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#### Logistics and Media Flows are intrinsically entangled – Supply Chain Networks require communication to circulate culture and knowledge to coordinate and quell threats to Logistical Infrastructures.
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media and logistics are global operating systems. They set conditions for the circulation of information and culture. They activate inventories of materials and networks of infrastructure. They coordinate interfaces between bodies, objects, and environments. Deployed in ongoing projects of capitalization and exploitation, often in the name of global connection, consumption, and security, they affect the day-to-day lives of people around the world. And they are inextricably entangled with one another. Even the text of this book has been enclosed in packets, transmitted, and reassembled innumerable times—a process guided by logistical principles. The materials that constitute it, whether printed on paper or housed in Amazon’s cloud storage, were transmitted via trucks, containers, pallets, and hands, their movement likely managed using logistical software. Logistics—the organization and coordination of resources to manufacture and distribute global commodities—depends not only on software and data infrastructures but on a mass of screens, communications devices, and paperwork. Assembly Codes is the first collection to critically interrogate the specific points of contact, dependence, and friction between media and logistics. We argue that the fundamental interconnections between these two systems are essential not only to understanding both of their operations but to the contemporary circulation of culture on a global scale. To describe the dynamics of media today—its production and industries, its vast infrastructures, its material forms, and its global movements—a basic conception of the supply chain and the science of coordinating techniques is necessary. For the operations of global logistics, a focus on media, whether in the circulation of internet traffic or on the devices that coordinate their commands, reveals crucial links, choke points, and dependencies. Media and logistics are interoperable systems, and the activities of one hinge on the smooth operation of the other. This collection builds on an exciting field of logistical study that has emerged over the past several decades. In geography, sociology, cultural studies, anthropology, science and technology studies, and history, among other fields, scholars have documented how logistics has been instrumental to warfare and capitalism, as well as to their attendant imperial projects. The idea of logistics was first articulated in the study of warfare, where its theorization elevated it to the same prominence as that of strategy and tactics, but recent work has focused on its adaptation into commerce, especially the impact of the logistics revolution in the early 1960s that cemented logistical operations as a cornerstone of neoliberal economics and politics.1 In economics, Peter Drucker famously declared logistics the “last dark continent” for commerce left to conquer, and scholars have documented this transition from the more constrained study of “physical distribution management” to the recognition of logistics as “the most encompassing term that describes the management of firms’ acquiring and distributing activities over space.”2 Collectively, this work reveals that, as the science of moving goods, people, and information as efficiently as possible to meet the global demands of capital, logistics has been the engineer of the mid-twentieth century. In the subsequent drama of globalization, in which factories have moved to the Global South to exploit cheap labor, and goods are shipped back to the Global North for consumption, logistics has been the star. In critical logistics studies—a field that coalesced from these inquiries to describe the conditions of logistics, the abstract structures of the supply chain, and their impact on modern life—media is ever-present, even if often in the background.3 In The Deadly Life of Logistics, Deborah Cowen explains that with the expansion of global supply chains, commodities are not produced in conventional geography, but “across logistics space.”4 Logistics space is mediated in a multitude of ways: through process maps, enterprise resource planning software, worker surveillance, the capture of biometric data, and satellite tracking. Logistics, Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson argue, fundamentally “involves the algorithmic coordination of productive processes in space and time.”5 Analyzing these algorithmic architectures, Ned Rossiter calls for a logistical media theory that grasps these technologies’ primary function: “to extract value by optimizing the efficiency of living labor and supply chain operations.”6 These accounts recognize that media are integral to the conceptualization and spread of logistics. **Supply chains are defined as much by their communications networks and media technologies as they are by their containers and pallets**. As logistics has become a topic in media and communications studies, scholars have expanded beyond the domain of supply chain management to address its broader conceptualization as a set of coordinating techniques. Paul Virilio’s “logistics of perception” places cinematic sounds and images alongside accounts of weapons, people, and materials.7 Media scholars, including Ned Rossiter, John Durham Peters, and Judd Case, argue that the study of “logistical media” does not simply involve analysis of the visual and computational dimensions of Walmart’s or Amazon’s operations but a recognition of media’s capacity to process data, coordinate movement, and more widely orient sociality.8 Logistical media, Peters writes, are the media of “orientation,” devices of cognitive, social, and political organization and control. They are clocks, maps, and calendars; positioning technologies such as radar; managerial forms such as lists; and commercial codes such as stamps. Due to their ability to organize storage and transmission, and their capacity to locate, arrange, and distribute, all media possess this logistical dimension. **Media, in other words, are not simply conduits through which global logistics emerges but exist “prior to and from the grid” through which such operations can be constituted**.9 They are not logistics’ black box. They are the instructions for its assembly. Assembly Codes enters into this conversation about the techniques of global logistics and the operative logics of media with three specific interventions. **First, it describes what we call the** logistical imagination. Logistical technologies have always been accompanied by new ways of seeing and listening, reading and knowing, thinking and moving—which have themselves catalyzed crucial shifts in our modes of communication. To unpack the logistical imagination is to trace the representational and imaginative modes of logistical activity, as well as the aesthetic and performative practices that have emerged to grapple with logistical transformations. **Second, the essays here illustrate what we call logistical instruments**: the extensive array of media techniques, technologies, and forms that are essential to the operation of global logistics. The collection’s essays demonstrate that media’s operative logics—their logistical capacity to orient, arrange, and sort—are deeply connected to the ways in which they have been instrumentalized in histories of militarism, commerce, and empire. As a result, the media technologies that hold these projects together necessarily advance the trajectories of capitalism, settler colonialism, and biopolitical management. Logistics invests these linked projects with their own seemingly organic and inevitable sense of life, what Cowen describes as an abstract vitalism, at the expense of the human lives of laborers and migrants, and several of our essays touch on these stakes.10 Finally, the essays reveal how the industrial processes of traditional media production—from cinema to sound recording—are being reshaped as supply chain media by logistical technologies and practices. While the processes of sourcing and assembly have always had a substantial effect on how media is produced, distributed, and consumed, contemporary media are being crafted in relation to what Anna Tsing has named “supply chain capitalism.”11 The elements of supply chain capitalism that Tsing documents—actual precarity, collaboration, nonscalability, and translation—are central concerns many of our essays also take up.12 While these interventions build across the collection, we have organized Assembly Codes into sections that foreground these three ways of rethinking media: as sites of logistical imagination, as instruments of logistical operations, and as products of global supply chains. In the remainder of the introduction, we chart the stakes, contexts, and future directions of these avenues of inquiry, as well as the ties between individual essays and our shared interventions. The authors assembled draw together a diverse set of objects as well as a range of theoretical and conceptual orientations: Black and Indigenous studies, German media theory and sound studies, and the analysis of media industries and production cultures. Their essays foreground the contiguity of production and distribution, the messy relationship between base and superstructure, and most importantly, the continuities between contemporary and historical forms of logistical mediation. They expose the way economic, political, and social power consolidates in and through logistical operations and acts of assembly. Through their careful analyses, the book reveals how contemporary mediation is haunted by its logistical substructures, from the slave ship to the supply chain.

#### Logistics is structured via Logistical Imaginations that control every-day life and are critical to the life-blood of Supply Chains which means interrogation of the Aff’s Knowledge Structure come over Materiality. Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to endorse Imagination and Subject Formation that exist outside Logistics.
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The Logistical Imagination How did the imagination of the world change once it expanded to include logistical ways of thinking? When did thoughts of logistical operations begin to hold sway over the details of daily lives? How can one represent the expansive system of global logistics? To answer these questions is to unpack the logistical imagination: the new ways of seeing and imagining the world brought about by logistics and the new forms of mediation, philosophy, politics, and aesthetics that have emerged to confront it. To analyze the logistical imagination is to understand what it means to see like a supply chain, to comprehend the conditions that make one feel like cargo, or to explore logistics’ racialized and gendered aesthetics. It is to document how the subject of Western individualism is, fundamentally, a logistical one, and to interrogate how the historical emergence of logistics in commerce and warfare reshaped everyday life for workers, consumers, and citizens. It is also, we suggest, to imagine how the vast contours of logistical systems elide the faults and friction of their diverse and often divergent operations.13 To do so involves charting how these underlying instabilities, where “capital hits the ground,” may elicit new political potentials and subjective possibilities.14 Critiques of capitalism often construe logistics as something simultaneously monumental and microscopic. It is always present but nowhere to be seen. Increasingly automated and algorithmic, it is, like capital itself, an inhuman, unknowable thing.15 Its representations in texts, photographs, and films are almost always defined by the enormous structures erected in pursuit of global trade. Capable of transporting more than ten thousand containers per trip, megaships, for example, are vessels so massive that they are unable to sail through the expanded Panama Canal locks, their decks unreachable by most North American cranes.16 The mind-boggling scale of these technologies and of the systems that manage their movements are defined by the dark dreams of the “logistical sublime,” where global trade flows are ever more precisely patterned in a nightmare of unending rationalization.17 Researchers have described how logistics is inextricable from other global phenomena, including the conditions of late capitalism and the politics of neoliberalism. Jasper Bernes has argued that “the totality of the logistics system belongs to capital,” and as such, it remains cognitively and materially impregnable by traditional revolutionary means.18 While the logistical sublime is the dominant form of the logistical imagination, mobilized by capitalists and critics alike, it is not the only representational possibility. As a means of opening up the analysis of the logistical imagination, the authors in Assembly Codes delve into the many ways that humans have engaged with and envisioned logistics. A study of these cases reveals that the logistical imagination is always refractive, embodied in the particular moments and media of their production. This is true when workers slow down or speed up to control the fluctuation of logistical time and speed; when protestors blockade ports to limit the movement of materials across logistical space; and when undocumented migrants and fugitive slaves seize opportunities to travel outside the well-ordered regimes of logistical control. But it is also true when middle-class people use locationbased apps to hook up, request a car to the airport, or arrange for a next-day delivery in a single click. The logistical imagination not only drives forces of oppression, it ignites resistance and lubricates banal normativity. Our aim is to understand the specific differences that these representations, aesthetic practices, and modes of thinking make to larger logistical projects. We are motivated by the recognition that new imaginations can catalyze systemic shifts. Indeed, the contemporary concern with logistics—which has culminated in academia in fields such as critical logistics studies—was sparked by the dissemination of new logistical imaginations and representations. It was in part through media coverage of the impacts of globalization, including its supply chains, workers’ rights, and environmental impact, that middle-class people in the Global North began to grapple with logistics. The anti-sweatshop campaigns of the 1990s that stemmed from Nike’s disastrous “sweatshop summer” gave rise to a new discourse of ethical consumerism, one that expanded to encompass concerns for human rights and worker welfare, the ethical treatment of animals, environmental contamination, and global climate change.19 Recent conceptions of corporate social responsibility, the connection between local sourcing and consumption, and assessment methodologies like carbon footprinting all bring to light the journeys commodities make as, driven by logistics, they are assembled and distributed around the world. At the same time, the meteoric rise of private carriers like FedEx, ups, and dhl made delivery trucks and logistical laborers familiar figures, so much so that the 2000 film Castaway could reimagine Robinson Crusoe as a narrative about a FedEx logistician stranded on a desert island in the crash of a cargo plane. It is precisely because of logistics’ extraordinary scale and apparent unknowability that media play such a critical role in shaping our knowledge of these systems and afford the potential for collective forms of resistance. An attention to forms of mediation reveals the language and iconography of logistics as a potential site for intervention. Marc Levinson’s The Box (2006) and Alexander Klose’s The Container Principle (2009), for example, both figure the container as the emblem of globalization and the originary sign of modern logistics.20 Carried by cranes between ship holds and truck beds, this intermodal innovation accelerated shipping times, ending the era of arduous and time-consuming break-bulk unloading, and the work of longshoremen who labored on the docks. By the turn of the century, the box was ubiquitous both in distribution, where the teu, or twenty-foot equivalent unit, had become the standard object of operational consideration, and in the public imagination, as developers repurposed it for the architecture of everything from modular housing to shopping malls. Sites like Box Park in London, Tolchok near Odessa, and Common Ground in Seoul reveal a logistical imagination at play, one that places global transportation in a local context of commodity display and retail consumption. The shipping container not only infiltrated the visual and architectural landscape, it was remediated in films (such as Allan Sekula’s 2010 The Forgotten Space), art installations (such as Gabby Miller’s 2015 Turquoise Wake), and podcasts (such as Alexis Madrigal’s 2017 Containers). Alberto Toscano and Jeff Kinkle identify a “poetics of containerization,” noting the form’s mesmerizing power as an icon of capitalist abstraction, especially to visual artists.21 Engaging with this form, activists, workers, and scholars have attempted to transform its meaning and leverage the logistical imagination in pursuit of progressive political causes.

