


Synthesis: an Anglophone Journal of Comparative Literary Studies

No 9 (2016)

Living through the Interregnum



Introduction: In the Wake of the Polity to Come

Mina Karavanta

doi: [10.12681/syn.16221](https://doi.org/10.12681/syn.16221)

Copyright © 2016, Mina Karavanta



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Introduction: In the Wake of the Polity to Come

Mina Karavanta

Difficult as it is to refute that life has gotten a lot worse since 2009 when Greece was submitted to the Troika supervision and was denounced as one of the economically delinquent countries in Europe, the word crisis can no longer describe the persistent effects of destructive measures and policies that have hitherto failed to restructure the country and boost its economy at the expense of the people that live in the country, citizens and denizens alike. It has rather become a catachrestic word promising an end that never arrives. Describing the collapse of a predominantly economic dream that promised political and cultural affluence — in other words— a politics of comfort, the word crisis continues to suggest the possibility of convalescence and restructuring. The “centre cannot hold” (W.B. Yeats) but the promise of a centre, that is, of a general structure that will be restored back to order feeds off the sustained use of the term. “A crisis is provisional, accidental, unintelligible--*but in regard to an order*” (Derrida 71); it thus signifies the presence of an economy, that, albeit destabilised, will be restored and made complete. There is “No crisis without a *dénouement*” (71) and without a “necessary judgment, choice, and decision *between two terms*” (72). In this respect, crisis is the manifestation of the incalculable as “a moment of calculation, the undecidable that is still determined as the relation of a voluntary subject to a possible decision, to a calculation with which he intends to reckon” (72). When in 2009 the prime minister of Greece announced that the country, in order to be saved, had to be submitted to the economic and political supervision of the Troika, the accompanying mythology was that this would be a period during which the country could save itself from its gilded dreams, undergo a process of fiscal and political restructuring and retrieve its way to becoming a European nation-state accountable to its partners and citizens. The discourse of salvation often goes hand in hand with destruction as it is used to justify the collateral damages of political

decisions that obliterate any form of accountability to the ones afflicted by them. Eight years have passed since the announcement of a new era during which Greece's economy would be restructured to make it more efficient and thus inviting to foreign investments, but economic instability, unemployment, poverty, and despair of ever exiting the crisis continue to prevail.

What has changed since 2009 is the deepening of people's awareness that what was announced as the crisis is a permanent condition without a foreseeable end; instead, Greece, under socialist, right-wing and left-wing governments, continues to balance on the tight rope between the intensification of the Troika's fiscal measures and a possible Grexit. A typically Greek tragedy, some would argue, as Greece is the only country of the infamous PIGS that has been unable to exit the crisis for reasons that are far beyond the scope of this special issue. The incentive for this issue is the normalisation of the condition of social and political insecurity as a result of the permanent state of debt in which Greece has existed for the past eight years. In Europe's debt and in a constant economic and political precarity, Greece has acquired the role of a postcolony within the ideological and political terrain of Europe; Achille Mbembe describes the postcolony as the space ordered by a regime of violence that has normalised the "commandment" (25-26) of state power consolidated on the colonial state and its political machineries in the postcolonial era. However different from the colonial histories that Mbembe has in mind, Greece in a prolonged state of precarity and exception shares with the postcolony the following features: a sustainable "*régime d'exception*" (29); the consolidation of state power "through administrative and bureaucratic practices" that produce a "master code" "governing the logics that underlie all other meanings within that society" (103); and the institutionalisation of a "socio-historical world" (103) that becomes the only possible real world instilled in people's consciousness as "common sense."¹ The representation of violence as common sense reveals how the tug of war between democracy and neoliberalism is getting off balance. This can be seen not only in the postcolonial world but also in sites like Greece, the Mediterranean and other places in Europe and the world, where neocolonial policies and politics are being implemented. Some of their immediate effects are the continuous reduction of labor rights and the implementation of austerity measures followed by the injunction of a closed-border policy to fend off the refugee crisis, namely, the growing number of stateless and displaced persons that include exiled people, asylum seekers and economic immigrants. Several EU states built razor-wire barriers and fences thus refusing to abide by the human rights

