

## Delay or accelerate the end? Messianism, accelerationism and presentism

Alfonso Galindo Hervás

To cite this article: Alfonso Galindo Hervás (2016) Delay or accelerate the end? Messianism, accelerationism and presentism, International Journal of Philosophy and Theology, 77:4-5, 307-323, DOI: [10.1080/21692327.2016.1262783](https://doi.org/10.1080/21692327.2016.1262783)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21692327.2016.1262783>



Published online: 11 Dec 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 26



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Delay or accelerate the end? Messianism, accelerationism and presentism

Alfonso Galindo Hervás

The Faculty of Philosophy, University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain

## ABSTRACT

This article analyzes different positions on the relationship between politics and the experience of time, both those which defend the legitimacy of institutions and those which claim to liquidate them. Recognizing the links between certain theological arguments and certain modalities of time and politics (which are examined using ideas from Paul of Tarsus, Carl Schmitt, Reinhart Koselleck, Giorgio Agamben or Jacob Taubes, among others), the article describes and analyzes three different theses: the one that defends institutions against the erosion of subjectivity in capitalist societies (compensation theory), the one that proposes a mystical anarchism with a messianic profile and, finally, the thesis that argues for the need to accelerate the contradictions of capitalism in order to overcome it and, at the same time, to preserve its conquests (Marxist–Deleuzian accelerationism of Nick Land and his followers). Finally, I vindicate certain experiences that involve and prioritize the body against sense or meaning (or rather, which relate sense or meaning to the body). To do this, I make use of some ideas of Agamben and Hans U. Gumbrecht.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 28 February 2016  
Accepted 16 November 2016

## KEYWORDS

Messianism; accelerationism; presentism; Giorgio Agamben; Nick Land; Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht

## 1. Time, politics, theology

This text is based on two suppositions. The first one is that there is a transcendental relationship between time and politics: the experience of time conditionally affects the experience of politics, and vice versa. The second one is that theology determines the understanding and experience of time and politics. For this reason, a particular theological understanding of time is an index and factor for the specific understanding of politics; and conversely, a particular theological categorization of politics presupposes and demands a certain approach and experience of temporality. One consequence of these suppositions is that understanding contemporary politics requires taking into account arcane theology which shapes its premodern meaning and modern developments.

Concerning the experience of temporality, the categorization of regime of historicity, proposed by François Hartog, contributes to our understanding of the meaning and implicit possibilities involved in the forms of temporality. In his famous essay, *Regimes of Historicity*, he defined it as the expression of a dominant order of time at a certain time, which is the result of ordering multiple experiences of time and articulating the

universal forms: past, present and future. The regime of historicity determines a form of historiography and, simultaneously, it is an indicator and a factor of that. Moreover, it helps to identify a crisis or change in the experience of time and it allows us to compare different temporal experiences.

On this basis, it is possible to characterize Modernity as it refers to the emergence of a new regime of historicity, namely one in which a gap and an asymmetry between experience and expectations happen, determining the prominence of future and the decline of past. This is what is reflected in the idea of progress, which shows that expectations are neither measurable nor are they derived from previous experiences. Unlike previous Christian experiences, acceleration now determines and demonstrates the obsolescence of all experience, replacing the lesson of history with a forecast.

Unlike Hans U. Gumbrecht (as will be mentioned again later), who defends the need to resist the loss of presence and the lack of corporality of capitalist acceleration, there is a current stream of leftist thought which recovers certain Marxist tendencies that claim the need to accelerate the processes of an advanced capitalist system in order to liquidate it. My thesis posits that this target must be understood within a framework built on two axes systematically and historically intertwined. First, there is the theological axis which we can refer to as the well-known secularization theorem. This shows its affinity with the messianic challenge, namely, to present a life beyond the standard, an anarchistic one and, in this sense, as it contrasts with the several institutional figures that resist such anomie. Second, the compensation paradigm allows one to understand the purpose of the German thinkers who were inspired by Weber. This school of thought, from the thirties to the sixties, defended the need to strengthen certain subjective dimensions within European nations in order to resist societal demands on accelerated industrial capitalism, which were dissolving traditional cultural heritage. As we shall see, that leftist thought has affinities with these debates, but it provides answers to the same challenges through completely opposite proposals.

