INVASION, SURVEILLANCE, BIOPOLITICS, AND GOVERNMENTALITY: REPRESENTATIONS FROM TACTICAL MEDIA TO SCREEN

Michael V DelNero

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2016

Committee:

Radhika Gajjala, Advisor

Scott C. Martin
Graduate Faculty Representative

Lara Lengel, Co-Advisor

Clayton Rosati

Alberto Gonzalez

ABSTRACT

Radhika Gajjala and Lara Lengel, Co-Advisors

This study situates invasion as a form of what Michel Foucault called governmentality. According to Foucault, governmentality determined how a society was ruled and by whom it was ruled, and under what conditions. A central argument in this dissertation is that invasion, both actual and imagined, has become a fundamental means of governing the population and body, and is as much a productive force as it is destructive. Turning to media representations across a variety of formats, this study examines four key case studies. The first is the Critical Art Ensemble, a tactical media group whose work designed to expose the working of the corporate food supply brought them into direct conflict with the federal authorities. Along these lines, this study argues that tactical media functions as both a form of surveillance and governmentality. Another tactical media group analyzed is the Yes Men, who use their own bodies and the visage of corporate America to expose the often twisted logic at work. This study then turns to representations on film and television, analyzing the film *Cloverfield* (2008) and the science fiction television series *Fringe*, both of which rely heavily in the tropes of invasion. "Invasion" has become a loose term and its workings are not fully theorized. By looking at how invasion, surveillance, and bodies interact, this study lays out a path that not only interrogates the concept of invasion, but also how invasion may be subverted or, by contrast, unquestioned. Methodologically, this study combines visual and ideological analysis, as theorized by Nicholas Mirzoeff and Lisa Nakamura and others, in order to uncover the myriad ways by

which invasion works. By combining these methods, the study examines key components from each of these sites. By examining closely the visual representation, and by turns the obfuscation of the such visual representations, of science, law enforcement, the military, surveillance, and destruction - as well as the obfuscation of their presence this study shows how invasion is a contested concept that is not so much enacted by state power and other actors as it is part of the ideology of twenty first century America.

I dedicate this dissertation to my mother,

Christine E DelNero,

who has always stood in my corner and provided love in all its forms.

I also dedicate it to my brother,

Matthew DelNero,

who is a source of inspiration in his work and kindness.

Finally, I dedicate it to my father,

Vincent DelNero and his timeless memory.

He taught me so much in life, and almost as much in death. As a rule, I don't have heroes, and I think the term gets misused a lot. But my father was, and always will be, my only hero. I wish he were here to see this, as it was with him that I first drove out to a new place called Bowling Green, Ohio. It seems that this journey is finally coming to an end, and with this end, I look forward to something new. Wherever I go, whatever I do, I'll remember you and your tireless sense of humor, your easy way, and your complete dedication to our family.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my committee members, especially Dr. Radhika Gajjala and Dr. Lara Lengel, my co-chairs. Both of them have seen this dissertation go through many drafts and iterations before becoming the document it is today. Thank you, as well, to Dr. Alberto Gonzalez, Dr. Clayton Rosati, and Dr. Scott Martin for their commitment to my dissertation committee. Thanks to Dr. Rosati who provided important insight during early drafts of the project.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr. Srinivas Melkote, Dr. Jim Foust, and Dr. Rick Busselle, who worked with me during my course revalidation process.

I also would like to acknowledge the many wonderful professors I had while earning my doctoral degree in School of Media and Communication. Among these were Dr. Michael Butterworth, Dr. Oliver Boyd Barrett, and Dr. Tori Ekstrand.

I have been fortunate to have the help of Bettina Elliot, who provided proofreading services in the early stages of writing.

Finally, I'd like to express my gratitude to Dr. Sung-Yeon Park, who helped me immeasurably during the final year of writing this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Biopolitics and Invasion: An Overview

In 2011, the Occupy movement attempted to reclaim a great many things: freedom from economic subjugation, elimination of student debt, a restoration of property rights, and elimination of criminalization of African Americans. But this was met with an equally vehement claim that those who disturbed the visual field of the perceived calm of daily life were the problem. The claim took the form of villainization: those who occupied were dirty, lazy, homeless, and dangerous. The raging debates that stoked passions were not simple contests between two sides; indeed, those that took root in New York City could often find no common ground. What is certain is that police and the governing bodies saw those who occupied highly inconvenient, and in dire need of removal.

Contesting how public infrastructure should work and who should control its manifestations is at the heart of a recently emerging debate. The debate at the heart of the Occupy movement, terrorism legislation, surveillance and public health is "what constitutes invasion?" This debate has come to the fore of American culture and politics. The debate takes place in the streets, on the shelves of bookstores, on television, and in the movies. Without noticing it, as it occurs by degree, our social institutions have become defined by the concept of invasion. Invasion is a concept that is often taken for granted, and yet it deserves much closer attention, both to how it actually works and how the means to determine what constitutes invasion are drawn. It is here, in this rather dimly lit cave that this dissertation seeks to enlighten.

Situating Invasion, Surveillance, and Representation

Situated within the cultural studies tradition of Michel Foucault, this dissertation moves forward with the understanding that power is productive (See *History of Sexuality, Society Must Be Defended, The Birth of Biopolitics,* and *Abnormal*) By drawing on Foucault and scholars who have taken up the mantle of governmentality and biopower, such as Mitchell Dean (2012), Nickolas Rose (2007), and Jack Bratich (2003), it is possible to see that what may be taken for granted is indeed the result of often conflicting and contradicting practices. Recent scholarship in cultural studies (see, for instance, Allmer, Fuchs, Kreilinger, and Sevignani (2013); Andrejevic (2007); Jansson and Christensen (2014); Lyon (2001); Nakamura (2015); Walby and Anais (2015)) has given much attention to surveillance, and this study follows suit. Further, this study takes as its object media representations and images through which invasion emerges. While the narratives are often not implicitly concerned with invasion, this study uncovers the complex mechanisms through which invasion functions. In this sense, it is very much a media driven cultural studies project. This study understands cultural studies to be "animated by desire to reveal and transform those who control the means of communication and culture" (Miller 2001, Pg. 7). This study works to examine visual and textual representations in order to understand how invasion is represented, mediated and perpetuated through texts. The shows examined are drawn primarily from popular culture, and given their interplay with current events, they suggest methods of proper action, and these actions are often discordant with an actually functioning democracy. Towards this end, events that occur in what might be called "real life" and those that occur on screens, as "representations" are

both important. Further, the notion of making power visible, as in the case of Steven Kurtz, relies on a systematic questioning of representation.

Invasion and current media formats have never been closer together. This study positions itself along the lines of media and cultural studies in order to provide a much needed examination of invasion not just as a genre or visible phenomenon. As media technologies themselves become more ubiquitous, questions arise over how these technologies can be used. The rise of cell phone cameras allows for the rapid transmission of dangerous behavior by those in power, and these videos can be quickly spread thanks to the Internet. Indeed, Wendy Chun (2005) in *Control and Freedom,* writes about how the Internet emerged as both a physical and ideological apparatus. Given how easily information can spread, those in power often seek to contain the means by which this information is created. Ideology thus operates at the level of the interface and the technology.

This dissertation aims to provide an understanding of invasion for several reasons. The first is that invasion has become a concept that, at least in America, drives a considerable degree of panic and policy. Further, while this study by necessity is focusing on four key case studies, it could have tackled any number of cases. In a sense, then, it provides an early history of the "new" invasion of the 21st century.

One need only witness the vitriol that has surrounded events in Texas, where open carry advocates are celebrating the victory of less restrictive open carry laws in the immediate aftermath of a shoot out among motorcycle gangs in Waco, Texas. (Glenza) The

idea of carrying a gun, openly in public certainly speaks to a threat, whether that threat is real or imagined.

Along these lines, contests over religion have become rife with the language of invasion. Just recently, Oklahoma made headlines for strong support for anti-Sharia law legislation (ACLU). The idea behind passing this law was perpetuated that outsiders (read Brown people) would come into the town and radically alter the lives of the citizens. Such an invasion could not be tolerated in mainstream white America. This notion was also very much at play in the battles over the construction of a mosque at ground zero.

Contagion as Means of Invasion

Further, battles over germs, viruses, and contagion have become commonplace in American culture. This was especially clear during the Ebola panic that ensued in 2014. The virus was overwhelmingly associated with Africa, and thus easily avoided by mobile white bodies. But the threat of it, and the fact that the virus came to the United States through air travel only amplified the fear response. While the actual impact of the virus is itself quite devastating, the threat of the virus spreading was heightened. Thus populations were regulated and travel routes were compromised due to this fear of contagion.

Contagion as a means of invasion has become part of mainstream culture. This can be seen in the battles currently being fought in hospitals and on television over vaccinations (Belisle 2015). Vaccinations designed to treat and prevent the spread of disease thus become, for some, the means by which the body is invaded with a foreign substance and transforms the child through the affliction of autism. Indeed, battles over how diseases

should be controlled and who is responsible for controlling these diseases speak very much to notions of governmentality and biopower.

Invasion is also a constant theme in current television shows. The success of the AMC series *The Walking Dead* (Created by Frank Darabont, 2010) speaks to this. The series' imagining of a world overrun by "walkers" is unique from other zombie narratives in that it posits an entire world in which the zombie has become a form of life that has to be dealt with on a daily basis. As such, the series offers no potential escape or resolution to the virus. It simply shows the characters living day to day in a world that is defined by suspicion, scarce resources, and the always present threat of irreversible transformation. From this threat arises a form of governmentality that dictates how human bodies are to protect themselves from potential transformation and strict rules for exterminating anyone who is transformed, including children.

The Walking Dead is just one of many texts that dot the current television schedule featuring tales of invasion and contagion. While a list of all such shows is outside the scope of this project,[1] it is worth mentioning one more, if only to draw out the themes that inform this study.

The cable channel, Animal Planet, in 2009 introduced a show called *Monsters Inside* Me. The show, now in its fifth season, features stories of people who have become infected with a parasite. The show has featured a rogue's gallery of parasites and dramatic

[1] For media and cultural studies scholarship aligning filmic and televisual texts on the zombie apocalypse with contemporary cultural anxiety, see "The Zombie as a Barometer of Cultural Anxiety" by Peter Dendle. See, also, Bishop; Bressler and Lengel; Lengel and Bressler; Platts; Wuthnow.

stories of how people came into contact with the parasite and how they either were treated or died. The show features a combination of talking heads made up of the victims, family members, and medical experts. However, the most striking feature of the show is the dramatic way in which it depicts the parasite invading the body and altering it. This is done with detailed computer graphics and dramatic music. Within the logic of the show, the parasites literally become characters in the show to be defeated by modern American medicine. The victims, once they have been treated, are shown sitting happily in their homes or running in fields, triumphant over the monstrous menace that had compromised their lives[2].

While *The Walking Dead* and *Monsters Inside Me* are explicit in their narrative of invasion, the cases examined in this study are not so obvious when it comes to diagnosing their invasion ontology. This study eschews the obvious in favor of a close examination how invasion works and what forms it takes through a close analysis of texts that not directly concerned with invasion.

A central argument in this dissertation is that invasion, both actual and imagined, has become a fundamental means of governing the population and body, and is as much a productive force as it is destructive. This study elaborates how the contemporary concept of invasion is as much a creature of modern capitalism as it is a bio-political project. All of this is not to say that invasion does not exist; on the contrary, it decidedly *does* exist and is a process by which life is structured, reconfigured, and destroyed. Indeed, to speak of

[2] The link to terrorism is clear in the titles of episodes from the Season One's six episodes of *Monsters Inside Me*. The first episode, for example, is titled "Sleeper Cells" and another episode is titled "Highjackers."

invasion is to render life vulnerable, but reciprocally, it calls up the means by which life is protected and sustained.

One of the key components of invasion is surveillance, which works to categorize and identify invasion. By understanding the relationship between invasion and surveillance, it becomes possible to analyze the manner in which both are prioritized and accessed by certain actors (be they high end corporate interests, state sanctioned institutions and agents, and military industries) and denied and vilified in the hands of other actors (e.g., artists, community interests, and viruses).

Invasion in/and Corporeal, Political, and Institutional Bodies

Invasion works by altering the manner in which a body functions or by entirely transforming the body. This applies to the corporeal body, the political body, or the institutional body. Invasion is often conceived as a negative, something that alters for the nefarious purposes, or changes something that was previously functioning properly. In short, it circumvents a current system and sets about bringing about some change. Right now, this simple definition will suffice before the concept is unpacked in the following chapters of this dissertation. What is certain is that invasion is not, as it is often conceived, a linear process or an act that is completed. Invasion rests at the center of current political, cultural, and media practices. Along these lines, this study will examine invasion as it takes the form of viruses, bombs, communication devices and their messages, assemblages, the human body, and not fully seen monsters. Additionally, as often as invasion may arrive beating down the gates with spears and arrows, it just as often arrives unnoticed, or in the form of what appears to be an ally. To understand just how these processes work and what

exactly they constitute, this study examines and works to define "invasion" through Michel Foucault's concepts of governmentality and biopower.

Foucault (1978) first laid out his concepts of governmentality and biopower in his monumental three volume, *History of Sexuality*. He would elaborate on these concepts further in his lectures given in France. These works offer nothing less than a new way of thinking through power and the micro processes at play in the body politic. Chapter two of this dissertation further explicates Foucault's conceptualization of the notion of the king and the right to kill versus the right to let live. The dissertation will turn to this theme consistently in theorizing and explaining invasion as a major contested area in 21st century politics. As in Foucault's work, nothing less is at stake than who has the right to live and under what conditions will they live. In short, this work posits that there is no body (as in body singular and as politically constituted) that is not defined by potential, imaginary, or actual invasion. In fact, it is the very threat that drives much of the narrative of external and internal threat today, themes that will recur again in this work.

Sites of Analysis: Tactical Media

While the majority of the cases examined here are in many senses "media texts," they are also very much cultural markers, indicating where current threats and fears lie. The first case, however, is a dangerous brew of artistic critique, social justice, and immediate post 9/11 American panic. It also brings us to one of the most fertile battlegrounds today over what comprises invasion: the food supply. The story begins, but does not end with Steve Kurtz, an art experiment, and his wife Hope's sudden death.

Steve Kurtz is a founding member of the Critical Art Ensemble (CAE), a group dedicated toward social critique through performance art, theoretical tracts, and intensive audience interaction. The CAE are practitioners of what is known as "tactical media." Geert Lovink, an early scholar of tactical media, defines it as:

> Tactical Media are what happens when the cheap 'do it yourself' media, made possible by the revolution in consumer electronics and expanded forms of distribution (from public access cable to the internet) are exploited by groups and individuals who feel aggrieved by or excluded from the wider culture. Tactical media do not just report events, as they are never impartial they always participate and it is this that more than anything separates them from mainstream media. Bearing witness to this effect is the growing need for tactical media practitioners to stretch beyond standard institutionalized walls in order to generate maximum impact. ("ABC's of Tactical Media")

Rita Raley's *Tactical Media* (2010), arguably the most definitive book on the subject, describes tactical media as "a mutable category that is not meant to be either fixed or exclusive. If there were one function or critical rationale that would produce a sense of categorical unity, it would be disturbance. In its most expansive articulation, tactical media signifies the intervention and disruption of a dominant semiotic regime, the temporary creation of a situation in which signs, messages, and narratives are set into play and critical thinking becomes possible" (6).

Finally, the Critical Art Ensemble defines tactical media as *"s*ituational, ephemeral, and self-terminating. It encourages the use of any media that will engage a particular socio-political context in order to create molecular interventions and semiotic shocks that collectively could diminish the rising intensity of authoritarian culture" (Critical Art Ensemble web site).

Much of the Critical Art Ensemble's work centers on the misuse of biology in everyday life, from military expenditures gone horribly awry to the proliferation of genetic modified organisms (GMOs). They make their theoretical tracts and videos available for free on their website and actively promote the use of their theoretical and practical tactics to challenge corporate control of the media, the food supply, and many other things. Their projects are designed to be easily engaged by their audience and always have a political bearing. They are as likely to be doing street performance as they are to be displaying their work in a museum.

Steven Kurtz and the Critical Art Ensemble are of great interest here because Kurtz found himself in the crosshairs of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The rationale for his arrest and subsequent trial: the discovery of materials that investigators deemed to be dangerous and potentially useful in a terrorist attack (Da Costa and Pentecost 2005). The materials found in his house were actually readily available and found in some of the food supply. These materials were to be used in an interactive exhibit in which patrons could bring in food and see its actual chemical composition. What brought the authorities to Kurtz's house was no tip off from a scared neighbor, late night shenanigans, or ghostly apparitions, but a desperate call by Kurtz himself to 911 to

report that his wife was not conscious or breathing. What happened next points to the dangerous antinomies of invitation and invasion, and this is the subject of chapter two.

Monstrous Presence

One of the sites of analysis is *Cloverfield* (2008), a film that revives the monster movie of the sixties by mixing it with the cheap, ubiquitous film style of the post millennium, defined in part by constant digital footage. The film's premise is simple enough, as a group of friends run across New York City, under attack by an unknown and largely unseen monster, to rescue a former girlfriend trapped in a lower Manhattan apartment complex. Chapter five does not focus solely on the monster, a key driver of the film, but also the slowly encroaching presence of the United States military, whose motives are not clear. It also examines the visibility of invasion. In conjunction with this, the chapter examines the viral nature of both video and the smaller creatures that fall from the titular monster and wreck a unique kind of havoc. In a theme that carries over to the analysis of the television series *Fringe*, the chapter examines the human body itself as an instrument that is concurrently invaded and invasive.

While *Cloverfield* situates itself inside the iconography of a post September 11 New York City and often works on the level of rhetorical allegory (Kaplan 2003) it replaces the faces of perpetrators of destruction with the idea that every moving body, human or otherwise, is a potential threat. This is its very real political semblance, one that resonates in the face of failed surveillance. Monstrous destruction can be handled only with more monstrous destruction, and hence the heavy reliance on the military, a double presence that is equal to the unseen monster in potential scope and destruction. This destructive potential

is analyzed closely through Foucault's conception of biopower alongside his theory of the abnormal.

What is more, the biopolitics of *Fringe* creates a dialectic between the threat of complete extinction while also offering the possibility that life never ends through its use of multiple universes, a key point that is discussed at length in the chapter.

Fear of Attack from Within

With the notable exception of Steven Kurtz and the Critical Art Ensemble, the case studies examined here followed the immense success of the television series, *24* (Created by Robert Cochran and Joel Surnow, 2001), a show that captured America's fear of attack from within. More than any other show, *24* preyed on and dramatized to an extreme level the idea that anyone, anything could be an immediate threat to the American people, which is of course code for a certain strain of fear based democracy.

Indeed, *24* was the first show of the new millennium to deal explicitly with themes of invasion by an unknown enemy. While the previous decade's *X-Files* (Created by Chris Carter, 1993) dealt with a complex government conspiracy to comingle with alien life forms, *24* presents a far grittier realpolitik without the sixties science fiction angle. Conspiracies abound, but in the case of *24*, they are almost always carried out by nefarious bad apples or done in the name of the safety of the American people. Interestingly, the show's first season premiered and was completed before the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The change in tone and urgency in the show was immediately apparent. What started off as a drama about subterfuge and personal revenge became intertwined into a grand narrative about a persistent potential threat from overseas forces, especially from the

Middle East and China. Indeed, the invasion came fast and straightforward in *24*. The show relied as much on complex plots and subterfuge as it did on a fast paced, an affective atonal musical score by Sean Callery, and multiple events occurring at the same time, marked by *24*'s use of overlapping windows.

