

Pre-print Version.

Published: Ashwani Sharma & Sanjay Sharma (2015) 'Thinking with *darkmatter*: Re-routing Race in the Networks of Info-Capitalism', in A. Cianelli & B. Ferra (Eds) *Postcolonial Matters. Tra gesti politici e scritture poetiche*, Napoli: photocity.it edizioni University Press. pp.27-39. ISBN: 978-88-6682-716-0

Thinking with *darkmatter*: re-routing race in the networks of info-colonialism

Abstract

In the form of a discussion the founding editors of *darkmatter* journal reflect on the challenges of developing an online race project in the neoliberal context of knowledge production. The independent open access journal, operating at the borders of academia, attempts to grasp the shifting contours of contemporary race and racism in a networked postcolonial world. Against the limitations of solely working within disciplines such as Postcolonial or Cultural Studies, *darkmatter* brings into dialogue a diverse range of conceptual frameworks to address the proliferation of race discourses.

Interrogating and reworking the developments in digital publishing, the project constructs a space for the exploration and dissemination of race thinking and creating relations between different fields, sites and groups. The threats posed by the info-colonialism of corporate academic publishing are transversed through the evolution of *darkmatter* with its experiments in techno-cultural design and innovations in autonomous working practices.

Thinking with *darkmatter*: re-routing race in the networks of info-colonialism

Introduction

darkmatter is an open access knowledge space for exploring contemporary operations of race and racism. Sitting inside/outside the borders of academia, the *darkmatter* project is an experiment in thinking-practice which interrogates race in relation to political, im/material, and informational transformations. A networked environment poses a set of challenges and possibilities for those of us concerned with the reconfigurations of race and racism, as well as the frameworks developed in postcolonial and cultural criticism.

The journal was launched in 2007, and as the founding editors, we consider it timely to reflect on our broader project, particularly in relation to current shifts in the neoliberal politics of academic knowledge production. Through a discussion format - garnered from conversations, email exchanges and editorial meeting notes - we collectively explore how the *darkmatter* project has engaged with an encroaching info-colonialism that seeks to subsume alternative and independent forms of critical inquiry.

Openings

Sanjay Sharma: Thinking back, developing an *online race* journal from the ground-up was an ambitious under-taking. At the time, there were at least three major concerns to address. Firstly, issues of funding, labour and technical skills. Secondly, the journal's authority and credibility; from the outset we agreed to be 'independent' - not being tied to any kind of publisher or institution. We were motivated because of the frustration of race work existing either through the walled-gardens of costly subscription-only academic journals, or specialized USA-centric race blogs. And thirdly, how the journal would engage with the problematics of race and racism that were increasingly difficult to address in a neoliberal context, which proliferates forms of racism yet obscuring an analysis of its operations.

Ashwani Sharma: I seem to recall, for a long time before 2007, we used to have extended discussions about the complex way race was being mobilized in contemporary culture, and some of the limitations of the theoretical work dealing with this. Against the drift towards a move away from race as an analytical concept, we maintained that race was an essential conceptual frame to understand the broader shifts, especially in the west. It felt that race and issues of racism were becoming *more* not less significant. This did become very apparent

with the ‘racism row’ in the Channel 4 UK TV *Celebrity Big Brother* in 2007, which led to the first special issue of *darkmatter*.¹ What was particularly striking and a trigger for us was the proliferation of apparently anti-racist rhetoric in a mainstream mediated context. At the time there was a lot of interesting commentary emerging all over the net, but it was hard to keep track of it or make much sense of the different positions being taken on racism. One of the impetuses was to create a shared space to gather and generate in-depth thinking of the evolving events, and to provide and disseminate a more nuanced understanding of the racial dynamics on the web.

It’s interesting to note how this one event raised a set of related issues that remain a focus of the journal: popular culture, convergent media environment, theories of race in a contemporary postcolonial context.

SS: And I’d stress that the journal’s approach to grasping race has been in constant evolution. It would be too limited to consider we’ve solely worked, for example, from Postcolonial Studies or Cultural Studies perspectives or by folding race into questions of the Migrant or Borders; because for *darkmatter* there’s always been a productive ambivalence concerning how race is to be conceptualized. This isn’t to say that thinkers such as Spivak, Said, Fanon, or hooks, Goldberg and Gilroy have been usurped by say post-raciality or neo-materialist turns in race thinking - rather, the journal’s trajectory is fomented by the contemporary, shifting problematics of race.