#### Desire for Objectivity is a form of Logistical Rationality that aims to control space, bodies, and subjectivities which undergirds political and economic spheres that cement Logistical control.
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LOGISTICAL RATIONALITY I deploy the term logistical rationality in order to describe the way in which the above set of logics structure political and economic possibilities, but further, constructs a regime that attempts to delineate and control space, time, bodies, materials, and subjectivities. This amounts to a necessary extension of the notion of political rationality as a product of modernity which fails to recognise the constitutive nature of colonialism and imperialism in its production.10 As such, logistical rationality recognises that the epistemic grounding of these logics has a longer history of violence that must be centred in any analysis of their contemporary manifestations, not only for reasons of analytic potency and clarity, but for reasons of epistemic justice. What I am terming logistical rationality is then also an intervention in a long history of writers thinking about rationality under modernity. Weber gave us an understanding of instrumental reason that recognised the increasing tendency to convert action-as-means to a permanent state of action-as-end. In other words, the tendency for rationality to mean a logic of pure means – with the end objectives irrelevant so long as the method itself is rational and rationalising. Wendy Brown knits this together with Frankfurt School developments of Weber’s theory of rationalisation to ground her deployment of Foucault’s understanding of political rationality. The Frankfurt School (broadly speaking) argued that instrumental reason had become ‘suffused with the norms and imperatives of capitalism to generate a rationality that saturated society and secured capitalism in ways Marx and Marxism could not fathom or explain’. 11 Brown extends this as a grounding for her account of neoliberal rationality. For her (and from Foucault), political rationality is not merely an instrument of governmental practice, but the condition of possibility of its instruments – it is the ‘field of normative reason from which governing is forged’.12 She writes, it could be said to signify the becoming actual of a specific normative form of reason; it designates such a form as both a historical force generating and relating specific kinds of subject, society, and state and as establishing an order of truth by which conduct is both governed and measured.13 I would venture that logistical rationality signifies the becoming-actual, or rather, becominginfrastructural of a specific normative form of reason, and one that establishes or maintains an order of truth through which conduct is governed. How logistical rationality goes beyond Brown’s account is in its insistence on tracing the connections between material rationalisation and logistical infrastructures; its deep influence throughout political and economic spheres; and the epistemic violence and specifically, the coloniality it is continuous with and continues to manifest. It is also not the case that this rationality emanates out of a specific state rationality, nor does it belong solely to the realm of the market or the governance of subjects bound by a nation-state. Rather, it continues a project of power and domination – Western modernity – that it simultaneously constructs and is constructed by. Thinking in this way, it becomes clear that the notion of a logistical rationality allows us to conduct this necessary intervention in teasing out the operative and epistemic dimensions of these logics, and allows us to think across the multiple registers that logistics intersects and organises. Logistics is of course the technologies, infrastructures and territories it shapes, it is protocol and extraction, and it is the logics and epistemic grounding of these technologies and physical manifestations. It is the rationality that, incorporating, extending and reworking a coloniality of power, animates logistical organisation, and further, allows logistical organisation to become seen as something like a universal model that can be applied to almost anything. From global supply chains to anthropological studies – from extractive debt architectures to microtargeting in political campaigns, logistical rationality appears to obscure the coloniality of power deeply implicated in its operations. To think logistics and logistics as rationality together is to consider both the materialinfrastructural and political-epistemic foundations of logistics and the ways in which these intertwine to contribute to the contemporary shape of modernity. It allows us to get underneath the neutral veneer of scientific objectivity and efficiency that envelopes the general discourse of logistics, and to begin to excavate the colonial logics that animate its organisation of the world. In considering logistics as a form of rationality and its epistemic foundations as a continuation of logics of coloniality, we can bring into relief the ways in which logistical organisation relies on and recalibrates structures that determine what counts as knowledge and what counts as being, and as a result can unearth its more violent tendencies of exclusion and erasure. Ultimately, logistical rationality advances an (impossible) attempt at a near-total control. As outlined above, the techniques and logics through which it attempts this include modelling, calculation and prediction; extraction, expropriation and standardisation; translation, erasure and the variability of inclusion & exclusion; and ever-increasing efficiencies, valorization and commodification, with a view to extending rational control over time and space, capital and materials, and bodies and subjectivities. In reaching back to think about how techniques and logics of domination inaugurated during this construction continue to shape our present, we can understand how logistics contributes to the maintenance and recalibration of these forms of domination in their interrelated epistemic, social and structural dimensions. This framework allows us to reckon with the forms of violence, structural, physical and epistemic, that lay the groundwork for processes of domination in the contemporary world. It re-politicises logistics, putting Empire back into its history and its contemporary operations. LOGISTICS, TOTALITY AND TRUTH NARRATIVES Mignolo argues that Western conceptions of rationality (at least prior to postmodernism) advance an ‘exclusionary and totalitarian notion of Totality … that is a Totality that negates, exclude, occlude the difference and the possibilities of other totalities’. 14 The project that I advance here does not attempt to write yet another totalizing grand narrative. Throughout my academic career I have struggled with the form and style of academic writing that neatly separates sets of ideas into distinct disciplines, themes and theoretical frameworks, and in particular, against myself in the habituated style of writing in the Western university that has led me at times to inadvertently erase the epistemic position from which I speak. As Grosfoguel reminds us, Western philosophy and sciences, in concealing the locus of enunciation, ‘are able to produce a myth about a Truthful universal knowledge that covers up, that is, conceals who is speaking as well as the geo-political and body-political epistemic location in the structures of colonial power/knowledge from which the subject speaks’.15 Further, in decolonial thought this concealment and the “Truthfulness” it affords is understood as an epistemic strategy which enabled ‘European/Euro-American colonial expansion and domination … to construct a hierarchy of superior and inferior knowledge and, thus, of superior and inferior people around the world’.16 This epistemic violence is the ground upon which European imperialism and colonialism was built. Gayatri Spivak is credited with coining the term in the seminal text ’Can the subaltern speak?’; in which she argues that epistemic violence is the active obstruction of non-Western approaches to knowledge production. 17 This process instantiates the active erasure of these knowledges and the attempt to overwrite them, and through this process the West becomes the legitimate epistemic subject and knowledge producer. Spivak argues that this movement establishes and generates an epistemic Other, through the ‘assumption and construction of a consciousness or subject’ that ‘cohere[s] with the work of imperialist subject-constitution, mingling epistemic violence with the advancement of learning and civilization.’18 Where the collectively and externally described and delimited non-Western subject-as-object or Other is defined against the rational subject of the West, they are constituted as lacking reason, subjecthood, and thus of the rights to self-determination and freedom from colonization. The epistemic violence then, the violent imposition and delimitation of ways of being, knowing and feeling provides the legitimating groundwork for violent interventions – as Grosfoguel writes succinctly, We went from the sixteenth century characterization of “people without writing” to the eighteenth and nineteenth century characterization of “people without history” to the twentieth century characterization of “people without development” and more recently to the early twenty-first century of “people without democracy”19 We can see the continuity of this logic with the movement and logics of logistical rationality animating the turn toward Big Data, behavioural management & modification, and the experimental governance of “nudge” and “libertarian paternalism” that we come to in the final chapter of this thesis. This replays a similarly interventionist characterization of “people without rationality”. We can think of the corollary shifts in the coloniality of modes of governance a number of ways. Kwame Nkrumah in 1966 writes powerfully on what he understands as the phenomenon of neocolonialism – the continuation of colonialism by other means. This involves economic domination and exploitation without the expense of maintaining governmental administrations. This ostensibly materialist assessment has been vital in informing the position of this thesis, paying attention to the economic structures put in place to maintain forms of domination and control over former colonies or large parts of the Global South without direct rule. Deploying a primarily Marxist anti-capitalist perspective, Nkrumah understands neocolonialism as a kind of ‘collective imperialism’, interrogating the international character of the agencies employed: financial and industrial consortia, assistance organisations, financial aid bodies, and the like. Friendly cooperation is offered in the educational, cultural and social domains, aimed at subverting the desirable patterns of indigenous progress to the imperialist objectives of the financial monopolists. These are the real methods of holding back the real development of the new countries. These are the paraphernalia of neocolonialism, superficially proffering aid and guidance; subterraneously benefiting the interested donors and their countries in old and new ways.20 This thesis attends to some of these questions in Chapters 1-3. This more historical section discusses the institutional advancement of development doctrines as irrevocably linked to logistical infrastructure building, as well as rational modelling and systems thinking; applied anthropology as both counterinsurgency and the extraction of knowledge about indigenous and national populations; and extractive mechanisms of debt and dependency as related to development and global structures of power and capital. Mignolo notes that critiques of modernity are currently centred on 3 distinct types – one, immanent to Europe, is a Euro-centric critique and internal to the history of Europe itself. The other two, he argues, emerged out of non-European histories and their entanglement with Western modernity; one with a focus on Western civilization, and the other on coloniality. Though my work takes elements of all three of these avenues of critique, the concept of coloniality is most useful in describing the trajectory and dissemination of logistical rationality and its epistemologies. The concept of coloniality is understood as a model of power which integrates the legacies and practices of European colonialism in social orders and ways of knowing. First used by Quijano and developed by Lugones and Mignolo amongst others, it refers to the way in which the concepts of modernity and coloniality are inseparable – that ‘the modernity that Europe takes as the context for its own being is, in fact, so deeply imbricated in the structures of European colonial domination over the rest of the world that it is impossible to separate the two: hence, modernity/coloniality’.21 As part of a broader project, the concept of coloniality seeks to decentre the geographical determinism and historical internalism often present in critiques of Eurocentrism, toward an epistemic critique that allows us to look at various forms of epistemic violence and how they are present across geographical locations.22 This thesis thus decentres the narrative of modernization that many contemporary, even critical accounts of logistics rest on – logistical globalisation presented as a result of technical developments in the 1950’s and 60’s elides accounts of Empire as a violent globalising force, and is commensurate with a conception of linear and homogenous time that anti- post- and decolonial accounts of modernity trouble as part of the construction of modernity itself. Deborah Cowen in The Deadly Life of Logistics, links anti-imperial piracy of the 17th Century to its contemporary forms and sees the 1950’s and 60’s as a threshold of contemporary globalisation and logistical organisation. She writes a convincing and situated analysis of logistics as an inherently spatial phenomenon, arguing that it represents a new ‘imperial imaginary’, with a distinct emphasis on the materialities of logistics.23 This is because logistics is concerned with the reworking of sovereignty through the production of ‘space’ beyond ‘territory’. She is one of the first writers, to my knowledge, explicitly connecting the contemporary operations of logistics with imperialism. Cowen traces the development of logistics, from its initial conception as a banal, subsidiary form of military art or strategy to its rise as a global business science. She specifically interrogates the way in which contemporary logistics transforms the ‘geographies of production and distribution and of security and war’, as well as ‘political relations to the world and ourselves, and thus practices of citizenship too’.24 For Cowen, logistics represents ‘a profoundly imperial cartography’, in which the production and contestation of logistics spaces and circulation refigures territory and sovereignty in the service of the protection of trade flows25. She writes that [f]rom its history as a military art in service of the national, territorial, geopolitical state, logistics became a technology of supranational firms operating in relational geoeconomic space. In contrast to the absolute territory of geopolitical calculation associated with colonial rule, geo-economics relies on the unimpeded flows of goods, capital and information across territorial boundaries.26 She thus figures logistics as a new imperial imaginary that fosters economic flows and produces ‘space beyond territory’.27 This production of space sees the reworking of national borders and trade routes as corridors and pathways, where “networked” and “systems” security reconstitute the border as an exceptional space of government, subject to different laws, trade agreements, tax breaks, and different levels of securitisation and labour rights. Put differently, logistics as a business science has come to ‘drive geo-economic logics and authority, where geo-economics emphasizes the recalibration of international space by globalized market logics, transnational actors (corporate, non-profit, and state), and a networked geography of capital, goods and human flows.’28 Her work demonstrates the necessity of a more theoretically informed interrogation of what it means that logistics reworks imperial power. As demonstrated above, there is a wealth of postand decolonial theory that shows the irreducibility of the construction of modernity and its political categories to the project of colonialism and vice-versa. For example, Mitchell shows us that an integral part of this construction is the production of what he understands as homogenous time and homogenous space. The organisation of time and space, in his account, is intimately tied to the project of Western modernity, as it is organised to produce a unified, coherent historical time that centres the West as the locus of its enunciation. Mitchell writes that ‘to disrupt the powerful story of modernity, rather than contribute to its globalization, it is not enough to question simply its location. One also has to question its temporality.’ 29 While Cowen does reference David Harvey on time-space compression and the importance of speed with regards to logistical circulation, we must interrogate this concept and the linear account of the temporality of globalization processes that still focus on the West as the centre from which they emanate. My thesis attempts to go further in arguing that logistics and the rationality that underpins it is a continuation of logics from as early as the 15th century, and that we can detail diverse genealogies that complicate this notion of a singular history and as a result, complicate the world-making representations of logistics.