It's important to briefly situate 9/11 here as a seminal event that had a grave effect on both the culture and the policy of the United States. The *New York Times of 12 September 2001* was adorned with the bold title, "America Attacked." The headline underneath read "Highjacked Jets Destroy Twin Towers and Hit Pentagon in Day of Terror." On this page appears images that would become iconic representatives of the day: pictures of the Twin Towers in New York engulfed in flames. The responsibility for the attacks was placed on Al-Queda, and its leader Osama Bin Laden, who at the time was living in Afghanistan under the protection of the ruling Taliban (Dudziak 2003). Despite the horror of the attacks and the almost complete accordance of the United States government to meet the attacks with military power, there were voices of dissent. As Mary Dudziak points out:

"The idea that the world was transformed on September 11 was pervasive in popular culture, but can this idea be sustained? According to diplomatic historian Marilyn Young, one aspect of global politics was the basic orientation of American foreign policy. She sees parallels in the Korean War where, as in post-September 11, 'the enemy…was a vast amoebic 'ism' that could take up residence in any number of surprising places […]

Rather than transformation, Young sees long-term continuity in American foreign policy before and after September 11."

This chapter has touched briefly on the themes that are examined in this dissertation. The next chapter brings to light biopower and governmentality and the myriad ways in which it informs this study. It also examines carefully the concept of invasion as it is understood for the purposes of this study. Finally, it provides an overview and introduction to the concepts that underlie the practice and form of tactical media.

Overview of Dissertation

This dissertation begins with a discussion of the social and cultural significance of invasion and surveillance. Chapter two explains the key theories that inform the work. By providing an overview of governmentality and biopower, it makes it clear why these concepts are well suited to an analysis of invasion. Chapter two also discusses the methodology for this project and the justifications for the decisions made surrounding the method of research. This includes an overview of why governmentality and biopower are so useful to understanding the cultural logic of invasion.

Chapter three examines the work of the Critical Art Ensemble and The Yes Men and situates them as using invasion as a means of social critique while at the same time being subject to invasion. Chapter four provides an analysis of the Fox hit television show *Fringe.* Through an analysis of the plot and primary characters, it demonstrates the problematic representation of science in the show and demonstrates how invasion lies at the center of the show's use of science. Chapter five examines the popular 2008 film *Cloverfield* and situates

the film as a narrative that attempts to reassert a military response to invasion in which civilian bodies become insignificant.

The analyses of the particular televisual and filmic texts in chapters three, four, and five in this dissertation are vital to understand the social and cultural underlying ideologies in media representation. Moreover, these chapters justify why the analysis of popular media forms can help understand the ideology of invasion that has increased over the past 15 years.

CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter provides an overview of the theory and methodology employed in this study. In discussing invasion, this study turns to the twin concepts of governmentality and biopower in order to situate its argument. It is important to understand the way that these concepts developed together, and how they inform this study. Biopower concerns the deliberate and systematic control of populations, as may be obvious from a cursory examination of the word itself. It is a theoretical concept that has found favor in recent years, mainly due to the translation of the seminars at the Collège de France Foucault presented from 1971, starting with *Lectures on the Will to Know*, until his death in 1984.

As Thomas Lemke makes clear, the term biopower has a long lineage, including uses of the term for nefarious purposes in discourses of genocide and racial superiority. Much of the debate currently surrounding the term derives from disagreement about whether the term denotes a productive or reductive, or negative, function. Giorgio Agamben represents the most salient example of a negative deployment, in which biopower is situated as a means of war and destruction, or a manner in which certain populations are targeted and rendered "bare". For Foucault biopower, like power, is a productive mechanism, one that both defines populations and helps situate how identities are formed and negotiated. Thus for Foucault, the idea cannot be separated from governmentality.

Productive Forces

This dissertation adheres to the position that biopower and governmentality are productive forces. In order to draw out this line of thought, it focuses on the work of several scholars who have made significant contributions to the debates currently informing biopower and governmentality. This literature review opens with an overview of Foucault's pioneering work on the subject, beginning with his work on the history of sexuality and expanding into his later work which was comprised primarily of lectures, especially *Society Must be Defended* and *Security, Territory, Population*. As mentioned in chapter one, this study begins with the concept of governmentality, which has been elaborated and expanded by scholars who have adopted Foucault's line of thought, including Mitchell Dean (1999), Nickolas Rose (2007), Jeremy Packer (2003) and, most notably for the field of communication studies, Jack Bratich and James Hay (2003). Each of these authors has his own take on the concept and their thoughts are invaluable in situating my own argument.

Following the discussion of governmentality, this review of literature moves on to an elaboration of biopower and recent scholarship that has framed biopower as a combination of governmental, biological, and capitalist forces often at odds with each other. In turning to the work of several key scholars, including Thomas Lemke, Timothy Campbell, and Melinda Cooper, this dissertation works to draw out the themes specific to the concept of invasion and make the necessary connections. Following a review of the key works of Michel Foucault that inform this study, the literature review delves into the work of Roberto Esposito, whose work has been important in studies of immunity and how life is situated as a site that is isolated from invasive forces.

Foucault's Key Works on Regulatory Control

This study follows the path laid out by Foucault in his key works *History of Sexuality* Volumes 1-3, *Society Must Be Defended*, and *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Foucault makes clear that biopower and governmentality are productive forces, which should not be confused with saying that everything that happens within these discourses and practices is cause for celebration. Indeed, as is shown in these studies, the very definition of invasion leaves open the possibility that one can be rendered vulnerable to a discourse of immunity, and this can be quite damaging. One of the most important lessons to be drawn from Foucault is that once a population has been defined, it is open to any number of governing discourses in the name of preserving life. As Foucault stated in *Society Must be Defended,* "Power is exercised through networks, and individuals do not simply circulate in those networks; they are in a position to both submit to and exercise this power…In other words, power passes through individuals. It is not applied to them" (29).

Foucault began his conception of biopower and tied it into the governmentality, in which a way of life is tied directly to control of the population; the right to let live, rather than the right to kill, becomes the grounding principle underlying all life. Foucault defined biopower as "regulatory control of the population" that operates through both the biological and the anatomical (*History of Sexuality,* Volume 1, 137). Central to this notion is the idea that it is the ability to "invest life through and through" as opposed to the right to kill that defines the workings of biopower (137). Foucault further clarified and elaborated upon the concept of biopower in several other lectures that have recently

been published. In *Security, Territory, Population*, Foucault spoke indirectly of biopower as a mechanism of control of populations, writing that the political problem of population is "not conceived as a collection of legal subjects, nor as a mass of human arms intended for labor; it is analyzed as a set of elements that, first, is connected with the general system of living beings (population in this sense falls in the category of the 'human race;' the notion, new at the time, is to be distinguished from 'mankind,' and, second, may offer a purchase for concerted interventions)through laws but also through changes of attitude, of ways of acting and living that can be obtained through 'campaigns'). Foucault explained that the concept of biopower revolves around the "right to let live" as opposed to the right of the sovereign to take life (*History of Sexuality,* Volume 1, 137). He further demonstrated how biopower is integral to the development of capitalism, as:

> The adjustment of the accumulation of men to that of capital, the joining of the growth of human groups to the expansion of productive forces and the differential allocation of profit, were made possible in part by the exercise of bio-power in its many forms and modes of application. (Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* Volume 1, 141)

Role of Surveillance as a Key Apparatus within Governmentality

Foucault's own theorization of biopower and governmentality was incomplete. While his later work on truth and subjectivity made passing references to biopower and governmentality, he never completed the project, leaving a fertile academic ground for his intellectual progeny who have taken up the concepts of biopower and governmentality and taken them into unique directions. This study focuses on the key work that has been done, especially those that address current biological and technological discipline of the human body.

Further, this line of thought has been directly linked to the larger context of the role of surveillance as a key apparatus within governmentality. Before delving further into the work of these key scholars, it is important to clarify some of Foucault's own positions, as many of the scholars who followed his lead have taken the work in directions that pertain to the political and social situations of the past twenty years, two decades that have seen a huge growth in bodily manipulation and techno-scientific reconfigurations of both the individual and social body.

Foucault's key points of departure are the 17th and 18th centuries, where "the human body essentially becomes a productive force" (*Society Must be Defended,* 3). In this seminal work, Foucault traced forms of knowledge that were necessary for certain practices to evolve and take hold. A key element of this process was the politics of exclusion through biopolitical categories such as madness (*Society Must be Defended,* 34):

> looking in historical terms, and from below, at how control mechanisms could come into play in terms of the exclusion of madness, or the repression and suppression of sexuality; at how these phenomena of repression or exclusion found their instruments and their logic, and met a certain number of needs at the actual level of the family and its immediate entourage, or in the cells or the lowest levels of society…family, parents, doctors, the lowest levels of the police, and so on (Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 32).

Foucault continued his analysis of power as a productive force in *Security, Territory, Population*. Here he expanded his thoughts on the specific workings of security and its interplay with exclusionary politics. Again taking the practice of the ancient world and the 18th century as his proving ground, Foucault further elaborated on the complex processes at work in defining and maintaining populations. This work is rife with compelling examples of populist uprisings and struggles to redefine the limits of labor and the jurisdiction of the ruling class. A key contribution of this work is the link between the physical infrastructure and the population:

> The milieu is a set of natural givens – rivers, marshes, hills – and a set of artificial givens – the agglomeration of individuals, of houses, etcetera. . . Finally, the milieu appears as a field of intervention which, instead of affecting individuals as a set of legal subjects capable of voluntary actions – which would be the case of sovereignty – and instead of affecting them as a multiplicity of organisms, of

> bodies capable of performances, and of required performances – as in discipline – one tries to affect, precisely, a population.

Foucault, in *Security, Territory, Population* explained the role of what he called "the pastorate" in examining the forms and origins of resistance. He explained, "There is terror when those who command tremble with fear themselves, since they know that the general system of obedience envelops them just as much as those over whom they exercise their power" (201). This is an important point, as Foucault makes it clear that power is not simply something that flows from above to those below, but rather is a force always in flux, containing all of those who parlay within its field of governance. Foucault elaborated five forms of what he called "counter-conduct" in the Middle Ages. These forms "redistribute, reverse, nullify, and partially or totally discredit pastoral power in the system of salvation, obedience, and truth" (204).

Role of Violence in Maintaining Community

Roberto Espositio takes Foucault's notions about biopower and uses them to develop a philosophy that encompasses the body politic, the law, and violence. He develops these ideas in three key volumes, *Bios*, *Communitas*, and *Immunitas*. Espositio's trilogy is especially relevant in examining the complex relationships that are formed between forces in society that hold a monopoly on violence and the role that this violence plays in maintaining community. For Esposito, there can be no functioning society without the presence and threat of violence, and it is this violence that keeps society immune from a greater violence. As he explains in *Immunitas*:

> by being condemned, life is reduced to pure material, it is subtracted from any form of right life or shared life. It is precisely this this formal possibility that is sacrificed to the reproduction of biological stratum of life, to the perpetuation of simple survival… This means that to preserve life something needs to be introduced into it that at least in some aspect negates it to the point of suppressing it. The relationship between life and death comes back into play: life only maintains itself in relationship with its opposite (33).

In *Bios*, Espositio developed the idea of biopower as a key idea framing immunity, from both disease and foreign bodies as "life subjected to politics" (15) and went on to define his term "bios" as "a life presupposed simultaneously in its general and specific dimension of biological fact" (27). He defined immunity as existing as a "political-juridical language" that "alludes to a temporary or definitive exemption on the part of the subject with regard to concrete obligations or responsibilities that under normal circumstances would bind one to others" (45).

Bodies and Economics

In *Life as Surplus*: *Biotechnology and Capitalism in the Modern Era*, Melinda Cooper (2008) takes Foucault's notions of biopower and uses them to interrogate modern medicine, its development, application and availability. Cooper points out how modern neoliberalism is "is crucially concerned with the emergent possibilities of the life sciences and related disciplines" (3). Her work is crucial in that it incorporates Foucault's thoughts on the rise of

neoliberalism in *The Birth of Biopolitics* with his work on the actual workings of biopower in *Society Must Be Defended* and the three volumes of *History of Sexuality*.

Pursuing the line of thought that renders the body as a site of discipline and governmentality, Melinda Cooper pointed to the rise in economic expenditure of funding for large industries such as the pharmaceutical industry as well as the privatization of the food and drug supply, a dangerous combination and:

> a process of transformation, [in which] two tendencies have been at work. On the one hand, the pharmaceutical and petrochemical industries have responded to crisis by initiating an extraordinary internal consolidation of all aspects of the commercial life sciences, with the result that a handful of transnational (but all U.S.- and EU-based) companies now effectively control every level of world food and pharmaceutical production. On the other hand, the same companies have preemptively moved to capture new and emerging markets in life science production by establishing strategic alliances with smaller biotech companies. (Cooper, 23)

Cooper further delineated this process as one that is not concerned so much with public health but that is concerned more with how life can be extended and marketed within the domain of neoliberal economic practice. She saw this process as drawing money away from the public and into the hands of a few large companies and private research institutions (Cooper, 35-38). She pointed out the global potential such

practice has, as life hangs delicately in the balance as “tensions of capitalism are being played out on a global, biospheric scale and thus implicate the future of life on earth“ (49).

In *Improper Life: Technology and Biopolitics from Heidegger to Agamben*, Timothy Campbell directly addressed the link that biopower plays between technology and invasion. Reading Foucault through Heidegger, he diagnosed what he called a "thanotopolitics” in which a constant anxiety provides the means by which communication technologies are offered as substitutes for genuine human interaction, and thus come to serve as substitute biopolitical companions. Moving from Heidegger and into modern practice, he situated our current age as being defined by the “thanatopolitical,” or a politics that divides proper and improper subjects (17). His account of biopower foregrounds media that can reach across vast distances as “Distancing marks man as the subject of improper revelation and is therefore what endangers him” (15). To make his point he cited the example of radio as a tool that brings subjects of the nation closer to the “homeland” and pointed out how listeners in Nazi Germany became inflected with ideology as biopolitical subjects (21). However, he also clarified that this phenomenon was clearly not just inherent to the Nazis and had been used across the political spectrum as “power is deployed on bodies in what we will want to describe, along with Foucault, as a power over life, or what Heidegger might call the acceleration of the two stars passing each other in the heavens: ‘ordering’ and ‘that which saves’” (23).

Situating biopower at the molecular level, Nicholas Rose writes:

> "It is now at the molecular level that human life is understood, at the molecular level that its processes can be anatomized, and at the molecular level that life can not be engineered. At this level, it seems, there is nothing mystical or incomprehensible about our vitality—anything and everything appears, in principle, to be intelligible, and hence to be open to calculated interventions in the service of our desires about the kinds of people we want ourselves and our children to be" (5).

Biopower is addressed by Eugene Thacker, who points to the cooption of modern DNA science by the military apparatus. Thacker provides a useful discussion of the stages of war, and how each of these stages acts upon and conceives the body. Key to his argument is the idea that American society is both most vital and vulnerable at the intersection of the technological and biological infrastructure, in which the individual body plays a key role. He elaborates on five stages of war; biological sabotage, biological weapons, genetic warfare, biocolonial mission, and finally, bioinfowar (217-225). He uses these five phases to strategically comment on how biological war and the threat of war can compromise the human body, thus making both the disease and the body containing the disease into a threat (228).

In *A Body Worth Defending: Immunity, Biopolitics, and the Apotheosis of the Modern Body*, Ed Cohen examines the human body as a contested spaces, looking to understand how notions of immunity work as both a threat and a promise of freedom from such threat. In his work, he attempted to understand how the human body is "reconceived

as a form of property" (Cohen, Kindle Location 1215). As Foucault and Esposito were concerned with the concept of bodies as integral parts of populations and discipline, Cohen concerned himself with how the body becomes a property, or site where ownership is contested. His concern with immunity and threat is echoed in the works of the Critical Art Ensemble, the U.S. federal government, the television show *Fringe*, and the film *Cloverfield*. Cohen reminds us that immunity is not a natural part of life:

> Despite our ready acceptance, however, immunity is not a natural choice of images for our ability to live as organisms among other organisms of various sizes and scales — nor is defense, for that matter. Instead, both terms derive from the ways that Western legal and political thinking accounts for the complex, difficult, and at times violent manner that humans live among other humans (57-59).

Oppositional/"Opposed readings" within Debates of Biopower

Thomas Lemke's work has been critical in delineating the different strains of thought inherent in discussions of biopower. Lemke traced Foucault's own innovations within the discourse, pointing out how prior to Foucault's work the term had a decidedly negative connotation, referring to practices such as eugenics and racist politics (49). One of Lemke's key contributions is to diagnose two "opposed readings" within debates of biopower, one which interprets it as "negative, and one which interprets it as a productive force (54). For Lemke, this debate was best encapsulated in

the positions of Giorgio Agamben's concept of 'bare life' and Hardt and Negri's conception of "immaterial labor" (59-65). Lemke unpacked his discussion by pointing to key concepts that underlie the work of both of these positions. In Agamben he analyzes an obsession with death and borders as leaving Agamben's position "in thrall to the law" (59), while Hardt and Negri positioned biopower as a productive force of bodies, intellects, and affects" (66).

In *Missing Bodies: The Politics of Visibility*, Monica Casper and Lisa Jean Moore combine Foucault's conceptualization of biopower with surveillance theory to examine how some bodies come to matter more in American culture than others. Crucial to their study is a close examination of bodies in war and how the masculine, white American body is visible at the expense of those bodies gendered female. They provide an in depth examination of truth and myth in the case of Jessica Lynch, who was reported to have been rescued by American soldiers, when in fact the story was far more complex and involved attempts of the Iraqi forces to return her to the American military. Lynch herself was silenced and made invisible so that a masculine tale of rescue from abuse and sexual assault could be told by mainstream media.

The reach of governmentality and biopower has extended into many disciplines and discourses, including those from the social sciences, humanities, and hard/medical sciences. While this study is concerned primarily with biopower's and governmentality's applications in terms of the humanistic study of communications, it is worth briefly mentioning some of biopower's many interlocutors. Ladelle McWhorter (2009) wrote about the debates over human enhancement, and using biopower as a

jumping off point, suggested ways in which the debate over its ethical implications could be bridged. Colin Salter mobilized the concept of governmentality to look at radical environmentalism. Ben Anderson (2010) attempted to link biopower to the concept of affect through an elaboration of the tendencies inherent in a tension between attempts at control and those of resistance.

The concept of biopower, as well as its companion, governmentality, have been used to great effect across a variety of disciplines and topics. And yet, there is a significant gap in looking at one of the most salient discourses of today, that of invasion. This dissertation, by building on the work of Foucault and his academic progeny, addresses that gap by situating invasion as a means of governmentality that seeks to render life as both a site of security and always potential invasion. It is in this dichotomy that so much that is relevant to modern economic and cultural practice occurs.

Some Final Thoughts on Governmentality

It is important to note that governmentality refers not simply to government as a formal body (as in the government) or set of practices confined to this formal body (i.e., government employees and government surplus) but is rather meant to refer to more micro practices that are present and formulated on a daily basis, or "the bodies of knowledge, belief, and opinion in which we are immersed" (16). The selection of how to rule and under what system become as important as the formal bodies that are enabled to make and enforce laws. As such, the police officer that enforces the law is subject to both a governmentality that defines the function of the law and the parameters in which he can act; it also exerts a form of power on the subject arrested or summoned by the police officer. Similarly, it also

functions within the domestic space of the household, whereby members of a family or multiple families reside and how such entities govern the matters of the household, from how time is spent to how food is prepared. As Dean points out, the dual concepts of population and political economy intersect in governmentality (19).

