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## 1

#### The carcel policy failure of Flint Michigan and the profitability of Black flesh marks through the transportation of water exemplified erasure of black life. The first global movement of commodities required algorithmic regulation and arrangement of bodies and movement so as to secure financialization that we witness today in commodification of resources. The digitalization of resources was never been merely about the movement and the process of selling to the consultant, but about the control of the flow of movement and touch within society itself. We must ask ourselves who is the consult that is able to drink? And how do they get the bottled water they desire? Thus, the nation-state serves here not as an external actor who can check capitalism’s excess, but rather an arrangement of bodies that ensures the enclosure of the form of radical touch that would threaten logistics.

#### This is endless access – Access to these resources is the moment that liquid touch to digitalize every aspect of society. This pathological desire for the codification and recodification of natural resources has resulted in racialization of who gets what resource. What is now necessary is an arrangement of governmentality that ensures the enclosure in the form of radical policy action in order to give us touch the resources that has been distributed to those who took it.
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The market joins forces with the state and its ideological and repressive apparatuses in this second lesson. Indeed, in many instances it is the state that makes the diagnosis of perversion, and in every instance the state that secures the **market**. The state **returns** to its **settler roots** securing not just **private property** but the private individual, indeed securing individuation itself as a principle necessary for speculation of this kind. Maria Josefña Saldaña-Portillo teaches us how property rights were foisted on indigenous people not only to extract land but also to instantiate individuation as the basis of the settler state’s expansion and legitimation.39 Incessant **privatization** of **social** production, policing, property **rights**, and propaganda remain the state’s specialties in this regard. But the state also joins the instruction in improvement, and in particular the speculative market in improvement. As a brief example, think of gentrification. To experience **gentrification** is to be **instructed** in **speculation**. One must learn to see history, parks, schools, **natural environments**, cultural difference, health, and **public life** all as monetized **values** that can be bet on, or against. These contemporary pilgrims want to ‘bring the neighborhood up.’ They desire its improvement, which means they also desire that which is to be improved. They detach themselves from, or exile, that which is to be improved and that detachment remains the essential structure of their desire. That’s why gentrification, as a force, is always seeking after the next neighborhood to conquer. It’s a Lacanian cheap trick, as it were. They not only want that which is to be improved, they also want to be wanted by that which is to be improved, desired by perversion. Crime, failing schools, disused or misused parks, and public transportation are subjected to the diagnosis of perversion. And the diagnosis is carried out by citizens. Citizens of gentrification take over schools, A Partial Education | 67 clean parks, work with the police, and generally identify those with something wrong with them. Tis conduct of oneself as a citizen of gentrification has as its schoolmaster this speculative state. To be instructed in gentrification is however not just to subject others to **evaluation** for **improvement** but also oneself. It is to submit to self-diagnosis, testing one’s capacity for improvement in the form of more speculation, such as the ability to take on more debt, more lifelong learning, more flexibility, more subservience to this speculative market in improvement. As degrading as this self-diagnosis may be, it is preferable to being diagnosed by those who self-diagnose, better, in other words, than being the ones who are said by others to have something wrong with them. It’s better to say something is wrong with me than it is to have them say there’s something wrong with you. It’s better to straighten yourself out. This forward and backward integration and management of the value chain was **accomplished** through metrics and the **algorithm**. Logistics has long been a field for algorithmic experiment centered on the ‘traveling salesman problem,’ which is concerned with determining the most **efficient route**, and the ‘Canadian traveler problem,’ which is concerned with finding the most efficient adaptations en route. What logistical theorists sought from the algorithm? was continuous recalculation – metrics not measurement. The evolution of the **algorithm** in **logistics** tends towards the elimination of “the controlling agent” – living labor – and with that the elimination of “human time,” as the logistics literature likes to call it. In the fantasies of logistics theory, intimated in the discourse of the ‘internet of things,’ where a general dehumanization – which humanization anticipates – is imagined, things will have developed a kind of **plasticity** in **response** to changes in **the environment**, transforming themselves without the intervention of living labor. Both the material developments of logistics and the immaterial interventions of logistics theory have **consequences** for more or less **conscious developments** in philosophy and science whose conditions of possibility are framed by the methodical algorithm at work and the methodological work of the algorithm in thought. The **state** is the **regulation** and oligarchization of corruption, the wealth of holding what is given and letting the given go. The continual corruption of the body, of its boundaries, the continual enactment of living as this sharing matter with the environment, is what the state was **b(r)ought to steal**. The state regulates sharing for the purposes of privatization; it commits (to) impoverishment in the name of value. So that what is called corruption in the political world, or the development world, would be the **metastasis** of the **state** as a regulator of corruption. Ten, anti-corruption drives are re-regulatory drives, designed to re-deliver the regulation of corruption, or to fail to do so; in either The Gift of Corruption | 163 case, it is our corruption that suffers at the hands of the vain attempt to privatize a piece of it, or isolate a moment of it in our ongoing entanglement. The regulation of and extraction from our corruption (including through pre-emptive logistics or surveillance) has to straighten out our kinky, curved, and matty, massive, unlocked flesh. It cuts one path through our tangled rendezvous, for watching. And what if surveillance isn’t a legal and extralegal category but an economic one? And what if corruption is a way not only to think the unity of political economy but its insufficiency, too? What if to strip the **earth/flesh** we have donned is to watch and **disentangle** the senses for the impoverished, non-renewable pleasures of capitalism, where enjoyment itself must be supplied through empty time? But this may simply be to say that blackness, and usually black people, deliver this kind of capitalist value whether in a recognizable economic category, including social reproduction, or not in one, through corruption. Surveillance then becomes a form of value extraction. And what is that form? The sucking of a sense, the shaving of a share, the culling of a curl, the dividing of a din, made possible by temporary, unstable isolation in the regulation of corruption. The mummification of pleasure won from the regulation of corruption, which they always lose, which always gets lost, in our eyes and arms. So, the **policy question** concerning the depth of your state’s corruption is really the constitutional question concerning that state’s **capacity** to **regulate** it. We turn to them to turn through them in speculation and the play of the informal; for the enforming, subsistent existence of life; as **material-environmental** exchange past the point where **exchange, environment** and the **environed maintain** their separable sense at the expense of material soul; up against the partition of ideality and actuality, where and when the event is in recess; with consensuality’s unravelling of the conceptual surround; toward thoughtfulness in measure, which refuses either to exclude or be grasped by measurement, which remains irreducible to itself insofar as measure is what it can neither exclude nor grasp; under song, as they say, or the poem, which fade into music and poetry fading into sound and sound, which is speech’s slur and ante-origin. All that is just our run-on itinerary, out here where tendency meets touching, feeling, and terrible availability in a sense or Sinn or sin Eve Sedgwick + Hortense Spillers understand. Chandler reminds us of a term W. E. B. Du Bois invented and employed; “democratic despotism.”21 When the consultant cannot demonstrate access, and therefore the algorithm cannot demonstrate improvement, the consultant calls for policy as once (and still) the citizen calls for heteropatriarchal nationalism or the settler for racist manifest destiny. Policy is past all that, even though all that’s not past. Policy comes in to diagnose what’s **blocking access**, and what’s blocking access are ‘those people.’ What’s wrong with those people in Detroit who want water, in British Columbia who want land, in Manila who want some place to stay? Policy says there is something wrong with those people that makes it so that the consultant can’t get access. But it is the other way around. The **consultant** is **denied access** – those **people deny him access** – because they embrace the general access-in-antagonism that he denies. And so policy must be called. Self-defense becomes the disease. Love becomes the problem because love is the problem, the self-defense of the accessible. But, hey, maybe governance can help, which is to say maybe those practicing self-defense may be willing to self-diagnose, self-refect, self-improve! One way or another policy will proscribe, or policy will get posed – as democracy, as democratic despotism, where everyone is given the chance to say there is something wrong with those people. Democratic despotism is the imposition of policy and its violent possibilities and impossibilities on the wrong(ed).

