Book reviews: *Interface*, *9*(2)

Review editors: Dawn Paley & Bjarke Skærlund Risager

Books reviewed in this issue:

Donna Haraway, 2016, *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham and London: Duke University Press (296 pp., paperback, $26.95)

Review author: Carolyn Elerding

Chris Robé, 2017, *Breaking the Spell: A History of Anarchist Filmmakers, Videotape Guerrillas, and Digital Ninjas*. Oakland, CA: PM Press (468 pp., paperback, $26.95)

Review author: Beth Geglia

Sharpe, Christina, 2016, *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Duke: Duke University Press (192 pp., paperback, $22.95)

Review Author: Shannon Walsh

Robbie Shilliam, 2015, *The Black Pacific: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Oceanic Connections*. London: Bloomsbury (251 pages; $21.99)

Review Author: Lewis B.H. Eliot

Ingeborg Gaarde, 2017, *Peasants Negotiating a Global Policy Space: La Via Campesina in the Committee on World Food Security*. Oxon: Routledge (212 pp., hardcover, £85)

Review Author: Maria Vasile

Wesley Lowery, 2017, *They Can't Kill Us All: The Story of Black Lives Matter*. London: Penguin Books (248 pp; £9.99).

Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, 2016, *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation*. Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books (270 pp; $17.95).

Christopher J. Lebron, 2017, *The Making of Black Lives Matter: A Brief History of an Idea*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press (187 pp; $27.95).

Review Author: Andrew Kettler

Jodi Dean, 2016, *Crowds and Party.* London & New York, NY: Verso (276 pp., hardcover, $26.95/£16.99).

Donatella della Porta, Joseba Fernández, Hara Kouki & Lorenzo Mosca, 2017, *Movement Parties Against Austerity.* Cambridge & Malden, MA: Polity (237 pp., hardcover, $70.31/£55).

Richard Seymour, 2016, *Corbyn: the Strange Rebirth of Radical Politics.* London: Verso (248 pp., paperback, £12.99).

Review Author: Andy Mathers

Dylan Taylor, 2017, *Social Movements and Democracy in the 21st century.* Cham (Switzerland): Palgrave (xi+290 pp; £66.99)

Review Author: Laurence Cox

Harald Bauder, 2017, *Migration Borders Freedom.* London: Routledge (135 pp., hardcover, $145; softcover £36.99/ $49.95)

Review Author: Sutapa Chattopadhyay

Nandini Sundar, 2016, *The Burning Forest: India's war on Bastar.* New Delhi, Juggernaut (413 pp., hardcover, $31.68)

Review Author: Sutapa Chattopadhyay

Kristian Lasslett (2014), *State Crime on the Margins of Empire: Rio Tinto, the War on Bougainville and Resistance to Mining*, London, Pluto Press (220 pp. + Bibliography and Index. $40.00)

Review Author: Alexander Dunlap

Adam Greenfield, 2017, *Radical Technologies: The Design of Everyday Life.* London: Verso. (368 pp., £18.99).

Review author: Harry Warne

Book review: Donna J. Haraway, *Staying with the Trouble*

Review author: Carolyn Elerding

Donna Haraway, 2016, *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham and London: Duke University Press (296 pp., paperback, $26.95)

Leftists situated by social disadvantages have had many occasions to critique oppression sustained in the name of militancy, solidarity, or justice. Nevertheless, what Donna Haraway describes as "staying with the trouble" remains a far better strategy for radical change than giving up on one another. Nowhere is this difficulty better exemplified than by the aggressive disapprobation from former allies that Donna Haraway has endured with impressive magnanimity since publishing her famous "cyborg manifesto" in the mid-1980s (Haraway 1985). I will refrain from commenting on other reviews, even their strengths, such as the detailed accounts of the manifesto's reception history many of them contain. Despite shrill opposition and the often challenging and idiosyncratic style of her writing, Haraway has continued to build an enthusiastic international readership.

As a graduate student, I began teaching science and technology studies (STS) and wrote an interdisciplinary dissertation about the materiality of digital media, technology, and culture. I soon discovered a strong resonance between Haraway's understanding of "material semiotics" and the ecumenical materialism I had begun to develop through comparative readings of theorists such as Theodor W. Adorno, Walter Benjamin, and Marxist and materialist feminists. It was my interest in intersectional feminist research on digital culture, such as Lisa Nakamura's, that first guided me toward the queer and feminist new materialists with whom Haraway is frequently categorized. Similarly, through my participation in FemTechNet, an international cyberfeminist network of instructors interested in critical pedagogy, art, and STS, I learned of the impact of Haraway's ideas in queer and feminist theory and practice across disciplines and movements. Another reason for my interest in Haraway is that, while many of her detractors invoke ultimatums, Haraway has never stopped including anti-capitalist argumentation, as well as references to Marx and Marxists, in her analyses. In other words, rather than draw lines in the sand, Haraway weaves webs (to indulge in a bit of respectful imitation of Haraway's adeptness with metaphor).

Staying with the Trouble, Haraway's most recent book, is best known for its contribution to debates surrounding the term "Anthropocene." However, the book's significance to the current era's interlocking "urgencies," to borrow Haraway's characteristically precise term, is far more extensive (p. 37). These urgencies include racism, global inequality, patriarchy, cis- and heteronormativity, and damage to the biosphere, as well as the capitalist

socioeconomic system that incentivizes all of the above. Providing a plenitude of intriguing and unforgettable examples, Haraway envisions staying with the trouble as nothing less than a comprehensive materialist theory and praxis for a multi-generational, multi-species, and global project of "ongoingness."

If potential connections with feminist traditions engaging social reproduction seem obvious, it should also be clear that Haraway's engagements with these currents constitute a queering and diversification of the meanings of reproducing society. At times, with Haraway's irreverent playfulness and refusal to sacrifice inquisitiveness and creativity to organizational or disciplinary belonging, she seems to dare readers to read less than generously. See, for instance recent claims that *Staying with the Trouble* implies a eugenics agenda when it raises the question of population control—this despite Haraway's prescient care in addressing these critiques (pp. 208-10). Haraway emphasizes that non-reproduction must remain a choice and primarily the responsibility of the privileged rather than the marginalized.

Haraway's sense of the temporality and spatiality of struggle facilitates her capacious generosity toward difference and disagreement, resulting in a politics of critical inclusion rather than antagonistic exclusion, a broadening rather than narrowing—but without losing the incisive emphasis on localized specificity as a basis for action (p. 131). In keeping with numerous currents in materialist and intersectional feminisms (some of them inspired by her own earlier works), Haraway has always and continues to insist upon situated foci and includes numerous case studies.

Haraway underscores the power of storytelling and other creative arts as ways of knowing and changing the world. Troping on Marilyn Strathern's words (*Reproducing the Future*, 10), Haraway writes: "It matters what thoughts think thoughts. It matters what knowledges know knowledges. It matters what relations relate relations. It matters what stories tell stories" (p. 35). Inspired by Ursula K. Le Guin's "carrier bag" theory of politicized storytelling (pp. 120-22), Haraway links her many ideas into a single flexible network: "SF: science fiction, speculative fabulation, string figures, speculative feminism, science fact, so far" (p. 2). Each iteration of SF presents a form of "becoming-with" by means of "rendering one another capable" through thinking and making (p. 96). On this basis, Haraway elaborates a mindful politics of learning to think and do in new ways and across species as well as cultural differences (pp. 12-14). Those seeking a formula, however, will be disappointed, since overall what Haraway formulates is an approach to formulating an approach.

Haraway's exceptional ability to master and connect numerous fields and disciplines aptly mirrors the interrelatedness and complexity of current challenges to the flourishing of life. However, this quality in Haraway's work also presents a great difficulty, even for well-prepared and highly motivated readers. Haraway's interdisciplinary acumen and ability to think in so many different ways reflect her extraordinary path through the North American academic system. Yet, also for these reasons, *Staying with the Trouble* contains something for nearly every reader. Deploying a variety of media and styles in

multiple registers, the book speaks to long-term activists and theorists, the newly politicized, and those returning to activism, as well as to Haraway's dedicated readership and those new to her notoriously challenging prose.

Haraway illustrates her conceptualization of material semiotics with numerous examples, including works of visual art, as well as a new development in Haraway's writing, her own science fiction storytelling (so as not to ruin the effect of "The Camille Stories," I will avoid sharing particulars). Both new and experienced readers of Haraway should consider starting with the final chapter, "The Camille Stories: Children of Compost." I recommend beginning at the bottom of Page 143 where Haraway's science fiction story starts, rather than with the opening sections of the chapter in which she details the project's provenance. For newcomers, the more theoretical overview of the major ideas presented in the Introduction will prove much more amenable with the science fiction story in mind. For others, engaging with Haraway's literary experiment will illuminate the significant expansions contained in this book relative to previous publications.

Readers interested in Haraway primarily as a theorist of epistemology (ways of thinking, learning, and knowing) may wish to turn first to the short essay "Making Kin: Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene," as it prismatically engages each major theoretical point in the book. "Tentacular Thinking: Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Chthulucene" and "Sympoiesis: Symbiogenesis and the Lively Arts of Staying with the Trouble" would also make effective starting points for epistemologists. These two sizeable chapters of previously unpublished theoretical material explore examples and potentialities of SF through an epistemological strategy Haraway describes as "tentacular thinking," closely related to the biological process of "becoming-with" or "symbiogenesis." Haraway also uses the term "sympoiesis" for its more cultural implications. However, her refusal to divide natureculture and the phrase "material semiotics" demonstrates the limited usefulness in her work of drawing too fine a distinction between the biological and the cultural. More importantly, it suggests the interpretive power of recognizing their mutual imbrication. In the interest of this epistemological politics, Haraway delineates her case for replacing, or at least augmenting, the controversial but now ubiquitous term "Anthropocene" with "Chthulucene": "To renew the biodiverse powers of terra is the sympoietic work and play of the Chthulucene. Specifically, unlike either the Anthropocene or the Capitalocene, the Chthulucene is made up of ongoing multispecies stories and practices of becoming-with in times that remain at stake, in precarious times in which the world is not finished and the sky has not fallen—yet" (p. 55). It is difficult, not to mention unsatisfying, to redact Haraway's phraseology.

To even the most skeptical, *Staying with the Trouble* will at least provide opportunities for valuable thought experiments, and for many it offers much more.

References

Haraway, Donna. 1985. "A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s." *Socialist Review* 80: 65-108.

Strathern, Marilyn. 1992. *Reproducing the Future*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

About the review author

Carolyn Elerding is a recent PhD teaching on culture, media, and technology in the NYC area. A recipient of the Sprinker essay prize, Elerding's research and criticism is published in journals including *Postmodern Culture, Mediations, Reviews in Cultural Theory*, and soon, *Communication, Culture & Critique* and *First Monday*. Elerdinc AT tcnj.edu

Book review: Chris Robé, *Breaking the Spell: A History of Anarchist Filmmakers, Videotape Guerrillas, and Digital Ninjas*
Review author: Beth Geglia

Chris Robé, 2017, *Breaking the Spell: A History of Anarchist Filmmakers, Videotape Guerrillas, and Digital Ninjas*. Oakland, CA: PM Press (468 pp., paperback, $26.95)

I read most of Robé's *Breaking the Spell: A History of Anarchist Filmmakers, Videotape Guerrillas, and Digital Ninjas* on a couch in a DC WeWork. A friend of mine had a membership and routinely gave me access to the shared workspace, a place where young freelancers, consultants, startups, and NGO workers estranged from office spaces encounter some semblance of community by working silently next to one another and enjoying the occasional free happy hour, networking event, or music show. As I read, the walls around me displayed multicolored motivational posters, one with the word "HUSTLE", another lining the wall across from me with the words "You are good, do better."

I mention the WeWork space because it is but one of many manifestations of a decollectivized, neoliberal work world, in which filmmakers, media strategists, and digital campaigners currently partake. In this neoliberal era where media work has joined the contours of the increasingly atomized "gig economy" (De Stefano 2015), and of an NGO-ized civil society resting evermore on contingent labor and self-branding, Robé calls on us to explore a history of alternative, anarchist-inflected media organizing strategies. *Breaking the Spell*, however, is as much a history of such media movements as it is a theoretical reflection on the changing nature of work, deindustrialization, neoliberalism, and the emergence of "new anarchism" (pp. 6).

The book begins by establishing the important role that media production takes in a neoliberal context. As capitalism seeks out new frontiers of accumulation, it increasingly encroaches on every aspect of life, even subjectivity itself. Thus, Robé approaches neoliberalism not as a set of pro-market policies but, at its core, as a remaking of the "self" under a capitalist vision. It is here where media activism, when done effectively, can deconstruct the neoliberal subjectivity imposed by corporate and mainstream media.

Breaking the Spell maps media activism onto the history of neoliberal transformation 1960s-present, including that of labor relations and the nature of work. This mapping is congruent with Robé's argument that media production is itself labor, and therefore it can either mirror the dominant social relations of production of the time or resist them. Robé essentially *defetishizes* the film, TV, and multimedia works he analyses by interrogating the race, class, gender, and power hierarchies embedded in the organization of their inception, production, distribution, and consumption. When viewed as a holistic process, we see that new subject formation takes place not just as the point of consumption (viewing), but that collective subjectivities can be fostered through every stage of the process. Taking a nuanced look at the various ideological sub-currents of anarchist-inflected social movements, Robé points to grey areas in which neoliberal ideology and new anarchism have dangerously overlapped. Thus he stresses the importance of critical socio-historical analysis of such anarchist practices in order to avoid the reproduction of neoliberal subjectivities.

Breaking the Spell begins in the 1960s with Third Cinema, an "anticolonial politicized approach to filmmaking" (pp. 16) that emerged internationally in the 1960s and has since inspired generations of activist filmmakers. In Third Cinema, film was used to critique oppressive structures while converting the spectator audience into an agentive collective with newfound consciousness. Robé discusses Patricio Guzman's *The Battle of Chile* as foundational to the genre, as well as to Chile's collective memory, class consciousness, and historical grappling post Pinochet dictatorship. He then moves to Detroit to tell the story of the making of *Finally Got the News* (FGtN) by the League of Revolutionary Black Workers. A fraught process between white activist filmmakers and black auto worker unionists complicates our understanding of Third Cinema, as Robé uses the example of FGtN to tease out the politics of participation, voice, and representation both in the movements surrounding these documentaries and the documentaries themselves.

The book proceeds chronologically to examine influential anarchist-influenced media projects through a similarly critical lens. Robé traces the rise of "video guerrillas" who attempted to use low powered television to claim an alternative space within cable TV. He focuses on the groups Videofreex and Top Value Television (TVTV) to look at the anarchist-leaning decision making structures that coexisted with the appropriation of new technology, as well as the factors that influenced TVTV's gradual absorption into commercial broadcast television. Robé then moves to the environmental and alter-globalization movement of the 1990s/ 2000s. He links the rise of the internet as a platform for new decentralized media hubs with the systematic dismantling of alternative video in the 1980s, which stemmed from the Reagan administration's defunding of public TV and the subsequent privatization and commodification of

communication. He compares eco-video activists in the Pacific Northwest with Indymedia to look at how both groups used open-access websites to foster solidarity, while perhaps overvaluing the individual at the expense of collective process and collaboration.

Particularly interesting is Robé's chapter on ACT UP titled "Testing the Limits," which explores the radical anti-AIDS campaigns of the 1980's. Here, Robé shows how the combination of spectacle-based media and direct action as a protest tactic helped move the private domain, the body (and illness), to the social domain. Access to healthcare and state neglect became questions of life and death. By deploying their own media, anti-AIDS activists were able to effectively puncture mainstream coverage of the epidemic and highlight homophobia and racism as central to the inequalities in care. Meanwhile, the embodied use of direct action tactics challenged the media's portrayal of HIV-inflicted bodies as sick, degenerate, and helpless. As Robé puts it:

> If we accept Autonomous Marxism's belief that subjectivity itself became a key terrain of struggle as capitalism increasingly infringed upon it, AIDS video activism dramatically highlights the centrality of where bodies converge with the means of communication over such fights (pp. 123).