#### The Impact is Global Civil War.
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Sneakers may still be easier to order online than smart bombs, but the industry that brings us both is making it increasingly difficult to discern the art of war from the science of business. Today, war and trade are **both animated by the supply chain**—they are organized by it and take its form. At stake is not simply the privatization of warfare or the militarization of corporate supply chains. With logistics **comes new kinds of crises**, **new paradigms of security**, new uses of **law, new logics of killing**, and a new map of the world. For many, logistics may only register as a word on the side of the trucks that magically bring online orders only hours after purchase or that circulate incessantly to and from big-box stores at local power centers. The entire network of infrastructures, technologies, spaces, workers, and violence that makes the circulation of stuff possible remains tucked out of sight for those who engage with logistics only as consumers. Yet, alongside billions of commodities, the management of global supply chains imports elaborate transactions into the socius—transactions that are political, financial, legal, and often martial. With the rise of global supply chains, even the simplest purchase relies on the calibration of an astonishing cast of characters, multiple circulations of capital, and complex movements across great distances. Take the seeming simplicity of a child’s doll purchased at a suburban shopping mall. We can trace its production to places like Guangdong, China, where dolls are packed into containers in large numbers, loaded onto trucks in the local Industrial Development Area, and transferred onto ships in the port of Zhongshan. Many of these dolls make the trek across the Pacific—6,401 nautical miles—via Hong Kong by sea to arrive at the Port of Long Beach approximately nineteen days and one hour later. Two days later the ships are unloaded, three days later they clear customs, and then our containers full of dolls are transferred to a set of trucks and delivered 50 miles east to a distribution center in Mira Loma, California. Here the containers are opened and the boxes are unloaded, sorted, and repacked before being loaded again onto any one of the 800 diesel trucks that pick up and drop off cargo every hour in that town. Some of these trucks travel as far as 800 miles or more to a regional distribution center before their cargo is unloaded, sorted, and reloaded onto a final truck and sent to one of Wal-Mart’s 4,000 American outlets. If this set of movements seems elaborate, this is in fact a heavily simplified and sanitized account of the circulation of stuff. First, it is misleading to think about a singular site of production. Commodities today are manufactured across logistics space rather than in a singular place. This point is highlighted if we account for “inbound logistics”— the production processes of component parts that make the manufacture of a commodity possible—and if we recognize transportation as an element of production rather than merely a service that follows production. The complexity would be enhanced dramatically if we took stock of all the ways that capital circulates through its different forms during this physical circulation of commodity to market. A more nuanced narrative would especially start to surface if we were to highlight the frequent disruptions that characterize supply chains and the violent and contested human relations that constitute the global logistics industry. To the everyday delays of bad weather, flat tires, failed engines, missed connections, traffic jams, and road closures, we would also need to add more deliberate interruptions. Just-in-time transport systems can be disrupted by the labor actions of transport workers at any one of the multiple links along the way. Workers, organized or not, may interfere with the packing and repacking of cargo at any of the transshipment sites. Ships are frequently hijacked by pirates in key zones on open waters, and truck and rail routes are sometimes blockaded—in response to both long histories of colonial occupation and current practices of imperial expansion. Even national borders, with the unpredictable delays of customs and security checks, challenge the fast flow of goods. The threat of disruption to the circulation of stuff has become such a profound concern to governments and corporations in recent years that it **has prompted the creation of an entire architecture of security that aims to govern global spaces of flow.** This new framework of security—supply chain security—relies on a range of new forms of transnational regulation, border management, data collection, surveillance, and labor discipline, as well as naval missions and aerial bombing. In fact, to meaningfully capture the social life of circulation, we would have to consider not only disruption to the system but the assembly of infrastructure and architecture achieved through land grabs, military actions, and dispossessions that are often the literal and figurative grounds **for new logistics spaces**. Corporate and military logistics are increasingly entangled; this is a matter of not only military forces clearing the way for corporate trade but corporations actively supporting militaries as well. Logistics are one of the most heavily privatized areas of contemporary warfare. This is nowhere more the case than in the U.S. military bases in Iraq and Afghanistan, where private companies are contracted to do much of the feeding and housing of troops. “Public” military logisticians rapidly cycle into the private sector, often precisely to facilitate the shifting of logistics contracts to private military companies. The entanglement of military and corporate logistics may be deepening and changing form, but logistics was never a stranger to the world of warfare. The language of the supply chain (its recent corporate management speak) would have us believe that logistics emerged out of the brave new world of business to only recently colonize the old institution of the military. And yet, while national militaries have indeed been taken over by a new kind of corporate calculation, it was historically the military and warfare that gave the gift of logistics (De Landa 1991; Shoenberger 2008). Logistics was dedicated to the art of war for millennia only to be adopted into the corporate world of management in the wake of World War II. For most of its martial life, logistics played a subservient role, enabling rather than defining military strategy. But things began to change with the rise of modern states and then petroleum warfare. The logistical complexity of mobilization in this context meant that the success or failure of campaigns came to rely on logistics. Over the course of the twentieth century, a reversal of sorts took place, and logistics began to lead strategy rather than serve it. This military history reminds us that logistics is not only about circulating stuff but about sustaining life. It is easy today to associate logistics with the myriad inanimate objects that it manages, but the very sustenance of populations is a key stake in the game. Indeed—the definitive role of the military art of logistics was in fueling the battlefield, and this entailed feeding men as well as machines. More recently, we see logistics conceptualized not only as a means to sustain life but as a lively system in itself. Contemporary efforts to protect supply chains invest logistical systems with biological **imperatives to flow** **and prescribe “resilience**” as a means of sustaining not only human life but the system itself. In this context, threats to circulation are treated not only as criminal acts but as **profound threats to the life of trade**. As I argue in the pages that follow, new boundaries of belonging are being drawn around spaces of circulation. These “pipelines” of flow are not only displacing the borders of national territoriality but also recasting **the geographies of law and violence** that were organized by the inside/outside of state space. Those on the outside of the system, who aim to contest its flows, face the raw force of rough trade without recourse to normal laws and protections. Logistics is no simple story of securitization or of distribution; it is an industry and assemblage that is at once bio-, necro-, and antipolitical. The Deadly Life of Logistics is concerned with how the seemingly banal and technocratic management of the movement of stuff through space has become a driving force of war and trade. This book examines how the military art of moving stuff gradually became not only the “umbrella science” of business management but, in Nigel Thrift’s (2007, 95) words, “perhaps **the central discipline of the contemporary world**.” But this book considers logistics as a project and not an achievement. Logistics is profoundly political and so contested in all its iterations—on the oceans, in cities, on road and rail corridors, and in the visual and cartographic images that are also part of its assemblage. This book explores how the art and then the science of logistics continue to transform not only the geographies of production and distribution and of security and war but also our political relations to our world and ourselves, and thus practices of citizenship, too. The third intervention is related to the first and second; it highlights questions of violence and calculation specifically by interrogating the shifting boundaries between “civilian” and “military” domains. These boundaries are not only conceptual and legal; they are also geographical (Mbembe 2003). As many scholars have outlined, the architecture of modern war was also a map of the modern state. War “faces out” from national territory, whereas the civilian was said to occupy domestic space (Giddens 1985, 192; Foucault [1997] 2003, 49). In the context of modernity, war designated “a conflict in some sense external to the structures of **sovereignty and civil war a conflict internal to them**” (Evans and Hardt 2010). But these boundaries are in significant flux. If **we are living in an era of “global civil war**” (Hardt and Negri 2002), wherein the national territorial framework that underpinned modern war erodes, then we are also seeing a corresponding “shift from the external to the internal use of force,” with armed conflicts administered not “as military campaigns but police actions” (Evans and Hardt 2010). And yet, this shift takes on a much more specific spatiality; the networked infrastructure and architecture of the supply chain animates both war and trade. This book insists that any serious engagement with contemporary political life must think through the violent economies of space. Our theory needs to engage our present as fundamentally a time of logistics space.

#### Their calls for progress are an algorithmic drive for improvement that hardens logistical control over bodies in a rush for productivity which results in land conflicts, ecocide, poverty, war and turns the aff.

Moten and Harney 17 (Fred Moten – Professor of English at the University of California, Riverside. Stefano Harney – Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University. Edited by Gaye Theresa Johnson and Alex Lubin. "Improvement and Preservation Or, Usufruct and Use" Futures of Black Radicalism, pgs. 83-91, DOA: 7-4-2020, jzn) recut //Jay

Exception is a categorization one grants oneself only at the price of imagining that it has been granted by an Other. To declare one'; exceptionalism is not a matter of exempting. or excluding. or excusing oneself, all of which are transitive. Exceptionalism imagines the intransitive and attributes action to Others and, more importantly. an originary kind of power to someone else. And it is here that we see how the pre-text Serequeberhan identifies is in fact pre-given in a double sense, it must be given but in order to be given it must also haw: been granted. there is no dialectic here. Rather we might say it is only the European who has ever been both master and slave. This is his drama, held in the body. and enacted in the world. He has to have. The exception will have been a power given by an Other to selves who, in taking it and its accompanying knowledge on, are supposed to have been provided. in this give and take, their own confirmation. But the pre-text is never truly grounded. never truly granted. never truly given. Europe is constantly disestablished by what it seeks to envelop. which, in and out of turn. envelops it. What surrounds the European even in his midst is the native informant Gayatri Spivak identifies as a creation text for a world of exception. against, but nonetheless within. the general antagonism of earthly anarrhythmia and displacement. The paradox of the pre-text is thus that being exceptional can no more be taken than it can be given and can no more be claimed than it can be granted. This simultaneity of being-master and being- slave is sovereignty's static, omnicidal decline. This is what it is to be chained to the struggle for freedom, a "rational" instrument run amok in place. as man's perpetually stilled motion. What does it mean to stand for improvement? Or worse, to stand for what busi- ness 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 diabol- ical usufruct. Improvement comes to us by way of an innovation in land tenure, where individuated ownership; derived from increasing the lands productivity. is given in the perpetual. and thus arrested. becoming of exception': miniature. 'This is to say that from the outset. the ability to own-and that abillty's first deriv- ative, 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 manage- ment 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 he forcefully speciated to he 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, Cedric Robinson identify in medieval Europe become usufructcd with modern posses- sion 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 in species-barley or rye or pigs. Localized ecosystems were aggressively trans- formed 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 corol- lary, 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 simulta- neous destruction and accumulation policy is meant to operationalize. This attri- bution of a supposedly essential lack. an inevitable and supposedly natural dimi- nution, 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 is the continuous crisis of speciation in the surround of the general antag- onism. 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.

#### The alternative is the undercommons as a nonplace that refuses the call to order, and engages in haptic love against the violent corrective of logistics and planning against policy.

Harney and Moten 13 (Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. "The undercommons: Fugitive planning and black study." (2013): 1. Pgs 87-91 (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)//Elmer

Never being on the right side of the Atlantic is an unsettled feeling, the feeling of a thing that unsettles with others. It’s a feeling, if you ride with it, that produces a certain distance from the settled, from those who determine themselves in space and time, who locate themselves in a determined history. To have been shipped **is to have been moved** **by others, with others**. It is to feel at home with the homeless, at ease with the fugitive, at peace with the pursued, at rest with the ones who consent not to be one. Outlawed, interdicted, intimate things of the hold, containerized contagion, logistics externalizes logic itself to reach you, but this is not enough to get at the social logics, the social poesis, **running through logisticality**. Because while certain abilities – to connect, to translate, to adapt, to travel – were forged in the experiment of hold, they were not the point. As David Rudder sings, “how we vote is not how we party.” The hold’s terrible gift was to gather dispossessed feelings in common, to create a new feel in the undercommons. Previously, this kind of feel was only an exception, **an aberration, a shaman, a witch, a seer, a poet amongst others**, who felt through others, through other things. Previously, except in these instances, feeling was mine or it was ours. But in the hold, in the undercommons of a new feel, another kind of feeling became common. Tis form of feeling was not collective, not given to decision, not adhering or reattaching to settlement, nation, state, territory or historical story; nor was it repossessed by the group, which could not now feel as one, reunified in time and space. No, when Black Shadow sings “are you feelin’ the feelin?’’ he is asking about something else. He is asking about a way of feeling through others, a **feel for feeling others feeling you**. Tis is modernity’s insurgent feel, its inherited caress, its skin talk, tongue touch, breath speech, hand laugh. Tis is the feel that no individual can stand, and no state abide. This is the feel we might call hapticality. Hapticality, the touch of the undercommons, the interiority of sentiment, the feel that what is to come is here. Hapticality, the capacity to feel though others, for others to feel through you, for you to feel them feeling you, this feel of the shipped is not regulated, at least not successfully, by a state, a religion, a people, an empire, a piece of land, a totem. Or perhaps we could say these are now recomposed in the wake of the shipped. To feel others is unmediated, immediately social, amongst us, our thing, and even when we recompose religion, it comes from us, and even when we recompose race, we do it as race women and men. Refused these things, we first refuse them, in the contained, amongst the contained, lying together in the ship, the boxcar, the prison, the hostel. Skin, against epidermalisation, senses touching. Thrown together touching each other we were denied all sentiment, denied all the things that were supposed to produce sentiment, family, nation, language, religion, place, home. Tough forced to touch and be touched, to sense and be sensed in that space of no space, though refused sentiment, history and home, we feel (for) each other. A feel, a sentiment with its own interiority, there on skin, soul no longer inside but there for all to hear, for all to move. **Soul music is a medium of this interiority on the skin, its regret the lament for broken hapticality, its self-regulatory powers the invitation to build sentimentality together again, feeling each other again, how we party**. This is our hapticality, our love. This is love for the shipped, love as the shipped. 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.