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

#### A critical point that marked this was in 2014 when liquid touch swapped water supplies yet ignoring proper testing measures which enabled the cost benefit analysis of black flesh only enabled by the privatization of touch – this same protocol has forced us to view water as something untouched, but every drop is marked by executive force with branding and colonial erasure

#### Political motivation transforming the slums of New York into gentrified areas displacing black and brown bodies while boosting taxes while boot lickers like Jeff Bezos pay nothing while at the same time incarcerating those same people who the state no longer saw value in decided would be less of a cost to society by then putting them in prisons

#### This politics of privatization creeps on every moment with every body repressing the stain of blood from the middle passage because those who win determine history

#### The African Slave Trade marked cartographic coherence onto water, this coherence within the topic has led us to understand incompletion, incompletion will always be part of an understanding the touch of liquid, only a Zen understanding of policy that uses a common under privilege is able to ask ourselves to live within the suffering of what resource has been taken
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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. The **Zen** heart **travels** without block. But we might also say it travels with nothing blocking it. And as we know first from Taoist philosophy, **nothingness** is **not emptiness**. It is not space. When the Zen heart travels through nothing, **nothing** is its constant companion. Nothing is the block through which it travels, on which it stands, in which it hangs. The block that makes no block into non non block. Nothing, naught, knot gives the Zen heart its directionless directions, its wandering syncopations, its tight-knit-open pansyncretic practices, allowing, in compelling, us to visit and **renew**. The unwatchable place we make when we watch with **one another**, having refused to watch one another, having refused one and another, is shared, unblocked, unloaded into a kink, the non non block of our stranded strand. What we want is usually said to be all bound up with what we don’t have. Zoe Leonard’s been talking about what we want, though, slantedly, in the dimensionless infinity room we can’t even crawl around in when we cruise the rub and whirr of the city as a grove of aspen in late fall, in the **mountains**, held and **unheld** at the bottom of the sea. She’s talking about what we want **in relation** to what we have when what we have is all this experience of not having, of shared nothing, of sharing nothingness. She speaks of and from a **common underprivilege**, from the privilege of the common underground, in and from the wealth of a precarity that goes from hand to hand, as a caress. Look at all the richness we have, she says, in having lost, in having suffered, in having been suffered, in suffering one another as if we were one another’s little children, as if we were in love with one another, as if we loved one another so much that all one and another can do is go. We want a president, Zoe says, **who’s loved** and **lost** all that with us, who’s shared **our little all, our little nothing**. Such a thing, the general and generative nothingness that is more and less than political, would be unprecedented. Maybe she doesn’t want a president; maybe she wants a precedent, the endlessly new thing of the absolutely no thing, its Zen xenogenerosity, its queer reproductivity, which keeps on beginning in beginning’s absence as ungoverned and ungovernable care(ss). Is it possible **to want what you have become in suffering**, both in the absence and in the depths of suffrage, **without wanting** what it is to **suffer**? Can you want what it is to be all, and want **what it is to be whole**, **without wanting to be complete?** Is it possible to crave the general incompleteness without that seemingly unbearable desire to be pierced, ruptured, broken? In lieu of the president we want and don’t want, we have Cedric Robinson, whom just a little while ago we lost. He says: If, in some spiteful play, one were compelled by some demon or god to choose a transgression against Nietzsche so profound and fundamental to his temperament and intention as to break apart the ground on which his philosophy stood, one could do no better than this: a society which has woven into its matrix for the purpose of suspending and neutralizing those forces antithetic to individual autonomy, the constructed reality that *all are equally incomplete. A logic is being jousted here.* Is it not so that the emergence of power as the instrument of certainty in human organization is seen by many to be the *consequence of* and response to the circumstances of inequality and sensed social entropy? Is it not so that individual autonomy, rare enough in the first condition and imperiled by the second, is in the final construction made foreign? And does not, logically, even autonomy require for its nurturance a hothouse of certitude similar to that required for the evolution of power – autonomy being to a degree a variant of power? The imperium of cotton and sugar not only hosted these fiendish early experiments in breaking collectivity on the line and inserting and asserting wills but also gave us an early glimpse of an integrated global supply chain. The breeding and marching or shipping of the enslaved southward and westward from Tidewater and Piedmont plantations, or inland from the Caribbean and Pacific Coasts of Colombia, to make **crops financed** through speculation on their torture-enforced, metric-imposed labor; and the bales of cotton or barrels of molasses loaded on ships in New Orleans or Bridgetown, insured in London, bound for Liverpool’s wholesale clearinghouses or Massachusetts distilleries, are links in a **global value** chain created by bankers, planters and **slavers**. But it is only in our time that this supply **chain** becomes fully **integrated** with the **flow** of the line inside the factory gates. Around the same time that operations management was coming to understand kaizen and the valuation of the flow of the line itself, it was also rethinking the linearity and finitude of the line. It is at this point that a new subdiscipline in operations management becomes firmly established as a rigorous academic discipline in the business schools: logistics. Of course, logistics already existed as a practice going back in military affairs as long as there have been sieges, invasions, and forts. Food, water, weapons, and people had to be transported and maintained to support any strategy of war. The African and **Trans-Atlantic** slave trade **represented** the great, hideous introduction of mass **logistics** for commercial rather than military or state purposes. It became the ghoulish lab of experiment in access for singular means of work and sex, worldmaking and subjectivization. Much would follow, including **infrastructure projects** for the circulation of people, goods, and information and, of course, more mass displacements, indentures and migrations in the brutal **enforcement against indigenous peoples** and he very idea and practice of indigeneity of the law of genocide and geocide. All of this logistics would not only bear this trademark of ‘continent of origin’ in the slave trade, but with usufruct the improvement of flow would become indistinguishable from racialization. Whiteness, as racialization’s origin and residuum, where access is imposition and submission in self-protection and self-determination rather than practicing incompleteness, is the self-improvement of flow. Blackness **becomes** what it already was, the prior **interruption**, the sabotage to come, the incapacity to breathe into the flow as the capacity for breath as means, for the breadth of means.