international laws and the initial agreements about humanitarian assistance to the stateless people across Europe.² The refugee crisis overlapping with the economic crisis is symptomatic of the political context that the word crisis obfuscates, namely, the persistent failings, if not failures, of democracy in Europe. Escaping from their own economic and political crises, the stateless cross the Mediterranean sea to arrive in Europe where the “right to rights” (Arendt 176) has been the foundation of human rights and asylum laws that are tightly intertwined with what Anthony Bogues calls the “*politics of the wound*, the politics of a historical catastrophe” (40) that colonisation and imperialism have systematically proliferated across the world. This politics haunts democracies in the present; colonialism and neo-colonialism, racism and neo-racism, imperial conquests and neo-imperial expansions, economic wars and states of exception are some of its names. Originating in colonial and neocolonial practices legitimised by race-thinking and its racist institutions, the wound thus refers to the various histories of the destruction of the human. Statelessness as a condition of “complete rightlessness” (176) that Hannah Arendt examines in *Imperialism* is the symptom of such a recurrent history in late modernity. Arendt shows how this history became the path to the institutionalisation of universal rights that would prevent this condition of statelessness from becoming the state’s means to legitimise the extinction of humans, as in the case of the slave plantations and the concentration camps. Choosing to forget this history of human catastrophe, Europe nowadays sees the surge of migrants and refugees as the burden that the citizen, that is, the civilised man, can choose to accept or not, the way those who have the power choose to grant the gift of philanthropy or not to those they represent as the humans outside humanity. This is another version of the “founding violence” that consolidates the “commandment” (25) of the civilising mission that Mbembe analyses in his text; the colonizer can choose to sympathise with the beastly colonised and grant him/her a favour for the sake of including the native and the indigenous in the white man’s humanity.

The history and content of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, though, casts a different light on their right to these rights, a right not granted as a gift but an earned right. A closer reading of the history of human rights discloses the contribution of the colonised world to the drafting and consolidation of the UDHR, which is not the logical conclusion of the European man’s categorical imperative prescribed by the humanity of his others³ but rather the outcome of “struggles for forms of radical equality” (Bogues 40) that postwar and postcolonial practices of

democracy made possible.⁴ In *The Common Cause*, Leela Gandhi attends to this important chapter in the history of the UDHR, which serves as the touchstone of democratic and humanitarian values and is founded on the participation of “several representatives from the colonized world [...] appointed to serve among the original eighteen member nations of the Human Rights Commission” in the drafting of the international bill of human rights (105). The history of the universal right to rights reveals how the document and discourse of human rights is not the recuperative project of Europe in the wake of WWII, in other words, the byproduct of the restoration of western humanism after two world wars and ongoing colonialisms; it is rather the text of a “diverse authorship” that represented the “anticolonial sentiments [...] concerning the universal applicability of the human rights covenant without discrimination ‘on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty’” (105-106). It therefore serves as an example of a transcultural and global postcolonial ethics rooted in anticolonial movements, insurgencies, and struggles and moulded out of discourses that affiliate humanistic values with anticolonial politics. Gandhi argues that it gestures to a poetics and politics of common cause crafted by minority and subaltern histories developed at the limits of or even outside hegemonic discourses and that answers to the need for culturally crosshatched political imaginaries; these engender what Edouard Glissant calls “a poetics of relation” and Edward Said identifies as the ontological and political work of affiliation that takes the human rather than man as its measure.⁵