#### Supply Chains drive for infinite interdependence are terminally unsustainable.

Rao 21 V Venkateswara Rao 10-20-2021 "Global supply chains are 'close to collapse'" <https://www.nationalheraldindia.com/opinion/global-supply-chains-are-close-to-collapse> (Leadership in Physics of Failure, Vibration Analytics)//Elmer

The UK government embarked on emergency efforts to rescue the country from supply chain chaos by offering European truckers 5,000 short-term visas. Britain's trucking industry relied on thousands of drivers from the EU, mainly from Central and Eastern Europe, who went home during the pandemic and many haven't been able to get back into a post-Brexit UK. Shortage of truck drivers caused fuel stations across the UK running out of stocks and in turn leading to empty supermarket shelves. Pandemic forced the EU truck drivers to leave UK and Brexit barred their re-entry into UK. Today, millions of products - cars, washing machines, smartphones, and more - rely on computer chips, also known as semiconductors. And right now, there just aren't enough of them to meet industry demand. Global chip industry is now facing both demand pressures as well as supply constraints. The rise of 5G increased the demand, and the decision by the US to prevent the sale of semiconductors and other technology to Huawei accentuated supply constraints. The US restrictions prohibit foreign semiconductor manufacturers whose operations use the US technology from shipping products to Huawei without first getting a license from the American officials. And these US restrictions caused immense damage to the global supply chains of semiconductor industry. Disruptions in the supply chain, political strains between the West and China, and the crackdown in Hong Kong, the home of the toy industry, are particularly challenging for the US toy industry, which relies upon China for 86% of its toys. Analysts anticipate global retail prices of toys to increase in the range of 25% during the current year, while supply chain challenges will continue through 2021. The electronic giant, Apple was expected to make 90 million iPhones in the last quarter of 2021. However, Apple was now having to tell its stakeholders that the total production will be lower by as many as 10 million units in the quarter, reported Bloomberg. Smartphone makers like Apple - one of the biggest chip consumers in the world - has been severely impacted due to semiconductor shortage. Ikea stores are experiencing product availability disruptions on both sides of the Atlantic, with some product lines out of stock. The ready-to-assemble furniture maker refers to 'supply delays due to COVID-19' as the reason for any product availability disruptions, on its US website. Major ports around the US are struggling with queues of anchored ships and yards of containers piled as high as local fire departments will allow, as per an article published by Bloomberg in September. Typhoons and Covid outbreaks have worsened major congestion in the global supply-chain networks, as container boxes have been lying at ports, railyards and in warehouses from the US to Sudan to China. This has lessons in the ripple effects across global supply chains, showing the limits of diversification as global value networks are closely interdependent. Food grade CO2 is used for hundreds of products. Agricultural chemicals industry produces CO2 as a by-product of its main product, fertiliser. As some UK fertiliser factories stopped working because of extreme rise in wholesale gas prices, there had been a cut of 60% of the UK's food-grade carbon dioxide supply. The UK poultry and meat producers said that the shortage of carbon dioxide "threatens national food security". Will these supply shocks prove merely a temporary disruption as the global economy recovers from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic? Or instead, will we face a meltdown of the global production system? Certain shortages such as those of truck drivers and shipping containers, or gasoline in the United Kingdom directly affect the logistics connecting the links in supply chains. Pandemic ensued border restrictions, distancing requirements and factory closures have all wreaked havoc on traditional supply chains, leading to congestion at ports, delivery delays and soaring freight rates on the main shipping routes between China, the US and Europe. As a result, supply-chain vulnerabilities have rapidly become mutually reinforcing and self-amplifying. Heavy rains have forced the closures of 60 coal mines in Shanxi province, the largest coal mining hub in China. China’s critical electricity shortage is the result of draconian regulation of coal mining, exacerbated by Beijing's punitive ban on Australian coal imports. Geopolitics, climate catastrophes and trade wars have also disrupted the global supply chains. The highly specialised and inter-dependent global production system has delivered substantial benefits in the past, but its weaknesses are now clearly visible.

### Case

#### The role of the ballot is to determine if the aff’s a good idea—anything else is self-serving, arbitrary and begs the question of the rest of the debate. Evaluate consequences

Christopher A. Bracey 6, Associate Professor of Law, Associate Professor of African & African American Studies, Washington University in St. Louis, September, Southern California Law Review, 79 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1231, p. 1318

Second, reducing conversation on race matters to an ideological contest allows opponents to elide inquiry into whether the results of a particular preference policy are desirable. Policy positions masquerading as principled ideological stances create the impression that a racial policy is not simply a choice among available alternatives, but the embodiment of some higher moral principle. Thus, the "principle" becomes an end in itself, without reference to outcomes. Consider the prevailing view of colorblindness in constitutional discourse. Colorblindness has come to be understood as the embodiment of what is morally just, independent of its actual effect upon the lives of racial minorities. This explains Justice Thomas's belief in the "moral and constitutional equivalence" between Jim Crow laws and race preferences, and his tragic assertion that "Government cannot make us equal [but] can only recognize, respect, and protect us as equal before the law." [281](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=cd9713b340d60abd42c2b34c36d8ef95&_docnum=9&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkVA&_md5=9645fa92f5740655bdc1c9ae7c82b328) For Thomas, there is no meaningful difference between laws designed to entrench racial subordination and those designed to alleviate conditions of oppression. Critics may point out that colorblindness in practice has the effect of entrenching existing racial disparities in health, wealth, and society. But in framing the debate in purely ideological terms, opponents are able to avoid the contentious issue of outcomes and make viability determinations based exclusively on whether racially progressive measures exude fidelity to the ideological principle of colorblindness. Meaningful policy debate is replaced by ideological exchange, which further exacerbates hostilities and deepens the cycle of resentment.

#### Biological death is bad – it obliterates metaphysics and ontology

Paterson 3 - Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, SAGE

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alternative of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather**,** death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81 In conclu sion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state thatany intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility**.**

AT: Tuck

1]

AT: Glenn

AT: Dalley

1] Not extinction rhetoric – we’ve indicted the way your modes of knowledge production result in existential violence

2] This is about using the prospect of extinction to persuade policies and foster violence

### Presumption

#### Vote Negative on presumption we will

#### 1] Their endless critiques of the state and refusal to engage in state-based politics cedes authority to the arbiters of violence and leads to violent lashout against their modality of Indigenous Objectivity

#### 2] Reliance on the Media as a distributor of knowledge ignores the fact that the Media is a colonial institution that must inevitably reflect and circulate dominant colonial ideologies.

Beckermann 19, Kay Marie. Newspapers as a Form of Settler Colonialism: An Examination of the Dakota Access Pipeline Protest and American Indian Representation in Indigenous, State, and National News. Diss. North Dakota State University, 2019. (Graduate Faculty of the North Dakota State University of Agriculture and Applied Science)//Elmer