#### In the degradation of man, we must learn to understand that policy is never complete – to resist action is to adhere to the rhythm of an algorithmically composed society
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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. Then what’s the relation **between** **absolution** and **insolvency**? Between insovereignty and the **refusal** of the **absolute**? Some loosening. **Embrace’s** turning **loose**. It’s like salvation is that present and absolute tactility of field, which is unified only insofar as it is unreachable and ungraspable. Do leaders solve or dissolve or both? Are they dissolved? Are they dissolute? Is solving to reduce? Is lysis on the way to incompleteness? Could the tragedy have been avoided if early on he’d said, “Hey fragment, don’t go home”? Then it’s not that we 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. To be formed is to be formed in this rhythm, to be algorithmically composed, to be compelled to carry this rhythm but also to develop it, to **improve** it, to export and import it, which is to say that to be **algorithmically composed** is not just to be beaten but to beat. This beaten beating is what might be called **synaptic labor**. To answer the compulsion of logistical capitalism it is necessary not just to carry this beat but to improve it, not just to be available to this rhythm but to make this rhythm available, to assail with this rhythm, to prevail in this rhythm against the surrounding informality that unsettles this zero-one, one-two, with a militancy that is neither one nor its absence. What is synaptic labor? It is in the first instance to be opened involuntarily, by compulsion, capriciously, to this rhythm that kills. But this moment of equivalence, of subject embodiment, of exploitable nerve and affect is matched by a degraded discretion, an impulse to take the beating in order to be worthy of holding the whip, an impulse to plot the rhythm upon the earth, to regulate with the rhythm, to form roving beats against fugitive grooves. To **improve** the **land**, to make new the people, these old cries uttered over the killing rhythm come back intensively, invasively, internally in synaptic labor, which always begins with administering the beat to one’s own rhythm by **administering** a **one to own**. The drummer is discrete but indifferent. The rhythm operates by way of a line. This line is two, zero and one. It is an assembly line where the same is done and the same is improved, as if in courtship with difference, until it is done again. The forwarded email with a comment is the mundane *kaizen* of this rhythm. But this example is deceptive, too, because it is not action but composure, comportment, algorithmic composition that is at stake. Improvement occurs in synaptic labor mostly not through making, but through making more available for exploitation, a primitive accumulation of the senses, and expropriation of intention, attention, and tension. The rhythm operates by way of an assembly line that runs through society, through the social factory, not to make anything in particular but itself. The line of production is its own product. This was the real meaning of kaizen, the improvement of improvement: metrics, algorithmic composition for itself. This means another connection must always be made, and another zero-one opened by that connection. Every connection becomes an arbitrage, every nerve is **speculative** as it fires in synapsis with another **connection**, discrete, equivalent, discrete again in nervous metrics of improvement. This metrics is both neurological and pathological in the face of all undercommon measure. And it must pursue such fugitive measure by necessity, by the compulsion to make available and be made available to this rhythm everywhere, all the time, in the where and when of this killing beat.

#### Liquid control is social production – it seeks on all scales to correct the perversions of trade so as to make spaces and peoples of the illicit economy ready for speculation and valuation. It becomes the same guiding force that regulated intimacies that produce property bearing subjects – makes us all complicit with trade policy – It poisons the water to those who move into neighborhoods brimming with brown and Black life only to police and deaden it as result we are constantly training ourselves to correct the perversions in ourselves and others through the protection of water to breathe life into the world.