In short, an objective of this article is to reconstruct and to analyze the historical and conceptual theoretical positions on the relationship between the legitimacy of institutional order, anarchy (which is delayed or promoted) and time acceleration (along with the time of the acceleration). Also, to assess the relevance of a leftist accelerationist position, and to do this, I will be referring to the thesis that argues for the need to claim the body as a strategy of 'production of presence' which resists the notion of abstraction and acceleration which are characteristic of modern and postmodern times.

## 2. Delay or accelerate the end of time (and the time of the end)?

The contemporary thesis which says that the political and the legal are related areas to do with the theological is a result of the ideas of Carl Schmitt, who defended the so-called secularization theorem.<sup>1</sup> He characterized and legitimized the modern state by referring to the Pauline figure of the *Katechon*, which slows the *Parousia* and, what is more important, the effects of anomie, which is typical of messianic life.<sup>2</sup> For Paul (2 Thessalonians 2: 7–9) everything that constituted power is *katechon*, power that slows the disclosure of the 'mystery of anomie', which is the mystery of illegitimacy and insubstantiality of all order in messianic time (a really exceptional state). In this sense,

the *katechon* contributes to the goal of maintaining historical order based on the consciousness of the finiteness of time.

Alongside various theories which legitimize multifaceted institutional order, for example, Schmitt's theory, we can identify a tradition of radical delegitimation of order which can be referred to as Pauline arguments. Jacob Taubes brilliantly represents this. For him, the sovereignty of the Messiah is one that fulfills the law absolutely. This apocalyptic and nihilistic delegitimation, which is present in the Letters to the Corinthians and to the Romans as well as in the early theological-political *Fragment* and in Benjamin's *Thesen*, presents a world that decays because it is unfounded.<sup>3</sup> This would be, then, the political dimension of Pauline messianism: the delegitimation of all worldly order, of every principle. This attitude can be seen, for example, in Joachim Fiore's reception of the thesis by Spiritual Franciscans, in Ficino or Luther's works or, in general, in numerous forms of millenarianism and apocalypticism which defend the acceleration of the end.<sup>4</sup>

But it is also possible to identify the presence and the philosophical and political fertility of the messianic attitude in certain deconstructive arguments and works by contemporary authors. These are philosophies which, without being confessional, claim the experience of time that defines messianic life as a political strategy, that is, messianic time, which unexpectedly interrupts all continuity.

One of the contemporary authors who has reflected on the political and nihilistic dimension of messianic arguments is Giorgio Agamben.<sup>5</sup> In *The Time That Remains*, he forwards the critical potential of Pauline messianism to the temporary experience which it is involved in and differs from homogeneous time. His argument (which cannot be fully explained here) is that time never coincides with its representations, because this leaves out an earlier time: the time which we use to complete our representation of time: that is, a time that remains. This time is a working time which coincides with ourselves, the only real time we have, and we must not confuse the end of time with the time of the end. According to Agamben, this is 'the messianic situation par excellence'.<sup>6</sup>

This experience of suspension of chronological time is the basis for legitimizing hope and revolution. The reason for this is that it suggests something outside of history that enables a radical change and a hope which transcends what homogeneous time can offer. Agamben argues that the key point of Romans is the deactivation of law.<sup>7</sup> In order to grasp the status of law under the influence of messianic *katárgesis*, he uses the ideas of Schmitt (although he will reach divergent conclusions) because his legal theoretical system depends on a decision, which is an event, so states of emergency are paradigms for the foundation of any law. The key thesis is that the features of the law in a state of emergency appear in a messianic *katárgesis*. That is, a Christ event also brings a deactivation of law because it introduces a residue which makes the inside and outside of law indistinguishable and, instead, demands a faith which excludes work.<sup>8</sup>

The concept of messianism includes the suggestion of another way of time experience and, to this extent, it questions the figures of idealized history (progress, emancipation and so on) and all institutions built on them. The subversive character of the concept of messianism is what gives its name to the possibility of a rest which will never be integrable and thus shows the existence of being outside of the law which can reveal certain subversive praxis.