INTRODUCTION The Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL) protest that took place near North Dakota’s Standing Rock Sioux Reservation the fall of 2016 opened my eyes to the media misrepresentations of American Indians. What I found most interesting was how American Indians were framed based on news organization proximity to the protest site. State news media, for example, often portrayed American Indian activists as nuisances that were breaking the law. National press, on the other hand, portrayed the indigenous population as frozen in an idealized past, often describing a pastoral countryside dotted with tepees. In both cases the media ignored the larger issue: that North Dakota’s settler colonial history underlies today’s oil extraction and transportation needs. The goal of my dissertation research is to identify how Indigenous, national, and state newspapers represented American Indian activists during the DAPL protest. I will also explain how the media processes support the structures of settler colonialism through their biased framing of American Indian people. The aim of settler colonialism is to elimination of the native through violence, assimilation, recognition, and a variety of other means. The media eliminates the protests, voices, reasoning, and the humanity of the American Indian by framing and continuous use of stereotypes, such as the noble savage, bloodthirsty savage, or generic stereotype (Baylor, 1996). These media actions are continuing the ideology of the dominant (i.e. Euro-American) class and repressing the true needs and identities of the American Indian. This dissertation reflects a communication perspective because it focuses on journalism and the power it has to alter realities of an event through media framing. Journalism as a cultural artifact perpetuates ideologies such as settler colonialism. This research is important because the American field of communication does little to address the media as a form of settler colonialism. While settler colonialism and neocolonialism are related concepts, this research argues that settler colonialism is a somewhat different concept that arises from a different conceptual base. Certainly the work by neocolonialists inform the concept of settler colonialism, but in this research I maintain that settler colonialism moves in a slightly different way, and so will build my research using a different conceptualization of the term that I have established based on my research. Consequently, I will draw from sociology to explain how the media distributes dominant ideologies. It is important, I believe, to understand how the media work in tandem with other apparatuses to continuously repress society. Since repression is often successful, the needs of American Indians—the people that Euro-Americans have attempted to eliminate for centuries—often go under- or mis- represented in the media. In order to fully understand the Dakota Access Pipeline protest and media representation, this chapter will give an overview of the protest, explore Indigenous fears of water contamination and destruction of sacred sites, review the importance of oil in the state of North Dakota, and explain how the media act as a public informant. The chapter will conclude with a summary of upcoming dissertation sections. The Dakota Access Pipeline Protest The Standing Rock Sioux first learned of the proposed construction of a pipeline that would cross near reservation boundaries in 2014. Concerned about the pipeline’s affect on water and sacred sites, the Standing Rock Sioux began a years-long opposition (Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-a). The Tribe voiced their concerns to numerous entities, including pipeline owners Energy Transfer Partners, state officials, and the United States Congress. The Tribe also met with and gained the support of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of the Interior, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Yet despite the backing of these federal agencies, Energy Transfer Partners was authorized to begin construction on the Dakota Access Pipeline in July 2016 (Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-a.). A few months earlier, in April 2016, approximately 30 members of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe began demonstrating against the pipeline. Their numbers grew throughout the summer, reaching over 1,000 activists staying at the Oceti Sakowin and other camps by September (McKenna, 2016a; Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-b). Unfortunately a demographic count was not recorded, but it is likely the early activists were Native American (McKenna, 2016a). In fact, this event is arguably the largest gathering of Indigenous Nations in decades (Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-b). An August demonstration of American Indians on horseback mock charging police lines brought the demonstration to the national consciousness via mainstream and social media (McKenna, 2016c). Several weeks later a video showing guard dogs attacking demonstrators went viral, securing the legacy of the Dakota Access Pipeline protest. With each passing month during the fall of 2016, the number of activists staying at the various camps increased, as did the number of demonstrations and violence. Case in point, hundreds of demonstrators were meeting near a police blockade in November. The response of the Morton County Sheriff’s department included use of “rubber bullets, tear gas, concussion grenades, and water cannon” (Hawkins, 2016; McKenna, 2016b, para. 3). The standoff lasted well into the night during below freezing temperatures and over 300 activists were treated for wounds or hypothermia (McKenna, 2016b). The reason for the gathering or response of the local authorities is not clear based on artifacts examined for this research; however, the violence seemed excessive given the actions of demonstrators. The protest reached its climax December 4 with approximately 10,000 activists living at the camps (McKenna, 2016a). North Dakota’s notorious winter weather quickly drove many activists away, with only 1,000 remaining by midDecember (McKenna, 2016a). Dakota Access and Water The 1,200-mile Dakota Access Pipeline does not directly cross tribal land; however, it does cross the Missouri River less than a mile upstream of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation (Dakota Access Pipeline Facts, n.d.-b). The Missouri River is the main water source for the Standing Rock Sioux (McKenna, 2016a). The issue is not necessarily where the pipeline is located but the damage to the water supply if the pipeline were to leak. An inadequate water supply is already an issue for the Standing Rock Sioux, with many people relying on “poorly constructed or low capacity” (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, n.d., para. 37) wells. The problems with wells are numerous, including contamination, low quantities of water, and they are expensive to maintain (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, n.d.). Problems not only affect the availability of drinking water, but water used for agriculture and cattle, which are main industries of the tribe. Surface water is unpredictable, shallow groundwater is limited, and deep groundwater is highly mineralized. These issues reduce the amount of land available for grazing, which affects the number of livestock that can be raised on the land, which in turn affects the quantity of cattle available for slaughter (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, n.d.). The Missouri River provides a high volume of clean water to the reservation and areas downstream; without it the people and industry will suffer. Dakota Access and Sacred Sites The Standing Rock Sioux also feared the destruction of sites that had cultural or religious value to the tribe (Stand With Standing Rock, n.d.-a). Pipeline construction was essentially a 150-foot-wide road cutting through over 300 miles of prairie and had the potential to destroy hundreds of sacred sites (Colwell, 2016; Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-a). According to the National Historic Preservation Act (1966/1992), federal agencies like the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are required to consult with tribes when construction may disrupt sacred places. However, the Standing Rock Sioux refused to meet with the Army Corps of Engineers as the Corps refused to review all land that will be disrupted; Corps interest was only in the water crossing (Colwell, 2016). The Standing Rock Sioux were concerned about the safety of their sacred sites over the entire path of the construction, not just the water passage. Archeologists did eventually walk the pipeline but the required tribal survey was not conducted. The issue with not having the tribal survey is archeologists view the land through a different perspective than American Indians (Colwell, 2016). Archeologists are scientific, searching for shards of pottery or buried villages, something tangible to explain the past. American Indians, on the other hand, view a space via multiple levels. These levels “layer time and place in a complex way, enlacing the real and tangible with the symbolic and representational” (Ferguson & Colwell-Chanthaphonh, 2006, p. 150). Therefore, a space can be replete with cultural meaning, such as a traditional area for gathering healing plants or a place where water is collected for ceremonies (Colwell, 2016). A space is more than the location of tangible artifacts. Hence, federal agencies approved the construction of the pipeline without recognizing how American Indians view their own heritage. The National Historic Preservation Act was amended in 1992 to recognize the value of traditional cultural spaces, acknowledging the importance of American Indian history (NHPA, 1966/1992). Energy Transfer Partners skirted around these requirements, going so far as to exclude the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in their Environmental Assessment documents (Environmental Protection Agency, 2016). The 6 breakdown between federal agencies and the Standing Rock Sioux could have been avoided had the government and corporation been willing to acknowledge American Indian perspectives. Dakota Access and the Media The Dakota Access Pipeline protest was reported across the globe. Top hits from the Google search “Dakota Access Pipeline Protest 2016” includes reports from Inside Climate News, New York Times, USA Today, CNN, NBC News, and The Guardian. It is clear from the thousands of articles found regarding the protest the media served as a public informant, acting as a conduit between those in power (oil companies, government agencies) and the masses. The press has the responsibility to inform the public so informed decisions regarding government actions can be made (Weston, 1996). This assumes, however, the press is sharing accurate information. The Hutchins Commission (1947) stated the “freedom of expression does not include the right to lie as a deliberate instrument of policy” (p. 10). To make an honest error is forgiven, but the press may not deliberately misinform the public. To suppress the truth also suppresses public discussion, which is important to a healthy society. The Hutchins Commission (1947) further states that debate “elicits mental power and breadth; it is essential to the building of a mentally robust public” (p. 9). This is an early formation of the public sphere as defined by Habermas, Lennox, and Lennos (1974), in which newspapers and other forms of mass communication exist to provide information to all people. Habermas et al (1974) states that in order for public debate to occur in a large society, the media must exist as a way to distribute information and “influence those who receive it” (p. 48). Nerone (2015) argues the values expressed in the Hutchins Commission are important today; however, individuals realize that news organizations are “unelected, unrepresentative (both demographically and politically), generally profit-seeking and, even in crisis, more powerful than they ought to be” (p. 324). 7 Contemporary reporters follow the Code of Ethics established by the Society of Professional Journalists, which states they should strive to “ensure the free exchange of information that is accurate, fair and thorough” (SPJ, 2014, para. 1). This is accomplished via four foundational principles: seek truth and report it, minimize harm, act independently, and be accountable and transparent (SPJ, 2014). Included in these principles are guidelines that encourage reporters to never “misrepresent or oversimplify” (para. 6) and to “avoid stereotyping” (para. 18). However, as literature regarding the media and American Indian representation points out, these guidelines are often blurred. When this occurs, according to Arviso (n.d.), the reporting is inaccurate and adds to the “longstanding ignorance of non-Native media as well as perpetuating stereotypes of Native Americans” (para. 5). Oil and North Dakota The history of oil production in North Dakota is relatively young as its discovery was in April 1951 (State Historical Society of North Dakota, n.d.). Oil production in the state has since increased significantly. Indeed, the average well in western North Dakota’s Bakken Formation can produce over 600,000 barrels of product over 45 years (State Historical Society of North Dakota, n.d.). The state relies heavily on oil production to fund “schools, roads and infrastructure, the North Dakota Legacy Fund, property tax relief, wildlife and natural resources, and more” (Energy of North Dakota, n.d.). According to Energy of North Dakota (n.d.), taxes paid for oil production and extraction was over $1.63 billion in 2017. It is easy to understand, therefore, why the state government supports oil production to the extent it will ignore the needs of its original inhabitants. Some state representatives are known to accept substantial donations from oil companies like Energy Transfer Partners. To illustrate, all three members of the North Dakota Industrial 8 Commission, the office in charge of the state’s Oil and Gas Division, accepted sizeable donations from oil companies in recent elections. Agriculture Commissioner Doug Goehring received campaign donations from at least ten oil companies or their executives (Scheyder, 2014); Attorney General Wayne Stenhjem accepted $50,000 during his last race; and Governor Doug Burgum accepted over $100,000 from oil company executives (Dalrymple, 2017). Acceptance of these donations is a conflict of interest between their duty to all people of the state and corporate interest. Governor Burgum shows his support of oil on the homepage of Dakota Pipeline Facts, stating the project has “faced months of politically driven delays and will allow for safe transport of North Dakota product to market” (Dakota Access Pipeline Facts, n.d.- a). He does not have a message supporting the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. It could be argued that acceptance of money from oil companies is a way to indicate their support of the oil industry in the state. Summary The media played an important role during the Dakota Access Pipeline protest. Through media framing of American Indian activists, newspapers reviewed in this research effectively rewrote the Indigenous narrative of natural resources inherently sacred to this population. My analysis of artifacts highlights North Dakota’s dependence on oil revenue and its willingness to repress its American Indian population. Therefore the mainstream media acted as a form of settler colonialism, under-or mis-representing the issue to the benefit of oil companies rather than follow the rule of law. The inclusion of Indigenous media highlights the multivocality of Indigenous reporters as they recognize the numerous levels of history and place during the protest. 9 The first chapter of this disquisition argues that today’s news media are a form of settler colonialism. Accomplished via media owners and boards controlling the narrative of American Indians, these men and women have the power to frame events in ways that will benefit the dominant class. The framing reinforces the structure in which American Indians are considered less superior by the dominant class. This leads to chapter two in which media framing is examined and explores how frames may influence audience perceptions. Chapter two also reviews the history of media bias against American Indians—and how this bias has not changed over the centuries. Chapter three discusses the comparative qualitative content analysis and coding frame used to examine artifacts regarding the Dakota Access Pipeline protest and the framing of American Indian activists. Chapter four explores the research findings and providing analysis regarding the five dominant frames discovered in the artifacts. The analysis also leads to the answering of the research questions. Chapter five concludes this disquisition, tying the chapters together to fully explain how settler colonialism is present in today’s news media. Implications of settler colonialism in the media and the legacy of the Dakota Access Pipeline protest are also discussed. 10 CHAPTER ONE: COLONIALISM & SETTLER COLONIALISM The term settler colonialism invokes pastoral images of pioneers crossing the open prairie in covered wagons, searching for a new life in America. Pioneers, or settlers, are often conceived of as young men eager to homestead in an effort to create an inheritance for future generations (Bowman, 1927). It goes without saying these young men are conceived of as white with a European ancestry following the ideology of a patriarchal social system (Veracini, 2013). It is also assumed these settlers will peacefully encourage the Indigenous population to resettle elsewhere (Ono, 2009). The reality of settler colonialism, in American and elsewhere, is significantly different from the popular conceptions noted above. It is a brutal act of elimination so embedded in society that it continues to repress today (Ono, 2009). Several theorists will be discussed in this chapter, ranging from Karl Marx to Noam Chomsky. The selection of theorists is not random, despite their varying ideologies. Rather, each theorist contributes to the understanding of colonialism. To illustrate, Fanon’s focus is post-colonialism. However, he understands post-colonialism via a historical lens, which contributes to Marx’s historical view of oppression. Both scholars discuss capitalist expansion and the widening gap between colonizers and colonized. Compartmentalization of social classes helps to understand settler colonialism and the efforts to eliminate the Indigenous. Marx and Fanon also discuss the tension in the relationship between the colonizers and colonized, as each are dependent upon one another. The bourgeoisie and colonizers cannot increase financial wealth without the labor of the working class and colonized. Settlers, however, were both colonizers and colonized. They attempted to eliminate the Indigenous, as this population was not needed for financial gain. However, settlers were dependent on the upper classes and lawmakers to eliminate the Indigenous without facing legal repercussions. 11 This chapter will provide a brief overview of traditional colonialism before discussing settler colonialism and the part it plays in today’s social structure before ending with a discussion of neocolonialism. The chapter will finish with a discussion of how the news media participate in settler colonialism via industry structure and how these actions maintain dominant ideologies. Colonialism: Then and Now Colonialism This section focuses on colonialism, which is the concept from which settler colonialism emerged. Colonialism is capitalistic expansion from one territory to another in which the ideology of race works to form distinct social categories. The Marxist perspective is applied due to his belief that, like colonialism, the working class suffers under the ideologies of the dominant class. It is a viewpoint of historical oppression, in which colonizers benefit from the labor of the colonized. As this research will discuss, the dominant class in the United States has long oppressed American Indians. European colonialism began in the Middle Ages with the goal of creating temporary or permanent settlements across the globe (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1998). It is defined as “the implanting of settlements on distant territory” (Said, 1993, p. 41). The origins of colonialism emerged from imperialism, a concept in which the dominant ideology stems from a metropolitan area ruling from a distance (Ashcroft et al., 1998). Expansion from metropolises to distant territories occurs when consumer demand of the bourgeoisie for a product increases while local resources needed for manufacture of the product decreases (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). Owners and manufacturers of the resources, or the bourgeoisie, compose a society’s dominant class and it is in their interest to meet the consumer demands and find new locations for resource extraction. If expansion does not occur, wealth will be lost. Hence, colonialism is capitalistic at 12 its foundation, as the European bourgeoisie could no longer increase their wealth locally (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). The bourgeoisie were forced to expand their resource extraction in distant territories in order to meet production demands. Philosopher and writer Frantz Fanon (1963), in his examination of colonialism, states “capitalism…regarded the colonies as a source of raw materials which once processed could be unloaded on the European market” (p. 26). Capitalism also defines the relationship between the production of goods and social class (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). History, it has been argued, is a continuous repetition of class struggle in which the bourgeoisie regularly exploit the proletariat (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). The repetition is ceaseless as humans are social beings that are shaped by the culture in which they are raised. A variety of social classes existed and evolved for centuries, yet the mid-17th century European bourgeoisie, desiring to meet the demands of global markets, reduced the class system into two factions (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). The two camps—bourgeoisie and proletariat1 —exist in oppositional tension as they rely on one another for existence. Yet when social classes are divided so clearly, a compartmentalized world is created (Fanon, 1963). For example, the bourgeoisie recognized the necessity of global expansion to meet market needs; therefore, they began to settle in distant territories to create trade relationships, extract resources, and modernize production (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). They also needed laborers, often individuals from the Indigenous population, for without them production would not occur and bourgeoisie wealth would not increase. Modernization, however, could lead to overproduction of goods that, in turn, may have a destructive effect on manufacturing. This results in decreased wealth of the working class due to overproduction (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). Ideology of Race The ideology of race, in which the white race is considered dominant, is a defining factor in the development of colonization (Césaire, 1955; Fanon, 1963; Memmi, 1965). Like the class structure studied by Marx and Engels (1848/1964), Fanon (1963) states colonized societies consist of two categories: oppressors/colonizers and the oppressed/colonized. The oppressors (white European/dominant class) form the repressive state apparatus, the institutions necessary to create and enforce laws (Althusser, 1971; Fanon, 1963). The goal of the repressive state apparatus is to maintain the status quo established by the oppressors. The oppressed are the Indigenous that suffer under colonialist rule (Fanon, 1963). These categories of colonized societies are based on the ideology of race with the understanding that white is best (according to Christianity and white men of the dominant class). The capitalistic view of colonialism, with the understanding that class division combined with forced labor, creates an economic structure based on race (Fanon, 1963). Colonial racism is the ongoing separation of the colonizer and the colonized (Fanon, 1963; Memmi, 1965). The ideology of this separation means the colonizer is continuously degrading and reajusting the position of the colonized, making sure the gap between the two classes is always clearly defined. Colonial racism exploits this gap to the benefit of the colonizer (Memmi, 1965). This is accomplished through the subjection of the colonized to labor for increased profit. Additionally, the differences between the colonizer and the colonized is 14 considered by all parties to be absolute fact (Memmi, 1965). The construct of race and superiority of the white race is “a sine qua non of colonial life, but it also lays the foundation for the immutability of this life” (Memmi, 1965, p. 74). Fanon (1963) highlights the irony that while colonial racism considers the white race to be superior, it is also the race that is always the foreigner in the colonized world. The colonizers are from elsewhere while the colonized are considered “the other” (Fanon, 1963, p. 5). Othering Colonial attempts at “othering” include making the colonized appear uncivilized in the eyes of the dominant class (Césaire, 1955). This tactic is employed when violence, which is always present in colonial situations, pulls the colonizer “deeper into the abyss of barbarism” (Césaire, 1955, p. 9). However, rather than blame themselves, the oppressors endeavor to turn the colonized into the barbarian. This can be accomplished by public displays of the colonizer’s virtue and attempts to appear heroic (Memmi, 1965). To illustrate, the colonizer may focus on their deep spirituality to indicate their faithfulness to a higher power; a spirituality they consider not possessed by the colonized. The colonizer also attempts to degrade the colonized, “using the darkest colors to depict them” (Memmi, 1965, p. 54). In other words, colonizers actively strive to ensure the colonized is seen as their direct opposite. However, the more the colonizer attempts to depict himself as heroic, the more he is aware of the unjust relationship between colonizer and colonized (Hanson & Hanson, 2006; Memmi, 1965; Weaver-Hightower, 2018). Rather than acknowledge the relationship, the colonizer continues to perpetuate the myth of their importance and the evil ways of the colonized. Othering is also accomplished by viewing and treating the colonized as animals (Césaire, 1955; Fanon, 1963; Memmi, 1965). When the colonized are viewed as animals, the colonizer 15 dominates, turning “the indigenous man into an instrument of production” (Césaire, 1955, p. 42; Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). This is not unlike the use of oxen to plow a field or horses to pull heavy loads. Similarly, the colonizer views the oppressed as without values, “impervious to ethics, representing not only the absence of values by also the negation of values” (Fanon, 1963, p. 6; Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). The colonizer, therefore, views the colonized as an animal absent of all values, worthy only of production and labor that will allow the colonizer to profit. Power and Domination Colonized people do not willingly allow themselves to be oppressed (Fanon, 1963). They are turned into a workforce through violence, slavery, and other means of domination in order to increase the wealth of the colonizers. French philosopher Aimé Césaire (1955) explains this using Hitler as an example of domination and capitalism. Hitler considered the colonized country to be one that must be “a country of serfs, of agricultural laborers, or industrial workers. It is not a question of eliminating the inequalities among men but of widening them and making them into a law” (Césaire, 1955, p. 37). This is similar to Foucault’s (1977) belief the human body serves as an instrument. When the body is used against one’s will, i.e. a prisoner or colonized person forced to work, it is only to deprive the person of freedom. The body, then, is simply “caught up in a system of constraints and privations, obligations and prohibitions” (Foucault, 1977, p. 11). Forced labor affects the body in some way, such as starvation, injury, or confinement. Despite affects on the oppressed body, the forced labor increases wealth for the oppressor, as the body is political (Foucault, 1977). Those in power have the ability to use colonized bodies as the dominant class desires to “invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies” (Foucault, 1977, p. 25). 16 Power over bodies occurs in colonized territories, similar to Foucault’s philosophy on prisoner bodies. The colonized body is in a relationship between power and economics of the colonizer. The body as labor power is only possible when subjected, meaning “the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body” (Foucault, 1977, p. 26; Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). Subjection of the body occurs through violence or strategy by the colonizer (Fanon, 1963; Memmi, 1965; Wolfe, 2006). Violence may be obvious to imagine, but the colonizer can strategically make life of the colonized unbearable through laws and other tactics to the point they have no choice but to submit to the oppression. If, as Foucault (1978) argues, truth is a function of power, then truth is built through knowledge/power systems. Not all people experience the systems in the same way, but they come to accept—by choice or by force—what is the truth. The truth eventually becomes a cycle of violence (Fanon, 1963). Like the colonized do not bow to subjection voluntarily, neither do colonizers stop oppressing voluntarily. In fact, colonization ends when the oppressed join forces for violent opposition (Fanon, 1963). Societies that participate in decolonialism, or the “revealing and dismantling of colonist power in all its forms” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1998, p. 63), engage in a long process punctuated by frequent violence to achieve independence (Fanon, 1963). All characteristics of colonial power must be dismantled for liberation to occur. This is a difficult process as many aspects of colonialism are buried within the structure of society, laws, ideologies, and institutions. Settler Colonialism While settler colonialism emerged from colonialism, significant differences between the systems exist, in particular intentions regarding land, permanence, and Indigenous elimination - 17 all of which lead to settler colonialism being a structural aspect of society. Like traditional colonialism, the goal of settler colonialism is to increase financial wealth through land ownership. Settlers desire total control over the land, politically and otherwise (Macoun & Strakosch, 2013). The reason is because land provides sustenance and livelihood: therefore, to own land is to be provided for (Fanon, 1963; Wolfe, 1999, 2006). Agriculture is a common use of land for settlers; however, it is also valuable for grazing, fishing, mining and forestry (Wolfe, 2006). Land often replenishes itself: fish repopulate, fields are replanted, grass regenerates for grazing (Wolfe, 2006). Regardless of use, land ownership gives the settler access to resources that will increase financial wealth. Settlers have the opportunity for permanence due to the continuous revival of the land and its resources. Settler permanence and relationship with the Indigenous in the colonized territory is another difference between the concepts. Permanence is tied to land ownership as settlers arrive with the intent to stay (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999). However, in order to stay on the land, settlers had to first remove the Indigenous occupants (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999, 2006). Operating under the principle of terra nullius, settlers could claim land if it was not already occupied, if occupants granted permission, or if taken by force (Weaver-Hightower, 2018). Settlers did not seek land-use permission from the Indigene. Rather, they worked to “‘remove’ [Indigenous] to establish a better polity, either by setting up an ideal social body or by constituting an exemplary model of social organization” (Veracini, 2010). In other words, settlers bring their ideologies and customs with them to the new territory. The United States, for example, excluded the American Indian from the “national racial identity” (Hoxie, 2008, p. 1164), or the dominant ideology that excludes all but the white race. Euro-American settlers 18 determined the national identity should consist of white individuals, whom they consider to be racially and culturally superior to American Indians (Glenn, 2015; Hoxie, 2008). Elimination of the American Indian Since American Indians did not fit the racial identity of the nation, they were considered an obstacle that needed to be removed in order to take the land to create a “new colonial society” (Wolfe, 1999, 2006, p. 388). One way to remove them was through the agricultural narrative. Some American Indians were highly agricultural prior to settler colonization (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Hurt, 2002; Iverson, 1994; Wolfe, 2006). In an effort to justify land theft, settler discourse framed the Indigenous as nomadic, never staying in one place and therefore removable (Iverson, 1994; Wolfe, 2006). Settlers then framed themselves as farmers and this narrative formed their identity and economic base, which remains intact today (Hurt, 2002; Wolfe, 2006). The irony of this reframing is the settlers were often landless (and assumed non-agricultural) prior to their move to a colonized area (Wolfe, 2006). Not only did settlers steal occupied land, but they stole the Indigenous identity as agricultural experts as well. This nomadic discourse and theft of identity facilitated, in part, the dehumanization of the Indigenous in the eyes of settlers, justifying elimination. Direct and indirect violence as an elimination tactic became a way of life for both the colonizer and the colonized. Case in point, settlers and the U.S. Army used forms of lowintensity warfare. They would intimidate, slaughter, and destroy Indigenous people and villages (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Glenn, 2015; Wolfe, 2006). All Indigenous people would suffer regardless of age or gender. Despite the fact settler colonialism was founded on violence, it was disavowed once settlers occupied the land and the Indigene were, for the most part, eliminated (Veracini, 19 2010). Settler justification lies in their belief that violent acts were in self-defense as they attempted to cultivate vacant land (Veracini, 2010). Another strategy aimed at the Indigenous economy includes the mass slaughter of millions of buffalo, which destroyed the “economic base of the Plains Nations” (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014, p. 142), and the separation of families via abusive boarding schools that attempted to erase the American Indian culture from the youth (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Feir, 2016; Glenn, 2015; Jacobs, 2005). The goal for these actions was to eliminate a culture. Elimination strategies pushed American Indians west until they reached the Pacific Coast. At this point settlers turned to the micro-level of assimilation as an elimination option, focusing on the Indigenous individual as a person (Wolfe, 2006). Through total assimilation into white society, complete with forced relocation and boarding schools, the Indigenous would become extinct and therefore no longer a settler issue. This is a process of breaking down every part of Indigenous life, including “religion, speech, political freedoms, economic liberty, and cultural diversity” (Wunder, 1994, p. 17). Assimilation, argues Wolfe (2006), can be more effective than genocide. Settler colonialism aims to remove the Indigenous population; to write them out of history through assimilation and other forms of elimination and to carry on as if this population never existed (Veracini, 2010, 2011). Elimination indicates the settler intends to stay on Indigenous land, prefering to remove those already inhabiting the space (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999). As Bird Rose (1991) famously notes, “people [Indigene] got in the way by just staying at home” (p. 46). The combined beliefs of permanent ownership of land and elimination of the Indigenous highlight the argument that settler colonialism is a structure, deeply embedded and unceasing, in society rather than a single event (Wolfe, 1999, 2006). This structure is formed via 20 the ideologies delivered by the settlers, ideologies they brought with them from their place of birth and now impose on others (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999). Structure in Society Structuration theory, developed by sociologist Anthony Giddens (1984), draws upon the tension between society’s structure and agency by recognizing that they cannot exist separately. Social systems are created and reproduced by the relationship between structures and agents. This creates a duality of structure, indicating that society is formed by individuals and individuals create their society. Structure can be considered the institutional rules of society. Rules can both enable and constrain the agency, or capability of action, of individuals within society. For example, language is a form of communication between actors and “forms a ‘structure’ which is in some sense constituted by the speech of the ‘language community’ or collectivity” (Cassell, 1993, p. 102). Therefore, two people speaking the same language follow particular rules regarding sentence structure, meaning of words, and so on. When members of society follow the guidelines set in place by structures, they are essentially reproducing the social systems set in place by structure and agency. Individuals within a society are raised with an awareness of rules and choose, consciously or not, to reproduce these rules in their daily practice. Rules are expressions of dominance and power, as the dominant class creates and maintains rules (Giddens, 1993). Through Western laws, for example, the dominant class in America recognizes, dehumanizes, assimilates, and eliminates the Indigenous (Morgensen, 2011). By recognizing American Indians via treaties and acknowledgement of sovereignty, a structure was formed. This structure is recognized today but only when it benefits the dominant class. However, the recognition mainly occurs when money 21 is to be made. As soon as financial wealth is to be gained, the dominant class disregards the legal recognitions they, themselves, created (Morgensen, 2011). Also, those in power often reproduce the rules without question (Cassell, 1993). This reproduction is known as a dialect of control, indicating that those in power, who wish to remain in power, willingly accept social structures. It does not benefit them to change social structures if it means they would lose the benefits offered to those in the dominant class. Biopower, or the activity that “inherits and transforms the deeply historical conditions of Western law” (Morgensen, 2011, p. 54), indicates the dominant class inherited settler colonialism. Structure also determines a society’s level of success based on its economy and relationship between social classes. Metaphorically speaking, structure is described as a building with an economic base (infrastructure) and two upper floors of superstructure (Althusser, 1971). The infrastructure is a unifying force in society because money is one thing all individuals and organizations need. One dollar bill has little value; however, a large quantity of dollar bills helps to determine that individual’s social class. Additionally, the amount of money exchanged determine’s the economic success of that society. A strong economic base with money being saved and exchanged determines the level of success of the superstructure. A poor economy, for instance, would be reflected through increased homelessless, unemployment, government assistance, and so on. That economy means the working class is not able to increase their own financial gain in addition to the wealth of their employer. The superstructure consists of two levels: political/legal and ideological (Althusser, 1971). The political/legal superstructure is also known as the repressive state apparatus, or RSA (Althusser, 1971). Consisting of the military, prisons, police, and court system, the repressive state apparatus rules through mental or physical coercian and violence. It is important to note the 22 repressive state apparatus follows the leadership of the ruling class. Therefore, the repressive state apparatus wields “a monopoly of the means of force in capitalist societies and applied that monopoly to support capitalist class structures” (Wolff, 2005, p. 225). Threats to the capitalist class are repressed as quickly as possible. The ideological state apparatus (ISA), the other level of the superstructure, guides society via ideology first followed by repression. Ideological state apparatuses instruct “children and adults with specific ways of imagining—thinking about and thus understanding—their places within and relationships to the societies within which they lived” (Wolff, 2005, p. 225). The variety of ideological state apparatuses—education, religion, family, communication—work together in order to be successful. Each ISA works in tandem with each other to encourage individuals to consider their relationship within each ISA and act according to ideological guidelines. This means individuals act accordingly or face discipline, either through the ideological institution itself or the repressive state apparatus. What is most interesting is Althusser’s argument that individuals follow ISAs based on their own self-choosing rather than realizing the ideologies have been inculcated since childhood. This allows ISAs to serve capitalism because they can “interpellate subjects within meaning systems…that make them at least accept and at best celebrate capialist exploitation” (Althusser, 1971, p. 226). The work force is willingly accepting their own subjugation. The combination of ideologies and social class distinctions create settler colonial structures that are deeply embedded into the weave of American culture and nearly impossible to change (Macoun and Strakosch, 2013). Settler colonialism is permanent and therefore part of America’s repressive and ideological structures (Kauanui, 2016; Wolfe, 1999, 2006). Writing as a contemporary Indigenous scholar, Kaunaui (2016) “colonialism cannot be relegated to the 23 past” (p. 10). When historicized, it means the past is being rewritten to the benefit of the dominant class. It “persists as a pervasive part of the contemporary normalization of settler colonialism” (Kauanui, 2016, p. 11). This is related to the education ideological apparatus as the dominant class whitewashes history to showcase their heroisim rather than their brutal takeover of land. For example, the settlers considered land as open and free for the taking once the Indigenous population was removed. The goal, then, was to eliminate the American Indians and proceed as if they never existed (Wolfe, 1999). The elimination of native societies means settler colonialism is not a one-time event, it is a permanent part of a society’s structure. Ideological Structure of News Media The media—television, radio, newspapers—form Althusser’s communication apparatus (Sevgi & Ozgokceler, 2016). The institutions within the apparatus contribute to settler colonialism as they recognize Indigenous populations; however, the industry controls the narrative of this community through media frames. Beyond these frames, which will be discussed in the next chapter, the narrative is controlled through the ideology and hegemony of media organizations. Based on the ideology of objectivity, news media (theoretically) attempt to distribute accurate and unbiased information to the masses. However, the institutional structure of the media ensures the dominant ideology is being supported (Althusser, 1971; Mullen & Klaehn, 2010). Media owners and managers control the appearance of objectivity and “their forms of social control must be indirect, subtle, and not at all necessarily conscious” (Gitlin, 2003, p. 259). This is achieved through the hiring of personnel w