In this discussion, Robé is able to celebrate the merits of spectacle-based media and consensus-based direct action while balancing this with a critique of "image events" that continues on through the rest of his case studies. Later, Robé laments how the low-resourced, rapid production of movement material risked feeding into a "riot porn" genre that fetishized confrontational tactics and rendered long-term organizing invisible. Ultimately this material energized only the left and failed to provide a counter-narrative to the broader public. As an alternative to that tendency toward self-satisfying, insular media, Robé discusses SmartMeme and a broader shift towards the production of viral internet content for mass consumption, although he ultimately criticizes such tactics for their "new age feel" (pp. 285), repurposing of corporate marketing tools, and lack of historical material analysis.

Another recurring tension identified in *Breaking the Spell* is the use of horizontal structures and unpaid labor in the production of film. While rooted in anti-capitalist ideology, Robé admits that when these occurred, they often reproduced the privileges and hierarchies of access to participation from the outside world. For example, those with the means to engage in time consuming and unpaid media production were often white males. While groups often saw the use of unpaid labor as either a material necessity or a rejection of the non-profit industrial complex (reliance on grant funding), and the alienation of wage labor, Robé argues that such practices overlap with neoliberal trends toward increasingly unpaid work. He highlights how later models, such as Canada's Media Co-op (MC) sought to remedy this dynamic by adopting an "own your media" mantra in which consumers became stakeholders in their own alternative media and collectively sustained its production by hiring paid staff. However, the inability of the MC to provide fair and adequate compensation for its contributors ultimately contributed to its near-collapse.

Robé closes *Breaking the Spell* by highlighting the work of a series of contemporary media collectives, including Philadelphia's network-based Media Mobilizing Project (MMP); Mobile Voices (VozMob) a mobile phone app developed for and with day laborers in Los Angeles; Outta Your Backpack Media, an Indigenous youth-led media organization in Arizona, and other groups that maintain a strong focus on skill-sharing and working-class capacity building. While not perfect, these groups provide examples where participation and access took precedent and were more effectively distributed across racial and economic lines.

In *Breaking the Spell*, Robé provides a unique contribution to both social movement history and media studies by combining detailed analysis of the audio-visual material itself with an ethnographic analysis of those who made it. The case studies at times seem disjointed, and the reader could benefit from a stronger theoretical thread connecting them throughout. It is not until the final chapter, in discussing a more individualized media agent, the "video ninja" does Robé re-enter into a discussion of the merits and shortcomings of various strains of anarchist politics.

Nonetheless, *Breaking the Spell* re-groups at the end to draw important conclusions to be considered by the world's future media makers. First, he argues that we must interrogate the limitations of anarchist-inflected practices in achieving media production by and for marginalized and oppressed groups. Such organizing models fail to recognize the "significant amount of cultural, political, and economic capital required to engage in… consensus decision-making and aggressive direct action protests" (pp. 406). Likewise, more "lifestyle activism" forms of anarchist practices might feel exclusionary to the communities being targeted for outreach, and women are often disenfranchised (work becomes gendered) when such spaces lack a feminist analysis.

Second, Robé concludes that media activists must study past movements to weigh the importance of aesthetics versus content. He warns against a glorification of commercialized aesthetics, noting that these do not necessarily translate into mass distribution and are less easily produced by lower-resourced communities. Instead, activists should not discount or undervalue media as an *internal* tool for movement education and networking. When we allow media to act as a central nervous system to our movements, it can foster solidarity, coalition-building, mutual support, and collective consciousness. Finally, Robé stresses the importance of process in media making over that of quality of output. As case studies have shown throughout, the process of organizing labor and resources around media production is itself a site of counter-hegemonic struggle, of individual and community empowerment, and of forging new subjectivities.

Perhaps missing from the end of Robé's long foray into the history of anarchist-inflected filmmaking as a counter power to neoliberalism is further discussion of new media movements' reliance on social media sites for distribution. While touched upon in his discussion of Occupy's shortcomings, Robé neglects an important point that he himself makes early on, and that is central to our understanding of neoliberal media consolidation. Beyond a simple concentration of mainstream media in few private hands, Robé notes that the proliferation of social media marks a transformative moment in the relationship between media and capitalism. He states:

> Capital's harnessing of profitability from subjectivity itself can be no better exemplified than by the rise of social media, where users become both content producers and consumers. Corporate entities provide platforms where users dedicate untold numbers of hours producing and consuming content, distributing information, and willfully disclosing critical personal information to third-party providers. Leisure and work conflate as production and consumption radically converge..." (pp. 10)

We are left to ask how alternatively-produced media can be distributed and consumed outside of platforms that generate massive corporate profits and capture surplus value from the work of media activists.

Breaking the Spell provides an expansive and detailed history of media activism bound to interest and inspire anyone engaged in movement media today. This history demonstrates the rich diversity of tactics employed by collectives to respond to and organize against the particular political, economic, ideological, and technological configurations of the time. His work is not meant to provide definitive answers as to which strategies worked and which did not, nor propose a one-size fits all solution, but instead to interrogate each method, each form of organizing, against the backdrop of larger movement dynamics; gender, race, and class hierarchies; and capitalist modes of production. Beyond the quest for media strategies that are simply politically effective, Robé challenges movements to ask ourselves: how are we organizing media in line with anti-neoliberal praxis? Ultimately, *Breaking the Spell* provides contemporary media warriors with tools to more deeply interrogate our current work.

References

Robé, Chris 2017. *Breaking the Spell: A History of Anarchist Filmmakers, Videotape Guerrillas, and Digital Ninjas*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

De Stefano V., "The Rise of the 'Just-in-Time Workforce': On-Demand Work, Crowd Work, and Labour Protection in the 'Gig-Economy'" *Comparative Labor and Law Policy Journal*, Forthcoming; Bocconi Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2682602.

About the review author

Beth Geglia is a filmmaker and a PhD candidate in anthropology at American University, where she researches new corporate enclaves in Honduras and incorporates documentary film into both research and activism. Prior, she studied documentary film at Duke University's Center for Documentary Studies. She is co-director of the feature length film *Revolutionary Medicine: A Story of the First Garifuna Hospital*, and has produced short films with grassroots groups in the U.S. and Central America. bgeglia AT gmail.com

Book review: Christina Sharpe, *In the Wake*
Review author: Shannon Walsh

Sharpe, Christina, 2016, *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Duke: Duke University Press (192 pp., paperback, $22.95)

It took me some time to write about this book. What words can I use to explain it, to comment on it? The effect (and affect) of its reading was such that it left me wanting to reinvent language, to find a new way to speak and to write. It forced me to see the language we have as inadequate, partial, always already corrupted. The poetry that Christina Sharpe brings to this work is not a formalist consideration, a writer's flourish. It is a necessity. A way to describe something that sits outside the way the world we share is expressed, but that has not been truly addressed. In her experimentation she attempts to describe what has been omitted, cast out, negated.

Her journey in the book begins in pain. Sharpe minces no words and does not attempt to hide the personal place that *In the Wake* emerges from. But the personal is used as a facet through which to view the structures of violence and antiblackness that describe Black life in America. She begins the book with stories of a series of deaths of people close to her, and their reverberations in her family and herself. These stories anchor what is to follow, keeping the reader tethered to the very real stakes for Black people in America. The stories remind and insist that theorizing is an urgent task, a way to make sense through the maze that so often tells Black people to move on, get over it, give up. Sharpe forcefully makes a case for why we, all of us, are still in the wake of slavery. Being in the *wake* for Black people, within a time of ongoing antiblackness, is being in the present. "In the wake, the past that is not past reappears, always, to rupture the present" (9).

Sharpe plays with words, turns them over like shards of glass, like the fragments in *Hanging Fire (suspected Arson)*, the Cornelia Parker image that adorns the cover of the book. Parker's image is an explosion of what looks like burned fragments, a disintegration, held together by wires in suspension. A still life of something alive and yet immobile, held, stuck. Similarly, Sharpe's language is a continual dissembling, a falling apart and reconstructing. "A mother slaps a child; the guards yell, hit, and pull; language falls apart" (69).

How to write in the wake of everyday violence, of a history of slavery, of things that do not disappear, even if we will them to, if we want them to? We are surrounded by ongoing antiblackness; it is as foundational as the air we breathe. Antiblackness is as alive as ever, and Sharpe makes a stunningly strong argument for why we are in the wake of the slave ship, still in the hold. Antiblackness is the weather. It is the hurricane. It is the flood.

Sharpe ties together past and present, doubling, revealing and re-imaging the

past into the present. We are there in 2013 on the boat with refugees, in 2010 on the streets with Eric Garner as he gasps, "I can't breathe." Moments colliding. Time's arrow, from the past to the present, all lived at once, overlapped and superimposed. What others have called the fungibility of Black life, Sharpe calls its "killability" (35). She writes of the *Zong*, a slave ship full of abducted Africans on its way to Jamaica, where black bodies were thrown overboard in a sick economics which could claim them as 'goods' for insurance, a sacrifice deemed acceptable for the insurance payouts it would make. Objects outside the realm of the so-called Human. Sharpe insists, echoing Black Lives Matter activists, that these lives be seen, heard, acknowledged. That we say their names. Then, as now. Sandra Bland. Trayvon Martin. Michael Brown. Philando Castile. And on, and on and on.

In the Wake is also a jazz ballad of references to contemporary Black intellectuals, building, playing, singing, vibrating against the work of Frank Wilderson III, Hortense Spillers, Fred Moten, Joy James, Saidiya Hartman. Dialogues, conversations almost, with these thinkers vibrate through the pages. Sharpe rejoins scholars who attempt to disentangle antiblackness and "our abjection from the realm of the human" by looking "at current quotidian disasters in order to ask what, if anything, survives this insistent Black exclusion, this ontological negation, and how do literature, performance, and visual culture observe and mediate this un/survival" (14).

The wake is the afterlife of slavery, it is what is left behind in the cumulative deaths of Black people, it is the wake of being awake, of being aware, a state of wakefulness; it is life in the wake of disaster and the mess created by racialized poverty and precarity; attending to wake as vigil, of watching over the dead. Sharpe suggests "...rather than seeking a resolution to blackness's ongoing and irresolvable abjection, one might approach Black being in the wake as a form of *consciousness*" (14).

In the Wake demands to be read by those interested in ways to understand ongoing racial inequality and antiblackness that permeates the world we live it. It demands of us to look again, awake, with fresh eyes, and to sit (in wake) with the discomfort of a world that is still in the wake of slavery and antiblackness.

About the review author

Dr. Shannon Walsh is a filmmaker and theorist who has written and directed three feature documentary films, which have screened in cinemas, museums, and over 60 film festivals around the world. Walsh is an assistant professor in the Department of Theatre and Film at UBC. Contact email shannon.walsh AT ubc.ca

Book Review: Robbie Shilliam, *The Black Pacific*
Review Author: Lewis B.H. Eliot

Robbie Shilliam, 2015, *The Black Pacific: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Oceanic Connections*. London: Bloomsbury (251 pages; $21.99)

In *The Black Pacific,* Robbie Shilliam offers a thought provoking examination of relationships between previously colonized peoples in the former British Empire. Shilliam uses an ethnographic description of a 1979 Te Hãpua (ceremonial Māori greeting) performed for a London-based Rastafari band and theater troupe when on tour in New Zealand as a point of departure for his analysis. From here, Shilliam poses two principle questions: How does a meeting between formerly colonized, yet otherwise completely unconnected, groups resonate with the two parties? And why are such rituals so rarely engaged with, both academically and among the broader public?

In approaching these questions, Shilliam presents four aims for *The Black Pacific*. He first explores the possibilities of analyzing connections and solidarity between colonized groups beyond the paradigms formed by the colonizers themselves. Second, Shilliam seeks to place Africa and Africans further towards the center of anti-colonial struggle globally. His third aim is to underline the fact that all European colonization was based on "super-exploitation" of local labor forces specifically for white mercantile gain. Finally, the author argues that the colonial oppressed are bound by a "deep relationship" not associated with geographical distinction, race, or "sociological hue" (pg. 2).

Although one of Shilliam's goals is to increase engagement with post-colonial studies among the non-academic community, he does make two historiographical points central to his thesis. He takes aim at subalternism for being both insufficiently specific and for collapsing itself into post-structuralism in a way that avoids understanding global democratization as the contemporary guise of white power. Then, as the title suggests, Shilliam pushes against Paul Gilroy's *Black Atlantic* thesis for silencing Africans in Africa. Indeed, Shilliam argues that anti-colonial struggles actively referenced Africa "as part of a global infrastructure of anti-colonial connectivity" (pg. 10).

For the most part *The Black Pacific* is structured chronologically. The bulk of the analysis is focused on New Zealand (referred to throughout by its Māori name Aotearoa) and examines the impact on native peoples of cultural discourse emanating from Africa and those of African descent throughout the world. The book's first chapter focuses on how to relate narratives that link disparate colonial peoples outside the structures of the imperial machine, a process Shilliam refers to as the creation of 'deep relationship' – connections beyond "the cause-and-effect laws of manifest domain" (pg. 15).

Chapters two and three focus on cultural politics. The second chapter concentrates on Māori youth adopting Black Power rhetoric in the struggle for native recognition in the region. This is an important development as it not only underlines the deep relationship between two colonized peoples, but also because it publicly decimated the assumption that Aotearoa was exceptional among settler societies in its "enjoyment of racial

harmony" (pg. 36). The third chapter examines the permeation of the hardline racial ideology inspired by Black Power beyond the Māori to other Pacifika groups – immigrants to Aotearoa from throughout the Pacific – and into national political discourse. Here Shilliam points to the South African national rugby team's 1981 tour to Aotearoa. The South African team – known universally as the Springboks – was, as per apartheid laws, white only. Much debate in Aotearoa at the time centered on whether the rights of non-white South Africans were at all comparable to those of Pacifika peoples. The public airing of this debate finally ended any narrative of New Zealander exceptionalism among former British colonies.

The next three chapters examine the role of colonial religion in the context of deep relationship among colonized groups in the British Empire. Chapter four explores the role of the Christian church in black liberation theology. While, by Shilliam's definition, subaltern, he does note that Pacifika churches proved as willing to engage with Black Power rhetoric as their congregations and lay activist groups. Chapter five delves deeper into the connections between non-European churches and native religious beliefs through close analysis of theological imagery and iconography. Shilliam points to the importance of shared ancestral connections as a corollary for blackness when engaging with the African diaspora. The sixth chapter makes these connections still more explicit by thoroughly analyzing indigenous Aotearoan relationship with Rastafari. Shilliam makes reference to the generational aspect of these deep relationships – those that supported Black Power in Aotearoa in the 1960s and 1970s disapproved of Rastafari's close relationship with reggae music and ganja smoking. Much of Rastafari's appeal lay in its ideology of colonial restitution, an important subject among Pacifika peoples.

The following chapters of *The Black Pacific* focus on the role of native religion in the generation of deep relationships across colonized groups. The seventh chapter discusses creolization, in particular the marriage of Christian and Māori traditions of prophecy. Shilliam argues that the domination of Māori prophetic tradition over its Christian counterpart created an "anti-colonial connectivity that has been retrieved from the spiritual hinterlands" (pg. 147). Chapter eight examines inter-religious connections, this time between Māori and Rastafari spiritual traditions. It is here that Shilliam makes his most explicit conclusions regarding the realities of deep relationship. The author argues that both religious traditions represent a distinct rejection of colonial authority and therefore warrant combined analysis as specific anti-colonial ideologies as well as religions in their own right independent of politics.

