### 1AC---Infosphere

#### We live in the *“infosphere”*1which *“denotes the whole informational environment constituted by all informational entities, their properties, interactions, processes, and mutual relations.”*1that is built on the codification of bodies by logistical capitalism and its enforcement of algorithmic governance operationalized through the extraction of bodily consciousness for the infosphere to be *“synonymous with reality”*1and to absorb *“any other reality”*1*.* The infosphere is *“populated by entities and agents all equally informational”*1as *“there is no physical difference between processors and processed”*1*.* Space policy in its façade of progress is *“an expression of the infosphere”*1which seeks to drive the notion of “reformism” and taking the private entities out of space just to ensure state domination. The *“infosphere is no longer ‘there’ but ‘here’”*1 *“becoming increasingly synchronized, delocalized, and correlated”*1Infiltrating both *“offline and analogue spaces of information.”*1 Evidenced by the never-ending accumulation of information from systems of surveillance hosted by institutions such as the “space information complex” that are built on the confinement of bodies. Reaching a point where *“what is real is informational and what is informational is real”*1*.* In its constant fluctuations *“the development of the infosphere is now jeopardizing the well-being of the biosphere.”*1

1Floridi 14 (, L., 2014. Luciano Floridi is Professor of Philosophy and Ethics of Information at the University of Oxford, where he directs the Digital Ethics Lab (DELab) of the Oxford Internet Institute. THE FOURTH REVOLUTION: How The Infosphere Is Shaping Human Reality. 1st ed. New York City: Oxford University Press.)-rahulpenu

#### Logistics has now evolved into a more insidious form of algorithmic regulation that transcends the movement of goods to controlling the flow of movement and touch itself. The nation-state serves as an arrangement of algorithmic governmentality that ensures the enclosure of the form of radical touch that would threaten logistics. This containerization of society made of an endless need of access leads to a living, breathing system of logistics that consumes civil society.

Harney et. al. 18 – Stefano Harney, professor at Singapore Management University, Niccolò Cuppini and Mattia Frapporti, Department Member of Independent Researcher & Department Member of Universitá di Bologna, “Logistics Genealogies: a dialogue with Stefano Harney”, September 2018, <http://www.intotheblackbox.com/articoli/logistics-genealogies-a-dialogue-with-stefano-harney/>, DOA: 11/15/2019)//shreyas //recut n33l

Answer 1: Modern logistics is a commercial logistics, with all the multiple sources that feed what Cedric Robinson calls racial capitalism. And it’s a capitalist science. Even today’s military logistics is most commonly outsourced to commercial firms, who make huge profits off the logistics of contemporary permanent war. As a commercial logistics, as a capitalist science, it can be traced directly and emphatically to the Atlantic slave trade. The Atlantic slave trade was the birth of modern logistics, as it was also the birth of a new kind of war on the human species, and of racial capitalism, which amounts to saying the same thing. This trade entailed the first global movement of mass commodities, voluminous and grotesque. Moreover these humans were also perishable and volatile commodities that could ‘go missing’ and were hard ‘to extract’ requiring cdeomplex, even diabolical, logistical technologies, supported by finance, insurance, law, and of course state and extra state violence. Ian Baucom locates the origins of modern insurance in the Atlantic slave trade in his important work Spectres of the Altantic. We know from Sergio Bologna how much contemporary finance and logistics are entwined in today’s over-leveraged global shipping industry, but this was true of the Atlantic slave trade too, where speculative finance was already at work. The story of the Zong slave ship is central to Baucom’s account, and is also beautifully, unbearably rendered by M. NorbeSe Philip in her book-length poem Zong!, capturing what the birth of modern logistics did to any possible project of the human by bringing finance and logistics together in a devilish alliance over the commodity that really ‘could speak,’ the ‘thing’ that talks or is somehow in-touch, neither subject nor proper object, a massive, subterranean, ethereal, undercommon threat to the individuation of modern ‘Man’ emerging at the same time. But the Atlantic slave trade was also the birth of modern logistics because modern logistics is not just about how to transport large amounts of commodities or information or energy, nor even how to move these efficiently, but also about the sociopathic demand for access: topographical, jurisdictional, but as importantly bodily and social access. The nearly complete access that was imposed upon the African enslaved, upon the African continent, and upon the lands and indigenous peoples settled for plantations, this kind of access remains the ambition of logistics today, and it is for this reason that the slave trade remains so contemporary, that abolition as Jared Sexton rightly says is yet to come. And we might add this abolition requires the abolishment of logistics which in its flows created a people without standing anywhere. We act in abolition not for a ground to stand on but for groundations beyond standing. Modern logistics, with its warehousing and its containers is as much about controlling the flow as ensuring the flow, as much about the interface of movement of commodities and financialisation of commodities as it is about just getting goods somewhere. That interface is an opportunity for speculation and today the line itself, the supply line and the assembly line, their speed, efficiency and metrics are source of massive financial speculation. This is also the horrific legacy of the Atlantic slave trade, the containerisation of people, of the sociopathic access demanded to labour and sex, and the storage, in forts, in the hold. And even more murderously, the elimination of goods, of cargo, when the price falls, or considerations of finance as in the incident of the slave ship the Zong, in which 133 enslaved persons were thrown overboard for insurance purposes during a logistical operation. In short, this aggregated access allowed for the most evil calculations about the perishability of goods, the planned obsolesence of products, and the cost of replacement, in a word financial speculation on the supply line that was in the case of the African enslaved in the Atlantic trade often indistinguishable from the assembly line. Marx said the first thing the worker makes is himself. The slave was worker on the line and at the same time the supply coming off the line and into the line. The same concerns with speculation on the line, the line as a modulation of investment and exploitation of labour are still found today at Walmart or Starbuck’s, not so far from their origins, at least for the most part. As Susan Zieger reminds us in her study of ‘Box’ Brown and logistics – he was the slave who mailed himself in a box to ‘freedom’ from the slave-plantation South to the slave-dependent North in the United States – logistics incorporates loss in its logics. As Fred Moten and I say logistics tracks us because it assumes fugitivity. Indeed what is called surveillance might also be called preemptive logistics. It is possible that all we know of surveillance studies, including its most incisive work in black surveillance like Simone Browne’s, could also go under the name preemptive logistics, even predictive logistics, the anticipation not of resistance but of a kind of impenetrability even in the give. In other words, our entangled, indeterminate, undercommon, rub-up of curvy lines, kinks, loops, and crooked lines summon logistics. It reacts to our sumptuous tangle. Our entanglement requires them to draw up contingency plans which are plans to make our indeterminacy mere contingency, to account for what goes missing. Logistics is the science of loss, the science of their lost means, which is to say it will always be the white science and the science of being white. Logistics is the science of their loss, not ours, though we, and those closest to blackness in particular, suffer horrific losses from their loss.

#### The infospheres’ modes of surveillance are not out there but in here *“academia is a model for parts of this algorithmic institution”*2The endless need for access and containerization is secured via the protocols of algorithmic governmentality in debate. Logistics, for its totalizing stronghold of governance and regulation is hyper dependent on *“academia[s]” “incredibly sophisticated system of mutual surveillance”*2*.*This is internalized in debates via the guise of the “neutrality” of fairness, predictability, stasis, clash, and topic education that are not a “negotiation of competing models” rather a replication of predetermined “exclusion” and “inclusion” efforts set as a mode of algorithmic regulation of what “can and cannot” be read for the process of *“the algorithmic institution”*2 *“picking off already existing”*2forms of debate that are “outliers” to the institution built on the exclusion of *“collective identities”*2formulating *“an incredibly effective form of mutual surveillance”*2that maintains the university’s *“surveillance system”*2.

2Harney 15, Stefano. Stefano Harney is Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University. Algorithmic Institutions - Vienna Interview. An Interview with Stefano Harney on "Algorithmic Institutions" in Vienna 2015 for "Algorithmic Regimes" hosted by Felix Stalder and Konrad Becker - 20:42 - 25:48. Transcribed from Vienna Interview Available at: <http://future-nonstop.org/c/f0c540494f23df09730d6b52b377a3d6>.)-rahulpenu

#### The way that we discuss the resolution matters. Logistics is a two-way street – it is always vulnerable to the system glitch.

Beller 2017 (Jonathan Beller – director of the Graduate Program in Media Studies, Pratt Institute, and the author of The Cinematic Mode of Production (2006) and The Message is Murder: Substrates of Computational Capital (2017). “The Fourth Determination”, *e-flux* Journal #85 – October 2017 – ERW) //recut n33l

