting, kicking, hitting with our hands and head, with our entire body until we manage to create in history the wound that we are...And then it turns out that someone walks by and sees us, sees the Zapatistas, hitting ourselves hard against that wall...30 We eventually learn that we are all the growing cracks in the wall and that we should not seek to mend the cracks but to join them, that another world may hatch. Further writing from Brabazon on play [P]lay, a re-creation of self in and for new contexts and conditions, is the work of imagination. Play is an act of mediation and translation. It carries hope and alternatives into repressive environments. It is not locked into the binary oppositions of work and play, **but instead flits between analogue and digital, adult and child, and creates scenarios for different and defiant ways of learning and living**.31 **The permissive and nurturing attitude toward imagination granted by modes-ofbeing grounded in play are crucial for populating and defending the world in which many worlds fit and the undercommons which we utilize to craft our many worlds**. **Those with access to more elite society commons and private property really owe it to themselves** **and everyone else to play:** it offers them a way out and a way to give others ways out. **Prison is simply the other side of education**. **In the world generated and maintained by education one is supposed to look to the job market**. But there are only so many jobs and now the robots are taking over and one truth is increasingly obvious: you can't eat money, but it can eat us if we let it. Recognizing the arbitrariness and illegitimacy of the success/failure generating function of education should alleviate negative judgment on the part of successful academics toward their companions suffering worse **for their different location in the carceral complex known as prison**. Lottery and other **gamefication** concepts **can serve as structuring mechanisms/autonomous organizing tools for the multitude to reconcile tensions** between careerist and movement oriented motivations32: e.g. if tenure faculty, administrators and other coveted positions within academia and elsewhere can exhibit certain behaviors **and participate in certain traditions in order to build material and symbolic solidarity with movement they can be rewarded by the mechanic of the game**. Gains of dignity, honor, and a generally strengthened undercommons which is really the autonomous alternative to social security could be their rewards. When undercommoning33 is thought of as a process of un-damming, the flow of money can be seen to be organized in such a direction as to begin to repair the damage $ has done and to restore the natural flows of abundance (8). **To conclude, a particularly urgent problem** (**whether or not one opts to play**) which Living PlayNETs and generally this writing hopes to address **via advocacy for decolonization, games, play, undercommons and critique of education**, is the fact of: “The unpreparedness of the educated classes, the lack of practical links between them and the mass of the people, their laziness, and, let it be said, their cowardice at the decisive moment of the struggle will give rise to tragic mishaps.” (Fanon34).

#### The role of the collaborative negation and what our spaces provide for haptic Strikes appear not as isolated events proven by Nei Mongol, Wild Cat Strikes, Black Kaizen in Detroit, Black Bear Ranch, Korean insurgencies, and PCI action that provided fugitive scenarios that created a wake to the disorganizing of capital

**Moten and Harney ‘4** (Fred Moten, Professor of Performance Studies for the Tisch School of the Arts at NYU, PhD in English from UC Berkeley, 2020 MacArthur Genius Fellow, Stefano Harney, Professor of Strategic Management for the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University, PhD in Social and Political Sciences from the University of Cambridge, co-founder of Ground Provisions—a curatorial collective, founder of the School for Study—a nomadic study collective, 2021, *All Incomplete*,)//Joey