The Black Pacific's final chapter, where Shilliam's writing is certainly the most passionate, represents a stinging rebuke to "colonial science" (pg. 172). This refers to the knowledge gathering practices of European colonizers throughout the world, approaches to knowledge that were ultimately utilitarian and so often downplayed or completely ignored many aspects of colonized cultures and societies, instead focussing on the ways in which colonizers could best benefit imperial interests. Shilliam argues that colonial science – which only attentive to "endless accumulation" of knowledge without thought to connections between disparate information – ignores the significant Pacific slave trade that operated between Oceania and Africa (pg. 174-6). The relative silence in the academic canon concerning this trade, known as blackbirding, is, as Shilliam concludes, a significant justification a wholesale rejection of colonial scientific

practices, including subaltern approaches to analysis, in favor of newer methodologies including the highlighting of deep relationships.

Of the four contributions that *The Black Pacific* aims to make to post-colonial literature, three are certainly achieved. Shilliam has done a sterling job of presenting the details of Māori struggles for recognition in the second half of the twentieth century, extended the accepted boundaries for the African Diaspora well into the Pacific World, and made still clearer the reality that European imperialism was, at its core, a racist exercise. Shilliam calls for the academy to work harder to identify anti-imperial connectivity among colonized communities, specifically by rejecting the "privileged narcissism" of universities' ivory towers. Unfortunately, it is here that Shilliam's work is at its weakest. While an academic audience may have no trouble reading and understanding this book, for a lay audience the jargon is too heavy, and many of the themes would require a widely read audience to fully appreciate them. Those who are familiar with the works of Georges-Louis LeClerc or Carl Linnaeus, would find Shilliam's issues with colonial science accessible and poignant. Non-academic readers, however, may find *The Black Pacific* hard-going. This is not to say that those without advanced academic training should shy away. The arguments made here make Shilliam worth reading despite this potential difficulty.

In an otherwise fascinating book, one concern stands out, this one regarding methodology. Much of the analysis in *The Black Pacific* concerns connections between Black Power ideology, Rastafari spiritualism, and the Māori rights movement. Irrespective of any commonality of experience, it is common language – English – that facilitates initial contact so that they can share those familiarities. Given that English is the language of the oppressor, the connections here are surely subaltern and this therefore somewhat weakens Shilliam's advocacy for modes of analysis that eschew any connection between imperial powers and colonized communities.

These are, however, minor concerns in an otherwise beautifully written, acerbic, and important post-colonial analysis that raises many pertinent issues regarding the post-imperial legacies of formerly colonized communities. That such groups continue to feel and resist the painful effects of domination by Europeans and those of European descent makes Shilliam's work an important study for most scholars of the humanities. Sociologists and anthropologists will appreciate the maverick theoretical paradigms in which he works, as well as his use of ethnographic and observational sources. Historians will be interested in the author's rejection of subalternism and thereby offer up fresh pathways into the historical analysis of colonized groups.

About the review author

Lewis B.H. Eliot is a PhD Candidate in History and Presidential Fellow at the University of South Carolina. He received a BA in History and Ethnomusicology from the School of Oriental African Studies (2012) and an MA in Modern History from Queen's University, Belfast (2013). His research focuses on the impact of anti-slavery rhetoric on those of African descent in the Atlantic World in the nineteenth-century. leliot AT email.sc.edu

Book review: Ingeborg Gaarde,
Peasants negotiating a global policy space
Review author: Maria Vasile

Ingeborg Gaarde, 2017, *Peasants negotiating a global policy space -
La Via Campesina in the Committee on World Food Security*. Oxon:
Routledge (212 pp., hardcover, £85)

Since the post-war era, food production, distribution and access have become
transborder matters and food governance takes place across local, national, regional
and global levels (Margulis and Duncan 2015). At global level, a multitude of
institutions, actors, norms and power relations emerged and are shaping decision-
making on agriculture and food matters. In this context, rural social movements
(together with other non-state actors) are increasingly participating to international
policy consultations and negotiations, putting forward rural people's knowledge and
opinions on global political arenas (Duncan 2015). Many of these movements call for
a shift away from neoliberal globalisation, a change in agriculture and food policies
and advocating for alternative values and practices to transform the dominant
agricultural model.

*Peasants negotiating a global policy space - La Via Campesina in the Committee on
World Food Security* by Ingeborg Gaarde is an important contribution to research
exploring how social movements launch into different levels of activism, engaging in
global politics, while continuing to partake in local and national struggles. By looking
at the international peasant movement *La Vía Campesina*, the author challenges
dominant theories of social movement institutionalisation, predicting that social
movements' access to institutions and internationalisation results in processes of
centralisation, bureaucratisation, de-radicalisation and cooptation (e.g. Tarrow 1998;
Tilly 2004).

More particularly, Gaarde analyses how *La Vía Campesina* creates a space for small-
scale producers and other rural people to participate in UN global policy-making
processes related to food and nutrition security, namely the 2009 reformed
Committee on World Food Security (CFS). By analysing how the members of *La Vía
Campesina* organise their participation in practice, she argues that the movement
managed to develop complementary local-global strategies, and that
internationalisation allowed for greater consolidation both in terms of cross-border
alliances and internal linkages.

The reform of the CFS is of historic significance for the direct participation of
producers and other rural people constituencies in transnational food and
agriculture governance (Brem-Wilson 2015). It allowed civil society to engage in the
Committee as official participants (and no longer as observers) and established a
body facilitating the consultation and participation of global civil society, the
International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism (CSM). *La Vía
Campesina* played a key role in the design of the CSM and its methodologies,

contributing to build a diverse, autonomous and self-organised arena. The CSM is described as

> A strategic space where power analyses are made, where both strategy and tactics are discussed and decided. In the CSM space, civil society actors engaging in the CFS seek to develop their own - to use Tarrow's (1998) term - 'action repertoires', ranging from debate to confrontation (Gaarde 2017, p.73)

By combining fieldwork and theoretical explorations, Gaarde analyses how *La Vía Campesina* organises to take part in the CFS discussions. The movement is both an actor and an arena, as it is composed of heterogeneous member organisations representing peasants, small and medium-size farmers, landless people, indigenous people, among others. The author elaborates on the evolution and consolidation of the movement and points out the importance of their common framework for action (originated around the concept of food sovereignty), not only for holding members together (by defining common language and identity), but also to ensure consistency between the different struggles with which they challenge the dominant neoliberal model of food production and consumption, both at local and global level.

Among other characteristics and practices of the movement described in the book, it is interesting to point out the relevance given to decentralised and participatory decision-making in practice. For the CSM, the movement encourages all members to share their different experiences and raise their concerns in the UN arena. To do so in a functional manner, the members of *La Vía Campesina* take forward processes of continuous dialogue and preparation with their grassroots constituencies, internal strategizing and evaluation, and alliance building.

These characteristics do not render the participation to global policy arenas simple and often conflict with the praxis, rhythms and language used in the UN context (for example, in relation to language barriers, the author expands on the crucial role of CFS interpreters). Similarly to what happens in local participatory governance arenas, social movements' members often need to adapt to prevailing mode of communication and norms, which correspond to persistent barriers to effective participation. That is why, Gaarde explains, the social movement battle is not only to influence the output of ongoing discussions but also to fight for the right of people for democratic control and effective participation, characterised by rules and norms that address structural power gaps. In this context, the authors depicts the CSM as a laboratory for social movement engaging in formal political spaces, "an antagonist arena, with room for disagreement, conflict and confrontational politics" (Gaarde 2017, p. 88).

Overall, the book represents an important contribution to literature on global food security governance but also on grassroots movements' engagement in policy-making processes more generally. By reporting on the ways in which *La Vía Campesina* links local struggles to a global policy space, Gaarde provides a comprehensive analysis of challenges and synergies arising from peasant's engagement in multi-site governance. These synergies are important both for

internal reflexivity and strengthening of the movement, as well as for advocating for enhanced democratic control in governance arenas. Above all, such participation is beneficial for improving the general quality of discussions and achievements in the policy space.

Gaarde's study is also a methodology lesson on how to analyse social movements, as she reports on innovative research methods, discusses the difficulty of getting close to rural activists and the importance of trust building. Based on her experience, the author invites us to further reflect on potential and challenges of scholar-activist relations for producing knowledge in favour of social movements' struggles.

References

Brem-Wilson, Josh. 2015. "Towards Food Sovereignty: Interrogating Peasant Voice in the UN Committee on World Food Security". *Journal of Peasant Studies 42:* 73-95.

Duncan, Jessica 2015. *Global Food Security Governance: Civil Society Engagement in the Reformed Committee on World Food Security*. London: Routledge.

Duncan, Jessica and Margulis, Matias. 2016. "Global Food Security Governance: Key Actors, Issues and Dynamics." in *Critical Perspectives in food studies,* edited by Mustafa Koç, Jennifer Sumner and Anthony Winson. Oxford University Press.

Tilly, Charles 2004. *Social Movements, 1768-2008*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

About the review author

Maria Vasile is a consultant in social protection at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, where she supports the thematic priorities related to *Expansion of coverage and scale-up of social protection to rural areas* and *Social protection and resilience.* She also researches on food governance and grassroots organizing. Mrvasile AT gmail.com

Book Review: Signifying Black Radicalism:
Reading Black Lives Matter in the Wake of Trump
Review author: Andrew Kettler

Wesley Lowery, 2017, *They Can't Kill Us All: The Story of Black Lives Matter*. London: Penguin Books (248 pp; £9.99).

Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, 2016, *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation*. Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books (270 pp; $17.95).

Christopher J. Lebron, 2017, *The Making of Black Lives Matter: A Brief History of an Idea*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press (187 pp; $27.95).

I write as the torches of Charlottesville still smolder. I hope that as you read that signifier has not been misplaced by the irrational rapidity and perpetual neurosis of the Trumpian news cycle. Because Charlottesville, like Ferguson and Cleveland, like Charleston and Baltimore, should be consistently evoked, so as not to be pushed aside by the constant drudgery of living under a rhetorically manipulative demagogue and his fatuous proclamations of Heritage, History, and the Rule of Law. I therefore also write against the causes of Charlottesville, the alt-right white nationalism that was born of internet misogyny and irrational fears of globalization. This review essay is not objective, as it stems from a place rational enough to understand that objectivity can never be neutral, especially in a time when protecting the memory of the treasonous Confederacy has become a legitimate and romanticized discourse for covetous American politicians.

The task at hand is to review three recent works on the emergence of Black Lives Matter within the American political spectrum. The actions that inspired the three books under review occurred during the Obama presidency, prior to the 2016 election, an electoral process that created freshly racist discourses through both subversive dog whistles and conscious internet amplifiers. The central challenge of this review essay is therefore temporal, pushing through the impracticality of judging three works that all ended with the hope of Black Lives Matter in the summer of 2016, before a nationalist challenge to identity politics created the present conditions of the racialized American public sphere.

The three books reviewed here offer explanatory potency to questions of racial violence. As an introductory list to the tragedies of recent American race relations, the works reviewed inform discussions related to: the police killing of Oscar Grant in Oakland on New Year's Day in 2009, the martyrdom of Trayvon Martin in Sanford, Florida in February of 2012, the killing of Jordan Davis in Jacksonville during November of 2012, the strangulation of Eric Garner by police in New York City in July of 2014, the police killing of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri on August 9, 2014, the shooting death of Tamir Rice on

November 22, 2014 in Cleveland, protests following the death of Freddie Gray in police custody in Baltimore of April 2015, the slaying of Walter Scott that same month, the slaughter of parishioners in nearby Charleston on June 17, 2015, the ignorant policing that led to the death of Sandra Bland in the next month, and thousands of other cases, too many to name, of similar racial injustices against African Americans during both everyday traffic stops and more violent law enforcement encounters.

Wesley Lowery's *They Can't Kill Us All: The Story of Black Lives Matter* (2017) is a journalist's summary of the emergence of Black Lives Matter, from the roots of the movement during the trial of George Zimmerman, through the rage in St. Louis, and into the tumultuous role Black Lives Matter played in the racial protests that followed police action in Baltimore and Cleveland. Lowery, a journalist at the *Washington Post* who released an earlier version of this work under the title *They Can't Kill Us All: Ferguson, Baltimore, and a New Era in America's Racial Justice Movement* (2016), explores the racial and social contours of Black Lives Matter through interviews with key actors in the movement. The work searches how the crusade sprang outward from deep inequality through interpersonal stories about the men and women who made the movement on the ground. The search here is for emotionality, to connect the reader with the human experience of feeling racial injustice as tacit knowledge, rubber bullets, and deadly force.

Lowery begins his narrative with a distanced reading of the arrest of Michael Brown as representative of the racialized structures of American policing. Lowery continues with what reads as an admission. His own life, sailing in Boston Harbor and writing about Northeastern politics, had sheltered the writer from the deep racial divides boiling within the country. But when Lowery entered Ferguson in August of 2014, that shielded cognizance drifted away, as residents engaged the young writer with constant stories of racial violence and corrupt policing. The great awakening of Lowery is portrayed as similar to the arousal of Black America at large, especially those citizens who tried to participate in Obama era post-racialism, even as black communities continued to be destroyed by racialized economic structures and African American bodies faced increased police violence.

They Can't Kill Us All summarizes the protests of Ferguson and examines how they spread through the potency of social networks. Exploring the role of networking in the making of the initial Ferguson protests, Lowery draws parallels between Ferguson and the false rumors that created the 1935 Harlem Riot. However, Ferguson was not created out of a fabricated anecdote, but through a series of injustices that residents proclaimed for decades, which only came to a culminating frenzy against increasingly militarized police forces in the days after Michael Brown's death. Lowery analyzes organizational activity in August, September, and October of 2014 as a process that awaited the coming moment of a possible indictment of corrupt law enforcement and the fires in St. Louis streets when prosecution did not come.

Lowery continues with a history of the killing of twelve-year-old Tamir Rice by a police officer in Cleveland. Through relationships with other journalists, Lowery searches the deep divides of Cuyahoga County through a reading of the racial and statistical history of the Cleveland Police Department and anecdotes from Lowery's college experiences living near the city. He summarizes these roots of Black Lives Matter in the depths of social media movements started by Alicia Garza, Opal Tometi, and Patrisse Cullors, and the spread of Black Lives Matter ideas due to figures like DeRay Mckesson, Shaun King, and Feminista Jones. Ferguson and Cleveland led increasing amounts of Black Americans to conclude that the post-racial goals of the Obama Presidency did not mean that black lungs could not be tear-gassed during peaceful protests.

Then, on April 4, 2015, Walter Scott turned to run. The police officer who shot Scott in North Charleston, South Carolina attempted to frame the fleeing man after firing bullets into his back, the action was all caught on camera, spread to the masses through the very connections of social media that gave Black Lives Matter broad audiences amongst younger generations. Despite the standard and repetitive police rhetoric about body cameras, instituting better training, and increasing funding that rose in opposition to those protesting in Charleston, Black Lives Matter continued to grow. As with his interviews of Scott's family, Lowery hits a moral and passionate tenor to each setting of racial injustice that frame his chapters.

Lowery's summary of what occurred in Baltimore after the death of Freddie Gray includes a well-rendered and emotional analysis of the tone-deaf peacemaking campaign of Presidential candidate, former Mayor of Baltimore, and previous Governor of Maryland Martin O'Malley. This brief examination illustrates the political blindness associated to racist policing within American cities. Countered by the intense political rhetoric of activists like Kwame Rose, the media stimulated the Baltimore protest movements through creating a focused news cycle that provided voice to social justice movements. Lowery's work ends with the growing hope of a new racial program in the face of continuing police violence, even as the vile acts of terrorism at Emmanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston turned hope to melancholy after a shooter entered the Church and took the lives of nine parishioners who pleaded with the methodical killer during a prayer meeting. Lowery identifies the white nationalist executioner as part of a larger syndrome of racial anxiety. Successful racial protests at the University of Missouri during November of 2015 are explored in the Afterword to *They Can't Kill Us All*, which situates a concluding hopeful tone that protest can create triumphs for social justice.