Along with these arguments that hold that the state is the main institution that slows an anomie characteristic of messianic life and, respectively, either defends it (like Schmitt) or delegitimizes it and claims messianic nihilism (like Benjamin, Taubes and Agamben), there is a third position which considers that since Modernity, the state does not stop anomie, but accelerates it. In this sense, Reinhart Koselleck argues that what could be conceived as *katechon* before the revolution becomes the stimulation of the revolution.<sup>9</sup> According to Koselleck, from the philosophy of progress emerged a new consciousness of time and future: from a century of progress emerged the deployment of a future which transcended predictable rhythms and natural experiences, that is, it created a specific historical time and provoked new transnational forecasts. Basic features of the future of this progress were acceleration which came with its unknown character. The event which did away with the exemplarity of the past was the French Revolution. Acceleration was the new experience determined by the emergence of such a historic time. Koselleck's thesis is that in Modernity expectations increasingly move away from experiences and this is a proof of acceleration.<sup>10</sup>

For my argument, it is important to emphasize two aspects of this time acceleration experience that characterizes the modern world. First, the role played by scientific-technical and sociopolitical progress in its emergence.<sup>11</sup> Second, an interest in Koselleck's analysis about possible affinities between modern apocalyptic acceleration and time shortening, wondering whether this is a secularization of apocalyptic expectations, because it would allow one to affirm that Modernity has not transcended the messianic tradition, and in short, its theological past (secularization theorem).

Koselleck's position on this point is that the apocalypse is a shortening of time. This means that it is the same time which is accelerated by the power of God, although the acceleration in progress does not involve a mutation of natural time, but rather a progress in science and culture which is produced faster and faster. Such an experience of acceleration would be an experience of immanent time, of historic time. The difference between the meaning of the shortening of time in the eschatological horizon and in modern acceleration is that in the Christian perspective the shortening of time is a divine grace and modern acceleration changes the subject of the action: from God to man. In other words, the apocalyptic shortening of time is a divine gift and revolutionary acceleration is a human task. However, according to Koselleck both positions have a teleological character, transcendent and immanent, respectively. What would have happened is a secularization of the ancient hope of future salvation, which becomes a mundane hope in Modernity.<sup>12</sup>

Based on this diagnosis, Koselleck argues that certain phenomena of acceleration have reached a level of saturation. Apocalyptic time shortening included an exit to eternal salvation, but worldly acceleration involves the possibility that men might annihilate the traditional conditions of their existence. For this reason, he questions Modernity and proposes to counter progress, in order to question the illusion of a complete availability of history and to counteract the acceleration of our civilization recovering the idea of history as *magistra vitae*.<sup>13</sup>

### 3. Accelerate the acceleration

Starting from the double consciousness shared by the examined positions (namely, the acceleration of modern capitalist society and the erosion of the life it leads to), there is a new theory that proposes to increase this speed and acceleration to increasing abstraction, modernization, productivity and consumerism, that is, to radicalize capitalism and its dehumanizing, uprooting and deterritorializing power in order to sink it. The goal is not a humanist resistance to capitalism, but aims to radicalize it to exceed all humanity and reach a post-human status. This is what Benjamin Noys has called 'accelerationism'.<sup>14</sup>

This version of accelerationism refers to Nick Land's work, which retrieves, enriches and radicalizes Deleuze and Guattari's thesis. But its main theoretical sources are older. Specifically, these sources are in conjunction with both the known Marxist thesis which states that it is possible to fight against capitalism by accelerating its contradictions and also the defense of an active nihilism by Nietzsche.<sup>15</sup> Emancipation seems to be equivalent to the integration and dissolution of man into constant capital, into the machine, in order to access a post-human status.

The first contemporary explicit reference to acceleration through and beyond capitalism was proposed by Deleuze and Guattari in 1972 in their work entitled *Anti-Oedipus*. This is the key paragraph from their publication, in the context of a reflection on the struggle against capitalism:

But which is the revolutionary path? Is there one? – To withdraw from the world market, as Samir Amin advises Third World countries to do, in a curious revival of the fascist 'economic solution'? Or might it be to go in the opposite direction? To go still further, that is, in the movement of the market, of decoding and deterritorialization? For perhaps the flows are not yet deterritorialized enough, not decoded enough, from the viewpoint of a theory and a practice of a highly schizophrenic character. Not to withdraw from the process, but to go further, to 'accelerate the process,' as Nietzsche put it: in this matter, the truth is that we haven't seen anything yet.<sup>16</sup>

In the context of the French protests of May 1968, these philosophers, and others such as Lyotard and Baudrillard, shared the goal of provoking the crisis of capitalism by radicalizing it and identifying an exit from it. Deleuze and Guattari believed this could be achieved by leading production to the end (the wishing production) in order to exceed any capitalist apprehension. If the index of capitalist disorder is a deterritorializer and decoded schizophrenia, the objective would be to radicalize and overcome all reterritorialization.