#### Thus, we affirm haptic care as a federal protection of water resources the same way debt flows to each other
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There’s a **touch**, a feel you want more of, which releases you. The closest Marx ever got to the general antagonism was when he said “from each according to his ability, to each according to his need” but we have read this as the possession of ability and the possession of need. What if we thought of the experiment of the hold as the absolute fluidity, the informality, of this condition of **need** and **ability**? What if ability and need were in constant play and we found someone who **dispossessed us** so that this movement was our inheritance. Your love makes me strong, your love makes me weak. What if “the between the two,” the lost desire, the **articulation**, was this **rhythm**, this **inherited experiment** of the shipped in the **churning waters** of flesh and expression that could grasp by letting go ability and need in **constant recombination**. If he moves me, sends me, sets me adrift in this way, amongst us in the **undercommons**. So long as she does this, she does not have to be. And what I want to do is say, **against** the **grain** of Fanon but in a way that he allows and requires me to say, no, let’s look at this shit from our perspective, from the perspective of the ones who are **relegated** to the **zone** of the crazy or, to be more precise, I hope, from the absent perspective, or absence of perspective, of the delirious, the more and less than crazy. And what we’re saying is we claim this, not just because it’s against the grain of the normative, not just because it allows us to call for something in the future; we claim this because this is who we are and what we do right now. Now, Fanon doesn’t say that in *Black Skin*, but I think he’s approaching that by the time he gets cut off, basically. This is not simply to repress or forget the pitfalls of spontaneity or the problems of national consciousness; it is, precisely, to remember them and what sends them; to consider what moves at and in this interplay of study and an ever expanding sense of who and what we are. That Derridean ‘who, we’ is already active in Fanon’s Algerian air – that open question of the human and its sound, which now we can take even further out into a general ecology or something like a Deleuzean ‘plane of immanence.’ And I think that you could project outward from Fanon’s last work and then come back and get something out of that interplay of the neurotic and the demand that he is beginning to approach in the chapters on mental disorders and anti-colonial struggle in *Wretched of the Earth*, because he’s recognizing that anti-colonial struggle is all bound up with the radical, sort of, non-normative form of cogitation, that it’s gotta be, because it is, thought in another way. It’s that shit that Shakespeare says: the lunatic, the lover, and the poet are of imagination all compact. Just edit it: the lunatic, the lover, and the anti-colonial guerilla, right?, are of imagination all compact. And that’s an aesthetic formulation that Shakespeare’s making. But it has massive social implications, which need to be drawn out, which in a certain sense Fanon is gesturing towards, something that we’re associating with blackness and the undercommons, something he tries to reach, something we’re trying to learn how to try to reach or reach for. But, what we understand as the social zone of blackness and the undercommons is the zone **precisely** in which **you make** that claim – so that **the demand** is a doublevoiced thing, an enunciation in the interest of more than what it calls for. You are saying what you want, though what you want is more than what you say, at the same time that you are saying what you are while in the guise of what you are not. There’s this other formulation of Baraka’s that McPhee would have known as well: “The new black music is this: find the self, then kill it.” That kinda thing gets said from the neurotic standpoint, in the neurotic habit, of the soloist. But the soloist is not one. Just like it was always about more than ‘the right to vote’ or the tastiness of the water that comes from this, as opposed to that, fountain. There’s **a touch, a feel** you want more of, which **releases you**. The closest Marx ever got to the general antagonism was when he said “from each according to his ability, to each according to his need” but we have read this as the possession of ability and the possession of need. What if we thought of the experiment of the hold as the **absolute fluidity**, the informality, of this condition of need and ability? What if ability and need were in constant play and we found someone who dispossessed us so that this movement was our inheritance. Your love makes me strong, your love makes me weak. What if “the between the two,” the **lost desire**, the articulation, was this rhythm, this inherited experiment of the shipped in the churning waters of flesh and expression that could grasp by letting go ability and need in constant recombination. If he moves me, sends me, sets me adrift in this way, amongst us in the undercommons. So long as she does this, she does not have to be. And in the undercommons of the **university** they meet **to elaborate** their **debt without credit**, their debt without count, without interest, without repayment. Here they meet those others who dwell in a different compulsion, in the same debt, a distance, forgetting, remembered again but only after. These other ones carry bags of newspaper clippings, or sit at the end of the bar, or stand at the stove cooking, or sit on a box at the newsstand, or speak through bars, or speak in tongues. These other ones have a passion to tell you what they have found, and they are surprised you want to listen, even though they’ve been expecting you. Sometimes the story is not clear, or it starts in a whisper. It goes around again but listen, it is funny again, every time. This knowledge has been **degraded**, and the **research rejected**. They can’t get access to books, and no one will publish them. Policy has concluded they are conspiratorial, heretical, criminal, amateur. Policy says they can’t handle debt and will never get credit. But if you listen to them they will tell you: we will not **handle credit**, and we cannot handle debt, debt **flows through us**, and there’s no time to tell you everything, so much bad debt, so much to forget and remember again. But if we listen to them they will say: come let’s plan something together. And that’s what we’re going to do. We’re telling all of you but we’re not telling anyone else.

#### This Affirmation asks you to Affirm a model of touch and feeling in order to generate the same processes seen in Zapatistas, Nei Mongol, The Notre Dame project, Black Bear Ranch – These movements tell you that liquid market touches operating system isn’t inherit but instead a recoding of flesh markets and its attempts to abstract our thought processes around existing movements

**SC ‘19** (Schools for Chiapas. . ““Development” and Extraction: Water Scarcity in Chiapas”. 7-9-2019. . https://schoolsforchiapas.org/development-and-extraction-water-scarcity-in-chiapas/. Accessed 7-13-2021)//Joey

In this context, capitalist **agribusiness** and mining interests are taking advantage of the situation to rapidly grab water resources and **privatize water access**. The soft drink giant Coca-Cola, for example, was granted exclusive rights to remove 150,000 gallons of water per day from the Huitepec aquifer on the mountain above the city of San Cristóbal de Las Casas. Huitepec farmers are running out of water in their wells, and entire neighborhoods of San Cristóbal are running out of water for several days each week. Coca-Cola pays almost no taxes and now sells more water than soft drinks. But privatized bottled water has a high price that rural communities will never be able to pay. At the same time, in the absence of available drinking water, mass-produced Coca-Cola carbonated beverages are trucked to remote rural communities and towns throughout Chiapas, leading to the phenomenon of the rural population drinking Coca-Cola instead of water. This grave situation has led to a 30% increase in diabetes deaths in just three years, just one way capitalist water grabbing spreads its “model of death” through the Mexican countryside. **Autonomous Zapatista** communities are facing this **water crisis** in the midst of a very difficult national political context. Their solution is to organize themselves and work with nature to find a way to restore water tables and sustainably manage aquifers. Luckily, **nature** has given us the most **effective**-possible **tool** for restore water tables: trees. As **Zapatista communities develop water autonomy**, the team of Schools for Chiapas has been tasked with supporting the creation of Water Forests, with nature in defense of life and dignity. All trees interact with soil humidity and atmospheric water, but in different ways. Trees draw water up from deep roots, which sometimes reach down more than 7 meters under the soil level, and distribute that water in leaves, branches and shallow roots. The kind of trees that use **shallow roots** and **distribute water** to their leaves and branches, where it is likely to be released as transpiration, may have the effect of **lowering** water **tables**. Eucalyptus trees are thought to have this effect, as up to 90% of their roots may be in the top 12 inches of soil. On the other hand, trees with deep roots that distribute water to their shallower roots, particularly at nighttime, where it can be extracted by dry soil and the roots of other plants, can contribute to a rising water table. This effect is known as hydraulic lift, and a well-known example is found in Oak trees (Quercus spp.). Hydraulic lift is one of several mechanisms that trees use to **protect water resources**. Providing shade to limit solar radiation and reduce daytime temperatures is another major contribution to water system conservation. In this sense, the height and darkness of tree shade is highly important, not only to water conservation but also to other agroecological functions, such as providing partial light to shade crops and giving farm animals a place to spend the hot hours of the day. Another important way that trees protect water is by distributing leaf litter—either throughout the year in the case of evergreens, or especially during one season—which physically protects the soil from the sun’s rays, as well as **providing carbon** and **microclimatic conditions** that favor the growth of microbial communities which, in turn, support root systems and diverse plant communities. In this way, diverse, native forests are the hands-down best option for recovering aquifers, although a vast range of multi-canopy agroforestry systems may also provide important water-conserving functions. This summer, Schools for Chiapas researchers Rosa López and Nils McCune are studying **native Chiapas** tree species that have the potential to recover groundwater and maintain water supplies to rural communities. Broadening the scope of agroecological work that the organization has done, and working in tandem with the rest our our team in San Cristobal, this **research** ties directly into its current Food Forest work with the **autonomous** secondary **schools**. Using community research methods, vital local knowledge—particularly that of community elders— form the basis for a peasant-based, community-organized efforts to reforest riparian areas and water sources with trees known to replenish aquifers. Our ultimate hope is that these Water Forests might begin as community tree nurseries, cared for by educators and students of the secondary schools. Having been meticulously researched, identified, collected, planted in nursery bags, and nurtured, these trees would then be planted out into the communities around the schools. This would be a **substantial** **contribution** to the capacity of **Mayan autonomous communities** to maintain their own **water systems** **sustainably** and **autonomously** for now and into the future.