Analogous to the land- and water-based commons that was planet earth, the cognitive-linguistic, the visual-poetic, and the imagination have undergone massive colonial expropriations, following immediately upon their separation and “liberation” from traditional ties to the body, and have entered directly into capitalist servitude. Bernard Stiegler refers to this phenomenon of cognitive collapse and short-termist thinking, organized by what he refers to as mnemotechnologies (technologies of memory that include print, cinema, and computation), as the “proletarianization of the senses.” This follows upon and overlaps with the proletarianization of the masses by the long industrial revolution and the capture and unspeakable violation of designated bodies by the slave trade. These aggressive and oftentimes annihilating encroachments on corporality, the senses, and the linguistic commons, achieved by cybernetic means, are mediological and technical phenomena as much as they are sociopolitical ones. Put another way, the mediological and the technical have been sociopolitical all along—to such an extent that with the level of technical saturation present today, “the political” has been lost. The “loss of the political” is an acknowledgement of the subsumption of policies and programs by capitalized financial calculus that chains representation to the process of accumulation. What indeed can “political” mean in a world increasingly characterized by algorithmic governance and platform sovereignty, that is, where capitalist power is increasingly automated, and discursive and affective labor is posited as a mere subroutine of capitalized computational processes—as engines of value creation? What of the political when “politics” has become a subroutine of computational capital and its discourses and actions are a modality of value extraction? It is an old lesson but it still applies (and we can see it from Israel to Burma): if subalterns use the same media and therefore modes of value extraction as oppressors in their struggles, then politics is simply a war over who will get the spoils of exploitation. The expropriation of the cognitive-linguistic by capital reduces discursive production—including the discourse of politics—to the subroutine of an abstract machine. This “machine,” though abstract, is nonetheless functional and material—we recognize it as the increasingly ubiquitous, increasingly networked computer or discrete state machine, but we must not see it as mere technology. The universal Turing machine, which when unified posits what I call the World Computer (“the invisible hand” codified as AI), has become the preeminent form of fixed capital. Machinic enslavement, whether to the assembly line, to the “media,” or to the computer, is indeed enslavement by other means, though we must insist that many of the “older” methods of extraordinary servitude stubbornly persist and the pain, like the profit, remains unevenly distributed. Following a backlash, in August 2017 the popular “FaceApp” removed a series of racially themed filters it had issued. The app had allowed digital blackface, yellowface, brownface, and a Caucasian setting to be added to selfies. Inequality, now sedimented into institutions and machines as materialized abstractions and designed into apparatuses, operationalizes historically variegated injustice, to produce and reproduce a planetary culture that at bottom is founded upon racism, gender inequality, national and cultural codifications, modern slavery, and a near total dispossession for billions. Machines, too, must be understood as racial formations. Given the data-logical nature of financialized systems underpinning “cultural” expression and iterated in and as machines, it is no surprise that Facebook’s machine-learning algorithm “Deep Face” imaged the minimally recognizable human face as that of a white man. Converting social life and social history into digital information and digital machines facilitates the as yet un-transcendable program of quantification that runs parallel to social-historical processes of social differentiation for the purpose of accumulation. The social emerges not as an abstract idea, but as a concrete substrate of computation. Sociality is posited then programmed as a series of leveraged accumulation strategies operating above or below or explicitly in and through everyday consciousness. Public faces are forms of data visualization and, circulating as images, are both programs and programmable. Bodies become “necessary media” of machinic digital operations that require from us (us bodies) attention, cognition, neuro-power, virtuosity, and sheer survival. As the auto-enthnography that is critical theory in the West might indicate, the remainders—interiorities and isles of awareness that fall away from informatic throughput—are in large part melancholic, cynical, disaffected, and abject laments. The rise of actually existing digitality thus appears as inseparable from the development and intensification of capitalism, that is, of media technologies as media of capital, which is also to say as media for the leveraging of agency and representation, such that decisions are made hierarchically and systemically while many aspects of life become almost unrepresentable and thus also unknown and unknowable. The ordinary taxonomies of social history continue to index zones and inflection points of this total and in certain definitive respects totalitarian process of digital enclosure. Our situation is effectively one of platform totalitarianism in which (the social) metabolism itself is captured by a leveraged exchange with capital and our media and machines are not only social relations but racial formations. This leveraged exchange of metabolism for forms of currency at rates set by platform capitalism is managed by ambient and ubiquitous computation, an electro-mechanical network that is composed primarily of fixed capital. The skeins of accumulation by means of informatic uptake lay closely upon body, mind, and time, and what value is extracted are the products of these. Thought and feeling are rendered quantifiable, computable, and indeed programmable. However, it is always a mistake to imagine that the impact of technology flows only in one direction: technical form emerges in a dialectics of domination and struggle. The global, technical evolution in the scale and granularity of the metabolic capture of what was once called labor power and social cooperation—a capture that fragments and cellularizes populations as well as bodies, minds, and neural networks—is not without its emancipatory potentials, as a Benjamin or a Brecht might remind us were they alive today. “The bad new things” are built out of and in response to new forms of struggle, and as Antonio Negri has always emphasized, the innovations of capitalist techné come from below, from the ways that the oppressed outflank domination and persist in living. A survey machine for customer feedback on the "immigration experience"—as long as the feedback is expressed in the form of smiley or frowny emojis. Towards a Reclamation of Value How then to investigate the capture and neutralization of the political domain and its uncountable longings by media-interfaced Computational Capitalism? How to transform and reprogram the failing powers of analysis, sensibility, and action such that they may function beyond the horizon of capitalist control? Four main hypothesis can guide us: 1) Computational Capitalism is an ambient financial calculus of value extraction working through any and all media. 2) Computational Capitalism is a development of Racial Capitalism and is thus also Computational Colonialism: vectors of race, gender, nation, sexuality, and other forms of social difference have been configured by and as strategies of value extraction and, like “structural racism,” have been sedimented into the operating systems and machine architectures of our machines. 3) The specter of revolution is everywhere visible if one knows how to see it. 4) For the first time in history a thoroughgoing revolution is possible that does not replicate the failed strategies of the radical break so tragically characteristic of twentieth-century revolutionary movements, but instead works to decolonize computation by transforming the money-form from within. I take it as axiomatic that the items telegraphically listed in the previous paragraph have become inseparable. What we thought of simply as computation is in fact computational capital—a supple and adaptive machine-mediated calculus on the social metabolism, one that can be gleaned through a deeper reflection on the notion of convergence. To illustrate aspects of convergence, we note that racialization and nationalization, along with regimes of gender, sexuality, borders, and incarceration, are part and parcel of the overall process of corporeal inscription, codification, and programmatic control endemic to digitization. Niche marketing and profiling are but two of the ways in which our bodies and practices are coded for capitalist and state-capitalist processing. One could add here the attempted subsumption of entire demographics under codifications indexed by “thug” and “terrorist.” Historical codes, including but not limited to race, gender, nation, class, and sexuality, are inscribed on our bodies, read, written, and rewritten by informatic machines. This functionalization of social difference (representational, biometric), to say nothing of the branding and scarring of bodies that is both past and present at so many levels, serves both as a means and a medium of capitalization and value extraction and as a necessary substrate to the development of computation. Within and at the scenes of inscription, the code works us and we work the code—again with historically overdetermined statistical variance. This is how it is at both the micro and the macro levels of struggle and organization. IBM’s role in the Holocaust, to give but one example, must also be understood as the Holocaust’s role in IBM and in the development of Hollerith punch cards and computational architectures, including search engines. Sociality and global lifetimes themselves have become the conditions of possibility for what, writ large, is the totalitarian emergence of the World Computer. That is why no existing political discourse can approach this horizon because current concepts and the activities of thought itself are fully circumscribed by it—ideas themselves have become operators (media) fully functionalized by and in the matrix of information. Understanding the transformation of semiotic process by information functioning as a form of capital, we can take the general formula for capital M-C-M’ (where M is money, C is commodity and, M’ is a greater quantity of money) and rewrite it as M-I-C-I’-M’, where I is image and C is code. The commodity as a distributed social relation has, with computation, become both produced and distributed in nonlinear networked operations that, unlike the assembly line, depend upon digital forms of attention, cognition, images, and codes for full valorization. This dependence on transformed conditions of labor germane to the social factory is (now) true even of older forms of production (e.g., automobiles) inasmuch as they are also networked in the world of information, advertising, Instagram, and the like. The valuation of a commodity requires a calculus of the image that modifies code, as does any interaction that transfers rights and value to said commodity (what used to be called sales). Production, circulation, valuation are all mediated by image and code, and that mediation occurs on a global scale. As the Anthropocene and its derivative concepts might testify, little or nothing remains untouched by this process of computational capital that penetrates down to the level of atoms. Here I want to propose further that this formula can be further modified to read M-I-M’, where I is information. To put this modification simply, money becomes more money through the movement of discrete state machines, the motor force of which is ultimately the bios (what was once thought of as the human life-world) struggling to survive its informatic capture. Labor becomes informatic labor and, as I endeavor to show in The Message is Murder, M-I-M’ means less that the commodity is one form of information, and more that the domain of intelligibility known as “information” directly emerges in the footprint of the value-form. Data visualization by computational processes screen-interfaced with the bios is a fundamental condition of the current regime of accumulation sometimes called post-Fordism. In generating M’ from M, it also effects what Paolo Virno calls “the communism of capital.” The programmable image as a worksite transforms and colonizes nearly all mental, sensual, and neuronal process while submitting them to interoperable regimes of background monetization. This financialization of everyday life, where everyone is forced to continuously throughput information in order to manage volatility and risk, facilitates a machinic enslavement profoundly enabled by and integrated with inherited forms of oppression. Navigating the matrix of capital-information is not an option, it is a matter of survival. Somewhere along the way, “consumer society” and “conspicuous consumption” became a semiotic game of survival. In the dominant order, these encodings are among the terms of wealth and power and only those who strive to organize in accord with a different order (or disorder) altogether have more than an inkling that there are better ways to be. We are dealing with the failure of revolutions, the overcoding of bodies and practices, and the absorption of political energy by strategies of accumulation. Computational capital names the integration of discrete state machines with fixed capital and sociality such that Marx’s “vast automaton” has become a global financialized socio-cybernetic system. “Politics” has been operationally reduced to a mere subroutine in the encroachment of this computationally integrated system on planetary life, and as Harney and Moten have pointedly underscored, “politics” and “policy” are today always on the side of the state—and the state is a state of capital.

#### Thus, we affirm logisticality.

#### Logisticality is the fugitivity of the ungovernable – the immense suffering by black and brown bodies birthed a mode of social capacity that constitutes the ability to find, move and break rules of time and space together. Logistics’ sociopathic demand for access is met with logisticality and its creation of modes of hapticality that overturn and reverse logistics. The social capacity is to anticipate and exceed logistics via our abilities to move and access through and within each other, as a mode of resistance against the “straightening” of logistics’ and an embracement of “incompleteness”.

Harney et al. 18 (, S., Cuppini, N. and Frapporti, M., 2018. Logistics Genealogies. Stefano Harney is Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University. A Dialogue With Stefano Harney – Into The Black Box. [online] Intotheblackbox.com. Available at: <http://www.intotheblackbox.com/articoli/logistics-genealogies-a-dialogue-with-stefano-harney/>.)-rahulpenu