At the risk of being reductive, the journal is about *exploding race*, breaching its disciplinary confines. Rather than being too hung up on what race *is*, it’s been the case of what the journal *can do with race* as a type of assemblage.² Nor is this determined by whether we’re interdisciplinary, trans-disciplinary, whatever ... It’s been about bringing together into dialogue - not however without tension - a diversity of race work, which accounts for the types of special issues that have been created.³ Perhaps *darkmatter* could be accused of being eclectic - though doesn’t that miss the point of the project?

¹ Ash Sharma and Sanjay Sharma, “Editorial: Celebrity Big Brother dialogues – the global pantomime of race”, *darkmatter Journal*, Issue 1, 2007, <<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2007/05/07/editorial-celebrity-big-brother-dialogues-the-global-pantomime-of-race/>> (06/13).

² cf. Arun Saldanha, “White ravers in a Goan village: race as machinic assemblage”, *darkmatter Journal*, Issue 2, 2008, <<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2008/02/23/white-ravers-in-a-goan-village-race-as-machinic-assemblage/>> (06/13).

³ See the section: Issues, *darkmatter Journal*, <<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/journal-issues/>> (06/13).

AS: We're operating at an interesting historical conjuncture - between a radically heterogeneous cultural field with the multiplication of differences, to a point where race effectively *disappears* as an analytical or political category,⁴ and, shall we say, the empiricism of a 'race relations' paradigm, which tends to reduce race to only the workings of racism. We cut across these by insisting on the fact of race as a conceptual and material category that does things in the world. Thus, we haven't taken a fixed political position or single theoretical approach, but have remained open to new ways of conceiving the racial problematic. This has led to a speculative approach productively configuring the contours of the journal. But maybe there is something else also underpinning the project, and that's the whole aspect of race and information control? The notion of 'independence' isn't just about being autonomous of the institutions of higher education and corporate publishers, but also about the journal being a 'black-led' project, with all the attendant risks and dangers this entails.

SS: I have to admit, *darkmatter* as a black-led project raises some difficult issues. Though I'm not only referring to covert essentialisms that can arise, or naively invoking and celebrating the plurality of what constitutes black. I'm more concerned with a mis-guided *belief* that there's a ready-made emancipatory space outside of the neoliberal academy. The whiteness of the academy today seeks to *differentially include* many of us marked as racialized 'other'. Indeed, some of us can 'play the game', though fail to acknowledge that we've been incorporated - '*become the game*'⁵ - whether it's through seeking recognition, gaining promotion or publishing in mainstream journals with 'high impact factors'. I've been advised by some senior colleagues to "not spend too much time on *darkmatter*" and ensure I focus on "*proper academic work*" to progress my career.

AS: In spite of some of the progressive gains in higher education, it remains structured by a normative racialized whiteness. One of the many things this means is that we have to invariably justify our positions, and are made continuously accountable to an audit-surveillance culture. We just didn't want to keep being determined by the constraints of a sector invested in a 'colour-blind' de-politicized (anti)intellectual space. While some of us have managed to be located within the academy, it's been a sort of a 'racial performance' negotiating the demands of a neoliberal agenda that limits the possibilities of our work - and one that readily co-opts us.

⁴ cf. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire*, Harvard University Press, London, 2000.

⁵ Nirmal Puwar, *Space Invaders: race, gender and bodies out of place*, Berg, Oxford, 2004.

I suppose some of us are of a generation that was committed to the idea of a 'political blackness'. This notion of Blacks and South Asians - at least in a UK context - operating within a shared identity was always going to be contingent, but isn't the journal rooted in this idea of blackness?

SS: Or should we say, *routed*...