Princeton professor and political activist Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor's *From #BLACKLIVESMATTER to Black Liberation* (2016) offers a direct and protest-oriented summary of the emergence of Black Lives Matter for readers along a broader political spectrum. Appropriately for a Haymarket publication, she situates her analysis as a specifically Marxist treatise that offers significant potential to explore transnational aspects of radical resistance. In her analysis, Taylor engages racial moderates who have been unwilling to stand for resistance

in the name of equality. For Taylor, colorblindness is not solely a denial of racism, but is also an assertion that racism has been transcended, usually trumpeted as a means to subversively further inequality through stopping progress in the name of a newfangled and false post-racial status quo.

Taylor discusses the dual nature of present Black America: a wealthier class that pursues the post-racial to subconsciously protect economic status, and of a larger working class Black America that protests continued structural inequality. Taylor therefore indicts the Black elite as a social class that pursued post-racialism at the expense of broader policies of racial justice. She consequently explores the future of black politics through a return of the wayward Black elite, who must re-learn their past as a means to tap into radical pursuits of labor resistance. Employing a historical look at black inequality in the roots of slavery and the political rhetoric that rose against the Civil Rights movement, Taylor interrogates Ferguson as a moment of awakening for portions of Black America that incorrectly believed they were immune to police violence.

Recent racial protests rose because of moments of vigilante violence and police brutality, and also from a longer narrative of manipulative rhetorics of race that prejudicially and deceitfully related a culture of poverty to black consciousness. The idea that welfare systems altered black minds to not pursue employment is a standard right-wing narrative. *From #BLACKLIVESMATTER to Black Liberation* explores how that rhetoric, after the Civil Rights Movement, defined many black Americans as separate from the possibilities of the American dream. The myth of the culture of poverty, a narrative which falsely defined that many Black Americans were purportedly trapped and willing to accept hand-outs, that family structures created citizens unwilling to access the fruits of American exceptionalism, further separated Black Americans from cashing the promissory note recited at the March for Freedom in 1963.

Taylor explores the politics of racial protest and social backlash in a radical history of the twentieth century. In doing, she offers a more causal narrative for Black Lives Matter than that described by Lowery. Her analysis of Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty, on the political shifts prophesied within Kevin Phillips' *Emerging Republican Majority (*1969), and the wide-ranging implications of Daniel Moynihan's distorted *The Negro Family* (1965), provides a clear history of changing forms of white racism. These customs shifted from the fire hoses of Bull Connor, to the Law and Order dog whistles of Richard Nixon that led to increasing mass incarceration, into the ideological purity of the Drug War espoused by Ronald Reagan, and through the semiotic manipulations within the modern Republican Party.

Taylor's integrated political knowledge also explores connections between black radicalism that rose in Midwestern cities during the 1970s and 1980s with the modern movement for black radical politics that is shaped by Black Lives Matter. These modern forces resist the tenets of the Southern Strategy that consistently re-birthed within rhetorical strategies that applied Willie Horton, the strapping young buck, and the crack epidemic into political discourse.

Through an analysis of the failures of police reform, Taylor's most aggressive argument is to proclaim Obama's racial politics as an illusion that failed to provide increased racial justice for the majority of black Americans.

From #BLACKLIVESMATTER to Black Liberation is a call for direct action, one that applies the historical attitude of W.E.B. Du Bois, Fred Hampton, and Angela Davis. This direct tone is part of a larger radical voice also found within the recent analysis of incarceration in Michelle Alexander's *The New Jim Crow* (2012) and within the tenors of black consciousness explored in Ta-Nehisi Coates' *Between the World and Me* (2015). *From #BLACKLIVESMATTER to Black Liberation* is a specific call to the Black elite to join the majority of Black America, and progressive Americans, with a trumpet to sound out super-predator and culture of poverty rhetoric. Taylor's voice is unswerving, calling out many leaders of the Civil Rights Movement as blind to the nature of present American racism on the ground. Taylor's text is therefore part of a black radicalism that finds the voice of Karl Marx in the proclamations of Martin Luther King, one that finds racial oppression as a fundamental aspect of labor repression.

Taylor's critical feminist perspective makes *From #BLACKLIVESMATTER to Black Liberation* the finest historical and social analysis of the emergence of Black Lives Matter thus far. Even beyond the confines of her analysis, Taylor's work takes on the racial consequences of mass incarceration after three strikes, mandatory minimums, truth in sentencing, and the Omnibus Crime Bill of 1994. This is the principal current work for remembering the four girls praying at Sixteenth Street Baptist, the open casket of Emmett Till, and the radical morality of Malcolm X. This is also the book to read in order to declaim the corporate and political links fermented by the American Legislative Exchange Council, the racial politics of Voter ID Laws, the disenfranchising consequences of *Shelby County v. Holder*, the profitable exploitation of labor in privatizing American prisons, and the racially disproportionate support of gun rights by the National Rifle Association, recently of importance with the killing of Philando Castille in July of 2016.

Like Taylor's book, Johns Hopkins Professor Christopher J. Lebron's *The Making of Black Lives Matter* (2017) offers historical ancestries to the causes of Black Lives Matter. Lebron tends to the deep tissue that made the radical body of Black Lives Matter through case studies on specific African American leaders and various themes of resistance. Despite a significant historical error early in the text that places Andrew Jackson within the Reconstruction Era, Lebron's work travels through a relatively informative history of moments when black liberation entered racially cooperative sections of the American public sphere.

Lebron articulates the idea of *shameful publicity* through exploring a broad history of Frederick Douglass and Ida B. Wells, who both searched human morality to re-align white American minds into perceiving the violence of slavery and lynching as against the common good. For Black Lives Matter, shaming those who commit racial violence and protect structural inequality comes from a root expectation of human respect that slavery and Jim Crow

denied. Through *countercolonization of the white mind* later writers Langston Hughes and Zora Neale Hurston explored ways to engage this destabilized racist mind with a renewed respect for equality. During the Harlem Renaissance, the New Negro of Alain Locke became a living symbol that aesthetics could arise from within the black community. In this project, the black artist became a performative representation of individual goals for the larger community. Lebron's specific work on Hurston explores that even as a listener may not engage within a conversation about social justice, the very act of aesthetic performance can offer paradigms for pursuing equality.

Through a combined reading of the tragic Eleanor Bumpers case in 1984 New York City, involving the fatal police shooting of an elderly woman during an attempted eviction, and the police negligence during a traffic stop that led to the July 2015 suicide of Sandra Bland in Texas, Lebron explores the idea of self-possession in the work of academic Anna Julia Cooper and poet Audre Lorde. These women discovered what Lebron terms *unconditional self-possession* as a way to accept individuality enough to honestly explore their own tragedies. With the works of James Baldwin and Martin Luther King, Lebron searches the idea of *fragmented compassion* as a way to push back against the racial foil that argues against a common ethic of human empathy. Lebron's historical roots are concise, offering a clear introduction to leading African American figures who articulated broad themes for the current Black Lives Matter movement.

Black Lives Matter was born of centuries of pain. It sparked to vigor in a momentary flash when that agony was awoken again in the past years of increased racial violence. The movement peaked before political discourse was altered with the election of Donald Trump in 2016. American neoliberalism of the Obama era had worked to limit racial perceptions in order to promote post-racialism, fomenting fluid market relationships between those previously considered ethnically incompatible. Most counter-hegemony is read through a romantic lens, often associated to the lower class struggle against the ideological apparatuses of capital. However, the most virulent strand of counter-hegemony against neoliberalism in 2016, and especially against the post-racial goals of neoliberal capital, was a recent turn towards insulated racial rhetoric when American nationalists trumpeted a narrative that argues American exceptionalism declines with increased globalization, cosmopolitanism, and cultural relativism. The rhetoric of the 2016 election turned the American white male into an underdog, a counter-hegemonic figure despite the hegemonic power the American white male obviously retains.

Today, hate has a renewed and legitimated sense of nobility, a new logic of racial romanticism. In the election of 2016, the concerns of progressive America were tactfully displaced by the fear, misogyny, and semiotic manipulations of the Republican Party and the Trump nationalists. In a triumph of the will, the ethnic nationalism of the American white male was legitimated through new controls on the signification of exceptionalism and equality. There is now a prevailing discourse, despite its absurdity, that asserts the American white male has become an underdog.

The works reviewed above speak to a moment before Trump, when Black Lives Matter occupied the media spectrum enough to educate the masses towards a more rational analysis of racial inequality. All three of these books are relevant because they explore the deep space between the history of racism and the overwrought signifiers employed in the current political sphere. These works should be read, and their historical narratives remembered, because ethnic resistance to neoliberalism and cultural relativism is now often considered a romantic racial narrative for many in the America First camp of the Republican Party. That romance is dangerous, as it has been exploited often within the focused political rallies, the contentious press conferences, and the ludicrous right-wing conspiracies of increasingly legitimated but objectively preposterous American populists.

References

Alexander, Michelle. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: New Press.

Coates, Ta-Nehisi. 2015. *Between the World and Me: Notes on the First 150 Years in America*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.

Moynihan, Daniel P. 1965. *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Policy Planning and Research, U.S. Department of Labor.

Phillips, Kevin P. 1969. *The Emerging Republican Majority*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington.

About the review author

Andrew Kettler is currently serving as Assistant Professor and Early American History Fellow at University College, University of Toronto. His research specifically focuses upon investigations into the sensory prejudices that justified the profits of the Atlantic Slave Trade. andrew.kettler AT utoronto.ca

Book review: Jodi Dean, *Crowds and Party;* Donatella della Porta et al, *Movement Parties against Austerity;* Richard Seymour, *Corbyn.*
Review author: Andy Mathers

Jodi Dean, 2016, *Crowds and Party*. London & New York, NY: Verso (276 pp., hardcover, $26.95/£16.99).

Donatella della Porta, Joseba Fernández, Hara Kouki & Lorenzo Mosca, 2017, *Movement Parties Against Austerity*. Cambridge & Malden, MA: Polity (237 pp., hardcover, $70.31/£55).

Richard Seymour, 2016, *Corbyn. The Strange Rebirth of Radical Politics*. London: Verso (248 pp., paperback, £12.99).

The crisis of neoliberalism and the associated austerity politics generated a global wave of protests which in turn has produced a renewed interest amongst activists and academics for political parties as means of expressing social movements and addressing their limitations in delivering an alternative project. Three new books, *Crowds and Party, Movement Parties against Austerity,* and *Corbyn: The Strange Rebirth of Radical Politics* offer useful insights for how to consider fruitfully the relationship between social movements and parties.

Writing mainly in response to her experiences of Occupy amidst the broader protest wave, Jodi Dean writes in *Crowds and Party* that the lack of "capacity to give social struggles political form" (p. 264) warranted a serious attempt to revive and reimagine the party as a form of organisation and struggle. She rejects the Left's acceptance of individualism and fragmented identities as the basis for developing an alternative politics in that this merely expressed earlier political defeats and celebrated organising on the bases on which the subject is constituted by capital and state. Dean proposes the Left refound communist organisation ("the Party") as a means of realising the new political subject ("the people") that exists within the collective desire for justice ("the crowd").

Dean uses Le Bon's *The Crowd* and Canetti's *Crowds and Power* to identify the crowd's "collective courage, directed intensity and capacities to cohere" (p. 115) as a positive negation of the capitalist social relations that it ruptures, albeit temporarily. Crowd events, such as riots, strikes and protests, are a "beautiful moment" that manifests momentarily the political subject which only the party, through a political struggle of interpretation, can reveal fully. Following Lenin, *Crowds and Party* argues that the party concentrates and directs the struggle by providing it with its lacking political dimension.

The analysis that the Party is less concerned with state power (at least in the current period) than with enabling the formation of a new political subject by linking and universalising specific struggles suggests the "movement party" does not stand in an external relation to the movement and act merely as its political

representative, but is persistently implicated in its development. This reveals that demands to defend the autonomy of the movement from political interference is itself a deeply political position. However, *Crowds and Party* dismisses the questions of "substitution, vanguardism, or domination" (p. 157) that may produce such a position by labelling such valid concerns as "attacks on mass, democratic, and people's politics" (p. 170) and by an analysis that focuses unduly on the affective, at the expense of the instrumental, dimension of the movement-party relationship.

This analysis results in a curious celebration of the oligarchic tendencies identified by Michels' *Political Parties* as necessary and normal political processes that indicate organisational capacity. The crowd, we are told, is relieved to delegate activities to leaders the idolisation of whom is represented as the displaced self-love of the crowd and deflected delight at its own power. The focus on the term "crowd" may be admissible due to the spontaneity of movements, but is suspect when it downplays the capacity for democratic self-organisation in social movements (particularly pertinent to Occupy) which prefigure egalitarian structures for party and state.

Crowds and Party presents a remarkably uncritical examination of the experiences of the activists of the Communist Party in Great Britain and the USA to demonstrate Dean's Lacanian analysis that the party acts as ideal ego, ego ideal and superego. This produces a constant collective self-examination that translates into incessant activity driven by a party discipline that, when not internalised, is reinforced through a show trial in which the accused party member is reduced to a shaking wreck incapable of speech. That this is presented as promoting an acceptable "communist sensibility" is a disturbing thought and one which should send social movement activists running for the hills. Moreover, presenting unproblematically the "lifeworld" of party organisations as the means through which a "red thread" runs through and connects "movements of the oppressed" (p. 262) does not consider how such organisations risk stifling the movement through its colonisation. The risks of substitution, vanguardism and domination simply cannot be finessed by a psychodynamic analysis. Although the book is a welcome corrective to ahistorical accounts of the party-form, by not interrogating this form fully it is unlikely to help rectify its previous shortcomings and disastrous consequences.

A more rounded analysis is provided by Donatella Della Porta et al's *Movement Parties against Austerity,* a study of movement parties in southern Europe which includes a theoretically and conceptually informed empirical investigation of Syriza, Podemos and the Five Star Movement (M5S). The genesis of these parties lay within anti-austerity protests triggered by the economic and political crises of late neoliberalism. In general, the movement parties examined developed where distrust in political institutions was greatest and where existing centre-left parties were most implicated in implementing austerity and so pressing issues arising from the movement arena were left largely unrepresented in the party system. The analysis of each case study proceeds by examining the interaction between the social movement field and

the party system in terms of three key elements (framing, organizational model, and repertoire of action) using concepts drawn mainly from the field of social movement studies. *Movement Parties against Austerity* is sensitive to national variation yet the case studies show how although some movement qualities were present within each "movement party", this was a rather limited and, as electoral office was attained, an increasingly fragile development.

The parties offered ideological resources that enabled a translation of movements' conceptions and demands into a new political language and political identities. Diagnostic framing reshaped the political cleavage from "centre-left" versus "centre-right" to "the people" against "the establishment". Prognostic framing shifted the possible solutions beyond the framework of neoliberal inspired austerity to a revived social democratic programme (Syriza and Podemos) and a reformed capitalism favouring small and medium-sized enterprises and environmental protection (M5S) both within a framework of a "social Europe". Motivational framing generated hope as seemingly futile protests were displaced by voting "with excitement" (p. 119) with the realistic prospect of governmental power fuelling hope for real change. Yet this hope was attenuated as governmental office translated into policies that resonated much less with movement frames.

Movement Parties against Austerity examines how organisational structures and repertoires of action emanating from the movements were harnessed by the parties to create a new political culture that favoured participation and protest. Each party developed an unconventional repertoire of action which included the mobilisation of, and support for, extra-parliamentary protests and this partly filtered through into institutional activity that broke with parliamentary orthodoxy. Organisational innovations that enable participation through utilising new communication technologies remain strongest in Podemos that allows an open membership with no fees, is based on crowd funding, selects candidates through open primary elections, includes citizen inquiries to make policy, and has a structure centred on a citizen assembly the basis of which are "circles" reminiscent of the M-15 movement. This has enabled power to be distributed more horizontally than in either Syriza or M5S, yet it has produced a highly personalised leadership that is shared by M5S and increasingly by Syriza in government. This is an indicator that the "movement party" can take various forms (tabulated on p. 16) one of which is a populist party with a plebiscitary, rather than a participatory, relationship with citizens. That these parties are increasingly by-passing movements once in office may be explained partly by the fact that these parties arose during the downswing of the anti-austerity protest cycle. They were more the products of the remnants of movement energy than a synergy of movement and party. The limits of substituting the party for the movement have been increasingly apparent once in office.