Surveillance Theory

While the main theoretical framework of this study is defined by governmentality and biopower, surveillance plays a significant role, especially when examining the work of the Critical Art Ensemble. One of the key points of surveillance that David Lyon makes is that surveillance extends beyond the power of the state (*Surveillance Society* 30). Surveillance is also a localized phenomenon by which people account for the veracity of strangers (*Surveillance Society* 27). As Lyon further points out, modern surveillance helps to shape social relationships through technology (*Surveillance Society* 5). In these mediated relationships, embodied persons have disappeared at an accelerating rate (*SS* 16). Lyon further points out that modern surveillance practices depend upon a "complex network of communicational information technology" that is largely invisible but supports all kinds of monitoring (*Surveillance Society* 31). Lyon also points to the origin of computers for surveillance use in the 1960s (*Surveillance Society* 31). Mark Andrejevic, echoing Lyon, reminds us that the modern use of surveillance for the control of large populations started in the Gilded Age. He further traces modern surveillance back to Frederick Taylor, who first used surveillance for the purposes of scientific management of his work force (51-52). Andrejevic elaborates on this point, stating:

> "Much of what passes for interactivity in the digital economy might better be understood as techniques for facilitating the scientific management of consumption, understood as a reliance on detailed forms of continuous data collection to help allocate resources more effectively not just in the realm of production, but also in that of marketing and advertising" (53).

In Lyons' *Surveillance Society* this logic extends itself by setting up technologies of defense, monitoring, and "sorting" (Gary Marx, cited in Lyons). The state occupies a place in this assemblage but is by no means the primary actor and indeed is often subject to the logic of surveillance.

As Beatriz daCosta and Claire Pentecost point out, the arrest of Steve Kurtz and subsequent persecution of associates of the Critical Art Ensemble was enabled by the Patriot Act, a central political statement that has ushered in a bold new era of state sponsored surveillance. As David Lyon argues, 9/11 resulted in a spread of draconian surveillance measures across the world, and yet these measures grew out of tendencies that were already in place, as "Surveillance responses to September 11 are indeed a prism through which aspects of social structure and process may be observed" (24).

Methodological Considerations

Choice of Texts Analyzed

This study relies exclusively on case studies from the Twenty First century, drawn from media texts all produced after September 11, 2001. This is important because this date and the event associated with it brought home the notion of invasion as a force, set of events, and possible consequences, clouded by considerable ambivalence. In order to situate the case studies used here, the primary lenses, as outlined above, are situated in biopower and governmentality. It should also be noted, as is argued throughout this study, that the actual and imagined forms of invasion took on new and mutated dimensions.

This study proceeds in the tradition of French deconstruction and textual analysis. As Paula Saukko points out, deconstruction is useful in avoiding dichotomies (147). While, as Saukko points out, deconstruction is not a positive science, it is a "useful tool for social critique" (147). By combining deconstruction with visual analysis, this study works to uncover the ideological underpinnings of the television series *Fringe* and the film *Cloverfield*. The analysis of *Fringe* focuses on specific visual representations of the scientific imagination of the show, including characters, locations, and technology.

This study forgoes analyzing specific episodes of the television series Fringe and instead concerns itself with the show as a holistic work, focusing on the narrative threads and images that speak to invasion. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) speak to this when they call on scholars to look at how media representations both constrain and

empower society. As Pickering (2008) reminds us, "Methods are guidelines for practice, and researchers should feel free to adopt them to suit their purposes" (8).

Similarly, the analysis of *Cloverfield* focuses on the apocalyptic imagination of the film, including key symbols such as the Statue of Liberty. Further emphasis is placed on the found footage style of the film, along with how New York City and a military occupation are represented. As noted visual culture theorist Nicholas Mirzoeff has observed, images are "performative events" (77). By understanding the images and the context in which they are used, this study reveals the machinations of invasion and surveillance. As Mirzoeff notes, following Raymond Williams, images arise in particular historical contexts. Speaking to the ideological power of images, Sturken and Cartwright remind us that "images are an important means through which ideologies are produced and onto which ideologies are projected" (21). Or, as Saukko notes, "we need to pay careful attention to the historical, social, emotional and so on economies at play in any given social movement or place" (105). As an example, the image of the Twin Towers of New York in *Fringe*, still standing in alternate universe in the year 2009, are deep signifiers of meaning.

While a combination of ideological and visual analysis (see, for instance, Davey (1998); Dikovitskaya (2006); Evans and Hall (1999); Finlay (2008); Kress (2006); Kress and Van Leeuwen (1996); Mitchell (1994)) drive the above described chapters, the chapter on the Critical Art Ensemble and The Yes Men is informed by arts-based methodologies (see, for instance, Finlay; Weber) and contains many references to the visuals of the techniques of the two tactical media groups, but it also is complemented

with the concrete material evidence, in the form of law and political wrangling that occurred during and after Steve Kurtz's arrest.

Many further case studies are possible that are not covered in this study. Narratives that deal directly with apocalypses and post apocalypses, for instance, would complement this study well. This is covered briefly in the conclusion. For now, it is sufficient to say that the cases studied here have three qualities in common: they deal with potential destruction of biology and infrastructure, they make direct and indirect reference to terrorist threat especially in the context of September 11, 2001. This allows the current work to explore invasion through concrete manifestations.

Jay David Bolter's and Richard Grusin's theory of remediation also plays a heavy hand in guiding the methodology of this study. While Bolter and Grusin define remediation as "the process by which new media come to take on some of the functions of older media while in turn old media reinvent themselves in order to stay competitive with the new media" (55). This study takes their notion to the ideological level and analyzes how the notion of "invasion" remediates across media platforms.

Analyzing the Impact of How Visualization Occurs

In the first chapter, these manifestations take the form of tactical media art, food, and the law enforcement. Each of these is divided further, as tactical media is made up of practitioners, molecular deconstruction, visual campaigns, and museum spaces. In order to provide an empirical investigation of the interplay of these forces, this study looks at media reports, law enforcement actions, testimony from members of the Critical Art Ensemble and the tactical media community, the theoretical tracts authored by the

Critical Art Ensemble, and the Critical Art Ensemble's web site. As Steve Kurtz has stated, "We are trying to impact how visualization occurs" (Kurtz, cited in Becker and Fleming, 32).

In addition to covering the Critical Art Ensemble, the third chapter of this dissertation also addresses The Yes Men, tactical media practitioners who use their own bodies as vehicles of invasion. For them, masquerade and identity play work to subvert established neoliberal logic. To examine The Yes Men, this study looks at the documentary film *The Yes Men* (Dir. Dan Ollman and Sarah Price). It also examines The Yes Men's web site and their recent Kickstarter campaign. In order to bring The Yes Men's brand of tactical media to light, this study turns to surveillance theory, especially the work of Mark Andrejevic and David Lyon. Surveillance theory is used here to analyze how invisible workings of global capital become visible, and the consequences of exposing these workings.

Turning to the world of film and television, this study's final chapter examines the film *Cloverfield* (dir. Matt Reeves, 2008) and the television series *Fringe* (created by J.J. Abrams, 2008-2013).

In analyzing *Fringe*, this study focuses primarily on the first two seasons of the show, as that is where the primary themes and biopolitical workings of the show are set in motion and most clearly elicited. However, reference is made to the full arc of the show, comprised of five seasons. In order to draw out an analysis of the show, this study focuses on the show's narrative tropes, which include clones, doppelgangers, alternate universes, the show's key locations of Boston and New York, and its representation of

law enforcement agencies, including the titular Fringe division. Further, the study focuses on the representation of the interactions of the human body with molecular manipulation. This is explored through close analysis of the show's visuals, many of which feature spectacular mutations and transformations. The human form is always constant, and yet unsteady. As Steve Kurtz from the CAE notes, "Struggles in representation are as significant as struggles for the factories" (Becker and Fleming 25).

CHAPTER III: BODIES (OF) LAW, UNLAWFUL BODIES

Background Information: Art and Politics

Art and politics are not easy companions. Theorists for years have attempted and debated exactly how the arts intervene and comment upon political projects (see Benjamin 1977, Adorno 1977 in Adorno et al; Ranciere 2004; Raymond Williams 1989). These debates tend to analyze avant-garde artists working in painting, playwriting, and performance. The debate was especially well articulated by Theodor Adorno, George Lukacs, and Ernst Bloch. Below is a short summary of this debate.

Lukacs believed that art was inevitably tied up in history and could not escape its historical placement (Livingstone, in Adorno et al 15). It was this belief that impelled him to become so critical of Realist art, which he maintained was an "apologia for, and a defense of, the existing system" (in Adorno et al 29). He goes on to state that "A campaign against realism, whether conscious or not, and a resultant impoverishment and isolation or literature and art is one of the crucial manifestations of decadence in the realm of art" (in Adorno et al 58). In this sense, Lukac's preceded arguments by Thomas Frank and others who point out the ways in which corporate and profit based actors subdue resistant art for their own purposes. For his part, Ernst Bloch believed in the ability of art to operate within the gaps and ruptures of late capitalism and critiqued Lukac's for not discussing any particular works of art and for favoring complete abstraction over any engagement with concrete works of art (in Adorno et al 16-24). Recently, Jacques Ranciere, following the Kantian tradition, has maintained that there can be a pure aesthetic experience that escapes politics and allows for a sublime experience (Ranciere 2004). In a recent interview, Ranciere stated that, "This

disturbing element must lead to the awareness that there is something wrong with the social order. But obviously there is no reason to believe that civil disturbance, as an effect, will lead to an awareness of the political situation of the world and to mobilization. On the one hand, Brecht's view of estrangement relies on the Marxist theory of alienation" (Dasgupta 74). Theodor Adorno was skeptical on the possibility of the arts making an intervention into politics but maintained that such an intervention was not outside the realm of possibility within the paradigm of dialectical thinking, writing in his correspondence with Walter Benjamin regarding a draft of Benjamin's Arcades project that:

> "it seems to me that the centre of the autonomous work of art does not itself belong on the side of myth…but is inherently dialectical; within itself it juxtaposes the magical and the mark of freedom…But the autonomy of the work of art, and therefore its material form, is not identical with the magical element in it. The reification of a great work of art is not just loss, any more than the reification of the cinema is a loss. It would be bourgeois reaction to negate the reification of the cinema in the name of the ego, and it would border on anarchism to revoke the reification of a great work of art in the spirit of immediate use-values" (122-123).

Peter Burger intervenes in the debate by questioning the means by which it is possible for art to exist as a separate social practice from the society in which it is created. He further pays mind to the question of the conditions of the production of the

work of art, clarifying that just because a work of art may hide the horrible conditions of its own creation, its beauty is by no means tainted. It is worth turning now to Raymond Williams, who stands as a theoretical predecessor of tactical media art.

Raymond Williams' Conception of the Avant-Garde

Williams believed that the avant-garde had the potential for substantial resistance while at the same time remaining open to cooption by modern capitalism. Williams's concern with the avant-garde and technology, as laid out in his essays "The Politics of the Avant-Garde" and "Technology and Culture" seeks to find a way that artists can make an intervention in political matters without being marginalized or appropriated by the systems of capitalism out of which the art must necessarily engage with. Williams points out the differences between Modernism and the avant-garde in which he positions the avant-garde as specifically attacking the bourgeois institutions of art (51). In his conception of the avant-garde, the innovation of the avant-garde is integral because "war is the necessary activity of the strong, and the means to the health of society" (51) and because "the bourgeois was the mass which the creative artist must either ignore and circumvent, or now increasingly shock, deride and attack" (53).

Williams further points to the artificial division that underlies much utopian thinking about technology, and he points out that technology grows out of current political systems (129). This idea is important in examining digital artists, who are often using the very technology of corporate domination and neoliberalism to critique these ideas. On the concept of resistance, Williams states of minority institutions that they have "adapted, even with enthusiasm, to modern corporate capitalist culture. This is so in everyday practice, where a

graded market has some room for them. It is so in the fact that the metropolitan areas of serious drama and fiction have been willingly incorporated into the market operations of sponsorship and prizes" (129). These minority cultures also face a "determined refusal of any genuinely alternative social and cultural order" (125). Further, Williams makes a valuable connection with Modernist art practice, whose practitioners were frustrated with the main avenues of distribution and turned for freedom to "new material bases and the negative freedoms of those centers" (131). Williams situates his argument within the context of burgeoning satellite and cable markets, and points to the concurrent development of both ideology and content, one concerned mainly with drama, crime, and entertainment (121-123). And yet the Internet relies on many of same ideologies and its development has been driven to a great extent by capitalist forces, as can be witnessed by recent debates over public domain, file sharing, and most importantly, net neutrality (see Lessig 2002; Lessig 2008). Williams points to the military origins of many of the satellite systems used for the dispersal of global entertainment, and his ideas easily apply to the origins of the Internet (122). Williams ideas remain useful in situating how digital artists formulate alternative ideas using technology to comment on the technology itself, as is the practice of the Critical Art Ensemble.

The line between art and commerce, especially in the years following 1970 have become so connected under paradigms of neoliberalism that the function of art to maintain a critical distance has been outpaced by profit incentives that can corrupt the ability of art to intervene by duplicating it endlessly, appropriating the subversive as corporate missive, as has been documented by Thomas Frank in the *Conquest of Cool*. David Harvey traces the

accelerating pace of private ownership, individualistic ideology, and the positioning of the state as an agent of business rather than an agent of social welfare and notes how these practices have created a dangerous environment in which countless millions of people have suffered displacement, job loss, poverty, hunger, and the growing imposition of a military order. As Harvey, invoking Karl Polanyi points out, "The Idea of freedom 'thus denigrates into a mere advocacy of free enterprise,' which means 'the fullness of freedom for those whose income, leisure, and security need no enhancing, and a mere pittance of liberty for the people, who my in vain attempt to make use of their democratic rights to gain shelter from the power of the owner of property'" (37). Further, Raymond Williams writes that

> "The politics of the new right, with its version of civil libertarianism in a dissolution or deregulation of all bonds and all national and cultural formations in the interest of what is represented as the ideal open market and truly open society, look very familiar in retrospect. For the sovereign individual is offered as the dominant and political and cultural form, even in a world more evidently controlled by economic and military power. That is can be offered as such a form, in such conditions, depends partly on that evidence which was once, within settled empires and conservative institutions, so challenging and so marginal" (62).

While this study does not take an overly deterministic approach, it does move forward with the understanding that as neoliberal politics works to advance market understandings of citizenship and participation, new media artists have responded by using the same networks to expose and counter these tendencies.

Examining the Critical Art Ensemble: Kurtz, Microbes, and Law

In 2004, Steven Kurtz, one of the founders of the Critical Art Ensemble (CAE), was arrested and charged under the USA PATRIOT act. The details of the events leading up to the arrest and the ensuing fallout from the case would have wide repercussions for both activist art and academics involved in the use chemicals and biological agents. Kurtz had invited the authorities into his house after having called 911 because his wife had stopped breathing. What followed this call set off a major scandal that pitted the representational power of critical art against the ethereal and mobile force of the PATRIOT ACT. Shortly after the call, his house was invaded by a Joint Terrorism Task Force (Hawkins 2008) In the span of two days, Kurtz was charged under the act for possessing chemicals that could be used in a biological weapon (CAE defense fund website). His wife's body (Hope Kurtz had died of a heart attack) was impounded was not returned to Kurtz for over a week (Hawkins). His home was quarantined, including his cat, which was left in the attic without food or water for a week (Hawkins; Liese). The chemicals found by the authorities turned out to be harmless and used every day in high school chemistry classes. Once the charges were proved to be groundless, the charges were shifted to mail fraud. These charges were also extended to Dr. Robert Ferrell, of the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, and who was accused of illegally sending chemicals to Kurtz. (CAE Defense Fund; Annas; Liese; Cash, *Art and Politics: A Strange Brew*). This would all seem to be a reduction from terrorism to mere mail fraud, but as Kurtz points out, they still faced the very real possibility of twenty years in federal prison (*Marching Plague*). Before continuing further in the analysis of the Kurtz case, it is worth closely examining exactly what tactical media means.

Defining Tactical Media

Geert Lovink, one of the earliest theorists of tactical media, defines it as:

> "what happens when the cheap 'do it yourself' media, made possible by the revolution in consumer electronics and expanded forms of distribution (from public access cable to the internet) are exploited by groups and individuals who feel aggrieved by or excluded from the wider culture. Tactical media do not just report events, as they are never impartial they always participate and it is this that more than anything separates them from mainstream media. Bearing witness to this effect is the growing need for tactical media practitioners to stretch beyond standard institutionalized walls in order to generate maximum impact" (Lovink, *ABC's of Tactical Media).*

Peter Wilson, a scholar in new media art and information technology, attaches tactical media to the issue of representation, stating:

> "The tactical problem consists of the need (or desire) to stay ahead of representation — not just to escape it, but to attain through mobilization a relative invulnerability from to representation. And the problematic aspect of the problem is that all media — even tactical media — deal in representation" (Fax to Autonomedia).

Finally, as discussed in chapter one, the Critical Art Ensemble itself provides a rather broad definition of tactical media, one that perhaps allows it to engage in a wide array of projects that are invite public participation while at the same time allowing them to engage in academic theorization that relies on concepts not readily accessible to their audiences. On their website, they define tactical media as:

> *"*situational, ephemeral, and self-terminating. It encourages the use of any media that will engage a particular socio-political context in order to create molecular interventions and semiotic shocks that collectively could diminish the rising intensity of authoritarian culture."

Tactical Media Overview

Tactical media has covered a diverse array of social and cultural issues, including gender inequality in museum exhibitions, the dangers of global capitalism, environmental issues, medical policy, the shrinking availability of public space, and the increasing militarization of daily life, to name just a fraction of issues it has tackled. In order to do justice to the topic and to provide an in depth analysis of the research questions proposed here, this study is concerned specifically with issues of security and the coexistence of corporate capitalism and sustainable life. The justification for such a choice is remarkably simple and yet complex at the same time: this study seeks to go deep into the issues and consequences of the tactical works examined within, and it would thus be impossible to cover the ground of tactical media in its entirety in one study. The second rationale is that

both of the issues tackled here have been at the center of the political moment leading up to and in the aftermath of the events of September 11, 2001. It thus becomes almost impossible to discuss tactical media without going through these events because the objects of critique within tactical media must inevitable wrestle with the broad spectrum of issues raised by the inequalities in global communication and movement that occurred increasingly in the aftermath of September 11 and that constructed the violence of the attacks as justification for the actions taken. More importantly, this justification just as often served as a method to cover up already complex imaginings and practices of inequality that existed prior to the physical events of the attacks and destruction. To clarify, this is not a study about September 11, but it does play a significant role in the way that tactical media has sought to intervene in notions of freedom.

Tactical media has often been described by its theorists and practitioners as an "ephemeral" and fleeting practice that brings about no tangible results except for those brought about in the accumulation of its objects and practices. This, however, is not a tenable solution in the face of corporate consolidation of power and the weakening of government agency. To answer this question, this study proposes that tactical media functions as a form of performative surveillance, one that ultimately is concerned with exposing hidden workings of late capitalism. Following this, I analyze several key works by the Critical Art Ensemble and their accompanying theory. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, this study proposes that tactical media functions as a form of governmentality that ultimately subjects the notion of embodiment to rigorous examination and situates the individual body as both a site of infection (ideological and physical) and revolution. In order to analyze this last point, the

dissertation examines the case of the Critical Art Ensemble and the trials they faced in very public showdown with both the United States Government and Monsanto (even as the later remained silently absent from the actual political and economic facts of the case.

