

<CT>Counterforensics/Counterlogistics</CT>

<CST>Seeing the Rot</CST>

<AU>Patrick Brian Smith</AU>

It has been argued that attempts to both comprehend and visualize formations of power predicated on exploitative movement and circulation have tended to rely on macro, totalizing, and often overwhelming imaginaries.¹ From Fredric Jameson's tentative formulation of an aesthetic of "cognitive mapping" to recent developments in network and logistics theory, a tendency to try to "see things whole" when attempting to render visible the ruthless movement—of people, capital, and objects—remains firmly present.² This is problematic, because such modalities of power are in fact predicated on forms of visual abstraction and obfuscation for their continued exploitation and violence. Indeed, as Alberto Toscano has suggested, while diverse conceptions and uptakes of mapping, network, and logistical theory are often attempting to "force into being a certain kind of political visibility and thus to counter the objective, material effects of a dominant regime of representation," do they not risk simply slipping back into such forms of abstraction, (re)masking those machinations they attempt to expose and critique?³ These are perhaps examples of what have become predictable forms of paranoid vision, focused on painting broad, totalizing visions of such systems and infrastructures. For example, as Jameson evocatively argues, a poor man's cognitive map is one that is built around paranoid modalities of vision.⁴ Similarly, Jon Simons suggests that "all the conspiracies that the paranoid fears, all the faulty, distorted, and degraded figurations of totality, refer obliquely or unconsciously to the 'absent cause.'"⁵ Consequently, is there a fundamental interdependence between the abstract and the paranoid? Are they mutually reinforcing modalities? To understand systems of power through abstraction potentially functions to further mask their operative and systemic logics. However, is there another way?

This essay aims to more fully think through alternative forms of visualization and critique that might operate subversively.⁶ Focusing primarily on the machinations of both immigration detention-removal and transportation logistics—where such violences of abstraction and ruthless efficiency are relentlessly deployed—this essay argues that by intertwining the concepts of the counterforensic and counterlogistic, we can foster an aesthetic-political practice that undermines such forms of obfuscated and streamlined violence. These are forms of counterpraxis that switch the scale of their foci, paying attention to the microphysical, granular, and detail within such formations of power and aiming to apperceive the weaknesses inherent in such totalizing manifestations of control and violence.⁷ Here, I also build on Martin Danyluk's assertions that we must understand that contemporary forms of violent circulation are in fact built around a "fragmentary, unstable ensemble of physical and social infrastructures . . . bound together in complex relations of contingency and

interdependence.”⁸ The reality is that these modalities of circulatory power are always riven through with contradictions, fragilities, and a systemic rottenness (a concept I will return to later in relation to the paranoid). I argue that these alternative forms of examination can function as atypical or unpredictable forms of paranoid vision and critique, exposing such formations of power through a subversion of investigatory scale. Such granular modes of seeing allow us to perceive potential cracks and fissures within such modes of power and violence that are specifically built around imaginaries of totalizing abstraction, streamlining, and efficiency. These countervailing aesthetic and political strategies allow for the mounting of new forms of resistance and political contestation.

<H1>Immigration Detention and Removal</H1>

The Harmondsworth Immigration Removal Centre at Heathrow Airport, the Special Immigration Appeals Commission (SIAC) field house in London, and the Inflight Executive Jet Centre at Stanstead Airport are the three sites investigated by James Bridle in his short video work *Seamless Transitions* (2015). As Bridle suggests, these sites are crucial nodes within the wider infrastructure of immigration detention and removal in the United Kingdom; however, they are increasingly invisible spaces of sovereign—and extrasovereign—violence: renditions and removals occur during the night, appeal trials are conducted in secret, and public access to the sites of detention is almost impossible.⁹ Bridle also argues that in recent years we have seen increasing collaboration between governmental and private-sector forces involved in immigration detention and removal as they attempt to occlude and obfuscate the physical and material presence of such disciplinary—and often deadly—practices from public view.¹⁰ Indeed, the catalyst of the *Seamless Transitions* project extends back to 2013, when Bridle read an article on the British government’s use of private chartered flights for the deportation of asylum seekers whose applications had been rejected.¹¹ The use of private contractors within the immigration detention and removal system is widespread, from the management of detention infrastructure to the logistics of deportation transportation. While failed asylum seekers were previously transported on commercial flights—typically accompanied by privately contracted security guards—this process of removal is now funneled almost exclusively through private charter companies. Bridle, offering up the primary cause for this shift, suggests that “the main reason the government uses private planes is because commercial carriers (and their passengers) don’t like flying people under duress, especially after the horrific death by suffocation of deportee Jimmy Mubenga” (figure 1).¹²

<INSERT Smith Figure 1>

In early 2010 Mubenga, a political refugee from Angola, had his asylum application rejected. On October 12, he was placed on a British Airways flight back to Angola. Official reports initially claimed that Mubenga had become unwell on the flight; the plane was rerouted to Heathrow, and he

was taken to hospital and later died.¹³ However, the investigative journalists Paul Lewis and Matthew Taylor gained witness testimonies from other passengers on the plane that attested to the fact that Mubenga had been placed in a dangerous restraining hold by three security guards employed by the private security firm G4S.¹⁴ Consequently, the calculated attempt to cover up the cause of Mubenga's death was only thwarted by the presence of passengers who could provide testimony to counter this official narrative.¹⁵ Mubenga's case not only offers a possible reason for the shift to privately chartered flights for immigration removal but is also representative of a collaborative effort between government and private-sector forces involved in immigration detention and removal to increasingly occlude and obfuscate the physical and material presence of such violent practices from public view. Indeed, as Bridle suggests, "what struck me most was the incongruity and apparently deliberate obfuscation of what was happening; a luxury private jet terminal being used to hurry overwhelmingly poor and vulnerable people out of the country under cover of darkness and blanket security."¹⁶ Immigration detention and deportation are practices of violence that increasingly rely on a web of what we could term ruthless efficiencies: of movement, of infrastructure, of temporalities, of geographies, of private security, and ultimately of the extrasovereign. And as Bridle suggests, the ruthless efficiency of such internment and removal practices means that they are increasingly hidden from plain sight, structured around a "policy of not being seen."¹⁷

