## Digital Cyclops

### 2AC – AT: Capitalism K

#### WRONG – It’s no longer just capitalism! It’s something worse!

Wark 19 [Mckenzie Wark, 2019, “Capitalism is Dead: Is this something worse?”, <<Professor of Media & Cultural Studies @ The New School>>, Verso][\\pairie](file:///\\pairie)

A reminder of the thought experiment that threads through these chapters: What if this was no longer capitalism, but something worse? Could we approach this now by describing relations of exploitation and domination in the present, starting with the emerging features, and work back and out and up from that? This chapter plays mostly with the sociological imagination. 1 This is the ability to conceptualize the problem synchronically, as if we could slice through the social formation of the present and look at its anatomy, rather than diachronically, in terms of patterns of development through time (a topic discussed in Chapter 5, a historical fantasia).

Since the sociology we are playing with is vulgar Marxist, our imagination might be drawn initially to some features of the forces of production. It is still the case that extracting useful organic and inorganic matter from the earth is the basis of social existence. And it is still the case that applying vast amounts of energy in the form of fossil fuels and labor to that base matter is still how the endless array of commodities around us come into existence. But both of those processes seem these days to be subordinated to a third form of relation. At the smallest and largest scales, so much of primary production and secondary manufacturing seems to be controlled by rapid flows, extensive archives and complex algorithms whose concrete existence is in a tertiary form—that of information.

The forces of production that instrumentalize information extend all the way into the production process, whether in the form of industrial robotics or the detailed and constant surveillance of living labor. They extend all the way out to global networks of measurement, command, and control that work in real time. These networks of information subsume not only inorganic and organic matter and energy in their web but also the human as “user,” who becomes a producer of information even when not working. The value of information can be extracted even from free labor. The relations of production seem to evolve to enclose these forces in rather novel extensions of the private property form. Wittgenstein’s contribution to communism was his robust proof of the proposition that there is no private language, but in our time, privatized languages are everywhere. 2 And not just languages: Images, codes, algorithms, even genes can become private property, and in turn private property shapes what we imagine the limits and possibilities of this information to be.

Information is a relation between novelty and repetition, noise and order. 3 Novelty is extracted from a class whose efforts are hardly described by the category of labor, for the simple reason that while labor repeats an action whose form is given in advance, the whole point of these actions is to produce unique instances of such forms in the first place. Alongside the worker is the figure of the hacker, producer not of repeated content but of novel form, and form which more often than not ends up being someone else’s property.

One has to ask whether the ruling class presiding over this mode of production is still adequately described as capitalist. 4 It seems no longer necessary to directly own the means of production. A remarkable amount of the valuation of the leading companies of our time consists not of tangible assets, but rather of information. A company is its brands, its patents, its trademarks, its reputation, its logistics, and perhaps above all its distinctive practices of evaluating information itself.

Some like to talk as if one could just add an adjective or two to capitalism and describe all this, but we have already rejected that option as uninteresting poetry. Maybe it’s not the same old familiar endless essence of capitalism cloaked in new appearances. For instance, call it finance capitalism if you like, but perhaps the rise of finance is really just a symptom. Yann Moulier Boutang invites us to see finance as something other than speculative or fictive excess. 5 It has to do with the whole problemof exchange value in an age where the forces of production are extensively and intensively controlled by information: nobody knows what anything is worth. Financialization is a perverse socializing of the problem of the uncertainty of information about value.

### 2AC – AT: Settler Colonialism K

#### Perm do both – it definitely solves – indigenous movements like Idle No More focus on rejecting the will to technology

Kroker 14 [Arthur Kroker, 2014, “Exits to the Posthuman Future,” <<Professor of Political Science @ the University of Victoria and Director of Pacific Centre for Technology & Culture>>, Polity Press][\\pairie](file:///\\pairie)