If the increase in Japanese industrial productivity is essentially fictive, so too is the ascendancy of quality. The oil shocks of 1973 and 1978 – part of a complex class struggle in the oil-producing regions, as the Midnight Notes Collective teach us – coincide not with the more reliable, higher quality Japanese durable goods that are supposed to be the products of a management miracle, but with cheaper cars that have better fuel efficiency. These cheaper cars appear amidst another class struggle not unrelated to the one in the oil fields. It is here that we can pick up the thread of operations management, especially ‘quality control,’ and its latent power as a class weapon. For while there is no evidence that total quality management was in any way responsible for the Japanese miracle, it was a useful tool in disciplining a collectivist insurgency in Japanese labor. Moreover, in the 1970s with the final breakdown of productivity deals in the United States, amid **wildcat strikes** and the rise of organizations like the League of **Revolutionary Black Workers** in Detroit’s auto industry, American management was looking for a new form of control. It is here that the failed management theory of Deming and company, burnished by the rise, for very different reasons, of competition in the car, electronics, and machine industries with Japan, finally had its day. This capacity to think and represent the inability to stave off errancy in the human, **to regulate** and manage **black and inhuman flaw**, is what makes us want to think Van Peebles and his ante-hero Jeff Gerber as a precursor to the Kafka we propose, who offers us a picture of Gregor’s anti-heroic condition as, in part, an inability to claim a certain monstrosity, an accession rather than a resistance to or refusal of total access. Is there a difference between Gregor and that sassy, all but sapphirically watermelon mannishness – in which one wakes up and realizes that he is not insofar as he is black, which blackness he has been trying to allay in a strenuous regime of constant improvement, so that Gerber is revealed as someone who’s been passing all along? Watermelon Man, whose self-improvement breaks down seemingly under its own weight, as if he literally sweated away his own makeup, his own capacity to keep (self-)making up for something, given in and as a whiteface that practically teases us with its audacious visual failure, doesn’t die alone in the room that is no longer, but has also never been, his own; rather, he enters into black sociality, walking into the blues with a drink in his hand. In *The Metamorphosis* we propose, Gregor will have realized he was a monster all along thereby claiming, which is to say radicalizing, the status of the shipped, the sold, in a general **refusal** and suspension of, a general strike against, calculation. The brain, **in**/and its **synapses**, is just another bad concept, a brutal conceptualization – by way of body, its spatiotemporal constitution, and its attendant metaphysics of the possessive individual self in networked relationality – of held flesh. What is valued is work directed toward the improvement of the flow, and in the social factory the flow of the line can run anywhere, and we must enter its streams. The pathway to the lived experience of impossible individuation goes through rigid conformity, whose severed, separate performances are strictly accounted for. School is where the social contract is taken out on kids. In good schools, network’s eclipse of contact is enacted with great efficiency; in bad schools, an experiment might happen, either accidentally, where networks and the networked don’t apply, or under the protection of an idea of the alternative. The loss of empathy in the submission of the social to the contractual ought only ever make us want to ask, can there be cybernetic bruise? Cybernetic caress? Cybernetic sensation? This we do in remembrance of the general antagonism and the general strike we keep all but enacting, **recognizing** that these questions arise not from the fact of new **computational hardware** but rather from the values that animate old computational software – a spiritless theory of mind/hand coordination manifest most clearly in the reduction of reverent touch to instrumental grasp. It’s not that touch is nonviolent. It’s that we need lovingly to return such violence from resource improvement back to its multiple sources. We want to intensify our thoughtful feel of bad complicity in the interest of its brush against the good so that no one can ever say, ‘Watch me make my own way through this bullshit.’ The record shows, no one can take the blows and remain intact in the effort to remain intact, which is only given in the taking of the blows. If we want to fight for the good, we have to overturn the bad rather than navigate it by ourselves in crowded loneliness. It’s all nappy and out of all compass – dread, naught, knotty, naughty, dred as worn cover and rent vessel. The oldness, the oldheadedness of the people, is given in their recognition and refusal of this turbulence we go through. There, they study what also can’t be there. It’s like a band straining against development, trying to make a music that studies it while avoiding it. Is there a point where you can’t go on indefinitely? Is that space limited or unlimited? The broken document of a workshop that breaks out into poetry by breaking from the crafting of poems is a concert film. The record of thoughtful play becomes a play. The act of emplotting yourself in time and space is – perhaps paradoxically at first – also the act of being all but nowhere. That spot you mapped is dimensionless. It cannot be found precisely because your act claims that the point you will have occupied is universal, the abstract point every individual can and must make and from which humanity becomes possible, with and through and in which the human finds himself. And because it is nowhere, its relationship to place is, in fact, one of impunity. It is this impunity that founds modern morality and the idea of responsibility or sustainability which this act of impunity then hires as its security detail. Can there be a better description of the human: the being who lives with impunity on the earth and is sorry about it? So, the question of what has happened can be taken with the question of what will happen in a way for which normative ethical questioning makes room. Against this abstract preparation for the victory of reason over its rivals, this tilting of the board toward one point, there is a way to live history and place that is not part of the humanization, that is to say racialization, of our earth and its reduction to world, its degradation of its means to mere logistical ends and its forfeit of sharing to mere ownership, all of which require and are instantiated by emplotment and its rule(r). Amiri Baraka calls this entanglement of history and place “place/meant” and we hear him, now, through M. NourbeSe Philip’s amplification of “dis place,” as if he meant for that errant and supplemental “a” to signify a movement of and in place, a radical and irreducible movement that **constitutes** our **undercommon indigeneity**, our shared, native, ante-natal turning out of (re)turn.71 If emplotment is how we give up the undercommons for a common grave, then dis place/meant is how we find and mark the surrealistic spot. The intensity of the trouble lies in that shit like this happens amongst *us*, the good people of every rotten, brutal, delusional nation-state. Every single person who isn’t really one, and knows why they aren’t and can’t really be one, means well when they speak for those for whom such personhood was less an object of desire and more a ghostly matter to beware and avoid and destroy. Hell, we mean well right now, hoping there’s something in what we say that pierces what we assume in saying it. It’s just that such hope is nothing without practice, such faith is nothing without work, without toil, without that constant, active, undergrounding labor whose by-product will have been our disappearance. This is the content of Cabral’s prophetic description. He sharpens the weapon of theory for us so that we can cut through theory and ourselves. He gives us a chance to see more clearly that the competing chauvinisms of native and immigrant, when the color line constitutes the interdiction of their convergence, obscures intra-diasporic, intra- and international class warfare in every outpost and refuge of Afrodiasporic life. The lives and struggles of Negro toilers remain to be thought, and inhabited, as the unswerving apposition of the unthought, the unhabitants’ fugitive deconstruction of world and reconstruction of earth. The weapon of theory lets us see through to the social lens we want to see through when we are Negro toilers, too.79