<H1>Logistics</H1>

<INSERT Smith Figure 2>

Many of these forms of ruthless efficiency also structure the increasing importance of logistics in the machinations of transnational global capital. The new geographical and geopolitical configurations wrought by the ever more systematic international division of labor has placed a greater emphasis on streamlining how things (capital, commodities, people) move around the globe. As Jesse LeCavalier suggests, "rather than encouraging congestion, logistics pursues unencumbered movement. Rather than seeking density, logistics aspires to coverage."¹⁸ As Charmaine Chua notes, this revolution in logistics has "shifted capital's focus from its sites of production to its sites of circulation."¹⁹ Logistical efficiency has become the primary method of profit accumulation under late capitalism's increasingly globalized fragmentation of labor. Consequently, it is possible to suggest that logistics and practices of detention-removal share the same basic logics. They both place an emphasis on the need for unencumbered movement, typically built around modalities of extrasovereign geopolitics, wider interconnections between state and private enterprise, and an overarching desire for obfuscation and invisibility. For logistics, practices of free-zoning, securitization, and

containerization help to withdraw its forms of violence from plain sight. This is what Susan Leigh Star and Karen Ruhleder have termed the “functional invisibility”²⁰ of logistics infrastructure, whereby such “systems . . . become virtually invisible while still acting upon us.”²¹ Similarly, Miriam Posner has suggested that supply chain management is characterized by “the need to erect strategic barriers to the fullest knowledge about supply chains. . . . This selective obscurantism is what makes supply chains so fast and efficient.”²² Consequently, forms of invisibilization and abstraction become mechanisms for supporting the ruthless efficiency and systemic violence of logistics’ machinations.

The interconnection between detention-removal and logistics also operates at structural and biopolitical levels. As Kay Dickinson has suggested in relation to the context of Dubai, the exploitation of migrant labor is in fact predicated on the logics of capital mobility: “migrants are reduced almost solely to economic entities. With no asylum or refugee status granted in the country and little, if any, recourse to state provision, non-nationals hold radically diminished scope to deviate from this social role.”²³ This desire to move capital, commodities, and people around with increasing efficiency is always underpinned by a reduction in basic protections and myriad forms of violence and exploitation. Thus, the structural violence of detention and removal is often mirrored by—and intertwined with—the reconstitution of labor regulation, territorial rights, and social protections by the machinations of contemporary logistics. Of course, the intertwining and mirroring of these two infrastructures of power also extends to those who bear the brunt of the violence inherent to their operations. Black, Asian, and minority ethnic communities are disproportionately impacted by the violence of capital’s circulatory movements and the violence of immigration detention and removal. These formations of power have been racially encoded from their very beginnings through practices of chattel enslavement, land theft, and colonial governance.

<H1>A Violence of Abstraction, or Predictable Paranoia</H1>

Why do I want to think operations and machinations of logistics and immigration detention-removal together? Beyond the structural and racial interconnections mapped out above, issues of how to visualize and map such systems of power are consistent problematics that have plagued diverse forms of visual media practice. Toscano has repeatedly highlighted this in relation to logistical systems; however, I think the same argument can be extended to the ruthless practices of immigration detention-removal. As touched on above, through various forms of ruthless efficiency and abstraction, these power formations resist visibility and legibility. These processes of obfuscation also simultaneously help to facilitate the continued effectiveness of their myriad forms of brutality. How do we comprehend systems and networks of power that are predicated on what we could perhaps term a “violence of abstraction”?

Crucial to the very optimization of logistics' operations is a general conception of space—both geographical and political—as “flattened” and “smooth.” The zones of logistics that connect these webs of trade corridors and channels—seaports, airports, inland ports, freight villages, logistics parks, and intermodal rail terminals—are also predominantly understood as discreet spatial arrangements, seamlessly networked across the globe, a series of supranational nodal points divorced from their immediate sovereign, geographical, or sociopolitical surroundings. Similarly, practices of detention and removal are increasingly funneled through private infrastructures (charter flight companies, security firms, and building management companies) to withdraw their violence from public view. This line of thinking builds from Toscano's crucial critique of how visual practices have predominantly engaged with logistics infrastructure. He writes that “the qualities of *isomorphy*, *modularity*, *abstraction*, *indifference (or anaesthesia)*, *standardization*, *mathematical*, or *scalar sublimity* that attach to logistical complexes *fascinate* the artistic gaze, drawing into a risky mimesis or replication of the very design and function of the abstract spaces of logistics.”²⁴ Similarly, Sarah Turnbull, discussing attempts to visualize the sites and spaces of immigration detention and removal, argues that they typically remain “devoid of the individuals who are subject to the harsher end of the UK immigration system, including the processes of detention and deportation,” and consequently there is a lack of engagement with the intricate and intimate machinations of these spaces and their operations.²⁵ A range of aesthetic practices that have attempted to visualize the sites and spaces of both logistics and detention-removal have fallen foul of this “mimetic lure of real abstraction,” focusing on the broader operations of power across these networks.

Abstracted representations of such violent infrastructural manifestations have close interconnections with the paranoid. In relation to immigration detention and removal, the general tendency to focus on the broader macrostructures of such forms of discipline and violence is reminiscent of Walter Benjamin's concept of “extralegal violence” and how “its power is formless, like its nowhere tangible, all-pervasive, ghostly presence in the life of civilized states.”²⁶ Eric Santner has highlighted how Benjamin's reading of violence is potentially “paranoid” in nature; framed as an abstracted agglomeration of macroforces, it hangs like a specter over civil society, unable to be effectively disassembled or resisted.²⁷ As touched on at the outset of this essay, by remaining focused on how such networks of discipline and violence operate at the broader macrolevel, we risk simply mirroring the very abstraction and obfuscation that materially aids the operation of these power formations. Such paranoid attempts to “see things whole” perhaps only function to further invisibilize these networks of violence. Similarly, according to Emily Apter (as well as the aforementioned work of Toscano), visual renderings of late capitalism and its logistical underpinnings are increasingly abstracted in nature.²⁸ As David Hodge and Hamed Yousefi suggest, “as abstraction reaches into every crevice of our existence, art increasingly adopts a style that

Apter has called *oneworldedness*: ‘a delirious aesthetics of systematicity . . . held in place by the paranoid premise that ‘everything is connected.’”²⁹ For Apter, at the level of aesthetic representation oneworldedness “matches the circular form of the globe—imagined as a smooth surface allowing the unimpeded flow of capital, information, and language.”³⁰ While Apter uses this conception of oneworldedness primarily as a way to unpack US-centric narratives of “delusional democracy,” it can also be seen as a dominant trend within a broader range of contemporary aesthetic practices, where the tendency to focus on the macrostructures of various networks of power and violence renders them abstract and, consequently, totalizing. As a result, these tendencies toward abstraction when attempting to visualize such networks of power are perhaps predictably paranoid in nature, reinforcing an understanding of their machinations and operations as totalizing, abstract, “formless,” and “ghostly.”³¹

