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#### We’re in a cybernetic episteme -- communication is structured by extraction of surplus, producing feedback loops of information that have destroyed objective reality. Technology has become a project of extracting personhood from the subject to upload it into the cloud. Cybernetic neuropower infiltrates and manipulates decision-making in order to make all actions productive for capitalism. Cybernetic capitalism depends on colonialism, imperialism and environmental destruction

Emmelhainz 21, visiting scholar @ Vermont College of Fine Arts (Irmgard, “Authoritarianism and the Cybernetic Episteme, or the Progressive Disappearance of Everything on Earth”, e-flux journal, issue 122 November 21. <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/122/430488/authoritarianism-and-the-cybernetic-episteme-or-the-progressive-disappearance-of-everything-on-earth/>)

Life and society worldwide have been transformed by digital technology, including the fabrics of emotional relationships. Many believed the internet would be the largest ungoverned space in the world with unlimited emancipatory potential, and trusted Big Tech to make the world a better­ place. Yet power and capitalism filled that space with surveillance systems, the production of private capital, the monetization of data, and the control of human lives. Social media now shape daily life and many have lost faith in the possibility of a shared consensus reality. We are living in a scenario similar to one imagined by Black Mirror: our belief in digital communication and social media creates narcissistic personalities, selves dissociated and dislocated from their reflections online. Digital communication offers an opaque mirror that delivers egos without bodies, eliding alterity.

The collapse of reality, however, is not an unintended consequence of advancements in, for instance, artificial intelligence: it was the long-term objective of many technologists, who sought to create machines capable of transforming human consciousness (like drugs do). Communication has become a site for the extraction of surplus value, and images operate as both commodities and dispositives for this extraction. Moreover, data mediates our cognition, that is to say, the way in which we exist and perceive the world and others. The image—and the unlimited communication promised by constant imagery—have ceased to have emancipatory potential. Images place a veil over a world in which the isolated living dead, thirsty for stimulation and dopamine, give and collect likes on social media. Platform users exist according to the Silicon Valley utopian ideal of life’s complete virtualization.

The internet, moreover, has radically changed the political communications game and must be considered a complex propaganda apparatus. Although a single Tweet can destroy someone’s career, and fake news can start a real news cycle, meaning is subordinate to the circulation of vacuous content. The capitalist capture of data for profit does not rely on policing content; the production of capital only relies on the constant exchange and circulation of information. We don’t yet know the full extent of the manipulation of companies such as Facebook, Google, and Amazon in the last two elections in the US or in other elections around the world. But it is undeniable that digital platforms are actively censoring content in the interests of particular political actors. For instance: in October 2020, Zoom canceled a meeting hosting Palestinian human rights activist Leila Khaled; a month before, Facebook and Twitter censored information detrimental to Joseph Biden’s presidential campaign. The same two companies intervened and shut down pro-Trump accounts in 2020, even Donald Trump’s own Facebook and Twitter accounts.

After the attempted coup at the US capitol on January 6, 2020, Facebook’s recently instituted oversight board ruled that Trump had created “an environment where a serious risk of violence was possible.” In this light, it seems likely that he will continue to be banned from the platform. According to journalist Shoshana Zuboff, however, this is insufficient, given that the oversight board’s decision (whose work is supported by a $130 million endowment from Facebook) follows years of inaction by CEO Mark Zuckerberg, who indulged and appeased Trump while entrenching what Zuboff calls “surveillance capitalism.” A liberal might think that shutting up Trump and helping Biden is not bad, as they are actions that seemingly advance the interests of the Democratic Party. What is at stake here, however, is not whether the platforms take a “good” or “bad” stance on a particular issue; the problem is that they have immense unchecked power and can act as they please. Platforms are allowed to secretly extract behavioral data from users, whether or not users are aware, transforming the information into targeted ads, destroying privacy, changing human experience into data, altering elections, and reshaping human civilization. This structure can be termed the “cybernetic episteme,” and the new form of control, which goes beyond the previous regime of biopower, can be termed “neuropower.”

According to its Greek etymology, an “episteme” is a system of understanding. In The Order of Things, Michel Foucault uses the term “épistemè” to mean the nontemporal or a priori knowledge that grounds what is taken as truth in a given moment. Several epistemes coexist at a given time, as they constitute parts of various systems of power and knowledge. The cybernetic episteme, as defined by the collective Tiqqun some twenty years ago, describes our relationship to technology and machines (which are inseparable from the workings of capitalism). The cybernetic episteme is based on the modern tenet of progress and human-led transcendence achieved through science and technology.

Under neuropower, the sensible gives way to cognitive pathologies. These pathologies depend on the consumption of content rather than the sharing of meaning. As Thomas Metzinger explains, the internet has become an integral part of how we model ourselves, as we use it for external memory storage, as a cognitive prosthesis, and for emotional self-regulation. This has radically changed the structure of conscious experience, creating a new form of waking consciousness that resembles “a mixture of dreaming, dementia, intoxication, and infantilization.” Other effects of neuropower are humans’ growing invisibility to each other and a paroxysmal racism that infiltrates power, technology, culture, language, and work. For Franco “Bifo” Berardi, racism has become a “virus” that exacerbates fear—above all, the fear of extinction, which seems to have become one of the motors behind white supremacy in the world. Dissociated from our environment, alienated from each other, we are oblivious to the challenges that are being posed to humanity by the Capitalocene.

1.

Under lockdown, internet-based technology became embedded in everyday life more than ever before. Zoom and other platforms became the matrix of a production model that exacerbates the power of technology over society. A new lockdown economy has emerged in this disembodied communication space, where knowledge is subsumed under the rules of capital accumulation. The pandemic has led to extreme alienation, to the point that privilege is defined as depending on invisible laborers to sustain forms of life. This means that a new “virtual working class” has emerged that can take basics like food, water, and electricity for granted, knowing that they do not have to risk their bodies to have these comforts.

Until 2016, digital technology promised access to all human knowledge, unlimited exchange, self-expression, democratization, participation, opportunities to make money, the acceleration of bureaucratic processes, and the means for grassroots and popular power to challenge governments and corporations. The peak of this alluring cyber-utopia came around 2010–11, when social media played a crucial role in the Occupy and Arab Spring movements. But in 2016, when Cambridge Analytica was revealed to have intervened in the US elections that brought Donald Trump to power, the public’s belief in such technologies to change power structures began to shift. We witnessed the worldwide rise of right-wing governments and populist movements supported by wealth. Maurizzio Ferraris has called this the era of “post-truth,” when the deconstruction of a stable truth became an important political tool. In online public space, discourse has been shattered, truth has become indiscernible, and relativism has become the norm. The public sphere—the bastion of established and emerging democracies, bolstered by mass media—began to shatter.

Leaders such as Benjamin Netanyahu, Donald Trump, Andrés Manuel López Obrador, Jair Bolsonaro, and Narendra Modi have used digital communications to construct charismatic identities and disseminate populist messages, causing deep social and political polarization. Politics has profoundly mutated: while minorities and people at the margins have found ways to validate their speech by expressing their perspectives, individualized propaganda has become the order of the day. Algorithms feed users the information they search for, resulting in personalized information bubbles designed to engage preexisting biases. Much of the news media now functions by monetizing user engagement through this type of targeting, which has led to new forms of intensified racism and other types of prejudice. Author Andrey Mir has termed this “postjournalism.” He explains that, since mass media outlets have lost publicity revenue, they need to monetize engagement on the internet and do so by generating anger and hatred, usually directed at some specific group of people. For many, the news is the way to access the world, and rage has become currency: platforms drive and monetize anger as a mode of engagement.

A complex form of authoritarianism is emerging, linked to digital platforms owned by the powerful CEOs who make up the notorious “Silicon Six.” Under the new authoritarianism, populations are no longer commanded: they are asked to participate, and in this simulation of involvement, the “ideology of connection” replaces the idea of social relations, neutralizing democratic demands from users to have control over their own lives, rights, and data. In this way, people are made passive. Cédric Durand explains the difference between the original conception of the World Wide Web and the subsequent development of closed platforms. The WWW began as a decentralized architecture in which a generic transaction protocol (http) and a uniform identification format (URI/URL) generated a space of flat content. In this space, human and nonhuman agents could have access to information without any third-party mediation. In contrast, closed platforms use application programming interfaces, or APIs, to mediate interaction, giving way to data loops in which interactions are more dense. The technical object that sustains this hierarchical architecture is the API, each of which is owned by a platform. On the one hand, big platforms, by way of APIs, offer apps that incorporate basic and indispensable data for users. On the other, platforms have access to the additional information generated by the API, such as user activity and buying habits. As the ecosystem grows in complexity, the platform is able to accumulate more and more data. We become more densely connected with each other and with the platforms every day, as our lives get more and more tied to the cloud. Our dependency on platforms provides the ground for technofeudalism. Historically, feudalism was characterized by a fundamental inequality that enabled the direct exploitation of peasants by lords. The lord was both the manager and master not only of the process of production, but of the entire process of social life. In today’s technofeudalism, platform owners are the digital lords and users are the serfs. Rather than commodity production, these platforms are geared towards accumulation through rent, debt, and the privatization of the basic infrastructure that sustains our lives. What is at stake is no longer “true” or “fake” information but the cybernetic episteme upon which our lives and subjectivities have been built.

The cybernetic episteme is premised upon modernity’s enclosure of experience. In modern epistemology, which is the precondition of the cybernetic episteme, the self is externalized and experienced at a remove from the body. Perception is centered on the brain and eyes instead of the whole body, separating sensation from reason. The self’s relationship with the world is mediated through mirrors, camera lenses, the canvas, the microscope, and mathematical models. The cybernetic episteme, moreover, is inextricable from colonialism, which entails dispossession, dislocation, dissociation, and appropriation. Ariella Azoulay has called the logic underpinning these processes “the shutter”; this logic is materialized in photographic technology that separates humans from objects, self from the world, and people from their lands. The shutter is the principle of imperialism by which campaigns of plunder have left people both worldless and objectless. For Azoulay, the logic of the shutter was invented centuries before photography gave it a technological apparatus, and it enabled the dispossession of non-Western peoples in tandem with the accumulation of visual and material wealth in archives and museums in the West.

The cybernetic episteme is likewise conceptually constituted by this shutter, since it relies on capturing, naming, moving, and archiving subjects—as does imperialism. In this regard, the cybernetic episteme naturalizes the mediation of the self; it creates not only the condition of detachment from the world, but allows the appropriation of the cultures of others, as well as the dissolution of collective being. The shutter is akin to Heidegger’s Gestell or “representation,” which goes hand in hand with Eurocentrism and Anthropocentrism. The Gestell and the shutter both imply that the world and experience have become representation, through an aesthetic order in which what is produced as artifice becomes the reality of experience.

In a 2017 Facebook promo video for a new virtual reality technology, Mark Zuckerberg and his colleague Rachel Frank tele-transported themselves to Puerto Rico after a devastating flood. They intended to showcase the potential of the new technology, but instead revealed its inherent violence. The ability to transport oneself to faraway places “as if” one’s body were present gives the illusion that one we can make a difference in the world through technology. Another example, in a different register of colonial modernity is that way Western museums allow visitors to "transport" themselves by observing objects looted from elsewhere, like the Pergamon Museum in Berlin where museumgoers can roam around the Ishtar Gate, which has been on display in the museum since 1930. In a section of Ariella Azoulay’s video Undocumented: Unlearning Imperial Plunder (2020), she films actual visitors to the Pergamon while noting that dislocation is the essence of (imperial) modernity. The VR museum visitor is at the center of a world, but they are not really there (an effect similar to the dispositive of perspective in painting). For globalized Western culture, the ground for vision, enlightenment, culture, and even social change is the dislocation and disappearance of bodies.