#### Philosophical Cosmopolitics are a priori – Accelerating the drive of the Anthropocene as well as technology predicated on recursive Empires throughout the university

**Hui ‘17** (Yuk Hui. Kaizen event author. “Cosmotechnics as Cosmopolitics”. https://www.e-flux.com/journal/86/161887/cosmotechnics-as-cosmopolitics/.)//Joey

The end of unilateral globalization and the arrival of the Anthropocene force us to talk about cosmopolitics. These two factors correlate with one another and correspond to two different senses of the word “cosmopolitics”: cosmopolitics as a commercial regime, and cosmopolitics as a politics of nature. Second, the human species on earth is confronting the crisis of the Anthropocene. The earth and the cosmos have been transformed into a gigantic technological system, the culmination of the epistemological and methodological rupture which we call modernity. The loss of the cosmos is the end of metaphysics in the sense that we no longer perceive anything behind or beyond the perfection of science and technology. When historians like Rémi Brague and Alexandre Koyré write about end of the cosmos in seventeen- and eighteenth-century Europe, this should be read in our present Anthropocene context as an invitation to develop a cosmo-politics, not only in the sense of cosmopolitanism but also in the sense of a politics of the cosmos. In response to this invitation, I would like to suggest that in order to develop such a cosmopolitics it is necessary to elucidate the question of cosmotechnics. I have been developing this concept of cosmotechnics in order to reopen the question of technology by undoing certain translations that were driven by the search for equivalence during modernization. This problematization can be presented in terms of a Kantian antinomy: Thesis: Technology is an anthropological universal, understood as an exteriorization of memory and the liberation of organs, as some anthropologists and philosophers of technology have formulated it; In order to elaborate the relation between cosmotechnics and cosmopolitics, I will divide this article into three parts. First, I will demonstrate how the Kantian concept of cosmopolitics is rooted in Kant’s concept of nature. In the second part, I situate the “multi-naturalism” proposed by the “ontological turn” in anthropology as a different cosmopolitics, one which, in contrast to Kant’s pursuit of the universal, suggests a certain relativism as the condition of possibility for coexistence. In the third part, I will try to show why it is necessary to move from cosmology to cosmotechnics as a politics to come. §1. Cosmopolitanism: Between Nature and Technology The main difficulty of all cosmopolitics is the reconciliation between the universal and the particular. The universal tends to contemplate the particulars from above, as in the way that Kant regarded the French Revolution, like a spectator considering a violent piece of theater from the mezzanine. Universality is the view of a spectator, never that of an actor. Kant writes, in his “Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim”: There is no other way out for the philosopher—who, regarding human beings and their play in the large, cannot at all presuppose any rational aim of theirs—than to try whether he can discover an aim of nature in this nonsensical course of things human; from which aim a history in accordance with a determinate plan of nature might nevertheless be possible even of creatures who do not behave in accordance with their own plan … [Nature] did produce a Kepler, who subjected the eccentric paths of the planets in an unexpected way to determinate laws, and a Newton, who explained these laws from a universal natural cause. In Beyond Culture and Nature, Descola has proposed an ontological pluralism that is irreducible to social constructivism. He suggests that recognizing these ontological differences can serve as an antidote to the dominance of naturalism since the advent of European modernity. But does this focus on nature (or the cosmos, we might say) in the interest of opposing European naturalism actually revive the enchantment of nature, this time in the name of indigenous knowledge? This seems to be a hidden problem with the ontological-turn movement: many anthropologists associated with the ontological turn have focused on the question of nature and the politics of the nonhuman (largely animals, plants, minerals, spirits, and the dead). This is evident when we recall that Descola proposes to call his discipline an “anthropology of