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## 1

#### 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. Medical policy and racial capitalist monopolization are two sides of the same coin—both are driven by the compulsive feedback loop of individuated ownership. Premising politics on either “merging” or “breaking up” corporate entities first requires 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.**

#### 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 requires imperial domination in order to secure national security in the name of God

#### A critical point that marked this was Sanofi testing which began in 2020 ignoring proper testing measures which 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 medical informatic production as something untouched, but every transaction or reorientation 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 public and private sectors so that both may be weaponized against the social life of the undercommons
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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**.

#### 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.

#### We affirm logisticality as an ante-competitive practice of undercommon (dis)assembly for ip medical protection that steals away from debate’s metaphysics of individuation

#### Debate is a form of synaptic labor where ballots over consecutive rounds synchronize participants to a settler rhythm that algorithmically entrenches logistical subjectivity. Only a practice of study that emphasizes the fugitive discomposition of the self-possessed subject can produce an ungovernable theory-in-praxis. Voting affirmative is a form of irregular exchange that recognizes that what can never be stolen is the power to give everything away
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**There is a rhythm making a world**, and the time and space this rhythm beats out **invites individuation in this world**. This is a rhythm that has been around for **five hundred years**. But now it **sounds to itself like the only rhythm**, the rhythm of the world, and of the individuals who strive to live in that world. It is the rhythm of **commodity production by commodities**, **internally disrupted** at its origin. **The first beat renders each commodity separate, bordered, isolated from the next**. **The second beat renders every thing equal to every other thing**. **The first beat makes every thing discrete**. **The second beat makes everything the same**. Time and space order this rhythm, and are ordered by it. This is a **settler rhythm**, this one-two of **capitalist production**, a rhythm of citizen and subject, of dividuation and individuation, of **genocide and law**. It sounds out by **expropriating any other movement of the beat**. It asserts **that nothing else can be heard**, **that nothing else need be felt**. It is in short **a killing rhythm**, as Fanon warned at the end of *Les Damnés de la Terre*. But this rhythm has always been set amidst, and beset by, the **general antagonism**, the cacophony of beats, lines, falsettos, and growls, of hips, feet, hands, of bells, chimes, and chants, **an undercommon track**. At the heart of its production is a certain **indiscretion**, a certain **differentiation that will not separate**, an **unbordered consolation against isolation**, a **haptical resonance** that makes possible and impossible this killing rhythm, the undercommon track that would remain **fugitive from the emerging logistics of this deadly rhythm and exhaust it**. Still, today this beating of commodity on commodity insists on a world as never before, **wraps its beats around the earth** in which **the party is compulsory**. And it penetrates deep into what did not appear vulnerable or even possible to **force into its time and space**. **Its one-two becomes a zero-one, zero-one** as it **sorts thoughts, affects, flesh, information, nerves, in ever more precise and minute attributes of duplicate separation**. In short, **this rhythm becomes an algorithm**. Every thing it captures, every thing it invades, every thing it settles is set with a beat that is **compelled to hear itself everywhere, feel itself everywhere**. **This compulsion drives deeper into the bodies it activates, the information it circulates, the nerves it fires to new connections, new networks of discretion and equivalence**. Its arbitrage opens this discretion in what was thought to be indivisible, whole, singular, and then opening this discretion closes it in equivalence, clears it for the next beat at the new margins of its rapacious drumming. So, too, does its time and space **force every thing into the claustrophobia of its world beat**, **every thing that is not fugitive is lost**. **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. **This is the logistics of algorithmic composition, and the rhythm of logistical capitalism**, which envisions and **by envisioning envelops and entraps the earth in a world that runs to the end of the earth and is the end of the earth**. **Logistics runs the globe**, **runs after the earth and the logisticality that has developed as a capacity on this earth**. Logistics extends, expands, accumulates the space and time of a capitalism driven across the earth by the algorithmic zero-one/one-two beat. And **by doing so it forces upon the earth, the world**. **If logisticality is the resident capacity to live on the earth**, logistics is the **regulation of that capacity in the service of making the world**, the zero-one, one-two world that **pursues the general antagonism of life on earth**. The world is posed as the way to live on the earth as **the individual is posed as the way to live in the world**. **To live in the world as an individual is therefore to be logistic, and to be logistic is to settle into a rhythm that kills, to beat out that rhythm over the undercommon track that keeps (giving away) its own measure**. To say that synaptic labor generalizes a certain availability is also to say that insofar as it is derivation, reduction, residuality, it cannot but be less amidst its drive to be more and to improve continuously. And so too for the desperate and dangerous acts of individuation, of global analysis, of **policy**, of **settlement**, of a finally **imperial antipathy to empathy** – a resonance open before it was opened and after it was enclosed. What one might call **the social life of things is important** only insofar as it allows us to imagine that **social life is not a relation between things** but is, rather, that **field of rub and rupture** that works, while **being the work of, no one, nothing**, in its **absolute richness**. **Such (social) work is no work at all but the madness remains**; rub and rupture all but emerge, but in nothing like an emergence, as something imprecision requires us to talk about as if it were some thing, not just discrete but pure. More specifically, almost salvifically, we want to call it a line, or a pulse, but it won’t come. **Ani*mater*ial riddim cutting rhythm cutting method** – **microtonality’s overpopulation of measure**, *Zaum* preoccupying *Raum* with an extrarational, hyperganjic, dancehallsanskritic, anachorasmiatic, al-Mashic, all mashed up buzz, the **alternate groove** we in, the **devalued and invaluable local insurgency** – disobeys our most loving invocation. **This gift of spirit gives itself away** and **zero-one/one-two is left embittered**. **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**. So we crossfade, Zo, where **the social skills of the anti-social can’t compare to the sociality of the more + less than skilled whose only problem is that they have no problem**. **The shit they call social skills is an algorithm for managing anti-sociality**. The zero-ones, who can only be where the other ones are, can’t compare to the more + less than ones who be everywhere. **Sensory processing order is the emergence and hierarchization of things**, which is some primitive shit to the more + less than ones who are in the mist, who are the midst, who **mix disorder**. You the **mixer**, **minor mixmaster in mining**, **digging with love**. We love you **don’t even begin to say**. We think we found each other **ain’t even close**. **The overpopulation of the measure**. The **overcrowding**. The forming of the pit. The shaping of **the palestra**. The non-invasive, unaxed clearing. **The subatomic trees**. **The cosmological feast**. **The factitious jam**. The zero-ones want a **pre-given, accountable, measured formula** for something that **is only worked in provisional, revisional practice where we have no problem, where the problem disappears in precision and impurity, where we must move in measure like a dancer**. Man! Even in Eliot, stealing away from certain bankerish tendencies, as if stolen by Olson, even in his phallo-projective embrace of being open(ed), **savoir-faire is everywhere!**26

#### Debaters should play in fugitive scenario planning indebted to each other its our sa---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).

#### 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. . “Cosmotechnics as Cosmopolitics”. No Publication. https://www.e-flux.com/journal/86/161887/cosmotechnics-as-cosmopolitics/. Accessed 9-24-2021)//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.

#### synaptic labor is interactivity – Fascism jumpstarts 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.