What shape might an unpredictable paranoia take, one that remains conscious of the broader scale of such networks of power and violence yet also attempts to resist their abstracted logics by developing alternative aesthetic and political strategies and techniques of critique? I want to consider how we might render visible such networks of power without defaulting to techniques of abstraction, answering Toscano’s call for a practice of “purposeful immersion.”³² Wendy Chun, in her essay in this issue, suggests that paranoia does not always respond “to an overwhelming, all-seeing power but rather to a power found to be lacking, rotten and inadequate, always decaying.”³³ Can a form of paranoid vision that operates at a different microscale level help us to effectively visualize the structural rottenness and weaknesses at the core of these formations of power? As Chun continues, after such an encounter with the rot and inadequacy of such systems of power, “the subject’s entire signifying structure disintegrates. During this period, delusions occur. . . After considerable effort, the signifying structure is reconstituted.”³⁴ However, what if this form of unpredictable paranoia actually resisted such a form of signifying reconstitution? What if the form of unpredictable paranoid vision I am putting forward was to remain at the level of rot and decay, prying apart and exposing the fundamental contradictions and fragilities at the heart of these neocolonial formations of power, resisting a return to forms of totalizing vision? Through a focus on the fragmentary and granular, can we cultivate an unpredictable form of paranoid vision that effectively exposes the contradictions, fragilities, and rottenness that lie at the heart of such circulatory systems?

Next, I want to consider how *Seamless Transitions* is perhaps symptomatic of a more predictable form of paranoid vision, examining how its representation of the sites and spaces of detention-removal fall into the similar “mimetic lure of real abstraction” that have structured aesthetic approaches to logistics space. Taking up Toscano’s critique of artistic renderings of logistical space, I argue that visual renderings of the spaces of immigration detention-removal may simply be reinforcing what is already self-evident about these clandestine sites. Following this—and

by way of pushing back against this dominant tendency—I want to ask what a countervailing aesthetic-political practice might look like, one that attempts to render the fragmentary and instability that is inherent to the organization of such spaces of violent circulation and movement. By intertwining the counterforensic and counterlogistic, I will consider how this countervailing practice might move us away from such a bind of abstraction and offer alternative forms of visualization and critique. If we are to have any chance of identifying the fractures and weak links within such power formations, we must undertake, as Eyal Weizman suggests, a “microphysical analysis in which the part or detail becomes an entry-point from which to reconstruct larger processes.”³⁵ By exploring these interconnected concepts, I argue that these formulations ask us to reconsider the scale at which we attempt to visualize such networks of power. Although this may sound like a simple question of scale (macroanalysis vs. microanalysis), it is my contention that when such systems of power are themselves predicated on privileging such abstracted, macroscale logics (helping mask and conceal their forms of violence), it becomes imperative to think through how an inverse, fragmentary, and localized aesthetic approach might offer up new forms of visualization and critique. To work at a different scalar level potentially becomes an act of resistance in and of itself. I argue that these concepts offer up an atypical and unpredictable form of “paranoid vision” that works at a different scalar level, one that is concerned with a detailed, forensic examination of such networks of power.

<H2>Seamless Transitions</H2>

Bridle’s recent work has increasingly focused on exposing abuses of sovereign power and discipline as well as exploring methodologies for visualizing the secret and inaccessible spaces of state violence. Bridle used a mix of evidentiary materials to create the visualizations found in *Seamless Transitions*: satellite images, planning documents, and testimony from those who are “subject to . . . [the] machinations” of these spaces.³⁶ The video work consists of a series of slow virtual tracking shots that move through these digitally rendered spaces. We begin with a crawling tracking shot through the entrance of the SIAC Field House. As the virtual camera glides over a security X-ray belt in the main lobby, the image divides in two. The bottom image continues tracking toward a set of double doors at the end of a corridor immediately off the main lobby, while the top image focuses on two sets of lifts to their immediate left. We then shift locations, moving down another corridor in the same building. This corridor opens onto a larger space that is flanked on either side by chairs, presumably a waiting area that connects several of the floor’s court chambers and hearing rooms.

<INSERT Smith Figure 3>

Moving inside one of these rooms, we see a typical configuration for a small hearing chamber. The farthest wall is adorned with a large royal coat of arms of the United Kingdom. In an article for *The Guardian* newspaper, Bridle discusses his sole field trip to Field House in 2015. His

first interaction was with a security guard in the main lobby who told Bridle “how proud he was to work there, because: ‘It’s transparent. It’s open to the public and anyone can come and see justice being done.’”³⁷ However, as Bridle continues on to suggest, after handing over his recording equipment to the security guard and proceeding to one of the court rooms, he “found the door was locked. The court was in secret session: under the special rules of SIAC, not even the defendant nor their legal team are allowed into the room to know the evidence against them.”

The SIAC was established in 1997 primarily as a venue of appeal for foreign nationals who were “facing detention, deportation or exclusion from the UK on grounds of national security.”³⁹ As Bridle suggests, much of the evidence presented in these cases included materials that appellants and their legal teams could not access due to national security protections: “reports of spying operations, phone taps or the testimony of informers deep inside terrorism organizations.” The SIAC aimed to address this by appointing “security-vetted special advocates (SA) to act for the appellant.” These security-vetted advocates could work with appellants on a case to a certain degree; however, as Bridle explains, closed sessions were held where only the special advocate could challenge the protected evidence.⁴² Bridle’s rendering of the SIAC at the Field House seems to emphasize the obfuscated nature of the processes that take place within this building. While the architectural visualizations afford us virtual access to this site, the fact that the space remains devoid of the infrastructural and judicial figures and mechanisms responsible for such extrajudicial obfuscation means that these levers of power remain beyond our grasp. Bridle has suggested that maintaining this level of impenetrability was intentional, suggesting that the work is “about the unaccountability and ungraspability of vast, complex systems: of nation-wide architectures, accumulations of laws and legal processes, infrastructures of intent and prejudice, and structural inequalities of experience and understanding.”⁴³ While Bridle’s attempt at visualization attempts to afford us some degree of “access” to the spatial configuration of this site of sovereign power, it also reinforces the fact that the machinations of extrajudicial power within its walls remains “ungraspable” through the intricate web of antiterror legislation that encases appellants and their legal support. The only true “image of power” we are offered in this sequence is purely symbolic: the royal coat of arms, a representation of sovereign extrajudicial violence par excellence (figure 4).