nature.” Furthermore, this tendency also suggests that the question of technics is not sufficiently addressed in the ontological-turn movement. For example, Descola talks often of practice, which may indicate his (laudable) desire to avoid an opposition between nature and technics; but by doing so, he also obscures the question of technology. Descola shows that analogism, rather than naturalism, was a significant presence in Europe during the Renaissance; if this is the case, the “turn” that took place during European modernity seems to have resulted in a completely different ontology and epistemology. If naturalism has succeeded in dominating modern thought, it is because such a peculiar cosmological imagination is compatible with its techno-logical development: nature should be mastered for the good of man, and it can indeed be mastered according to the laws of nature. Or put another way: nature is regarded as the source of contingency due to its “weakness of concept,” and therefore it has to be overcome by logic. These oppositions between nature and technics, mythology and reason, give rise to various illusions that belong to one of two extremes. On the one hand, there are rationalists or “progressivists” who hysterically struggle to maintain their monotheism after having murdered god, wishfully believing that the world process will stamp out differences and diversities and lead to a “theodicy.” On the other hand, there are left intellectuals who feel the need to extol indigenous ontology or biology as a way out of modernity. A French revolutionary thinker recently described this situation thus: A funny thing to see these days is how all these absurd modern leftists, all unable to see anything, all lost in themselves, all feeling so bad, all desperately trying to exist and to find their existence in the eyes of the Other—how all these people are jumping on the “savage,” the “indigenous,” the “traditional” in order to escape and not face themselves. I am not speaking of being critical towards one’s “whiteness,” towards one’s “modernism.” I am talking of the ability to peer inside [transpercer] oneself. My refusal of the above two extremes does not come out of any postcolonial “political correctness,” but rather out of an attempt to go beyond postcolonialism’s critique. (Indeed, I have elsewhere reproached postcolonialism for its failure to tackle the question of technology.) I hold the thesis that an ontological pluralism can only be realized by reflecting on the question of technology and a politics of technology. Kant was aware of the importance of technology in his comment on trading as communication; however, he didn’t pay much attention to the technological difference that finally led to planetary modernization, and now planetary computation, since what was at stake for him was the question of the whole that absorbs all differences. Kant criticized the impolite guests, the greedy colonizers who brought with them “oppression of the native inhabitants, the incitement of the different states involved to expansive wars, famine, unrest, faithlessness, and the whole litany of evils that weigh upon the human species.” Commenting on the defense strategies of China and Japan, Kant said that both countries have wisely, limited such interaction. Whereas the former has allowed contact with, but not entrance to its territories, the latter has allowed this contact to only one European people, the Dutch, yet while doing so it excludes them, as if they were prisoners, from associating with the native inhabitants. When Kant wrote this in 1795, it was too early for him to anticipate the modernization and colonization that would take place in Japan and China. If this phase of globalization was able to take place, it was because of the technological advancement of the West, which allowed it to defeat the Japanese, the Chinese, and other Asian civilizations. Nature, the guarantee of perpetual peace, didn’t really lead us to perpetual peace but rather to wars and more wars. To appeal for a cosmopolitanism today, I think we must reread Kant’s cosmopolitanism according to the process of modernization and revisit the question of nature and technology anew. The arrival of modern technology in non-European countries in recent centuries has created a transformation unthinkable to European observers. The restoration of “indigenous natures” itself has to first be questioned, not because it doesn’t exist but because it is situated in a new epoch and is transformed to the extent that there is hardly any way to go back and restore it.