Disembodiment and dislocation are also fundamental epistemological premises of transhumanist Silicon Valley ideology. In this ideology, the teleology of secular modern individualism culminates in the uploading of a person’s mind to a new biological, artificial, or biological-artificial body. The utopian goal of expanding and preserving human consciousness is physically and spiritually achieved. Transhumanism is the dream of enhancing the human body through technology, and ultimately escaping human suffering by transcending the “errors” of death and aging.

Posthumanism takes things a step further: its goal is to immortalize consciousness by uploading it to a robotic or synthetic body. Posthumanism does away with the biological dimension of the self, fundamentally altering what it means to be “human.” In both trans- and posthumanism, technology promises to give us the divine attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience, making humans into “pure consciousness,” achieving a kind of individual and secular transcendence. In the first episode of the British TV series Years and Years (2019), Bethany, an adolescent whose face is hidden behind a 3D emoji mask, announces to her parents that she is “transhuman.” She declares: “I don’t want to be flesh. I want to escape this thing and become digital, I want to live forever as information.” Eventually Bethany becomes a hero with transhuman superpowers: her mechanized eyes and brain, which are connected to all the data in the world, allow her to make visible the horrors that the British government have perpetrated in a refugee camp. This techno-utopian narrative implies a democratic ideology, insofar as one political goal of democracy is to make visible the ordeals of oppressed minorities—in this case through virtual disembodiment.

In contrast to this techno-utopian narrative, science fiction—especially cyberpunk literature— generally portrays transhumanism as a nightmarish apocalyptic scenario of social control and individual subjection. Several episodes of Black Mirror do this, for example. But what Black Mirror and Years and Years have in common is that technological advances and the increasing symbiosis between humans and machines are associated with political, economic, and social instability. In reality, “mind uploading” has attracted millions of dollars of investment from the billionaires of Silicon Valley and beyond. In a mixture of engineering and enlightenment, consciousness is now being hacked through biofeedback techniques, meditation practices, and microdosing drugs. Many critics have observed that the utopian ideology of transhumanism underpins the Valley’s culture of “move fast, break things, and make as much money as possible.” Technologies aiming to expand human consciousness are rooted in purely extractivist, capitalist values. In this sense, cybernetics is a political project on a planetary scale. As described by Tiqqun, cybernetics is a gigantic “abstract machine” made up of binary machines deployed by empire, and a form of political sovereignty that has merged with the capitalist extractivist project.

2.

In the pre-cybernetic era—that is to say, before the 1940s—machines were intended to emulate humans; their actions resembled human behavior, but ostensibly without intent or emotions. This is why Donna Haraway describes pre-cybernetic machines as “haunted.” They seemed animated by ghosts, reminiscent of Walter Benjamin’s automaton that was inhabited by a hunchbacked dwarf. Machines were not self-moving, self-designing, or autonomous. They could not achieve human dreams, only mock them. In turn, humans related to machines by using or acting upon them: switching them on or off, using them as tools to achieve an end. Today, the relationship between human and machine is based on internal, mutual communication in a feedback loop. Early machines were led; today, machines lead us. This does not mean that machines have simply become humanized through the proliferation of androids. Rather, humans have surrendered consciousness to AI, becoming obedient and predictable. In the twenty-first century, machines have blurred the distinction between the artificial and human mind, not only because machines can imitate human functions, but because humans have become increasingly passive, since we are now subject to neuropower.

Within the cybernetic episteme, it is no longer enough to talk about a “control society”; we must talk instead about a composite of interlinked forms of oppression (exploitation, alienation, and domination), in tandem with extreme securitarianism. Another way to see the cybernetic episteme is as the reconceptualization of social worlds into information-processing systems. Practices of computation are used to produce new organizational and infrastructural apparatuses, which in turn create value and profit by exploiting and disposing of human life. Social worlds are subsumed into technologies through techniques such as statistical forecasting and data modeling.

The cybernetic episteme stems from a world brought into being by Europeans; this world began with the discovery of the “new world” and the creation of empires and colonies (which coincided with the scientific revolution). In this sense, the cybernetic episteme is inseparable from the Western civilizing project for the whole world, which connected disparate places through technologies like the telegraph and steam shipping, often powered by the extraction of fossil fuels like coal. This project has culminated in globalization as the deregulation and financialization of world economies.

The Western civilization project, based on Enlightenment values including equality, peaceful public life, access to modern science, the rule of law, democracy, and technological progress, involved the creation of infrastructure to unify nations and the world. We can call this infrastructure the “technosphere.” The technosphere comprises not only digital technology but all machines, factories, computers, cars, buildings, railways, and mobility infrastructure, as well as systems of food production, resource extraction, and energy distribution. Today, the infrastructure of the world—the technosphere—is shaped by information, which means that the world we inhabit is designed by data.

The technosphere is a supplement humans have created to help overcome the limits of “human nature” insofar as humans cannot live independently from structures geared towards sustaining life. The technosphere has promised to enable us to increase production and reproduction with less human effort. Moreover, the technosphere is also regarded as the main tool humans have to fight decay, entropy, and death, since it comprises all the structures humans have built to keep themselves alive on the planet. The total mass of the technosphere amounts to fifty kilos for every square meter of earth’s surface—a total of thirty trillion tons, which coexists with the diminishing hydrosphere (water, the frozen polar regions) and the biosphere (all of earth’s living organisms). The ultimate price of the technosphere is global warming and environmental devastation. Like humans, the technosphere needs external energy input, which is not sustainable as long as it comes from fossil fuels that will eventually be depleted.

From this standpoint, the cybernetic episteme represents the gradual merging of human activity into the activity of what we have built and surrounded ourselves with. Much of this built environment is invisible. Infrastructure and data are partially occult because we are alienated from them, even as we are produced and managed by them. The invisible infrastructure that sustains our lives is what matters politically right now. And insofar as the technosphere is cybernetic, it is inextricable from capitalism and politics.

3.

Human communication is at the center of the cybernetic global order. The neural system of globalized networked society is digital communication. In a 1975 film called Comment ça va?, Anne-Marie Miéville and Jean-Luc Godard discuss the “illness” of information. They begin with an image of the Carnation Revolution in Portugal, published in the leftist newspaper Libération. At the time, photojournalistic images had begun to proliferate as a form of information, and Godard and Miéville critique Libération (the most left-wing newspaper in Europe in those days) for failing to include the reader in the creation and dissemination of information. They ask: “How is it that things enter and exit the machine?” (Comment ça va de l’entrée à la sortie de la machine?). This question is about how ideas, words, discourses, human interaction, and images become information and then reach readers and viewers.

In Comment ça va?, mass media represents an illness that has killed communication and language. Last year, Godard updated his critique of the media in an interview posted to Instagram. He stated: “Plato’s cave has been fixed on paper/screen.” For Godard, the consequence of the becoming-information of communication and language is the loss of ambiguity in communication. Digital technology has infiltrated every aspect of existence, and the margin of error between the transmission and the reception of a message has been eliminated by mediatization and digitization. For Godard, digital communication denies the force of the image or the word because it eliminates redundancy, misunderstanding, the possibility of reading between the lines, and the possibility of alterity.

In a more recent film of his—Adieu au language from 2014—Godard suggests that digital media have destroyed face-to-face communication. He asks: What kind of self could emerge in a time when objects and bodies are disfigurable and refigurable through virtual manipulation? Godard posits that the origins of today’s totalitarianism can be traced to the interruption of interior experience by the spectacle. In the film, Godard features a lengthy quote from Philippe Sollers explaining that the spectacle “cuts off” the subject from its interior life—a process that is, paradoxically, highly seductive. Furthermore, for Godard digital communication creates a new form of isolated solitude where people lack ties to others. In this light, technology has not become an extension of man, as Marshall McLuhan predicted, but has instead attained autonomy from man, since digital media can communicate amongst themselves without human mediation. For Godard, this means that the “face-to-face” encounter—a basic form of human relation that is the foundation of ethics—is no longer possible.

Sherry Turkle, a clinical psychologist and sociologist, comes to similar conclusions: daily conversations no longer involve eye contact, and face-to-face discussion has been replaced by words on a screen. According to Turkle, texts, tweets, Facebook posts, Instagram messages, and Snapchats split our attention and diminish our capacity for empathy. They have created new codes of etiquette; no longer do we feel restrained from reaching for our phones in the presence of other people. This new etiquette entrenches a culture of individualism and isolation from each other. This isolation cultivates the perfect ground for fascism.

The digitization of communication not only has political and communal consequences. It also affects the neuroplastic potential of the living brain. The cybernetic episteme reshapes our working memory by rearranging its contents. As Warren Neidich writes, the new focus of power is not only the false reproduction of the past (the manipulation of the archive), but the manipulation of our working memory—the type of memory that influences our decision-making. Authoritarian neuropower wants nothing less than to shape our future memory, argues Neidich.

If the nervous system of cybernetics is digital communication, at the center of digital communication is desire. Mark Fisher devoted his last lectures at Goldsmiths in 2017 to this subject. During one lecture, he played for his students a famous Apple TV commercial from 1984, directed by Ridley Scott and originally broadcast during the Superbowl. In an overt reference to George Orwell’s novel 1984, the commercial depicts a dreary, repressive control society. This society is seemingly liberated when a buxom blonde woman tosses a sledgehammer at a large screen broadcasting the image of an authoritarian figure, causing the screen to explode. The commercial ends with these lines crawling across the screen: “On January 24, Apple Computer will introduce Macintosh. And you’ll see why 1984 won’t be like 1984.” Fisher observes that the video counterposes top-down bureaucratic control to upstart entrepreneurialism. The dreary control society depicted in the commercial is an allusion to not only the Soviet Union, but also IBM, the dominant computer maker at the time. Apple posits itself as the dynamic, colorful new company that will liberate society from dreary IBM, ushering in a new, more vibrant world order. This new world order will fulfill our (capitalist) desires in a way that the communist world cannot. As Fisher suggests, we now live in that world of libidinal capitalism.

Elsewhere Fisher writes that what drives the circulation of information is the user’s desire to make one more connection, to leave one more reply, to keep on clicking. Capitalism persists because cyberspace is already under our skin, writes Fisher; to retreat from it would be like trying to retreat into some nonexistent precapitalist imaginary. In his view, we believe we have as much a chance of escaping capitalism as we do of crawling back inside our mother’s womb.

5.

By means of the cybernetic episteme, Silicon Valley has shaped the world we all live in. As we are poisoned equally by microplastics and fake news, losing our grasp of a shared reality, the “Silicon Six”—as Sacha Baron Cohen called the titans of Silicon Valley in a 2019 speech—propagate algorithm-fueled fear, propaganda, lies, and hate in the name of profit. As Baron Cohen pointed out, the major online platforms largely avoid the kind of regulation and accountability that other media companies are subject to. “This is ideological imperialism,” he said. “Six unelected individuals in Silicon Valley impos[e] their vision on the rest of the world, unaccountable to any government, and acting as if they are above the law.” He called digital platforms the greatest propaganda machine in history.

Democratic institutions have failed to reign in the information chaos and the destruction of the public sphere. As Shoshana Zuboff argues, we inhabit a communications sphere that is no longer a public sphere. She describes this situation as an “epistemic coup” that has taken place in four stages: First, by way of companies gathering personal data about us and then claiming it as their own private property. Second, through data inequality, which means that companies know more than we do. Third, through the epistemic chaos created by algorithms. And fourth, through the institutionalization of this new episteme and the erosion of democratic governance.

Baron Cohen observes that people can take a stand against platforms by recognizing our power to boycott them. (One example is the mass defection from WhatsApp to Telegram when the former announced that would share its user data with Facebook.) But we also need to defend the existence of facts and a shared reality, understanding the world not as something we see but as something we inhabit—treating life not as something we have, but as something we live. Anti-platform strategies might be accused of Luddism, but they are not necessarily opposed to technology—only to certain uses of technology.