ho are typically white and uppermiddle-class, decisions as to who is promoted or otherwise rewarded, and organizantional 24 policies. The result is upper-level decision makers that were raised in the dominant ideology and share the “core [emphasis original] hegemonic assumptions of their class” (Gitlin, 2003, p. 260). The media in America are ubiquitous, which makes it an ideal format for those in power to disseminate their ideology to the masses. The media are arguably the most “dynamic part of this ideological structure” (Gramsci, 2009, p. 36) as the dominant class works vehemently to maintain and defend their ideologies and use the press to circulate them to the masses (Gramsci, 2009). News stories that support dominant class ideologies are “reinforcing dominant social norms and values that legitimize the social system” (Gurevitch, Bennett, Curran, & Wollacott, 1982, p. 9) The Propaganda Model investigates how norms and values become standardised in a society. It explores the “relationships between ideology, communicative power and social class interests” (Mullen & Klaehn, 2010, p. 217). Developed by Herman and Chomsky (1988) the model argues that news flows through multple filters, each designed to maintain dominant class power. The Propaganda Model, particularly when viewed through the traditional Marxist lens and Althusser’s ISAs, emphasizes the fact that media are influencers in the control of the dominant ideology (Sevgi & Ozgokceler, 2016). This is accomplished through the five filters of the Propaganda Model: size, ownership, and profit of mass media; advertiser influence; use of sources; flak; and anti-communision as a control mechanism (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). This research focuses on two filters in particular, the size/ownership/profitability of mass media and reliance of government or corporate sources. The size/ownership/profitability (SOP) filter supports the institutional structural argument. The investment needed to start a media organization with significant outreach has grown to extreme proportions (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). Media historian Ben Bagdikian 25 (2004) points out that historically, many different individuals ran the dominant media corporations in America. However, by 2003 only five firms controlled most of the 37,000 media outlets (Bagdikian, 2004). The Big Five,2 as Bagdikian (2004) calls them, have access to the over $2 billion spent per year in advertising; money that helps them purchase and maintain the numerous media entities in their name. This trend continues, as 15 billionaires currently own 90% of American media (Vinton, 2016). This includes individuals such as Jeff Bezos, owner of amazon.com, who purchased the Washington Post for $250 million (Vinton, 2016). Prohibitive costs leads to reduced opportunities for small and/or alternative media to reach the masses as they typically do not possess the necessary capital (Goodwin, 1994). Most media owners and boards of directors are extremely wealthy, full-fledged members of the dominant class (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). For example, current board members of the New York Times include 11 corporate executives of global companies, two Times executives, and one lawyer (New York Times Company, n.d.-a). Additionally, the average net worth of board members is approximately $2 million.3 This is considerably more than the average net worth of the American worker, which is under $200,000 (Campbell, 2018). Board members are also closely aligned with brokerage firms and banks that, in turn, own stock in media organizations (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). If the news disseminated does not favor increased shareholder wealth, they may be inclined to sell stock or withhold advice (Bagdikian, 2004; Herman & Chomsky, 1988). This quid pro quo relationship indicates strong connections between dominant market forces.