However, it was not just modern logistics that was **born** **in** this **hellfire**. It **was** also the birth of what Fred and I call **logisticality**, **a** **social** **capacity** **found** most **intensely** **amongst** **those** **who** **found themselves**, who found **each** **other**, **under** the **duress** **of** almost **total** **access** but in the grip of each other. As Frank Wilderson writes at the end of Incognegro, his brilliant more-than-memoir: ‘something happened to us in the hold.’ And not just in the hold. In her heart-breaking but unavoidable book Lose Your Mother, Saidiya Hartman speaks of **the** **fugitivity** **that** **the** **ungoverned** **and** the **ungovernable** of Africa **were** **forced** **to** **invent** because of the reach of the Atlantic slave trade. Those captured by the trade either were or became the people Cedric Robinson understands in Africa as living by a principle of ‘individual’ incompleteness. Such peoples existed everywhere as James Scott asserts in The Art of Not Being Governed. Scott details how highland peoples in South East Asia avoided the massive slave trade of the padi-states, at trade that dominated pre-colonial South East Asia to the point that slaves became not only the biggest trade but currency itself. In many languages of the padi-states these peoples were already known by the name ‘slave’ before they were enslaved. These peoples refused to form political societies, have leaders, or see land as owned or even shared in ownership. They gathered, and they wandered. No written languages, they sought refuge with each other. But **the** **hold**, the middle passage, **the** **fire** **that** **African** **peoples** **went** **through**, those who were captured, and those who became fugitive, **created** something perhaps unprecedented in its total span across societies and histories. This is what Fred and I call **logisticality**, **the ability to find each other**, to **move together**, to **break the rule of Newtonian time and space**, **disorder it**, and legislate new time and space to disorder, to gather, stranded into refuge together. **A** **people** **came** **into** **existence** **without** **origin** – anoriginal as Nahum Chandler would say – **who** **were** **‘in touch,’** **whose** **response** **to** the **sociopathic** **demand** **for** **access** **was** paradoxically and necessarily **a** **radical** **opening** **of** **being**, a practice of touch without surface or border or edge, **a practice of hapticality**. Fred and I understand hapticality **as** **a** kind of **touch** **without** **surface** **that** undoes, that **saps** **the** **fever** **of** **individuation**, in a sometimes violent and profane exorcism. It is not a reassuring touch. It uninsures precisely because it’s a loving touch. In a sense, African **slaves** **who** **came** **through** **the** **fire** could be said to have **reversed** **logistics**, and overturned it. Now **the** **slaver** **sought** this **logisticality**, **sought** **but** **could** **not** fully **capture** **something** **that** **had** **been** **produced** **in** **capture** but also preceded it as Robinson and Scott suggest, calling capture into being in all its murderous regulatory force. We can understand this logisticality in two registers, as I’ve suggested. First in C.L.R. James’s famous contention that slaves ran the plantations in the Caribbean – that it was the slaves who had the capacity and know-how to work across half a dozen African and European languages in this early crucible of world capitalism. It was the slaves who worked the nascent capitalist machinery of the sugar mills, and who handled the logistics of transport to the ships, and sometimes on the ships. It was the slaves who worked in exchanges of different currencies, commodities, and calculations of the future, with world prices. The slaves also ran the households, providing the care, nurturing, and attention. Now as James would be quick to point out, all this occurred despite the unbounded inhumanity and cruelty of the owners, as for instance he details in his chapter on owners and on the property in the Black Jacobins. All of this was also going on in the 16th and 17th century at a time, when as James notes, most of our families in Italy and across Europe as we might say ‘still only knew the bell tower.’ **This** **logisticality** – **the quantum finding**, this **hapticality** – this feel without surface that hurts and loves, could also be understood **as** **a** **capacity** **to** **recreate** Robinson’s principle of **incompleteness**, and indeed to detect and translate such principles of incompleteness **and** **ungovernability**, of the **unregulated**, the **disorderly** **and** the **unruled**, **to** **feel** these things, and feel others feeling you being undone. This hapticality was never going to be fully enslaved, even when American slavery turned to its specific Taylorist brutality and slave-breeding with the rise of the cotton trade and industrial capitalism at the end of the 18th century. But more importantly it survives as the basis of the black radical tradition, in radical social poesis, as Laura Harris say. **It survives in/as blackness**. So the shipped, the containerized, the accessed of the Atlantic slave trade gave birth to modern logistics but also conjured something in the break of this massive enclosure of those who lived together by the principle of incompleteness. And despite this, **it** **is** **fundamentally** **necessary** **to** **place** that **hapticality** **against** what Christina Sharpe, writing recently about the slave ship and its wake, might call **its** ‘**weather**,’ the pervasive anti-black racism that this founding of modern logistics also bequeathed the contemporary world, and perpetuates today. Question 2: It is really interesting what you are writing because in this perspective logistics and counterlogistics were basically born at the same time. Now we would like to follow this genealogical line which keeps together logistics and counterlogistics, asking you how this relationship was evolving in the historical periods following to the ones we have been referring to up on till now. More specifically, how this union was developing during the first “industrial revolution” and in the consecutive first stage of globalization? Answer 2: We could begin the next chapter of logistics with Kant. He says famously that we should treat men as ends and not means. It’s true. It’s in all the business ethics textbooks! This would appear at first sight to run counter to the history of logistics, where people seem to be treated as means to an end. At first people and things seem to be mobilized as means to the end of profit through war and conquest, and then with the Atlantic slave trade and settler colonialism mobilization of people and things is for the end of profit through racial capitalism. Logistics delivers humans, animals, energy, earthly materials to an end, to a point, the point of production. But this includes, crucially, the point of production of the settler, the production of the entrepreneur, the banker, the slave trader, and the investor. These figures I mention are produced as ends. So it is not that Kant does not mean what he says, nor that logistics is in conflict with what he wants. It is just that what he understands is this: that man is an end when he is this kind of figure, a figure who posits himself as self-made, self-sufficient, and self-determined. Kant may want this for everyone. But his very formulation, seeking this self-possessed man as an end, this man who has come out of the tutelage of someone else this kind of ‘man’ requires the rise of logistics. Because the only way to create this kind of man as an end – or any kind since this man is Man – is to mobilize and deliver resources that allow for this false and indeed delusional claim of independence to appear plausible, at least to this man and men like him, such as Kant. These means are utilized for but one end: the production of profit and cispatriarchy that support and make possible this illusion of self-authored man who can declare himself an end. This end of man is, in other words, a degradation of means. Indeed if I were asked to give a short definition of logistics, I would call it the general degradation of means. This is how Fred and I understand modern logistics. Other histories, other ways of living, might suggest to us that not being capable of being an end in oneself, indeed of every fully being one-self, is in fact a way to disabuse this ‘oneself’ delusion and place the incomplete self in the hands of others for use, for service, for love. Here means are enlarged, enriched, and entangled for each other. You may hear echoes of Agamben on use here but let’s be cautious about that. We would have to do something for our comrade he will not do for himself, any more than Hegel would. We would have to bring him out of the ancient world of master and slave. Because we are not talking here about **countering** **logistics** **with** a **mutuality** **of** **means** that **allows** **all** of us **to** **reach** a more **balanced** **individuation**, as in Agamben’s forgotten pre-classical world. And more importantly all that we have developed historically in the fugitivity of use – history and future in the **present** **of** **logisticality** **and** **hapticality** – all of this Agamben has chosen not to inherit by his willful disregard of the black radical tradition. We need only recall Fanon here on the difference of the colonial relationship of master and slave to see that the break or escape must be with recognition (of an end) itself, with both subject and object, and indeed we should perhaps read Fanon as saying revolt and revolution are laboratories of a means without ends. In other words, when Fred and I speak about **hapticality** we are talking **about** **a** **materialism** beneath materialism, **under** **materialism**, an undercommon materialism, what our friend Denise Ferreira da Silva calls **difference** **without** **separability**. Our **ability** **to** be in the **feel** of **each** **other** is historical and magical, painful and beautiful. It **emerges** **in** **its** **strongest** **form** – from a thousand rivers – **in** **the** **nautical** **event**, the first horrible logistics dedicated to the ends of man/Man. An event that is the dispersion of event, its shoreless strand. It’s a way we inherit – or we can inherit – an experimental undermaterialism of sound, feel, taste, touch, including at a spooky distance. This is an undercommon materialism that having been denied an end, already rejects that end for this spooky means. This includes what Cedric Robinson calls the capacity ‘to retrieve things that presumably no longer existed.’ And if it has a theory – like Marx’s early theoretical senses – it is a theory that somehow, always, escapes. **This** **hapticality** **is** **the** **fugitive** **call** and response **in** the **face** **of** **logistics**, that degradation of means to produce man as an end. The call and response and the ring shout are sonars of logisticality. It’s **our** **endless** **revolution**, and again as Robinson says, revolution is magic because it should be impossible. Admittedly this creates a problem for enlightenment thinkers who seek a universality of the end, including some of the Left today. We see this problem most clearly with Hegel, and most symptomatically in his discussion of usufruct. In the Philosophy of Right, following a long discussion on slavery, in which Hegel asserts that both slaves and masters will cease to exist and will become independent wills when they are historically ready, Hegel turns – without an apparent linkage – to laws and customs of usufruct. The use of someone else’s property for production, and the idea of improving someone else’s property, the history of usufruct is for Hegel profoundly disturbing. He tells us that you cannot have two wills, two would-be owners, in one property. There can be no progress for Hegel where there are usufructuary owners and ‘naked owners,’ as they continue to be called, for instance, in Louisiana. One will has to prevail in the property. Hegel is clearly on the side of the improving owner, the usufructuary owner. Improvement requires one will to dominate. Or simply that will itself, or man as an end, dominate over naked owners (at least before Hegel moves on to other ends). Hegel was already amidst an historical era where improvement was coming to engulf both all property and all persons. Self-improvement and the improvement of property melded, for some, while the harsh regime of the improvement of others would be claimed as the management rights of these self-improved. All of this will reach new saliency with total quality management, kaizen – defined as the continuous improvement of everything all the time – and the audit society, and the algorithmic institutions at the end of the 20th century, with the full realisation of logistical capitalism. The ‘usufructuary will’ must hasten this process for itself and for the naked owner by imposition of its will as fully as possible. Improvement and development demand intervention wherever the naked owner is found. This is where Fred and I see a key torque in capitalist logistics. It is not a clean periodization, as you both understand well in the way you are phrasing your questions, not least because the black radical tradition is the pause not the period, the break in/of the beat. Still because there is said to be no more naked owner, no owner with less will, in Hegel’s time, than the African slave, who is constructed as such when ownership is projected onto her, where ownership’s nakedness is posited, paradoxically, as the radical incapacity for that brutal and necessary redundancy, proper ownership. As real property, insofar as she cannot own it, it is as if she is indigenous land – at once land and person, doubly unaware of their own nakedness. Man’s end demands the subsumption of what is seen (or, more precisely, unseen) as etiolated will; logistics instantiates that subsumption as the degradation of means. Indeed, in the absence of the will of the naked owner, whose “property” is said to be fallow, who bears no possibility of becoming an end in herself, the more total and vicious can be her penetration by the will of another, for improvement, for productivity. We get confirmation of the ascendancy of this usufructuary will with the first trials of the assembly line, not yet in the workshops, but in the cotton fields. Many have written about the practices of modern management first developed and tested through what is euphemistically called plantation management – the management of slave labour camps. Bill Cooke at York University, who works in a business school and does not get enough credit, is a pioneer here. But in an important new book, called The Half Has Never Been Told, by Edward Baptist, we see the origins of the coming together of modern management and logistics. This new line, Baptist teaches us, was developed in response to the demand for cotton and the shift from other slave crops such as rice, sugar, indigo, etc. Now with new profits available to those who could supply the emerging garment industry, slave owners ‘innovated.’ Slaves were formed in lines of pickers who followed each other down long rows of cotton plants. Previously, slaves might work in groups or gangs on other kinds of crops like rice or indigo or even the back-breaking work of sugar cane, dividing the hard labour amongst themselves in service of the demands of an overseer and a slave owner. Now all this was organized by management to measure and increase productivity through the logistics of this line. The best picker was placed first to keep the pace. Each individual slave was now responsible for an ever increasing weight of cotton. No one could help anyone else on pain of torture or death. Indeed helping another was punished more severely than weighting your own bag with a stone or fruit. In this way individual productivity could become a means to measuring and improving the entire line, and thereby also linking each working body to metrics, and therefore to finance, to loans. Each naked (non)owner of his or her labour, already owned by another, was willed to improvement by this usufructuary owner, and since this naked ownership was itself already essentially negated, there was no end unto death to this willed improvement. The degradation of the means reached zero. Logistics and the management of production had become one. There was never a more brutal example of the reduction of logisticality to logistics. Marx will try to fix this, in his way, as Frederick Douglass would in his. I never really understood why the early Marx is considered the humanist and the later Marx less so. It always seemed the opposite to me. Early Marx appears ready to explore an undercommon materialism without the subject, straining toward a synaesthesia that is unowned by Man. Later Marx once again has a subject of history, first capital, and then the society of producers, leaving the Left with the task of a better logistics for this collective subject, something we can see in recent debates on the Left about logistics. Maybe this is what Althusser, late on, was trying to amend. In any case, logistics would soon become indistinguishable from infrastructure with the rise of industrial capitalism on the back of the cotton line. Whereas once infrastructure, as a village or even imperial waterworks, might be for sustaining life, now it was clearly for improving it. And infrastructure itself would become nothing but logistical, nothing but degraded means, until it reaches what might well be its conclusion in ‘resilience’ today. But Douglass, like the early Marx, has hidden something for us. We can find it, in part, in a recent book, a very cool book, called Ariel’s Ecology by Monique Allewart, where she traces the dissolution of land into sea, of personhood into earth, flowers, birds in the plantation biosphere. Here the most naked of owners, owners not even of the flesh, still become rich means of life for each other and for us – a kind of decomposition and recomposition, an earthly hapticality. However, we also take heed here: that we are already, that we already can be, a means to a means encourages the predations of capital, so invaluable is this dissolution. Question 3: And then the factories arrive…The fascinating and original historical reconstruction which is rising from your answers, is offering an overall picture that put together logistics with many elements which are usually only analyzed in separate perspectives. Continuing our historical path, and grasping your references to Marx we reach the true heart of the first industrial revolution and the consequently spread of the factory system. How could we read the development of logistics in this outline? Could we state that we can only fully understand the “factories system” if we arrange it since its beginning in a complex and widened logistics structure? And then: do you think that it would be useful to look at W.E.B. Du Bois, who claimed that to fully understand the industrial revolution it would be more useful to look at the Atlantic Ocean rather than at Manchester? To conclude, which kind of “expression” could be characterizing for the counterlogistics when the cornerstone of the production became the “new factory” around which the new urban center were starting to spread? In other words: if during the Atlantic slave trade the “expression” of counterlogitics was the slaves themselves, who and how would represent the “expression” of counterlogistcs after the industrial revolution? Answer 3: With the rise of the ‘kingdom of cotton’ and the industrial revolution, the