AS: Of course it's very difficult to sustain any kind of political blackness as an overt political identity given the globalised differences of race, but this kind of project does function under-erasure, or an axiomatic given maybe. Although against this, or because of the way ethnicity operates with the university, we haven't overtly focused on ideas 'black' or 'ethnic' culture. In fact *darkmatter's* somewhat promiscuous approach tries to disseminate the idea of race into the broader fields of culture and theory. I'm not sure how successful we are, but the desire is to 'contaminate' thought with some racial matter! To change the contours of thinking and not just to add 'a bit of colour'. Here the journal has some similarities with the way Stefano Harney and Fred Moten conceive of the 'Undercommons'.⁶

SS: Yes, they highlight it's about creating sets of relationships, between different modalities of work informed by the machinations of race that operate across a range of fields of study - even if we're not necessarily cognizant of how these relations are forming. In these emergent networks of knowledge, we could claim *darkmatter* acts as a 'strange attractor' that *inhabits* thinking and writing.

Formations

AS: Haven't the connections and affinities that the journal generates been also constituted by its evolving online digital form?

SS: Well, do you recall how developing *darkmatter* took a few iterations before we discovered an appropriate design? During 2005-6, we experimented with a bare-bones website which simply listed articles - the pursuit of a pure HTML minimalism in reaction to a corporatized Web 2.0! It's only when I began to re-purpose the open source Wordpress blogging platform,⁷ did *darkmatter* take its current form.

⁶ Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, "The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study", *Minor Compositions*, 2013, <<http://www.minorcompositions.info/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/undercommons-web.pdf>> (09/13).

⁷ Wordpress, <<http://wordpress.org/>> (06/13).

AS: Our web-site has followed a *do-it-yourself* ethos - apart from the minimal cost of using a host server, the work of *darkmatter* has involved only voluntary 'free' labour. Although it wasn't merely a question of finding a zero-cost online publishing platform. The question of technology has been entangled with the question of our political project and autonomous working practices.

SS: Yes, we've paid significant attention to technological form and design. There has been an on-going attempt to work with and adapt the available technologies to our concerns. We can see that the evolution of the site and different sections and elements reflecting the variegated registers that race thinking has taken. The journal doesn't have a teleological goal in relation to the nexus of form and content.

AS: I believe the evolution of *darkmatter* has been neither simply planned by design, nor developed by random acts of inspiration. If anything has guided the workings of the journal, it has been the multiplicity of race: how it demands to be deployed from a dynamic set of techno-cultural practices.

SS: Indeed, the current form of the *darkmatter* is quite different from what we began with or had imagined. The journal has shifted from a blog-like rolling content to a rather more organized form, while continuing to deploy a 'publish-when-ready' approach, because we aren't restricted by the serial publishing deadlines and page limits of print. And as we're able to present multi-media content, the question of how race can be explored has opened up. While the essay form still persists - which says much about what counts as legitimate knowledge in academia - we've aimed to nurture other modes of media and cultural output.

However, on occasions the journal's legitimacy has been questioned. For instance, when we added a link from our 'The Wire Files'⁸ special issue to the main Wikipedia *The Wire* page,⁹ it was immediately removed by an over-zealous wiki-editor because *darkmatter* was not considered to be an authoritative source - unbelievable! And it involved an excruciating discussion to have our edits reinstated. We were so incensed that it led to us writing a piece

⁸ Ash Sharma (ed.), "The Wire Files", *darkmatter Journal*, Issue 4, 2009, <<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/category/issues/4-the-wire/>> (07/13).

⁹ The Wire, Wikipedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Wire>, (07/13).

about the process of inclusion called ‘*darkmatter* Journal versus Wikipedia: race and the hierarchy of knowledge’.¹⁰

AS: There’s been a long history of the policing of what counts as legitimate knowledge, especially in terms of black folks and the marginalization of certain types of thinking and intellectual work. The technology of web platforms does offer the possibility of new modalities of output, but we’ve been wary of not fetishising the digital and networks as inherently progressive in comparison to the past. Given the way racial discourse is tied to western history of science and technology, our approach has practiced a kind of postcolonial re-inscription of the digital into the longer histories of the racialization of technology.