Technologies of abandonment: lost dreams of the sustainable “global village” Insurgencies of the periphery: Idle No More, a courageous Indigenous political protest of global significance, takes place in the bitter cold of a Canadian winter.1 Inspired by a hunger strike by an Indigenous woman, Chief Theresa Spence, an Attawapiskat tribal leader, from a community on the shores of James Bay, Idle No More is resistance by the abandoned. Not quiet resistance, but Indigenous collectivities in solidarity, spontaneously organizing as dancing flash mobs moving to the inspiring rhythms of Indigenous drummers in shopping malls, outdoor city squares, blockading busy highways and barricading railway tracks. Day after day, the hunger strike by Chief Spence continues with one simple, but basic, demand: to meet with the Canadian government to negotiate nation-to-nation exploitative land-use policies affecting all the energy sectors that are quickly destroying the land and its Indigenous inhabitants. The government’s official response is the silence of cynical indifference, perhaps based on the political calculation that defeating Indigenous protest will facilitate exploitation of the land. In this case, the themes rise beyond simple politics to the level of Thinking the Future 185 eschatology. As long as Indigenous responsibility for the land and its inhabitants exists, the earth will continue to exist. Disappear Indigenous protest, and the land and its (dissenting) inhabitants may well disappear as well. When McLuhan once said that, in the electronic world, any periphery can quickly become the center of politics, he probably didn’t have in mind a hunger strike undertaken by a single Indigenous woman in a teepee on a small island on the Ottawa River across from the parliament buildings of Canada. Truly one of those insurgencies of the periphery in which great eschatological themes – the future of the land, the very survival of Indigenous peoples, the possible reconciliation of humans with earth, sky, water, and air – achieve such powerful clarity that suddenly the center of politics, Canadian at first, but swiftly by extension any form of politics steered by massive energy projects, gravitates around the profound ethical issues raised by an Indigenous tribal leader who says “no.”

With Idle No More, we are present at the first of the clashes of cosmology that will increasingly dominate the politics and culture of the twenty-first century – a cosmological collision between the system of politics, economy, and information associated with the ruling will to technology and the more profound vision of sustainability emerging from this insurgency of the periphery. If official power can respond only with the silence of indifference, perhaps that is because the masters of the technological universe – political and energy elites – recognize that no mediation is possible in this clash of cosmology, that in the courageous body politics of an Indigenous tribal leader willing to wager her claims to a broader sense of justice on the scales of life and death, that everything is at stake, that there can be no easy reconciliation between these competing life visions because what is really involved here is less a local political protest than a fundamental turning point in the direction of cosmology – technologies of abandonment represented in all their destructive intensity by mass energy projects versus enduring dreams of earth, land, and people mediated by social community and personal responsibility as a common dwelling place. Seemingly everything, today, is environment to the will to technology, not only the natural environment but human nature as well with all that entails for the future of human subjectivity. Transcendental in spirit and driven by a double dialectic of augmentation and incorporation, the will to technology has evolved to a point well in excess of what Nietzsche described as the “will to power” and Heidegger the “will to will.” Perhaps sensing the appearance of an epochal change, that moment when the will to technology began to turn back on itself, the philosopher Hannah Arendt captured the essence of contemporary 186 Crash times when she noted in her last book, Life of the Mind, that the future will be fully enveloped by the metaphysics of the “not-will” – a time of abandonment of all that is not necessary for the self-preservation of the will to technology. In Arendt’s prophetic vision, the historical primacy of conditions for the self-preservation of technique will inevitably result in the nihilism of “not-being,” that moment in which everything that is valued is measured only in its relationship to the self-preservation of the will to technology and, subsequently, everything that is not a condition of self-preservation is abandoned, effectively left behind as surplus remainder. Idle No More, this insurgency of the periphery, this declaration on behalf of a deeper conception of a sustainable environment that speaks to issues of individuals, community, and nature, is a rebellion against this formulation of the will to technology.

#### This is offense – it means the alternative’s knowledge production is wedded to technical development narratives.

Castro-Gómez 7 [Santiago Castro-Gómez, 04-03-2007, “The Missing Chapter of Empire: Postmodern reorganization of coloniality and post-Fordist capitalism,” <<Santiago is a Colombian philosopher & professor at the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana>>, Cultural Studies Vol. 21, Nos. 2&3 March/May 2007, T&F Online][\\pairie](file:///\\pairie)

The centrality of knowledge in the global economy and in imperialistic politics of development is made more evident when we examine the subject of the environment. Beginning with the Conference in Rio already mentioned, the environment becomes the backbone of sustainable development. It was at the conference where this Conference that The Agreement on Biological Diversity was signed, obligating signatory nations to protect their genetic resources given that now genetic resources were considered part of the ‘common heritage of mankind’. The United Nations’ interest in the conservation and management if this ‘heritage’ is clear: genetic resources have economic value and mean benefits for those businesses that work with the latest technologies in the areas of biotechnology and genetic engineering. In this way, the handling of information and abstract languages what H/N call ‘immaterial production’ is placed at the center of the capitalist, postmodern business.