The resuscitation of this history that unearths the codependence of postwar democracies and anticolonial thought can be the ground for the revival of the political subsumed by a political pragmatism that presents politics as a dilemma between economic survivability and political extinction. The increasing ranks of stateless people demanding their much fought-for and sought-after right to rights and the growing number of people identified as the precariat make up the multitude of humans,⁶ whose continuing state of economic, social and political expropriation exerts pressure on democratic ethics, as circumscribed as they may be under the current state of economic and political insecurity. Notwithstanding the unevenness that separates them and their discrepant modes of existence that shield the one from the other, these two multitudes constitute a human force that may be socially and politically isolated from communities of support but are great in numbers. They thus represent a human potentiality whose ethical impetus and

political exigency trump the financial imperatives and political pragmatism of the current democratic states. This is another face of the global, the human face of those, removed from their homelands because of global economic or military politics, who are trekking through war zones and treading the rough seas. A global populace in transit —physical, social, and economic— rises from the ‘shadows’ of the laundry lists of the neocolonialist and neoliberal agendas. Jacques Derrida affiliates this yet-to-come that is already present with what he sees as the task of democracy in the present, namely, the effort to create imaginary and thus political alignments with the constituencies that its sovereign order has expropriated the way it has excluded the beastly, the monstrous, the abnormal.⁷

The overlapping of these two new conditions of precariousness, the stateless and the precariat, is one of the challenges that democracies are facing across the world, especially in places like Greece where the prolonged state of economic insecurity and a state of exception have become the norm. As a result, the reduction of the welfare state to the economic mandates of global capitalism threatens to dissolve the strife between “the subject of rights and the subject of interests” into a permanent condition of interest flouting and overflowing right (Foucault 272-74).⁸ This is a symptom of a regime of biopolitics that now offers survivability-in-insecurity in exchange for submission. Living through the interregnum while retaining the right to a bios politikos rather than bare life and fighting for the maintenance of the subject of rights as an ethical being is the politics without a name, a concrete class consciousness, an organised syndicate and political party, even a stable and supportive community. However, it is a politics immanent in impromptu insurgencies; solidarity acts performed by citizens and denizens, whose response and responsibility to the human wins over their interests; occupy movements; and minor gestures of human care, incalculable, unpredictable and unaccountable to the measures set by political and economic pragmatism. Albeit still in the making, this politics of organizing a new polity of human rights and democratic values that promote the right to rights and consolidate the promise of a politics that remains open to the precarity of its others, is material as well as imaginary, real as well as desired, sought after as well as anticipated, especially by the oppressed, the expropriated, the excluded.

It is the task of the humanities to attend to this politics by the practice of what Edward Said calls democratic criticism. This criticism affiliates the histories and discourses that nationalist politics and neoliberal agendas represent as oppositional and dividing without foregoing or turning a blind eye to their

discrepant realities so that it can articulate the interacting aesthetics, knowledges, “border gnoseologies” (Mignolo 22) that reveal what it means to be human “after the last sky” (Said). This special issue is the response to such effort; to articulate the different tasks that the name of the crisis puts under erasure, the task to contemplate democracy and the subject in the interregnum, the need to articulate modes of re-presentation that engender an aesthetics attentive to the active conversation between the polis and the subject; the charting of the interregnum both as a genealogy and a political condition that is normalised; the interruption of the sign of the crisis and the naming of politics that it has engendered or obfuscated. How can a democratic politics attentive to the growing needs of an economically and politically insecure demos be imagined? Dimitris Vardoulakis examines this question while drawing a conceptual framework centred on an agonistic democracy that is generated from a relational ontology. Taking to task Jacques Rancière’s axiom of equality against the relational ontology of an agonistic democracy and conversing with Spinoza’s ethics, Vardoulakis explores the imbrication of the ontological, the ethical and the political as the foundation of an agonistic democracy. Ann Cacoullis unearths Plato’s critique of democracy in the Republic and reads it as a contestation of its limitations rather than a rejection in toto. In tune with the readings that suggest that the Republic should be analysed as a theoretical figuration of the polis rather than as the depiction of an actual state, Cacoullis demonstrates how the Platonic text is symptomatic of how the Greeks also invented the idea that democracy is “an essentially contested concept.” The contradictions in democracy reveal how democracy, despite its errors and limitations, promotes the art of self-examination and the practice of the constant contestation of its political culture, an art that contemporary democracies need to revitalize against inequality and injustice. The polis as a partitioned space with inner borders that generate social, economic and political unevenness is symptomatic of a political modernity mediated by neocolonial politics. Charting the trajectory of the partitioned polis at the turn of the twenty-first century, Maureen Fadem examines the potentiality of political communities contingent on places whose borders are fluid, easily contested and volatile. Foregoing the solid structures of nation-states, places that host a “new consciousness of streets,” insurgencies and revolts that express the urgent needs of the people engender a new way of conceptualizing and actualizing imagined political communities in the present, especially in places still unaccountable to the agenda of nations.