coming of the factory raises the prospect of two kinds of ‘flows’ coming together, as they were already doing in Barbados, Haiti, Jamaica, and other early centers of logistics centuries earlier. On the one hand you have the flows of raw materials and on the other hand the flow the line inside the factory. Or in other words, colonialism and capitalist industrialization. This is why you both are right in your question to speak of Du Bois because to look at Manchester is to look at the Atlantic, and then never to look at Manchester again the same way. The integration of these two flows into a ‘continuous flow,’ as Marx himself first called it, will eventually be the job of operations management in the second half of the 20th century, largely leaving in place or deepening the interdependence of this pair. The job of logistics remains in a sense to manage the relationship between the two social relations in/of production, in conjunction with finance of course. The belt and road project of the Chinese government shows how much the relationship remains the same, and perhaps, concerning the debates around the Chinese and the question of neo-colonialism, even settler colonialism, reminds us to look for changes too. But in the industrial revolution itself the two flows are not yet integrated – though their dependency on each other does intensify the world market. There are however a number of prefigurings of this future integration of the two flows and the subordination of labour to these flows. And these are to be found in abundance in the black radical tradition. We find an example again in the work of C.L.R. James for instance. He recasts the New England whaling boat of Herman Melville’s Moby Dick as a factory in Renegades, Mariners, and Castaways. The supply chain and the factory processing have become one on the boat. The whales are caught and processed on board. The multi-national crew has been thrown together on this line, each with a specialized task, and the factory boat literally tracks its own supply chain through the ocean. I have already spoken of James’s other prefiguration – the 16th and 17th century Caribbean plantation, town, and dock as the first instance of a production process – and the first instance of workers – being fully inserted in a world market. On the other side of our dialectic or perhaps appositional to this world market we find an example of this emerging logisticality in a new book by Marisa Fuentes on enslaved and fugitive women in Barbados in the 18th century, Dispossessed Lives. As she attempts to reconstruct the lives of these women, Fuentes appears to have little to work with except absences. Escaping women in Bridgetown had no where really to go and the official archives contains only the coldest and cruelest bare facts. **Enslaved** **women**, most burdened of all by the flow of the lines coming together in these early logistical hubs, **had** **to** **invent**, to draw upon, to conjure **some** **way** **to** **protect** and practice **their** **logisticality**, **to** **exercise** **with** **other** **and** **those** **they** **loved** **the open secret of their hapticality**. And they do this precisely through an archive. Soon it becomes clear in her brilliant account that these women were building their own archive everyday as they disappeared into the market or ‘down the gap.’ As Hilary Beckles teaches us, Barbados may appear to us by the 19th century to be amongst the more pacified islands of slave labour camps, but in fact this is because it was amongst the most conspiratorial in the Caribbean, with a number of total island conspiracies and revolts in the 16th and 17th century requiring small and large slaveholders to unite and militarise into the unified fort Barbados became. But even in ‘the in-between’ of that fort Fuentes shows us all the acts of escape, resistance, solidarity. These women produced forms of communication and movement appropriate to and appropriating of the duress of extreme surveillance and topography. They crafted an archive of the throat and the fingertip, of the glance and ‘the cut eye.’ The absence of the official archive is precisely the condition for the emergence of this fugitive, rebel archive. The menace of this archive of hapticality is that it cannot be enclosed, to recall Foucault’s thought, nor ever totally collected. And the painful beauty of it, the beautiful pain of it, is that this archive appears without warning, now as then. It is, as Nadia Ellis says, blackness ‘at large.’ A sabotage of the line that the line does not see coming, a crop-over party of the accursed sharers. Amidst these prefigurings however something also starts to emerge – something Du Bois would teach us about as he came to understand the global color line. (I recommend the unmatched work of Nahum Chandler on Du Bois here.) These **global supply chains** and the way they are labored, most especially by African slave labour, by the motley crew, and by indentured colonial labour, **produced** a **new** **kind** **of** **collectivity** **that** **runs** not only along those lines but **along** **and** **across** the **ones** **collectively** **forged** **in** **flight** **from** **these** **lines** – **the archive of curves, swerves, revisions and improvisations of logisticality**. This is Nadia Ellis’s being ‘at large.’ And of course we hear an echo of criminality in the notion of being at large, un-captured, escaped. The lines and the curves mean such collective being can show up anywhere. Collectivity at large, logisticality, produces the generalized fears of blackness, of communism, of queerness. Being at large along these lines means ‘they could be anywhere.’ Yet against these possibilities the beginnings of the factory also mark a frightening new development with which we still live and against which we must still fight. As I mentioned, Fred and I have adapted that term usufruct to talk about this coming together at the end of the 18th century of two kinds of improvement – economic improvement and especially the improvement of property, including human property – and self-improvement, especially the quest to prove one can improve oneself and by so doing be qualified to supervise the improvement of property and of others. The rise of this self-improving ‘subject’ who needs only himself to improve, to be self-authoring, self-sufficient is truly a genocidal and geocidal figure. This figure has been threatening since the birth of European colonialism but he was initially guided by anti-Moor Christianity then and thus not self-improving as only God can improve someone, though this makes the figure no less brutal in his way. But he really takes hold with the combination of improvement in commercial and plantation agriculture and the improvement ideologies of the Enlightenment. And then he becomes the factory owner. His claims to self-sufficiency, to being self-made, are as ludicrous and as dangerous as the idea that the colonial fort was sovereign and self-sufficient. Of course it relied on the land and people it was built to attack continuously for their resources. So too with this self-made, self-improving bourgeois subject – he too requires massive resources to pronounce himself self-sufficient, resources he can never acknowledge. Beyond all the social reproductive labour of women, children, the elders, and servants, he requires these supply chains and the labour on them, and the assembly line and all the labour on that, and behind this the massive exploitation of the earth upon which that system is based, mono-crop destruction of biospheres, mining, etc. That’s the ‘self-sufficient’ bourgeois subject, the entrepreneur, and with his ‘democratization’ as Angela Mitropolous says through what Du Bois calls democratic despotism ‘he and his’ confront us still with genocidal and geocidal consequences. Of course the proliferation of these modern subjects chase the logisticality of those who reject the idea of the individuation all around the globe. Thus **the** **situation** **is** **more** **volatile** **than** **ever** worldwide. Continuous improvement only **barely** **‘holds the line’** **against** **continuous** **revolution**. Question 4: After this wide historical overview, we would like to conclude this dialogue with some considerations more related to present times. First of all, many authors are proposing to date a “logistics revolution” in the Fifties and Sixties of the Twentieth Century. According to the various insights you have given us up till now, we are actually problematizing this kind of clear-cut temporalization. Instead we would prefer to highlight the logistics’ multiple historical proveniences, framing it as a process of longue-durée. Or do you think that considering the “logistics revolution” as an historical turning point is a truly productive approach, such as – for example – the one that Edna Bonacich and Jake Wilson (in “Getting the goods”) adopt? Secondly, what is according to your conception the contemporary relationship between logistics and counter-logistics? We would like to hear your opinion about the today’s dynamics defined by this relationship both from the theoretical side and from a more grounded perspective (with the latter we refer to the many episodes of struggles that have been developed worldwide in the last decade in many logistics hubs). Last but not least, we would be pleasured if you could give us some perspectives, hints or possible tendencies and developments which logistics could gain in the next future both as a tool to analyze global capitalism, and as a political element to grasp the possibility of an alternative politics. Answer 4: Here is the fuller quote from Marx I sampled earlier. He says: “The collective working machine… becomes all the more perfect the more the whole process becomes a continuous one”. Marx was already talking here about what we would later call total quality management and continuous improvement, or in Japanese, kaizen. Logistics is as old as the circuits of capital, Marx teaches us, and those circuits, as I have suggested, take shape in the Atlantic slave trade and colonialism. This is the logistical revolution. But of course something important does happen after World War Two. And it is not because of the advent of containers or the Vietnam War, or any of those manifestations. It is in my view because the inner workings of capital – what Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilsen would call the “operations of capital” – these inner workings change, the class struggle in racial capitalism on the ground changes. In particular, operations management, the study of the movement of the assembly line, encounters and incorporates supply chains on the one hand and customers on the other in new ways. This is the new collective working machine. Supply, production, and consumption become linked by capitalist sciences of management, and integrated, at least to some extent. This historical process culminates in kaizen. Now each person is individually responsible not just for the flow of the assembly line – wherever it flows through finance, services, unpaid work, personal health – but also the continuous improvement of that line, regardless of whether you are formally employed and tied to that line by a labour contract. The metric of the economy is a brutal one, and it works because logistics produces access, and access inserts the metric, in a vicious circle. This is a story of management science, the conscious search for access and application of the metric throughout the circuits. That said, the both of you are right your question to speak of many provenances with different stories to tell about logistics as befits a central force in global capitalism. First and foremost Deborah Cowen’s work is vitally important as was the foundational work of Edna Bonacich, but we also have fascinating work of Sergio Bologna, of Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, and linked to all this the relationship between logistics and the algorithm, and the ground-breaking work of Ned Rossiter, Tiziana Terranova, and Matteo Pasquinelli, to name three theorists who have been important to me. I think we should also be grateful for work on infrastructure like that of Abdoumalik-Simone and others. And there is very good work on counter-logistics from the Oakland Public School, from Alberto Toscano, as usual, and more. And let us not forget the work both of you are doing! For me, it is nonetheless important to make a distinction between counter-logistics and what Fred and I call logisticality. Counter-logistics is a vital strategy, as vital as the strike or movements in the street, as vital as resistance and opposition remain to the very possibility of life on this earth. But sometimes counter-logistics confronts logistics much as the state was once (and still is) confronted: faced with what seem like two choices, take over logistics, or abolish it (or most of it). Logisticality is something else and therefore does not confront that choice. **The** **term** **logisticality** **we** **use** to **suggest** we have **the** **capacity** **to** **anticipate** and **exceed** **logistics**. Or the term (and the term does not matter just the concept) might help us reverse our view, and our practice. We suggest **our** **logisticality** **is** **prior**, as Mario Tronti might have it, that our **abilities** **to** **move** **each** **other** **and** **access** **each**, our movement **through** **and** **within** **each** **other** and **in and with the earth**, comes first. From this viewpoint, **logistics** **chases our capacity**. But something more. Logistics **needs** **to** **‘straighten us’** **to** **pass** **through** and indeed when it does, it is then we who pass, as if straightened, made proper by logistics, proper conduits, enhancers, stimulators of logistics. Our straightening is our degradation, the reduction of our means to the ends of Man. **Logisticality** **suggests** that **we** **do** **not** **begin** **in this straightened form** (I think about Deborah Cowen’s use of queer theory here) **nor** **do** **we** **consent** **to** **end** **there**. We don’t begin by letting logistics pass through us or have to end as people who pass. We might even say **logistics** **wants** **to** make us white and straight, to **get** **us** **to** **aspire to be a man**, even as it must deny us this on behalf of the Man. What Fred and I mean by straightening, by passing, under conditions of logistical capitalism is this: **logistics** **degrades** **all the ways we** **move without position**, all the curves and swerves and reverses, **in** **favor** **of** the ‘**efficiency’** **of flow-through**. **It misses** most of **our capacity** to be a means for each other, **or** it **brutally** **suppresses** **all** these **capacities** **by** **passing** straight **through** **us**. (This is why all white people have to do is walk through a room to fuck something up. Logistics, the science of whiteness, instructs how they walk through and occupy space.) But they can’t ever fuck it up completely – unless they destroy the earth – because they depend on our capacities, this logisticality, these means without ends, the means not just in themselves, but for themselves. These means are radically open, **we** who **embrace** them are radically open to each in **this** **logisticality**, in our **hapticality**, **in** **our** **incompleteness**. And of course logistics exploits this in its degraded, limited, but nonetheless destructive way. But what if we don’t pass? Don’t straighten? This would be a kind of counter-logistics but it would also be ‘a return to who we will be’ and therefore something more than counter-, something closer to logisticality, our prior and ongoing undercommon invaluable debt and enrichment. In American (and in Latin American and Caribbean) literature the figure of the person who passes is a well-known tragic figure. The figure is taken by society to be white, but comes from a black family and community (or a native or aboriginal one), one which the character hides for social advantage. But logistical capitalism raises a question. What if we are all passing? What if none of us is straight until straightened? What if we begin as something monstrous to logistics? What if we appear in our logisticality, our rich curving, swerving, revising means, to be opaque, impenetrable? What if we appear to logistics as monstrously mis-shapen, unfathomable, dense and slow! Then in a sense, logistical capitalism is the counter-logistics. Logistical capitalism must counter this threat, find a way to pass through us, straighten us, access us. Fred and I have written about the murder of black people by police with this partly in mind – the way black people violate the demand for full and immediate access by the police – and violate it a priori because of the white supremacist order which posits black people as both unknowable and as without an interior that could be then rendered transparent. Michael Brown, murdered by the police in the US in 2013 near St. Louis in the town of Ferguson, was described by his killer, the police officer, as appearing like a monster. Now for us the question becomes: with access forced upon us by logistical capitalism, brutally demanded with the job or with the bullet or with sexual violence, how do we maintain and cultivate our hapticality? Which is to say, how do we remain radically open amidst the war against us waged by logistical capitalism, a war that demands in the most sociopathic ways, total access to us? This seems to me to be our task – to finds ways where we can remain open to each other, allow our means to explore the full entanglement of our lives together and our full entanglement of this love, pain, and joy with each other in and of the earth. We have to find what my friend Manolo Callahan calls new habits of assembly that are not those of the logistical line, the logistical assembly line. Though the final part of your question is important, I am perhaps not the best person to predict what shape the new confrontations with logistical capitalism will take. I will look to some of the theorists who really grappling with the algorithm like Luciana Parisi, and those I mentioned, Tiziana Terranova, Matteo Pasquinelli, Ned Rossiter. And at the same time I’m learning from a new generation of scholars in the black radical tradition like Terrion Williamson, Alvaro Reyes, Che Gossett, Dhanveer Brar and Fumi Okiji. What I would repeat is something I heard Judith Butler say recently. Perhaps it is time to return to the early Marx, to his interest in the senses as theoreticians. Remember that another word for our means might be our senses. Traditionally our senses were supposed to deliver something, transmit it, logistically as it were, to our brains, minds, reason. Many debates follow. But what Marx suggested in this ‘early’ moment is perhaps something we can place against his prediction of total quality management and continuous improvement. What if we could rediscover a materialism equal to the confrontation with logistical capitalism – would this be a materialism of the theoretical senses, a development of our means as ends in themselves? Could this theoretical development be a radically open access that at the same time withdraws its relationship to ends, refuses to straighten, to pass? Could the hapticality of the black radical tradition that anticipated Marx already be this theory and practice? Could we plot a general strike against logistical capitalism through the radical self-organisation, collective organisation of our senses, a commune of the senses with what Manolo Callahan calls new habits of assembly. This would be a renewed habit of the assembly of means, by any means necessary, our haptical, subnautical assembly.