Information paradox and physics takes out other reasoning – Outside information can’t ever explain how we ought to cope with anti-blackness and only gets violently reiterated into the world

Murillo’16 (John Murillo III. Quantum Blackanics: Untimely Blackness, and Black Literature out of Nowhere. Diss. Brown University, 2016. Pg 169-172 (B.A., University of California, Irvine, PhD in Philosophy in Department of English at Brown University)//Joey

80 See Sabine Hossenfelder, “If it Quacks like a Black Hole,” posted on BackRe(Action), a blog devoted to physics that she shares with her husband, Stefan Scherer. Sabine Hossenfelder is a theoretical physicist, and the Assistant Professor for High Energy Physics at Nordita, the Nordic Institute for Theoretical Physics. Stefan Scherer is a physicist in the field of heavy ion physics, working in the field of scientific publishing. 81 I need to clarify that a singularity, as it’s thought in terms of a black hole, marks a site at which hat happens. This is where it is theorized that quantum gravity might come into play, having the explanatory power to remove the singularity. Right now, however, the singularity seems to be a source of a **paradox**, as it suggests that information is lost after a certain point. If the black hole evaporates—since black holes appear to evaporate—what happens to that information? This “information paradox” surrounding what exactly happens to the information that ‘goes into’ a black hole is the subject of an ongoing and unresolved ‘debate’ in physics, having a number of proposed solutions (the cited Stephen Hawking paper stirred the pot a bit, portending a solution of its own, but one which is neither ‘new’ **Black revolutionary violence** does not promise redemption, but might provide a way to **render** the impossible and the irredeemable available to the possibility of redemption, without really offering a fixed or clear image of what that redemption could look like. The deathliness that renders time untimely in relation to Blacks, the **deathliness** that **characterizes** untime and all its constitutive features and effects, might make legible the possibility of its own redemption via a Black revolutionary violence that has, as its stakes, being, itself. Taking the risk means making the leap or taking the plunge **into the black hole**, means embracing the inescapability of the tidal forces emanating from its central singularity—the antiblack imposition of the fact of Blackness. As I read him, Fanon describes this unimaginable spacetime as “the zone of nonbeing,” a derelict spatiality and temporality, “an utterly naked declivity where an authentic upheaval might be born.” Only “here” and “now,” or “there” and “then,” along the downward slope(s) of the “zone,” or the inward funnel of the black hole’s gravity well, an “authentic,” which might mean “redemptive,” upheaval might become available to thought. Specifically, this upheaval might be conceived, carried to term, and brought into being (born). The “zone of nonbeing,” the “black hole,” is the only site for the (pro)creation of redemption via an embrace of obliteration; but it is also an “arid and sterile region,” constitutively infertile, or at least, resistant to the kind of redemptive creation that stages or embodies “authentic upheaval” in the form and wake of Black revolutionary violence and its attendant risk of political ontological obliteration. To heed Ursa’s call, to leap into the black hole, to enter into the dereliction of being, is to fall into unimaginable contradiction in the form of an unresolvable paradox.