#### Absent voting Aff – The cartographic coherence of liquid protection results in an abstraction process of management that purpurates carcel policy failure and extinction

Beller ‘21 – Jonathan Beller is Professor of Humanities and Media Studies and co-founder of the Graduate Program in Media Studies at Pratt Institute. (“The World Computer: Derivative Conditions of Racial Capitalism,” 2021, pg. 6-11)//Joey

Taking the notion that **Capital** was always a **computer** as a starting point (DyerWitheford, 2013), The World Computer understands the history of the commodification of life as a process of **encrypting** the **world’s myriad qualities** as quantities. Formal and informal techniques, from double-entry bookkeeping and racialization, to the rise of information and discrete state machines, imposed and extended the **tyranny of racial capital’s** relentless **calculus** of profit. By means of the coercive colonization of almost all social spaces, categories, and representations—where today language, image, music, and communication all depend upon a computational substrate that is an outgrowth of **fixed capital**— all, or nearly all, expressivity has been captured in the dialectic of massive capital accumulation on the one side and radical dispossession on the other. Currently the money-likeness of expression—visible as “likes” and in other attention metrics that treat attention and affect as currency—is symptomatic of the **financialization** of daily **life** (Martin, 2015a). All expression, no matter what its valence, is **conscripted** by **algorithms** of profit that **intensify inequality** by being put in the service of racial capitalism; consequently, we are experiencing a **near-apocalyptic**, **world-scale failure** to be able to address **global crises** including migration for reparations, **carceral systems, genocide, militarism, climate racism, racism, pandemic, anti-Blackness, extinction**, and other geopolitical ills. The colonization of semiotics by racial capital has rendered all “democratic” modes of governance outmoded save those designed for the violent purpose of extracting profits for the enfranchised. Culturally these modes of extraction take the form of fractal fascism. An understanding that informationalized semiotic practices function as **financial derivatives** may allow for a **reimagining** of the relationship between **language**, visuality, and that other economic medium, namely money, in an attempt to **reprogram economy** and therefore the creation and distribution of value—and thus also the politics and potentials of representation. In what would amount to an end to postmodernism understood as the cultural logic of late capitalism, our **revolutionary politics** require, as did the communisms of the early twentieth century, a new type of economic program. In the age of computation, putting political economy back on the table implies a **reprogramming** of our **cultural logics** as economic media for the radical redress of the ills of exploitation and the democratization of the distribution of the world social product. Sustainable communism requires the **decolonizaton of abstraction** and the remaking of the protocols of social practice that give rise to real abstraction. While computational racial capital may appear in the guise of its many instances (e.g., the state form, fractal fascisms, institutional entrenchment, ambient social media, carceral systems, military-industrial complexes, a fleeting affective dispensation, a click, any datalogical event), the world computer endeavors to name the highest order abstraction of the transnational and indeed transspecies and multiversal historicomaterial logic that coordinates—and in reality (such as it is) ordinates—the planetary bios—at myriad levels of scale and with vast, increasingly integrated systems. Because of the planetary— and from an epistemological standpoint, cosmic—scope of this encroachment, along with the physical and **metaphysical consequences** thereof, it will also be demonstrated here that computational racial capital, as the world computer, commands the **value-extractive reprogramming** of ontologies—a reformatting of life, time and cosmos by means of information. This reformatting is practical-material, representational, physical, and metaphysical, but above all, political-economic. Digitization, parallel processing, the Hayekian market, informatics, financialization. The problem that is computational racial capitalism is known mostly by its scattered symptoms: burnout, add, psychosis, genocide, famine, border walls, camps, interminable war, settler colonialism, carceral society, climate injustice, militarized policing, state terrorism, plutocracy, Apple, Google, tech boosterisms, business innovation, high school shootings, bail bonds, megalomania, neo-Fascist grandstanding, Lamborghinis, super yachts and the like. Like our words, images, and thoughts, our problems do **not** exist in **isolation**, even though atomization, separation, and social alienation may seem to render them modular. Though ostensibly disparate and unevenly distributed, these problems and too many others to name here are profoundly integrated in and through their striated differentiation. The World Computer endeavors to offer a partial description of the rise and function of this matrix of extractive abstraction that results from the historically imposed conversion of any and every thing whatever into an informatic asset that is, in one way or another, a derivative exposure to risk; a description of the abstract machines of differentiation and integration, separation and accumulation, profit and dispossession—machines that, though abstract, function in an integrated fashion. They function concretely by crunching information, shattering life, and shedding blood. d more recently with the Extinction Rebellion, the Chilean uprising, and even perhaps the potentials of #AOC, Ilhan Omar, and Rashida Tlaib we can observe other modes of pixel programming besides those composed in the key of fractal versions of charismatic fascism—and therefore other ways of organizing the attentional product. “Black Twitter”—including @Nettaaaaaaaa (Johnetta Elzie), @Tefpoe (War Machine III), @deray (DeRay Mckesson)— Jewish Voice for Peace, and the bds movement are among countless examples of folks working to change the way the United States understands racism and the everydayness of the legacies of slavery: by focusing critical attention on the diurnal experiences of racism and police violence. On the **academic front**, **intellectuals** and activists make their marks and assemble the ranks, challenging settler colonialism, carceral society, police brutality, imperialist war, structural violence, homophobia, heteropatriarchy, transphobia, racial capitalism, and other matrices of violence even as they face penal threats, lawsuits, institutional ostracism, and alt-right blowback (Canary Mission!). Among the ways these challenges are posed is the demonstration that **status quo violence** is presupposed and **perpetuated** by the **knowledge** base and ways of knowing. These ways of knowing, once considered cultural, institutional, and ideological are increasingly to be understood as also technological and mediological—algorithmic. The focus, solidarity, documentation, community building, pedagogy, outcry, and organizing of protest, new knowledge, and counteraffect made possible by numerous activists using social media, broadly understood, cannot be underestimated. Here, in the spirit of Negar Mottahedeh’s and Jodi Dean’s more affirmative takes on selfie dialectics, we sense that the cybernetic outgrowth of social media is also an outgrowth of the commons, of something like what the early Marx might have called species life and species consciousness—a welling up “from below” of liberatory aspirations, or, more dialectically perhaps, a repository of modes of strugle and a transmission of subaltern becoming: a postliterary “world literature.”5 One can in fact participate in platforms like Instagram, Tumblr, YouTube, and others to help create a sustaining environment for, for example, gender-queer becoming, anti-Zionist activism, #BlackLivesMatter, and much else. 6 These scenes of cultural production have their own specific and often alternative relation to the logistics of attention economy. However, there is a war over the utility, meaning, potentials, and proprietary control of these technologies and performances (to say nothing of the conversion of all semiotic exchange into a medium of advertising or other types of value-extraction). My point is obvious: present media technologies of value extraction and creation are also social, historical, and biosynthetic outgrowths; they are part of political economy and thus sites of strugle. In this respect, they are economic media.