In effect, the identification, alteration and transference of genetic material by way of knowledge have economic applications in the fields of agriculture and health. In the agricultural sector, biotechnology works by incrementing the production of food by means of the production of transgenic plants that are most resistant to plagues and insects, and less vulnerable to chemical fumigation. In 1999, 90 percent of the soya beans produced in Argentina and 33 percent of the corn produced in the United States originate from transgenic crops, and that percentage is even higher for products like cotton, tomatoes, tobacco, sugar cane, asparagus, strawberries, papaya, kiwi, barley, cucumber and zucchini. The biotechnological transformation of agriculture is a profitable business for the food industry and is controlled by a handful of businesses specialized in biotechnical research. The same occurs in the health sector. The pharmaceutical industry is concentrated in the production of medicines with a biological basis that are used in the treatment of illnesses like cancer, hemophilia, and hepatitis B, not to mention the growing production of generic medication and pharmaceutical drugs. It is estimated that the market for medication derived from pant extracts or biological products generates profits that hover around four hundred thousand million dollars annually, earnings that are concentrated in the hands of a small number of multinational businesses that monopolize ground-breaking research.14

Therefore, the subject of biodiversity places us at the forefront of a strategic sector of the global economy that will certainly redefine the geopolitics of the twenty-first century because access to genetic information will determine the difference between success and economic failure. Multinational corporations are interested in genetic resources that can be altered and manipulated by expert knowledge. Interestingly enough the greatest diversity is found in countries located in the South, the underdeveloped countries. For this reason, these businesses have initiated a real ‘lobbying’ campaign to obtain patents for these resources, appealing to intellectual property rights (CDI). Before the Uruguayan round of the GATT15 in 1993, no transnational legislation existed that pertained to intellectual property rights. Multinational businesses like Bristol Myers, DuPont, Johnson & Johnson, Merck and Pfizer, with vested interests in the biodiversity business, pressured for the introduction of the TRIP16 accord into the negotiations. This agreement permits the monopolistic control of the planet’s genetic resources by businesses.

Intellectual Property is a juridical concept with a transnational scope. It is protected by the United Nations through the OMPI (World Intellectual Property Organization), which protects and regulates the ‘creations and innovations of the human intellect’, such as artistic and scientific works.17 According to this norm, when immaterial products involve some type of technological innovation that has commercial application, they can be patented by their authors and used as if they were private property.18 A patent is defined as the concession that the State grants to an inventor so he can commercially exploit his product in an exclusive way, for a certain amount of time. In the case of biodiversity and genetic resources, multinational corporations that work with the latest technologies can legitimately claim that any genetic alteration of the flora and fauna implies an inventive activity of the intellect that has a direct application in the agricultural or pharmaceutical industries, and therefore they are rightfully protected by patents. By claiming that genetically modified biological material is no longer a product of nature but of human intellect, the multinationals claim the right to patent and declare as their own the economic benefits from the commercialization of these products. Legitimated in this way by a supranational juridical regime, the intellectual assets administered by multinational corporations are converted into the key sector for the creation of wealth in postmodern capitalism.

But it is precisely here where the ‘postcolonial face’ of Empire is revealed. I am talking about the ways in which new representations of development reinforce the modern/colonial hierarchies in a postmodern register, establishing a difference between the valid knowledge of some, and the non-knowledge or doxa of the others. One example of this is the way in which global agendas of sustainable development approach the subject of ‘traditional knowledge’. Multinational corporations are aware that by association with biodiversity and genetic resources, traditional knowledge and its ‘officials’ acquire a fabulous economic potential and represent numerous opportunities for commercialization. It is no wonder that in 2001 the OMPI created a ‘intergovernmental committee for the protection of intellectual property, genetic resources, traditional knowledge and folklore’, and that in 2003 UNESCO declared that ‘ ... communities, in particular indigenous communities, play an important role in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and recreation of the intangible cultural heritage, thus helping to enrich cultural diversity and human creativity’.19 The ‘safeguarding’ of traditional knowledge, now transformed into the ‘guarantors of sustainable development’, does not come for free. What is sought is to put a whole series of knowledges used for hundreds of years, by hundreds of communities world-wide at the disposal of multinationals specialized in research on genetic resources. These knowledges become susceptible to appropriation by multinational corporations through patents. Naturally, this requires a change in the representations of the other. What does this change consist of?