SS: The history of western technology - how it has been conventionally narrated - has obfuscated race. Only a handful of theorists such as Wendy Chun¹¹ and Tara McPherson¹² have revealed how economic, political and *racialized* relations are embedded and materialized in hardware, software and code. In a modest way, our project customizing Wordpress as a platform for an online *race* journal, renders more visible and has made possible, how software and code can be re-inscribed. And as McKenzie Wark says: “Whatever code we hack ... we create the possibility of new things entering the world ... While hackers create these new worlds, we do not possess them.”¹³ However, rather than relying on open source that services neoliberal ideology and capitalist economics,¹⁴ I’d like our project to develop its own journal software platform from the ground-up, and make it available as Free Software. If any coders are out there - get in touch!

AS: *darkmatter* will always exist as an *online* platform, by utilizing appropriate software, rather than the prohibitive costs of propriety journal software. Our project conceives software as politics, which is also tied to the politics of making content freely and immediately available - to anyone who has a net connection. During the early 2000s, *open access* journal content was being championed by relatively few academics and organizations. Although the writing was on the wall even back then: publicly funded academic research should no longer be controlled by corporate publishers.

¹⁰ darkmatter Editors, “*darkmatter* Journal versus Wikipedia: race and the hierarchy of knowledge”, *darkmatter Journal*, 2009, <<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2009/06/05/darkmatter-journal-versus-wikipedia-race-and-the-hierarchy-of-knowledge/>> (07/13).

¹¹ Wendy Chun, “Introduction: Race and/as Technology; or, How to Do Things to Race”, *Camera Obscura*, 24, 1 70, 2009, pp. 7-35.

¹² Tara McPherson, “U.S. Operating System at Mid-Century: the intertwining of race and UNIX”, in Lisa Nakamura and Peter Chow-White (eds.), *Race After the Internet*, Routledge, London, 2012.

¹³ McKenzie Wark, *Hacker Manifesto*, Harvard University Press, London, 2004, p.[004].

¹⁴ Toni Prug, “Hacking ideologies: Open Source, a capitalist movement”, *Hack The State*, 2010, <<http://hackthestate.org/2010/05/18/hacking-ideologies-open-source-a-capitalist-movement/>> (10/13).

SS: None the less, we're now in a situation that there are more journals than ever, *but* with less of them run by independent or not-for-profit publishers. And then there are the corrupt monopoly-type practices of publishers selling only 'bundled journals' to libraries; as well as some embracing 'gold' open access, which merely moves the burden of inflated costs to the author instead of subscription fees.

AS: Corporate and private for-profit publishers are effectively exploiting mechanism of online distribution, and retaining control over the flow of academic knowledge. As Ted Striphas has so rightly argued, this form of academic capitalism has created both a crisis of over-production, and the production of scarcity of knowledge.¹⁵

SS: This issue of knowledge exploitation runs deep. It was interesting to discover that at the time of developing *darkmatter*, Open Journal Systems (OJS)¹⁶ was the only purpose-built open source software platform for online publishing. We found its work-flow clunky, and ironically its form was rather print-based. Though most significantly, OJS offered the choice of monetization via subscriptions and the timed-release of articles: features which from our practice are ideologically suspect. While it requires constant technical labour - for which we need to recruit a committed coder - customizing Wordpress has been a pragmatic solution for *darkmatter*. I briefly wrote a piece about how we utilized Wordpress,¹⁷ and it's become one of the most journal's read posts - pointing to how solutions for independent online publishing are still being sought after.

AS: It's become all too apparent that corporate publishers are including elements of both open access and open source software, for their profit making business. And isn't it remarkable, so called radical writing, especially in the fields of race and postcoloniality, remains determined by the exploitative practices of the mainstream (white) publishing sector?

SS: At least we're seeing alternative initiatives such as the Cultural Studies e-Archive¹⁸ and the Open Humanities Press¹⁹ ...

AS: But have they focused enough on challenging how academic knowledge is *legitimized*?

Practice

¹⁵ Ted Striphas, "Acknowledged Goods: cultural studies and the politics of academic journal publishing", *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 7, 1, 2010, pp. 3-25.

¹⁶ Open Journal Systems, <<http://pkp.sfu.ca/ojs/>> (10/13).

¹⁷ Sanjay Sharma, "WordPress as Academic Journal Software?", *darkmatter Journal*, 2009, <<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2009/12/06/wordpress-as-academic-journal-software/>> (06/13).

