- accumulation requires either 1) more raw material or 2) larger consumer base

- capital 1: 1867

- Marx notes gold and silver taken from America, enslavement and murder of indigenous populations in america, the looting of the east indies, the transatlantic slave trade, and the forceful expropriation of land from the english peasantry to a few landowners

- harvey notes that these processes don't just happen in the primitive sense but are ongoing, now, as always

- 13357 citations (!)

Chakravartty, Paula, and Denise Ferreira Da Silva. "Accumulation, dispossession, and debt: The racial logic of global capitalism—an introduction." American Quarterly 64.3 (2012): 361-385.

I read some of this stuff last semester, and started thinking through it, and there were some spots where it could definitely be expanded:

- global nature
- other crises besides 2008
- how does that racial logic function

(history)

- if I had an banana valued at $1 today, but the US dollar is being pumped up in value so that tomorrow this price of $1 actually represents $10, nobody will want to buy my banana

---

- model modernity

    – racial hierarchy made this, this makes racial hierarchy
    – universalizing - differentiating

as important as the actual events that led to the crisis actually are, what I am much more interested in explaining and understanding and making a thesis about is the logic behind all of this

---

- if that doesn't make sense, it's because I have no idea what I'm talking about
- pictures sometimes are better than words

---

in the midst of my thesis i have become frustrated and have been searching for a better way to do scholarship. one that opens up the humanities, from being focused on a canon, from providing little new theory and being scholarship for the sake of scholarship, from being distributed in the same inaccessible mediums,

I want a humanities for everybody, a humanities for the public instead of a humanities limited by the all of the walls in the ivory tower. In the process, in the theory, in the methods, in the sources, in the conclusions – all of these should point outwards. The arbitrary divisions that structure each of them have to be torn down. We need to open up the humanities.

These are some reflections on how I am doing this project in this pursuit. In this project, they have boiled down so far to four claims:

1. Accessible tools
2. Accessible products
3. Accessible processes
4. Accessible presentations

Or to state it in a single sentence, we should open up the humanities.

we should document the process

Theoretically: Writing a history is itself a historical event. When I'm writing about the IMF and the Asian financial crisis, what is relevant are not the events of 1997, but also the thoughts and notes I am writing right now in 2021. The historian is very much implicated in the process of creating history, because history is not only those that "do the events" but also the ones that make these events knowable and known to others.

This is a statement every historian and scholar in the humanities can agree with, but still the process of writing history is not one that in my view is treated as a history. We should be creating and documenting archives while we write. We should be reflecting, self-critiquing, tracking.

Morally: Writing a history right now occurs by one person one their computer, typing away on microsoft word. The process of writing history is locked in the ivory tower, to only those academicians and putting these characters on the page. It's impossible to see the development of research from outside this. We need the documentation of the process as it happens right now.

Conclusion: we should document, journal, log our own processes and how they come to be; and through all of this make it freely accessible and

we should use freely accessible resources to make research

we should make our resources freely accessible

we should use more accessible mediums of presentation

We have coalesced to a defined canon of presentation as well