#### As Harney articulates, logistics operates by individualizing us

#### Logisticality *“is an attack on the assembly line”*4that not only overturns & reverses logistics but acts in *“a subversion of logistical capitalism”*4 It is a *“continuous breaking up”*4 of logistics in the midst *“of our continuous get together”*4*.* *“When we move we move to access, which is to say we assemble and disassemble anew”*4*.* Above all it *“is our incompleteness that inclines us toward one another”*4*.*

4Moten & Harney 15 (, F. and Harney, S., 2015. Fred Moten is Professor in the Department of Performance Studies, Tisch School of the Arts. He holds an A.B. from Harvard and a Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. Stefano Harney is Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University. Mikey The Rebelator. 1st ed. Taylor & Francis, pp.141-145.)-rahulpenu

#### The 1AC is a sabotage of information – the university is a “ministry of information” that spews information to the killing machine about the infospheres’ subjects in the form of misinformation and propaganda. Sabotage breaks the informational regulation, accumulation, and the destruction of bodies subject to exploitation by algorithmic governance.

Moten & Harney 16 (**,** F. and Harney, S., 2016. Fred Moten is Professor in the Department of Performance Studies, Tisch School of the Arts. He holds an A.B. from Harvard and a Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. Stefano Harney is Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University. From Cooperation To Black Operation A Conversation With Stefano Harney And Fred Moten On The Undercommons.)-rahulpenu