Philip Hager attends to Michail Marmarinos's *Reconstruction* of Grotowski's staging of Wyspiański's *Acropolis* and examines the ways Marmarinos deconstructs the monumentalising processes by which the city becomes a site of dispossession. Arguing that the democratic city can be "performed, re-imagined and re-membered through the ruins of the spectacle of the neoliberal city," Hager reads Marmarinos's minoritisation of the Acropolis as a disruption of the politics that transform its aesthetic and political spaces into neoliberal capital. A site of the invisible but persevering "becoming-minorities" (Deleuze), the ancient ruin signifies the mobilising of dispossessed subjectivities and their minor acts of resistance. Konstantinos Blatanis also focuses on the dramatisation of crisis in Anna Deavere Smith's *Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992* (1993) and José Rivera's *Marisol* (1992). Written in response to the economic and political turmoil that defined Los Angeles and New York City in the nineties, both plays represent the experience of the disenfranchised in these two American global cities while contesting their hegemonic role and structure as aesthetic products that take the risk of commodifying the ontological, political and social effects of the crisis by translating it into a spectacle. Arguing that they succeed in dramatising the struggle for politically effective discourses and modes of representation rather than succumbing to representing the subjects of the crisis as commodity-spectacles, Blatanis examines the ways contemporary drama opens the horizon of politics. Both Hager and Blatanis illuminate the ways contemporary art dramatises the political as the site where aesthetics interrupts politics not to correct it but to transgress the codes, discourses, inner structures that bind art to economy and an order of politics that restricts the potentiality of aesthetics: to revolutionize the imaginary and reinvent the political while attending to the care of the human as other, as minor and expropriated, as a being in a polity and with an unconditional right to one.

Philippe Theophanidis's succinct genealogy of the interregnum through Antonio Gramsci and its later deployment by Zygmunt Bauman and Étienne Balibar grounds the term crisis in the current thinning out of authority (*auctoritas*) and intensification of executive power (*potestas*) that modern democracies are facing in the present. For Theophanidis, Both Bauman and Balibar contemplate the potentiality of a new commons empowered by the proliferation of insurgencies and democratic movements. This polity to come consolidated from below and addressing the urgent needs of a demos rife with social unevenness is a symptom of a politics in the making and a possible "way out of the interregnum."