#### 3] External critiques fail to produce meaningful change and allow capitalism to profit off liberal movements through direct responses that foster its own growth.

#### Baudrillard, (Jean Baudrillard, sociologist, philosopher and cultural theorist, “Symbolic Exchange and Death,” <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B5o2oXdmBrRYbHR5VGlWM242LVE/view)> We will not destroy the system by a direct, dialectical revolution of the economic or political infrastructure. Everything produced by contradiction, by the relation of forces, or by energy in general, will only feed back into the mechanism and give it impetus, following a circular distortion similar to a Moebius strip. We will never defeat it by following its own logic of energy, calculation, reason and revolution, history and power, or some finality or counter-finality. The worst violence at this level has no purchase, and will only backfire against itself. We will never defeat the system on the plane of the real: the worst error of all our revolutionary strategies is to believe that we will put an end to the system on the plane of the real: this is their imaginary, imposed on them by the system itself, living or surviving only by always leading those who attack the system to fight amongst each other on the terrain of reality, which is always the reality of the system. This is where they throw all their energies, their imaginary violence, where an implacable logic constantly turns back into the system. We have only to do it violence or counter-violence since it thrives on symbolic violence not in the degraded sense in which this formula has found fortune, as a violence 'of signs', from which the system draws strength, or with which it 'masks' its material violence: symbolic violence is deduced from a logic of the symbolic (which has nothing to do with the sign or with energy): reversal, the incessant reversibility of the counter-gift and, conversely, the seizing of power by the unilateral exercise of the gift. 25 We must therefore displace everything into the sphere of the symbolic, where challenge, reversal and overbidding are the law, so that we can respond to death only by an equal or superior death. There is no question here of real violence or force, the only question concerns the challenge and the logic of the symbolic. If domination comes from the system's retention of the exclusivity of the gift without counter-gift the gift of work which can only be responded to by destruction or sacrifice, if not in consumption, which is only a spiral of the system of surplus-gratification without result, therefore a spiral of surplus-domination; a gift of media and messages to which, due to the monopoly of the code, nothing is allowed to retort; the gift, everywhere and at every instant, of the social, of the protection agency, security, gratification and the solicitation of the social from which nothing is any longer permitted to escape then the only solution is to turn the principle of its power back against the system itself: the impossibility of responding or retorting. To defy the system with a gift to which it cannot respond save by its own collapse and death. Nothing, not even the system, can avoid the symbolic obligation, and it is in this trap that the only chance of a catastrophe for capital remains.

#### 4] The university is a dying institution and they reinject it with cruel meaning that sustains its violent existence.

**Baudrillard 95**,Jean Baudrillard – Dead French – Simulacra and Simulation: The Spiraling Cadaver //Scopa

**The university is in ruins**: nonfunctional in the social arenas of the market and employment, **lacking cultural substance or** an end purpose of **knowledge**. Strictly speaking, there is no longer even any **power**: it **is also in ruins**. Whence the impossibility of the return of the fires of 1968: of the return of putting in question knowledge versus power itself - the explosive contradiction of knowledge and power (or the revelation of their collusion, which comes to the same thing) in the university, and, at the same time, through symbolic (rather than political) contagion in the whole institutional and social order. Why sociologists? marked this shift: **the impasse of knowledge**, **the vertigo of nonknowledge** (that is to say at once the absurdity and **the impossibility of accumulating value in the order of knowledge**) **turns like an absolute weapon against power itself**, **in order to dismantle it according to the same vertiginous scenario of dispossession**. This is the May 1968 effect. Today it cannot be achieved since **power itself**, after knowledge, **has taken off**, has become ungraspable - has **dispossessed itself**. In **a now uncertain institution**, **without knowledge content**, **without a power structure** (except for an archaic feudalism that turns a simulacrum of a machine whose destiny escapes it and whose survival is as artificial as that of barracks and theaters), **offensive irruption is impossible**. **Only what precipitates rotting**, **by accentuating the parodic**, **simulacral side of dying games of knowledge and power**, **has meaning**. **A strike has exactly the opposite effect**. **It regenerates the ideal of a possible university**: **the fiction of an ascension on everyone's part to a culture that is unlocatable, and that no longer has meaning**. **This ideal is substituted for the operation of the university as** its critical alternative, as **its therapy**. **This fiction still dreams of a permanency and democracy of knowledge**. Besides, everywhere today the Left plays this role: **it is the justice of the Left that reinjects an idea of justice**, **the necessity of logic and social morals into a rotten apparatus that is coming undone**, which is losing all conscience of its legitimacy and renounces functioning almost of its own volition. **It is the Left that secrets and desperately reproduces power**, **because it wants power**, **and** therefore **the Left believes in it and revives it precisely where the system puts an end to it**. The system puts an end one by one to all its axioms, to all its institutions, and realizes one by one all the objectives of **the historical and revolutionary Left** that sees **itself constrained to revive the wheels of capital in order to lay seige to them** one day: from private property to the small business, from the army to national grandeur, from puritan morality to petit bourgeois culture, justice at the university - **everything that is disappearing**, **that the system itself**, in its atrocity, certainly, but also in its irreversible impulse, **has liquidated**, **must be conserved**. Whence the paradoxical but necessary inversion of all the terms of political analysis. **Power** (or what takes its place) **no longer believes in the university**. It knows fundamentally that it is only a zone for the shelter and surveillance of a whole class of a certain age, it therefore has only to select - **it will find its elite elsewhere**, or **by other means**. Diplomas are worthless: why would it refuse to award them, in any case it is ready to award them to everybody; **why this provocative politics**, if not in order to crystallize energies on a fictive stake (selection, work, diplomas, etc.), **on an already dead and rotting referential?** By rotting, the university can still do a lot of damage (rotting is a symbolic mechanism not political but symbolic, therefore subversive for us). But for this to be the case **it is necessary to start with this very rotting,** and **not to dream of resurrection**. **It is necessary to transform this rotting into a violent process**, **into violent death,** through **mockery and defiance,** **through** a multiplied **simulation that would offer the ritual of the death of the university as a model of decomposition to the whole of society**, **a contagious model of the disaffection of a whole social structure**, where death would finally make its ravages, which the strike tries desperately to avert, **in complicity with the system**, but succeeds, on top of it all, **only in transforming the university into a slow death**, **a delay that is not even the possible site of a subversion**, **of an offensive reversion**. That is what the events of May 1968 produced. At a less advanced point in the process of the liquefaction of **the university** and of culture, **the students**, far from **wish**ing **to** save the furniture **(revive the lost object**, in an ideal mode), **retorted by confronting power with the challenge of the total**, **immediate death of the institution**, the challenge of a deterritorialization even more intense than the one that came from the system, and **by summoning power to respond to this total derailment of the institution of knowledge**, to this total lack of a need to gather in a given place, **this death desired in the end** - **not the crisis of the university**, **that is not a challenge**, on the contrary, it **is the game of the system, but the death of the university** - to that challenge, power has not been able to respond, except by its own dissolution in return (only for a moment maybe, but we saw it).

#### 5] Their linkage of identity politics with trauma maintains affective structures that undergird liberalism. Baudrillard 94, Jean, Baudrillard The illusion of the End, Page 66-70//Scopa