These concepts emerge !om a terrain of struggle. That terrain was unsettled long before we fled to it. And that struggle was planned long before we got there, long before we got to the kitchen table, long before we got to stand around the stove, or we were invited sit on the steps, or to jump up in the fete. Black women thought and fought this struggle and led us into the land we continuously unoccupy with our hospitality. The black radical tradition is where these concepts came !om, and very specifically black radical women then and now. And this is so because black women have been for so long theorizing and planning what we have called the undercommons as the place where you can no longer just be yourself and never were. Their planning is our queer debt, our black debt, our trans debt, which is of course not ours. **The hold is different**. It is the specificity in the general deployment of the black radical tradition, and although different accounts of blackness may change the specificity of the hold, they cannot change the **hold’s** **specificity**. As such it cannot operate like the other concepts in the book, but must be constantly withdrawn if the general antagonism of our history in the present is not to be mere agonism. At the same time, and this is a difficult kind of philosophical thing, that specificity, which is irreducible, is also irreducible in, say, the modern world system, because **the** **hold** of the ship **is** **the** **condition** **of** **possibility** of that system. Every place held by governance and policy bears the weight/trace of that specificity even if it can’t be said to be that specificity. Along that socio-geological line, where is the undercommons, where is the under in undercommons, is it the mole, the underground, the water vein, is it under and beyond like the Latin sub? Is it implicitly antagonizing or problematizing or subverting the concept of the common(s)? As form of knowledge it (is it they or it?) seems to be quite different $om what has been discussed as common(s), not general, but in proximity to the general antagonism, knowledge emerging in governance, but not in the dichotomy of victims and subjects, not on governance’s radar, but governance is always in search of it, though it emerges before governance. As form of subjectivation, as survival, as poetry, as affection, as connecting, not relating, potential of resistance, not critique, abstract line, not in line, it is everywhere. Is it everywhere? When we are asked about the undercommons this way we sometimes say that we are more interested in the undercommons of the concept than in the concept of the undercommons. This is to say that it is not only important for the undercommons to remain an improper term, an inappropriate term, an unfinished term, but it is also important for the term to join a disallowed terminology in general, to resist the terms of debate or the terms of service, to refuse the terms of a contract or the terms of a settlement. It’s just like with credit and debt. There are terms of credit but not terms of debt, not bad debt anyway, not the kind we try to get into. When we study our debts, the term never ends. But it may be that the undercommons is less a set of common capacities or an imagined common space - as the term common⒮ o(en denotes – and therefore less about collective living than about collected being, or better still, being that is both collected and stranded together, both stolen and given away, not enough but already good and plenty; or maybe collective living in uncollected, disheveled, dispersed being. Maybe the question concerning “where” belies or deflects or obscures a radical non-locality, a general displacement, the field of the feel, a social disruption of ontology, or at least of already existing modern ontology’s commitment to a certain classical notion of space/time. 11 years a!er the text on the university and the undercommons was published in Social Text, most of it still sounds to come $om today’s factories of knowledge. Still, what are your thoughts on the current state of the university, and new recipes for its desertion? Especially as you remain inside, wor%ng and struggling in this field… Here we could risk a bit of philology on this piece. Our work started in !iendship and always already in the study of !iendship. The university came to block our ability to study, which is to say cultivate !iendship generally. At first we wrote several critical texts, not included in the book, in the mode of those who expect something !om institutions, even if that expectation is about their transformation. But even as we were writing the ‘University and the Undercommons’ essay, we came to see something clearer. And it was this: **the modern university is nothing other than a ministry of information** during wartime. It **spews** **out** **information** **in** **support** **of** **a** **killing** **machine** **in a war** that Europeans and Americans have tried to globalize for five centuries. This war is called, variously, the public, the economy, or just ‘man.’ It is a war **on the human**, and other living things, and the earth, primarily prosecuted in the name of the human, the improvement of the human, the usu!uct of man and nature. Now, firstly, **a ministry of information in wartime** **pumps out** information in the form of lies, of **misinformation**. This is largely the function of the social sciences today. But secondly, a ministry of information in wartime also pumps out **propaganda for ‘its own side.’** This is, of course, the function of the humanities. The sciences for their part may be employed in either of these functions, or **folded** directly and **silently** **into** **the** **killing** **machine** **itself**. Now **what** **you** **do** **with** **a** **ministry** **of** **information** during wartime **is** **that** **you** try to **sabotage** **that** **information**. And we have a word for the **sabotage of information**, and that word is study. But this is to say that study, insofar as it comes first, **is what the ministry of information has always been trying to regulate**—simultaneously to accumulate and destroy. So you try to study, where to study, to be collected and stranded in study, in !iendship, not, in the first place, to try to sabotage information; rather we might say study sabotages information precisely because that it is not its aim. Study is not a critique of information. In fact, study is aimless, shi(less. Study is a dri(ing hobo camp of sharecroppers with untimely dreams of cooperative farms, dreams that never settle, as, for instance, Christopher Taylor reads CLR James’s writings on sharecroppers. **The university - the ministry of information – can be sabotaged**, but it cannot be transformed. Study is not transformational. It is deformational, subformational, formless formation. Could you tell us about the process of producing these texts? Academic cooperation in research and writing seems to have become a must, but your practice is a specific and very different case, not the least because of the overlapping poetic and theoretical styles and languages, up to the point where it is no longer possible to distinguish borders. Is your cooperation purely affirmative or are there ways to cope with disagreement, negation, particular antagonisms? What about the very specific disciplinary specificities, for example, when it comes to technical terms $om economics or black aesthetics? Is there a practice of discussing dark sentences, if there are any? How do you work together with respect to conceptual inventions, and the sound and rhythm of the texts, when music and poetry are not only content, but obviously also a formal aspect? What if we thought of cooperation as the breakdown of being together? What if cooperation is an emergency measure taken to curb the emergence of the individual capable of cooperation? Cooperation would then be the self-defense of !iendship, its violent moment. Cooperation might then indeed include an affirmative or dissensual communication. This violent singling out in communication, this cooperation, may sometimes be necessary (just) as self-defense as theorised by revolutionaries. But it is just as surely a deviation, distraction, and subtraction !om being together. Poetry is where dissensus and affirmation blur. In defense of undercommon difference we wanted to make a difference engine, a generative machine, that would also be a mechanism of and for attunement, in the tradition of making what you say sound like something. We have been interested in the transition !om cooperation to black operation. Over and beyond more of the same, which is cool, what might a dark sentence generate if a gathering forms around it? We were definitely thinking about that!

#### The Role of the Ballot is to affirm Debate as an act of Planning, not Policy – instead of forcing normative outcomes via spaces of study, you should affirm acts of self-preservation within political spaces.

For spec – orientations to politics matters first, debate is a site of planning which means our affirmation of a model of debate outweighs

Greer 18, G. H. "Who Needs the Undercommons? Refuge and Resistance in Public High Schools." Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice 28.1 (2018): 5-18. (Concordia University (Canada), Art Education Department, Graduate Student.)//Elmer//recut n33l

Planning While study in the undercommons is a sociality that provides **refuge, joy, and resilience**, planning is the ongoing process of resistance which protects study. In the terms of complexity theory, planning creates the conditions for study to emerge. Planning defends study, for example, by attending **to methods**, when economic forces are oriented toward outcomes. In such a case, study thrives in the fascination required to build a car from scratch but is extinguished by a production line. Planning may then take the form of activism against the process of de-skilling workers. Generally, study is in trouble where labour is detached from purpose, discovery, and agency; and planning poses resistance to such divisions. Resistance may take a passive form like absenteeism or an active form like student strikes; it is an ongoing social experiment. The subjects of difference who inhabit the undercommons initiate planning in support of further difference: “planning in the undercommons is not an activity, not fishing or dancing or teaching or loving, but the ceaseless experiment with the future presence of the forms of life that make such activities possible” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 74). Importantly, “[p]lanning is self-sufficiency at the social level, and it reproduces in its experiment not just what it needs, life, but what it wants, life in difference…” (p. 76). Planning resists the austerity of conformity. Difference may bring the concept of diversity to mind for social justice educators. There are a number of distinctions between the difference that propels planning in the undercommons and diversity as it is understood in the field of education. Social justice education organized around diversity involves “eliminating the injustice created when differences are sorted and ranked in a hierarchy that unequally confers power…” (Adams, Bell, Goodman, & Joshi, 2016, p. 3, emphasis in original). In this sense, equitable diversity is an end goal that is, significantly, often supported by the implementation of policy. Planning, on the other hand, is a process, rather than an outcome, that resists policy, as explained below. Planning appears distorted, if at all, **from the commons where the rules are made**: “Because from the perspective of **policy it is too dark in there, in** the black **heart of the undercommons, to see**” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 79). Planning may become invisible or **appear criminal in the light**. Historical examples of such distortions are plentiful. The Freedom Riders were planning in 1961, boarding buses into their own brutalization to desegregate the southern United States; in the light of curricular history, Freedom Riders disappear and are replaced by parliamentary motions. There was planning at the Stonewall Riots in June of 1969 when homeless queer kids led by trans women of colour revolted against police brutality; the political necessity of Stonewall disappears in the parade lights of Pride every year on its own anniversary. Planning made visible but distorted is apparent in current events in the criminalization of self-preservation: from immigration (Ackerman & Furman, 2013), to activism (Matthews & Cyril, 2017; Alonso, Barcena, & Gorostidi, 2013), to panhandling (Chesnay, 2013). Educators who wish to see the planning of the undercommons, or to make it visible to students, must research to discover the exclusions of curriculum. When we include stories like the Stonewall Riots or the Freedom Riders in our teaching, we offer a connection to students who see their lives reflected therein. Stories of resistance to injustice, particular to local contexts, are important educational resources. In addition to these, pedagogical models which support the development and scholastic direction, of planning skills among students include: problem-based learning (Walker, Leary, Hmelo-Silver, & Ertmer, 2015), choice-based art education (Douglas, & Jaquith, 2009), critical media literacy (Funk, Kellner, & Share, 2016), and anti-oppressive education (Kumashiro, 2000). Policy From the perspective of the undercommons, policy inevitably conflicts with the forms of study and planning described above. Policy is the **instrument of efficiency**; it seeks measurable, predictable outcomes. The immeasurable social experiments and emerging differences of planning and study cannot be reconciled with administrative control as exercised through policy. Policy from the perspective of the undercommons operates under three rules. First, it diagnoses planners as problematic and prescribes itself as the solution; “This is the first rule of policy. It **fixes others**” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 78). Second, policy requires the participation of planners in the fixing of themselves; “Participating in change is the second rule of policy.” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 80). In this way, participants implicate themselves in order to fulfill the third rule of policy: that “wrong participation” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 81) provokes all manner of crises. If there is no crisis then the participant is fixed and may be deputised in order to fix others. More commonly, any crisis at all proves that policy was right about the planners all along; and of course, they were bound to fail. The circular logic of policy as viewed from the undercommons reflects what Spade (2015) calls administrative violence. Spade (2015) details a story which I relate here to clarify the operations of policy. Bianca, a trans girl, was sent home from her high school in 1999 for wearing clothing that affirmed her gender. She was not allowed to return to her classes. Bianca’s parents called the school and received no response. Spade met Bianca in 2002 when she was homeless, unemployed, and attempting to leave an abusive relationship. Bianca had enrolled in a welfare work program but was outed as a trans woman by her male identification (ID). She was subsequently harassed and forced to quit, losing her income and making her ineligible for Medicaid. She became homeless, and because of her male ID she was barred from women’s shelters and fearful of further abuse at shelters for men. Without an address, medical benefits, or an income Bianca was unable to complete the process to correct her ID and could not afford the hormone treatments that allowed her to maintain a feminine appearance. Bianca’s ability to pass as a cisgender woman protected her on the street from further harassment by both the public and the police. In order to afford hormone injections, Bianca engaged in sex work. The injections were not regulated because they had to be obtained illegally which placed Bianca at increased risk of infection by HIV, hepatitis, and other diseases. Although Bianca’s story is not recent, the factors that contributed to her difficulties are relevant: transgender youth are still significantly over-represented in groups of early school leavers, homeless youth, and survivors of violence (Morton et al., 2018; Keuroghlian, Shtasel, & Bassuk, 2014). In the language of the undercommons Bianca planned to survive by expressing her gender, but this plan was subverted by school policy, causing her not to graduate and significantly reducing her prospects for employment. Following the first rule of policy according to the undercommons, Bianca’s school would not accept her attendance until she fixed her gender. Bianca then followed the second rule of policy and made attempts to become a participant. She tried to stay at shelters and enrolled in a social welfare work program. In each of these cases, she experienced the crisis of harassment. Following the third rule of policy, these crises were framed as the result of Bianca’s wrong participation: she did not have the right identification. For survival, Bianca must then become a fugitive by engaging in criminalized activity: sex work and the illegal procurement of hormones. In an educational context, considering policy, according to The Undercommons, pushes educators to ask how the rules in our schools create, rather than respond to, fugitivity among students. Fugitivity Being a fugitive according to The Undercommons means being marked as an outsider. Fugitivity happens to people when: first they act, and second policy outlaws those actions. But fugitivity must also be embraced. Those who refuse the rules of policy, as outlined above, become fugitive. Fugitives will not be fixed, refuse to participate, and deny responsibility for the crises that befall them. Fugitivity recognises systemic racism, classism, ableism, and cis/heteronormativity in the disallowance of demographic-specific behaviour. It is fugitive sociality that composes the undercommons in order to provide refuge and resistance. In high schools, the undercommons provides social refuge in the form of patient listening and covert smiles to: hat wearing, cell phone texting, hall running, affection displaying, fugitive students; and granola bar giving, grade fudging, student failing, smiling before Christmas, fugitive teachers. These now-fugitive activities are planning behaviours, they sustain study for those that commit them. These things have been happening since before policy determined that education is a predictable and measurable thing. Fugitive planners generate study with unforeseeable ends and immeasurable learning. Turning planners into fugitives has some effects: ease of administration and evaluation is one; the reinforcement of unjust hierarchies is another.