It is also crucial that we regard the cybernetic episteme as inextricable from a broader malaise: humanity’s relationship to life and the planet is a toxic one. The very technologies that supposedly enable us to read, think, flourish, and desire are destroying the world we inhabit.

People continue to yearn for commonality, mutuality, and something to share. But the culture we currently share is largely mediated by repressive, profit-driven digital platforms. This is why we need to flee from the invasion of images, to distinguish between image and reality, and to affirm the opacity of the world and the ambiguity of language. We need to resist platform monopoly through presence, embodiment, immediacy, and human memory. We need to find ways to create life as opposed to turning it into data, combine emotional and intellectual knowledge, and regard visceral gut feelings as a form of human consciousness. We need to learn to exist in symbiosis with others and with the environment, not dislocated, uprooted, and detached.

#### Social and economic control is a means to grease the wheels of cybernetic capitalism. It’s unsustainable, so markets have replaced the “invisible hand” with industry sectors and legal restraints.

Tiqqun 1, they are a French collective formed in 1999! (“The Cybernetic Hypothesis”, http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/tiqqun-the-cybernetic-hypothesis#toc4)

Nothing expresses the contemporary victory of cybernetics better than the fact that value can now be extracted as information about information. The commodity-cybernetician, or “neo-liberal” logic, extends over all activity, including that which is still not commodified, with an unflagging support of modern States. More generally, the corollary to the precarization of capitalism’s objects and subjects is a growth of circulation in information on their subject: this is as true for unemployed workers as it is for cops. Cybernetics consequently aims to disturb and control people in one and the same movement. It is founded on terror, which is a factor in its evolution — the evolution of economic growth, moral progress — because it supplies an occasion for the production of information. The state of emergency, which is proper to all crises, is what allows self-regulation to be relaunched, and to maintain itself as a perpetual movement. Whereas the scheme of classical economy where a balance of supply and demand was to permit “growth” and thusly to permit collective well-being, it is now “growth” which is considered an endless road towards balance. It is thus just to critique western modernity as a “infinite mobilization” the destination of which is “movement towards more movement.” But from a cybernetic point of view, the self-production that equally characterizes the State, the Market, robots, wage workers, or the jobless, is indiscernible from the self-control that moderates and slows it down.

It comes across clearly then that cybernetics is not just one of the various aspects of contemporary life, its neo-technological component, for instance, but rather it is the point of departure and arrival of the new capitalism. Cybernetic Capitalism — what does that mean? It means that since the 1970s we’ve been dealing with an emerging social formation that has taken over from Fordist capitalism which results from the application of the cybernetic hypothesis to political economy. Cybernetic capitalism develops so as to allow the social body, devastated by Capital, to reform itself and offer itself up for one more process of accumulation. On the one hand capitalism must grow, which implies destruction. On the other, it needs to reconstruct the “human community,” which implies circulation. “There is,” writes Lyotard, “two uses for wealth, that is importance-power: a reproductive use and a pillage use. The first is circular, global, organic; the second is partial, death-dealing, jealous... The capitalist is a conqueror, and the conqueror is a monster, a centaur. His front side feeds off of reproducing the regulated system of controlled metamorphoses under the law of the commodity-talion, and its rear side off of pillaging overexcited energies. On the one hand, to appropriate, and thus preserve, that is, reproduce in equivalence, reinvest; on the other to take and destroy, steal and flee, hollowing out another space, another time.” The crises of capitalism, as Marx saw them, always came from a de-articulation between the time of conquest and the time of reproduction. The function of cybernetics is to avoid crises by ensuring the coordination between Capital’s “front side” and “rear side.” Its development is an endogenous response to the problem posed to capitalism — how to develop without fatal disequilibrium arising.

In the logic of Capital, the development of the piloting function, of “control,” corresponds to the subordination of the sphere of accumulation to the sphere of circulation. For the critique of political economy, circulation should be no less suspect than production, in effect. It is, as Marx knew, but a particular case of production as considered in general. The socialization of the economy — that is, the interdependence between capitalists and the other members of the social body, the “human community” — the enlargement of Capital’s human base, makes the extraction of surplus value which is at the source of profit no longer centered around the relations of exploitation instituted by the wage system. Valorization’s center of gravity has now moved over to the sphere of circulation. In spite of its inability to reinforce the conditions of exploitation, which would bring about a crisis of consumption, capitalist accumulation can still nevertheless survive on the condition that the production-consumption cycle is accelerated, that is, on the condition that the production process accelerates as much as commodity circulation does. What has been lost to the economy on the static level can be compensated on the dynamic level. The logic of flows is to dominate the logic of the finished product. Speed is now taking primacy over quantity, as a factor in wealth. The hidden face of the maintenance of accumulation is the acceleration of circulation. The function of the control devices is thus to maximize the volume of commodity flows by minimizing the events, obstacles, and accidents that would slow them down. Cybernetic capitalism tends to abolish time itself, to maximize fluid circulation to the maximum: the speed of light. Such is already the case for certain financial transactions. The categories of “real time,” of “just in time,” show clearly this hatred of duration. For this very reason, time is our ally.

This propensity towards control by capitalism is not new. It is only post-modern in the sense that post-modernity has been confused with the latest manifestation of modernity. It is for this reason that bureaucracy developed at the end of the 19th century and computer technology developed after the Second World War. The cybernetization of capitalism started at the end of the 1870s with the growing control of production, distribution, and consumption. Information regarding these flows has since then had a central strategic importance as a condition for valorization. The historian James Beniger states that the first control-related problems came about when the first collisions took place between trains, putting commodities and human lives in peril. The signalization of the railways, travel time measurement and data transmission devices had to be invented so as to avoid such “catastrophes.” The telegraph, synchronized clocks, organizational charts in large enterprises, weighing systems, roadmaps, performance evaluation procedures, wholesalers, assembly lines, centralized decision-making, advertising in catalogues, and mass communications media were the devices invented during this period to respond, in all spheres of the economic circuit, to a generalized crisis of control connected to the acceleration of production set off by the industrial revolution in the United States. Information and control systems thus developed at the same time as the capitalist process of transformation of materials was growing and spreading. A class of middlemen, which Alfred Chandler called the “visible hand” of Capital, formed and grew. After the end of the 19th century, it was clear enough to PEOPLE that expectability [had] become a source of profit as such and a source of confidence. Fordism and Taylorism were part of this movement, as was the development of control over the mass of consumers and over public opinion via marketing and advertising, in charge of extorting from them by force, and then putting to work, their “preferences,” which according to the hypotheses of the marginalist economists, were the true source of value. Investment in organizational or purely technical planning and control technologies became more and more salable. After 1945, cybernetics supplied capitalism with a new infrastructure of machines — computers — and above all with an intellectual technology that permitted the regulation of the circulation of flows within society, and making those flows exclusively commodity flows.

That the economic sectors of information, communication, and control have taken ever more of a part in the economy since the Industrial Revolution, and that “intangible labor” has grown relative to tangible labor, is nothing surprising or new. Today these account for the mobilization of more than 2/3 of the workforce. But this isn’t enough to fully define cybernetic capitalism. Because its equilibrium and the growth depend continually on its control capacities, its nature has changed. Insecurity, much more than rarity, is the core of the present capitalist economy. As Wittgenstein understood by looking at the 1929 crisis — and as did Keynes in his wake — there is a strong bond between the “state of trust” and the curbing of the marginal effectiveness of Capital, he wrote, in chapter XII of General Theory, in February 1934 — the economy rests definitively on the “play of language.” Markets, and with them commodities and merchants, the sphere of circulation in general, and, consequently, business, the sphere of production as a place of the anticipation of coming levels of yield, do not exist without conventions, social norms, technical norms, norms of the truth, on a meta-level which brings bodies and things into existence as commodities, even before they are subject to pricing. The control and communications sectors develop because commodity valorization needs to have a looping circulation of information parallel to the actual circulation of commodities, the production of a collective belief that objectivizes itself in values. In order to come about, all exchanges require “investments of form” — information about a formulation of what is to be exchanged — a formatting that makes it possible to put things into equivalence even before such a putting of things into equivalence has effectively taken place, a conditioning that is also a condition of agreement about the market. It’s true for goods, and it’s true for people. Perfecting the circulation of information will mean perfecting the market as a universal instrument of coordination. Contrary to what the liberal hypothesis had supposed, to sustain a fragile capitalism, contracts are not sufficient unto themselves within social relations. PEOPLE began to understand after 1929 that all contracts need to come with controls. Cybernetics entered into the operation of capitalism with the intention of minimizing uncertainties, incommensurability, the kinds of anticipation problems that can interfere in any commodity transaction. It contributes to consolidating the basis for the installation of capitalism’s mechanisms, to oiling Capital’s abstract machine.

#### Focus on healthcare entrepreneurship atomizes care and precludes collective responses to public health crises.

Viana & da Silva 19, \*Ana Luiza d’Ávila Viana, Departamento de Medicina Preventiva, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de São Paulo. \*\*Hudson Pacifico da Silva, Institut de Recherche en Santé Publique, Université de Montréal. (“Neoliberal meritocracy and financial capitalism: consequences for social protection and health”, *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, 23(7), pg. 2108, DOI: 10.1590/1413-81232018237.07582018)

Ten years after the publication of the article entitled Economia política da saúde: introduzindo o debate (Political economy of health: introducing the debate)1 , written by the authors of the present article and professor Paulo Elias, there are obvious tensions between healthcare understood as a right and collective (or public) good and healthcare as a private good in the wake of the rapid global advance of the commodification of both funding and provision of healthcare services. These tensions – over healthcare services, which are increasingly delivered by multinational corporations with business activities in various sectors and dependent on the financial cycle, and over funding, given that individuals are having to take increasing responsibility for ensuring they have access to health actions and services – are being transformed into antagonism and threat.

In the abovementioned article, we talked exactly about the tensions inherent in the idea of health as a right and universal collective/public good and health as a private good. From the latter perspective, health service provision is brought closer to the logic of ownership and funding ceases to be a collective responsibility in the form of general taxation, becoming dependent upon ability to pay, without solidarity between different segments of society – the healthy and the sick, the rich and the poor, the young and the old. As highlighted by the World Health Organization (WHO), out-of-pocket payments (OPP) are the least equitable way to finance health systems and one of the major causes of impoverishment, particularly in low and middle-income countries, where OPP remain the primary source of funding2.

This amounts to an abrogation of the collective responsibility for health, whereby responsibility for individual health and risk is left solely with the individual and access to health services is held hostage to the numerous purchasing mechanisms (paying up front, installments, and individual and group payment schemes), according to individual and family income, in a confusing mosaic of individual and collective forms, both belonging to the market cycle.

The entrepreneurization of public sector healthcare provision3 and financialization and internationalization of healthcare (health insurance companies, health plan operators and service providers)4,5 are a major move away from the provision of free health services as a public good (in the case of national health systems) and social security as a public policy (in the case of contributory health systems) towards ownership-individual, production-rentier logic (market-based health systems).

#### You may not see it, but it sees you. Anti-trust reform is a spectacle that refigures resistance away from structural action by acting in the most conservative ways. Anti-trust reform never will never achieve anything rather mask the *transcendental parasitism* of cybernetic capital hidden in hyperreal advertisements.