We know that in the modern paradigm of development, non-occidental systems were seen as the enemies of progress. It was assumed that industrialization created the conditions to leave behind a type of knowledge based in myths and superstitions, replacing it with the technical-scientific knowledge of modernity. It was also believed that personal traits like passivity, lack of discipline and indolence, associated perhaps to defects of race, depended rather on the ‘absence of modernity’. The absence of modernity could be overcome in the same way that the State resolves structural problems like illiteracy and poverty. In this way, the modern paradigm of development was also a colonial paradigm. ‘Other’ knowledges had to be disciplined or excluded.

However, and as H/N see it, postmodern capitalism is presented as a machine of segmentary inclusions, not of exclusions. Non-occidental knowledge is welcomed by the global agendas of Empire because it is useful to the capitalist project of biodiversity. The tolerance of cultural diversity has become a ‘politically correct’ value in Empire, but only in the sense that diversity is useful for the reproduction of capital. The indigenous person, for example, is no longer seen as someone pertaining to the social, economic and cognitive past of humanity, but as the ‘guardian of biodiversity’ (Ulloa, 2004). Once considered obstacles to a nation’s economic development, the indigenous are now seen as indispensable to the sustainable development of the world. Traditional knowledge is elevated to the category of ‘the intangible heritage of humanity’. Arturo Escobar formulates it in this way:

### 2AC – AT: Feminist Cyborg K

#### Perm do both – the post/transhumanist reading of her work is wrong and gets coopted by the same cybernetic systems we are describing – Haraway agrees!

Haraway & Gane 06 [Dona Haraway & Nicholas Gane, 12-01-2006, “When We have Never Been Human, What Is to Be Done?: Interview with Donna Haraway,”, <<Donna is a Professor in the History of Consciousness Department & Feminist Studies Department at the University of California>>, Theory, Culture & Society][\\pairie](file:///\\pairie)