Della Porta et al's study demonstrates well how breaks in political organisation are generated partly by social movements, but also how the trajectories of existing political parties are a crucial element in shaping political developments. This is evident in relation to the shift in direction of the British Labour Party

since the election to its leadership of Jeremy Corbyn. In *Corbyn: The Strange Rebirth of Radical Politics,* Richard Seymour explains this surprising result in relation to the same crisis of neoliberalism within the British context. This crisis was expressed particularly acutely in the Labour Party as its increasing orientation to office above electoral support resulted in a drastically falling party membership, itself largely disillusioned and disengaged. This was echoed by many of its traditional core supporters who increasingly abstained from voting, often deliberately as a means of punishing the party's bipartisanship on austerity and war. Labour's shift to the neoliberal centre-ground did not give rise to a radical left party as the "vacuum thesis" would suggest. This was due to the utter defeat of the Labour Left in the 1980s which demoralised the older generation of activists and the relative weakness of recent anti-austerity protests which, beyond the unions, were led mainly by the younger generation which was highly reticent about finding a political home. In this context, Corbyn was recognised universally, and elected unequivocally, as "a man of the movements, not of the markets" (p. 7).

Seymour offers a hyper-realist, indeed a pessimistic, assessment of the prospects for "Labour's nascent new Left" (p. 84) suggesting that under Corbyn the likelihood of election victory is slim, democratising the party is highly unlikely, and taking office would be a "poisoned chalice" (p. 86). This assessment is based on a historical analysis of the Labour Party as emerging from, and inextricably tied to, an ideology of labourism and a social democratic practice the successful prosecution of which was based upon sustaining economic growth and profitability. The likelihood of reproducing these conditions in contemporary globalised capitalism he argues is very low indeed. History also shows that prospects for transforming the Labour Party into "real Labour" are largely illusory and therefore "Corbynism" is a fleeting moment in the inevitable "degeneration of Labourism" (p. 90): a long process that accelerated during the New Labour years.

It is difficult to fault the almost entirely accurate account of the Labour Party as a parliamentary party, yet this is a largely one-sided account that pays little attention to the extra-parliamentary activities and movements associated with the party. In *Labour: A tale of two parties*, Hilary Wainwright (1987) provided a different reading which contrasted the "ameliorative, pragmatic" social democratic tradition expressed principally in the Parliamentary Labour Party with a "transformative, visionary" democratic socialist tradition associated mainly with the grassroots members engaged closely with extra-parliamentary struggles. This account enables a greater focus on the party-movement relationship and thereby opens up the analysis of the current situation to a different trajectory to the one offered by Seymour who states that "Syrizafication" (i.e. the neutralisation and defeat of the radical left in the party) is the highly likely outcome.

Corbyn: The Strange Rebirth of Radical Politics spells out the dangers of favouring a shorter-term strategy of transforming the Labour Party above the long game of rebuilding social movements, and the labour movement

particularly, as the basis for effective political organisation. Seymour does this though at the expense of missing the opportunities present in that although he suggests the need for a "vibrant and mobilised grass-roots Left in the unions and beyond" (p. 217), he fails to recognise the contribution that the resurgence of grassroots activity in the Labour Party could contribute to making this happen by developing a more organic link between party and movement and especially amongst the grass roots.

All three books make specific contributions to the field which can be comprehended through Roberts' (2015) model of the relationship between movement and party: vanguard, electoral, and organic. *Crowds and Party* celebrates a revival of the vanguard model in which the party controls social movements. *Movement Parties against Austerity* demonstrates how in Southern Europe the dominant form is tending towards the electoral model in which party relations with social movements are mobilised for electoral gain. *Corbyn: The Strange Rebirth of Radical Politics* warns of the possibility, indeed the probability, of this model occurring in Britain. Seymour dismisses, however, the admittedly slight but still real possibility for the development of an organic model in which a mass party with a class basis becomes deliberately blurred with the movement. It is only to parties operating according to this organic model that we can satisfactorily attach the label of "movement party".

References

Roberts, Kenneth, M. 2015. *Changing Course in Latin America: Party Systems in the Neoliberal Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wainwright, Hilary. 1987. *Labour: A Tale of Two Parties*. London: The Hogarth Press.

About the review author

The author is a Senior Lecturer in Sociology & Criminology at UWE Bristol and is active in the trade union and anti-austerity movements. He can be contacted at Andrew.Mathers AT uwe.ac.uk

Book Review: Dylan Taylor, *Social Movements and Democracy in the 21st Century*
Review author: Laurence Cox

Dylan Taylor, 2017, *Social Movements and Democracy in the 21st century*. Cham (Switzerland): Palgrave (xi+290 pp; £66.99)

The challenge of comradely criticism

There is a problem, today, with disagreement on the left. Disagreement itself is no bad thing: it can be a sign of movement democracy, or an indicator that a particular space is able to hold more than one social position, movement, organisation, political tradition or organising approach together. Given the forces we are up against if we want large-scale social change, we need this situation.

But we also need disagreement that can either be overcome in our own learning and alliance processes, or at least lived with as an enriching factor and a reminder of the need to engage the much wider social realities that our opponents often make manifest. Put another way, the really important strategic conversations are the difficult ones, because they represent alliances that have not yet been made, or learning that has not yet been gone through.

Disagreement often doesn't work like this. All too often it produces self-righteousness (a refusal of learning or alliances), denial of the realities represented by our comrades and comp@s, new grievances which stand in the way of further conversations, and widespread demobilisation of those who lack the time, energy or emotional resilience to continue. In some spaces, victory goes to the last person standing, as in earlier generations committee or assembly decisions were made by the faction willing to keep going longest.

A culture of deliberately vicious ("sectarian") polemic is nothing new, but recent decades are different. The material conditions of radical political action and theory have, in the global North at least, radically changed over the past fifty years. If in 1967 the primary context and point of reference was parties, unions, left periodicals or other movement institutions, today a greater proportion of radical positions are articulated within traditional intellectual relationships, those of academia or those of left celebrity, the building of niche markets largely disconnected from movement organisations.

Under these conditions, there are greater rewards for representing disagreement as unchangeable: as the result of a fundamental flaw, whether theoretical, moral or personal. Audiences can be built and satisfied in this way – and with information overload one of the main things even radical audiences need is easy dismissals, good reasons *not* to know more about this or that. The one-liner which presents a different movement, political tradition, organisation

or theorist as not worth knowing about is an extremely welcome tool in this context.

How to overcome this? In *Interface* we ask authors to speak beyond their familiar audiences and write for those they do not usually speak to; this process is not always easy, and does not exclude forming alliances at the expense of a third party. It is not that we need to or should agree all of the time; the question is rather how to practice constructive disagreement without precluding future alliances.

Reading Dylan Taylor, I found myself disagreeing repeatedly, but not wanting a fight. I felt this book was a good representative of another left reality which cannot sensibly be ignored and needs to be engaged with rather than written off.

Structure and strengths

Social Movements and Democracy… is written in three sections. Part I gives us an introduction, a potted history of social movements, an overview of social movement theory, a summary of Marxist political economy and a discussion of "left political strategy". Part II gives us an empirical study of Occupy, organised around issues of internal decision-making, how the collective subject was understood and discussion of space and the Internet. Part III draws on Poulantzas' theory of the state and offers a conclusion in terms of political strategy.

The book is well-written and accessible. It has the great merit of opening up a wide range of issues and ways of thinking about movement politics to newcomers; clarity and ambition are a powerful combination. Its ambition lies in thinking these different things more closely together: contemporary social movement theory is often quite innocent of movement history; rarely does analysis of contemporary movements engage seriously with radical political theory; we need to think the relationship between movements and political economy more systematically; and so on. It is perhaps less important whether we agree with the specific conclusions that are drawn and more important to say that we should be having these discussions far more frequently.

This sort of work is a much-needed antidote to a positivist version of social movements research as an institutionally and intellectually narrow subdiscipline, and to the kinds of Marxist work that internalise the boundaries of the academic fields they seek a home in. Social movements, as a central aspect of the social world, enable connections: as the practical meaning of popular political subjectivity in ordinary times, without which "radical political theory" is either oxymoronic or theological; as a term which helps political economy become something other than either the hidden hand of subject-free structure or a dystopian account of elite agency alone; and as a positionality from which we can take the Feuerbach theses seriously.

The view from where?

The book's own positionality is not as clearly accounted for, but the ways in which its individual themes are approached will be familiar to Anglophone Marxists within the sorts of spaces marked out by points of reference such as Jacobin or the International Socialist Tendency, Left Forum and the Historical Materialism conference: a post-1968 left, neither social democratic nor Stalinist.

This approach is distinctly statist in tone, to the point of assuming at times that what defines Marxism *is* its relationship to the state, but characteristically Anglophone in that it is rarely expressed from within or in relationship to left parties of any electoral or governmental significance, or from any long-term position of strength in social movements, even (as the rhetoric might suggest) the labour movement. Put another way, in countries where radical left parties are permanent or occasional power-holders, or significant electoral presences, Marxists tend not to agonise about The Party as an ideal, but spend a lot of time discussing the many problems with the actual party or parties that they have to deal with.

The long-term institutional bases of this particular tradition, then, lie within micro-parties, the English-speaking Internet and the university. It shares a key weakness inherited from Trotskyism as "the last surviving Anglophone Leninist tradition" (Davidson 2017): a tendency to an abstract internationalism which seeks a single, universally applicable line (in English!) at the expense of in-depth engagement with the concrete and the national – and an underlying assumption that with the right line somehow everything else will fall into place.

At least, this was my impression as a reader trying to understand the book, although it tends to present itself as something of a "view from nowhere", reluctant to account for its own choices as to what to think about, who to read and how to interpret them. Taylor edits the interesting *Counterfutures: left thought and practice Aoteoroa*, whose self-description (counterfutures.nz) situates it between the left academy and social movements; but this book reads rather more like a rewritten PhD thesis.

An obvious example is in the chapters on political strategy. Rather than (for example) a critical analysis of people who are read today within different movements, or for that matter within different Marxist traditions, "reconceptualising political strategy" appears here as a task assigned to the academy (p. 99). We are presented with Badiou, Žižek, Rancière, Laclau and Mouffe, Hardt and Negri, Poulantzas as "prominent theorists in this field" (p. 100), although what the field is, and who determines prominence, is never quite specified. The questions of whether "contemporary left theory" is really best represented by an academic reading list, why the changing sociology of "the left" might make this so, or how culturally specific the authors chosen, are not discussed.

There is also no discussion of what *concrete* political challenges their reflections draw from, or how they have actually engaged with and been read by movements – surely an important question for Marxists thinking about theory.

Even with Poulantzas, presented (ch 9) as the way out of the difficulties of contemporary strategy (treated here as synonymous with theory), we are given no account whatsoever of his relationship to Greek or French parties or movements; we are told that things have developed since his death (p. 234), but not what he did while alive.

I do not think we should hand over responsibility for the strategic direction of our movements (or parties) to a purely academic logic, particularly one which assumes rather than justifies the significance of a particular set of authors and thus naturalises the local logics of an unspecified academic context. It is not that we can learn nothing from such debates; many of our best thinkers *do* operate within university contexts. But the touchstone has to be practice; as Marxists we cannot simply leave Theory to its own devices and be content to listen at the feet of different Masters.

Difficulties of the analysis

One point where I felt this strongly is in the book's repeatedly failing to learn from the left trajectories that constitutes our shared political ancestry, in the account of "after 1968", in chapters 2 (history of social movements) and 5 (political theory). There is a back-handed recognition that the Party, and its orientation to the State, had been seen to fail by 1968 on many fronts, though the discussion of these is often blurred. This failure lay in the reality of Soviet state socialism (if not yet, for some, the Chinese variant); in the reality of western Fordism, *particularly* where social-democratic parties had achieved some significant power; and in the reality of independent post-colonial states.

The once entirely reasonable assumption that the way forward lay in taking power within a state which was, in the mid twentieth century, more central to economic activity and social development than before or since, now came face to face not just with the disappointments of partial success in these areas, but with tanks in Prague and social-democratic support for the Vietnam War.

Yet in Taylor's account the reason activists turned away from a focus on parties and the state is not primarily explained by the disappointments of statism, or even by the defeat of the revolutionary struggles around 1968 and the question of how to continue fighting under conditions not of our own choosing. It seems to be the turn from unity to multiplicity in academic left theory. And here I have some questions.

Is this account not every bit as idealist as those liberals who ascribed the French Revolution to the influence of the *philosophes*? Does it not make more sense to treat academic left theory as a rarefied and often distorted reflection of learning and discussion processes within popular movements, rather than as "the conscious element" somehow imposing itself? If this is a material analysis, how are we to imagine the theoretical impact of Rancière or Žižek on the Arab Spring? Will we find, if we read through the tweets of the day, the turn to multiplicity as an ideological element imported from above?

I do not think so; even for a more obviously movement-connected thinker like Toni Negri it makes more sense to see his theorising as growing from the extraordinary richness of Italian struggles in the 1960s and 1970s, and subsequently his engagement with the movements of the 1990s and 2000s. I have met activists who have read Negri (far more than have read Rancière): and it would be unfair and self-defeating to suggest that theory never affects what people do. But surely a core Marxist proposition is that analysis needs to start from people's material realities and everyday praxis rather than to treat them as "cultural dupes"?[1]

One crucial strategic difficulty of idealism is in how it leads us to think about contemporary movements as somehow the incarnation in this material world of Ideas – rather than, as the historical analysis of ideas no less than movements would suggest, seeing the ideas expressed around particular movements as bearing in interesting, but indirect, relationship to their practice. Consider, for example, Marx's enthusiasm for the innovative *practice* of the Paris Commune as against the predominantly Blanquist, Jacobin and Proudhonist *ideas* of delegates to the Commune – or his comments in the *Eighteenth Brumaire* on how revolutions seek for a language to express what they are actually doing.

We should of course engage with movements' own fumbling attempts to articulate a theory of their own; but that engagement needs to be helpful and comradely, if we can: to understand that people are, of course, developing their ideas as they go, and engage as a peer, not judging them from a great height for the benefit of some external audience. The latter, will neither convince them nor help us to learn from them.

From a comparative perspective, what I found most telling was the failure to ask why Occupy was such an Anglophone phenomenon. It took place simultaneously with revolts across the Arab world and anti-austerity uprisings around the European periphery; yet the question of why Occupy took place *where* it did is barely discussed here. Of course, doing so would suggest that – far from being a general expression of a particular moment in history, to be responded to theoretically – it was deeply shaped by the politics of a small number of English-speaking countries with a particular history of neoliberalism. In these countries, at least up till Momentum, "the Party" is invoked by some kinds of Marxism precisely because of its absence in political reality. Understand the *difference* between these contexts and those of other global struggles, and we start asking different kinds of political question.

---

[1] A more trivial, but indicative note: Taylor reads Alf Nilsen and myself as taking a broadly similar position to Laclau and Mouffe (p. 69), with the comment that either we are hiding our debt to them or that our putative similarities are due to a common awareness of Gramsci (which is not, perhaps, as unusual as it may seem for European Marxists). This point of similarity, however, turns out to be the question of how a movement or party can *find allies* and *convince others of the value of its strategy*. These are rather important, and pretty basic, questions for activists, and it speaks volumes about the "strategic" value of this kind of political theory that they are read simply as indicators of a particular intellectual tradition.

Models for the future?