**ANON 18** (ANON’s description of themselves: “We are a collective of ‘Other.’ Some of us are sex workers, some immigrants, many of us queer. There are even a few privileged whites amongst us. Nevertheless, ANON is largely the work and brainchild of People of Color (PoC). Our social disciplines are as varied as our identities, from journalists to dominatrixes. ANON are the intellectual cousins of #BlackLivesMatter divorced from liberalism,” “Ultra-Œdipus//Sub(lime)space,” https://4roko.wordpress.com/2018/09/26/ultra-oedipus-sublimespace/)

**The oedipalization of post-disciplinary, control societies seduces or indulges the libido as opposed to the suppressing the individual’s desire.** Desire at all levels (e.g. impulsive, visceral, aspirational, social, and covert) weaponized against the subject as a Pavlovian, disciplinary instrument conditioning their libidinal investments, their wants and needs to serve and obey power mechanisms. They’re pushed into deeper and deeper submission to a point where you losing themselves themselves in rapture, no longer able to distinguish between ecstasy and agony, and acclimate to their own exploitation and abuse. The individual gets addicted to the libidinal high, the rush of dopamine—a side effect of transcendental parasitism—and they surrender their autonomy in exchange for pleasure to a sublime, master signifier (e.g. the domme, an oedipal symbolic figure representing the nexus of pain and pleasure) which colonizes and codifies desire at the base, subliminal level. **Hard power hides in plain sight and remains unchallenged because the individual is transfixed by the exciting soft power of spectacle, and their entire sense of reality is an overcoded simulation.** You might work tirelessly at a repetitive job, sacrificing years of your life to an 8 hour day/40 hour week cycle, eating microwaved leftovers or processed pink slime on your 40 minute lunch break, giving thankless labor to your supervisors so you pay off the mortgage for a depreciating piece of property, or so you can afford to go on a three day vacation with your estranged spouse and your alienated children who don’t really know you that well because you barely ever see them and you \*actually\* believe that this is what qualifies as success. **When you no longer notice that the cops in Times Square brandish automatic weapons because you’re entranced by hyperreal advertisements embedded into the architecture while everyone around you continues to shop in peace is when know you’re in deep sub(lime)space—the ultimate realization of atomized, liberal subjectivity.** Taken from Jeremy Bentham, the panopticon is an institutional building of control that was designed to allow for 24-7 surveillance of inmates. In it, there is a center from which a watchman can view all of the cells within the circular prison, and thus all of the inmates, without any of the inmates knowing for sure if anyone is in the cell. Also, inmates are partitioned off and can not see into neighboring cells. The idea behind this is that if inmates never know whether or not they are being watched, they will be incentivized to act in a proper manner. Foucault takes this and turns it into the idea of panopticism or panoptic surveillance. In Discipline and Punish, he tackles the idea of power and builds on Bentham’s idea. After explaining Bentham’s panopticon, he states, “All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in a central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schoolboy.” Thus, he replaces our rigid idea of “prisoner” and replaces it with a multitude of possible subjects that could be in that position. **The panopticon “reverses the principle of the dungeon; or rather of its three functions – to enclose, to deprive of light and to hide – it preserves only the first and eliminates the other two. Full lighting and the eye of a supervisor capture better than darkness, which ultimately protected. Visibility is a trap.”** He then supplants the idea of a prison guard with any “public officer” making the position in the center of the prison assumable by anyone who volunteers, “so to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action.” What’s more is this “is an important mechanism, for it automatizes and disindividualizes power.” Throughout the book, Foucault traces a transition over time from a more obvious and visible kind of power to today’s form of soft power. He claims that, in the past, people had vested power in a sovereign and this ruler then had complete control over their lives, or the right to choose between life and death. A historical transition was made from this to modes of power that govern without bodies, disciplines that control without designated rulers: In physical torture, the example was based on terror: physical fear, collective horror, images that must be engraved on the memories of the spectators, like the brand on the cheek or shoulder of the condemned man. **The example is now based on the lesson, the discourse, the decipherable sign, the representation of public morality. It is no longer the terrifying restoration of sovereignty that will sustain the ceremony of punishment, but the reactivation of the code, the collective reinforcements of the link between the idea of crime and the idea of punishment.** In the penalty, rather than seeing the presence of the sovereign, one will read the laws themselves. A neighborhood policed by broken windows logic is arguably an attempt to create a city wide panopticon. Not only do the police look for mild offenses, but the citizens themselves are encouraged in this environment to become watchers. A deeper change happens on the level of the individual in this kind of society, and the assumption is that people will regulate themselves, for they can’t pinpoint exactly who is watching or when they are being watched. Times Square as we now know it today is credited for the most part Mayor Giuliani, who decided to target the sex industry in the area and altered the landscape dramatically. Under his watch, “Peep-shows could no longer operate within 500 yards of each other, allowing companies such as Disney to take over.” This and other actions Giuliani took during his time as mayor effectively altered this area and much of the city. Now, Times Square still seems like a fun time for some, though it’s a different kind of entertainment. Filled with broadway plays and gift shops, the area has become a hot spot for families and visitors. However, when we take different modes of power into consideration with an increasingly technologically advanced world, we must realize that this Disney-fied source of commercial growth comes at a potential price. The photo for this section shows police officers on duty in Times Square. In addition to the officers presented here, there is a police station placed firmly in the area, amidst the bustle and stores. Some officers resemble cops that most people encounter in urban settings often, others are more militarized, armed with helmets and large weapons. **The police here are an expected part of surveillance in the area, but the “potential price” I believe we are paying when we enter the area** (and some say, many streets all throughout the city) **lies with the types of surveillance that cannot be seen.** In March 2017 the New York City Council introduced a bill that attempted to increase “transparency and oversight over the NYPD’s use of sophisticated new surveillance technologies and information sharing networks. Dubbed the Public Oversight of Surveillance Technology (POST) Act, the legislation requires the NYPD to disclose basic information about the surveillance tools it uses and the safeguards in place to protect the privacy and civil liberties of New Yorkers.” While law enforcement and urban government officials would suggest that these measures help cut down on crime, the reality is “many law enforcement surveillance devices collect information about innocent citizens.” Aside from a plethora of cameras, some devices can track targets’ phones (sometimes trapping information from other citizens in the process) and facial recognition is becoming another technology that is becoming increasingly used. While some may advocate for the use of police technology, regardless of what it is, critics of these measures claim such tactics threaten our freedom without offering any transparency.

#### The alternative is to embrace speculation through a machine epistemology. As computation becomes intermingled with whiteness, the response is to create moments of dissonance -- ruptures in planetary computation.

CCB 21, a collective of researchers and writers working between technology and culture, computer science and information theory, aesthetics and politics. The members—Luciana Parisi, Ezekiel Dixon-Román, Tiziana Terranova, Oana Pârvan, and Brian D’Aquino—are situated in the US, the UK, and Southern Italy, and engage with networks spanning several continents to intervene in the techno-politics of racial capitalism and its recursive regeneration. (Critical Computation Bureau, “Editorial—“Dialogues on Recursive Colonialisms, Speculative Computation, and the Techno-social””, e-flux Journal, issue 123, https://www.e-flux.com/journal/123/438467/editorial-dialogues-on-recursive-colonialisms-speculative-computation-and-the-techno-social/)

Working in the strange attraction between speculative approaches, critical theorizations, and imaginary practices, this issue also asks how a technology or machine epistemology constituted by the entanglement between racial capitalism, recursive colonialisms, and computation can still overcome the overrepresentation of Man or Promethean cosmogonies. How does machine epistemology also allow for futures that run counter to a mere feeding into and from techno-social networks? In this procedure of abstraction, which could be called socio-technical or techno-sociogenic, the iterability of techno-signs through the flesh discloses the possibilities of otherwise languages, otherwise worlds, otherwise cognitions. If machine epistemology depended only on the cognitive extension or prosthetics of the brain’s neural networks, it would be just another version of the Promethean project of the mastery of tools. Machine epistemology does not articulate cognition in terms of embodiment in an environment, but rather in terms of a form of cognition. This entails a possibility for a techno-semiosis whereby the flesh at once remains and becomes the medium of the world and as such becomes a techno-sign of cultural formations. We have thus become aware of how the socio-technical or techno-sociogenic can inherit existing cosmogonies, not in a deterministic or imitative way, but through its iterability. But if techno-sociogenic flesh is shaped by repetition with alterity, it also takes on a mix of cosmogonies to make something else.

What we call “cosmo-computation” entails a fully automated recursive system for which there is supposed to be no human-in-the-loop. This term applies Yuk Hui’s concept of cosmotechnics (which calls for a technical mediation between metaphysics and cultures that do not conform to the universal standardization of knowledge) to the cognitive paradigm of technology by asking what it would mean to experiment with auto-imaging multiple ontologies and multiple metaphysics through computation. But cosmo-computation still maintains the specter of whiteness and intensified legacies of racial capital within itself. These are legacies whereby computational schema cannot erase anti-blackness or the brutalities and techno-semiotic hieroglyphics marked in flesh. In other words, cosmo-computation must also work on the cyber-mechanics of the machine in relation to slavery, to take on and step outside the dialectic of the human and the thing.

But how to run with cosmo-computational epistemologies without risking a reinforced universal logic or another plea to techno-cultural difference in the name of multiculturalism? What critical space is left to counter-actualize the recursivity of this double pincer that simply conceals the monologic discourse of self-determination through a proliferation of dualities? How can cosmo-computation—as a procedure of existing as techno-flesh—become a way to construct worlds from the heretical rules of what Denise Ferreira da Silva calls “difference without separability”?

Cosmo-computation does not coincide with any reclamation of the modern history of technology that starts from the local, the periphery, or the colonies of the West. Its critical possibility lies in exposing the operative power of the universalism-multiculturalism double pincer in preserving the overrepresentation of Man. This critical moment is undoubtedly haunted by the “continuous present” (Fred Moten) of the brutalities of racial capitalism, colonialisms, and slavery. Thus, it must also become surrounded by practices of fugitivity, by speculative moments, methods, and activities that spring out of the negative negation (da Silva) of the slave, the refugee, the woman, the immigrant, the trans through the existence of otherwise techno-flesh that refuses the saving promise of Promethean Man.

Our proposition is that machine epistemology, as a cosmo-computational affair, must not only challenge the view of techno-capital but also the human form. Within the history of machine epistemology, industrial capital took on the prototype of automation, replacing the archetype of enslaved labor. With the invention of the robot, the enslaved became enfleshed in machines as much as machines became the hosts of already brutally wounded flesh. Even if this modern form of recursive epistemology extended colonial mentalities into the model of global ecologies of extraction and commodity exchange, it had already voraciously incorporated into techno-capital an irreversible contagion that infiltrated the cosmogony of Man and his belief in the bio-economic myth of evolution.

From this standpoint, it seems essential today to not separate the critical from the speculative moment. Speculation is not the opposite of critique, but rather the whirlwind, the spiral, the vortex, the invaginations of critique inside-out. In the critical there is always the possibility of the speculative. As such, cosmo-computation can also be a space of transversal epistemological possibility whereby otherwise cosmogonies are not originated by, from, or against Promethean Man, but are rather ante-universal patterns, fractal algorithms that come before and run beneath, alongside of, and break across the pattern.

The dialogues in this issue are both critical and speculative interventions into practicing cosmo-computation as thinking with “difference without separability” and venturing into how AI—from expert systems to machine learning to interactive computational languages—contributes to defining what computational epistemologies can do. As much as recursivity preserves the iterability of functions and constitutes the structural parts of an overrepresentational whole, it also maintains a rhythm that is out of sync with itself, an atonality or dissonance in the beats. This out-of-sync rhythm and computational dissonance are the reverberations of a haunting that is not a trace of what was and no longer is, but rather tells us of the rhythm that stands apart. It tells us what exists within its elemental functions of counting infinities and of assembling together what falls out of patterns of recognition.

What recursivity therefore entails is how the complexity of critique and speculation cannot be separated into two forms—into models or paradigms that are in contradiction or that fall into a linear order. Recursivity tells us that critique and speculation can happen at once—multiple times in space and multiple spaces in time. But this simultaneity also demarcates the interlayering of techno-flesh in the ongoing project of Promethean cosmogonies that have returned across and within the computational forms of colonialisms and racial capitalism.