<INSERT Smith Figure 4>

From here we shift locations, moving through the Harmondsworth Immigration Removal Centre. Originally named the Harmondsworth Detention Unit, the site was opened in 1970. This site was the first purpose-built immigration detention center and the first to be constructed outside a prison or airport. The center expanded state power in crucial ways, as it “unlocked the potential for administrative confinement of foreign nationals.”⁴⁴ As Mary Bosworth suggests, while the 1969 Appeals Act aimed to strengthen denied Commonwealth citizens’ right to in-country appeal, the

resulting web infrastructure surrounding it (of which Harmondsworth forms a crucial part) ultimately served to enhance sovereign power over foreign nationals, with powers for indefinite detention being perhaps the most crucial dimension of this control. We begin with a slow virtual tracking shot through a set of double doors, reinforced by iron bars and monitored by a closed-circuit television camera. This room then opens up onto what appears to be a waiting room or lobby area. Fluorescent lighting panels in the ceiling give the room an austere white glow. The tracking shot continues, moving us across the room and toward an identical set of double doors to the first, on the far side. Between these two doors, the supposedly natural exterior light casts a long ray of light onto the floor. Already “illuminated” by the fluorescent lighting panels on the ceiling, this ray of “natural” light seems particularly incongruous (figure 5).

<INSERT Smith Figure 5>

As suggested above, Bridle’s rendering of these sites remains attentive to the “unaccountability and ungraspability” of these spaces of sovereign power. While these spaces remain devoid of the infrastructural and judicial figures and mechanisms responsible for such extrajudicial force, the “uncanniness” of their digital rendering and visualization also plays an important role in trying to understand where the responsibility lies for the creation of these carceral spaces. Within *Seamless Transitions*, we find multiple instances of “uncanny” representation. Jörg Majer (the director of *Picture Plane*, a collaborator on these renderings) suggests that “we didn’t want to take it to an absolute real space; we wanted it to feel like it is still . . . somehow virtual.”⁴⁶ The incongruity of certain features of the spatial renderings in *Seamless Transitions* seem to have been intentionally constructed. Why did Bridle insist on keeping these “diagrammatic” qualities within his architectural renderings? As he suggests, the video work “is itself at a distance; like all simulations, it cannot possibly convey the bodily, fleshy, visceral realities of detention and deportation.”⁴⁷ Here Bridle acknowledges that the video work operates at an abstracted remove through both the virtual and diagrammatic veneer of the renderings as well as the previously examined absence of figures and infrastructures responsible for the execution of sovereign power.

Through the uncanny aesthetics of these images, Bridle seems to want to point toward their inherent constructedness as well as the larger formations of power behind their creation. As a result, the “perfection” of these renderings seems simultaneously to mask and point toward the violence they conceal. Here, Bridle offers a parallel between the generation of such architectural visualizations and the increasingly impenetrable web of immigration policymaking and border control. For him, within both these realms of practice—one primarily corporate and visual, the other juridical and semantic—there is a similar obfuscation of who is accountable for their creation. The complex webs of actors and infrastructure involved in their generation mean that these “kinds of agglomerations and accumulations” make it extremely difficult to locate who is fundamentally

responsible. This is particularly true of the current immigration detention system in the United Kingdom, where we find the complex interrelations between public and private actors, policy and contracting, and law and finance all united around a wider aim to occlude the visibility of the extrajudicial processes they are tasked—and oftentimes financed—to carry out. *Seamless Transitions*' aesthetic and political aims seem to focus on rendering the “unaccountability and ungraspability” of these extrasovereign spaces. However, when “unaccountability and ungraspability” are in fact integral to how these spaces operate—systematically attempting to avoid scrutiny and oversight—is this approach simply reinforcing what is already self-evident about such sites and spaces?

It is my contention that the aesthetic-political approach developed by Bridle risks simply reinforcing the abstracted logics that allow these spaces to function without proper structures of accountability and justice. Despite its use of evidentiary materials—renderings built from architectural plans, testimony, legal documents, etc.—Bridle's work is fundamentally a practice that operates according to the logics of “real abstraction” mapped out by Toscano above. Even though these architectural renderings afford us virtual access to these sites, their methods of visualization remain abstracted and distant, devoid of the infrastructural and judicial figures and mechanisms responsible for such extrajudicial obfuscation. While Bridle's work affords us some degree of “access” to the spatial configuration of these sites of sovereign power, it also reinforces the fact that the machinations of extrajudicial power within their walls have been very effectively “made invisible.” And again, this relates us back to the critique of logistics' aesthetization. If “isomorphy” or “scalar sublimity” is the aesthetic lure of logistics space, for Bridle and his aesthetic approach to the sites and spaces of detention and removal it is the juridical invisibilization and securitization of these extrasovereign spaces that hold a similar lure of abstraction. The risk here is that we fall back into the same bind of abstraction. When such a trend toward abstraction dominates visual attempts to confront these complex assemblages of power (whether in relation to logistics or detention-removal practices), it is important to ask what alternative forms of visual address might be possible and how such practices might operate differently and ultimately engender different forms of visibility, political address, and collective action.

<H1>Counterforensics/Counterlogistics</H1>

How can we attempt to push beyond such abstracted attempts to render visible such formations of power and violence? And how can such renderings help to expose the unstable and fragmentary logics upon which such systems operate? It is my contention that by interlinking the concepts of the “counterlogistic” and “counterforensic” we can attempt to foster such an alternative form of praxis. The origins of these intersecting theoretical and aesthetic concepts can be traced back to the work of

photographer, filmmaker, and theorist Allan Sekula. To begin with, I will briefly lay out the origins of these notions within Sekula's work. I will then move on to examine how they have been deployed across various forms of cultural production and aesthetic practice, highlighting their conceptual intersections and similarities. Through this analysis, I am not aiming to provide a totalizing theorization of these new forms of counterpraxis; rather, I want to signal the new directions that such modes of address could be taken in. Ultimately, paying attention to different scales of power may open a space for a critical, frictive, and unpredictable mode of paranoid vision.