#### The inevitable 1NC tricks dump re-entrenches violence against people of color in debate by abstracting from discussions of race and locks out black participation.

Smith ’13 [Elijah, PhD, 2013 NDT Champion, Director of Debate at Rutgers University-Newark. 09/06/2013. “A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate.” <https://www.vbriefly.com/2013/09/06/20139a-conversation-in-ruins-race-and-black-participation-in-lincoln-douglas-debate/>] Pat

At every tournament you attend this year look around the cafeteria and take note of which students are not sitting amongst you and your peers. Despite being some of the best and the brightest in the nation, many students are alienated from and choose to not participate in an activity I like to think of as homeplace. In addition to the heavy financial burden associated with national competition, the exclusionary atmosphere of a debate tournament discourages black students from participating. Widespread awareness of the same lack of participation in policy debate has led to a growing movement towards alternative styles and methods of engaging the gatekeepers of the policy community, (Reid-Brinkley 08) while little work has been done to address or even acknowledge the same concern in Lincoln Douglas debate. Unfortunately students of color are not only forced to cope with a reality of structural violence outside of debate, but within an activity they may have joined to escape it in the first place. We are facing more than a simple trend towards marginalization occurring in Lincoln Douglas, but a culture of exclusion that locks minority participants out of the ranks of competition. It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of social control, the reality of racism in debate is constituted by the singular choices that institutions, coaches, and students make on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to abstractions to distance the conversation from the material reality that black debaters are forced to deal with every day. One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. Community norms would have competitors do intellectual gymnastics or make up rules to accuse black debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations but as someone who understands that experience, the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, and then find strategies to deal with the issues at hand. It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. A student should not, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, have to justify why oppression is bad. Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential. Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape. Current coaches and competitors alike dismiss concerns of racism and exclusion, won’t teach other students anything about identity in debate other than how to shut down competitors who engage in alternative styles and discourses, and refuse to engage in those discussions even outside of a tournament setting. A conversation on privilege and identity was held at a debate institute I worked at this summer and just as any theorist of privilege would predict it was the heterosexual, white, male staff members that either failed to make an appearance or stay for the entire discussion. No matter how talented they are, we have to remember that the students we work with are still just high school aged children. If those who are responsible for participants and the creation of accessible norms won’t risk a better future for our community, it becomes harder to explain to students who look up to them why risking such an endeavor is necessary. As a student provided with the opportunity and privilege of participation by the Jersey Urban Debate League, I can remember plenty of tournaments in high school where the only black students at the tournament were individuals from my high school. It was a world shattering experience; no one spoke to us first and those we did approach didn’t have to acknowledge the fact that, every weekend, our failures and successes made us the representatives of black America in the minds of students and judges that never had to freely associate with black people. The irony of participation for black students is that to understand your existence in an academic, usually white, space throws that very space into question. They are both told that joining debate will make you smarter, more personable, and better able to communicate; however those who are already there don’t speak to them, they don’t vote for them, and they don’t associate with them. The unanswered question, then, is “For which bodies does LD exist?” Continuing to parade LD under the guise of neutrality will reproduce the problem at hand. Hiring practices, Judge Preferences/Strike Sheets, invitations to Round Robins, and who coaches don’t require their students to associate with all contribute to the problem at hand because they “accidentally” forget to include people of color. When only two major debate workshops bothered to hire anyone black to work with their students this summer it spoke to the reality of which bodies are seen as being competent enough to teach. Their skills as pedagogues weren’t dismissed because they aren’t qualified, but because they are black .If we are to confront structural discrimination against the black community, we can’t retreat to a defense of neutrality but have to take strides in addressing and ending the cycle of exclusion. If black students do not feel comfortable participating in LD they will lose out on the ability to judge, coach, or to force debate to deal with the truth of their perspectives. The work that has been done to address the issue has been fragmented and individual at best, leaving the burden of ensuring debate is an accessible space the responsibility of a small vanguard of coaches and students dedicated to improving the conditions of our community. Lincoln Douglas is no longer just the younger sibling of cross examination debate, but has taken on a life of its own. No matter how many times people accuse LD debaters of “misusing” arguments from other events, only someone who has done this event can understand what it is like to teach someone how to answer multiple a-priori’s in a 4-minute 1AR or to efficiently explain how a criterion can encapsulate another in under 20 seconds. Policy may have come first, but just these few examples speak to the norms of our community not being dependent on those of the former. Our ability to address anti-black exclusion should not be dependent on policy debate finding the correct answer first but should be determined by a concerted effort to widen the scope of the conversation.