Speculation therefore works from within critique through the iterative moments exposing the continuous performance of anti-blackness and the renewed conjunctures of auto-poiesis that obliterate difference. From the techno-surrogacy of intelligent flesh to the necropower of planetary computation to the biopolitics of debilitation and the modulations of slow life/death, modes of haunting return to expose the 0 value of blackness across stateless and dispossessed realities of techno-social practices around the globe. What the enfleshed machine can do is to explode within recursive procedures of disability and debilitation anytime and everywhere.

## Inherency

#### 1--Biden has formalized enforcement of the aff already – even if he hasn’t, deterrence checks

1AC Rosalsky jul 20 [KU = Green] (Greg. Greg is a reporter for NPR’s “Planet Money”. National Public Radio “The Untamed Rise Of Hospital Monopolies”. Accessed 8/15/21. <https://www.npr.org/sections/money/2021/07/20/1017631111/the-untamed-rise-of-hospital-monopolies>.//LS)

Last month, Michigan's two largest hospital systems, Spectrum Health and Beaumont Health, announced they wanted to become one. The $12.9 billion "megamerger" would create a health industrial complex spanning 22 hospitals, 305 outpatient facilities, and an insurance company. It would employ 64,000 people, making it the largest employer in Michigan. Local newspapers had [expected](https://click.nl.npr.org/?qs=aac6a52802998e4c874d348d09d013ee6fac4afcaa868f51b9ba9812e6564a6014246c86c9911ad577c2c989fcb3411a69bff4b5bdaa8990) the merger to "sail through" government approval. But now they're [not so sure](https://click.nl.npr.org/?qs=aac6a52802998e4cb2ec16e3cb13d72e48351e2cc2a1515e26419299bbebc270fde9d94f82535cfdcd56f2cc7e81124d1be58f4cbc4ac965). That's because President Biden recently signed an executive order saying his administration was serious about promoting competition, and he specifically singled out hospitals as an area where growing monopolization is a concern. The order, [the White House says](https://click.nl.npr.org/?qs=aac6a52802998e4cb30f686eec44ad08aa95d8c8d87561e95acc115cf414796a479cbdc2a29c23723b64aba89a4f3d92a252b54a0e2c5c82), "underscores that hospital mergers can be harmful to patients and encourages the Justice Department and Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to review and revise their merger guidelines to ensure patients are not harmed by such mergers." Hospitals are a really important part of the American economy. Not just in terms of health and wellbeing, but in terms of dollars and cents. The largest chunk of America's healthcare spending goes to hospitals. And the hospital sector is one of the largest sectors in the overall American economy, accounting for [about 6 percent](https://click.nl.npr.org/?qs=aac6a52802998e4c990362d9064534376d0f112a51a4355aea1dbc927a0880a203f31eeaadb8c2ac20c7d67fb5099d6554b04aac49559f24) of America's GDP. Hospitals do a lot of good things. They save lives. They create good jobs. But because of growing monopolization of them, Zack Cooper, an economist at Yale School of Public Health, worries that they're becoming like a "Dracula" that "sucks some of the vibrancy out of a lot of towns across the country." Cooper and his colleague, Martin Gaynor, have crunched the numbers on hospitals using the government's preferred way of measuring market concentration, and they've found that [about 80%](https://click.nl.npr.org/?qs=aac6a52802998e4c0b1652603c21631d660ea6328799483443b10b4cf0e407ef7a0e1fbdb9359303a4232b1b21ff1d1fb258a48bcaa2c9b4) of America's hospital markets are now "highly concentrated." "The average hospital market in the U.S. is just way over what the FTC and the DOJ would consider a healthy level of concentration," Cooper says. Many of these markets, he says, are dominated by just one or two hospitals, giving them market power to suck extra money from communities for health procedures and emergencies. In addition to decades of mergers and acquisitions with hospitals gobbling up other hospitals, hospitals have also been increasingly buying up physician practices. Economists refer to this as "vertical integration." Think steel manufacturers buying the railroad lines. Like with mergers and acquisitions, Cooper says, many of these deals have not received adequate scrutiny from federal regulators. The research clearly shows, Cooper says, that growing monopolization has raised prices for patients. Less competition means hospitals can charge higher prices and get away with it. They can pay lower wages and get away with it. And they can provide worse care and get away with it. "We want firms to compete and be incentivized to raise their quality to attract more consumers, and the more that hospitals merge, the less sharp those incentives become," Cooper says. "We have evidence that death rates are literally [higher](https://click.nl.npr.org/?qs=aac6a52802998e4c5c1aaef55148e0a3c35e11600f3e40833c154e0c77d978ccedddd5faf3c5a0fe6e390ff4c85e2dc7b04e6c5c1169a406) in markets where hospitals face less competition." The bizarre part of all this is that many of these monopolizing hospitals are technically considered "nonprofits." There are, apparently, "a lot of nonprofits to be made in the healthcare industry," Cooper jokes. He doesn't take their "nonprofit" status very seriously. He sees it more like a game where instead of making profits that are distributed to shareholders, nonprofit hospitals take the extra money they make and use it for executive compensation and buying shiny stuff. Cooper says nonprofit hospitals tend to "overinvest in technology. And the irony of that is that you get even more expensive gizmos that are probably not necessary in the first place — and they suck more money into the healthcare system." Being a non-profit offers hospitals some quirky benefits. They don't have to pay taxes like for-profit businesses do. And while the FTC can block anti-competitive mergers between non-profit hospitals, they are hamstrung in investigating non-profit hospitals for anti-competitive conduct under current law. "It's sort of ~~crazy~~," Cooper says. Many of these markets, he says, are dominated by just one or two hospitals, giving them market power to suck extra money from communities for health procedures and emergencies.

## Advantage

### 1nc – presumption

#### 1--Vote negative on presumption – nothing about the plan or the aff’s speech resolves ableism as an underlying system of oppression or exhaustion that arises from disability existing in ontological excess of the normative human

#### 2—They don’t solve the Schalk evidence – it’s about academics embracing CDS as a frame, they don’t have a link between the methodology of a plan and the form of critical disability studies. Cap turns because their scholarship gets commodified.

### 1nc – turn

#### 3--Economic managerialism like the affs use of antitrust necessitates debilitation of populations – turns the aff

Scannell 18 (R. Joshua Scannell – Assistant Professor of Digital Media Theory at New School's School of Media Studies. “Electric Light: Automating the Carceral State During the Quantification of Everything” A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York [2018] <https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3617&context=gc_etds>, DOA: 9/25/21, kbb)