The notion of the counterlogistic gained critical currency in the early 2010s as several Marxist geographers and theorists began to examine the material impacts of logistics infrastructure across the globe. However, it is arguable that these contemporaneous usages of the term are indebted to the earlier aesthetic and theoretical work of Sekula.⁴⁸ Indeed, it is within Sekula's 1995 project *Fish Story* that we perhaps find the earliest example of how such a counterlogistic practice might operate. This photo essay sought to render visible the impacts of an increasingly logistified and containerized maritime economy across a geographically diverse set of spaces. The bulk of the photographs and accompanying essays contained in the collection seek to examine the impacts of maritime logistics networks on the localized material sites they border and interact with, exposing the material fragilities and instabilities that exist within these sites. One of the most striking photographic diptychs of the book can be found in the chapter "Seventy in Seven." Among a sequence of photographs depicting laborers working at the Hyundai Heavy Industries shipyard in Ulsan, South Korea, we are presented with a shot of a billboard that promotes the future development of an amusement park on the site of the Ilsan fishing village. Ilsan is adjacent to the Hyundai Heavy Industries shipyard and is under threat from the influx of development that naturally accompanies such spaces of capital flow. As Bill Roberts suggests, "a clear theme of the disappearance of public space amid rampant private development runs throughout this chapter."⁴⁹

Sekula remains focused on the ways in which Hyundai is reshaping life in the peripheral zones of the port but also pays attention to how these logistical spaces are always fragmentary and unstable assemblages. Indeed, the second photograph of this diptych presents us with a portrait of Kim Kyung-Seok, a former fisherman and current Ilsan resident who is now a factory worker at a Hyundai subsidiary (figure 6). Here, then, the previous image of an idealized future for this space of capital circulation is juxtaposed with the lived reality of life in these peripheral arteries, highlighting complex social relations and interdependencies that exist across these sites. These dialectical juxtapositions are a common feature of Sekula's approach to the counterlogistic, aimed at disrupting any smooth or seamless readings of these spaces of violent capital mobility. Here, the spaces and sites of logistics are examined not as discreet nodes seamlessly networked across the globe but instead as unstable and fragmentary zones of interaction that restructure the spaces they border.

Consequently, reading logistics space as piecemeal and interdependent allows for better insight into the impacts on those who live and labor in these peripheral arteries.

<INSERT Smith Figure 6>

For Roberts, Sekula desired to not only bring home to “his audience some of the myriad local effects of global capitalism, but [also] to relate his necessarily incomplete impressions of the totality dialectically[;] . . . this means to recognize the inherent contradictions of a complex and continuously changing world-system, and indeed to insist on contradiction as the very locus of change.”⁵⁰ Through the myriad of instabilities captured by Sekula’s camera—moving between different geographical, sovereign, economic, and juridical frames—we come to recognize the “social contradictions” and “economic disparities” at the heart of the operative logics of logistics infrastructure. Sekula develops an aesthetic praxis that attempts to pinpoint localized fragmentations and social effects within the broader matrix of global capitalism’s logistical infrastructures. And as Roberts and Toscano variously suggest, these attempts to focus on the local microsites of logistics infrastructure is connected to a broader desire to aesthetically resist re-creating the abstracted and “immaterialized” renderings of these sites, which too often fall into a pattern of “risky mimesis.”

As I have previously suggested, this early theorization of the counterlogistic has been revived and radically redeveloped throughout the 2010s, most notably in the work of Jasper Bernes. Bernes similarly emphasizes the importance of understanding the fragmentation and instability of logistics’ operations. For him, such systems of power are always precarious and unstable agglomerations, not “cohesive operational units,” to take up Martin Danyluk’s term.⁵¹ And it is within such moments of fragmentation and instability that the potential for resistance lies. Bernes argues that particular modes of visualization could certainly be taken up to help “identify and exploit bottlenecks, to give our blockaders a sense of where they stand within the flows of capital. This counter-logistics might be a proletarian art of war to match capital’s own *ars belli*.”⁵² The importance of visibility links up with a need to both comprehend and focus on the fragmentary, piecemeal, and unstable composition of logistics infrastructure, opening up a space to perceive the potential cracks and fissures within such networks of power. For Bernes, this counterlogistic practice might find its clearest articulation as a form of “logistics against logistics.” Here, “the conceptual and technical equipment of the industry”—supply chain visualization software and terminal operating systems such as Navis Spares N4 and CatOS—could be subversively co-opted and used against their operative logics in order to “identify and exploit” the “bottlenecks” within capital’s supposedly seamless flows (figure 7).

<INSERT Smith Figure 7>

For Bernes, the visual tools of logistics management can potentially be utilized to counter the very networks they organize and support, taken up to identify potential sites of weakness, bottlenecking, or transitory coagulation, which could then be exploited to disrupt these corridors of

capital movement. Such visual regimes of “hypervisibility” and “hyperorganization” can be used precisely against their operative logics. While dealing with radically different sorts of visual regimes to those fashioned by Sekula, across both these counterlogistic models there is a shared desire to try to upset traditional modes of viewing logistics infrastructure as “cohesive operational units,” instead emphasizing their inherent instabilities and weaknesses. Indeed, as Bernes continues on to suggest, “imagine if our blockaders knew exactly which commodities the containers at particular berths, or on particular ships, contained; imagine if they could learn about the origin and destination of these commodities and calculate the possible effects—functionally and in dollars—of delays or interruptions in particular flows.”⁵⁴ Within Bernes’s radical model of the counterlogistic, particular regimes of visibility that are typically encoded for streamlining and efficiency could be taken up to crack these very same networks apart, inserting points of blockage and rupture. It is not difficult to imagine how similar tools used in the processes of detention and removal—flight tracking software, court records, etc.—could be co-opted in similar ways.