#### The result of computational fusion to the environment is interactivity – Fascism begins a software update to begin neurophenomenological control

**Parisi ‘13** (Luciana Parisi. . “ Luciana Parisi, Contagious Architecture: Computation, Aesthetics, and Space”. https://philpapers.org/rec/PARCAC-6. Accessed 7-15-2021)//Joey

This notion of **interactivity**, however, despite being rooted in the **biophysical** and **evolutionary** vision of autopoiesis, seems to be a far cry from the more general notion of responsive environments in which the human user seems to directly animate algorithmic objects. Here the **solipsistic ontology** of **autopoiesis** defines a center able to **incorporate interactive** parts into one architectural whole. It seems that the recent trend toward “ **responsive environment** ”projects seems to be exactly framed according to this ontology. 64 As Lucy Bullivant explains, the notion of interaction has been challenged because it merely describes a unidirectional pattern of communication in which software delimits the potentialities of users. 65 The notion of responsiveness, on the other hand, includes visitors, participants, and users: the ultimate **manipulators** of structures, buildings, and spaces. In particular, **responsive environments** define “ spaces that interact with the people who use them. ” 66 Responsive environments are said to have **phenomenological impact**, “ meaning that the body is able to directly experience its environment in a very direct and personal way. ” 67 By focusing on how the output of the observer/participant is able to reconfigure the relationship between the input and the output, responsive environment projects, such as the sound installation Volume by UVA, do not require people to understand the algorithmic model in order to become part of the overall architecture. From the standpoint of computation, this general space of experience is instead the space of randomness, of unsynthesizable quantities that are common to all actualities. The oneness of the space of experience is therefore a quantum defined by the primacy of incomputable quantities, whose discrete infinities (or Omega probabilities) infect the binary sequences of soft thought. Random quantities are not simply designed in a **software program**, but are internal anomalies that connect actualities without the latter becoming synthesized into one form, regardless of whether it involves neural, electrochemical, or digital computation. This is not to deny reality to the **biophysical** and **biodigital** architectures of thought, by privileging a mathematical ontology wherein eternal forms or ideas remain incorruptible and distinct from matter. On the contrary, **soft thought** as immanent experience can only reveal that **incomputable quantities** infect, but do not constitute, physical, biological, and technological actualities. The contagious architecture of these quantic infinities turns the computational grid into a Swiss cheese of irregular holes, rough edges, and blind spots. From this standpoint, computation can no longer be saved from the uncertainties of unknown worlds, but has instead become as open to contingencies as biological and physical fields of knowledge. This means that the **epistemological investigation** into **neurocomputational architectures** of thought cannot circumvent the speculative drive toward unknown thoughts and unprecedented occasions of experience. Similarly, if **neuroarchitecture** is a way to grasp the **aesthetic impact** of **software** in spatial design, it will have to venture **beyond neurophenomenological** **cognition** by countereffectuating neurophysical architecture with the actualities of soft thought. By suspending the relational circuit between the world and the brain, soft thought will not simply work to guarantee the transmission of information from one terminus to another by cutting a clear passage through the clutter of bodies, machines, locations, and climates. Similarly, soft thought is not equivalent to the “ datafication ”of things and cannot be contained within data (e.g., images, texts, code, and speech). Instead, soft thought implies an algorithmic aesthetics proper to **computational space**, revealing that incomputable quanta are in the foreground of our **programming culture**. From another standpoint, the emphasis on the new tendencies of **algorithms** to be overshadowed by infinite volumes of data explains the ingression of **computational logic** into **culture**. What is important here is not that culture has become **doomed** by the **automated rules** that transform its variety of expressions into data that can be classified, profiled, and consumed. Instead, the addition of random quantities to finite procedures turns automation into a computational adventure resulting in the determination of new cultural actualities. Instead of being exhausted by the formalism of rules or symbols that execute instructions, automated processing requires a semiopen architecture of axioms, whereby existing postulates are there to be superseded by others that can transform infinite quantities into contingent probabilities. Incompleteness in axiomatics thus brings to light the fact that automated processing is not predeterminate, but rather tends toward new determinations. In making this claim I do not intend to suggest that computation can now explain culture, aesthetics, and thought because it can account for change. My contention is rather that there is a **concrete culture**, an **aesthetic** and a mode of thought, specific to the computational production of new probabilities. Nevertheless, according to Neal Leach, the complexity and the dynamic capacities of discretely computed objects — a complexity and a dynamics that define new spatial relations — can only be the result of autonomous **design agents** which are able to self-organize. 88 For an instance, Leach draws on the Kokkugia network of Australian architects, who have devel oped a multiagent design tool based on the notion of swarm intelligence. This multiagent system does not, however, simply simulate or map actual populations of agents in order to find optimal solutions for urban planning. On the contrary, this is a flexible system based on self-generating objects-agents, which **interact** with one another and thus reveal spatial mobility. To put it more simply: as digital computational models have become dynamic processes (driven by evolving and swarming algorithms), the Euclidean grid of discrete objects has turned into a continuous variation of form. What is at stake with these generative algorithms is that the notion of discreteness (parts and objects defined by finite sets of instruction) has changed, and now includes a model of interactive agents that evolve in and through time. Nevertheless, this is not to say that these aqueous qualities confuse the singularity of water with that of oxygen. Since qualities are intrinsic to these objects, they are indissoluble from them, and yet irreducible to this or that particular object. From this example, it is not only evident that qualities define the indissoluble singularity of an object; it is also clear that quantities and their relations define the singularity of an object. For instance, the molecule of water is composed of two atoms of hydrogen and one of oxygen. The hydrogen atoms are attached to one side of the oxygen atom, resulting in a water molecule that has a positive charge on the side of the hydrogen atoms and a negative charge on the other side, where the oxygen atom is. Since opposite electrical charges attract, water molecules will tend to attract each other, making water “ sticky. ”But these numerical and electrical quantities also compose other objects, and relate objects together. Each and any object is indeed not only chemically composed of or related to another object; in addition, its algorithmic computations act to chemically constitute the operations of an object, which can also be generative of other objects and relations. This example could explain why Harman ’ s theory of objects is relevant to the articulation of algorithmic objects, which are not simply quantities of physical qualities, but are themselves qualitative quantities. For **cognitivism**, the condition for algorithmic processing is any physical architecture that runs the **instructions** through the connection of data that form a neural network; for enactivism, this condition is an environment in which the neural structure of cognition is dynamically triggered through sensorimotor perception. Thus while for cognitivism algorithmic processing is equivalent to cognitive states, for enactivism it is the effect of being **embedded** within an environment that allows cognitive states (as neural changes) to emerge. Consequently, and although they offer what seem to be **incompatible ontological frameworks**, both approaches conceive of algorithms as executable procedures, as codes that perform thoughts upon a material substratum, or which cause thoughts to emerge from the latter. Yet regardless of whether these thoughts emerge from neural connections or are constructed throughout the sensorimotor schema of perception, algorithmic procedures remain the executers of thought. In short, the conditions for algorithmic processing are established by the sense in which the physical architecture of the brain is always already set to ensure the performance of thought. What is missing from these approaches is the possibility of conceiving algorithmic processing as a mode of thought, an expression or finite actuality, and not as the instrument through which thought can be performed, whether through neural nets or enacted via embodiment. This means that if computation does not explain cognition, then it is also problematic to describe cognition as a totalizing function of thought defining the “ autonomy and intentionality of life . . . that encompasses the organism, one ’ s subjectively lived body, and the life-world. ” 24 Algorithmic modes of thought must be conceived away from mere mechanical (or predetermined) functions, and yet they cannot simply be replaced with the ontobiological ground enacting thought as the full force of life. Neither mechanical functionalism nor embedded vitalism can explain the persistence of algorithms as actual modes of thought or as finite expressions of infinities. But how can we account for these modes of thought away from mechanistic and vitalist conditions? How can we explain algorithmic thought as an actual mode determined by its own prehension of the infinite infinities of thought? It is impossible to deny that **algorithmic architecture** has become the expression of a **neurocognitive model** of thought. From models of artificial intelligence to media of augmented perception (including mobile devices), from neural networks to robotics prosthetics, algorithmic architecture has become housed in a multiplicity of physical and mechanical structures that aim to strip away all abstractions from rational processing. This has meant that thought, as a result of the rise of digital design, has come to exist independently of any material substructure; at the same time, the assumption that thought is granted by the existence of a specific materiality has also been challenged. It is noticeable that since their computational inception, architectures of thought — from the Turing machine, neural networks, and self-emergent autopoietic structures to multiagent systems and the most recent robotic models of enacted or embodied cognition and affective computing 33— have exceeded their metaphysical premises, questioning both the ideality of mathematical form and the empiricism of sensorimotor data (including emotional and qualitative patterns) in the definition of cognition. In this sense, the more thought has become computed, the more it has become detached from the mathematical and **biological substratum** of cognition, and it has instead become an autonomous computational expression of the incomputable residues of incomprehensible and incompressible data.