In 1913, Brandeis is economic policy advisor to Woodrow Wilson and his Progressive New Freedom project. While Wilson makes himself busy Progressively segregating the federal government, the future justice of the Supreme Court focuses on banks. Against anti-trust regulation or nationalization, Brandeis argues that the best way to break financial houses’ control over the economy is to publish their service fees. Doing so, he claims, alerts investors to unfair practices, incentivizes them to invest with honest houses, and forces banks to behave fairly. “Sunlight,” he says, “is said to be the best of disinfectants; electric light the most efficient policeman” (Brandeis 2009). Brandeis is wrong about sunlight regulating banks. In the absence of effective state regulation, they continue to concentrate power, and eventually collapse, triggering the Great Depression. But his slogan becomes a mantra for what Tariq Ali calls the “Extreme Center” of American politics (Ali 2015). The Extreme Center, made up of political agents of all parties whose allegiance is to the maintenance of free market capitalism at all costs, is in 2014 caught between the rock of “transparent” racial state violence and the hard place that necessitates statesanctioned armed cadres to maintain a fraying political economic structure. Overwhelmed, the extreme center insist that the facts aren’t in, and call for better data, and for better analytics. Or for what Lim, quoting Brandeis, calls “sunshine.” In the mid 2010s, that call for “sunshine” translates into the rollout of police worn body cameras on the one hand, and improved resource management software on the other. Critics like Elizabeth Joh point out that, from a civil rights standpoint, police worn body cams are a disaster (E. E. Joh 2016). She’s right (E. Joh 2016). The distinction between transparency (“sunshine”) and surveillance is fictive to begin with (Levy and Johns 2016). For instance: The Axon Corporation, formerly called Taser, is most famous for its formernamesake “less lethal” police weapon. But it is also the largest producer of police worn body cameras, among a range of other surveillance technologies and analytics systems. As early as 2010, Taser articulates a vision of integrating facial recognition technology into police worn body cameras that can scan crowds and match faces to outstanding warrants in real time (Gross 2010). In 2017, the company pivots its business model to analytics. In April 2017, the company announces that Taser is now Axon, and will offer free body cameras, as well as “supporting hardware, software, data storage, training, and support to police departments free of cost for one year.” Axon plans to use a proprietary, expanding database of body camera videos to develop technology that can “anticipate criminal activity” by reading body language to warn officers if “someone’s demeanor has changed and may now be a threat” (Kofman 2017). So, the tool to achieve greater transparency (“sunshine”), and heal the trust deficit between police and “the communities they protect” is also how police surveillance generalizes, and how analytics automates carceral precarity, debilitating populations (Puar 2017). What the extreme center never says out loud is that the other side of transparency and sunshine is the policeman, and electric light. In September 2014, a few months before Lim publishes his article in Newsweek, the New York Times runs a report on policing in Brownsville, a poor and largely black neighborhood in Brooklyn. A new Mayor, Bill de Blasio, has recently been elected on the promise of ending the New York Police Department’s unconstitutional Stop, Question, and Frisk policy (Vaughan 2013). The reporter is in Brownsville to see what has changed since the city pivoted to its new strategy, called “Omnipresence.” He finds: police cruisers parked at every junction, emergency lights flashing until the early hours of the morning; powerful floodlights on all night pointed at public housing projects’ windows; officers patrolling building interiors with flashlights on and guns drawn; helicopters flying overhead, shining searchlights down at the neighborhood. Electric light, everywhere. One person who lives in the neighborhood tells the reporter that “[we] feel like we live under siege” (J. Goldstein 2014). Omnipresence is the brainchild of Commissioner Bill Bratton, who, in 2014, is pushing hard to drive NYPD’s information technology development. The NYPD’s Information Technology Bureau estimates that implementing the total wish list will cost $350 million. It includes plans to build a proprietary fiber optic network for the police, new data centers and cloud capability, efforts to link NYPD camera feeds with independent agencies (like NYCHA), to construct a citywide data fusion center under NYPD control, to expand the existing Domain Awareness System nerve center for processing data streams and to push that system’s platform to field officers, to install ShotSpotter gunshot detection centers city-wide, to contract predictive policing software as a service from a private company, to equip officers with body cameras, and to issue NYPD emails to officers (New York City Police Department 2015). These are a different sort of omnipresence; a different set of techniques for leveraging algorithms to bathe a city in electric light. In Dark Matters, Simone Browne introduces the concept of “black luminosity” as a framework for understanding the racializing violence that inheres in the productive surveillance of blackness. Black Luminosity is “a form of boundary maintenance occurring at the site of the black body, whether by candlelight, flaming torch, or the camera flashbulb that documents the ritualized terror of a lynch mob.” This boundary maintenance is “intricately tied to knowing the black body, subjecting some to a high visibility…by way of technologies of seeing that sought to render the subject outside of the category of the human, un-visible” (Browne 2015, 67-68). We might add to this historical list floodlights, CCTVs, facial recognition software, gait matching software, social media surveillance, data fusion, predictive policing, body cameras, surveillant sensors, heat maps, compstat maps. In other words, the 21st century technological assemblage of black luminosity that underwrites American matrices of domination (Collins 2009) Algorithmic policing – Electric Light – is a deepening and extension of the boundary making that Browne identifies. Emerging concerns about digital surveillance technologies - that they inhumanize and dividuate people to circulate their data as valuable, securable information (boyd and Crawford 2012, Lyon 2011) are in some ways a much-belated realization of the process by which taxonomies of the body have organized and distributed population. Against the concern that digital surveillance presents a new problem of reducing people to constituent parts and alienates the subject from itself and from the law, we might look to Jennifer Morgan’s argument in Laboring Women that early modern European taxonomies of non-white women were central to nascent state projects of colonialism. These taxonomies laid the intellectual, financial, and ideological groundwork needed to produce captive labor forces on which new modes of capitalist accumulation could be built (Morgan 2004). Morgan argues that a fundamental technique of the production and circulation of what we now understand as “race” was European explorers’ efforts to “read” non-European women’s bodies as uniquely capable of producing new bodies for captivity through pregnancy and reproduction while also doing agricultural labor. This subtended a colonial fascination with the imagined physicality of the “indigenous other.” European “experts,” for instance, argued that nonEuropean women’s breasts were especially and monstrously elongated so that babies could be carried on their backs and “suckle o’er their shoulder” while they did agricultural labor. The (imagined) breast became a key metric, along with the supposed ease and painlessness of delivery, by which Europeans determined the sliding scale of populational fitness for civilization or enslavement. Biometrics and racialization have always been of a part (Ajana 2013, Browne 2015, Duster 2003) And the racializing technologies of biometrics always require illumination. Eighteenth century British colonial authorities in New York developed what Browne calls “Lantern Laws” in response to widespread enslaved’ and indigenous resistance to the colonial regime. The white ruling class feared that the free and untracked movement of enslaved persons invited danger. Where enslaved people could freely meet and talk, they could strategize insurrection and plan revolt. These laws thus mandated that black and native persons, when walking two or more at a time and unaccompanied by a white person were required, after dark, to carry lit candle lanterns. They were made to be luminous (Browne 2015, 76-83). An urban reimagining of the rural “pass,” the Lantern Laws organized the imagined infrastructure of the city through the circulation of illuminated black and native bodies (Hadden 2003; Browne 2015). Colonial luminosity assembles surveillant technologies (candles, lanterns), racial technologies (bondage, property rights), capital (the sea, the ship, the financial instrument, the east India company) and imperial affects (the impetus for these laws is to defend the sanctity of the afternoon tea ceremony) to map carceral, colonial New York. Back to the future, in 2014, the New York Police Department assembles surveillant technologies (cctv, ShotSpotter, crime mapping, gait matching, facial recognition, automated license plate readers, predictive policing), racial technologies (incarceration, underfunded schools, rent gouging, poor wages), capital (credit, real estate value, data farming, analytics), and imperial affects (the colorblind land of opportunity, the American dream) to map carceral, 21st century New York. As in Brownsville in 2014, so too in colonial New York: the mobility and opacity of free white colonial subjects depends on black and native bodies’ forced illumination. In their passage through the colonial city, black and native bodies were not only forced to present before the panoptic regard of the white gaze, they were constitutive of sovereignty’s field of vision (Kelley 1996, Bell 1992, Scott 1999, Ong 2006). As in the 18th century, so the 21st: racialized bodies’ “improper” movement (including the refusal to “move along”) in and through New York invites a range of punishments, up to and including torture and death. Surveillance, torture, capital, necropolitics, biometrics, carceral securitization, hot spot policing. The conflation of the terrorist and the criminal all coalesce across time and space. Light organizes race. Police tactics have not changed much. We may not call them “Lantern Laws” anymore, but NYPD’s “Omnipresence” strategy positions police floodlights in and around “high crime” neighborhoods so that the police can see, can “know,” when and where people of color move about the city. The designation of “high crime neighborhood” is itself a certain type of luminosity. The heat maps that transform the lived environment into a state target, and depress the constitutional protections of people living under conditions of “high crime” (Ferguson and Bernache 2008) are themselves the product of the ubiquitous racialized surveillance that Broken Windows reauthorized in the 1990s, and that Microsoft analytics digitizes on behalf of “the public.” Risk, heat maps, hot spots, and predictive policing are some of the 21st century’s techniques for illuminating the progress of “dangerous” bodies through the urban environment. So, the logic of securitization endures. What has changed is that inhumanist techniques of “algorithmic governance” now deliberately disaggregate the metrics of flesh from any imagined figure of the human (Negarestani 2014a; Terranova 2007; Patricia T. Clough 2010). Electric light means an intensification of the violent, profitable production of flesh against the body, hidden behind mathematical parameters, and “progressive” reforms (Spillers 2003). There is not a contradiction between a more accountable and technologically savvy police department and siege. The former makes the latter possible. But the techniques of policing and organized dispossession (Harvey 2004) that constitute the “changing same” of American carceral capitalism are nonetheless transforming. Jasbir Puar writes about the Israeli occupation of Palestine as “inhumanist biopolitics,” in which state power turns on the deliberate debilitation and stunting of target populations (Puar 2015). This “right to maim,” she argues, is useful to contemporary modes of imperial rule that depend on comporting with the letters, if not spirit, of international human rights benchmarks. By rendering subject populations debilitated, rather than dead, regimes suspend victimized communities in a profitable interstice of “will not let or make die.” Populations in such necropolitical limbos provide the grist for expanding domestic security industries, non-governmental organizations, medical research, and other sectors whose use-value accrues from the profitable management of organized debility (Puar 2017). The term “inhumanist biopolitics” tracks two theoretical lines in this mode of debilitative governmentality. On the one hand, that it is biopolitical in the “classical” Foucauldian sense of the word. It is a logic of governing that is dependent on figuring some populations’ bodies for maximum life and capacity and others for slow death (Berlant 2007) and debility through a positive feedback loop between state science, state racism, biological knowledge, and what David Beer calls “metric power” (Beer 2016; Foucault 1978). On the other hand, Reza Negarestani’s (2011) term, “inhumanism” denotes a break with the “human” temporalities and figures that frame “biopolitics” (Negarestani 2014b). Negarestani’s concept of the “labor of the inhuman” is dense, and I will not attempt a full excursus. To gloss, Negarestani argues that, “humanist” and “anti-humanist” conceptions of “the human” are rooted in nostalgic (imagined historical) or theological (either explicitly religious, phenomenal, or “natural”) reifications of “human” as coherent, and self-evident figure. Inhumanism reworks “human” as a process of constant renovation and construction – what he calls “the revisionary catastrophe.” His point is that, pragmatically, what “human” means is under incessant revision and stress, and that this stress comes “as a force that travels back from the future to alter, if not to completely discontinue, the command of its origin.” To commit, politically, ethically, or intellectually, to “human” means taking as a starting point the constant destabilization of “the human” that unfolds from the future. The systems through which “human” is distributed are multiscalar, complex, and functional (in the sense that they are processual and material). “Humans” do not preexist these systems’ feedback processes, which splay the “human” across diachronic temporalities. Negarestani means (I think) to develop the concept of inhumanism as a tool for liberation, as a means for reckoning with the failures of liberatory politics and philosophies to make sense of the ways in which cascading technics and technologies ontologically destabilize sociocultural units of analysis and action. While there is certainly merit in this aspect of the project, inhumanism scans much more readily as Puar invokes it: as a schematic analysis of contemporary forms of (post)-biopolitical control.To return to Puar’s example of Gaza, we might ask how to conceive of the temporal scales of the epigenetic research streams that flow from Gazans’ toxified bodies. Militarized epigenetic research is driven by a speculative loop that aims to locate a proteinate source of Palestinian resistance to occupation. Occupation policy aims to debilitate “generational time” by inflicting “psychological and cognitive injuries” that “stunt” human development, foreclosing the possibility of children’s resistance in an indeterminate future. These tactics decant “the human” from its molecular composition to make Palestinians “literalized and lateralized as surface, as bodies without souls, as sheer biology, thus ironically rendered non-human, part of creating surface economies of control, and captured in non-human temporal calculations” (Puar 2015, 15). The ultimate target of these tactics of (literal) molecularization, and debilitation is an old “biopolitical fantasy, that resistance can be located, stripped, and emptied.” In these occupational dynamics, resistance itself’ becomes a target of computational metrics: How to measure, calculate, and capture resistance? But not only is biopolitical control a fundamentally productive assemblage; the ontological irreducibility of ‘resistance itself’ is elusive at best” (ibid). Eyal Weizman explains this conjunction of biopoltical control, transnational norms, computational capacity, and technocratic measurement in the context of possible soldiers’ defense against war crime charges brought under the framework of “International Humanitarian Law (IHL).” He notes that militaries have, in part due to pressure from international humanitarian organizations and national legal bodies, increasingly adopted automated and robotic technologies to command, control, and govern the normative distribution of violence and death (Weizman 2011). This integration has transformed military action into a systemic process of command and control “that is undertaken by a diffuse assemblage of sensors, automatic weapons, computers and optics together with human operators, overseers and regulators.” This inhumanist structure makes it nearly impossible to identify, with any certainty, nodes at which war crime violations take place. Computers and sensors cannot be held responsible for the commission of crimes, and human operators are often acting under their “direction,” which is normally “designed” to inflict minimal, rather than maximal violence (Chamayou 2013). Weizman points out that this produces a perverse circumstance in which a human accused of committing war crimes might feasibly launch a legal defense on the grounds that they inflicted maximal possible violence. Against computers’ antiseptic program of minimally inflicted damage elongated over the maximal duree, the human warfighter evinces humanity by committing greater violence than is asked or “required.” As Weizman puts it, “The breach of the techno-civilized logic of computation and calculations could thus be argued as madness itself” (Weizman 2011, 16). Perhaps it is madness, but it reads like meticulous work. In particular, it conjures the infrastructures of human commodification that undergird the “intimacies of four continents” in the black Atlantic (Lowe 2015; Gilroy 1993). It reads like the “protocol of search and destroy” that Hortense Spillers identifies as the “zero degree of social conceptualization” between “body” and “flesh” (Spillers 2003). The digitally driven surveillance and control techniques that render Palestinians soulless “surface economies of control” may call to mind, as many have argued, a posthuman reordering of Giorgio Agamben’s concept of bare life in an “algorithmic state of exception” (McQuillan 2015). But, following scholars like Alexander Weheliye (Weheliye 2014) I want to suggest that the musselman of the Nazi camps is not, as Agamben (Agamben 1999) argues, the zero degree of this moment’s methods for inscribing a “hieroglyphics of the flesh” (Spillers 2003). There is nothing particularly “exceptional” about the dehiscence of “human” from “flesh” (Moten 2008; Pitts-Taylor 2011a), nor have those terms historically relied on “life,” no matter how bare. Dylan Rodriguez argues in “Forced Passages” that the carceral organization and mechanization of the Middle Passage is the working prototype for the contemporary “prison regime” (Rodriguez 2007). For Rodriguez, the American prison regime, like the Middle Passage “is a point of massive human departure—from civil society, the free world, and the mesh of affective social bonds and relations that produce varieties of ‘human’ family and community” (Rodriguez 2007, 40) that exceeds economic logic. Although organized by and in response to assemblages of speculative capital, labor transformation, and mutually articulating state and economic crises, Rodriguez argues that both regimes are tutelary. In both cases, the regimes serve “a pedagogical and punitive” function that, in the case of Middle Passage “deployed strategies of unprecedented violence to “teach” captive Africans and coerce them into the methods of an incipient global ordering.” The Prison Regime has Come to form a hauntingly similar spatial and temporal continuum between social and biological notions of life and death, banal liberal civic freedom and totalizing unfreedom, community and alienation, agency and liquidation, the “human” and the sub- and nonhuman. In a reconstruction of the Middle Passage’s constitutive logic, the reinvented prison regime is openly articulating and self-valorizing a commitment to efficient and effective bodily immobilization within the mass-based ontological subjection of human beings (Ibid. 48). Rodriguez points out that contemporary digital technologies of surveillance and control represent an “epochal leap from the carceral practices of the Middle Passage” that “Represents a