In considering how tactical media functions as a form of governmentality, this study puts the practice of tactical media into its historical context as a practice that emerged post 1989 (Lovink, *Dark Fiber)*. In order to understand tactical media, it is equally important to understand how the interventions it makes are bound up with social and technological developments of the time. As discussed in the introduction to this chapter, tactical media practitioners have been around well before 1989, mostly in the form of avant-garde performance that pushed the limits of representation (Sadie Plant, *The Most Radical Gesture*). The years after 1989 become particularly important because it saw both the defeat and major roll backs of union power and the slow dismantling of the state as a protective enterprise, and ensuing migration of how citizenship cam to be defined to the corporate and private sphere (as David Harvey argues in *Enigma of Capital* and *Brief History of Neoliberalism*). By the time that tactical media has reached its audience, it has gone through numerous changes and remodifications. Its fluid structure and constant search for new actors provides it a sort of capital that mirrors capital's own fluid flows. This is not, however, to be taken that tactical media possesses the same representational power of capital. It decidedly does not. But in order to conceptualize tactical media as a form of invasion, it is necessary to recall that invasion inevitably changes the structure or workings of the thing it invades, whether permanently or temporarily.

Levels of Invasion

The Critical Art Ensemble/Steve Kurtz case illustrates some of the key issues at the heart of this study. One of the constant themes running through the battles between tactical media and both government and private interests (and these two are not one and the same and should not be treated as such, as will be made clear shortly) has been invasion. Consider, for example, that the installation that the CAE was working on at the time of Kurtz's arrest and for which the chemicals that set off the investigation were intended. Kurt's house and domestic space became, quite literally, a site of invasion. Removed from his home, it became a string of quarantine tape and officials dressed in hazmat suits. Another level of invasion involved in this case concerns the nature of the installation for which the chemicals were intended. Designed to serve as a means of surveillance and demonstrate harmful chemicals that are present in the everyday food supply, CAE were attempting to demonstrate the "invasion" of corporate power into the food supply, and on another level, the invasion impure elements into what is thought to sustain life. So that which sustains life, in both cases, becomes the threat, mimicking Foucault's diagnosis of the transformation of the sovereign into a despot, and thus a monster (See Foucault, *Abnormal*). One of the key aspects of tactical media and the struggles it engages directly concerns how bodies come to be defined, and under what conditions. The body, in order to be sustained, must exist in a state of perpetual potential invasion. This is a development of increased mobility, modern industrial agriculture, modern financial currents and flows, advanced communication technology, and weapons that have the capacity to destroy almost all life on the planet.

Making the Invisible Visible

As the above story about Steve Kurtz illustrates, tactical media interventions had a very direct cost to the lives and bodies of its practitioners. While some have argued, and with some merit, that the workings of tactical media are "rhizomatic" and "non-nolactable" (Lovink, Giannachi, 45), this is a dangerous simplification. While tactical media may combine elements of 'non-locatability,' the increased militarization of the public sphere (as documented by the Critical Art Ensemble in *Marching Plague*, David Harvey in *Brief History of Neoliberalism*, and Naomi Wolf in *Give me Liberty*) makes this aspect increasingly problematic. Thus while CAE has given author to documents that chronicle tactics (what they call fuzzy biological sabotage that can be used by anyone, the assumption here is that those committing these acts will not be subject to authoritarian subjugation; it also assumes a complete knowledge of tactical media terminology and technique. In short, what makes Kurtz and the Critical Art Ensemble as well as The Yes Men so effective is that they can be located, that they are willing to situate themselves in the complex matrixes of state, corporate, and activist vectors.

In combination with these facts, the migration of tactical media to the Internet also problematizes this notion. While Gabriella Giannachi correctly points out that the Critical Art Ensemble "combine different and even seemingly diverse media discourses" (45), it can only be invisible when it is ineffective. Quite to the contrary, it works by making the often hidden mechanisms of power visible. And as the legal case against Kurtz makes abundantly clear, the physical and psychic effects can be quite profound at the level of the body. Before continuing along these lines, it is important to provide an overview of some of the key works

of the Critical Art Ensemble. These are laid out most readily in their theoretical tracts *Marching Plague* and as well as the exhibit at the center of the Kurtz case, *Free Range Grain*, and the exhibit created in the aftermath of the Kurtz case, Seized!

In *Free Range Grain*, the Critical Art Ensemble situated their argument within the realm of invasion as it occurred as a deleterious effect of globalization as the "'smooth space' of global trade enables the very "contaminations" the authorities say it guards against" (see Critical Art Ensemble's website for full description). By inviting participants to bring in everyday foods, the CAE encouraged a form of surveillance by which the corruption of the food supply was revealed.

In their participatory exhibit, the Critical Art Ensemble wanted visitors to the Massachusetts Museum of Modern Art (Mass MOCA) to bring in food to be tested for levels of toxicity and agents that could be harmful to the human body. In short, they were calling attention to the corporate food supply and attempting to make visible what remained hidden to most people. The fact that the food chain is a massive industrial undertaking is easy to miss, in objects that show up whole in local markets and in restaurants.[3]

Recall that governmentality, in its simplest form, is the means by which a given people allow themselves to be governed (Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* Volume 2). In short, it is what is important to a citizenry, and how they conceptualize the means of commerce, taxes, health care, and daily ritual of life As Mitchell Dean points out, it is

[3] Recently, the corporate food supply has come under greater scrutiny, with dozens of documentaries on the subject available on Netflix and other streaming services. However, at the time that the Critical Art Ensemble was planning this exhibit, this was not the case.

concerned with “the organized practices through which we are governed and through which we govern ourselves” (18).

Access to food is a taken for granted part of daily life. In terms of governmentality, it is what sustains the body, and much of daily life is structured around forms of discipline such as meal times, shopping excursions, coupon clipping, store loyalty cards, and lunch hours and places of employment. Indeed, one need only look to much of the literature on Google and the ways in which they cater to employees by providing a plethora of food options. Food and the subject of what to eat is also one of the primary ways in which dating rituals are constructed. So it’s clear how important food is at the social and disciplinary level.

Working at the molecular level, however, the Critical Art Ensemble was attempting to bring forth a closer examination of the very substances that lay just below the surface of these daily rituals.

The CAE's works *Marching Plague* and *Seized!*

Marching Plague

Marching Plague (MP) is the Critical Art Ensemble's theoretical analysis of American military expenditure on chemical warfare programs[4]. By turns both scathing and rich in historical fact, *Marching Plague* documents the use of secretive programs by the United States and Soviet governments from the 1960's onwards. *Marching Plague* argues that these programs are often a waste of money and show no actual benefit, while at the same time exposing unsuspecting populations to dangerous experimentation, as "Given the new global

[4] The Critical Art Ensemble website, while relatively bland, does provide several links to click. These links provide a short overview of the projects that the CAE sponsor and blend visual synopsis via slide shows with short, theoretical text. In the first slide for *Marching Plague*, the fifteen volunteers are dressed in bright yellow shirts and stand on the stairs of what appears to be an official looking building. They are flanked by Kurtz and another member of the CAE, each wearing white lab coats. Thus the picture enacts resistance by marking Kurtz and his fellow CAE member as experts, and the yellow shirted volunteers stand out from the stoic official background. The yellow shirts further mark them as part of a collective, and only by reading the position paper and accompanying captions does the idea of resistance fully come into full view. While the tactical media portion of the project is complete, the website documentation of it stands as an example of both how to conduct resistance and the consequences of resistance.

Clicking through the slide show, the viewer is guided through the steps of the project, in which the human volunteers literally enact Foucault's notion of biopower, as they become both targets of disease and actual agents of disease. Progressing through the slides, for example, shows a marching band that is part of the project marching down the street of Leipzig and surrounding the consulate, mirroring the often celebratory imagery of war. The next slide shows Kurtz with his arms outstretched with the caption, "The Corps surround the consulate." The next slide shows a magisterial image of the capital building, with the simple caption "the bacteria is unleashed," followed by the next slide with caption, "the human guinea pigs line up to be swabbed for the bacteria." The next slide is a close up of one of the human guinea pigs being tested by Kurtz and one other member of the CAE. The image suggests expertise and victimization, two constant themes of modern warfare and surveillance. The final slide shows Kurtz, no longer in a lab coat but dressed simply in jeans and a leather jacket smiling as he stands in front of a door where woman in a lab coat smiles. The caption underneath the slide states simply, "The samples are give to a lab technician at the Institute for Microbiology. The results are inconclusive as only two of the samples test positive for Subtilis."

By placing their position paper in conjunction with the images from a real-time protest, the CAE uses the screen as a site of resistance that calls into question official iconography and posits a position that falls well outside mainstream media debates. By visualizing resistance within the city and using human bodies as both disease and victims, the CAE further call into question the notion of the population as imagined target and suggest that the actual targeting which occurs is much more about using the idea of safety in order to advance neoliberal policies that rely on military solutions.

order's increase in mass international travel, global shipping, and commodity exchange, the likelihood of using germ warfare without killing unintended populations is at an all-time low" (*Marching Plague*, 7). *Marching Plague* places current germ biological warfare in historical context, tracing the use of bacteria as a weapon to the 1500's. Within this framework, *Marching Plague* argues that the use of such weapons in current times is primarily psychological, as there are much more effective methods for maximizing kill rates:

> The stealth advantage of using tasteless, odorless, invisible germs is worth considering in the indoor scenario; however, why a military would want to employ a weapon of random death that would be limited to a single building is hard to imagine. Only under rare conditions would there be a military advantage, and for terrorists, more profoundly symbolic and terrible ways to kill are just as available (*Marching Plague*, 32).

The concept of invasion is important just to the functioning of tactical media, but also to the very ideas that tactical media critiques, and the ways that tactical media is positioned by the entities and forces it critiques. There is no predetermined order for which the different stages of invasion must occur. The CAE points out, for example, that in the case of germ warfare, "everyone loses" (*Marching Plague,* 25). Another level of invasion was that, as described above, of the authorities into Kurtz's home, one that was immediately attached to the idea contamination. That is, the possession of chemicals in and of itself implied a malevolent intent, that is, the introduction of the uninvited into the social body, similar to what occurred in the post 9/11 anthrax panic that used the rather mundane site of

postal service as a delivery device. Finally, invasion becomes a dominant logic through which populations are governed, or as Jack Bratich states, "thought, because it has been made governmental under liberalism, is an important point of contestation" (68). Another facet of invasion is the promised repeat of the attacks of September 11, 2001 on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. As such, it is important to note that the idea of threat had already been present even before these attacks, as the invasion films of the 1950s testify.

The concept of biopower, whether stated or not, is more often than not at the heart of the tactical media interventions covered here. Recall that biopower, at a very basic level is "a politics that deals with life" (Lemke, 1),[5] one that also presents a "border to politics" that should be both "respected and overcome" (Lemke, 4). Tactical media is most concerned with the "overcoming" side of the equation. If we begin to understand tactical media as a practice and a diverse set of objects produced in this questioning and overcoming the borders, it begins to appear as if tactical media must find its strength within a milieu that takes certain structural apparatuses as a given (following the above example of the Critical Art Ensemble, their performance and theory on free range grain assumes a global food network in which citizens of the Western world must consume food in order to sustain life. What they call into question is the contamination, or impurity of this system that comes to serve a counter-purpose to which it was intended. Thus food remains a source of sustainability but also becomes unstable and dangerous once the boundaries of this system

[5] Lemke adds biopower "aims at the administration and regulation of life processes on the level of populations. It focuses on living beings rather than on legal subjects – or, to be more precise, it deals with legal subjects that are at the same time living beings." (4)

fade away and it becomes a node in global capitalistic excess. So the Critical Art Ensemble and The Yes Men become sites of probing questioning, and it is only when they confront the boundaries of life, or how these boundaries are transgressed, that they become dangerous to entrenched modes of governmentality (and in all cases, this ties back to corporate capitalism with an enormous underclass of both producers and consumers).

Tactical Media as Governmentality

The move here to situate tactical media as a form of invasion is done for two primary reasons. The first has to do with the larger mediascape (Falcous and Maguire 2006) and the ways in which tactical media exists in conversation with more commercial forms of communication and media. In order to understand tactical media as invasion, it is worth recalling the concepts underlying governmentality, which is concerned with the movement between micro-practices and how these micro-politics form a coherent political environment and the formations through which deviance is rehearsed. Similarly, tactical media must remain, as many have stated, fluid in its concrete forms (moving from the streets to the networks to museums and back onto the Internet).

As long as tactical media is theorized as a leaving only ‘ephemeral’ or ‘temporary’ disruptions, then it will never begin to compete or intervene within the corporate and militaristic flows in which it seeks to intervene. And yet, as the future becomes clouded further through advancements both technological and economical, it becomes more difficult to see how tactical media may begin to make any sort of concrete impact upon the world. The fact of its existence and its propensity to avoid results, to fade as quickly as it began, leaves it often on the back shelf as history, disregarded as merely a prank or a neat idea at

the time, some fun while it lasted. Alas, then, these responses are apt to leave the pursuit altogether hopeless, worth abandoning for some more fruitful pursuit. But to think along these lines is perhaps to miss the point of tactical media, and more explicitly, to ignore the conditions under which tactical media arises and the manner in which it cultivates its responses, responses which themselves often leave the enterprise and its practitioners in decidedly life or death situations. Tactical media, in allowing itself to be imagined as 'ephemeral' misses the greatest possibility for its own invention. Tactical media structures itself in the form of governmentality by clashing most forcefully with the objects and practices it seeks to undermine. This can be done deliberately or through strong the results that arise when tactical media provokes an intense response from power, as in the case of the CAE. It exhibits a call, and then the dark shadow descends with the full force of military force, tactical media can stand against this tide only by performing an inverse appropriation, as the matter of tactical media exists already as an understated underbelly of the easy flow of capital and armies.

Seized! The Aftermath

The Critical Art Ensemble's *Seized!* (2008)[6] which rendered the struggle of Kurtz and the CAE into a concrete exhibition by showcasing the items that were seized by the FBI and other authorities during the raid on his home, while other portions are made up of literal garbage such as pizza boxes and other debris left behind by the various investigation teams. This exhibit, comprised of the debris left behind by the law enforcement agencies that

[6] The full details of the installation can be found on the CAE's website, which includes detailed pictures of the exhibit.

occupied his house, demonstrate the conflicting nature of invasion. A quick recap is in order: Kurtz invited the authorities into his house in a desperate attempt to save the life of his wife, Hope. It was at this point that the spirit of the time, high on (largely imaginary but no less powerful) terrorism and anthrax threats, took hold of the authorities and soon gave way to an invasion of law enforcement officials. Kurtz's life had been turned inside out.

This case demonstrates invasion as a form of governmentality on several levels. At one level, society is governed by notions of entry and profession. The ambulance and the medical team were invited. However, with this invitation, initiated with the numbers 911, came an invasion of a very different sort, one that was directly connected to the fears of that other 9/11. Governed by the idea of threat, more specifically, bio-threat, one that was particularly salient at that exact moment in time, Kurtz was arrested on some very dubious suspicions. It should not be lost that Kurtz and the CAE were attempting to expose a third level of governmentality, that which dictates how exactly human bodies are sustained on a daily basis. As Allen Feldman and points out, "The frame of reference of the human monster is, of course, the law" (Kindle location, 1667).

The pizza boxes and other garbage left behind by the FBI and local law enforcement gives strong testimony to the physicality of this governmentality. While Kurtz remained removed from his home (and it is not without irony that it was at this time that notions of the "homeland" had come to the forefront of American culture, mostly used in the context of a place that would be protected by means of militarized force). Kurtz and his wife's body were both removed from what would be understood as the proper space. For Kurtz, it was his home and workspace, and for Hope, it was long delayed proper burial and mourning services

for friends and family. Life would be preserved at all costs. As Nicholas Michelsen points out in the context of the biopolitical dimensions of the suicide bomber, but relevant here: "Liberalism does not refuse the right to kill, but rather justifies killing by identifying certain (diseased/unpolitical) bodies in the global space as integrally threatening to population health

The Yes Men and Biopolitical Invasion: Bodies as Viruses

The Yes Men[7] are famous for posing as members of the WTO, Dow, and other large multinational corporations and making outlandish statements such as "there ought to be a market for human rights abuses." Their statements are quite obviously meant to skewer the corporate motif of profit above all else and the focus on bottom line corporate responsibility. But the more interesting aspect of their performance is the often underestimated manner in which their performances situate the group itself *deliberately* as a subject of surveillance to be removed. Their performances render corporate power (specifically those specializing in chemical enhancement and finance) visible. The Yes Men's performances have yielded a good degree of critical attention, as their masquerades have been taken at face value by

[7] The Yes Men videos:

YesMen. (n.d.). Dow Chemical. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SlUQ2sUti8o

YesMen. (n.d.). Exxon. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WkLzK13rI-Y&feature=related

YesMen. (n.d.). Haliburton catastrophic loss conference. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=00w3nY6hkas

YesMen. (n.d.). Site they used to get access. Retrieved from www.Haliburtoncontracts.com

YesMen. (n.d.). Interview on CNN on faux NYT. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dO6Oi3XUYgg&NR=1

YesMen. (n.d.). Guide to high level pranking. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GhrpSW_pnck&NR=1&feature=fvwp.

national news outlets such as CNN. As Hynes, Sharpe and Fagan point out, "the kind of practical joke that the Yes Men have made their modus operandi can be seen as political because it provides the conditions through which the new is able to emerge and initiation becomes possible" (108).

Kate Kenny has analyzed The Yes Men through the performative theory of Judith Butler. She points out how parody can work as a mechanism that can bring about social change, but also questions whether it is simply a "safety valve" (222). Her study works to question the effectiveness of parody, while this study is more concerned with how The Yes Men work more as an invasive force, under which parody becomes a secondary mechanism; thus it highlights both The Yes Men and the key organizations (namely the BBC and Dow Chemical).[8]

The YesMen is made up of two primary players, Andy Bichlbaum and Mike Bonanno. For years, they have been drawing attention to corporate abuses of power through comedy with a biting edge. As shown in the documentary *The Yes Men*, one of their most famous tactical acts was to perform as members of the Dow Chemical Company. Using their website, they managed to set up a meeting with the BBC and pose as Mike Bonanno was able to pose as a representative of Dow Chemical. In this performance, on the anniversary of the Bhopal energy disaster, they offered an apology for the event and announced that they would be paying for damages.

[8] Kenny also points out how The Yes Men use DVD technology to spread their message. It is worth noting that this is an indication of how fast technology has changed, as now much of their work is available through online media such as Youtube, as well as the streaming service Netflix.

This tactical performance was not without intended and unintended consequences. It affected the BBC, who broadcast the stunt, Dow, and the citizens of Bhopal, India. First, Dow's stock value went down considerably. Next, the BBC was forced to issue a prompt apology that the subject that they had just interviewed was not in fact a representative of Dow. And finally, the citizens of Bhopal were lead to believe that they would be getting long overdue financial compensation.

The YesMen shows Mike and Andy traveling to India to get their response to their performance. Dow had attempted to cast the YesMen as villains, offering false hope to the citizens of Bhopal. However, once the YesMen arrived in Bhopal and showed the video of the event to the citizens, they were shown laughing and overcome with joy that the tragedy of Bhopal was not being so easily forgotten.[9]

Analyzing the YesMen's Invasion

As the YesMen point out, one of the key resources they use to receive invitations to the halls of corporate power is the design of very simple websites. The YesMen, more than the Critical Art Ensemble, rely in the screen and the ways in which it provides a web site with a mark of authenticity. We can further see the YesMen's approach as threatening because it is, on one level, similar to the mechanisms of the attacks of 9/11. By donning the garb of the elite, the well-tailored sleek suit, the members of the Yes Men were able to position themselves as an outside agent in the body of the corporate elite. Once they

[9] Of course, this is how the documentary shows the tragedy of Bhopal. And it is not without irony that, as is the narrative often told in America, that white bodies were shown protecting and looking out for "third world" citizens.

successfully "invaded" the corporate hall, they used ideology and performance as a weapon in order to turn the mechanism of rampant, unchecked capitalism back on itself. Such action would be impossible, or at least highly improbably, without the networked screen.