In many ways, the notion of the counterforensic builds from a similar set of aesthetic and theoretical preoccupations with questions of scale, visibility, and co-optation. For Sekula, the counterforensic aims to invert state-sanctioned forensic procedures and resulting evidentiary forms and weaponize them against their own internal logics, using them to produce records of violence against those very same networks of state power. Thomas Keenan argues that counterforensics “refers to nothing less than the adoption of forensic techniques as a practice of ‘political manoeuvring,’ as a tactical operation in a collective struggle, a rogues’ gallery to document the microphysics of barbarism.”⁵⁵ For Sekula, state-produced materials hold the potential to be taken up and utilized as tools for “political manoeuvring” and, consequently, to produce an archive of state violence. As Keenan suggests, “‘forensic methods (detective methods focusing on evidence and the body) offer a tool for oppressive states.’ But, [Sekula] somewhat unexpectedly continues, ‘forensic methods have also become tools of opposition.’” Consequently, the aim of a counterforensic practice is to build up evidence of violence and oppression through a “reversal” or co-optation of “policing techniques.” Ultimately, various power formations—intentionally or not—have created vast (and ever-growing) archives documenting their acts of violence and neglect, and the practice of counterforensics seeks to retool these repositories, co-opting and utilizing these forms of evidence to hold those same power formations to account. Eyal Weizman—director of the London-based interdisciplinary research hub Forensic Architecture, a group at the forefront of developing such counterforensic tools and technologies—has suggested that by developing such a counterforensic practice, “the direction of the forensic gaze could . . . be inverted, and used . . . to detect and interrupt state violations.”⁵⁷ The central power of the counterforensic is both its attention to the microphysical

scales at which such potential forms of violence operate and the power of co-opting and inverting already-existing tools and technologies of suppression to render such forms of barbarism visible.

Charles Heller and Lorenzo Pezzani's multimedia work *Liquid Traces: The Left-to-Die Boat* (2014) is a good example of how such counterforensic sensibility works. *Liquid Traces* examines the fateful journey of a migrant vessel that attempted to cross from Tripoli to the Italian island of Lampedusa in 2011. Approximately eighteen hours after departure on March 27, the boat sent out a distress call from an onboard satellite phone. In the early hours of March 28, the boat ran out of fuel. For the next fourteen days, the boat drifted. Finally, on April 10 the boat drifted back onto the coast of Libya. Only nine of the seventy-two passengers survived. During the period of the boat's fateful journey, the NATO was in the process of enforcing an arms embargo in the central Mediterranean. As a result, the oceanic space the boat moved across was being meticulously patrolled and surveyed by an array of national and supranational forces.⁵⁸ Consequently, the boat's drift took place in one of the "most highly surveyed areas of sea in the entire world."⁵⁹ As Heller and Pezzani suggest, the boat was spotted, surveyed, and interacted with multiple times during its fateful journey. The increasing modes of technological visibility across such oceanic spaces are intimately connected to the multiple fragmentations of the border within these same spaces. Consequently, reformulations and multiplications of the border have led to a marked rise in "operational" or "instrumental" images, necessary for the documentation and contestation of movement across these precarious zones. Despite these myriad instances of visibility and interaction, the boat was offered no substantive assistance or aid. The objectives of *Liquid Traces* are twofold. First, it is an investigative study into the structural neglect of the migrant vessel and concomitant criminal inaction of these state/extrastate bodies. Second, it examines how such an act of willful neglect occurred alongside the rapid proliferation of bordering, surveillance, and visualization technologies across this same space. Through a detailed forensic cataloging of these different forms of surveillance, it quickly becomes clear that these two issues are intimately interrelated.

The seventeen-minute video is built around a single image of the Mediterranean Sea, the oceanic space traversed by the migrant vessel (figure 8). Over this single image, the work forensically maps the operations and trajectories of these different surveillance forms (automatic identification system vessel tracking systems, synthetic aperture radar imagery, etc.), evincing the new regimes of visibility within this deadly oceanic space. These different forms of surveillance technology are visually interwoven and overlaid throughout the film, building a rich tapestry of their different—yet often violently collaborative—scopic regimes. Through this steady accrual of visual and cartographic data, the work highlights the deep contradiction in the fact that despite a rapid proliferation of new forms of surveillance and border protection, there is an increasing risk involved in traversing these spaces for groups that are deemed to fall in-between the various sovereign and

extrasovereign remits of control and protection. In a similar manner to Bernes’s model of a practice of logistics against logistics, here we have a practice of surveillance against surveillance: the tools of hypervisibility and hyperorganization that govern the visibility of this space are deployed against themselves.

<INSERT Smith Figure 8>

As Heller and Pezzani suggest, they aimed to turn “the knowledge and awareness generated by those surveillance technologies into evidence of responsibility for the crime of non-assistance.”⁶⁰ Therefore, this attempt to counterforensically turn such devices back on themselves not only aims to expose evidentiary materials but also looks at the wider infrastructures that produce these new archives of surveillance and monitoring. Through this approach, the film also explores the broader interconnections between new practices of border securitization, the expansion of various surveillance and monitoring image regimes, and long-enduring forms of racially inscribed border control. In many ways, the particularities of such surveillance practices—and interconnected forms of “deadly inaction”—are reminiscent of Simone Brown’s notion of “racializing surveillance,” which “signals those moments when enactments of surveillance reify boundaries, borders, and bodies along racial lines, and where the outcome is often discriminatory treatment of those who are negatively racialized by such surveillance.”⁶¹ By highlighting the clear discord between an intensifying surveillance regime and the deadly nonassistance offered to this migrant vessel, *Liquid Traces* highlights how such regimes of visibility operate along exclusively biopolitical and racialized lines, protecting some forms of supposedly “good” movement (goods, capital, arms, etc.) while murderously and violently avoiding other supposedly “illicit” or “unproductive” forms (refugee and migrant movements). The counterforensic practice at work in *Liquid Traces* aims to co-opt and critique these new surveillance regimes, using them as mediated evidence of the deadly “crime of non-assistance” and highlighting how such areas of intense visibility can strategically keep certain populations effectively “invisible.”

<H1>Conclusion</H1>

Both the counterlogistic and the counterforensic not only resist abstraction but also push toward what Toscano (building from Sekula) highlights as a “practice of purposeful immersion,” a focus on the detail, fragment, and fissure within such networks of power. The case studies examined in the second half of this essay offer some fleeting examples of how this countervailing aesthetic and political praxis might operate, privileging a different scale of visualization that can potentially resist the violence of abstraction that these networks of power structure their operations around. Indeed, much discussion of tactically negotiating and negating these power formations emphasizes the need to expose choke points, or weak links, in such infrastructural systems that are predicated on