We have long denounced the capitalistic, economic exploitation of the poverty of the 'other half of the world' [['autre monde]. We must today denounce the moral and sentimental exploitation of that poverty - charity cannibalism being worse than oppressive violence. The extraction and humanitarian reprocessing of a destitution which has become the equivalent of oil deposits and gold mines. The extortion of the spectacle of poverty and, at the same time, of our charitable condescension: a worldwide appreciated surplus of fine sentiments and bad conscience. We should, in fact, see this not as the extraction of raw materials, but as a waste-reprocessing enterprise. Their destitution and our bad conscience are, in effect, all part of the waste-products of history- the main thing is to recycle them to produce a new energy source. We have here an escalation in the psychological balance of terror. World capitalist oppression is now merely the vehicle and alibi for this other, much more ferocious, form of moral predation. One might almost say, contrary to the Marxist analysis, that material exploitation is only there to extract that spiritual raw material that is the misery of peoples, which serves as psychological nourishment for the rich countries and media nourishment for our daily lives. The 'Fourth World' (we are no longer dealing with a 'developing' Third World) is once again beleaguered, this time as a catastrophe-bearing stratum. The West is whitewashed in the reprocessing of the rest of the world as waste and residue. And the white world repents and seeks absolution - it, too, the waste-product of its own history. The South is a natural producer of raw materials, the latest of which is catastrophe. The North, for its part, specializes in the reprocessing of raw materials and hence also in the reprocessing of catastrophe. Bloodsucking protection, humanitarian interference, Medecins sans frontieres, international solidarity, etc. The last phase of colonialism: the New Sentimental Order is merely the latest form of the New World Order. Other people's destitution becomes our adventure playground. Thus, the humanitarian offensive aimed at the Kurds - a show of repentance on the part of the Western powers after allowing Saddam Hussein to crush them - is in reality merely the second phase of the war, a phase in which charitable intervention finishes off the work of extermination. We are the consumers of the ever delightful spectacle of poverty and catastrophe, and of the moving spectacle of our own efforts to alleviate it (which, in fact, merely function to secure the conditions of reproduction of the catastrophe market); there, at least, in the order of moral profits, the Marxist analysis is wholly applicable: we see to it that extreme poverty is reproduced as a symbolic deposit, as a fuel essential to the moral and sentimental equilibrium of the West. In our defence, it might be said that this extreme poverty was largely of our own making and it is therefore normal that we should profit by it. There can be no finer proof that the distress of the rest of the world is at the root of Western power and that the spectacle of that distress is its crowning glory than the inauguration, on the roof of the Arche de la Defense, with a sumptuous buffet laid on by the Fondation des Droits de l'homme, of an exhibition of the finest photos of world poverty. Should we be surprised that spaces are set aside in the Arche d' Alliance. for universal suffering hallowed by caviar and champagne? Just as the economic crisis of the West will not be complete so long as it can still exploit the resources of the rest of the world, so the symbolic crisis will be complete only when it is no longer able to feed on the other half's human and natural catastrophes (Eastern Europe, the Gulf, the Kurds, Bangladesh, etc.). We need this drug, which serves us as an aphrodisiac and hallucinogen. And the poor countries are the best suppliers - as, indeed, they are of other drugs. We provide them, through our media, with the means to exploit this paradoxical resource, just as we give them the means to exhaust their natural resources with our technologies. Our whole culture lives off this catastrophic cannibalism, relayed in cynical mode by the news media, and carried forward in moral mode by our humanitarian aid, which is a way of encouraging it and ensuring its continuity, just as economic aid is a strategy for perpetuating under-development. Up to now, the financial sacrifice has been compensated a hundredfold by the moral gain. But when the catastrophe market itself reaches crisis point, in accordance with the implacable logic of the market, when distress becomes scarce or the marginal returns on it fall from overexploitation, when we run out of disasters from elsewhere or when they can no longer be traded like coffee or other commodities, the West will be forced to produce its own catastrophe for itself, in order to meet its need for spectacle and that voracious appetite for symbols which characterizes it even more than its voracious appetite for food. It will reach the point where it devours itself. When we have finished sucking out the destiny of others, we shall have to invent one for ourselves. The Great Crash, the symbolic crash, will come in the end from us Westerners, but only when we are no longer able to feed on the hallucinogenic misery which comes to us from the other half of the world. Yet they do not seem keen to give up their monopoly. The Middle East, Bangladesh, black Africa and Latin America are really going flat out in the distress and catastrophe stakes, and thus in providing symbolic nourishment for the rich world. They might be said to be overdoing it: heaping earthquakes, floods, famines and ecological disasters one upon another, and finding the means to massacre each other most of the time. The 'disaster show' goes on without any let-up and our sacrificial debt to them far exceeds their economic debt. The misery with which they generously overwhelm us is something we shall never be able to repay. The sacrifices we offer in return are laughable (a tornado or two, a few tiny holocausts on the roads, the odd financial sacrifice) and, moreover, by some infernal logic, these work out as much greater gains for us, whereas our kindnesses have merely added to the natural catastrophes another one immeasurably worse: the demographic catastrophe, a veritable epidemic which we deplore each day in pictures. In short, there is such distortion between North and South, to the symbolic advantage of the South (a hundred thousand Iraqi dead against casualties numbered in tens on our side: in every case we are the losers), that one day everything will break down. One day, the West will break down if we are not soon washed clean of this shame, if an international congress of the poor countries does not very quickly decide to share out this symbolic privilege of misery and catastrophe. It is of course normal, since we refuse to allow the spread of nuclear weapons, that they should refuse to allow the spread of the catastrophe weapon. But it is not right that they should exert that monopoly indefinitely. In any case, the under-developed are only so by comparison with the Western system and its presumed success. In the light of its assumed failure, they are not under-developed at all. They are only so in terms of a dominant evolutionism which has always been the worst of colonial ideologies. The argument here is that there is a line of objective progress and everyone is supposed to pass through its various stages (we find the same eyewash with regard to the evolution of species and in that evolutionism which unilaterally sanctions the superiority of the human race). In the light of current upheavals, which put an end to any idea of history as a linear process, there are no longer either developed or under-developed peoples. Thus, to encourage hope of evolution - albeit by revolution - among the poor and to doom them, in keeping with the objective illusion of progress, to technological salvation is a criminal absurdity. In actual fact, it is their good fortune to be able to escape from evolution just at the point when we no longer know where it is leading. In any case, a majority of these peoples, including those of Eastern Europe, do not seem keen to enter this evolutionist modernity, and their weight in the balance is certainly no small factor in the West's repudiation of its own history, of its own utopias and its own modernity. It might be said that the routes of violence, historical or otherwise, are being turned around and that the viruses now pass from South to North, there being every chance that, five hundred years after America was conquered, 1992 and the end of the century will mark the comeback of the defeated and the sudden reversal of that modernity. The sense of pride is no longer on the side of wealth but of poverty, of those who - fortunately for them - have nothing to repent, and may indeed glory in being privileged in terms of catastrophes. Admittedly, this is a privilege they could hardly renounce, even if they wished to, but natural disasters merely reinforce the sense of guilt felt towards them by the wealthy – by those whom God visibly scorns since he no longer even strikes them down. One day it will be the Whites themselves who will give up their whiteness. It is a good bet that repentance will reach its highest pitch with the five-hundredth anniversary of the conquest of the Americas. We are going to have to lift the curse of the defeated - but symbolically victorious - peoples, which is insinuating itself five hundred years later, by way of repentance, into the heart of the white race. No solution has been found to the dramatic situation of the under-developed, and none will be found since their drama has now been overtaken by that of the overdeveloped, of the rich nations. The psychodrama of congestion, saturation, super abundance, neurosis and the breaking of blood vessels which haunts us - the drama of the excess of means over ends – calls more urgently for attention than that of penury, lack and poverty. That is where the most imminent danger of catastrophe resides, in the societies which have run out of emptiness. Artificial catastrophes, like the beneficial aspects of civilization, progress much more quickly than natural ones. The underdeveloped are still at the primary stage of the natural, unforeseeable catastrophe. We are already at the second stage, that of the manufactured catastrophe - imminent and foreseeable - and we shall soon be at that of the pre-programmed catastrophe, the catastrophe of the third kind, deliberate and experimental. And, paradoxically, it is our pursuit of the means for averting natural catastrophe - the unpredictable form of destiny - which will take us there. Because it is unable to escape it, humanity will pretend to be the author of its destiny. Because it cannot accept being confronted with an end which is uncertain or governed by fate, it will prefer to stage its own death as a species.

#### 6] They are a failed radicalism that masks effective responses to power.

#### Agent Z 11, (Anonymous Blogger @ In Bed with the Resistance, So You Think You’re Radical?, 5/22/11, <http://withtheresistance.com/so-you-think-youre-a-radical/>)

I’ve always quite liked those essays and pamphlets that have from time to time been put out to confront politically active people with their own behaviour patterns. They tend to have a provocative edge and slightly supercilious note that I will attempt to emulate in this post. Because this one is for people who think of themselves as radicals. This is a post about how radicalism might not be radical, and you’re probably to blame. No, not you, obviously, I mean all the people behind you. I should make it clear I’m not talking about spontaneous outbursts of action by people fighting for what they need. It’s not reasonable to discuss what is or isn’t radical about sudden mass movements of people trying to make space for themselves in the world. It simply happens. I’m talking about – and to – the people who sit around discussing how to change things. Events like the demonstration on the 26th March have begun to bother me. Before it happened there was all sorts of talk about all the cool stuff that was going to happen, yet apart from UKUncut very little happened outside the march. Some people ran around in circles for a bit and had some barneys with the police, but no targets, no occupations, no serious disruptions. It seemed that people were waiting for someone else to organise the cool stuff and when it didn’t they just accepted they were riding on the back of a demonstration created by an organisation many of them despise. What is the cool stuff anyway? What is radical action? Well we’re all agreed now that radical stuff should feel good. It should feel liberating as well as being liberating. It should be exciting. It should give you a buzz. It should give you some sense of inner release, or expansion, or connectedness. Having read a load of radical literature from the 60s and 70s I think I’ve found the roots of this attitude: the 60s and 70s. And its not only our attitudes we get from there, but also our rhetoric, and our theory, and most of our idea of what radical action is. A startling amount of it comes from the Situationists and if you haven’t read them, you should, because that’s who you’re following. Problem is, that was a time of a great outburst of individualism among young people. It felt great. I’m sure many people had really interesting experiences of personal liberation. And the structures of society remained largely untouched. I don’t think that was just because the US government shot people at Kent State University or whatever other particular event you choose to blame. I suspect it is because you can’t really challenge large-scale structures – hierarchical collectives if you will – as individuals. And here’s the really horrible thing I’ve begun to suspect: in political terms your personal liberation doesn’t count for diddly-squat. Yes, I know we’ve all come to believe that the liberation of society and our personal liberation are intimately bound up with each other, and maybe they are bound up with each other a bit, but they are different things. I think when eager young people (like me ten years ago) are inducted into what passes for radical culture, they are really inducted into a sub-culture that is very good at giving a sense of personal liberation. And that’s it. Not much more. I think this helps to explain why some people in Britain in the late 90s and early 2000s were convinced they were part of an anti-capitalist movement. As individuals they were anti-capitalist. All their friends were anti-capitalist. The fact that 99% of the population didn’t care often seemed to escape their notice and they called themselves a movement. It wasn’t a movement. I don’t think there is an anti-cuts movement at the moment either. Just a few people who agree with each other hanging around with each other and not much will – from what I’ve seen – to try and break out of that bubble. So someone can make a claim like ‘everyone knows the NHS is being privatised’ and not understand how wrong they are. The truth is, it’s hard work to set up organisations open to everyone. It’s hard to beat the mainstream media at disseminating information outside of twitter. If activism should feel fun, I guess we just won’t do it, because hard work isn’t fun. As for why I would focus on organising: I think the people in charge are really well organised at the moment. The reason every government is more right wing even than we feared is because there is very effective right wing organisation pulling in one direction and there is no organisation at all pulling in any other direction. One of the problems with radical political circles is the failure to communicate with ‘outsiders’ and another, perhaps even more insidious, is that everyone agrees on what radical action is. Even though in our current social context (by definition, since each context is unique) these actions we are taking have no track record of success, this is what we do. This is radical action. Protest. Direct Action. Solidarity rallies. Occupations. I do these things myself too, but I’ve often been filled with doubt while doing them, and surprised by the certainty of others that they know the right way to fight for change. Some of the actions are even actions known to have failed. I was surfing the internet while distracting myself from writing this post and I came across the Jarrow March 2011. A bunch of unemployed workers are planning to march from Jarrow to London to highlight their situation, in imitation of a similar march in 1936. Now, I don’t know how to point this out without sounding like the bad guy, but someone’s going to have to say it. Guys, you know it didn’t work in 1936, right? You know it made bugger all difference? I suppose the reference to history is supposed to create certain resonances with another time of austerity. But couldn’t we try something that might work this time? It might seem counter-intuitive that I’m talking about a lack of hard-work organising and that people are organising things that don’t work in the same post. But they are related. They’re both about people pursuing their personal liberation along lines laid down in another time, by other people. And the personal liberation can be such a good feeling that people end up sure they know how to liberate others and throw themselves into ‘radical’ activism with all their might. And often what they’re really doing is continuing their personal journey of liberation. Don’t get me wrong: personal liberation is good, and the first direct actions anyone does can be amazing for that reason, but it should be the start of other things. I really don’t want to denigrate people’s efforts within anti-cuts groups. But more and more I start to get the feeling that many people are campaigning within a bubble of them and others who agree with them.

I think this is in part a consequence of the idea that activism is meant to feel good. And I don’t see much reflection on how we can bring change prior to taking action, or see enough thinking about how society is different now than in the past, and how we might have to adjust our methods to deal with that. I see very few people admitting that we aren’t sure how to be radical yet. And it may turn out we want to be as individualistic as mainstream culture – or even more so – but I don’t think we should just adopt that culture with self-fulfilment without thinking about it. I don’t know how to be radical, but I would like to propose two ideas that might lead in that direction. The first is to analyse in detail the structural and social landscape in which you live. It is different to at any time in the past. Any radical actions proposed in the past may no longer be radical. Like the TUC march, they may be mere ritualised resistance, bothering the people in power not one bit. So let’s examine the possible routes to change as society stands right now. To do this properly doesn’t quite mean throwing away everything you know about radical action, but it requires you to bracket it while you imagine doing things completely differently. It might mean never going on a protest again. Probably not, but it might. The second idea is for you to challenge your notion of yourself, the way you relate to the world, and what you expect of the world. Because I don’t think radical action will always feel good right now – though I agree that if it doesn’t feel good in the long run that’s a problem. I don’t think it will always feel liberating in the moment of doing it. And I don’t think how you feel about it should matter as much as most people seem to think it should. If we care about change we need to have an effect on the world, and that’s a very different thing from the satisfaction of individual desires. I certainly wouldn’t want people to engage in hair-shirtism for the sake of it, or return to the days of moralistic mutual discipline in political organising, but I wish at least more people would start thinking about – for instance – how we can really get organised outside of the traditional leftist modes and the boring legwork that will be necessary for it to happen. I think the lack of self-reflection among people who consider themselves radical is so great that to some extent I wish people would stop doing stuff. Stop marching, stop occupying, stop publishing, stop tweeting, stop doing direct actions, stop everything. Just for a bit. As you become ‘radicalised’ you become inducted into a culture of ‘radicalism’ that is as individualistic as the culture it claims to oppose, and adheres as strongly to ritual forms as our would-be masters do. I think we still need to work out how to be radical: how to think radically, how to act radically, how to relate radically. I don’t think we know yet. I think the assumption you know how to be radical is killing radicalism.

a