¹⁸ CSeARCH, <<http://arc.tees.ac.uk/VLE/DOMAIN/CSEARCH/TABS/About.asp>> (10/13).

¹⁹ Open Humanities Press, <<http://openhumanitiespress.org/>> (10/13).

SS: With *darkmatter*, we've spent a lot of time thinking about the 'objects' produced by the journal in relation to an ever-expanding capitalist knowledge economy. As both the form and content have evolved for the journal, *darkmatter*'s material practices via an online platform has been structured by a pedagogic trajectory. In a discussion about textual materialities and publishing, Nick Thoborn - via Oury and Guattari - reminds us that a "... collectively produced publication works as a therapeutic 'third object', a mediator to draw out, problematise, and transversalise social and libidinal relations among groups ...".²⁰ The charged politics of race, its affective intensities and mutant becomings has constantly beared upon the practice of *darkmatter* - we incessantly deliberate as to what kind of intervention is the journal making and to what ends. The default position of an *academic* journal can be to slide towards an institutionalization of knowledge practices, servicing a commodified academy driven by insidious research measures such as 'quality', 'value' and 'impact'.²¹

AS: In contrast, *darkmatter* attempts to create forms of thinking and practices outside the logics of capitalist informational processes. It's not just about the content of the *darkmatter* but how a readily accessible online archive is able *re-route* thinking and generate connections. It is less about us being an 'authority' or 'the experts' and more about creating racially inflected knowledge practices. In this sense *darkmatter* resonates with Harney and Moten's idea of *study* "... as something not where everybody dissolves into the student, but where people sort of take turns doing things for each other or for the others, and where you allow yourself to be possessed by others as they do something".²²

SS: And what's worth stressing is the *entanglement* of the production of racial knowledge *vis-à-vis* academic practices. *darkmatter* has carefully navigated the encumbered terrain of how so-called 'academic authority' is mobilized: a couple of years ago - after endless discussion! - we introduced an external 'peer review' practice for particular sections of the journal. Although at the same time, we recognized that orthodox peer review as it often operates - especially in the humanities and social sciences - is at best, flawed, and at worst, broken.²³

²⁰ Jodi Dean *et al.*, "Materialities of Independent Publishing: A Conversation with AAAAARG, Chto Delat?, I Cite, Mute, and Neural", *New Formations*, 78, 2013, p.175-6.

²¹ Nirmal Puwar, Gerald Raunig and Brett Neilson (eds.), "University Struggles and the System of Measure", *Edu-Factory Web Journal*, First Issue, 2011, pp. 3-81. <http://www.edu-factory.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/first_issue1.pdf>

²² Stefano Harney & Fred Moten, *ibid*, p.115.

²³ Toni Prug, "Open-process Academic Publishing", *Hack The State*, 2009.

²³ <<http://hackthestate.org/2009/12/16/open-process-academic-publishing-v1-2/>> (10/13).

AS: Our attempt to innovate an alternative mode of ‘open’ peer review aiming to make the process more transparent is in constant development - the reason why it’s presented on our project wiki-space.²⁴ And it’s more than a technical issue of, say, instigating a kind of online crowd-sourced peer reviewing as utilized in some science publications; rather it unravels the ethics of digital knowledge production and how academic legitimacy is instituted. Instead of feeding an already bloated neoliberal academy, the transversality of race needs to be harnessed if we are to make it do political work beyond the university.

SS: While there was much resistance to introduce any kind of formal peer review for *darkmatter*, none the less it brought into sharp relief how knowledge about race is legitimized. Some ‘successful’ journals are producing nine or more issues per year - no doubt incited by publishers’ accumulation of profit. How can so-called peer-review ‘quality’ be maintained with this kind of sped-up over-production? *darkmatter* aims to activate a politics of knowledge generation: the object of race that is materialized is *fraught* - replete with the instabilities, repulsions and affinities - and is constitutive of the dissonant terrain of the journal. Yes, we do some peer review, but we hope our practices will create a ‘noise’ in the academic knowledge economy, by offering an alternative imaginary for how race work can be done.