#### False attachments – Our method is a pre req before any reasoning – anything else results in cruel optimism naturalizing material violence for debaters in this space

Sullivan ‘17 (Shannon Sullivan, Chair of Philosophy and Professor of Philosophy and Health Psychology at UNC Charlotte, “Setting Aside Hope: A Pragmatist Approach to Racial Justice”, 2017)//Shreyas

IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY, significant racial inequalities and anti-black violence continue to be rampant in the United States. Decades, even centuries, of political and legal struggle have deco lisle to change that fact. This chapter will argue that black Americans need new tactics and strategies for responding to the white class privilege and white supremacy that fundamentally structure the country.' They need to increase the number and type of tools in their racial justice toolkit, expanding beyond liberal faith in civil rights and white people's good intentions to cooperate with racial change. The political and legal work that black and other people of color (along with some white people) have done to eliminate antiblack racism isn't working. Pragmatists in particular need to be able to face up to that fact given that we value the practical work that ideas, concepts, and truths can do. Why then, as Calvin Warren pragmatically asks in the epigraph above, would we expect people fighting racism to keep doing the same thing? Why would anyone hope that the same failed actions and strategies would mm out any differentia the future? This kind of hope can function as a cruel optimism that "works" by keeping black people focused on the very thing that undercuts their flourishing (Warren 2015, 221). In line with Warren's concerns, I argue that black America' hope that political struggle can achieve racial justice tends to be a harmed emotion they should avoid. I maim my case in a pragmatist spirit that opposes Comet West's influential argument for black hope In contrast to West, I contend that pragmatists and others concerned about racial injustice would do better to draw on Derrick Bell's racial realism and Warren's blank nihilism to develop alternative strategies for addressing antiblack racism In related ways, Bell and Warren urge their readers to reckon with the permanence of racism and to give op hope that additional political struggle will eliminate it. After exploring their complementary accounts, I augment them with concrete evidence from the health sciences that black hope can be physically harmful to black people, weathering their bodies nod damaging their psychosomatic health such that they are less able to withstand the inequities of anti-black racism. I conclude by arguing for the advantages of reading Bell's and Warren's claims about the permanence of racism pragmatically, that is, by assessing the truth of their claims via their effects. The result m the working hypothesis that black people will have a much greater chance of developing new practices, habits, and strategies of flourishing in an anti-black world if they no longer hope that political struggle will eliminate racism.