The above tactical performance of the YesMen demonstrates the complexities involved in invasion. While the specifics of the Bhopal plant explosion are tangential to this study, it is worth noting that Dow, as a multinational corporation, had a great deal of power to influence the citizens of Bhopal. Further, the explosion that killed over one thousand people had the effect of cataclysmic change.[10] The YesMen's attempt to resolve this issue by preventing it from fading from memory is done by invading the media in a similar manner in which a virus invades a host. As Bill Wasik and Monica Murphy point out, disease has existed for much of human history as a metaphor (*Rabid* 50). The Yes Men took this metaphor and quite literally performed the work of a virus by altering the way in which the BBC operated, and had a direct impact on the lifeblood of Dow, its stock price. While the effects of this invasion were temporary, The Yes Men performed an imaginary governmentality in that they suggested, though a temporary restructuring of reality, the way that a society not beholden to capitalistic markets could work. In order to do this, however, they had to invade the very body of capitalistic production. In so doing, they made the invisible bodies that Casper and Moore theorized visible. They accomplished this by both bringing into focus the dead and the living of Bhopal, as well as the often hidden corporate faces that do their best to stay hidden during such tragedies.

[10] The *YesMen* documentary points out that the exact number killed is unknown, given that the gas explosion had a cumulative effect over a period of time. Estimates range from 2000 to 8000 people.

Contagion

The spread of contagions and diseases, as Irwin W. Sherman points out, is based as much on travel patterns and sociological factors (17) as well as a relatively sedentary population (23). While this may seem like a stretch, it is worth noting that The Yes Men relied very much on a format that is situated on sedentary bodies, television, in order to accomplish their task. And the very real threat that this posed, however temporarily to Dow, was in fact a media virus, one that could not be undone easily. The Yes Men, using simple tools such as suits and a website were able to infiltrate, much like virus, a host organism and perpetuate a challenge to the normal functioning of Dow and the BBC.

Concluding Remarks: "The First Taste of the Last Frontier"

In *The Art of Free Cooperation*, Geert Lovink and Trebor Scholz wrestle with the very idea of cooperation. This notion of cooperation runs through the work of the Critical Art Ensemble and The Yes Men, whose work is made freely available to those with an Internet connection and have a desire to integrate themselves into debates around global capitalism, militarism, and ecological preservation, through the use of what the CAE terms "fuzzy biological sabatoge" (*MP*). But Lovink and Scholz make it clear of collaboration that "we don't really have a choice in the matter. Collaboration always already happens, forced or not, tense or joyful, stomachaches or hot rushes" (15).

The project of tactical media has rapidly given way to new forms of intervention, especially after Edward Snowden's revelations regarding the magnitude of the United States' National Security Agency (NSA). With the advent of YouTube and viral videos, along with

memes, tactical media seems at times to be quaint, almost unsustainable at times. And yet, it is worth keeping in mind that both the CAE and The Yes Men continue to thrive. And they often work at a more theoretical level than many of the other projects that are available. Their strength lies in their continuing ability to expose the hidden, and in this sense they continue as a valuable form of critical invasion.

The Critical Art Ensemble continues to operate their website, though it remains as stagnant as always. They make available their theoretical tracts, as well as advice for citizens interested in performing their own tactical performances. They also provide a partial list of their own tactical performances, the most recent which was in 2013, called Keep Hope Alive, a project designed to deal with high unemployment in the Sheffield, England.[11] They also continue to exhibit in museums and have turned their focus to the environmental activism.

Although The Yes Men had not made many public appearances or engaged in as many pranks in the past few years, they have just returned, with a new focus on climate

[11] The Critical Art Ensemble provides the following description for the project: "Whenever the inequitable distribution of resources crosses into territories once thought impossible, Critical Art Ensemble (CAE) has responded with a public party to highlight the achievements of various oligarchies and plutocracies in a manner that is less painful to those who must suffer the injustice. The first installment was in Sheffield, UK, highlighting the city's twenty percent unemployment rate. The second installment was in Kyoto, spotlighting the failure of cultural institutions to function as public institutions. And now, here in the US, in Portland, we will party in recognition of a distribution of wealth reminiscent of the era of the robber barons. The vast majority of wealth may be in the hands of the very few, but the many have a handful of remaining assets to give us pleasure, and at the KHABP we shall indulge in them all: Sustenance (we cannot guarantee that it is delicious, healthy, or life sustaining, but the soup kitchen will be open and calories will be delivered all afternoon); Delirium (forty-ounce bottles of Miller High Life for those of age, and Big Gulps of Mountain Dew for our under-agers); and Hope (raffle tickets offering big cash prizes, so that for a lucky few, economic mobility will not only be downward). For just one dollar, this trifecta of resources for the poor and downwardly mobile is available to all comers. Let's party like it's 1929."

change. Unlike their previous projects, which were all housed on their home page, The Yes Men branched out to Kickstarter to fund their third film, *The Yes Men are Revolting* (2015).[12]

One day prior to the June 12, 2015 release of *The Yes Men are Revolting* (2015), The Yes Men staged a convincing scheme in New York City's Columbus Circle. Performing as employees of Royal Dutch Shell, complete with "yellow-and-red Shell swag," members of The Yes Men handed out free shaved ice carved from a chunk of the "last iceberg in existence" to give New Yorkers and tourists the "first taste of the last frontier." Given the "sweltering day in New York, and the cheerful 'Shell employees' had no trouble garnering interest in the free icy treats. But many patrons soon turned bewildered or upset" after reading the slogans on the free icy treat display: "'The Future Never Tasted So Sweet' and 'Narwhals Are the Unicorns of the Ocean. We Provide the Rainbows' (in the form of an oceanic oil sheen)" (Rolling Stone).

[12] Consider the page for their newest venture: "*The Yes Men Are Revolting* is a funny, action-packed adventure. With the environment on the brink of collapse, we ask a pressing question: at a time when corporate forces have bought and sold democracy, how can we effect real change? Our answer: get every viewer involved in the struggle." For those willing to donate to the film, they offer the following "gifts": "Secret Decoder Ring: Our precious USB ring is loaded with media, tools, and your access code to becoming an agent in the Yes Net, unlocking special communications we send in the future, including videos and action plans that invite you to join in the fun. In addition to your code, the ring contains an agent-induction video, "Beautiful Trouble" ebook, and addictively fun video games from Molleindustria, including the banned iPhone game PhoneStory."

Another option they offer for those willing to donate ten thousand dollars or more is "OPTION B: Sailing excursion with the Yes Men. Yes, you heard us: yachts are for the 1%, but wind-powered sailing is for anyone. Of course, Andy doesn't have his own boat, but as a sailing teacher in a community waterfront organization, he can take you out for a day of irony on the waters surrounding the financial capital of the world. Plus everything in the Mega Fan Pack including the Citizen Producer credit, decoder ring, movies, shirt, books, and more! (Transportation to New York City and lodging not included.) Estimated delivery: Jun 2013."

Robert Vest, a New Yorker who happened to be walking by the prank, sent several images of the “Shell” display via Instagram, complete with hashtags, #badmarketing, #poorchoice, #shocking, #corporategreed, #dumbass. Vest told the *Rolling Stone* reporter covering the event, "They're making snow cones out of an iceberg? How fucking insulting is that?" After learning that the “ordeal had been a work of satire, he laughed. ‘I thought, 'What assholes. But maybe [Shell is] stupid enough to do something like this. What an epic fail for their PR department"’ (*Rolling Stone*). While Vest said he was "totally relieved" that the "first taste of the last frontier” was a prank to raise awareness about Artic oil drilling and climate change, it "sent [him] into action mode” — precisely the goal of The Yes Men.

CHAPTER IV: CLONES, DOPPELGANGERS AND THE FRIENDLY FACE OF SCIENCE: A CLOSE ANALYSIS OF BIOPOLITICS IN *FRINGE*

Introducing *Fringe*

The plot of *Fringe* (2009, created by J.J. Abrams) concerns the workings of the Fringe division, a law enforcement group dedicated to exploring and solving crimes involving scientific anomalies. It is worth noting that there is nothing supernatural about the show; rather, all the mysteries revolve around themes involving doppelgangers, telepaths, good and evil scientists. As the plot develops towards the end of the first season, the show introduces the main plot device around which all future seasons and episodes will revolve: the existence of an alternate universe that is populated by different versions of the same characters. The presence of this alternate universe is at first seen as a threat, as the characters battle with the other versions of themselves. However, as the show progresses, they come to an understanding and work together to face the primary threat posed by the show's main villain, Robert David Jones and in the final season, William Bell (Leonard Nimoy).

The Characters of Fringe

Fringe works through a complex narrative device through which the main characters are connected through a complex history. Olivia (Anna Torve), the main agent and love interest of Peter Bishop (Joshua Jackson) served as a test subject for Walter Bishops's (John Noble) experiments with *cortexafan*, a sort of miracle drug that unleashes superpowers and is a key component of traveling between universes. Walter Bishop is Peter Bishop's father, but due to their estrangement and complex history, Peter always refers to him as "Walter." Approximately twenty years prior to the start of the show's

narrative, Walter crossed universes to save his 'son' and brings him back to our side[13]. Peter leans he is from the other side. While all of this is going on there are men known as the watchers who make creepy appearances and give cryptic advice to Peter, Olivia, and Walter. Astrid (Jasika Nicole) is a charming nerd and serves as a high level assistant to Walter Bishop. Throughout the show, the story connects back to scientific phenomena such as clones, telepaths, time travel, and transferred memory syndrome.

Another central element of the show is the company Massive Dynamic, a multinational corporation on steroids that was started by Walter Bishop and his partner William Bell.[14] Once Walter was locked up the company fell into more nefarious hands; the company straddles a line and often engages in less than ethical conduct, but also is an ally of the Fringe unit at other times.

The above summary is necessarily painted in broad strokes, and there are many other details that have been omitted for the sake of clarity. However, the above summary will serve the analysis of the show provided here.

The Places of *Fringe*

The show, in its setting of Boston and the surrounding area, with occasional trips to Washington, DC and New York, presents a picture of a well groomed and happy city life. As

[13] This is a key point in the show's narrative. All of the main characters have a double in the alternate universe, except for Peter. The original Peter from "our" universe died, and Walter, seeing through to the other universe, stole the alternate universe's Peter in order to prevent him from dying. This sets up the complex relationship between Walter Bishop and the alternate universe's Walter Bishop (Walternate), who is much more stoic and is the Secretary of Defense.

[14] William Bell is not revealed as an antagonist until the end of Season 4. It is revealed that he was the one responsible for sending shapeshifters and other nefarious beings to the "our" universe. It is also revealed that he was working to create a third universe of his own, one where he would be a god figure.

Timothy Campbell points out in his reading of bipolitics in Peter Sloterdijak, Peter, Olivia and the rest of the fringe division "[detach] themselves from the collective bodies to which they belong…. [and] move towards other political collectives whose function is directed principally to individual security" (90). The super powered individuals and occasional malcontent often break this picture of urban happiness, but it most often occurs to intervene in the private lives of its star cast, the scientist, the army veteran, and the good hearted FBI agent. Thus peril comes down to the individual level, always rooted in past transgressions, as most of the villains encountered in the series serve as either impetus for Olivia to forgive or understand some aberration that Walter and his research inflicted upon her as a child. Cities of power thus become the private spaces of this individual security against the backdrop of imagined peril.

One of the most iconic shots from *Fringe* occurs in the final episode of Season 1 ("There's More than One of Everything," 2009), where Olivia is transported to the alternate universe. At first, she is unsure where she is. But then the camera pans up from her point of view, and Olivia, along with the audience, see the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center. With this image, the show immediately conjures a political moment in time, suggesting that the alternate universe has proceeded very differently.

The presence of the Twin Towers suggests that the security measures employed to control and contain the population of the alternate universe have been highly effective. Interestingly enough, the show eschews any manner of political debate directly, instead focusing on the affective lives of its characters. As Mathias Nilges reminds us, "the form of representations of destruction is contingent upon a specific historical context we need to

examine to arrive at a detailed understanding of the forces that influence cultural form." (in *Reframing 9/11,* 431-432).

Another iconic image *Fringe* uses to establish the two universes is the Statue of Liberty. While the one in "our" universe appears as normal, with its green hue, the Statue of Liberty in the alternate universe is gold. A further facet of the alternate universe is that it is much more "visibly" militarized than "our" universe. The Fringe division, for example, does not dress in suits, but rather are garbed in full military gear. Further, the alternate universe's Agent Broyles has an eye patch, suggesting a much more dangerous environment.

The final and perhaps most troubling aspect of the alternate universe is the use of what is known as "quarantine." This is represented as a technology that spreads like a golden hue over any dangerous area that cannot be contained. The devise is used frequently, and any people who are in the area of the quarantine are placed in suspended animation as a result.

Fringe and Biopower

Fringe works implicitly in a biopolitical matrix that underscores debates around the ethics of science in the early 21st century. And in doing so, it facilitates and advances a relatively passive citizenry that is beholden to powerful but often invisible forces. In constructing it's heroes and villains, its elite and its militarized forces, *Fringe* asks for acceptance of a benign militarized presence into everyday life.

The show represents a utopian view of science, and more importantly, the biopolitical machinations that it depends on to function become lost in this utopian vision.

This chapter proceeds by analyzing the specific biopolitical workings of the show and the ways that the shows narrative both celebrates an unequivocal celebration of

scientific excess, even as it hides the means by which these utopian scientific visions come about. To be clear, the show relies heavily on a post-invasion threat: No bodies are stable, the rise of a scientific and military ruling class circumvents criticisms through benign familiarity with characters, and space becomes unstable, as it is both a target and molecularly unsound.

The Dialectic of the Two Universes

The presence of two universes that drive the narrative of the show. These two universes create a dialectic that both empowers and imperils the populations of the two universes. In creating this dialectic, the show resolves scientific queries through affective communication. For example, biological preservation and love compel Walter, Olivia, and Peter to make grave decisions.

Unstable Bodies

The presence of unstable bodies in the form of dopplegangers. These dopplegangers fall into two categories: main characters with presences in both universes (for example, Olivia in the first universe and Fauxlivia in the alternate universe) and biocybernetic creations sent by Walternate to infiltrate the first universe. Scientific knowledge functions as the primary form of governmentality, as it is the means by which the show presents and solves the mysteries it presents. It also presents science as a set of rules, practices, and protected spaces that cultivate life.

In its constantly open narrative, it also undermines the notion of long-term consequences of dire decisions. For example, Walter can save his son and this extend his life infinitely, with the minor side effect that a parallel universe is ripped asunder and suffers

regular quarantine events. Thus the show's narrative structure and ideological foundations play well into modern neoliberal fantasies, but with a new twist: it tries to have it all ways without ever committing to an ideology of excess, and it can do this so well because the imagining of the parallel universe forestalls consequence.

In order to situate *Fringe* in the modern political moment, it is important to keep in mind that television shows are created artifacts that play a significant role in the reciprocal relationship of ideological normativity. As such, *Fringe* plays very much on contemporary science fiction themes, while at the same time is situated in a historical moment in which apocalyptic imagination serves to offer something of a remedy, while at the same time obscuring the often invisible and mundane forces of economic and cultural erosion. As Toby Miller reminds us, "the all-powerful agent is the television audience, not the industry " (27).

It is pertinent to recall the various strains of biopolitical thought at play in the show. The show creates a discourse of hetero-normative love, charming madness, and diabolical scientific machinations. While Foucault's line of thought allows us to see the show as a series of complex man to position the body as a site of redemption and betrayal, such as Peter's life being literally beholden to two completing scientific worlds, Melinda Cooper takes it a step further by putting Foucault's theories in direct dialogue with the most modern developments in medical technology. In short, the working of biopower in the show mobilize bodies as both threats and agents of safety, often times the same body in an alternate form. Secondly, the very idea of memory becomes a site of commodification, never accurate, always fluid, and open to the

manipulations of Massive dynamic and other forces such as the villainous Robert David Jones, who appropriates scientific knowledge for obvious personal gain, in this case control of the universe.

Narrative Incongruity

The narrative of the show thus stands in sharp contrast to the current political and economic workings of the pharmaceutical and other big health care industries, which often remain faceless except in the form of pill or stock number or, as Melinda Cooper puts it in quite concrete terms, "redistribution of funds away from public health and nonprofit medical services toward commercially oriented research, health services, and for-profit applications" (15). Cooper makes clear the ways that the development of drugs (such as those used to treat AIDS) often develop out of public view, and their very proliferation into strong markets often hides the ways in which the dead are marked by the very unavailability of these drugs. *Fringe* may play at this local market politics as the Fringe division deploys life saving technology even as its cities remain resolutely western and predominantly white.

Thus even the alternate universe with all its scientific advancements plays up cures for everything from limb loss to toxic containment while still managing to make the end result utopian without any question of the process of those who may be outside this utopia.

As such, the science of *Fringe* is represented as a primarily benevolent force, completely isolated from larger questions of social economics and the flow of commodities. It also ties in federal funding agencies and law enforcement directly into a

triangle of good intention, with the occasional alternate world (Walternate) that wants to rule the world through his scientific machinations. There is no sense of labor or time spent to create these devices, they merely appear. While Walternate is constructed as a malevolent Secretary of Defense (a most appropriate title, given the program's reliance on narratives of benign defense) in contrast to the confused, kindly Walter, his scientific machinations are always quite spectacular to observe and to imagine. In short, the alternate universe skirts the dialectic of apocalypse and 21st century capitalism, while committing to neither and thus resisting not only answering, but even approaching complex questions about the nature of life. As Toby Miller writes, "The genre constructs a viewing position that accepts the state monopoly on the exercise of "legitimate" violence in the protection of private property, private morality, and human safety" (2010, 84-85).

The Imaginary of a Depoliticized Science

This imaginary of a depoliticized science masked by melodrama is inscribed directly into the narrative and onto the bodies of the characters who populate the show, from the week's cast of fascinating and superpowered criminals and deviants, to the conflicted nature of Peter's feelings for both Olivia and Folivia (the faux-Olivia, as the Olivia from the alternate universe is called). While Foucault speaks of the right to let live, *Fringe* presents a portrait of life beholden not to science in the abstract, but a specific scientific discourse that privileges a uniquely elite form of life, one in which those who are 'abnormal' are easily remedied by recourse to simple reference to the past of this discourse. Thus Olivia can find salvation quite literally in the minds of men. This

is, to put it simply, great fun amidst the spectacle that *Fringe* offers, but quite problematic.

Scientific Expenditures

Pursuing this line of thought, Melinda Cooper has pointed to the rise in economic expenditure of funding for large industries such as the pharmaceutical industry as well as the privatization of the food and drug supply, a dangerous combination: "In this process of transformation, two tendencies have been at work. On the one hand, the pharmaceutical and petrochemical industries have responded to crisis by initiating an extraordinary internal consolidation of all aspects of the commercial life sciences, with the result that a handful of transnational (but all U.S.- and EU-based) companies now effectively control every level of world food and pharmaceutical production. On the other hand, the same companies have preemptively moved to capture new and emerging markets in life science production by establishing strategic alliances with smaller biotech companies" (26).