multiplication of the potential sites and scenarios of subjection and physical punishment. This high technology re-maps prisoners’ bodies onto a virtual terrain, abstracting their bodily movements and gestures into a computerized grid of obedience and disobedience, submission and violation. Such innovations effect a re-spatialization of the prison itself, marking the extension and veritable omnipresence of the state’s capacity to practice a violent domination over its “inmates” (Ibid. 50). Technologies designed to extend the surveillant reach and punitive freedom of the carceral state are ontological conditions for racial capitalism, rather than the ramifications of a state of exception. To Agamben’s argument that the logic of “security” has, after 2001, instituted a sort of soft crisis in which biometric technologies that were “invented for recidivist criminals, [and] remained for longtime their exclusive privilege” have now been turned on the general population, thus undermining Western countries’ claim to “democracy” or even “politics” (Agamben 2014), we can posit Simone Browne’s point that race has always been a biometric project, and Western “democracy” and “politics” has likewise always been “impossible.” What Browne (2009) calls “digital epidermalization,” the “exercise of power cast by the disembodied gaze of certain surveillance technologies (for example, identity card and e-passport verification machines) that can be employed to do the work of alienating the subject by producing a ‘truth’ about the body and one’s identity (or identities) despite the subject’s claims,” does not have its roots in the “crisis” of the post-9/11 terror state, but the “mathematics” of racialization (Browne 2010, 135). Or, as Katherine McKittrick puts it, “the list, the breathless numbers, the absolutely economic, the mathematics of the unliving” to which the “pedagogical” regime of Middle Passage sought to reduce black life (McKittrick 2014, Rodriguez 2007). Digital policing technologies are a contemporary iteration of this mathematics. They are part and parcel of a broad reorganization of the techniques and tactics of racialization and value concurrent with digital capitalism’s “quantification of everything” (Browne 2010, 2015). Just as Rodriguez argues that the rudimentary digital surveillant technologies of turn of the 21st century prisons were an “epochal leap” from the Middle Passage, I am going to argue that the contemporary datafication and mathematization of the world has conditioned another “epochal leap” in which the target of the carceral state ceases to strictly be “human,” or “life” but rather “population,” and “liveliness.” In other words, to circle back to Puar and Negarestani: policing is “inhumanist.” As an example, let’s consider predictive policing – a contemporary (if somewhat minor) technology that we will circle back to throughout the dissertation. Predictive policing consolidates and operationalizes risk, possibility, and insecurity as ontological indeterminacies against which apparatuses of security must be brought to bear in a state of durable crisis. This long crisis is both beyond exception in that it is mundane, and also in that it depends on the feeding back from the future of “inhumanist” (Negarestani 2014b) populations of insecurity. These are the predicted calamities to come – the digitally realized failures to act on a future subjunctive that hemorrhages consequences in the present. From the “perp” not arrested to the stock not shorted, the future materializes as demand for action in the present, and as the ongoing failure to not have acted “otherwise.” In practical terms, this means an intensification of policing surveillance logics and practices, and circulations of risk historically generated by the carceral archipelagos of racial capitalism (Nelson 2016, Duster 2012, Gandy 2009, Foucault 1995; C. Robinson 2000). This “epochal leap” is not just a byproduct of changing technologies, or the unfortunate result of an interesting set of technical solutions being used to bad effect (O’Neil 2016). It was engineered with the specific intent of transforming policing from reactive enforcement of the penal regime to proactive agent of digital capitalism’s economic infrastructure. The impetus for this was the state crisis of the 1970s and 1980s. In the face of massive popular resistance to the American penal regime, American cadres of law and order reimagined the racial-sexual rationales of American racial capitalism as plausibly different from the historical cartographies of racialsexual difference (McKittrick 2006; Gilmore 2007). Policing became inhumanist because the police could no longer justify their mission in “human” – (or should we say dehumanizing) terms. The solution was to shift the terms that justified American policing. From the “condemnation of blackness” (Muhammad 2010) that epistemologically enframed policing during the postwar Race liberal order (Melamed 2010), advocates of state repression turned to “swift and sure” “law and order” maintenance as a praxis of technocratic common sense (Hall et al 2013, Gilmore 2009). Against race, police intellectuals leveraged the imagined neutrality of “math” and “prediction” (Harcourt 2007). That turn is at the root of the bad faith question that haunts most criticism of the consolidated techno-dystopian present: How can an algorithm be racist and sexist (Brennan 2015)? In the closing days of 2015, Ray Kelly and Bill Bratton -- two of the most powerful figures in US law enforcement -- made national headlines for fighting over data-entry methodology. (Fermino, Sandoval, and Tracy 2015; FOX 2015; Weichselbaum and Blau 2014; Levitt 2015, Yee 2014). The fight itself was frivolous, but it elicited a degree of rancor from public officials that illustrates just how central the minutiae of data collection and analysis is to narratives of 21st century crime control. Only twenty-one years prior to Bratton and Kelly’s spat, the NYPD did not even record regular statistics except to file semiannual Unified Crime Reports to the FBI. The extensive use of digital databases to granularly track crime and disruption dates to 1994, when Bratton introduced the CompStat system to the NYPD. In the years since, data-driven police management has become commonplace and widespread. It increasingly mirrors contemporary corporate management schemes and structures -- what you might call a proof-of-concept for remaking America’s civil service in Silicon Valley’s image. In 2009, for instance, the LAPD explicitly recommended that cutting edge departments look for best practices in the algorithmically driven logistics and data mining strategies championed by companies like Wal-Mart and Amazon (C. Beck and McCue 2009) rather than in public safety agencies. Digitization as a police strategy has grown in tandem with the centrality of digital capital. Of course, it’s no revelation that police strategies and aims transform with shifts in political economy: Police exist to ensure the viability of a society’s capacity for social reproduction. That is, after all, what it means to maintain “law and order” or “keep the peace” (Hall et all 2013, Gilmore 2007, Linebaugh 1992). This not only means enforcing regimes of economic dispossession (the law) but cooperating with state and infrastate agencies to produce populations primed for debilitation and exploitation (Puar 2017, Beckett and Murakawa 2012), or what Foucault calls “racism” (Foucault 1978) and Ruth Wilson Gilmore defines as “the state- sanctioned or extralegal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death” (Gilmore 2007, 28). Terms such as “group-differentiation,” “vulnerability,” and “premature death” are noncategorical – each is a metastable range of intelligibility brought into being through techniques of measurement. Articulating that range demands stewardship and benchmarks, rationalizing techniques and social investment (Latour 1999). It requires social projects that conjure bodies as objects of (dis)investment, discipline, punishment, and control. Race, in other words, is technology. It organizes the horizons of the social and directs the technical apparatuses of the state and its surrogates to intervene differently in different bodies, structuring the spaces, times, and places in which those bodies concatenate as targets for management (Roberts 2011; Benjamin 2016). This, of course, is what Michel Foucault called biopolitics: a distribution of life chances, or the exposure to premature death, that is articulated at the level of the population and legitimated by invoking the health of the polity (Foucault 2008, 1978). Biopolitical projects are in turn managed by a tripartite political structure that he collectively refers to as governmentality. For Foucault, governmentality is a “complex form of power, which has as its target the population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security” (Foucault 2007). Governance under capitalism is, in other words, a project of differentiation that is instrumentalized at the level of the population to organize exposure and vulnerability to facilitate accumulation. The current centrality of metrics to what Bratton calls “the practice of policing” (Bratton 2016) is in keeping with 21st-century governmentality’s inhumanist investment in prevailing technologies of neoliberal accumulation (Roberts 2010; Brown 2015). But it also indicates the reverse: that policing is increasingly central to the development of these metrics. After 1994, with the introduction of the COMPSTAT system, policing went from enforcing capitalist social relations to a leading innovator in reorganizing them. Like aught else, neoliberal reforms in 1980s New York drove a breakdown in the previous century’s practices of American policing. Spurred by the orchestrated collapse of Fordist disciplinary institutions like schools and factories, and the onset of a generalized “crisis” of crime, public and private leaders demanded a transformation of police logics from an integrated, criminal justice model to a proactive, punitive one centered on maintaining “order” (Murakawa 2008, Phillips-Fein 2017, Henry 2002, McDonald 2001). Order, of course, is not a neutral term, and it tends to be defined against the vulnerable. The homeless, for instance, were in 1980s and 1990s New York considered, ipso facto, to be signs of “disorder.” By 1994, public discourses of “order” explicitly tethered the term to wealth, proximity to whiteness, and heteronormative sexual discretion (Hanhardt 2013, Delaney 1999). The “Zero Tolerance” campaign to “retake” New York City in the 1990s was waged explicitly in defense of that particular intersectional “order” (Smith 1996; Vitale 2009). It is in the context of that campaign to make the city safe for neoliberalism that the computer, and its analytic capacities, emerges as a central tool of policing. Overwhelmed by the scale and scope of its adopted civilizing mission, and heavily influenced by neoliberal management theory’s love affair with cybernetics, the 1990s NYPD turned to digital statistics and mapping software to organize their campaign against “crime.” This set the stage for a transformation in what Clough and Craig Willse call the “political branding” of crime such that it came “to resonate with the more ordinary biopolitics of branding policy and programming, or what might be referred to as the ‘technical solutions’ of making live and letting die” (Patricia Ticineto Clough and Willse 2010, 49-50). CompStat’s influence is enormous. It is not merely an innovation in police management protocol, but a coalescence of strategies designed to produce and manage surplus populations in the context of massive political economic restructuring (Patricia T. Clough 2010). It is also a peerless example of what Michel Callon et al have called “technical democracy,” in which metrics and number stand for transparency and political community (Callon, Lascoumes, and Barthe 2009). CompStat’s reflection of the American political economy’s neoliberalization is crucial to its success as a political object (Harman 2009; Morton 2007, 2013) that has successfully reoriented commonsense understandings of how to govern crime and crime prevention. But CompStat also reorganizes the demands made of calculation and digitization to assemble heterotopic “liveliness” (Bennet 2010) that undergirds the emergent “stack” of planetary computation (Bratton 2015). If meta-level digital “worlding” (“the quantification of everything”) is the ontogenetic waypath for transnational capital after the crisis of neoliberalism, then the lodestar is CompStat. This is true first because if one scratches hard enough at political economy, one finds carceral infrastructure (Duster 2018, Heiner 2007, Harcourt 2011). And second, because CompStat diagrams an assemblage of racialized value and metric precision (Moten 2018), of biomedia and ontopower (Thacker 2006, Massumi 2011) that is directly inherited from longstanding traditions of American racial capitalism (Roberts 2011; Fouche 2012). Specifically, I refer to American racial capitalism’s metric production of the raced and gendered distinction between the “body” and “flesh” that Hortense Spillers argues is the “central one between captive and liberated subject-positions” (Spillers 2003, 206-207). Flesh, for Spillers, is “the zero degree of social conceptualization that does not escape concealment under the brush of discourse.” This flesh, she argues, is produced by the rending violence of racialization. It is, A kind of hieroglyphics…whose severe disjunctures come to be hidden to the cultural seeing by skin color…These lacerations, woundings, fissures, tears, scars, openings, ruptures, lesions, rendings, punctures of the flesh create the distance between what I would designate a cultural vestibularity and the culture, whose state apparatus, including judges, attorneys, “owners,” “soul drivers,” “overseers,” and “men of God,” apparently colludes with a protocol of “search and destroy” (Spillers 2003, 207). I want to return here to Browne’s theory of digital epidermalization in which the “white prototypicality” of biometric technologies organize “the computational means through which the body, or more specifically parts and pieces of it, are mathematically coded as data” in order to perform digitized racialization as a “fracture of the body from its humanness, refracted into a new subject position” that is “ontologically unstable” and subject to a “structured violence that is productive of and produced by a certain white normativity” (Browne 2009, 134-135). Where Browne focuses her cases of digital epidermalization on the productive and performative racializing violences of biometrics, I want to suggest that thinking through CompStat’s nonbiometric analytic frame lets us productively expand the concept of digital epidermalization to encompass a broader racializing assemblage in which the “protocol of search and destroy” is fed forward into a capacious rendering of the social field as ontologically destabilizing productive violence. This ontological destabilization occurs, under CompStat, at the level of governmentality, even as the “real life” violences of that ontological instability redound onto the intersectionally “same” historically violated bodies that are foundational platforms of racial capitalist extraction. That is to say, the digitalizing infrastructures of 21st century carceral capitalism do the work of digital epidermalization without necessary recourse either to biometrics or to “white prototypicality,” but always with recourse to “blackened” population racism and racialized extraction (Sojoyner 2017; Sharpe 2009). And because the capitalized digitalization of the ontologically destabilized social field is intrinsically cathected to, and in fact conditioned by, the carceral infrastructure of political economy, all the smart city’s sensor-laden streets lead back to the foundational dehiscence of “body” from “flesh,” to the “cultural vestibularity” of the “protocol of search and destroy” (Spillers 2003). Or, in other words, to a digitizing carceral state. Or, to put it more bluntly: we must heed the oft-repeated truth that surveillance and policing require neither digital technologies, nor complex technical infrastructure to be omnipresent, intrusive, and violent. That, in fact this is the specific work that racialization and gendering are meant to achieve (see e.g. Morgan 2004, Hartman 2007, Shabazz 2015, Amar 2013). Enfleshment under racial capitalism is precisely a project of group-differentiated debilitation because it weaponizes organic surveillance systems and organic complex technical infrastructures: that is to say bodies (Kaba 2015; Pitts-Taylor 2016, 2006) Cops don’t need surveillance cameras or biometric technologies, and banks don’t need automated credit forecasts to produce and police racial difference because “race” is already datafication, and human wetware, indeed the human sensorium, is already weaponized (Nelson 2016; Gumbs 2016; Kaba 2015). But, knowing that the correct answer to the question of whether policing requires advanced technology to violently perpetuate inequality is “no;” that Chicago Police are perfectly capable of terrorizing black and brown youth with or without automated heat lists; that the NYPD do not need surveillance vans to construe Muslim college students as terrorist, new technologies nevertheless make a difference. Database-driven, automated, digital technologies do real work to the real world even if the phenomenological fallout from those processes feels like more of the “changing same” (Gilmore 2007, Yost 2008, Fouche 2012). The fact that the product is the reproduction of already existing structures of oppression and exploitation speaks to the effectiveness of new iterations of digital epidermalization to do the work of maintaining racial and sexual difference while also reconfiguring corporeality for-and-as capital in new techno-shocked arrangements (Tallbear 2015; Brown 2015). The digital obviously does not introduce the idea of rending vulnerable flesh into profitability through “protocols of search and destroy” but it facilitates new ways in which capital flows into, out of, and through corporeality (Noble and Tynes 2016, Chun 2008, Povinelli 2016, Hansen 2015). This, in turn has an impact on ontologies of the body and its capacities that matters very much to the institutional commitments of carceral capital (Jackson 2016, Amoore 2013). The fact that this “mattering” is so very dear to “carceral capitalism” (Wang 2018) means, I think, that it ought to matter to those who would abolish those institutions and their intellectual foundations. So, to the question “does digital technology change everything or nothing?” we might characterize the deep center’s long-recurring answer as “everything needs to change, so everything can stay the same” (Lampedusa 2007) Pushing this argument, I am suggesting that the “smart city” is not so much the offspring of the historical violences that devalue the lives of the intersectionally oppressed, but rather the contemporary iteration of mutative institutions of inhumanist biopolitics that work to assign, with terribly mounting precision, the value of extractable life, and the liveliness of extractable value. Fred Moten calls the ontological condition of this “logistics in the hold” (Moten and Harney 2012), this surgery of life, capacity, and price “blur” (Moten 2018). I want to suggest that we also colloquially call a consolidating technosocial iteration of it “the cloud” (Peters 2015, Bratton 2015).
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In other words, as a result of disability studies scholarship and modern-­ day global disability rights movements working alongside other identity-­ based efforts at equality, disabled people have shifted from modernity’s exception (a lineage of defect to be isolated and eradicated) to neoliberal exceptionality . In this latter state, the ontology of disability retrieves a formerly fallen object and makes it newly available for cultural rehabilitation . While rehabilitation often refers to a productive process of recovery leading to a return to approximations of normative embodiment (and, ultimately, employability), here the term suggests something less optimum. Cultural rehabilitation refers to normalization practices at work within the neoliberal era through which nonnormative (i.e., nonproductive) bodies become culturally docile. This process accomplishes its task of adjustment through a gradual ceding of democratic state power and the duty to govern on behalf of the people to corporate interests both benign and disciplinary. Such practices jettison the value of the commons (literally selling off the collectively held riches of the commonwealth) while enlisting nonnormative bodies in service of inclusionism as a further fetishization of the accomplishments of the neoliberal state’s normalcy. Claims to neoliberal exceptionality rely on a largely rhetorical celebration of this accomplishment of inclusion long before any such utopian realizations could be justifiably demonstrated. Or, rather, such arrivals at inclusionist goals prove successful only because their application to marginalized lives is so meager. Throughout this book we have referenced this implementation of neoliberal diversity as the “weakened stain” of inclusionism akin to inoculations from disease that introduce a small amount of virus into a system in order to ward off greater degrees of infection in the future.