AS: There are a whole set of structural limits which bear upon what we do - the uneven development of the web globally and dominance of the English language has meant we operate in a context where we’re seeing the continual (re)colonialization of information and knowledge. *darkmatter* with its editorial London-hub at once risks reproducing these relations of power, but at the same time because of this site-ing is able to undo some of the ways that academic knowledge functions. It recognizes and affects a more complex racial topology of power and information.

SS: For instance, the ‘Challenging Italian Racism’²⁵ special issue wasn’t hampered by institutional, as well as ideological constraints of academic publication in Italy - a fundamental reason why the Italian-based editors of the issue collaborated with *darkmatter*. The transnational forms of ‘autonomous’ intellectual work that the journal engenders, is a form of (anti)institutional ‘translation’ and ‘displacement’ of the authority of knowledge production.

²⁴ darkmatter Project, *Open Peer Review*, <http://www.darkmatter101.org/wiki/open_peer-review> (06/13).

²⁵ Anna Curcio and Miguel Mellino, “Challenging Italian Racism”, *darkmatter Journal*, Issue 6, 2010, <<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/category/journal/issues/6-challenging-italian-racism/>> (07/13).

AS: The hegemony of western academia and the unevenly globalised accessibility of the web, does mean that our user traffic is unsurprisingly dominated by ‘Anglo-American’ locations. However, because of what could be identified as the ‘long-tail’ effect of network culture we have a readership that spans across over 120 nations, particularly some from outside of the usual consumers of western journals.

SS: The journal’s influence can also be gauged by the popularity it seems to have with students and others outside of tenured academia. We meet, or are contacted by, a range of readers whom enthusiastically declare that they’re *darkmatter fans!* - perhaps due to a certain kind of online aesthetic-affective quality of the journal?

How the production of racial knowledge is being blurred across academic and non-academic spaces and reconfigured in converging media spaces is challenging to grasp. And this accounts for why *darkmatter* has evolved into a *project*, rather than only remaining as a journal. For example, we’ve recently focused on exploring the formation of ‘digital race’ in relation to social media, network effects, algorithmic practices, proliferating online racisms, and the materialities of digital communication.²⁶

AS: The potential is that the networked info-spaces enable us to connect to and *exploit* the communication *protocols* immanent to hegemonic control and further marketisation.²⁷ The uneven global development of the net and information flow is producing new geographies and temporalities of racialization that require critical enquiry informed by the histories of (post)colonialism, and the speculations on ‘post-racial’ futures.

SS: One of our key challenges is to conceptualize these new modalities of communication power by drawing upon a wide range of disciplines - from software design to archive studies - this is the expanded field of race in which postcoloniality is having to address. It requires *collective* intellectual labour that a project space like *darkmatter* has been trying to organize.

AS: Hasn’t it been challenging, given that we are working with almost no funding and no full-time staff? There are limits to free labour and the Internet gift economy, especially if we’re reliant on university salaries to support our left-field activities! We do need to develop

²⁶ *darkmatter* Project, *Digital Race*, <<http://www.darkmatter101.org/wiki/digital-race>> (06/13). See also: Sanjay Sharma, “Black Twitter? Racial Hashtags, Networks and Contagion”, *New Formations*, 78, 2013, p. 46-64 (pre-print: <http://www.darkmatter101.org/wiki/media/digital-race/sharma_black_twitter_final.pdf>).

²⁷ cf. Alex Galloway and Eugene Thacker, *Exploit: A Theory of Networks*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2004.

new economic practices for online journal production that enables us to be more independently sustainable.²⁸

SS: Don't we situate *darkmatter* as part of a longer history of black and anti-colonial projects that have had to develop and work in the face of hegemonic whiteness and capitalist subsumption.

AS: Well, nothing changes then! Or the changes always challenge us to develop other ways of working.

SS: It's not just that we have some new digital tools to play with - can we dismantle the master's house, by dismantling ... no, *hacking* the master's tools?

²⁸ See for example, Dmytri Kleiner, *The Telekommunist Manifesto*, Notebooks 03, Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, Amsterdam, 2010, <<http://telekommunisten.net/the-telekommunist-manifesto/>> (10/13).