Coding the crisis as economic and representing the political effects of the austerity measures as secondary have been the strategies of a systematic disavowal of EU politics that has led to a failure of the political. R. Radhakrishnan examines the effects of the delinking of economy from politics and the current crisis of the political as a crisis of representation that unconceals the normalisation of political amorality. Radhakrishnan shows how the Greek crisis signifies a larger crisis of the political in both the European and the global terrains by highlighting the representational politics that stigmatises the weak states as the “constitutive outside” of the crisis and, thus, what European sovereignty can force outside its structures leaving them no choice but a “lose lose” one. By drawing on the “ambivalence of the plebiscite” that took place in Greece in the summer of 2009, just before Mr. Tsipras’s government was forced to agree to another memorandum and the banks were closed in Greece, Radhakrishnan shows how the people of these states are doubly abjected: both as the people of nation-states whose rights can no longer be protected within the weak structures of their rogue economies; and as the people of Europe whose claim to Europe is no longer legitimate. This double abjection conjures the question of political representation as a question of speaking for and speaking to. Here, Radhakrishnan conjures not only Gayatri Spivak’s question about the subaltern’s ability to speak for herself but also Étienne Balibar’s systematic critique of Europe’s politics of closed borders and neoliberal politics.⁹ How can the weak represent themselves within structures that have already represented them as the rogues, the beastly, the politically deficient because economically defaulted? When represented, who speaks? Who has the right to Europe? Who are the people of Europe in the eurozone regulated by a political modality that reduces the “realm of the political to the domain of economic institutions”?

The delinking of the political from the economic and the production of economic centres and dependent peripheries in Europe is not a new phenomenon; David C. Lloyd argues that what is new is the legitimisation and normalisation of these structural divisions followed by new racist discourses applicable now to the level of the nation-state and its subjects. By tracing the metonymies of PIGS, the acronym for Portugal, Ireland/Italy, Greece and Spain, Lloyd shows how this name has not only signified the natural baseness of these countries failing to meet the economic criteria of the rich North; it has also conjured a long history of race thought in Europe rooted in a certain idea of Man, the “overrepresented European Man” (Wynter 260) that both Frantz Fanon and Sylvia Wynter have decried in their

works, that has been the source of “neo-racism” (Balibar 20-21). The subjects not made to his measure and their organised polities that fall short of the proper Europe only certain European nation-states ideally imitate are the beasts, the rogues, or the abnormal that should be cured, policed or ordered by sovereignty. The archipelagoes of Greece and Ireland are for Lloyd sites of transformative politics rather than rogue peripheries; they call to forms of solidarity that “exceed the centripetal logic of austerity.” The response of small islands in the European periphery like Lesvos exemplifies this transformative politics that deluges the centre of economic austerity with acts of humanitarian aid that secure a polity to come; a polity whose centre is the human, not man, and whose offering is the social and political potentiality of the constituencies and their collectivities who survive not to barely live but with a profoundly human task at hand, to have a political life, *a bios politikos*, to live well.¹⁰

Giovanna Covi’s essay examines the new forms of solidarity paving a way out of a political standstill. For Covi, solidarity is effective when it is rooted in acts of relationality that fight against gender, racial, ethnic and religious divisions proliferated by the growing unevenness in Europe across its borders. Europe’s incapacity to respond to the humanitarian crisis met at its borders represents the limit of its humanitarian and humanistic heritage formed as a kind of solidarity against war and totalitarianism in Europe but not necessarily as a politics of solidarity for the human and her collectivity, wherever this arises or from wherever it arrives. This limit accounts for Europe’s capacity to close its borders and shut its gates in the name of security and the humanism it has secured for itself. A humanism of closed doors to humanity and a hospitality that becomes a politics of hostility by way of safeguarding its gifts have become the tokens of European politics in the present; rather than saving Europe, though, such practices contribute to the rise of anti-European sentiment and politics. The special issue closes with Maro Germanou’s interview with Costas Douzinas that examines the grafting of the crisis onto politics; Germanou invites Douzinas to an examination of the ways the urgency of the term that we use to refer to the prolonged state of political and economic insecurity in Greece overwhelms the political. Democracy, insurgency, politics rooted in the needs and urgencies of the demos are restrained and constrained by the delimited and supervised sovereignty of the state. The crisis shows how the “institutional idea of democracy, what we call liberal or parliamentary democracy...decaying now” (Douzinas) has tried to put under erasure another aspect of democracy, namely, the “power of the people over all

aspects of their existence.” Douzinas and Germanou examine the questions of the nation, the people, human rights, cosmopolitan values and the potentiality of new forms of collective resistance within the context of new regimes of biopolitical violence and in the current formations of neo-colonial and neo-imperial politics, in view of the timely need to imagine and practice a revolutionary politics.