In some ways this book recapitulates Barbara Epstein's (1993) arguments about the relationship between the grassroots-democratic practice and culturally-liberatory spirit of more recent movements and the rather bird's-eye view of Anglophone academic and sectarian Marxism, and arrives at a point not a million miles away from Hilary Wainwright's (2009) *Reclaim the State*[2]. We have been here before, in other words, because the relative isolation of an older model of left practice in the English-speaking world, and its consequent manifestation in universities and micro-parties, has tended to mean that a certain way of articulating Marxism in relation to (wished-for) parties and the state is a sort of boundary-definition exercise; or, to borrow a phrase, identity politics. From this perspective, social movements are both necessary and – in their actual practice – rather frustrating.

Politically, the book calls (chs 9 and 10) for a new relationship between parties and movements, in ways which have been common on the west European left since 1968 and sometimes before. There are spaces in which this is a new, and surprising, thing to say; but this position really outlines a question rather than providing an answer.

Chapter 9 rightly points to different experiences in southern Europe (Syriza, Podemos) and Latin America (Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador). The logic of the book, however, suggests that these experiences are primarily the result of advances *in theory*, of having the right line: but from the point of view of empirical research into social movements and revolutions, much is missing.

Podemos, it is true, did have elements of this top-down origin – but situated within a long and massive tradition of anti-authoritarian movements in Spain. Syriza is a more classical representative of the "older" European new left. Tellingly, there is no discussion of Iceland, Portugal or Italy – though the comparison is instructive. The *diversity* of learning traditions on the European left in terms of how to relate parties and movements is perhaps a more useful resource when trying to make sense of our own local contexts. Otherwise we are doomed (for example) to become disillusioned with Podemos and start making eyes at Momentum; the search for a Model which proves us right and solves our own problems is always likely to be a moveable feast.

So too with Latin America: an account which excludes the 24-year-old Zapatista revolution and the *Argentinazo* in favour of a focus on Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador is making things easy for itself – but by the same token making it harder to think about what can be usefully translated for struggles elsewhere. There is little mention of the dialectics *between* movements and parties here (Cicciarello-Maher 2016 shows this for Venezuela, the most statist of the three);

---

[2] It is Wainwright's great strength that, while remaining committed to the necessity for engagement with the state, she consistently does so from within movements, and with an open mind as to what such engagement might actually mean at different times in different countries.

nor of the increasing conflicts between movements and state in these specific countries, expressed in intensifying authoritarianism and (an important economic fact) shaped by the neo-extractivism underpinning these state models. Such accounts will not help us think what we should do where we are.

We cannot choose the situations we act within; but we can, perhaps, acknowledge the crucial importance of national context and not treat The Party as something that exists over and above these minor details of concrete place and history. Nor can we or should we assert the primary significance of The Party as an identity marker of Marxism or on the basis of political theory, separately from the history of actually-existing Marxist parties.

Put another way, the real historical question is what any given party is actually able to do to advance popular struggle in practice[3]. Given that in most countries in the world over the past half-century social movements have rather more successes to offer than radical political parties (and I imagine this is also true in Aoteoroa / New Zealand), movement activists may often and reasonably feel that party politics is not a great use of their time; and they are likely to judge parties in terms of how they actually relate to movements rather than in terms of how their adherents convince themselves of their own necessity.

Learning from movements

Marxism's "material force" has experienced a series of defeats, some external but some very much from our own side if not self-inflicted. As a practice-oriented theory, we have to take this experience seriously and try to learn from it. As a materialist theory, we need to understand the social realities of different kinds of Marxist practice, notably to account for the context and situational meaning of our own work in the way we seek to do for other theories. This also means a less schematic engagement with popular political practice.

Like 1968, the Occupy movement – and the far larger, contemporary struggles of *indignad@s* in southern Europe – helped both to show the possibility of new kinds of mass participation in movement activism and (for the same reasons) undermined the legitimacy of the currently-existing modes of capitalist organisation. Surely the most important intellectual question here is not the theoretical limitations of their exponents' rhetoric, but the question of how they could have got *so much* right in terms of mobilising large numbers of ordinary people around fundamental questions of power and inequality, not least by comparison with Anglophone Marxism's limited ability to do so. Posing the question this way, in terms of political practice, means writing not so much as

---

[3] Taylor criticises Alf Nilsen and myself (p. 248) for placing movements first and being interested in parties to the extent that they actually contribute to movements rather than instrumentalising them, substituting themselves for them and all the other experiences which have become so common. But to put it at its simplest, once a party winds up sending the riot police against popular movements that supposedly constitute its base – as in Greece and Bolivia – it is making a fundamental strategic error, which will irretrievably shape its future.

academically-accredited specialists in How To Think and more as fellow-activists who are also contributing to struggles, hoping to learn from these movements while also having something useful to say.

Conclusion

The richness of a book is often shown by how much one wants to argue with it: bad books are easily dismissed, while strong books require more detailed responses to cover even part of their material. My copy of *Social Movements and Democracy...* has dozens of corners marked down, each noting a point where I wanted to say more, respond or challenge the analysis, most of which I have not had space or time to return to here.

This book is a good read. Readers new to this terrain will find much of value here, while more experienced activists and scholars will still find many points of interest and a valuable challenge in the connections attempted, whether or not they agree with the author's approach. I look forward to the next book.

References

Cicciarello-Maher, George. 2016. *Building the Commune: Radical Democracy in Venezuela*. London: Verso.

Davidson, Rjurik. 2017. "Between Como and confinement: Gramsci's early Leninism." *Marxist Left Review* 14 (Winter) [free online]

Epstein, Barbara. 1993. *Political Protest and Cultural Revolution: Nonviolent Direct Action in the 1970s and 1980s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Milkman, Ruth, Luce, Stephanie and Lewis, Penny. 2013. *Changing the Subject: a Bottom-up Account of Occupy Wall Street in New York City*. Russell Sage Foundation report [free online]

Szolucha, Anna. 2016. *Real Democracy in the Occupy Movement: No Stable Ground*. London: Routledge.

Wainwright, Hilary. 2009. *Reclaim the State: Experiments in Popular Democracy*. Kolkata: Seagull (2nd edition).

About the review author

Laurence Cox has been involved in social movements since the 1980s but swore off activism in (actually-existing) political parties before the turn of the millennium. He has published widely on social movements and Marxism, most recently *We Make Our Own History: Marxism and Social Movements in the Twilight of Neoliberalism* (Pluto 2014, with Alf Nilsen), *Why Social Movements Matter* (Rowman and Littlefield forthcoming) and *Revolution in the Air? 1968 in the Global North* (Pluto forthcoming, with Bjarke Risager and Salar Mohandesi). He can be contacted at laurence.cox AT mu.ie

Book Review: Harald Bauder, *Migration Borders Freedom*
Review author: Sutapa Chattopadhyay

Harald Bauder, 2017, *Migration Borders Freedom*. London: Routledge (135 pp., hardcover, $145; softcover £36.99/ $49.95)

Undivided by commas, the title *Migration Borders Freedom* is open to many interpretations. The three concepts can be read as a set of nouns, a sentence or a phrase. Alternatively, as author Harald Bauder (2017, ix-xi) states: migration is not freedom, which conversely means that movement or mobility restricts freedom. Most times, host countries fail to free migrants from manifold insecurities that they attempt to escape. Moreover, with a lack of citizenship and legal documents to work or stay, migrants are denied access to the formal labor market, from a decent livelihood or regular pay, education, healthcare and other benefits or protection. Rather, migrants end up in conditions where they vacillate between hope and despair. The author's second explanation of the title takes us to feudal Europe. Bauder draws a parallel between serfs and modern-day migrants. Although the serfs were bound to the land, they entered the city for work like bonded slaves but lived in the hinterland while the wealthy land owning classes stayed inside the city. Neither the serfs were free inside the fortified walls of the city, nor are modern day migrants.

Bauder intelligibly takes full advantage of the three concepts of migration, borders and freedom to discuss many conceivable possibilities and contradictions that counter walls, borders, lines, and divides. Throughout *Migration Borders Freedom*, he contests increased securitizations and violence at borders and the internal policing of migrants as failed mechanisms. Henceforth Bauder introduces relevant and provocative policy measures on migrant rights to work and stay, by referring to restrictions imposed to citizenship, territoriality, and the nation-state. He explains that a problem with the state, and in particular the nation-state, is that it exercises its sovereign rights to exclude. He analyses free movements that link to dialectical connections between the regulatory measures imposed by the nation-state and local-scale sanctuary practices. Bauder broadly follows anarchist, post-structuralist and socialist alternatives, and Indigenous understanding of land and people. The book has two sections. First, he analyses discriminatory policies that prevents migrants from accessing a healthy living without fear and uncertainties while in the second section, he journeys through liberatory social movements, and sanctuary and solidarity networks that are spread out in Europe and North America.

Migration Borders Freedom departs from violence at borders to the urban scale in order to illustrate how migrants belong and can be included in urban communities through solidarity alliances, sanctuary or no-border/open border movements (93-100). Although the urban provides an important "strategic site"

(Sassen 2013, 69), the notion of sanctuary for migrants and refugees is not only an urban phenomena, but also exists at other scales (national) and in non-urban contexts[4]. According to Isin (2007, 212), the city "exists as *both* actual and virtual spaces." The "actual space" of the city includes physical infrastructures like housing, streets, bridges, and parks, which congregate bodies through physical proximity (Butler 2012, 117). In this way, the city captures formal belonging but also acts as a space for forging new social formations to articulate political identities. During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, cities responded as core sites of production, exploitation, and class struggle, and of proletarian/plebeian/non-conformist peoples' identities and revolutionary movements (Sassen 2013, 69). Similarly, urban social and political transformations led to the abolition of slavery and feudalism through practical engagements of everyday politics and demanding the willingness to embark on a path towards an unforeseeable reality. The city is also a "virtual space" that has an "imagined community" (Anderson 1991) as well links with supranational entities like the EU (Bauder 2017). In this space, ideas like the global village, global commons and global/subaltern citizenship burgeon. Thus, the urban is necessarily the scale at which "possibilia" are enacted.

Bauder sets out in search of what he coins a "possibilia", that links possibility with utopia and from a critique of utopia (see below). He advocates "possibilia" as a concept that does not have the language to describe itself yet, whereas contingent possibilities would be the multiple layers of possibilities that pro-migrant groups have to work with in order to open borders, and to make things immediately better for migrants. Political and social transformation mirror contingent possibility and "possibilia". Activists have argued that the nation-state must accommodate migrants by granting them domicile citizenship (acquisition of citizenship by residence/habitation/home), and simultaneously chip away at the state's legitimacy to grant or deny them their rights. Indeed, these positions are contradictory. In *Migration Borders Freedom,* contingent possibilities and possibilia must be pursued simultaneously as they are complementary and mutually exclusive. However, once we let go of the idea that politics or human life must always fit into a straitjacket of uniformity, we reach a necessary moment for social transformation. This realization has motivated activists to pursue various levels of possibilities.

Nandita Sharma's (2013) no-border call is "not a political proposal–it's a revolutionary cry," a fundamental reconfiguration of the way people live together and govern themselves (Bauder 2017, 112). The conditions, practices, and mindset that characterize such a world do not yet exits. Nevertheless widespread no-border networks (in Germany, Italy, the UK, and other European countries) illustrate how the evolution of a possiblia is possible. In the early 2000s, no-border networks organized camps in Strasbourg (France), Rotenburg (Germany), Bialystok (Poland), Tarifia (Spain), and Trassanito (Italy). The purpose of these camps was "to allow refugees, migrants and undocumented

---

[4] Similarly, No One Is Illegal (NOII), a migrant justice group led by migrants and racialized people in Canada.

migrants and members of support/campaign groups from across Europe to forge new alliances and strengthen solidarities" (Allderd 2003, 153). The camps were organized and managed in symbolic locations, not only at or near borderlands, but also in cities that represented European integration (i.e. the triumph over national hostilities and fall of border walls) (Bauder 2017, 112). In the context of social activism, solidarity is fundamental to no-border politics, for "the creation of new political actors" (Bauder 2017), for the "community of interests, shared beliefs and goals around which to unite" (Hooks 2000, 67). It also entails listening and comprehending "other" experiences, needs, and desires. Solidarity affirms community by creating bonds of love, moral principle, respect, loyalty, empathy, and mutual aid (Walia 2013, 269). Following Hegalian and the aforementioned conceptualizations, *Migration Borders Freedom* understands solidarity as a new political consciousness. Moreover no-border politics follows a long tradition of critical practice, from workers' resistance (Marx and Engels 1953) to "consciousness-raising" (Pratt and Rosner 2006, 15) among marginalized communities to current acts of solidarity. Therefore no-border politics is not utopian, rather, "it is in fact eminently practical and is being carried out daily" (Anderson *et al* 2009, 12), and it should be carried out because it is urgent (Bauder 2017, 111-17)[5].

The domicile principle of citizenship is a missing connection between jus sanguinis (citizenship by blood) and jus soli (citizenship by the place of birth, or soil/place/ground). In practice, most countries combine these categories in some way. Bauder's (2017, 82-90) argument expands beyond the citizenship principles, elevating the domicile principle over other principles that frame citizenship as a birthright. The principle of domicile can lead to far-reaching transformations in the realm of possibilia. Domicile-based citizenship affirms territoriality, emphasizing the territory in which one lives. Bauder's practical argument seeks to provide an intermediate or "meso-level" (Bauder and Matheis 2016) policy solution to the unequal treatments, social injustices, and other forms of oppression experienced by migrants.

Among many significant contributions of the book, one of the decisive offerings is its historical and context-particular analysis of migration. Pertinently, Bauder points to the lack of attention in migrant justice movements to settler politics, Indigenous exclusion and the interconnections between occupied lands and its foreign migrants in the academy. The book is timely and adds to a canon of scholarship on *Open Border* (Hayter 2000), *No Borders* (King 2016, Anderson

---

[5] The solidarity between NOII and Indigenous organizations acts in unity with migrants to affirm the shared experiences and struggles of the racialized and dispossessed people as common struggle against other existing domination and exploitation of First Nations people. NOII demands for rights of all-people irrespective of their legality, color or creed and therefore rejects the categories and labels in which nation-states segregates its populations. Bauder finds similarity with the logic of "possibilia" with that of activist Ruby Smith Dias's dream that lies at the utopian horizon. Similar to NOII are Indigenous protests against the criminalization and oppression of illegalized migrants in Arizona, titled as Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhood Act (or SB1070). These movement practices are used by Bauder (2017, 115) to advocate for "possibilia" while arguing utopia.

et al 2009, Alldred 2003), *Undoing Border Imperialism* (Walia 2013), *Ethics of Immigration* (Carens 2013), *Migration, Squatting and Radical Autonomy* (Mudu and Chattopadhyay 2017) and *Migrant Activism* (Longhi 2013, Pojmann 2008). Bauder chose to provide a plainly worded analysis to some of the most convoluted and troubled issues around migration, migrant exclusion, bordering policies, and migrant situations across Europe and North America. Lastly, he opens a whole range of steps to move towards a better world. As he brings back a sense of utopian possibility that was lost in academic research and politics in recent decades, he also argues that the immediate goal is to stop violence directed at migrants of all ages, sexes, and ethnic and racial groups, and therefore that there is not time to wait for a perfect utopian solution (Bauder 2017, 108-119).

References

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Anderson, B, Sharma, N, and Wright, C. 2009. "Why No Borders?" *Refuge.* 26(2): 5-18.

Arendt, H. 1960. "Freedom and Politics: A Lecture." *Chicago Review*. 14 (1): 28-46.

Alldred, P. 2003. "No Border, No Nations, No Deportations." *Feminist Review.* 73: 152- 157.

Bauder, H. 2017. *Migration Borders Freedom.* London: Routledge.

Bauder, H and Matheis, C, eds. 2016. *Migration Policy and Practice: Interventions and Solutions.* New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Butler, J. 2012. "Bodies in Alliance and the Politics of the Street." In *Sensible Politics: The Visible Culture of Nongovernmental Activism.* McLagan, M and McKee, Y (eds). New York: Zone Books.

Carens, J. 2013. *Ethics of Immigration.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hayter, T. 2000. *Open Borders- the case against immigration controls.* London: Pluto Press.