The threat of bodies is located directly into this matrix of power and economic practice. Thus *Fringe* confronts the viewer with the double edged sword of both the doppelganger, or alternate in the alternate universe, or the always potential false other in the form of the shape shifter, creatures which are quite literally modern day biopolitical reimaginings of Donna Haraway's cyborg, an inverted being that does not open but closes off possibility. The overarching parable of the modern war on terrorism is inescapable. The divergencies of life are marked by a lack of unity that becomes re-established only once the proper law enforcement or moral codes of a few select players are enacted. Thus the biopolitics of the population at large is given two choices: play along as victim/suspect,

or face quarantine. As Cooper points out, "These reforms have transformed the nature of life science research in such a way that the mere hope of a future biological product is enough to sustain investment" (26).

This constant threat of the doppelganger/shapeshifter is beholden to a state of surveillance that further ensconces the military-law enforcement affective economy over the issue of labor. And surveillance in *Fringe* runs the scale from the most micro, that of the removal of brain tissue to the macro, the inside of Olivia's mind in which they become cartoons in an attempt to find her lost consciousness. So we have literal surveillance of bodies, but we also have surveillance of memory, one that scarcely avoids becoming a commodity. The constant surveillance also presents a utopian view of a science fiction world minus the pesky issue of labor or resources. As Kelly Gates has pointed out in *Our Biometric Future*, surveillance technology is becoming increasingly used that undermines the need for human input or agency (Kindle location 150). Complementing Cooper's work, David Harvey points out that the accelerating pace of private ownership, individualistic ideology, and the positioning of the state as an agent of business rather than an agent of social welfare and notes how these practices have created a dangerous environment in which countless millions of people have suffered displacement, job loss, poverty, hunger, and the growing imposition of a military order.

In order to expand on this, it is important to understand the components that drive the show's ideology and scientific imagination. The primary manner in which Fringe exacts its pure science is the human body.

Bodies, Experiments and Ideology

Fringe concerns itself with the human body as a site of transformation and always potential transgression. Bodies are the means by which the show perpetuates its mysteries; signifies transgression of the "natural" order, and provides the means through which the shows sense of balance is realized.

A close look at the characters of Olivia, Walter Bishop, and a menagerie of the show's villains will serve to demonstrate how the body becomes a primary site of invasion and hence subject to the doctrines of governmentality.

The Body that is Invaded / The Body that Invades

As *Fringe* progresses throughout its five seasons, Olivia emerges as a primary test subject in much of the technology developed by Massive Dynamic. Walter and Olivia are linked through this past, as the extent of the experiments Walter conducted on the young Olivia is revealed. As a eight year old child, Walter gave the drug Cortexiphan to Olivia and several other children. These children would go on to develop powers that they could not fully control, and several of the Cortexiphan subjects die by their own hand as a result of not being fully in control of their powers. Two such examples include a woman who blows herself up, along with the patrons of a diner, due to her ability to control electromagnetic energy. Another example is a man who controls lightning and ultimately ends up killing himself once he realizes he cannot control this power.

There are many other examples, but these suffice to demonstrate the way in which bodies themselves become sites of constant invasion. While these characters serve a narrative function in bringing out Olivia's character and show her discipline

and mastery of her own abilities, they also serve to Once these bodies have been subjected to Cortexiphan, they are marked by this drug and its ideological lineage for the duration of their lives.

As Alexander Galloway notes, "bodies are not natural objects made of flesh and blood, but rather are complex intersections of materiality and meaning" (190).

For Olivia, this meaning arises through her interactions with her Fringe team members and contestation with her own identity as the subject of grotesque experiment. This meaning also beacons her as a subject of corporate power, one whose identity is kept restricted from her by the company Massive Dynamic.

Olivia is forced to participate in the very regime of power that victimized her as a child and continues to do so throughout the duration of the program. Towards this end, she is a torn between exposing the power structure of Massive Dynamic and using the very tools they give her to battle other villains in the show, such as David Robert Jones, the main villain for much of the series. The experiments that Walter and his colleagues conducted on these people as children come back to haunt them.

For Olivia, marked as an object of experimentation, the only way to get answers to her condition is to give herself to the powerful scientific entities in the show in an attempt to understand her own body and how it functions, or suffer the consequences of others like her who have either been killed or destroyed. As a body that is both defined by being invaded (through subjection to Cortexiphan trials) and a body that invades, Olivia exists in a liminal space (Turner 1969) that allows her to speak truth and render visible the workings of power, or what Mitchell Dean calls "the signature of power," where "Power

is not a substance or thing, it takes and can be known through these substantive forms and their signatures" ("Signature" 114).

Along these lines, Massive Dynamic stays hidden and keeps their nefarious activities out of view. Olivia walks a fine line, working to understand her own past, as well as the super-powered weaponry and scientific technology being developed by Massive Dynamic. The technology developed by Massive Dynamic often belies this "signature of power" as it is unique and well beyond the current technology of what science is capable of in the year 2009. Some of these technologies include devices that allow the dead to talk and be interrogated and technology that allows a corporeal body to become malleable and able to pass through hard surfaces.

Olivia's body is repeatedly used for various purposes by multiple characters, including Nina Sharp (Blair Brown), who serves a surrogate mother character but who often uses Olivia for her own nefarious purposes. For example, in a key scene during Season Four, masked men break into Olivia's apartment after rendering her unconscious using a nerve toxin. They take a sample of her blood and then rush out. As they leave, one of the masked intruders is revealed as Nina Sharp.

As Eugene Thacker notes in *After Life*, "Life is classified or stratified; perhaps it is designated rights, perhaps one speaks for this or that form of life, perhaps some lives are more worth living than others. Life may be named, constructed, instrumentalized, it may itself become a form of power" (5).

The Ideology of a Pure Science

When Walter Bishop is first introduced in *Fringe*, he is in a mental hospital and shown as despondent, rambling, and unkempt. His long beard and standard uniform lets him blend in with the hospital population. As a scientist who conducted multiple experiments on human subjects, many of dubious ethical distinction, Walter is forced to live a similar life. It is revealed over the course of the show that Walter asked William Bell to place him in the hospital and to remove a part of his brain that caused him to do horrible things. Walter thus becomes a confessing vessel and repents for his past actions, but in so doing becomes subject to the same ideology of confinement and control that he imposed on his human subjects.

Walter's confinement is ended only through the intervention of Olivia and her position as a federal agent. The show presents a contest of power vectors, one that pits two modes of governmentality against each other. One is the notion that those who are prescribed as insane remain confined to a well-defined spatial and institutional boundary. The other notion insists on the public safety of the population and securing this safety even at the potential cost of releasing a "madman" from his confines. As Frederic Gross notes of the civilian population:

> "They are what must be protected: what is sacred is no longer the sovereignty of the state, but the life of the individual. From here arises the principle of the right to interference, or what international institutions today define as the 'responsibility to protect.' If today, in whatever corner of the

> world, the life of a population or populations is directly endangered (e.g., by a bloodthirsty state), this constitutes a breach of security as human security. As soon as the state is no longer the first and final object of security, everything that is involved in the life of civil populations becomes an object of security" (Kindle Locations 507-512).

Foucault's Parrhesia

Eventually freed from the confines of the hospital, Walter Bishop is placed under the watch of Fringe division and granted a small apartment in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Once under the surveillance of the Fringe team. Walter, however, is imagined in the show as a kindly senior professor who frequently botches people's names and passes gas. His testimony about regretting what he did in the past is accepted by almost all of the characters around him, especially Olivia.

Thus Walter engages in what Foucault terms parrhesia, a political notion in which the person speaking "takes the risk of telling the whole truth that he thinks, but it is also the interlocutor's courage in agreeing the to accept the hurtful truth that he hears" (*The Courage of Truth* 13). David Novak brings the concept of parrhesia into communication studies and calls for scholars in the field to make use of the concept. In his own essay, he examines the myriad ways in which Malcolm X's ideas, despite being unpopular with large segments of the population in the early 1970's, were actually compatible with a functioning democracy, despite Foucault's claims that parrhesia could exist only outside the realm of democracy.

Walter has many of these moments of parrhesia, where he becomes fully reconciled with his loved ones. He is allowed to come back home, so to speak, while those he

experimented on are left damaged or dead. Thus Olivia and the Fringe unit are sent out to stop the monsters who continuously threaten the towns and cities of New England and New York. To the series' credit, the characters are given fully formed personalities but are seldom given the privileged moments of parrhesia that Walter has.

As shown in a flashback, Walter experiences a key moment of parrhesia when he confesses to William Bell that he no longer trusts himself and has Bell remove part of his brain. This difference is made most clear in flashbacks when the show represents Walter prior Bell's procedure as ruthless and focused solely on advancing his science, no matter what the cost.

Foucault explains that the act of parrhesia involves a complete truth telling by the subject to the person he speaks, and that there must be "the manifestation of a fundamental bond between the truth spoken and the thought of the person who spoke it" (*Courage of Truth* 11). He goes on to explain that the act can potentially break the bond between the subject and the interlocutor (11).

While Walter is given this ability to repent for his past actions, even going so far as to undo catastrophic events in the universe, the science of Fringe still presents a case in which human bodies are exploited.

In *Monsters of the Market,* David McNally explores the hidden history of creatures such as zombies and vampires, pointing out how bodies were used by the elite classes in the eighteenth century. The body of the peasant was a source of incredible anxiety to the higher classes and was given to science. He notes, "What characterizes monstrous humans…is their role as destroyers of social bonds and obligations" (46).

These monsters, often cultivated by Walter in the past work to break the parrhesia that he currently cultivates with Olivia, thus the monstrous bodies are forced to battle each other so that Walter may be ultimately cleansed of his past. Fringe ultimately maintains the same "pure" science that McNally deconstructed.

McNally points out that the criminal body was punished through a spectacle of dissection in a "quintessentially capitalist" display of domination (34). *Fringe* is full of such scenes, including many where Walter straps subjects to a chair in a rather compromising way in order to administer Cortexiphan and other drugs. Most of these scenes occur in Walter's humble lab, located at Harvard in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The relationship between the experimented body and the repentant scientist thus harkens back to McNally's idea of science being used to discipline the poor.

For example, an episode from season four involves Walter and Nina literally bringing a woman's body back from the dead in order to interrogate her about her connection to David Robert Jones. The scene is quite medieval, as the woman's body is strapped down to a chair, her head held still by restraints. Walter and Nina surround her as the subjects' eyes suddenly flutter as she is injected with a massive needle. Words fly out of her mouth as temporary life returns to her recently deceased body. The Fringe team immediately begins their interrogation of the newly animated head. At first, the woman attempts to fool them, crying out for her children. But the team persists. Even in death, the woman is lying. Peter Bishop reminds her that she has no children, at which point the woman's head twists and a devious comportment occupied

her face. With more prodding, the woman finally reveals David Robert Jones's location.

The woman becomes a subject of science, and even her act of confession never reaches the level of parrhesia, as it does not come willingly and is compelled by torturous means.

Along this line of thought, the show television can be seen as what Jack Bratich has described, following Foucault, as a node of power, as "the conduct of conduct takes place at innumerable sites, through an array of techniques and programs that are usually defined as cultural" (4).

Conclusion

For those moments of unheralded and unimpeded heroism, the series presents us with Peter, a poor lost boy who already died once, and now is willing to sacrifice everything in order to bring two universes together and save the day. Thus we have power reinscribed directly from a collective democracy onto literally the body of one man. The science of this powerful singular and neoliberal vision presents the right to live freely, at the molecular level, and at the level of individual sovereign.

For Olivia/Folivia, we are presented with the full commodification of memory, in which it becomes unreliable unless somehow validated by the authority of the scientific sovereign of Walter/Walternate.

As for the other universe, it simply occludes the process of commoditized science, presenting an almost Disneyworld like escape destination where the roster of characters can come to terms with their slightly alternative selves. Olivia gets to be daring and a

little rock and roll, while the heroic and dashing Lincoln Lee becomes a more forthright, uptight version of himself. And the most dangerous problems faced in this world are quarantine zones caused by "fringe events", or time rifts from the original universe, masking, as Melinda Cooper reminds us, "In this way the debt form is not merely promissory or escapist but also deeply materialist; that is, it seeks to materialize its promise in the production of matter, forces, and things. In the long run what it wants to do is return to the earth, recapturing the reproduction of life itself within the promissory accumulation of the debt form, so that the renewal of debt coincides with the regeneration of life on earth—and beyond" (31).

CHAPTER V: AS ABOVE, SO IT IS BELOW:

THE BIOPOLITICAL IMAGINATION OF *CLOVERFIELD*

While the Critical Art Ensemble and the Steven Kurtz case analyzed above dealt specifically with the clash of law enforcement and the artist over how invasion could be used, and exactly what constituted invasion, this chapter focuses on a cinematic creation that captured the imagination primarily due to its inherent genre quality, all the while disavowing any political stance. In short, much of the rhetoric surrounding the film dealt directly with two main themes: how the film fit into the monster genre and how it modernized these themes in light of the spectre of terrorism on sovereign soil. The film fits in more clearly with direct invasion, if such a thing is possible, then my previous case study. What hasn't been looked at carefully is the precise ways in which invasion is formed and what must exist outside the invaded and invader. The notion of human life, as a concept, and as a biological entity, is precisely what occupies this space.

Long before zombies became the monster of the month, it was the threat of invasion from above that held audiences in sway. In order to unpack this idea closely, this chapter will provide an in depth analysis of the recent film *Cloverfield* (Matt Reeves, 2008). The film holds sway for several reasons, most pertinently in its recall and mobilization of a massive threat that literally dwarves the city. However, the film goes beyond the normal pale of the giant monster with the addition of three key facets: A "minor threat" in the form of smaller creatures that accompany the monster and dwell on the ground; and the use of the (at the time) relatively new genre of "found footage" filming technique.

The mobilization of the military as not just heroic forces sent to stop the monster, but as threats to the main characters. This is a key divergence from science fiction films of the fifties and sixties in which the military and science industries worked effectively together toward heroic ends.

The film succeeds in presenting invasion as a multiple set of forces that show no concordance among them. Each of these mobilizations of invasion alone would provide a sense of unease, but taken together they leave literally no safe place as a confluence of forces render the human body a site always at danger and concurrently a threat.

In order to best understand the film's complex interplay of invasion and surveillance, we should look at how exactly the film situates life, and more specifically, human life. Life outside that which is human, or that which is *compromised* by that other than human (disease and the unknown) renders the the population expendable by the very nature of an imagined contagion. Killing equals quarantine.

The film relies, much like the case of Steve Kurtz, on the mobilization of invasion as a practice of governmentality. This is to say that the actual invasion and the current threat of invasion is necessary for the film to function as it does: zones of restriction and spaces of potential collapse. As invasion functions as a form of governmentality, or a means that justifies certain practices and ways of being, it is important to understand that invasion in and of itself is a somewhat problematic term that is riddled with contradictions. As seen in the previous chapter, the case of Steve Kurtz brought forth how the means of invasion are dogmatically protected as corporate, and to a lesser extent, state, practice. Invasion, while never the favored term of those who make the laws, is also mobilized as a means by which

populations are protected. Here, the most trenchant, and recent example, would be the United States sanctioned and executed invasion of Iraq. All of this aside, however, *Cloverfield,* captures the discontinuities inherent in current material practices and cultural imaginary of invasion and the invaded.

While the filmmakers recall imagery from classic invasion films such as *Godzilla* (Ishiro Honda, 1954), *Invasion of the Body Snatcher*s (Don Siegel, 1956), and *War of the Worlds* (Byron Haskin, 1953) *Cloverfield* differs in that it creates a sense of chaos that is seen only in partition, or in frightening moment to moment, The master threat exists as thus a direct personal attack and at the same time an attack on the potential for community. The monster in *Cloverfield* is not just the monster to which the title refers, but also to all the human bodies rendered potentially monstrous by the smaller creatures that accompany the monster, or what Foucault calls "the monster from above" (*Abnormal* 1999).

Foucault goes to great lengths to explain the rise of the monster in *Abnormal*, pointing out how the rise of the monster is both the domain of the king and of the people who would oppose the king. While the concept of "king" has its own lineage, *Cloverfield* displays a direct split between the monstrous body (literally, an inhuman monster of godlike proportions. So godlike, in fact, that it literally decapitates the queen of freedom, the Statue of Liberty. While the monster wreaks a havoc parallel to war on New York City, such as destroying buildings, laying waste to landmarks, crushing people by the dozens, and directly overwhelming traditional forces of law (witness the crushed police cruisers and the fleeing police, soon to be replaced with an ominous military presence) the human protagonists are rendered both citizen-victims, and fleeing criminals. As Foucault reminds us, "there is a great

difference between…crime that is a disease of the social body but rather the criminal…. [who] is someone who may well be ill" (91).

As such, *Cloverfield* separates the criminal from the monster. It succeeds not only in doing this through a series of acts of violence, but also through its images of destruction and its insistence that the monster is always near. Even in the absence of the monsters its presence is visualized through the breakdown of modern society, such as transportation systems that no longer function, electrical failures, and the trembling instability of the city's infrastructure – what was once concrete and safe becomes perilous and trembling. Bruce Braun addresses this phenomenon, writing that "public health remains a geopolitical exercise concerned with the sanctity of borders, dangerous migrations and foreign risks" (cited in Moore and Casper, Kindle Locations 1878-1879).

Monster(s) as Means of Visualization

The monster serves as a means of visualization as much as the character Hud's camera does. In essence, the monster's destruction of the city serves to underscore the visibility of structures that are often coded as invisible. The things taken for granted break down, and the former civilized city comes into view only in its dark parallel. Much has been made of the film's somewhat obvious connections to 9/11 (Fuchs; North). At the center of any narrative of invasion is the presence of bodies, specifically human bodies. This is precisely where Foucault 's notions of governmentality's sister theoretical framework biopower comes into play. In order for peril to exist, bodies must be at stake, be they dead or living. As Lisa Moore and Monica Casper put it, "Bodies must be exposed in order to be seen and, consequently, longed for. However, there is an unequal distribution of exposure

to danger, risk, and disease; and because certain bodies do not garner attention or visibility, they are often missed" (Kindle Locations 1511-1513). In this vein, the film eschews a more divided politics that is considerate or race or income disparity and gives voice to the endless "everyone came together" rhetorical framework that accompanies many catastrophic events but that was especially durable in the response to 9/11.

The film most certainly plays into the iconography of September 11 narratives, such as the imperiled city, destruction of major landmarks, and the panic of no way out traffic. And as Cynthia Fuchs points out (Fuchs 2008), the film recalls heroic narratives of people doing extraordinary things and traveling perilous conditions to rescue the imperiled. Bloodsworth-Lugo continues in this vein, having stated that "Post-9/ 11 films have developed their narratives within this context. Many of the unfolding stories within these films reflect American fears and anxieties even if the films themselves do not directly address the events of September 11, 2001" (Levinas Kindle Locations 6219-6221). While these elements are important, this study focuses on the film's reliance on the idea of catastrophic witness and the parallel threat of invasive forces that cannot be readily discerned with the naked eye. To accomplish this, it is necessary to look at how surveillance and the visible operate within the film. Thus the film parlays the widespread proliferation of cheap consumer goods (in this case the camera, as the film's central narrative trope and it's imperiled cargo load-that which is witnessed to the viewer of the film should must be kept secret).