### 1AC---Underview

#### This will be a debate about debate---you should put a hold on procedural issues and gain a new understanding of how the logistics operates within the infosphere.

Kelsie 19 – Amber Kelsie, University of Pittsburgh, Communication and Rhetoric, Graduate Student, “Blackened Debate at the End of the Word”, Philosophy & Rhetoric, Volume 52, Number 1, 2019, pp. 63-70 (Article), Penn State University Press)//Shreyas

We are haunted by the specter of civil war. Liberal and conservative politicians and commentators openly express anxiety about the possibility of outright hostilities and the “unravelling [of ] our national fabric” (Gambino 2017). Increasing polarization, identity politics that destroys persuasion, an atmosphere of conspiracy regarding the deep state or foreign puppet masters, apparent disenchantment with institutions, general mistrust in electoral politics, a gridlocked and weak congress, and open skirmishes between white nationalist and antifascists are put forth as signs of the end times (see, e.g., Blight 2017; Wright 2017; DeGroot 2018; Smith 2018). The looming crisis of the end of politics that everywhere drives the nostalgic desire for a return to a normalcy and civility invites us to rethink debate and to pose a different question that does not seek to redeem a past that never was and continues to come at too high a cost for the wretched of the earth. Rather than “make debate great again,” I’d like to sit with the vertigo so as to consider debate’s (im)possible outside. Such a quest for a horizon that is before-after-immanent to the End (of politics or history or the world) will require that we rethink the spatiotemporal coordinates of the entire liberal project that secures the parameters of debate as the dialectical and agonistic contestation of the possible. My central interlocutor here will be blackness: that (non-)ontological constitutive outside of the modern grammar that is relegated to the realm of absolute necessity, negativity, incapacity, and pathology that subtends the political and the rhetorical. As that which is always already outside the World/History, blackness provides an anoriginary nonplace from which to think crisis and a politics of actualizing the impossible. Imminent civil war is an interesting but unsurprising anxiety; it is unsurprising because the U.S. Civil War informs so much of the popular narrative of the United States and its ethical position that confirms the progressive nature of time, and because liberal sovereignty was always a war waged against civil war.1 And it is interesting because the Greeks referred to civil war as “stasis.” Today standing, state, and stability are also meanings of stasis, as it emerges from histemi. Stasis then doubles both as sovereignty and as sovereignty’s undoing and evokes a constant permanence of war even in peace. Stasis in rhetorical studies takes on the meaning of “issue” and serves as a hermeneutic for coming to consensus on the point of contention from which debate proceeds. Stasis here also means standing in the sense that there is some “ground” in the form of prior consensus on the nature of the disagreement.2 The somewhat paradoxical relationship between consensus and dissensus found in stasis speaks to a kind of disavowal of ungroundedness that precedes even the point from which to begin speaking. Must one have a presupposed potentiality for a common ground to be able to proceed in argument? Refusing this disavowal of groundlessness as it emerges in contemporary figurations of agonistic debate might enable us to more accurately think of rhetoric in its modern inflection as the presupposition of a ground as a war against its own void via antiblackness. The inversion of Clausewitz’s proposition is salient: rhetoric is the continuation of war by other means; rhetoric as a mode of war in an effort to ontologize itself against its groundless outside.3 The (im)possible is always at stake in debate since rhetoric regards the contingent as its necessary presupposition. According to Dilip Gaonkar, this “key, but largely unnoticed, assumption in contemporary rhetorical theory” finds its basis in Aristotle’s response to Plato’s charge of the unspecifiability of rhetoric (2004, 5). Instead of freeing us to reflect explicitly on the nature of contingency, Aristotle’s domestication of rhetoric by placing rhetoric within the domain of the “contingent, yet probable” has prompted most rhetorical scholars to forgo consideration of contingency in favor of the thematic of probability: doxa, constraints, norms, ideology. Contingency in these schemas tends to be considered as a property ascribed to statements, propositions, and rhetorical acts—to the ontic world that constitutes the context of the rhetor—rather than as a mode of the subject or the singular encounter that constitutes a rhetorical situation. The possibility of rhetorical dialectic, that exigency that provides the opportunity for agonistic argument that can be sublated into judgment, animates historical progress and places debate as the ground for civic life. In the liberal understanding of contemporary debate, contingency takes on an interior spatial dimension as the possible content through a disavowal of the contingency of debate’s outside that is rendered impossible. To say that debate is impossible is then to beckon to war on the horizon. It is to recognize the state of emergency as the end of the state of debate.

#### Fairness is the shield behind which liberalism lives - we can't tolerate it in the infosphere.

Wilderson 8 (Frank B. Wilderson, “Incognegro: A Memoir of Exile and Apartheid”, South End Press, pp. 406-411)//CoppellDR //recut n33l

Just two years ago, in December of 1999, I'd written a letter and stuffed it, late one night, in the faculty mailboxes. It began with what must have appeared to the faculty's confused eyes as a red herring. It spoke not about my excruciating encounters with them, but began, instead, out of left field by discussing the plight of two students whose troubles with the College had been the topic of recent debate. Reading of Sonia Rodriguez's and Selma Thornton's troubles with the Student Senate and its White liberal adviser Tim Harold reawakened my disdain for Cabrillo as an institution and for the English Division as one of its flagship entities. I then went on to explain how Selma and Sonia had resigned their posts in the Student Senate in protest over Harold's decision not to allow thirty students of color to have funds to travel to a conference on race at Hartnell College. Instead, Harold spent the money on T-shirts. He had also put the sign-up sheet for the conference not in the Student Center, but in some obscure location where it would never be found thus sabotaging the excursion further. This seemed like a trivial enough matter, but it compounded the hurt and sense of isolation and rebuke which so many Black and Latino students felt at Cabrillo but could not name. I felt a piqued kinship with their unspeakable pain and used the rare moment of it having turned into a tangible event as a way into what I wanted to say to the faculty and administration...and to Alice. In defense of his actions, and as a way of indicating the absurdity of Selma and Sonia's objections, Harold issued a public statement in which he did not comment (or at least the newspaper did not report his comments) on his funding priorities; rather, he simply said "The sign-up sheet was posted for a week, the same way we treat any workshop." To this, I wrote: Whereas Selma Thornton attempts an institutional analysis of the Student Senate by way of a critique of Tim Harold and his practices, Harold responds with a ready made institutional defense and, later in the article, a defense of his integrity (a personalized response to an institutional analysis). He brings the scale of abstraction back down to the level most comfortable for White people: the individual and the uncontextualized realm of fair play. It's the White person's safety zone. I'm a good person, I'm a fair person, I treat everyone equally, the rules apply to everyone. Thornton and Rodriguez's comments don't indict Harold for being a "good" person, they indict him for being White: a way of being in the world which legitimates institutional practices (practices which Thornton and Rodriguez object to) accepts, and promotes, them as timeless—without origin, consequence, interest, or allegiance—natural and inevitable. "The sign-up sheet was posted for a week, the same way we treat any workshop." The whole idea that we treat everyone equally is only slightly more odious than the discussion or how we can treat everyone equally; because the problem is neither the practice nor the debates surrounding it, but the fact that White people can come together and wield enough institutional power to constitute a "We." "We" in the Student Senate, "We" in Aptos, "We" in Santa Cruz, "We" in the English department, "We" in the boardrooms. "We" are fair and balanced is as odious as "We" are in control—they are derivations of the same expression: "We" are the police. The claim of "balance and fair play" forecloses upon, not only the modest argument that the practices of the Cabrillo Student Senate are racist and illegitimate, but it also forecloses upon the more extended, comprehensive, and antagonistic argument that Cabrillo itself is racist and illegitimate. And what do we mean by Cabrillo? The White people who constitute its fantasies of pleasure and its discourse of legitimacy. The generous "We." So, let's bust "We" wide open and start at the end: White people are guilty until proven innocent. Fuck the compositional moves of substantiation and supporting evidence: I was at a conference in West Oakland last week where a thousand Black folks substantiated it a thousand different ways. You're free to go to West Oakland, find them, talk to them, get all the proof you need. You can drive three hours to the mountains, so you sure as hell can cut the time in half and drive to the inner city. Knock on any door. Anyone who knows 20 to 30 Black folks, intimately—and if you don't know 12 then you're not living in America, you're living in White America—knows the statement to be true. White people are guilty until proven innocent. Whites are guilty of being friends with each other, of standing up for their rights, of pledging allegiance to the flag, of reproducing concepts like fairness, meritocracy, balance, standards, norms, harmony between the races. Most of all. Whites are guilty of wanting stability and reform. White people, like Mr. Harold and those in the English Division, are guilty of asking themselves the question. How can we maintain the maximum amount of order (liberals at Cabrillo use euphemisms like peace, harmony, stability), with the minimum amount of change, while presenting ourselves—if but only to ourselves—as having the best of all possible intentions. Good people. Good intentions. White people are the only species, human or otherwise, capable of transforming the dross of good intentions into the gold of grand intentions, and naming it "change." ...These passive revolutions, fire and brimstone conflicts over which institutional reform is better than the other one, provide a smoke screen—a diversionary play of interlocutions—that keep real and necessary antagonisms at bay. White people are thus able to go home each night, perhaps a little wounded, but feeling better for having made Cabrillo a better place...for everyone... Before such hubris at high places makes us all a little too giddy, let me offer a cautionary note: it's scientifically impossible to manufacture shinola out of shit. But White liberals keep on trying and end up spending a lifetime not knowing shit from shinola. Because White people love their jobs, they love their institutions, they love their country, most of all they love each other. And every Black or Brown body that doesn't love the things you love is a threat to your love for each other. A threat to your fantasy space, your terrain of shared pleasures. Passive revolutions have a way of incorporating Black and Brown bodies to either term of the debate. What choice does one have? The third (possible, but always unspoken) term of the debate, White people are guilty of structuring debates which reproduce the institution and the institution reproduces America and America is always and everywhere a bad thing this term is never on the table, because the level of abstraction is too high for White liberals. They've got too much at stake: their friends, their family, their way of life. Let's keep it all at eye level, where whites can keep an eye on everything. So the Black body is incorporated. Because to be unincorporated is to say that what White liberals find valuable I have no use for. This, of course, is anti-institutional and shows a lack of breeding, not to mention a lack of gratitude for all the noblesse oblige which has been extended to the person of color to begin with. "We will incorporate colored folks into our fold, whenever possible and at our own pace, provided they're team players, speak highly of us, pretend to care what we're thinking, are highly qualified, blah, blah, blah...but, and this is key, we won't entertain the rancor which shits on our fantasy space.