Harvey, D. 2012. *Rebel Cities : From the Right to the City to Urban Revolution.* London: Verso.

Hooks, B. 2000. *Feminist Theory: from margin to center.* London: Pluto Press.

Isin, E. 2007. "City State: Critique of Scalar Thought." *Citizenship Studies.* 11(2): 211-228.

King, N. 2016. *No Border.* London: Zed books.

Marx, K and Engels, F. 1953. *Die deutsche Ideologie* [The German Ideology]. Berlin: Dietz Verlag.

Mudu, P and Chattopadhyay, S.2017. *Migration, Squatting and Radical Autonomy*. London: Routledge.

Lefebvre, H. 1996. *Writing on Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Longhi, V. 2013. *The immigrant war: A global movement against discrimination and exploitation*. Bristol: Policy Press, University of Bristol.

Pratt, G and Rosner, V. 2006. "The Global and the Intimate." *Women's Studies Quarterly*. 34(1/2): 13-24.

Pojmann, W. 2008. "Migration and activism in Europe since 1945." New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Sassen, S. 2013. "When the center no longer holds: Cities as Frontier zones." C*ities*. 34: 67 – 70.

Sharma, N. 2013. "Translating welfare and migration policies in Canada and Germany: Transatlantic and Transnational perspectives of social work". Discussion at a workshop. Frankfurt: Germany.

Walia, H. 2013. *Undoing Border Imperialism*. Oakland: A.K. Press.

About the review author

Sutapa Chattopadhyay is a geographer and an affiliated scholar at University of Regina, and United Nations and Maastricht Universities. Her research focuses on the politics of development (Indigeneity, gender, and nature), Migrant incarceration, borders and autonomy, social and ecological movements. Sutapa thanks Leah Montange for her promptness in reading earlier drafts of the review and Dawn Paley's consistent suggestions. s.chattopadhyay AT maastrichtuniversity.nl and sutapajacob AT gmail.com.

Book Review: Nandini Sundar, *The Burning Forest*

Review author: Sutapa Chattopadhyay

Nandini Sundar, 2016, *The Burning Forest: India's war on Bastar*. New Delhi, Juggernaut (413 pp., hardcover, $31.68)

Background

If you are a cinephile, Nandini Sundar's (2016) shocking sketches of violent development in her book *The Burning Forest* will remind you of Satayajit Ray's 1980s political satire *Hirok Rajar Deshe*. Ray's film captured the forced grouping of precarious peasants in efforts to make their lands available for wealth generation through the employment of free-rein abuse, and an egregious

and structural exploitation of the underclass. Similarly, James Cameron's trailblazing 2009 animated fiction, *Avatar*, illustrated the battle between mercenary earthlings and the hunter-gatherer Na'avi tribes whose lands were encroached upon for mining extraction (Ramani 2016). Ray's and Cameron's portrayals run parallel to Sundar's lucid depictions of the deep extortion of the Gondi Adivasis. *The Burning Forest* features textured and lurid description of Adivasis held in the crossfire of extreme barbarity and malice by Indian security forces and ordinary cops in the Bastar region in Eastern India.

In the three sections of the book, Sundar canvasses the origin and genealogy of state-led counterinsurgency *(Salwa Judum),* providing a harrowing analysis of various mechanisms deployed towards the apathetic destruction of Adivasi villages, assets and livelihoods, as well as exploring the miscarriages of the Indian judiciary system and state legitimization of violence against minority citizens.

In the 1980s, Maoist *dalams* (guerrillas) crossed into Bastar, in the south of Chhattisgarh, from neighboring Telangana in Andhra Pradesh to protect the Adivasis from exploitation by forest officers, contractors, traders, and land revenue officers; there they ran a parallel government. Delhi and Bhopal politicians were unconcerned with Maoist (Communist Party of India) control in the region until the liberalization of the mining sector in 2003. Sundar explains that since 2004, Bastar has been torn apart by the Indian government's war against Maoist guerrillas. Today, the forests in the northern Indrawati River are lacerated by heavy artillery, air raids, and land mines, and ground battalions spread out to hunt Maoists who operate through inscrutable circuits of information, covert networks, and limited resources (2016, 15).

Consequent to other Indigenous uprisings against the domination of the comprador class and colonial state, the *Bhumkal* rebellion in Bastar in 1910 was an attempt to protest against foreign rule and restore the Adivasi way of life. Maoist revolution is an offshoot of Naxalbari Andolan, which can aptly be described as a social movement (from below) that did not emerge abruptly, but evolved out of a long-standing agitation in response to deep extortion of the precarious workforce. Since the 1930s, Bengali communists in the region were organizing cadres, drawing on the experience of anti-capitalist mass struggles, most prominently the Tebhaga movement. Before long, the Naxal uprising proclaimed the 'annihilation line,' i.e, the killing of 'class enemies'. Nevertheless, Naxalbari evolved into a new political consciousness or a space for a new form of 'mass party politics' with 'democratization' (Sundar 2016, 3; Guha 2007). As Sundar documents, Adivasi marginalization meets the contours of economic neoliberalism, political indifference, and state-corporate greed.

Lives in exception

In 2004, when the Maoist war against the state intensified, Manmohan Singh, then-Prime Minister of India, called Bastar India's 'biggest internal threat' (Sundar 2016, 13). From 2005 onwards, the Indian state has made concerted

efforts to undermine the Maoists' sources of food, recruits, shelter, and intelligence while Adivasi villagers are forcibly dislocated in temporary camps. The *en masse* encampment and internment of Adivasis is described by Sundar as a state tactic to segregate Adivasis from Mao guerrillas. Those who refuse to leave their lands or relocate to the makeshift camps are brutally tortured, humiliated, raped, and sometimes killed as Maoists or Maoist sympathizers and supporters. The manner in which grouping of Adivasis in 'relief camps' or 'model villages', or Salwa Judum 'base camps' is devised replicates British-controlled Malaya where the uprooted Chinese were contained in 'new villages' to 'wean them away' from the Communist Party. Sundar explains how Americans installed similar approaches in Vietnam, constructing 'strategic hamlets' to segregate peasants from the *Viet Cong* in order to deprive the latter of supplies and information (Sundar 2016, 17). In this manner the state has taken absolute control of the region to tap into Bastar's rich mineral wealth. Additionally the precarity of Adivasis in the region relates to the intrusion of large numbers of non-Adivasi migrants due to state-corporate partnerships around mining industries. Therefore, there can be many conceptualizations of Salwa Judum, depending on who is analyzing it.

Salwa Judum is a Gondi concept that means 'purification hunt'. The current Hindu State Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) and opposition political party, such as the Congress, mobilized local people by fear and force to join Salwa Judum. They project the caucus of militarized cops as a 'spontaneous self-initiated people's movement' or counter-insurgent people's organization against the Naxalites, while the popular media manufactures Judum as a commonplace-overt uprising. Since November 2009, it has been called 'Operation Green Hunt', which in reality is a full-blown, nationwide paramilitary operation to cleanse the region of its Maoist insurgents. Paradoxically, as years pass, the death toll of ordinary villagers, Adivasi and non-Adivasi, has surpassed that of Maoist forces or state security squads (Sundar 2016, 15-16).

Some youths join the Judum because of the regular salary, while others are either former Maoist informants or apathetic to Maoists and forced to join the Judum after their villages are burned. Therefore, those involved in the Judum are impelled by desperation, force, or greed. Some special police officers, or SPOs, rose to become powerful leaders in their own right. Drawing from Doty (2007), I suggest that the manner in which the Indian state determines any particular situation as a factual danger to the state gives uncontrollable power to the agents of the state—in this case, Salwa Judum SPOs and their counterparts—to eliminate the underclass with impunity. Nandini Sundar documents how lives that are stripped of capital become damaged lives. The conceptualization of a life without value, such as the lives of the Adivasis, extends to Agamben's (1998) refinement of Aristotle and Hannah Arendt. Bare life is a life held in between *zoe* (i.e., "a particular life") and *bios* (i.e., "qualified" or "political life of speech and action"). In this case describes the Adivasi lives that transcend to a liminal position in between mere life and a good life. *Homo Sacer* is life in exclusion not purely a referent but an outcome of the violence of the sovereign. However it is not possible to analyze the shortcomings of

Agamben's conceptualizations, in this review, elsewhere I have argued for the agency of Adivasis (Chattopadhyay forthcoming; Agamben 1998, 114).

An important contribution of *The Burning Forest* is its account of the dysfunctional Indian justice system. Local police refuse to record any information on the offense of SPOs, and carry no responsibility to trace the accused. Further, police incarcerate a range of Adivasis and non-Adivasis for alleged connections to the Maoists. Some people are genuine *sangham* (Maoist) members, but many others are arrested arbitrarily. Bail is routinely denied. Court hearings are suspended while the accused spend years in squalid jails awaiting trials. Top-down revolutionary violence in Bastar is a perfect case of unharnessed power given to agents of the state (i.e, Salwa Judum) as the state declares itself in a particular situation (Doty 2007) that legalizes the tyranny of state agents over its subaltern citizens in the transition zones like Bastar. The latter has been extended in James Scott's (1998) 'Seeing like a State' and Johnson's (et.al. 2011, 68) 'Seeing like a border'. Both the concepts account the perspectives from those who shape and enforce the laws. This intricately connects with Sundar's problematization of Judum's selective control of the people, in the case of Bastar.

Conclusions

Sundar locates Bastar as a social space where guards, security forces, or paramilitary agents exercise unlimited power to act with impunity due to the exceptional nature of these spaces. Hence, the question remains – if Bastar was not endowed with metallic and nonmetallic mineral reserves would the state have orchestrated the war against its people? Following the sordid state of Bastar, economic development can be argued no longer as the responsibility of the state (Rist 1997, 223-6); rather, the state in collaboration with the private corporates sets the wider framework for capital accumulation with brutal alienation of people from their natural resources bases.

The Burning Forest is interdisciplinary and intersectional. Rarely do we come across books that are comprehensive and that attends to all levels of readership. Nandini Sundar's communicative and expansive appeal for reasoned humanity cannot be more eloquently expressed. This book does not praise Maoists for their sacrifices, "but disagree[s] with the wisdom of their path, and ... recognize[s] that violence, even against injustice, can degenerate into brutality and corruption" (Sundar 2016, xiv-xv). However, it does applaud the heroism of the Adivasis who are challenged by extreme circumstances; in the absence of justice, it takes "superhuman efforts to merely survive" (Sundar 2016, xv). Sundar writes the book with the voice of a vulnerable researcher who witnesses the deep exclusion of Indian autochthonous people over three decades, and simultaneously marks the failures of Indian democracy, the violence of development, counter-movement from above, and the politics of state formation.

References

Agamben, G. 1998. *Homo sacer. Sovereign power and bare life.* Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

Chattopadhyay, S. forthcoming. "Bodies, Nomos and the Cadance of Borders: *Storying Migrant Trajectories." ACME: Critical Geography Journal.*

Doty, R.L. 2007. "States of exception on the Mexico-U.S. Border: security, decisions and civilian border patrols." *International Political Sociology* 1(2):113-137.

Guha, R. 2007. "Adivasis, Naxalites and Indian Democracy." *Economic and Political Weekly.* 42 (32): 3305-3312.

Johnson, C, Jones, R, Paasi, A, Amoore, L, Mountz, A, Salter, M, and Rumford,C. 2011. "Interventions on rethinking 'the border' in border studies. "*Political Geography.* 30: 61-69.

Lefebvre, H. [1974] 1991. *The Production of Space.* Trans. Nicholson-Smith, D. Oxford: Blackwell.

Marx, K. [1867] 1977. *Capital. Vol. I.* Trans. Moore, S and Aveling, E, Ed. Engels, F. New York: International Publishers.

Ramani, S. 2016. "Elusive peace in Bastar." http://www.thehindu.com/books/literary-review/Elusive-peace-in-Bastar/article16072998.ece [accessed 06.06. 2017].

Rist, G .1997. *The History of Development.* London: Zed Books.

Scott, J. 1998. *Seeing like a State.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

About the review author

Sutapa Chattopadhyay is a geographer and an affiliated scholar at University of Regina, and United Nations and Maastricht Universities. Her research focuses on the politics of development (Indigeneity, gender, and nature), Migrant incarceration, borders and autonomy, social and ecological movements. Sutapa thanks Leah Montange for her promptness in reading earlier drafts of the review and Dawn Paley's consistent suggestions. s.chattopadhyay AT maastrichtuniversity.nl and sutapajacob AT gmail.com

Book review: *Kristian Lasslett, State Crime on the Margins of Empire*
Review author: Alexander Dunlap

Kristian Lasslett (2014). *State Crime on the Margins of Empire: Rio Tinto, the War on Bougainville and Resistance to Mining*, London, Pluto Press (220 pp. + Bibliography and Index. US$ 40.00)

Comprised of seven chapters and an afterword, *State Crime on the Margins of Empire* examines the early years of the Papua New Guinea (PNG) civil war ignited by the Rio Tinto subsidiary company, Bougainville Copper Limited (BCL). The lessons offered by author Kristian Lasslett have profound implications for understanding the actions and reactions of extractive industries and governments when their operations are challenged. A senior lecturer in criminology at Ulster University, Lasslett is director of the Institute for Research in Social Sciences, Editor-in-Chief of *State Crime Journal* and an executive board member of the *International State Crime Initiative*. This book is highly recommended to anyone interested in understanding the complexity of ecological conflicts triggered by extractivism, offering a valuable and detailed case study which dates back twenty-eight years.

The book begins by rooting itself theoretically, introducing the region, method and outlining the structure of the book. A special emphasis is placed on advancing classical Marxian theory as a means to approach the (formally) nascent study of state crime, which Lasslett blends with an acknowledgement of Foucauldian 'modalities of power' and 'governmentality' (pp. 5-6). A significant amount of space is dedicated to discussing orthodox Marxian theory, interview and archival research method, before providing a short book summary.

State Crime on the Margins of Empire then delves into the historical development and contextual specificities of Bougainville PNG. The section, like the last, begins with a discussion on Marxian theory, showing, despite Trotsky's use of modernist language (e.g. 'backwards country', 'savage'), that there is a nuance embedded in Marxian thought capable of accounting for flexibility and adaptability of imperial capital to different cultural circumstances that results in both 'uneven' and 'combined development' (p.27). Lasslett elaborates on the colonial-developmental history of PNG, and goes on to examine changes in the managerial dynamics within BCL, different tensions within the PNG government as well as land owners' associations to explain the emergence of 'social rupture' (p. 51) and/or conflict. Outlining textbook ecological distribution conflict dynamics triggered by the BCL/Rio Tinto mine in operation since 1972, protest erupted over exploitative (colonial) relationships, unequal benefit sharing and racism, which manifested in people engaging in non-violence civil disobedience and sabotage tactics against BCL, which quickly escalated.

Chapter 4 guides the reader from protest to guerrilla warfare against the BCL mine and PNG government. Detailing the different political positions of BCL, the PNG administration and later the Australian government (which has an interested in the mine), this chapter documents how economically and politically marginalized Bougainvilleans, 'dispossessed of land,' and mine workers, 'aggravated by the actions and attitudes of expatriate supervisors and managers,' 'rushed to join' the newly forming Marxist-Leninist inspired Bougainville Revolutionary Army (BRA) (p. 88). Insurrection against the mine transformed into struggle for national liberation against the PNG government, which resulted in the government dispensing indiscriminate and widespread state terrorism in an attempt to control the population.