A Severed Head as Communicative Act

Cloverfield concerns a small group of friends who begin simply enough enjoying a going away party for a friend. In their New York City apartment, the audience is shown the events unfold through the handheld camera wielded by Hud, the "frat boy" goofball of the group. It is through Hud's camera that the events of the film are experienced. As the party progresses, amid the tensions and dramatics of the group, the ground begins to shake, offering the first signal that something is amiss. Within moments, downtown Manhattan begins to explode and fall into complete chaos. The group of friends set out to see what is happening. About five minutes into the film, the audience is offered the first apocalyptic gestures: the head of the Statue of Liberty arrives in brutal fashion, as the once welcoming greeting to the tired masses becomes a dangerous weapon as it skids rapidly through the midst of the Times Square crowd. This severing of head from body was widely advertised in the film's trailer and serves as an indicator of the film's invasion based politics. There is no clearer statement, visually and viscerally, of proof of death than the severed head. As Regina Janes put it:

> "Never a solitary act (until modern times), removing a head as a communal act defines body and head as separable, affirms a preference for the head over other body parts, and asserts a desire to possess the good represented by the head. The head, seat of breath, and (later) soul, remains a site of power and a locus of desire. Reuniting the living and the dead over the gap created by death, pre-human decapitations make visible the rift that constitutes symbolization, the gap between value and object, word and thing,

> signifier and signified-referent, that makes imagination so hungry and so insatiable symbolization creates the crack in reality that it is always trying to heal" (68-62).

Arriving in 2008, whether deliberate or not, the film was immediately in dialogue with beheadings happening in America's war zones. And most certainly, the severing of a head forestalls further invasion, indicating decisive end of life. This seminal scene from *Cloverfield* recalls key moments from films such as *Bram Stoker's Dracula* (Coppola, 1992), and the more recent *Hostel* (Eli Roth, 2005), which made the severed head a central trope. In direct opposition to the beheading of the Statue of Liberty, made visible only through the imagery of the head itself, the monster itself is never seen in full. Its monstrous form is revealed through a glimpse at its head, supporting Janes claim that

> "the body makes no claims for itself; the symbolizing head makes claims on its behalf, and that symbolizing head often prefers something else to the body, even its own body" (69-71).

A question that the characters in *Cloverfield* struggle with, in panicked tones, is "what is it?" Indeed, to know the form of life one is facing, and more specifically, to know that it is actually alive, gives both relief and terror. The very nature of the terror invading the city brings up questions on how best to confront the "thing," whether to destroy it, run from it, or try to reason with it. As the film progresses and it becomes clear that the "thing" will not stop, leaving only further destruction in its wake, the answer becomes clear: it must be dealt with in the only way befitting a threat: with unbridled military force. Even police

cars and regular law enforcement are rendered helpless before the "thing," forcing the main characters to run further into retreat. However, even their survival is not guaranteed, as they go from threatened bodies, to threatening bodies that must be dealt with and disposed. It is not a pleasant sight for the friends to bear witness to the destruction of their own. As Daniel North points out, the film differs from traditional monster narratives in that *Cloverfield's* main characters do not investigate their foe or plot to destroy it" (79). However, the group of friends end up confronting another deadly threat in the state sanctioned force of the military.

The presence of the military plays a constant role in the film. Serving as vanguards of the status quo, the military becomes a faceless force that seeks to stomp out the threat, any threat, that bears any mark of the monster. As Levinas reminds us:

> "Crucially, there are two aspects to the new exercise of biopower. Not only are certain kinds of lives fostered and shaped through its disciplinary institutions, while others are let expire through neglect or design, but also— and more importantly— this new biopower establishes a logical connection between the making-live and letting-die that institutes a paradoxical logic." (Kindle Location, 3589-3592).

Like the monster, the military are not seen immediately but rather in quick glimpses and flashes of sound. As the film progresses, however, the military plays a much greater role. The members of the military make decisions about which parts of the city are off limits and provide a means of communication and site of truth for what the monster "is." As state

sanctioned authority, they are charged with "knowing" what the nature of the threat is and how best to confront it, or having what Foucault called "saviors...forms of knowledge" (*Courage of Truth,* 9), or what Timothy Campbell describes as "communication [going] hand in hand with the greater possibility of domination over beings" (25). The monster itself exists as a thing unto itself, its nature never being revealed. The monster does not speak and makes its presence felt only through disruption and destruction. Indeed, the "monster" label poses the title creature as a malevolent stand in for all threats that must be stopped through perpetual military action. Invasion begets invasion. Thus the military and the monster work as forces in tangent, working at concurrent times to remake the city. Narratives and criticism that fail to consider this and privilege only the monster as a force of invasion miss a key element of current narratives and constructions of invasion. Further, these criticisms often parlay the smaller creatures that accompany the monster to second tier status, when in fact they work very actively to augment the threat to the biological body and the population. As Moore and Casper write :In Western frameworks, an innocent body is one that is unmarked, not guilty, and not tainted by stigma; it is the embodiment of purity.") (Kindle Location 451).

While the camera at the start of the film captures the identity of the main protagonists, the notion of facelessness remains a constant theme throughout the film. The military soldiers, for example, while having human faces, remain more tied to the idea of practice and uniform that to individual identity. They function as a force, much like the monster. As Bruce Braun and Sarah Whatmore noted:

> "there is a technical history of the face, perhaps best illustrated by the history of cinema and its effects on our perception. For example, the close-up is a crucial way station in the history of the modern face, providing new means of attending to the face and new possibilities for relation, not least those arising out of the close-up's peculiar ability to generate both intimacy and threat, not least as a disembodied affect." (Kindle Locations 2044-2047)

As Morore and Casper note, "The vulnerability of innocents to exploitation requires prophylaxis. In the West, conscientious social monitoring, typically but not only by parents, is required to maintain purity and value. (Kindle Locations 458-459).

Hud's Camera, or Making Subjects Visible

The film fits neatly into a category that, momentarily setting aside the histories of avant garde cinema, began with *The Blair Witch Project* (1998) known as the "found film" genre. The "Found Film" genre is defined by mimicking consumer technology, such as small hand held cameras. The films often revolve around the idea that the protagonists in the film perish or meet unknown fates, leaving behind only the footage of the harrowing events. Following in the footsteps of this film, many of its progeny have fallen into the horror genre. These films continue in popularity to this day, no doubt due to their substantially low budgets and the ready availability of cheap filmmaking equipment. Further, these films are often overtly concerned with surveillance of the metaphysical and spiritual worlds, with the recent *Paranormal Activity* franchise being a particularly vivid example. These are just a few examples of the plethora of films that fall into this genre. In

these films, the camera, and the presence of a "reliable" visual apparatus plays a primary role. The film *Cloverfield* is unique in that it does this on two levels, working its way between Hollywood large scale epic and small, personal drama that takes place within the small frame of the camera and within intimate spaces such as apartments.

Within the frame of Hud's camera, the audience is introduced to the main characters and to the destruction of the city. The use of first person point of view (P.O.V.) renders the city visible as a place where biopolitical subjects make sense of the established order, only to have it overturned over the course of ninety minutes.

The film opens with a huge going away party for Rob who has taken a job in Japan (and here the reference to the Godzilla films of the 1950's is unmistakable). The mood is set with ambient noise of merry party goers, who are each approached by Hud and asked to say something about Rob. Some wish him luck, many make jokes, and some reference Hud's relationship to Rob, asking, "how will you get along without your main man?" Here the presence of the camera establishes the characters as biological beings who bear witness to a departure, one which they can appreciate and take full part in. Each of them is given a moment to speak, and thus to exist. The mood of the party quickly changes, however, when a loud monstrous moan is heard in the background. The ground shutters, and the lights go out, as sirens, car alarms, and screams all converge together.

Further, "Becoming a visible body, a body that counts and is taken seriously, involves the experience of being seen by a critical mass of people with power and institutions of power." (Moore and Casper, Kindle Locations 1481-1482). Once visualized, the protagonists become bodies that are imperiled and are perilous. A key scene in the film

that demonstrates this occurs when the protagonists are taken forcibly by the military to a makeshift base and subjected to the chaos of no longer having freedom to move about the city as free subjects. In fact, it is here that they become witnesses to the horrific power of the smaller creatures that accompany the monster. Through a screen, they witness their friend whither in pain and undergo mysterious spasms and spew blood. This transformation is sufficient to instill terror, but rather than being treated the friend is shot dead by one of the soldiers. This response is in line with Lisa Moore and Monica Casper's assertion that public health is now based on "a biopolitics of monitoring and surveillance (Kindle 1613-1614) As Tony Sampson wrote, "the inventions of biopower play to the vulnerabilities people feel when they encounter disease" (Virality 5).

Urbanscape as Monster

As the city itself becomes "monstrous," in the sense that it is no longer recognizable, the military presence instills a past morality that deals with the threat of contagion through elimination. In *Cities Under Siege: The New Military Urbanism* Stephen Graham charts how cities have become more militarized in their structure and response to crisis. He writes:

> "Fundamental to the new military urbanism is the paradigmatic shift that renders cities' communal and private spaces, as well as their infrastructure – along with their civilian populations – a source of targets and threats. This is manifest in the widespread use of war as the dominant metaphor in describing the perpetual and boundless condition of urban societies – at war against drugs, against crime, against terror, against insecurity itself. This development

incorporates the stealthy militarization of a wide range of policy debates, urban landscapes, and circuits of urban infrastructure, as well as whole realms of popular and urban culture. It leads to the creeping and insidious diffusion of militarized debates about ‘security’ in every walk of life” (xiii-xiv Kindle Edition).

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Prevailing Themes

Invasion has become a major force by which ideology, politics, and territory are contested. Both the physical act of invasion and the representation of invasion are being contested like never before.

This journey began with the Critical Art Ensemble and their attempts to expose potentially harmful materials, materials that most humans would not even consider. By bringing these invasive processes to light, the CAE and Kurtz exposed themselves to further invasion. As the case of the CAE demonstrated, art and its practitioners can do a lot to expose invasion by turning it back on itself. The CAE continues to thrive, and it will be interesting to see what forms their future research takes. What is more, computer technology has become a major source of contested.

It is worth noting that this study includes an examination of both real and fictional sciences, and the parallels that exist between their research methods. As Kurtz and the CAE worked to expose the molecular underpinnings of the food supply and the militarization of germs, the fictional Walter Bishop worked to unravel the mysteries of eternal life, travel between universes, and the ability to literally speak with the dead.

While Kurtz and the CAE worked within the parameters of a legal framework and invited audiences to participate in the scientific process, Walter Bishop and his colleagues worked in the privacy of a Harvard lab. This difference should not be taken as a judgement, but it does suggest a radical difference in the way that governmentality of science is represented and how it is actually practiced.

In terms of the representation of invasion, both *Fringe* and *Cloverfield* presented familiar stories of invasion with new twists. It is worth noting that in both *Cloverfield* and *Fringe*, the security state plays a large role. This security state is constantly in flux – they ostensibly exist to protect, but their actions are often compromised by corruption, political subterfuge, and bad intentions. The large corporation Massive Dynamic is ultimately redeemed in Fringe, but outside the confines of television, things do not play out so neatly.

In both *Fringe* and *Cloverfield*, too, symbols of national pride are widely exhibited. For Fringe, it is the Statue of Liberty and the Twin Towers. In *Cloverfield*, the Statue of Liberty also gets a starring role, but only in the form of her severed head rolling through Times Square. Both of these monuments are symbols of governmentality, representing triumph and capitalistic freedom. Their erasure reinforces the notions of a rapidly growing security sector, both public and private.

Cloverfield represents the disruption and chaos of an ordered society, a similar theme that the Yes Men also perform. While the Cloverfield monster wrecks havoc without reason, the Yes Men seek to expose, call out, and remedy those ills that do in fact tear at society from behind closed doors.

Directions for Future Research

Invasion is a topic discussed frequently in history and military tombs. But it has not gotten its due in the humanities and social sciences. There is much more work to be done in this area, and this study should serve as an invitation to engage in such work.

As this dissertation has shown, invasion takes multiple forms and is a contested concept. This is illustrated no more clearly than in the Steve Kurtz case. Almost eleven

years after the Kurtz case, the world met a man named Edward Snowden who exposed an enormous breach of trust. While there was suspicion for some time that surveillance was rampant, Snowden's revelations exposed them to be far deeper and more ominous than previously imagined. Unlike Kurtz, Snowden was not allowed to return home. His case reveals how deeply invasion is contested. While Snowden himself performed an invasion into the systems of the national security system and showed them to the world, there were many who claimed that such surveillance was necessary to *prevent* invasion.

Snowden is just one of many whisteblowers who have come forth. Tragically, those who invade in the name of democracy are often cast as villains by those in power. One need to only consider the case of Chelsea Manning, the whistleblower who released valuable information about American abuses of power in Afghanistan. Like Snowden, she will not be able to return home.

This dissertation has focused on invasion through a Foucauldian lens. There are many other possibilities for studying invasion, such as considerations of the aesthetics of invasion. Another possible future venue for media studies is to examine the forms of media that are being contested as tools of invasion, such as cell phones and cheap technology such as Go-Pro cameras. These practices have become hotly contested, as organizations and state powers seek to operate without abuses being seen. As these technologies have become more prevalent, they have taken on the function of both entertainment devices and tools of activism. One need only consider the recent events involving the police killings of Michael Garner and Tamir Rice.

While it was outside the scope of this study, Jussi Parikka has made a significant contribution to the manner in which computer viruses have developed in his landmark study, *Digital Contagions*: *A Media Archeology of Computer Viruses*. Parikka takes a historical approach and examines the power of the technological virus as both a metaphor and a digital artifact.

Indeed, the computer and digital technology will become increasingly the site of contests over invasion. Computer technology has always had its own form of governmentality, in terms of what can be done with a computer and the rules that govern its often taken for granted infrastructure.

Governmentality has made great inroads into communication and media scholarship. It remains a fertile theoretical philosophy with which to examine the ever changing media landscape, from the duality of screens (ever so portable with tablets and mobile phones and huge televisions designed to mimic the movie theater) to the growing use of internet technologies to observe, control, and often times destroy.

The growth of micro-industries that specialize in the home delivery of products such as shaving razors, toys, ready-made meals, and clothing are all worth close examination, as they speak to the way citizens are spending their time. These micro industries have migrated rapidly to podcast sponsorship, and ethnographic study of podcasting and its audiences would benefit immensely from a governmentality framework.

WORKS CITED

ACLU. “Bans on Sharia and International Law.” www. Aclu.org. Accessed 2 July 2015.

Adorno, Theodor, Walter Benjamin, Ernst Bloch, Bertolt Brecht, and Georg Lukacs. *Aesthetics and Politics*. New York, NY: Verso, 1977.

Allmer, Thomas, Christian Fuchs, Verena Kreilinger, and Sebastian Sevignani. Social Networking Sites in the Surveillance Society: Critical Perspectives and Empirical Findings. *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social Perspectives.* Edited by André Jansson and Miyase Christensen. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Anderson, Ben. “Affect and Biopower: Towards a Politics of Life.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37 (28-43). 2012.

Andrejevic, Mark. *iSpy: Surveillance and Power in the Interactive Era*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2007.

Andrejevic, Mark. “Ubiquitous Surveillance” in D. Lyon & K. Ball (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies.* New York and London: Routledge, pp 91-98, 2012.

Andrejevic, Mark. 'The Work of Being Watched: Interactive Media and the Exploitation of Self Disclosure' in L. Ouellette (ed) *The Media Studies Reader.* New York and London: Routledge, pp 492-506, 2012.

Andrejevic, Mark. “Surveillance in the Big Data Era.” In Kenneth D. Pimple (ed) *Emerging Pervasive Information and Communication Technologies (PICT): Ethical Challenges, Opportunities and Safeguards*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, pp 55-69, 2013.

Andrejevic, Mark. 'Wikileaks, surveillance and transparency', *International Journal of Communication*, 8, pp. 2619-2630.

Andrejevic, Mark and Gates, Kelly. "Big Data Surveillance: Introduction". *Surveillance and Society*, 12:2, pp. 185-196.

Barlow, John Perry. "A Cyberspace Independence Declaration" Available from the Electronic Frontier website. http://w2.eff.org/Misc/Publications/John_Perry_Barlow/?f=barlow_0296.declaration.txt. 9 February 1996. Last accessed 14 March 2015.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1957/2012.

Becker, Konrad and Jim Fleming, eds. *Critical Strategies in Art and Media*: *Perspectives on New Cultural Practices*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia, 2010.

Belisle, Amy. "Children Continue to Die from Vaccine Preventable Diseases. We Can Stop That." *The Guardian UK.* www.Guardian.com. 4 June 2015. Accessed 2 July 2015.

Bellour, Raymond. "Battle of the Images." *Future Cinema: The Cinematic Imaginary After Film.* Edited by Jeffrey Shaw and Peter Weibel. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003. 56-59.

Bishop, Kyle. "The Sub-Subaltern Monster: Imperialist Hegemony and the Cinematic Voodoo Zombie." *Journal of American Culture*, 31.2 (2008): 141-152.

Birkenstein, Jeff, Anna Froula, and Karen Randell, eds. *Reframing 9/11: Film, Popular Culture and the 'War on Terror'.* New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010.

Bolter, Jay David and Richard Grusin. *Remediation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.

Bloodswoth-Lugo, Mary and Carmen R. Lugo-Lugo. In *Monster Culture in the 21st Century* . Edited by Marina Levina and Diem My T. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013. Kindle Edition.

Bonefield, Wener, editor. *Subverting the Present, Imagining the Future: Insurrection, Movement, Commons*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia, 2008.

Bratich, Jack Z, Jeremy Packer and Cameron McCarthy. "Governing the Present." *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality*. Edited by Jack Z. Bratich, Jeremy Packer, and Cameron McCarthy. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2003. 3-22.

Bratich, Jack Z. "Making Politics Reasonable: Conspiracism, Subjectification, and Governing through Styles of Thought." *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality*. Edited by Jack Z. Bratich, Jeremy Packer, and Cameron McCarthy. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2003. 67-100.

Bratich, J. Z. 'Adventures in the Public Secret Sphere: Police Sovereign Networks and Communications Warfare.' *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 14.1 (2013): 11–20. Web.

Braun, Bruce and Sarah J. Whatmore. *Political Matter: Technoscience, Democracy, and Public Life* (Kindle Locations 2044-2047).

Bressler, Nancy and Lara Lengel. "Mothering and/in Dystopia: Lone Parenting in a Post-Apocalyptic World." In Maki Motapanyane (Ed.), *Motherhood and Lone/Single Parenting: A 21st Century Perspective.* Bradford, Ontario: Demeter Press, in press.

Burger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Trans. by Michael Shaw. Minneapolis, MN. Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Butler, Judith. *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* New York, NY: Verso, 2010.

Byfield, Ted et al. *Critical Strategies in Art and Media: Perspectives on New Cultural Practices*. Ed. Konrad Becker and Jim Fleming. United States: Autonomedia, 2010. Print.

Christensen, Miyase. Complicit Surveillance and Mediatized Geographies of Visibility. *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social Perspectives*. Edited by André Jansson and Miyase Christensen New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2014.

Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong. *Control and Freedom: Power and Paranoia in the Age of Fiber Optics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

Cook, Sarah. "Online Activity and Offline Community" Cultural Institutions and New Media Art." *Theorizing Digital Cultural Heritage: A Critical Discourse*. Edited by Fiona Cameron and Sarah Kenderdine. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007.

Cooper, Melinda. *Life as Surplus: Biotechnology and Capitalism in the Neoliberal Era*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2008.

Couldry, Nick. "The Digital Divide." *Web Studies: Second Edition*. Edited by David Gauntlett and Ross Horsley. New York, NY: Edward Arnold, 2004. 185-194.

Couldry, Nick. *Media Rituals: A Critical Approach*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2003. Print.

Critical Art Ensemble. *Seized!* Available at http://www.critical-art.net. Last accessed 20 May 2015.

Critical Art Ensemble. *Marching Plague*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia, 2006. Available at http://www.critical-art.net/books/digital/

Croteau, David. *Media/society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2000. Print.

Curran, James. *Media and Power*. London: Routledge, 2014. Print.

Da Costa, Beatriz, and Pentecost, Claire. "Of Patriots and Profits: New Tools for Keeping Academic Research in Line." *Radical History Review*. 93: 2005. 111-121.