#### Local insurgency must be met with shared abstraction of what has become codified - To cope is to rejoice in the water we drink out of thirst, the factors that drain us into feelings of thirst require we feel, this insurgency should be understood as a jay walker within the cracks of policy

**Harney and Moten ‘21** (Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. "ALL INCOMPLETE" (2021): (Stefano Harney is the Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University., Fred Moten is the professor of Performance Studies at New York University and has taught previously at University of California, Riverside, Duke University, Brown University, and the University of Iowa)//Joey

The undercommons is not a coalition. It’s an absolutely open secret, with no professional ambition. The devaluation of local insurgency takes the form of forgetting, which then manifests itself as mourning for the mass movement that never was, some dreamy coalescence of undishonored ones, a resurrection of this one or that other one that’s done gone, like some kind of **corporate afterlife**. Michael Porter says the fundamental question of strategy is how to get your company out of the market. This exodus takes the form of command, the arbitrary power to make policy but also the regulation and governance of externalities. Policy says: I fixed myself so I can help you. Meanwhile, **we squat planning**. Don’t prove; don’t improve; don’t even show. This is the romantic dream of the itinerant barbecue. We prepare fire table from oil drum, an immanence (that interinanimation of limit and transgression) always there as something more and less than itself, because the linepulse is so much more and less than that and seems to spread and wonder like a spill, like a neither singular nor plural activity of aggressive bordering or demarcation in (violation of) every locale, everywhere but extraterritorial, in touch but way out, the chic but disenchanted *bons temps* of the shipped, who feel remotely, their afterlife being fleshly and marked by irregular exchange. **Algorithm** is the **imposition** – by rule, at scale – of the impossible task of **shared abstraction**. Mary Pat Brady shows how scale’s bad feel, and the bad feelings the desire for scale requires and induces, are **implications** of this **shared abstraction**, this abstracted sharing, this **discretionary metaphysics** of individuation given in electronic lock step and brutal (single-)line dance as pulse **enforcement’s networked composition**.25 On all them other hands, algoriddim is contact improvisational violence to the **zero-one/one-two**, a disruption of its protocols, which form the binary rhythm of the iron system as Adorno accurately described and inaccurately ascribed it. When the senses become theoreticians in their practice a **discomposition** of the individual occurs; **flesh/ blackness**, as the end/**death** of the individual, is the individual’s decomposition. The move from logistics to logisticality – from **forced availability** (“in the flesh” as Hortense Spillers puts it) to a **mechanics** of **undercommon hapticality** – is, itself, spooky action at a distance, the exterior affects and effects of the intramural. We study the relation between the intramural, as Spillers works it, and entanglement, as Silva works that. They breathe **agony into empathy** and **empathy into ethics** and **we feel** that; they weave difference without separation and we wear that. In the interest of being really useful, we study the minor internal contact and internecine radiation of various quartets, which remain unheard by the ones, you know, the zero-ones/one-twos, who have interests, who are interested in being themselves in the interest of some kind of owning, as if owning were a mode of defense. The only defense is openness. The only owning is unowning. Give everything away until you have nothing. Give it all away until you are nothing. You got to give it up. You can’t get ahold of it; you gotta hope, against hope, that it gets ahold of you. That’s what the (zero-) ones(-twos) call stealing, when neither self nor world are graspable, which is to say that the closer you get to grasping either one, the closer we get to disappearing. But you already know that everything in blurred lines was already there in got to give it up. In the face of this **stealing** from the **stolen** what we continue to receive in them is their stealing away, in undercommon assembly, in the thickness, in varying sharpnesses of drafting and overdrafting, of speculative, anarchitectural, antinational, profanational drawing, of parabolic turns and eccentric, centrifugal, extracircular returns of the drawing of breath, drawn away from it, in and out of itself, off scale, over (and under) rule, (up) against it. Our high-low monastic nothingness is irrectangular blurrrrr, out of line and out of round and out of turn, multiply tabled/terkhed/torqued/ twerked/tongued, our uncorralled chorale. The **general abstraction** is like the El gone underground. Poetic detachment is public transportation – a **social force**, or a popular campaign, or a populous expedition. It’s not a team but it is a kind of teeming, an inappropriable swarm having a funky and inappropriately good time, dispersed as an infinite series of breaks in an infinite passion. Abandon in abandonment can’t be read in any other way. If you’re stranded and you can’t go home, or can’t get out, then you have to go farther away and further out. If you’re fallen and you can’t get up, all you can do is get down until you pierce the bottom of the broken world and its infinite crises in and out of regulation. So you ground, knowing that it’s necessary but insufficient, until exhausted; with neither world enough nor time, earth be present and been gone. Ascension comes to those who dig, without global position, in turned, anaproprioceptive descent, a common insurgency you twist and shout, as how you remain, as how you stay. To stay *there*, in a constant rehearsal of being sent from there into there’s other plane as there’s other plain, is to place not just this or that concept of this or that object into question; it is, rather, to place the concept as such under an intense generative and degenerative