The following section details the conflict and varying political positions and dynamics between key actors in the years 1989-1991, highlighting how BCL along with the PNG and Australian governments facilitated a counterinsurgency campaign against the BRA. Drawing on rich archival and interview material, *State Crime on the Margins of Empire* outlines the relationships, negotiations and measures taken by the PNG government and collaborators to diminish a vibrant and increasingly successful insurgency. Initially the PNG government negotiated (indirect) concessions known as 'the Bougainville Package' and carried out direct political policing; the process eventually gave way to a 'hard' counterinsurgency campaign. In addition to scorched-earth style tactics targeting the population at large, the campaign included the clearing and resettlement of over 16 villages into strategic hamlets or misnamed 'care centres,' where spatial-confinement, surveillance, impoverishment and rape were commonplace. The 'hard' military tactics employed by the PNG government supported by BCL/Rio Tinto and Australian government actually resulted in increased popular support for the BRA. This led BRA to form a coalition government, which obliged them to (violently) regain control of their soldiers and the population at large. Meanwhile, BRA attempts to restore order in Bougainville led the government to adapt their counterinsurgency strategy to exacerbate social divisions in attempt to build support for the PNG state and weaken the independence movement. The end result, however, was an intensification of a civil war that would end only with a peace agreement in 2001.

State Crime on the Margins of Empire ends with a summary of the take aways of previous chapters, providing readers with the concluding analysis. Problematizing 'landowner conflicts', Lasslett's Marxian approach highlights important factors involved in this conflict, such as 'the coercive effects of competition and the spatio-temporal demands of valorization' that are enmeshed with geopolitical strategies of states (pp. 180-3). The chapter transitions to discussing six lessons emanating from the case study, which concludes by discusses attempts by Rio Tinto to re-open the mine, as well as the co-optation of once important anti-mine activists, and how this relates to aggravating civil war trauma.

The detail and conversation analyzing the mining inspired civil war in Bougainville is astounding. That said, *State Crime on the Margins of Empire* has a tendency to prioritize Marxian theory, trying sometimes too hard to fit this case study into state crime studies. This raises concern with the word 'crime,' which implicitly relies on state/colonial and international legal structures, which are not only responsible for enforcing political, economic and extractive violence—the structure of conquest— but also legitimizing it. When we approach these questions within the logic of state-centric institutions, how does state crime studies differ from human rights studies? I suspect state crime studies faces similar disciplinary-political dilemmas as human rights, attempting to hold governments and corporations accountable through a legal system that states themselves designed or at least influenced. In addition, acknowledgement of the impacted ecosystems and ecological ontologies were absent from the analysis, which might reflect classical Marxian theoretical concerns that have historically sidelined ecosystems and more-than-human relationships. Engagement with political ecology would have benefited this book.

The most impressive aspect of *State Crime on the Margins of Empire* is the level of detail regarding how Rio Tinto/BCL sparked a civil war and its role within a two year long counterinsurgency campaign. Rio Tinto/BCL is both familiar with counterinsurgency and has actively participated in coordinating war efforts with PNG and Australian government. This acknowledgment could re-situate the rise of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and The Global Mining Initiative (GMI) that encourage corporations to seek 'social license' to operate and rebrand mining activities as environmentally 'sustainable' (see Seagle, 2012). These initiatives are preemptive responses to the anticipated resistance (and potential insurgencies) generated by large-scale development and mining projects. Corporate social technologies emerge from a continuum of environmental warfare, representing a (manipulative) strategic adaptation to advance company interests, which simultaneously attempt to reduce the economic and social costs for participating (directly or indirectly) in 'hard' counterinsurgency campaigns.

Counterinsurgency campaigns carried out in PNG (and elsewhere) have undoubtedly influenced resource extraction company policy and 'soft' approaches to manufacture politically and economically favorable extractive conditions. This is often done through public relation campaigns advertising the benefits of mining (e.g. jobs, social development, prosperity, etc); securing local collaborators (e.g. elites, politicians, landowners, church and civil society groups); and delegating political stability to participating collaborators (making them responsible for identifying, targeting and isolating dissident groups opposing the project). Lasslett's key contribution in this volume is to explain how Rio Tinto is no stranger to asymmetrical combat and navigating the complications of buying the 'hearts and minds' of governments and populations. Activists and scholars are remiss to ignore the fact that extractive companies are applying warfare techniques, in coordination with states, to secure their operations. For scholars to neglect this 'war component,' however subtle, tends toward erasing and forgetting the continuum of struggle by peoples—

Indigenous and otherwise—fighting for community control, alternative pathways to development and the ability to say 'no' to social, cultural, and ecological exploitation and degradation.

References

Seagle C. (2012) Inverting the Impacts: Mining, Conservation and Sustainability Claims near the Rio Tinto/Qmm Ilmenite Mine in Southeast Madagascar. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39: 447-477.

About the review author

Recently awarded a doctorate in social anthropology from Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Alexander Dunlap's previous research examined the social impact and conflict generated by wind energy development in Oaxaca, Mexico. Other publications by Alexander appear in *Anarchist Studies*, *Geopolitics*, *the Review of Social Economy*, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *Human Geography* and *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*. alexander.a.dunlap AT gmail.com

Book review: Adam Greenfield,
Radical Technologies: The Design of Everyday Life
Review author: Harry Warne

Adam Greenfield, 2017, *Radical Technologies: The Design of Everyday Life*. London: Verso. (368 pp., £18.99).

There is a strong temptation to make broad, excited claims about the potentials of contemporary computer systems and the more-or-less worldwide network that connects them. On the left, the theoretical future possibilities of computer technologies have an inviting allure, giving us hope for how we might overcome the shortcomings and failures of our social movements. In subtle contrast to these cyber-utopian hopes, the undercurrent running through Adam Greenfield's new book *Radical Technologies: The Design of Everyday Life* is an idea summed up by the tongue-in-cheek words of Richard Barbrook and Andy Cameron: "technology is not the issue." (Barbrook and Cameron, 1995). New novelties may emerge from shifting material realities but politics is just as painful and prolonged as it has always been, forever situated in the socio-political fabric of the moment. And it is unlikely that technology will change this anytime soon, if ever. Greenfield does not dismiss the possibility of advances in technology catalysing more loving futures but he is not optimistic about the prospect. He claims such a dream "is troublingly founded on an *ex machina*

retuning of human nature" (p. 290). And often it appears more likely that these technologies are paving the way for more inequality, not less.

Radical Technologies is a tour through some of the latest technological developments our increasingly information based, capitalist world has produced. Each chapter focuses on a different set of technologies: the smartphone, the internet of things, augmented reality, digital fabrication, cryptocurrency, the blockchain, automation, machine learning, and artificial intelligence. Greenfield claims they are all, in the forms that we are presented with today, indicative of what he calls the "contemporary technics" of "posthuman capitalism":

> that everyday life is something to be mediated by networked processes of measurement, analysis and control… and above all that human discretion is no longer adequate to the challenges of complexity presented to us by a world that seems to have absconded from our understanding (p. 308)

Greenfield's methodology is to first introduce a technology, its rudimentary functions and methods, and give some context for its deployment. He then proceeds to critique the forms of knowledge and power this may re/produce. Most of his explorations remain grounded in real world anecdotes, reflecting his unease with deterministic, futurist extrapolations many commenters on these issues lean towards - a breath of fresh air in a discourse often dominated by figures like the futurist Ray Kurzweil and Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg (Lev-Ram, 2017; Russell, 2017). For example, Greenfield offers a critique of the use of machine learning algorithms within juridical processes in the United States, where digital adjudicators have shown similar racial biases to their flesh and blood counterparts (Angwin et al, 2016). He paints us a picture of a world awash with information and offers up many examples of that information being utilised in flawed technical systems which - intended or not - reproduce inequality. In the words of cyberneticist Stafford Beer: the "purpose of a system is what it does" (p. 155). An auxiliary theme is the trust we put in technology and where this can take us.

I will avoid reiterating too many details from Greenfield's discussions in *Radical Technologies*. However, it is interesting to note his omissions. Whilst the machine learning chapter is 48 pages long, the chapter on artificial intelligence which follows it is a mere 12 pages. This chapter feels more like an extension of the one before it, which makes thematic sense. But its brevity is interesting considering the renewed interest in the prospect of advanced machine intelligence we have seen in recent years, particularly discussions around the existential risk this may pose and massive rewards this may bring (Bostrom, 2016: pp. 6-14). The moment of "Singularity" - the theorised time at which a machine intelligence is created as capable as any human, which could then set upon improving itself and start a runaway process manifesting a

superintelligent entity beyond our control - is something which is being taken seriously by those in the halls of the United Nations to the likes of Stephen Hawking (Boffey, 2017). Perhaps for its headline grabbing quality but also out of genuine concern about what many consider an immanent possibility (Bostrom, 2016: p. 23). But Greenfield chooses to say almost nothing on artificial intelligence, appearing baffled in the face of an increasingly impenetrable world[6] (pp. 270-271). His comments on the possibilities of automation and the end of work, another hot topic, are similarly brief. Most of Greenfield's exposition is a critique of commentators (including Paul Mason, Jeremy Rifkin, Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams) who have placed these technological advances at the centre of their advice for social movements and other actors.

Greenfield seems unable to comment on Singularity or of the end of work. He acknowledges how stunted our discourse is and how bound we are to the present, drowning in speculation - much of it wild. Where others try to make colourful predictions, Greenfield is ready to hold his hands up and admit where he feels we are unqualified to stray. This is an area for development by social movements, however. Towards the end of his discussion on automation he writes:

> [W]e urgently need to reinvent (particularly, but not just) a left politics whose every fundamental term has been transformed: a politics of far-reaching solidarity, capable of sustaining and lending nobility to all the members of a near-universal unnecessariat. (p. 206)

Humans are less and less necessary for the reproduction of the economy but the left is yet to manifest viable political projects which can rescue humanity from irrelevance.

Greenfield wears his pessimism on his sleeve with regard to the direction in which humanity is moving. Perhaps we are in too deep, engulfed by the hegemony of late capitalism. This hegemony actively reproduces itself,

> sustaining and being sustained by a continuous and all but unquestioned framework of assumptions about what technology is for, how it is developed, and who makes it. And in doing so, it tends to deny the space in which alternatives might be nurtured, to the extent that those alternatives have all but literally become unthinkable. (p. 313)

Radical Technologies reads like an account of globalisation and technology written by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri on a day when the pair are both

---

[6] Many advances in AI in recent years have been down to advances in techniques relating to artificial neural networks. One characteristic of the architecture of such systems is that very often even the human programmers do not understand exactly how their AI system produced its output (Knight, 2017).

feeling more pessimistic than usual. In their 2004 work, *Multitude*, the pair go to great lengths to detail the communicative, connected nature of what they see as the emerging hegemony of "biopolitical production." Their analysis details a two-sided concept of globalisation, one of both new challenges and new possibilities - *Empire* and *the multitude*, in their words. They use Internet technologies as a symbolic example of the networked character of a world which they claim presents the opportunity, for the first time, of worldwide democracy. While they do not necessarily understate the challenges presented by the hegemony of capitalism and its related structures of power/knowledge, their project is one predicated on a more optimistic view of the landscape before us. The epigraph to their 2000 work, *Empire*, reads "any tool is a weapon if you hold it right." But Greenfield's concern is that the tools we are presented with are too embedded in structures of information based capitalism to serve as weapons.

Hardt and Negri argue that globalisation offers up new opportunities for a democracy which can overcome the new challenges that a globalised world presents. Greenfield borrows the term "path dependence" to speak of "the tendency of a dynamic system to evolve in ways that are determined by decisions made in its past" (p. 232). Few things are inevitable, but, in short: are we too far gone? Not to suggest that Hardt and Negri or other similar archaeologists of globalisation lack nuance and caution, but this is a possibility often missed or glossed over in many other inquiries. Perhaps for morale.

Almost every work which details some aspect of the shittiness of our world seems compelled to end with an optimistic proclamation. Despite the author's overall pessimism, *Radical Technologies* is no exception. However, one is left with the impression that his attempt is shoehorned. Many authors would offer up a chapter but, as with other things he feels ill-equipped to comment on, Greenfield offers only a few pages. And even within these he speaks less of the triumph of democratic movements and more of the indomitability of the human spirit and how, against all odds, life finds a way in the margins, in the cracks.

Greenfield's brief conclusion on how we should respond is nonetheless potent and pressing:

> If what we find in the radical technologies we've discussed is the power to transform the very ground of our social being in a particularly inimical way, it [is] difficult to imagine that any choice we can make as individuals or small clusters can do much to undermine the prerogatives of the institutions of scale that are interested in seeing this transformation made real ... And yet, daunting as it may be, that is exactly the task that now lies before us, the charge that is ours to discover, inhabit and make our own.
> ...
> It's absolutely vital, now, for all of us who think of ourselves as in any way progressive or belonging to the left current to understand just what the emerging technics of everyday life propose, how they work, and what they

are capable of. *A time of radical technologies demands a generation of radical technologists* (pp. 313 - 314, emphasis added)

A bold battlecry. Albeit one that, in the thrust of *Radical Technologies*, feels tacked onto the end. If we are to take onboard the analysis presented in this book, its detailing of the current and emerging possibilities for the accentuation of an impoverished and violent world order, then what choice do we have? We must hope that we can find a way to hold the tools right and act as if we can.

Radical Technologies is a book that does not aim to present any answers. It is difficult to read it and not experience a few moments, sat back with eyebrows raised, thinking, "oh, they can do that now?" Every chapter leaves the reader with a growing impression that the future is being built elsewhere, by those with motivations that the progressive among us would find insidious. And soon these innovations are finding their way onto our streets, into our courts, into our pockets, and mediating our perceptions of the world. Many profound changes are not in the distant future: they are here.

Greenfield name drops a few groups he thinks are doing good work (Deep Lab and the annual Radical Networks conference) but his impression is of a world where progressive forces are left trailing behind the dizzying progress of posthuman capitalism, an economy that less and less needs humanity for its reproduction. As Greenfield stated following the book's release: "We need a posthuman politics for a posthuman economy" (Greenfield, 2017b).

But the question remains: where are all the radical technologists?

References

Angwin, Julia; Larson, Jeff; Mattu, Surya; Kirchner, Lauren (2016), "Machine Bias", *ProPublica*, 23rd May 2016. Available at: https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing

Barbrook, Richard and Cameron, Andy (1995), 'Basic Banalities'. This wall poster was produced for the 1995 *Imaginary Futures* conference at Warwick University, Coventry, England. Text available at: http://www.imaginaryfutures.net/2007/04/15/basic-banalities-by-richard-barbrook-and-andy-cameron/

Boffey, Daniel (2017), "Robots could destabilise world through war and unemployment, says UN", *The Guardian*, 27th September 2017. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/sep/27/robots-destabilise-world-war-unemployment-un

Bostrom, Nick (2016), *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies* (Oxford University Press)

Book reviews

Greenfield, Adam (2017a), *Radical Technologies: The Design of Everyday Life* (Verso)

Greenfield, Adam (2017b), '"We need a posthuman politics for a posthuman economy" Verso Books, video uploaded to *Youtube* 7th July 2017. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EvIjga_sDbY

Hardt, Michael & Negri, Antonio (2000), *Empire* (Harvard University Press)

Hardt, Michael & Negri, Antonio (2004), *Multitude* (Penguin Press)

Knight, Will (2017), "The Dark Secret at the Heart of AI", *MIT Technology Review*, 11th April 2017. Available at: https://www.technologyreview.com/s/604087/the-dark-secret-at-the-heart-of-ai/

Lev-Ram, Michal (2017), 'Why Futurist Ray Kurzweil Isn't Worried About Technology Stealing Your Job', *Fortune*, 24th September 2017. Available at: http://fortune.com/2017/09/24/futurist-ray-kurzweil-job-automation-loss/

Russell, Jon (2017), "Elon Musk says Mark Zuckerberg's understanding of the future of AI is 'limited'", *TechCrunch*, 25th July 2017. Available at: https://techcrunch.com/2017/07/25/elon-musk-mark-zuckerberg-artificial-intelligence/

About the review author

Harry Warne is a UK based postgraduate researcher and an alumnus of Aberystwyth University, Wales. He is interested in the emerging possibilities and pitfalls of artificial intelligence and how critical theory can help nuance our discourses surrounding technology. Author contact: harry AT aftercalifornia DOT com.