NG: One thing I find fascinating about the ‘Manifesto’ is its complex mix of feminism and cybernetics. It is stated, for example, that ‘Human beings, like any other component or subsystem, must be localized in a system architecture whose basic modes of operation are probabilistic’ (Haraway, 1991a: 212). This is a radical extension of Claude Shannon and Warren Weaver’s famous Mathematical Theory of Communication (1949), in which information is defined in statistical terms. In an interview conducted in 1999 you said that you were familiar with the work of Norbert Wiener at the point of writing the ‘Manifesto’ (Haraway, 2004: 324), but were Shannon and Weaver also key points of reference? And what of cybernetics more generally – is this a field which continues to influence your work? DH: Yes, Shannon and Weaver were there. I had read them and the Macy conferences were there more generally. My dissertation adviser was Evelyn Hutchinson (1903–91), who was a really wonderful man: a theoretical ecologist, mathematician, biologist, natural historian, studier of Italian medieval manuscripts – a polymath of his generation, English by origin (see Hutchinson, 1979). I fled to his lab from developmental biology and its molecular incarnations because all my cells were dying in the lab – partly! But mainly because I was intellectually unhappy and I finally had to get it that biology for me was a cultural-material practice. I needed to locate biology in its intersection with many other communities of practice, made up of entangled humans and others, living and not. Evelyn Hutchinson’s lab made that possible. In his lab we read things like Simone Weil, Shannon and Weaver, and Virginia Woolf – those were the ‘biology’ texts that we read as part of his lab group. It was not a biology lab group in the narrow sense. It was a ‘what’s interesting the world’ lab group. And a lot of people that came out of Evelyn’s lab – like Robert MacArthur (1930–72) – [were] really important biologists. MacArthur’s colleague-ship with E.O. Wilson on island biogeography (MacArthur and Wilson, 2001 [1967]) is really important. MacArthur was a major cybernetic theorist in animal behaviour and a fabulous ornithologist. 138 Theory, Culture & Society 23(7–8) Downloaded from tcs.sagepub.com at University of Waikato Library on June 8, 2014 Anyway, a lot of people came out of Evelyn’s lab deeply interested in various aspects of cybernetics, including me. But how could you not be interested in that stuff in those years? The quote you just read is not so much what I want to be the case but my sitting down and looking at what seemed to me to be an imperative that knowledge projects these days constitute their objects of attention in the Foucauldian sense – as discourse constitutes it own objects of attention. This is not a relativist position. This is not about things being merely constructed in a relative sense. This is about those objects that we non-optionally are. Our systems are probabilistic information entities. It is not that this is the only thing that we or anyone else is. It is not an exhaustive description but it is a non-optional constitution of objects, of knowledge in operation. It is not about having an implant, it is not about liking it. This is not some kind of blissed-out technobunny joy in information. It is a statement that we had better get it – this is a worlding operation. Never the only worlding operation going on, but one that we had better inhabit as more than a victim. We had better get it that domination is not the only thing going on here. We had better get it that this is a zone where we had better be the movers and the shakers, or we will be just victims. So inhabiting the cyborg is what this manifesto is about. The cyborg is a figuration but it is also an obligatory worlding – that inhabiting it you can’t not get it – that it’s a military project, a late capitalist project in deep collaboration with new forms of imperial war – McNamara’s electronic battlefield is of course a major parent of cyborg worlds – also the Bell telephone company. And much more than that – cyborgs open radical possibilities at the same time. This is like Bruno Latour, but I give more space to the critic in the basement than Bruno Latour. I have more sympathy with critical theory than Bruno does – much more. And I’m much more willing to live with indigestible intellectual and political heritages. I need to hold on to impossible heritages more than I suspect Bruno wants to. Our kinds of creativity take different directions but they’re allied. So yes, Shannon and Weaver are in there big time. Cybernetics is in there in various forms. Gregory Bateson is in there too, and through Bateson’s lineage the second/third order of cybernetic worlds that Katherine Hayles analyses (see Hayles, 1999). I’m sympathetic to certain kinds of cybernetic efforts to think through autopoiesis. Lynn Margulis is also in there with the whole Gaia hypothesis of the world, including her symbiogenesis stuff. I am nonetheless deeply resistant to systems theories of all kinds, including so-called third-order cybernetics and the autopoiesis and structural coupling approaches. I’m not really happy there, but I remember that there is much more than Norbert Wiener in cybernetics. NG: There seems to have been a general resurgence of interest in cybernetics as debates over the ‘posthuman’ have come to the fore (for example in Hayles, 1999). The subtitle of your 1992 essay ‘Ecce Homo, Ain’t (Ar’n’t) Gane & Haraway – Interview with Donna Haraway 139 Downloaded from tcs.sagepub.com at University of Waikato Library on June 8, 2014 I a Woman, and Inappropriate/d Others’ is ‘The Human in a Post-humanist Landscape’ (in Haraway, 2004: 47–61). What do you take this term ‘posthuman’ to mean? Is it a concept that you continue to find useful? DH: I’ve stopped using it. I did use it for a while, including in the ‘Manifesto’. I think it’s a bit impossible not to use it sometimes, but I’m trying not to use it. Kate Hayles writes this smart, wonderful book How We Became Posthuman. She locates herself in that book at the right interface – the place where people meet IT apparatuses, where worlds get reconstructed as information. I am in strong alliance with her insistence in that book, namely getting at the materialities of information. Not letting anyone think for a minute that this is immateriality rather than getting at its specific materialities. That I’m with, that sense of ‘how we became posthumanist’. Still, human/posthuman is much too easily appropriated by the blissed-out, ‘Let’s all be posthumanists and find our next teleological evolutionary stage in some kind of transhumanist technoenhancement.’ Posthumanism is too easily appropriated to those kinds of projects for my taste. Lots of people doing posthumanist thinking, though, don’t do it that way. The reason I go to companion species is to get away from posthumanism.

### 2AC – AT: Antiblackness K

#### Permutation do both – theorize through black data.

McGlotten 14 [Shaka McGlotten, 02-13-2014, “Black Data,” Traversing Technologies, <<Shaka is a social anthropologist & Professor of Media Studies at the State University of New York>>, [https://sfonline.barnard.edu/traversing-technologies/shaka-mcglotten-black-data/]\\pairie](https://sfonline.barnard.edu/traversing-technologies/shaka-mcglotten-black-data/%5d\\pairie)

Thurston’s work on race and technology provides a template for my talk today. Here I engage in a Black queer call and response with a few key areas in culture. I use an eclectic group of artifacts: Thurston’s slideshow, an interview with Barack Obama in the wake of the NSA surveillance scandal, the artwork of Zach Blas, and a music video about technology and gentrification. I do this to proffer the heuristic Black data. This heuristic, I suggest, offers some initial political and analytical traction for Black queer studies to more fully engage with the theories, effects, and affects of network cultures. And although there are some significant bodies of literature in science and technology studies, as well as cultural and media studies, that grapple with issues of race, there are only a handful of issues from Black queer studies itself that really address sexuality and new media head on.