Rather than social pariahs, disabled people increasingly represent “research opportunities” in the sense that medical race sociologist Aihwa Ong means when she argues that “treating” ill and disabled Cambodian refugees in the United States increasingly “became the justification for state and local clinics to obtain much-­ needed funding from the federal government” (96). Rather than a former era’s economic “burden,” disabled people have become objects of care in which enormous sectors of postcapitalist service economies are invested. In the terms of recent political economy, disability has been transformed into a target of neoliberal intervention strategies— ­a “hot” ticket item for potential research and policy funding schemes. Disabled people, once thrown out of the labor system on the basis of their lack of normative productivity in a competitive labor market, now find themselves “at hand for [the] purposes of accumulation at a later point in time. Put in the language of contemporary postmodern political theory, we might say that capitalism necessarily and always creates its own ‘other’” (Harvey, Neoliberal- ism 141). The historical production of others situates bodies in a position tantamount to un(der)explored geographies: they come to be recognized as formerly neglected sites now available for new opportunities of market extraction that fuels so much of the production end of neoliberal capitalism. Such developments arrive, inevitably, with their own contradictions intact, but they also provide opportunities for rethinking disability as not only alternatively social, but also nonnormatively material, subject.

# 2NC

#### 2—Critically interrogate their research – cybernetic capitalism predetermines their creation and use.

Jackson 20, Professor, Department of International Education @ Education University of Hong Kong (Liz, “‘But Is It Really Research?’ Mentoring Students as Theorists in the Era of Cybernetic Capitalism.” Educational Philosophy & Theory, vol. 52, no. 1, Jan. 2020, pp. 17–21. EBSCOhost, doi:10.1080/00131857.2019.1591150.)

As Michael Peters notes (2017, 2018), in this age of 'cybernetic capitalism', the global knowledge infrastructure is dominated by trillion-dollar multinationals. These forces are reshaping what counts as valuable knowledge, interpreting academic significance in terms of the capacity of research to directly lead to neoliberal market-oriented economic growth. An outgrowth of the rise of the age of cybernetic capitalism is the increased valuation and appreciation of big data over other kinds of evidence and bases for knowledge. As Kenneth Neil Cukier and Viktor Mayer-Schoenberger (2013) have noted, the subsequent rise of big data as the most valued currency can be characterised by 'the ability to render into data many aspects of the world that have never been quantified before'. To neoliberal institutions and nation-states, which provide public and private information infrastructure, such data is of tremendous use and power. Ordinary academics in this environment have tended to conform to capitalistic frameworks of value in this case, working to gather and analyse data in ways that benefit dominant social institutions and political economic actors. Some may assume there is a mutual benefit, as more funding will be granted, and greater significance ascribed, to researchers gathering data that is of more value under neoliberal growth models and agendas.

Educational researchers are far from immune to these pressures and these seductions. Major associations for educational research such as the American Educational Research Association celebrate their connections with government funders such as the National Science Foundation, which specifically funds 'scientific' research that aims to have an impact. By 'impact', it is implied that the research must agree broadly with the goals of institutions and the value of forwarding them, without major critique or investigation. By 'scientific', there is an emphasis on data. While one might say, following Peter Roberts ([ 7]), that all research is informed by data, as it is 'generated through human experience', in competitive environments in the age of cybernetic capitalism 'more data' is regarded as better data. Quantitative data becomes better than qualitative data, and so on.

There is perhaps no more vital task of educational theorists in this age than to understand and examine how economic growth models are shaping knowledge production agendas, as well as economic and information distribution, normally to benefit the visions of leading players in the age of cybernetic capitalism (Peters, [ 3]). Yet in this context, it would appear that academics researchers are more constrained than ever before by these political-economic forces when it comes to producing research, to be accountable to higher educational institutions and other funding bodies which follow the lead of multinational giants. Rather than setting agendas, most are complying, seeing little recourse and indeed lacking tools that have become devalued by, or may even now be regarded as inherently threatening to, the architects of neoliberal structures that frame information production agendas today.

In the context of ordinary higher education and research institutions, with the ability to gather more data has come greater possibilities for quantitative research. In education, as in other fields, quantitative research has retained a favoured status over qualitative and philosophical approaches for decades. Maths and sciences are still seen as the 'hard' and 'tough' sciences and fields, over the 'softer' arts. That this is senseless binary, particularly in education, has been argued by many philosophers of education (Pring, [ 5]). Qualitative researchers are not immune to the significance of numbers, and quantitative researchers should not be looking at numbers to the neglect of everything else. Yet today, one can see that this binary clearly does have a logic: to divide and differentiate research according to its value within the orientation to the world undergirding cybernetic capitalism. In this framing, educational theory, with its focus on ideas, is even more of a loser than qualitative research, not even deemed as research by some due to its lack of big data—and lack of neoliberal priorities.

This is just the latest challenge educational theorists have faced in defending their position in the academy, given the way their work does not tend to fit perfectly with traditional conceptions of educational research, or of applied philosophy (Roberts, [ 7]). Philosophers of education have expressed for a long time a sense of a minority status in teacher education institutions as well, which are normally focused mostly on educational practice, and on training students in qualitative and quantitative research methods. Philosophers and theorists may be feel further crunched today, in education and other fields, as the datafication era aligns with the push for competitive large-scale grants in higher education, which also makes empirical and quantitative research appeal more than ever before.

In this context, educational theorists can do more than simply try to conform, in vain. Instead, they can take responsibility to question neoliberal assumptions about value and significance, interrogate contemporary political-economic influences on academic research and social life, and provide alternative accounts of what is good, significant, and 'productive'. As Roberts ([ 7]) writes, they can also resist 'some of the demands of a performance-driven world', for instance by taking time to pay attention to what is happening in their institutions and in the field today: not to be pragmatic or 'relevant' for the sake of developing neoliberal 'impact', but to reconsider the way their values and ideas do and do not align with the processes and value orientations experienced in the world around them. Additionally, they can train fellow researchers to focus on these issues to a greater extent than they had been focused on in the past. This can also entail cultivating communities which are dialogic and supportive of alternative visions in research and social life.