fragmentary, unstable, and rotten “physical and social infrastructures,” a conception that in and of itself further undermines a reading of these spaces as seamless and smooth. Such choke points are the sites of potential bottlenecking, or coagulation, in systems of movement and flow. It is my argument that returning to the detail, the fragment, the fissure (be it political, judicial, infrastructural, logistical) offers a greater chance of exposing such choke points. These are systems that are riven through with structural weaknesses to be exposed by close forensic examination, not through praxes derived from abstraction. Indeed, as Toscano suggests, “our crisis-ridden present throws up ever more intense forms of abstract domination, for which image-making stands as a crucial conduit, but also a potential choke-point.”⁶² Through the examples explored in this essay, I have pointed toward the ways in which image making has the potential to function as such a choke point, co-opting dominant regimes of visibility and using them against the grain. The works explored above are operating in this counterforensic and counterlogistic mode, rendering visible all those moments when the ruthless efficiencies of such networks of power fail, leaving behind material traces and evidence, the visual evidence of potential choke points. These are modes of unpredictable and frictive paranoid vision; they remain at the level of the rot that ultimately undergirds all these forms of “inadequate” and “always decaying” circulation and movement. By uniting the counterforensic and counterlogistic, we can push toward such a form of subversive surveillance from below, breaking these networks of domination and exploitation apart to explore the violence inherent within them. All this might just seem to be a question of scale (micro vs. macro), but when such systems of power have always been predicated on forms of violent totalizing abstraction, the scalar and detail both seem of central importance. Focusing on fragments and details is the chance for the visual to become a choke point, a locus for intervention.

<H1>Notes</H1>

¹ See, for example, Alberto Toscano, “Seeing It Whole: Staging Totality in Social Theory and Art,” *Sociological Review* 60 (2012): 64–83. Toscano goes into detail on various theories (and limits) of mapping, including the Jameson’s theory of the “cognitive map” and Emily Apter, “On Oneworldedness: Or Paranoia as a World System,” *American Literary History* 18, no. 2 (2006): 365–89.

² For example, as Patrick Jagoda suggests, “networks, a limit concept of the historical present, are accessible only at the edge of our sensibilities. Networks exceed rational description or mapping.” Patrick Jagoda, *Network Aesthetics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016), 3. Similarly, Jasper Bernes has suggested how the ideal imagining of logistics is one of “planetary flows, chopped up into modular, component processes which, separated by thousands of miles, combine and recombine according to the changing whims of capital.” Jasper Bernes, “Logistics, Counterlogistics and the Communist Prospect,” *Endnotes* 3 (2013), <https://endnotes.org.uk/articles/logistics->

counterlogistics-and-the-communist-prospect. For more on the notion of “seeing it whole,” see Toscano, “Seeing It Whole.”

³ Alberto Toscano and Jeff Kinkle, *Cartographies of the Absolute* (London: Zero Books, 2015), 26.

⁴ Fredric Jameson, “Cognitive Mapping,” in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Lawrence Grossberg and Cary Nelson (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 356. For a more thorough analysis of paranoia’s interconnections with such formations of power that are predicated on particular forms of effacement, secrecy, and visual abstraction, see the section “A Violence of Abstraction, or Typical Paranoia.”

⁵ Jon Simons, “Postmodern Paranoia? Pynchon and Jameson,” *Paragraph 23*, no. 2 (2000): 210.

⁶ Here, I am building on crucial work done by Alberto Toscano, who has pushed for alternative forms of visualization in the face of such abstracted, totalizing visualizations. See, for example, Alberto Toscano, “The Mirror of Circulation: Allan Sekula and the Logistical Image,” *Society & Space* (blog), 2018, <http://societyandspace.org/2018/07/30/the-mirror-of-circulation-allan-sekula-and-the-logistical-image/>. Responding to Toscano’s call, I aim to think through what shape such alternative praxes may take.

⁷ Alberto Toscano suggests that this might be understood as a move from the “panorama” to the “detail.” Toscano, “Seeing It Whole.” Similarly, Walter Benjamin considered the magnification of detail, the fragment, as an alteration to the whole, a qualitative change. See Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002). I thank Timothy Robert Holland for this insight. For other key engagements with the abstractions of modernity, see Siegfried Kracauer, “The Mass Ornament,” *New German Critique*, no. 5 (1975): 67–76; and Martin Heidegger, *Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1982).

⁸ Martin Danyluk, “Fungible Space: Competition and Volatility in the Global Logistics Network,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 43, no. 1 (2019): 107.

⁹ James Bridle, “Planespotting,” Booktwo (blog), December 18, 2013, <http://booktwo.org/notebook/planespotting/>. I use the term “extrasovereign” to refer to the complex interconnections between private-sector and governmental forces (the state and the corporate) that deeply structure the immigration detention and removal systems in the United Kingdom. These interconnections often serve to obfuscate and conceal accountability.

¹⁰ James Bridle, “What They Don’t Want You to See: The Hidden World of UK Deportation,” *The Guardian*, January 27 2015, <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/jan/27/hidden-world-of-uk-deportation-asylum-seamless-transitions>.

¹¹ Hugh Muir, “Diary: Millions on Charter Flights, Private Jets: It’s the Deportation Game,” *The Guardian*, November 28, 2013, <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/nov/28/hugh-muir-diary-charter-flights-deportation-game>.

¹² James Bridle, “What They Don’t Want You to See.”

¹³ Jimmy Mubenga Inquest: “‘No Signs of Life’ after G4S Restraint,” BBC News, June 3, 2013, <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-london-22757147>.

¹⁴ Paul Lewis and Matthew Taylor, “BA Flight 77 Passengers Haunted by Last Cries of Dying Man,” *The Guardian*, October 15, 2010, <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2010/oct/15/jimmy-mubenga-scotland-yard-investigates>; and Paul Lewis, Matthew Taylor, and Cécile de Comarmond, “Security Guards Accused over Death of Man Being Deported to Angola,” *The Guardian*, October 14, 2010, <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2010/oct/14/security-guards-accused-jimmy-mubenga-death>.

¹⁵ Despite this investigation, which highlighted multiple passengers hearing Mubenga stating “I can’t breathe,” and the ensuing trial, the three G4S security guards Hughes, Kaler, and Tribelnig were cleared of manslaughter in 2014. Matthew Taylor and Robert Booth, “G4S Guards Found Not Guilty of Manslaughter of Jimmy Mubenga,” *The Guardian*, December 16, 2014, <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/dec/16/g4s-guards-found-not-guilty-manslaughter-jimmy-mubenga>.

¹⁶ James Bridle, “Making ‘Seamless Transitions,’” *Border Criminologies* (blog), February 25, 2015, Faculty of Law, University of Oxford, <https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/research-subject-groups/centre-criminology/centreborder-criminologies/blog/2015/02/making-seamless>.

¹⁷ James Bridle, “Planespotting.”