So here I use Black data to think through some of the historical and contemporary ways that Black queer people, like other people of African descent and people of color more broadly, are hailed by big data, through which techniques of race and racism reduce our lives to mere numbers. We appear as commodities, revenue streams, statistical deviations, or vectors of risk. Big data also refers to the efforts of states and corporations to capture, predict, and control political and consumer behavior. In my reading, then, Black data is also a response to big data’s call. And I’m going to offer some readings that outline possible political and affective vectors—some ways to refuse the call or perhaps even to hang up.

Black queer lives are often reduced to forms of accounting that are variously intended to elicit alarm or to direct highly circumscribed forms of care. Statistics are typically used to mobilize people, for example, in the fight against HIV/AIDS—statistics like the fact that Blacks account for 44 percent of new HIV infections in the United States. Statistics are also used to direct attention to the omnipresence of violence in Black life or to the specific forms of violence that are directed against Black LGBTQ people, as in the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs 2012 report, which describes how LGBTQ people of color were nearly twice as likely to experience physical violence as their white counterparts and transgender people of color were two and a half times more likely to experience police violence than white cisgender survivors.

Assigning numerical or financial value to Black life, transforming experience into information or data, is nothing new. Rather, it is caught up with the history of enslavement and the racist regimes that sought to justify its barbarities. Between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries more than twelve and a half million Africans were transported to the New World. Two million, and likely many more, died during the Middle Passage alone. A typical slave ship could carry more than 300 slaves, arranged like sardines, and the sick and the dead would be thrown overboard, their loss claimed for insurance money.

Other more recent data circulates in the wake of the ongoing global recession, or the protest against George Zimmerman’s exoneration in the killing of seventeen-year-old Trayvon Martin. In this period, Black families saw their wealth drop 31 percent. This is just between 2007 and 2010 in the United States. And in 2012, 136 unarmed Black men were killed by police and security guards.

It is tempting, of course, to ascribe these racialized accountings to the cruel systems of value that are established by capitalism, which seeks to encode, to quantify, and to order life and matter into categories of commodity, labor, exchange value, and profit. Indeed, race itself functions as such a commodity in the era of genomic testing. A simple oral swab test can help you to answer Thurston’s question “How Black are you?,” and you can watch others’ reactions on the popular television show Faces of America, a show that’s about genealogical testing and people trying to find their racial or ethnic roots. But as Lisa Nakamura, Peter Chow-White, and Wendy Chun observe, race is not merely an effect of capitalism’s objectifying systems. Rather, race is itself a co-constituting technology that made such forms of accounting possible in the first place.

Race as technology, Chun notes, helps us to understand how race functions as the “as,” how it facilitates comparisons between entities that are classed as similar/dissimilar. As Mel Chen put it in their recent book Animacies, race is an animate hierarchy in which the liveliness and value of some things—say, whiteness, or smart technology—are established via proximity to other things that are positioned lower or further away—like Blackness, or dumb matter. This poster’s tweet, “Wow. Too many negroes in the trending topics for me,” simply reiterates in the realm of microblogging hierarchical techniques of racism that see Black people as polluting, and therefore as distasteful or dangerous, or that would deny information and technology to the subjects of discrimination.

Of course, all of the statistics that I have just gone through are probably familiar, at least to some of us. And while useful, they tell only very partial stories, and they tend to reduce Black life to a mere effect of capitalism or to a kind of numerology of bare life. So in what follows, I’m going to sketch a few different trajectories for what I’m calling Black data. I’ll enact Black data as a kind of informatics of Black queer life, as reading and throwing shade to grapple with the NSA surveillance scandal, new biometric technologies, and the tech-fueled gentrification of San Francisco. These readings, which are perhaps obviously also actings out, also help to illustrate the ways that Black queer theories, practices, and lives might be made to matter in relation to some of the organizing tensions of contemporary network cultures, privacy, surveillance, capture, and exclusion.

Black queers help to frame what is at stake in these debates insofar as we quite literally embody struggles between surveillance and capture, between the seen and unseen, between the visible and invisible. Moreover, queers of color and people of color more broadly have developed what others have called rogue epistemologies, which often themselves rely on an array of technological media which might help to make us present or to disappear. In the readings that follow, I also gesture towards the virtual infinities that Black queer theoretical or political projects might share with cryptographic and anarchistic activism.