The dissemination of nationalist, xenophobic and racist discourses in Europe are some of the effects of the reduction of political sovereignty to economic survivability; in other words, the security measures have only succeeded in further consolidating a state of ontological and political insecurity. Europe has closed in on itself only to face its own heart of darkness, what Edmund Husserl called the “exteriorization” and “absorption” of rationalism in “‘naturalism’ and ‘objectivism’” (191). This kind of politics foreclosing the openness of a horizon can be interrupted by aesthetics, discourses, solidarity acts, and politics that forego the national and supranational structures contingent on economic survivability. This calls for the intellectual and political work that does not rely on hope but draws its energy from the constituencies and the collectivities whose desire to live well is the matter of the political and the polities to come that are present and persevering. The figure of the refugee bears the promise of this to-come; every arrival of the saved that has not drowned flouts the economic order of interests with the unconditional claim to rights that incite the polis that receives the ones who have arrived to offer hospitality, to care for the human in the name of her unconditional “right to rights,” and thus, to act as a democratic polity. This is the work of ethics against economy, the work of rights against interests, the work of the political beyond the limits of politics. What we need to do is to preserve and be in the wake.¹¹

Acknowledgements

I thank Adam Spanos, R. Radhakrishnan and William V. Spanos for their valuable comments and suggestions and for continuing to inspire me to persevere.

The essays by R. Radhakrishnan, David Lloyd and Giovanna Covi were initially written for a special roundtable for the Modern Language Association’s 2016 International Symposium, *Other Europes: Migrations, Translations, Transformations* (Düsseldorf, Germany). The title of the roundtable was “Greek Crisis is Europe’s Crisis is Global Crisis” and was organized and coordinated by R. Radhakrishnan. The special issue editors, Maria Germanou and Mina Karavanta, warmly thank Professors R. Radhakrishnan, Giovanna Covi and David Lloyd for accepting our invitation to contribute their essays to this special issue.

¹ A close reading of Achille Mbembe's *On the Postcolony* reveals a number of other features that substantiate the analogy between Greece and the postcolony such as the "zombification" (104) of the people represented as undomesticated and unruly natives that Europe needs to control; the ascription of beastly and animal attributes to the lazy and rogue natives (189-190); and the legitimation of severe punitive measures in the name of the civilizing mission that intends to shape humanity out of the vulgar and dissident native.

² See *The EU and the Refugee Crisis* published by the European Commission in July 2016: <http://publications.europa.eu/webpub/com/factsheets/refugee-crisis/en/>

³ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak explains how a travestied appropriation of the categorical imperative by the state can "justify the imperialist project by producing the following formula: make the heathen into a human so that he can be treated as an end in himself; in the interest of admitting the raw man into the noumenon; yesterday's imperialism, today's 'Development'" (123-24).

⁴ I draw on Bogue's argument that the "politics of the wound" prompts us, those who inherit the history of the disaster and choose not to defy its specters, to think about the relationship "between the wound as historically catastrophic and as a wrong" so that we engage democracy not as "consensual, rational practice that operates through forms of deliberative procedures and leaves legacies intact" but as a "way to reformulate struggles for forms of radical equality" (40).

⁵ See Edouard Glissant's *Poetics of Relation* and Edward Said's *Culture and Imperialism* as well as *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*.

⁶ Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri differentiate the multitude from the concepts of the mob, the crowd or the mass, and define it as the "internally different, multiple social subject" formed on "what it has in common" (100), what it might share and a commons it might build in precarity, rather than identity or unity. For an analysis of the precariat, see Guy Standing's *The Precariat* and Isabell Lorey's *State of Insecurity*. Both texts punctuate the consolidation of this new class of flexible workers without the support of a community, or the promise of a unified class consciousness, as the example of a biopolitical governmentality in a permanent state of insecurity.