¹⁸ Jesse LeCavalier, *The Rule of Logistics: Walmart and the Architecture of Fulfillment* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016), 6.

¹⁹ Charmaine Chua, “Logistics, Capitalist Circulation, Chokepoints,” *The Disorder of Things* (blog), September 9, 2014, <https://thedisorderofthings.com/2014/09/09/logistics-capitalist-circulation-chokepoints/>.

²⁰ Susan Leigh Star and Karen Ruhleder, “Steps toward an Ecology of Infrastructure: Design and Access for Large Information Spaces,” *Information Systems Research* 7, no. 1 (1996): 111–34.

²¹ Paraphrased by Jesse LeCavalier in *The Rule of Logistics: Walmart and the Architecture of Fulfillment* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016), 50.

²² Miriam Posner, “Breakpoints and Black Boxes: Information in Global Supply Chains,” *Postmodern Culture* 31, no. 3 (2021): 1.

²³ Kay Dickinson, *Arab Cinema Travels: Transnational Syria, Palestine, Dubai and Beyond* (London: British Film Institute, 2016), 156.

²⁴ Toscano, “The Mirror of Circulation.”

²⁵ Sarah Turnball, “Visualising Immigration Detention and Deportation,” *Border Criminologies* (blog), March 9, 2015, <https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/research-subject-groups/centre-criminology/centreborder-criminologies/blog/2015/03/visualising>.

²⁶ Walter Benjamin, “Critique of Violence,” in *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*, ed. Peter Demetz, trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York: Schocken, 1986), 286–87.

²⁷ Eric Santner, *My Own Private Germany: Daniel Paul Schreber’s Secret History of Modernity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), 10.

²⁸ Emily Apter, “On Oneworldedness: Or Paranoia as a World System,” *American Literary History* 18, no. 2 (2006): 365–89.

²⁹ David Hodge and Hamed Yousefi, “Paranoid Subjectivity and the Challenges of Cognitive Mapping—How Is Capitalism to Be Represented?,” e-flux, March 23, 2015, <https://conversations.e-flux.com/t/paranoid-subjectivity-and-the-challenges-of-cognitive-mapping-how-is-capitalism-to-be-represented/1080>.

³⁰ Emily Apter, “On Oneworldedness: Or Paranoia as a World System,” 370.

³¹ This mode of predictable paranoia extends from Jameson’s understanding of paranoia as a poor man’s cognitive mapping as well as Santner’s engagement with Benjamin’s “extralegal violence.” Predictably paranoid modes of visioning are, I argue, happy to remain at the level of the macro and the abstract, unwilling to drill down into an examination of the fragmentary machinations of such networks of power. The counterpraxes of unpredictable paranoia that I am exploring in this essay are instead concerned with reading such networks of power and violence through their incoherent and contradictory operations. Through such a mode of unpredictable paranoid vision, I would argue that such networks of power are more effectively and accurately rendered as unstable, indeterminate, and fragile agglomerations that contain structural weaknesses and endemic rottenness.

³² Toscano, “The Mirror of Circulation.”

³³ Wendy Chun, “Taking the Reparative Pill: Cyberspace, Machine Learning and the Closure of the Real,” *Discourse* 45, no. 3 (Fall 2023): {page }. Here, Chun is engaging with the work of Daniel Paul Schreber and Eric Santner.

³⁴ Chun, “Taking the Reparative Pill,” {page }.

³⁵ Eyal Weizman, “Introduction: Forensics,” in *Forensics: The Architecture of Public Truth*, ed. Forensic Architecture (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014), 18–19.

³⁶ Bridle, “What They Don’t Want You to See.”

³⁷ Bridle.

³⁹ “Q&A: Secret Court Explained,” BBC News, April 28, 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/3666235.stm.

⁴² Bridle, “What They Don’t Want You to See.”

⁴³ Bridle, “Making ‘Seamless Transitions.’”

⁴⁴ Mary Bosworth, *Inside Immigration Detention* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 22.

⁴⁶ The Photographers Gallery, “James Bridle Interview: Seamless Transitions,” Vimeo, 2015, <https://vimeo.com/117787795>.

⁴⁷ Bridle, “Making ‘Seamless Transitions.’”

⁴⁸ Alberto Toscano has done important groundwork here. For example, while not directly engaging with the notion of the counterlogistic, his essay “The Mirror of Circulation” does argue that Sekula has developed a practice of “critical humanism” that aims to document the material labor at work within such globalized systems, helping to push back against such tendencies toward abstraction. However, by suggesting that Sekula’s work is also readable as a counterlogistic practice, I want to highlight how he reads the sites and spaces of logistics as “fragmentary” and “unstable” zones of interdependence, riven through with potential weak points that can be exploited for resistance.

⁴⁹ Bill Roberts, “Production in View: Allan Sekula’s *Fish Story* and the Thawing of Postmodernism,” *Tate Papers* 18 (Autumn 2012), <https://www.tate.org.uk/research/tate-papers/18/production-in-view-allan-sekulas-fish-story-and-the-thawing-of-postmodernism>

⁵⁰ Roberts, “Production in View.”

⁵¹ Martin Danyluk, “Fungible Space: Competition and Volatility in the Global Logistics Network,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 43, no. 1 (2019): 107.

⁵² Bernes, “Logistics, Counterlogistics and the Communist Prospect.”

⁵⁴ Bernes.

⁵⁵ Thomas Keenan, “Counter-Forensics and Photography,” *Grey Room* 55 (2014): 69.

⁵⁷ Weizman, “Introduction,” 10.

⁵⁸ See Jack Shenker, “How a Migrant Boat Was Left Adrift on the Mediterranean,” *The Guardian*, March 28, 2012, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/mar/28/migrant-boat-adrift-mediterranean>; and Charles Heller, Lorenzo Pezzani, and Situ Studio, “Report on the ‘Left-to-Die Boat,’” Centre for Research Architecture, Goldsmiths University of London, April 11, 2012, <https://www.fidh.org/IMG/pdf/fo-report.pdf>.

⁵⁹ Charles Heller and Lorenzo Pezzani, “The Left-to-Die Boat,” Forensic Architecture, accessed July 3, 2019, <https://forensic-architecture.org/investigation/the-left-to-die-boat>.

⁶⁰ Heller and Pezzani, “The Left-to-Die Boat.”

⁶¹ Simone Browne, *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 16.

⁶² Toscano, “The Mirror of Circulation.”