



Look into the *occupy* phenomenon, and one discovers a couple repetitive ideas: corporate influence on politics and wealthy individuals (1%) greed. How have so many come to express, and possibly believe, that greedy corporations and individuals are controlling the world? Why in such a way as to come to general assemblies and protests flush with emotions of rage, pride, inspiration, sadness and righteousness? The more *occupy* is explored the more curious this viral movement becomes.

Though there is surely some accuracy to the idea that corporate greed effects politics to most everybody and everythings detriment – this is a fuzzy notion. The corporate world with all its species and

levels of organization and power, and the way it literally co-evolved with the current political field, is itself nothing more than a necessary product of certain types of relations. Namely a drive towards progress, accumulation, exchange and reification, in other words capitalism. The corporation has no sentience or control over its actions over and above what the market and society demands of it. Nor could it choose to act more humanely or compassionately. What a corporation most commonly is, a hierarchical organization with the sole intent of expanding and dominating within intense market conditions, cannot exceed itself while the stasis that creates the proper moments for the greedy corporation to flourish remain unchallenged. Calls for taxing the corporations or restructuring political donations do not challenge these conditions, which are entirely diffused throughout culture.

While it is implied that government exists to serve the people when we hear complaints about corporate influence on politics, when one inquires about the corporations existence and ability to maintain order and extraction from an unruly organic world, it appears that corporate influence in government is a carefully synchronized balance of forces ever staying ahead of and indeed creating social demands. A science of maintaining a baseline of productivity and exchange among wide swaths of territory and bodies. How much of this kind of human livestock has to be sustained – with this or that special ingredient (the right to see a movie on Saturday) – for this or that production to be made possible, and to sustain this or that work flow in the system. This is what all your talk of civil rights amounts to. We can see similar schemes of ordering in the regulation of immigration or black market goods by the dominating power of the police and prisons/detention centers. This is why one might say *police are the absolute enemy*.

The description being laid out here is one of discarded understanding. We don't know anything. Yet it has become clear, power is not a substance but a relation. Power is therefore not possessed but exercised. Power cannot be conceptualized as the property of someone who can be identified and attacked, nor can it be thought of as embedded in particular agents or institutions. Instead, power is what characterizes the complex relations among the parts of a particular society – and the interactions among individuals in that society – as relations of ongoing struggle. Power is thus a dynamic situation, whether personal, social, or institutional: it is not an objectifiable quantity but a strategic, unstable relation.

This is not to say that you or I are responsible for the shitty state of the world we have. Only that we have taken up certain conventions for survival, just as the most wealthy individuals and destructive corporations have. If we wish to see an end to this world, then we must start everywhere at once, denying the legitimacy of any collaboration with this state of affairs. And this in turn means the violent destruction of the alliances and strategic relations that keep us in our place, many of which are squarely situated within the 99%.

For an occupation to be desirable then, it must provoke the capacity to write different kinds of relations into our lives, relations that resist the prevailing order of things. The free giving of needed items, disobedience towards the police and representatives, rejection of rigid identities, ideology, and exploitative relations. The danger that is becoming apparent is the recuperation of both the form and term occupation, as liberal activists begin calling the most mundane political demonstrations. The only positive attribute to such a miscellaneous gathering of people is the collective incoherence of demands and grievances. Every clearly enunciated demand comes with fully formed despots willing to grasp and manipulate raw emotions and lead the way forward, to ever more horrible progress. It is as though these protests crave their own cessation into masses, to end seeing ourselves before anything has even begun. Perhaps in this light it is worth maintaining just this powerful moment of incoherence, resisting law, politics, accumulation and progress. Occupation as an end in itself. The positive potential of an occupation further lies in its negative ability to continuously struggle against the flattening and re-ordering of creativity proposed by peace-keepers of social unrest. It has been said *occupy everything*, but it is now worth mentioning *occupy forever*.

non-violent violence. non-violent violence. non-violent violence. non-violent violence. non-violent violence.