In the nineties, Nick Land and other colleagues from Warwick University created the Cybernetic Culture Research Unit. Their approaches, which relate the *Anti-Oedipus* theory with a cyberpunk futuristic type of esthetic (Philip K. Dick, Ridley Scott, W. Gibson) and Detroit techno (Atkins, Derrick May, Drexciya), brought together the accelerationist ideal of man-machine integration and replied to the changes and crises of capitalism of this time. Categories like machine, desire, acceleration, dissolution, death or criticism, among others, appear connected in Land's work giving his thought a futuristic, materialistic and antihumanist appearance.

A summary of Landian thought might begin by marking its goal of radicalizing machinic revolution, deterritorialization and the market in order to accelerate flow so

that productive forces become uncontrollable. His assumption is that the state has humanistic elements and that its actions do not accelerate but slow the dehumanizing potential of capitalism.

Compared to the traditional leftist claim of more regulation, Land defends a return to the speed of capitalist forms that penetrate existence through abstraction and create the experience of dynamism and the dematerialization of bodies, which is achieved by integrating variable capital (manual labor) into constant capital (machines).<sup>17</sup> For this position, what is revolutionary is uninhibited desire, which is heterogeneous in any institution. We must further deregulate both production and knowledge in order to accelerate the arrival of a post-human society in which there is no agent other than unconscious matter, a production machine and desire. Thought is an epiphenomenon of matter and the human being is the product of schizophrenic cosmic will, whose height is reached with neoliberalism, so it is necessary to accelerate it, because it is the most coherent system leading to the dissolution of man.<sup>18</sup>

According to this proposal, whose thesis reflects the context of the nineties, we can infer that a central feature of Land's thought, which mixes scientific data with fictional unfalsifiable foresight, is to identify redemption with the coming of a post/inhuman state which would be reflected in and supported by the acceleration of the capitalist system. Like Deleuze and Guattari, Land aims to overcome all anthropocentrism claiming the overdetermination of man by the decisions of impersonal agents (microbiotic particle, data flows and so on). The human condition is something fictional that fades into a raw material made up of bodies without organs, mere machines. Artificial intelligence will surpass biological intelligence and this should not be regretted or even understood, because the body-machine process will think for itself. The matter produces and represents itself because it is a mere machine that regulates the data flow in a process without a subject.

Land has exposed this argument in three texts significantly entitled 'Making It with Death: Remarks on Thanatos and Desiring Production', 'Circuitries'<sup>19</sup> and finally 'Machinic Desire'.<sup>20</sup> The first argues that both the mode of production and the reason (Transcendentalism) of Modernity follow a self-perpetuating movement of deregulation and immanent release which, as Deleuze and Guattari said, is offset by the reconstitution of archaic control mechanisms (faith, neo-tribalism and so on). For him, Deleuze is the best example of a stream of modern philosophy which criticizes transcendental program completion. Faced with deconstruction, which indefinitely radicalizes a non-iconic relationship with the absolute, schizoanalysis believes nothing and extinguishes all nostalgia of belonging and all transcendent principles of justice, participating in the delicious anarchic cosmic irresponsibility. The key point of Land's argument is that schizoanalysis is equal to capital. From his point of view, death is not an external possibility of capital, but its inherent function. The transformation of worker into a zombie (loss of identity, submission to productivity, abstract work, lifelong learning, drugging of emotional life and so on) is seen as alienation by humanism and it is morally condemned. By contrast, in *Anti-Oedipus* (1972) production goes from personality toward an impersonal zero, as if death was the subject of production. Land underlines the thesis of *Anti-Oedipus* in which death is one of the main forms of absorption of surplus-value under capitalism. Revolutionary desire is allied with molecular death which repels the organism