⁷ See Michel Foucault's *Abnormal* and Jacques Derrida's *The Beast and the Sovereign*.

⁸ In *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault excavates the consolidation of the homo economicus as the "eminently governable" man (270) whose model biopolitics makes applicable to every aspect of social life, thus threatening to constrain the subject of rights and thus reducing ethics, justice, responsibility to the mandates of the market.

⁹ See Étienne Balibar's *Equaliberty* that examines the potentiality of a politics of co-citizenship consolidated on what Balibar calls equaliberty ; and *We, the People of Europe?*, which interrogates the politics of "fortress Europe." For an examination of the important development of Spivak's analysis of the representational politics that can silence the subaltern, see her essay and the collection of essays that draw on her work in *Can the Subaltern Speak? Reflections on the History of and Idea*, edited by Rosalind C. Morris.

¹⁰ Daphne Matziaraki's documentary "4.1 miles" is a vivid representation of the efforts of a coast guard crew in Lesbos to save the refugees from drowning and a testimony to a polity in the making.

¹¹ I borrow this phrase "to be in the wake" from Christine Sharpe's *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Attending to the Atlantic history of human catastrophe, she builds a poetics of remembrance that resists the forgetting of being and calls for a politics of actively inheriting from the spectres of Atlantic histories, by being in their wake while holding a wake, remaining vigilant. For the polity to come as the work of exilic consciousness that draws on the figure of the refugee, see William V. Spanos's *Exiles in the City*, a powerful analysis of Hannah Arendt and Edward Said's poetics of affiliation.

Works Cited

- Arendt, Hannah. *Imperialism*. New York: Harcourt, 1951.
- Balibar, Étienne. *Equaliberty*. Trans. James Ingram. Durham & London: Duke UP, 2014.
- . *Race, Nation, Class*. Trans. Chris Turner. London: Verso, 1991.
- . *We, the People of Europe?* Trans. James Swenson. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton UP, 2004.
- Bogues, Anthony. *Empire of Liberty*. Hanover: Dartmouth UP, 2010.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Economies of the Crisis." *Negotiations. Interventions and Interviews, 1971-2001*. Trans. & Ed. Elizabeth Rottenberg. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2002: 69-74.
- . *The Beast and the Sovereign*. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington. Chicago & London: U of Chicago P, 2009.
- Foucault, Michel. *Abnormal*. Trans. Graham Bruchell. London: Verso, 2003.
- . *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Trans. Graham Bruchell. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Hardt, Michael & Antonio Negri. *Multitude*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*. Trans. Quentin Lauer. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Gandhi, Leela. *The Common Cause*. Chicago & London: U of Chicago P, 2014.

- Glissant, Edouard. *Poetics of Relation*. Trans. Betsy Wing. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997.
- Lorey, Isabell. *State of Insecurity. Government of the Precarious*. London: Verso, 2015.
- Mbembe, Achille. *On the Postcolony*. Trans. A.M. Berrett et al. Berkeley: U of California P, 2001.
- Mignolo, Walter. *Local Histories, Global Designs. Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000.
- Morris, Rosalind C., ed. *Can the Subaltern Speak? Reflections on the History of an Idea*. New York: Columbia UP, 2010.
- Said, Edward. *After the Last Sky. Palestinian Lives*. New York: Columbia UP, 1999.
- . *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- . *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*. New York: Columbia UP, 2004.
- Sharpe, Christine. *In the Wake. On Blackness and Being*. Durham & London: Duke UP, 2016.
- Spanos, William V. *Exiles in the City*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2012.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999.
- Standing, Guy. *The Precariat*. London: Bloomsbury, 2011.
- Wynter, Sylvia. "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation--An Argument." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3.3 (2003): 257-337.