#### Unfairness good.

Warren 11Warren Waren University of Central Florida, Orlando, Using Monopoly to Introduce Concepts of Race and Ethnic Relations The Journal of Effective Teaching, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2011, 28-35 [Shreyas]

Undergraduate students often enter our classrooms convinced that the battles of the Civil Rights Era solved the issue of race in America. They are generally unacquainted with the long history of race in the United States and almost universally underestimate the structural forces which carry racial disparities into their new century. As sociologists and teachers, it is our responsibility to tell that story and explain those forces. Our new challenge is: How do we teach students the extent of racism in America when, from their point of view, the problem of the color-line has been solved? One option is to use a game. Sociologists have used games or simulations to spark the sociological imagination (Dorn, 1989; Jessup, 2001; Fisher 2008), to stimulate critical thinking (Pence 2009), and to introduce social stratification (Ender, 2004; Waldner & Kinney, 1999). When students from relatively privileged backgrounds “experience” a temporary bout of unfairness in a simulated game, it creates the opportunity to change their perspective (Coghlan & Huggins, 2004; Haddad & Lieberman, 2002).

The injustice of the situation, if directly connected to broader theory, can lessen a student’s social distance from marginalized groups. A game may help a student to understand some of the previously inexplicable attitudes and behaviors of actors on either side of a power relationship. Also, as this paper demonstrates, a properly constructed simulation can give the student a sense of the structural nature and lasting legacy of racial discrimination—a fuller sense of the “history and biography” of race in the United States (Mills, 1959). The great advantage of a game is that it is a completely controlled environment—there are no unexplained variables. In fairness to all the players, all rules are explicitly stated at the outset of game play and apply to all players equally (Waldner & Kinney, 1999). Ordinarily, in a competitive game this assumption of fairness supports an ideology of individualism. However, a pedagogical game is concerned with learning, not winning. In order to disentangle a complicated issue, the instructor may purposefully introduce inequality into an otherwise “just” world. Again, because all rules are explicit (even unfair ones), the problem exists in the game without confounding effects. This simplification allows students to easily focus on the nature and development of the problem. By extension, it is hoped that the game encourages students to reassess similar problems in the real world. Use of Pedagogical Games Dorn (1989) identifies multiple criteria for games or simulations to be effective in the classroom as pedagogical tools. He argues the games must: reflect reality; motivate students through "experience"; develop awareness of personal values through moral and ethical implications of the game; connect abstract concepts with concrete experiences; create a shared experience from which the students can draw; offer a form of debriefing to both address emotional issues and to connect theory to experiences. In the technique I describe below, I try to incorporate these ideas with Straus’ (1986) emphasis on simplicity for in-class games. In teaching and learning, the goal of simulation is the “experience” itself. Jessup (2001) argues that simulation should be the “experiential anchor for the elaboration of conceptual tools” (p.108). Therefore, this game is created to offer a chance for relatively privileged students to experience the unfairness of structural inequality. After temporary exposure to an analog of racial discrimination, students with no prior familiarity of racial discrimination will have a deeper understanding of the effects of racism on many levels. Pedagogical games are used to challenge our assumptions about how the world works (Waldner & Kinney, 1999).

For example, the basic assumption of competitive games is fairness. This assumes that the world is fair (i.e., a meritocracy) and that individual effort or talent is the main factor in success (i.e., an ideology of individualism akin to Ross’ (1977) fundamental attribution error). In competitive games therefore, groups are treated equally and the best players win. But a pedagogical game may challenge the assumption of fairness directly by having structural inequality built into the game. The experience of a good player losing an unfair game creates cognitive dissonance—that cognitive dissonance is our teaching moment. I assume that students as game players can easily identify games that are “unfair” based on unequal outcomes for equivalent behavior. As a pedagogical tool, I want it to be relatively easy for them to spot the explicit rules which cause the inequality.

#### Their vision of clash is superficial multiculturalism that intensifies racial terror.

Hawthorne and Heitz 18. University of California-Berkeley (Camilla and Kaily, “A seat at the table? Reflections on Black geographies and the limits of dialogue,” Dialogues in Human Geography 2018, Vol. 8(2) 148–151) ipartman

As Rose-Redwood et al. (2018) rightly argue, certain voices have been systematically excluded from the physical and metaphorical spaces of dialogue within the field of human geography. The marginalization of Black geographic scholarship within the discipline cannot be understood separately from the marginalization of Black scholars at all levels within geography. This means that the academy can itself be a site of violence that regulates who can participate in scholarly dialogue. But, at the same time, we want to argue that the project of Black Geographies is more than simply **a project of ‘add Black people and stir’**. It is about moving beyond a liberal politics of superficial and provisional inclusion to think seriously about which voices, intellectual genealogies, and traditions of thought are deemed sufficiently canonical or scholarly—and why. **Claims to dialogue** within human geography, and the academy writ large, are frequently invoked to **obscure a lack of engagement** with noncanonical scholarship. Yet we are still convinced that geography has important things to offer our understanding of blackness, and vice versa—that centering blackness can actually tell us important things about space and place, about power and the politics of resistance. The Black Geographies Symposium, for instance, was centered on a shared understanding of blackness as a fundamentally spatial relation, of space as profoundly racialized, and of the history of geography as entangled with racism, colonialism, and enslavement. What would it mean, for instance, if geographers were to read Marx on the factory alongside W.E.B. Du Bois and C.L.R. James on the plantation, or Jamaica Kincaid alongside Doreen Massey on relational understandings of place? A Black geographical scholarly praxis entails a willingness to subvert arborescent models of intellectual lineage in favor of queerings, rhizomes, undercommons (Harney and Moten, 2013), provincializations, or even the Sankofa (Benjamin, 2013). These are, in other words, nonhierarchical and nonlinear modes of study that can attend to the complex geographical itineraries and interconnected struggles that continue to shape our understandings of the relations of capitalism, racism, and sexism that structure the modern world. Perhaps, then, we should be striving for something more radical than dialogue. Rose-Redwood et al. (2018) point toward the possibilities of dialogue as embodied action; but **what if we instead take liberatory knowledges as the point of departure, rather than ‘democratic’ dialogue or abject embodiment**? In her keynote presentation at the Black Geographies symposium, Katherine McKittrick suggested that scholarly dialogue necessarily invokes the materiality of humanness in both body and place: ‘The materiality of intellectual inquiry, the ideas we share, the counsel we give each other, is an ongoing referential conversation about Black humanity. [ . . . ] The materiality of intellectual inquiry, the ideas we share, is a referential conversation that begins from Black humanness’. Dialogue from a place of Black humanness refutes cursory lip service to Black scholarship, and thereby necessitates a politics of engagement that recognizes how deeply consequential intellectual praxis is to our spatial and material realities. Furthermore, our citational practice in dialogue may be thought of in who we emulate both on and off the page. Citing long excluded, marginalized, and delegitimized scholars in our debates within geography is as important as the way that we cite movement leaders, activists, and artists—such as Patrisse Cullors, Alicia Garza, Opal Tometi, Martin Luther King Jr, James Baldwin, Claudia Jones, June Jordan, Angela Davis, Fannie Lou Hamer, or Malcolm X—to interrogate and decolonize spaces of intellectual dialogue. This labor entails a sort of cross-generational call-and-response with our intellectual–political forbearers. As young scholars, **we vehemently reject the individuating pressures of the neoliberal academy and recognize instead that we stand on the shoulders of giants. Generations of Black scholars have persistently carved out spaces** within the discipline of geography **even when they are not formally offered a ‘seat at the table’ of dialogue**— from Clyde Woods to Katherine McKittrick, from George Lipsitz to Ruth Wilson Gilmore, from Harold Rose to Carolyn Finney (and many, many more). Through their engagements with issues ranging from residential segregation to the prison industrial complex, these scholars have set powerful examples of how Black geographical scholarship should reside in the world. Thus, when we enter into an online debate, record an injustice using our phones, or make space for colleagues who are typically silenced in meetings, **we are implicitly citing the radical Black tradition** and our co-conspirators engaged in the ongoing project of liberation. To engage the ‘spatialities of scholarly dialogue’ is also to critically consider how our situated geographies of knowledge are informed by latent, inequalities made speakable through the spatialities of blackness. That the spatialities of dialogue have profoundly material consequences is particularly important to remember now, when words that appear harmless online manifest as real harms for their targets. These are not purely intellectual exercises—they are tied to the urgency of our current conjuncture. We are seeing directly how White supremacy, environmental racism, border militarization, urban displacement, and racial capitalism are deeply spatial and lived. When we stand by as White supremacists come to our campuses under the premise of engaging in free-speech dialogue, we forgo the embodied threat that their words online—and militarized in-person presence—pose for marginalized students, faculty, and staff. Dialogue like this comes at a high cost; it creates a real sense of harm that implicitly excludes these participants from the discussion space, thereby reinforcing structural barriers to entry. From the gates of the university to streets of Oakland, to as far afield as the shores of Lampedusa, we are thus seeing how Black liberation must be understood as a spatial praxis that challenges the limits of dialogue under **the structural conditions of White supremacy**.