Davey, Nicholas. "The Hermeneutics of Seeing." *Interpreting Visual Culture: Explorations in the Hermeneutics of the Vision*. Ed. Ian Heywood and Barry Sandywell. New York, NY: Routledge, 1998. 3-29.

Davis, Mike. *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future of Los Angeles*. New York, NY: Vintage, 1992.

Dean, Mitchell. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage Publishing, 1999.

Dean, Mitchell. "The Signature of Power." *Journal of Political Power* (5) 1, 2012. 101-117.

Deleuze, Gilles. "Postscript on Control Societies." In *CTRL Space: Rhetorics of Surveillance from Bentham to Big Brother*. Edited by Thomas Y. Levin, Ursula Frohne, and Peter Weibel. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002. 316-321.

Dendle, Peter. "The Zombie as a Barometer of Cultural Anxiety." *Monsters and the Monstrous: Myths and Metaphors of Enduring Evil.* Edited by Niall Scott. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007. 45-55.

Denzin, Norman K. "Moments, Mixed Methods, and Paradigm Dialogs." *Qualitative Inquiry* 16.6 (2010): 419–427. Web.

Denzin, Norman K. *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1977. Print.

Dikovitskaya, Margaret. *Visual Culture: The Study of the Visual after the Cultural Turn.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

Druckrey, Timothy. "The Truth is Out There." In *The Art of Detection: Surveillance in Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT List Visual Arts Center, 1997. 11-20.

Dudziak, Mary. "Introduction." *September 11 in History: A Watershed Moment?* Edited by Mary Dudziak. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2003. 1-9.

Esposito, Roberto. *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Trans. Timothy Campbell. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008. Print.

Esposito, Roberto, and Zakiya Hanafi. *Immunitas: The Protection and Negation of Life*. Cambridge: John Wiley & Sons, 2011. Print.

Esposito, Roberto. *Communitas: The Origin and Destiny of Community*. Trans. Timothy Campbell. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010. Print.

Evans, Jessica, & Hall, Stuart. *Visual Culture: The Reader.* London: Sage, 1999.

Falcous, Mark and Joseph Maguire. "Imagining 'America.' The NBA and Local-Global Mediascapes." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport.*41: 1 (2006), 59-78.

Feldman, Allen. 'On the Acturial Gaze: From 9/11 to Abu Ghraib." *Cultural Studies*. 19(2), 2005. 203-226

Feldman, Allen. 'Inhumanitas.' *In the Name of Humanity: The Government of Threat and Care*. Ed. Illana Feldman and Miriam Ticktim. 1st ed. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010. Print.

Finlay, Susan. "Visual Images in Research." *Handbook of the Arts in Qualitative Research: Perspectives, Methodologies, Examples, and Issues.* Edited by J. Gary Knowles and Ardra L. Cole. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008. 41-54.

Fiske, John. *Television Culture*. London: Methuen, 1987. Print.

Flick, Uwe. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Hermeneutics of the Self*. Trans by Graham Burchell. New York, NY: Picador, 2001.

Foucault, Michel. "Preface." In Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans by Hurley, Seem, and Lane. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Foucault, Michel. *History of Sexuality Volume II: The Use of Pleasure.* New York, NY: Vintage, 1985.

Foucault, Michel. *History of Sexuality: An Introduction. Volume I*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1990.

Foucault. Michel. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Foucault, Michel. "The Birth of Biopolitics." In *Foucault, Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. Edited by Paul Rabinow. New York, NY: New Press, 1997. 73-79.

Foucault, Michel. "Society Must be Defended." In *Foucault, Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. Edited by Paul Rabinow. New York, NY: New Press, 1997. 59-65.

Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, and Population: Lectures at the College De France 1977-1978*. Trans by Graham Burchell. New York, NY: Picador, 2004.

Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College De France 1978-1979*. Edited by Michel Senellart. Trans. By Graham Burchell. New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2008.

Foucault, Michel. *The Courage of Truth: The Government of the Self and Others II. Lectures at the College de France 1983-1943*.Trans. by Graham Burchell. New York, NY: Picador, 2012.

Fringe. Produced by J.J. Abrams. Staring Joshua Jackson, Leonard Nimoy John Noble, Lance Reddick, Anna Torv. 2009.

Fuchs, Cynthia. *Cloverfield*. Popmatters. Popmatters.com. 18 January 2008. Accessed April 9, 2013.

Fürsich, Elfriede. 'In Defense of Textual Analysis.' *Journalism Studies* 10.2 (2009): 238–252. Web.

Galloway, Alexander. *Protocol: How Control Exists after Decentralization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004.

Gates, Kelly. *Our Biometric Future: Facial Recognition Technology and the Culture of Surveillance*. New York, NY: New York UP, 2011.

Gere, Charlie. *Digital Culture*. London: Reaktion Books, 2008.

Gilliom, John. *Overseers of the Poor: Surveillance, Resistance, and the Limits of Privacy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Gillett, Rachel. "Intimidation and the Art of Terrorism." *The Humanist*. July/August 2004. 33-34.

Graham, Stephen. *Cities Under Siege: The New Military Urbanism* (pp. xiii-xiv Kindle Edition). New York, NY: Norton, 2011.

Glenza, Jessica. "Texas Open Carry Gun Bill Passes Just Days After Deadly Waco Shootout." *The Guardian*. www.guardian.com. Accessed 8 June 2015.

Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974. Print.

Gross, Frederic. "The Fourth Age of Security." *The Government of Life: Foucault, Biopolitics, and Neoliberalism.* New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 2014. Kindle.

Grossberg, Lawrence. *Bringing It All Back Home: Essays on Cultural Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997. Print.

Hall, Gary, and Clare Birchall. *New Cultural Studies*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2006. Print.

Hall, Stuart. 'Notes on Deconstructing "the Popular".' *People's History and Socialist Theory*. Ed. Raphael Samuel. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Books, 1981. 227–240. Print.

Hall, Stuart. 'Encoding/Decoding.' *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. Ed. Stuart Hall. London: Routledge in association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, 1992. 128–138. Print.

Hansen, Mark B.N. *New Philosophy for New Media.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

Holmes, Brian. *Unleashing the Collective Phantoms: Essays in Reverse Imagineering*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia, 2008.

Hodkinson, Paul. *Media Culture and Society: An Introduction*. London: Sage, 2010. Print.

Holtzman, Linda. *Media Messages: What Film, Television and Popular Music Teach Us About Race, Class, Gender and Sexual Orientation*. New York, NY: Sharpe, M. E., 2000. Print.

Hynes, Maria, Scott Sharpe, and Bob Fagan. 'Laughing with the Yes Men: The Politics of Affirmation.' *Continuum* 21.1 (2007): 107–121. Web.

James, David E. "Hardcore: Cultural Resistance in the Postmodern." *Power Misses: Essays Across (Un)Popular Culture*. New York, NY: Verso, 1997.

Jansson, André and Miyase Christensen (eds), *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social Perspectives*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2014.

Jameson, Fredric. Afterword to *Aesthetics and Politics*. New York, NY: Verso, 1977. 196-213.

Janes, Regina. *Losing Our Heads: Beheadings in Literature and Culture*. New York, NY: NYU Press, 2005.

Johnson, R. 'What Is Cultural Studies Anyway?' *What Is Cultural Studies? A Reader*. Ed. John Storey. United Kingdom: Arnold Publication, 1996. 75–114. Print.

Juris, Jeffrey S. *Networking Futures: The Movements Against Corporate Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008.

Kaplan, Amy. “Homeland Insecurities: Transformations of Language and Space.” *September 11 in History: A Watershed Moment?* Edited by Mary Dudziak. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2003. 55-69.

Kellner, Douglas. ‘Toward a Critical Media/Cultural Studies.’ *Media/Cultural Studies: Critical Approaches*. Ed. Douglas Kellner. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2009. 5–24. Print.

Kenny, Kate. ‘“The Performative Surprise”: Parody, Documentary and Critique’. *Culture and Organization* 15.2 (2009): 221–235.

Kress, Gunther. *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Kress, Gunther, and Theo Van Leeuwen. *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Lawler, S. ‘Stories and the Social World.’ *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*. Ed. Michael Pickering. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008. 32–49. Print.

Lengel, Lara and Nancy Bressler. “DIY Dys/(u)topia: Mediated ‘How To’ Texts on Surviving a Post-Apocalypse”. In Amber Day (Ed.), *DIY Utopia: Creative Play and Future Potentialities*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, in press.

Lovink, Geert and David Garcia. "The ABC's of Tactical Media." Posting to nettime.org mailing list. Archived at nettime.org. 16 May 1997. Accessed 10 June 2015.

Lovink, Geert. *Dark Fiber: Tracking Critical Internet Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.

Lovink, Geert, and Trebor Scholz. *The Art of Free Cooperation*. Ed. Geert Lovink and Trebor Scholz. New York, NY: Autonomedia / Institute for Distributed Creativity, 2007. Print.

Lunenfeld, Peter. "Unfinished Business." *The Digital Dialectic: New Essays on New Media*. Edited by Peter Lunenfeld. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999. 6-23.

Lyon, David. *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*. Philadelphia, PA: Open UP, 2001.

Lyon, David. The Emerging Surveillance Culture. *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social Perspectives*. Edited by André Jansson and Miyase Christensen New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2014.

McNally, David. *Monsters of the Market*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, 2012.

McLaren, Peter, and Nathalia E. Jaramillo. 'A Moveable Fascism: Fear and Loathing in the Empire of Sand.' *Cultural Studies <—> Critical Methodologies* 4.2 (2004): 223–236.

McWhorter, Ladelle. "Governmentality, Biopower, and the Debate over Genetic Enhancement." *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 34 (2009) 409-437.

Michelsen, Nicholas. 'Liberalism, Political Theology and Suicide Bombing.' *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 42.1 (2013): 198–223.

Miller, Toby. "What it is and What it isn't: Introducing…Cultural Studies." In *A Companion to Cultural Studies*. Edited by Toby Miller. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2001.

Miller, Toby. *Television Studies: The Basics*. London, Routledge. 2010. Kindle edition.

Mitchell, W.J.T. *The Reconfigured Eye: Visual Truth in the Post-Photographic Era.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994.

Mitchell, W.J.T. "There are no Visual Media." *MediaArtHistories*. Edited by Oliver Grau. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007. 395-406.

Mondloch, Kate. *Screens: Viewing Media Installation Art*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Morley, David. *Television, Audiences, and Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Morley, David. 'Texts, Readers, Subjects.' *Culture, Media, Language*. Ed. Stuart Hall. Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell, 1980. 163–176. Print.

Morley, David. *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2000.

Mosco, Vincent. *The Digital Sublime*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004.

Mukerji, Chandra, and Michael Schudson. *Rethinking Popular Culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991. Print.

Munster, Anna. *Materializing New Media: Embodiment in Information Aesthetics*. Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 2006.

Nakamura, Lisa. "Cultural Difference, Theory, and Cyberculture Studies: A Case of Mutual Repulsion." *Critical Cyberculture Studies*. Edited by David Silver and Adrienne Massanari. New York, NY: New York University Press: 2006. 29-36.

Nakamura, Lisa. Afterword. Blaming, Shaming, and the Feminization of Social Media, *Feminist Surveillance Studies: Critical Interventions*. Edited by Rachel E. Dubrofsky and Soshana Amielle Magnet. Durham, NCL Duke University Press, 2015, 221-228.

North, Daniel. "Evidence of Things Not Quite Seen: *Cloverfield's* Obstructed Spectacle." *Film and History* Spring 2010 40: 1, 75-92.

Novak, David. "Engaging Parrhesia in a Democracy: Malcolm X as Truth-Teller." *Southern Communication Journal*. 71:1. 2006. 25-43.

Owen, S. 'Richard Hoggart as Literary Critic.' *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 10.1 (2007): 85–94. Web.

Parikka, Jussi. *Digital Contagions: A Media Archaeology of Computer Viruses*. 1st ed. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2007.

Pfeil, Fred. *Another Tale to Tell*. New York: Verso, 1990. Print.

Pfeil, Fred. 'Textual Analysis of Fictional Media Content.' *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*. Ed. Nicholas W Jankowski. London: Routledge, 1991. 121–134. Print.

Pickering, Michael. Introduction. In M. Pickering (ed.), *Research Methodology for Cultural Studies* Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press, 2008. 1-14.

Raley, Rita. *Tactical Media*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

Ranciere, Jaques. *On the Shores of Politics*. New York, NY: Verso, 2007.

Raunig, Gerald. *Art and Activism in the Long Twentieth Century*. Trans. by Aileen Derieg. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotexte, 2007.

Rojek, Chris. 'Cultural Studies: What's in a Name? (One More Time).' *Media/Cultural Studies: Critical Approaches*. Ed. Douglas Kellner and Rhonda Hammer. 49–62 vols. United States: Peter Lang Publishing, 2009. Print.

Rolling Stone. "Watch The Yes Men Impersonate Shell, Make 'Last Iceberg' Snow Cones." *Rolling Stone*, June 12, 2015. http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/videos/watch-the-yes-men-impersonate-shell-make-last-iceberg-snow-cones-20150612

Rose, Nicholas. *The Power of Life Itself*: *Biomedicine, Power and Subjectivity in the Twenty First Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2007. Kindle edition.

Sampson, Tony. *Virality: Contagion Theory in the Age of Networks*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Saukko, Paula. *Doing Research in Cultural Studies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003.

Scher, Julia. "Artist's Statement." In Druckrey, Timothy. "The Truth is Out There." In *The Art of Detection: Surveillance in Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT List Visual Arts Center, 1997. 39.

Shanken, Edward A. *Art and Electronic Media*. New York and London, Phaidon Press, 2009.

Shanken, Edward A. *Roy Ascott: Telematic Embrace-Visionary Theories of Art, Technology, and Consciousness*. "From Cybernetics to Telematics: The Art, Pedagogy, and Theory of Roy Ascott." Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press, 2003. 1-96.

Sherman, Irwin W. *The Power of Plagues*. 1st ed. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Microbiology, 2005.

Sholette, Gregory. *Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise Culture.* Pluto Press, 2011.

Singer, P.W. *Wired for War*. New York, NY: Penguin, 2008.

Slack, Jennifer, Daryl Wise, and J. Macgregor. *Culture and Technology*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2005.

Stratton, Jon. "Zombie Trouble: Zombie Texts, Bare Life and Displaced People." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 14(3): 2011, 265-281.

Stuart, Stuart. *Media Studies: A Reader*. Ed. Paul Marris and Sue Thornham. 3rd ed. Washington Square, NY: New York University Press, 2010. 269–276. Print.

Sturken, Marita and Lisa Cartwright. *Practices of Looking: an Introduction to Visual Culture*. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 2001.

Sutzl, Wolfgang and Geoff Cox, editors. *Creating Insecurity: Art and Culture in the Age of Security*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia, 2009.

Terranova, Tiziana. *Network Culture: Politics for the Information Age*. Ann Arbor, MI, and London: Pluto Press, 2004.

Thacker, Eugene. *The Global Genome: Biotechnology, Politics, and Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

Tiessen, M. 'Coding the (Digital) Flows: Debt-by-Design and the Econo-Blogospheres' Transparency-Driven Infowar With the Federal Reserve.' *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 14.1 (2013): 50–61.

Thurtle, Philip and Robert Mitchell, eds. *Semiotic Flesh: Information and the Human Body*. Seattle, WA: Walter Chapin Simpson Center for the Humanities, 2002.

Turner, Graeme. 'The Mark of Cultural Studies on Communication Research: A Perspective from the Audience', *Cultural Studies, 29*:1, pp 51-54, 2015.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1969.

Vint, Sheryl. "Zombies." In *Monster Culture in the 21st Century*. Edited by Marina Levina and Diem My T. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Virilio, Paul. *War and Cinema: The Logics of Perception*. Trans. by Patrick Camiller. New York, NY: Verso, 1989.

Virno, Paulo. *A Grammar of the Multitude*. Trans. by Isabella Bertoletti, James Cascaito, and Andrea Casson. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e), 2004.

Walby, Kevin and Seantel Anais. "Research Methods, Institutional Ethnography, and Feminist Surveillance Studies." *Feminist Surveillance Studies: Critical Interventions*. Edited by Rachel E. Dubrofsky and Soshana Amielle Magnet. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015. 208-229.

Wasik, Billand Monica Murphy. *Rabid: A Cultural History of the World's Most Diabolical Virus*. New York, NY: Penguin Books, 2013.

Weber, Sandra. Arts-based research. *Handbook of the Arts in Qualitative Research: Perspectives, Methodologies, Examples, and Issues.* Edited by J. Gary Knowles and Ardra L. Cole. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008. 71-81.

Williams, Kevin. *Understanding Media Theory*. London: Bloomsbury, 2003.

Williams, Raymond. "The Politics of the Avant-Garde." *Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists*. New York, NY: Verso, 1989. 49-64.

Williams, Raymond. “Culture and Technology.” *Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists*. New York, NY: Verso, 1989. 119-140.

Wuthnow, Robert. *Be Very Afraid: The Cultural Response to Terror, Pandemics, Environmental Devastation, Nuclear Annihilation, and Other Threats*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Zurawski, Nils. Consuming Surveillance: Mediating Control Practices Through Consumer Culture and Everyday Life.

APPENDIX A: MEDIA CITED

24 (FOX, 2001-2010). Robert Cochran and Joel Surnow, Creators. Starring Kiefer Sutherland and Mary Lynn Rajskub. Written by Howard Gordon, Michael Loceff, Evan Katz. Produced by Imagine Entertainment, 20th Century Fox Television, Real Time Productions, Teakdwood Lane Productions.

Fringe (FOX 2008-2013). J.J. Abrams, Alex Kurtzman, and Roberto Orci, Creators. Produced by J.J. Abrams, Bryan Burk, Tamara Isaac. Starring Anna Torv, Joshua Jackson, Leonard Nimoy, John Noble. Music by Michael Giacchino and Chris Tilton. Produced by Bad Robot, Warner Brothers Television, FB2 Films, Fringe Element.

Monsters Inside Me (Animal Planet 2009-). Beth Hoppe, Martha Ripp, Dominic Stobbart, Nicola Moody, Executive Producers. Mia Bauman, Make Up Department Head. Kurt Oldman, Gary Kuo, Music Composers. Produced by Optomen Productions

Strange Culture (L5 Productions, 2007). Written, Directed, and Edited by Lynn Hershman-Leeson. Steven Beer and Lynn Hershman-Leeson, Producers. Melina Jampolis, Executive Producer. Hiro Narita, Cinematography. Music by the Residents. Starring Tilda Swinton and Thomas Jay Ryan. Distributed by Videorama.

The Walking Dead (AMC, 2010—). Robert Kirkman, Creator, Executive Producer, and Writer. Glenn Mazzara, and Scott M. Gimble, Executive Producers/Writers; David Alpert, Gale Ann Hurd and Tom Luse, Executive Producers; Greg Nicotero, Executive Producer/Special Effects Make-Up Designer. Produced by AMC Productions, Circle of Confusion, Darkwood Productions, Valhalla Motion Pictures, Valhalla Entertainment, and Idiot Box Productions.

The Yes Men (MGM 2005). Dir by Dan Ollman and Sarah Price. Starring Mike Bonanno and Andy Bichlbaum. Sarah Price, Doug Ruschhaupt, Randy Russell, Chris Smith, Producers. Dan Ollman and Chris Smith, Cinematography. Produced by The Yes Men LLC Films.

The Yes Men are Revolting (Candescent Films, 2015). Starring Mike Bonanno and Andy Bichlbaum. Alex Cooke, Adam McCay, Executive Producers. Didier LePlae and Joe Wong, composers.