distress. Black study is just this extraconceptual or anaconceptual force, counter-negative propulsion written in duplicate on the same sheet, cut along a jagged line, serrated, winding, a chirographic dance up to the instrument and through it, a solo so multiple, an instrument so deeply and habitually prepared, an indenture so commonly disbursed, an abstraction so dispersively sown, that even **financialization falters**. It can neither be insured nor secured. It’s like it has been played so hard that tuning is other than what it is, like tuning is illuminated, like a contract for **destruction** and **rebuilding** that can only be fulfilled in something both more and less than performance. Everything’s written together, huh? We anticipate and survive being torn apart. **Disruptive innovation** is the term in management science – especially in the field of strategy – that is used to designate a kaizen event in the social field. A kaizen event is an unexpected turn in the flow of the line, or a surprising insight about that flow, that is then integrated as an improvement to the flow. As Marina Vishmidt astutely points out in the context of contemporary art, this disruption of the flow lines of assembly makes no distinction between the flow and those who reproduce it.64 We are called things and are then called upon to be nimble Canadian salesmen full of innovative volition in a Great White North gone global. We are everywhere degraded in common loneliness and flattered every day in being made to make new theories of connection. Social life is subject to metrics that seek out and valorize disruption as improvement and improvement as the only metric, leaving any repose in social life – what we would call, with Valentina Desideri, our militant conservation, the fermentation of our desires – subject to attack as anti-social. And so, we must dissemble in order to renew our habits of assembly so **we can breathe** in the breadth of our means. **Communal sensual life emerges** in the hapticality of those called upon to **assemble** this **flow**, those who dissemble this flow in their renewed assembly, running **underground** and overhead and **undercommon**. This is the uncontrollable improvisational effect of a general and material communicability that refuses the virtualization that forms its shadowed, accidental fellow travelers. This living, poetic communicability lays down other lines that it exceeds, riding the blinds, jaywalking the streets, or staying home in sub-domestic, ante-logistic transmutation. Or, maybe what’s at stake is the trace of perfume that has been released. It is changed in being-sensual, depurified in being breathed. There is a socialization of essence that is given in and as sociality itself and maybe this is what Marx was talking about under the rubric of sensuous activity, but against the grain of his adherence to a logic and metaphysics of (individuation in) relation. All this makes you wonder what the difference is between strategy and faith. When we say difference, here, what we really mean is caress – how strategy and faith rub up against one another in a kind of haptic eclipse, or auditory submergence, or olfactory disruption, or gustatory swooning of the overview. In this regard, strategic essentialism is something like the soul feast’s homiletic share or, more precisely, the ana- and ani-charismatic sharing of the homiletic function in and by the congregation. When we say preach when we hear preaching we be preaching. It’s like a conference of the birds – a constant re-materialization and proliferation of the concept; a constant socialization of the concept rather than some kind of expedient decree by some kind of self-appointed consultant who finds himself to have been gifted with the overlooking and overseeing power of the overview. The consultant’s capture and redeployment of strategic essentialism is faithless and lonely. It exudes the sovereign religiosity of the non-believer. Let me tell you what we need or don’t need, it says, always doubling down on you whenever it says we with a heavy, I/thou imposition, a charismatic boom that somehow both belies and confirms its sadness in the serial deanimation of its personal relationships, which is felt by us as the toxic solace of being spoken to and of by the one who is supposed to know. So maybe it’s just a matter of where **strategic essentialism**, strategic universalism, or the concept, in general, are coming from. Unremitting predication bears a boogie-woogie rumble, where deferred dream turns to victorious rendezvous. Down here underground, where the kingdom of God is overthrown and out of hand and hand to hand, there’s a general griot going on. His (and that of any of his representatives’, the ones who must be representing us but can’t) strategy is exhausted and surrounded by our plans. The point here is a nagging one. Maybe it was wrong to propose that the petty bourgeoisie might make the choice to commit suicide as a class. Newton is working on this problem with his idea of revolutionary suicide. He seems not to require the entirety of the class but at the same time to seek some way for that partiality **not** to fall into **individualism**. His is not simply a vanguardist asceticism – that the leadership must ‘die for the people’ – but rather an understanding of the way the petty bourgeoisie could have it both ways, or in other words, how the petty bourgeoisie were/are a true class, operating between the bourgeoisie and the workers. This was the class Newton met in Oakland as his father took him around when it was time for people to pay the monthly bill for the household furnishings they’d bought on time. He saw the durability of a class of local collectors, gathering the evilly distilled wealth of the neighborhood and thereby playing the indispensable role of distinguishing the workers and the lumpen through the function of management and finance; he also saw through mere analysis, which is, in itself, held as comfortably in the hand of policy as a mace or a pike; he saw through what Cabral called the structure of “ownership in society,” which never overlaps directly with the ownership *of* society, to which the furniture dealer, the furniture manufacturer, and the professor lay claim.