and facilitates uninhibited production flows (deterritorializes, dissolves); by contrast, fascist desire produces ‘molar’ death, which reterritorializes and reinstates social order, segmenting production according to transcendent identities (organs). Land criticizes the change of position that, in his view, Deleuze and Guattari carry out in *A Thousand Plateaus*. While in *Anti-Oedipus*, the revolutionary task is to radicalize the coexistence of capital with internal forces that will ruin it, in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980) such a position is abandoned. This is because they differ between National Socialism and Fascism. While Fascism was determined by an imperative of social order under the domain of a ‘molar’ state, National Socialism was suicidal and used the state as a tool of the instinct of death. Consequently, policies to link us with molecular flows driven in *Anti-Oedipus* turn us into Nazis. It must be stressed, however, that for Land (who did his thesis on Bataille) the death instinct is not a desire to die or to produce death, but a tendency towards the dissipation of ego intensity (by those he claims have explored death: poets, vampires, werewolves and the like). Moreover, he argues that trying not to be a Nazi, you approach Nazism because this can be characterized as effort and moral politics.

Land calls for a solution which would be applied paradigmatically in overcoming the human ‘in’ and ‘through’ the machine. In ‘Circuitries’, he argues that the future of knowledge will be the migration of cognition toward techno-scientific spaces; intelligence will be abstracted from the obsolete anthropoid and moved to software. The machinic is not transcendent or opposed to social relations, but instead integrated into them and it deterritorializes them. In cybernetic models, all items automatically converge without any plan. For this reason, Land says that cybernetics dissolves the dominating features of transcendental philosophy. The cybernetic sense of control is different from the traditional conception of political power based on a lord–slave relationship. The affinity of this position with schizoanalysis is that it discovers and combats the social repression of unconscious and desiring production, which is the impersonal machine and not the representational flow, a mere body without organs which is blocked by social order.

According to Ray Brassier,<sup>21</sup> this conception of criticism, which radicalizes objectives such as materialism, deterritorialization or anti-representationalism, underestimates conceptual consistency and gives all the attention to mere *praxis*. Land radicalizes the materialistic sense of Deleuze’s criticism to Kantian transcendentalism, and he converts all conceptual representation into a function of the matter, which is conceived as a process that synthesizes itself and produces its own representation, which is an absolute transcendental illusion. The problem is how to grasp this process, which is not accessible by intuition. According to Land, this is not a problem, because the only important thing is to know whether schizoanalytic practice accelerates production or not. But the paradox is that the imperative to accelerate deterritorialization means that the end of the acceleration process (zero degree of intensity) is death or cosmic schizophrenia and this neither has nor demands a human subject, but instead demands the elimination of mankind. That is, schizoanalytic deterritorializing practice happens through human subjects and kills them. This explains Land’s criticism of the Marxist left, which would be anachronistic if it relied on human agency, and his defence of deterritorializing impersonal processes in order to instrumentalize neoliberalism to achieve something different and more corrosive.



Land's work has been a source of inspiration for a series of reflections offered by Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams in 2013 under the title 'Accelerate: Manifesto for an Accelerationist Politics'.<sup>22</sup> The presupposition is the same: achieving a new social, economic and political paradigm is not feasible through direct opposition, but it is necessary to accelerate the destructive tendencies of the system, namely, to promote the growth of capital. However, they argue that Land's proposal gives a capacity of acceleration and deterritorialization to neoliberalism which is false, and therefore it should be abandoned. For them, acceleration is not just limited to the speed of the neoliberal capitalist system, and they do not believe that mere economic deregulation implies political and social deregulation. They have an anthropocentric and voluntarist point of view, because they claim the need for traditional policy action. Their positioning, which is more Marxist than Deleuzian, is motivated by the idea that capitalism will not destroy itself and, therefore, it is necessary to plan for and act to prevent the destruction that it brings. The key is that to liquidate capitalism, it is essential to understand acceleration differently, and this requires theoretical and political changes. From the theoretical point of view, they defend a hyper-illustration based on the development of techno-scientific knowledge. From a political point of view, they claim the traditional leftist critique of capitalism as the mode of production which slows progress and represses the forces of production. The aim is to identify the emancipatory potential of capitalist technologies and to focus on post-capitalist ends.

But this leftist orientation of accelerationism does not mean that they refuse to criticize the existing left. To Srnicek and Williams, neither Keynesianism nor Communitarianism is feasible against global capital. The biggest deficiency of the contemporary left is its neo-primitivist localism, which rejects technology and values face-to-face relations as well as local roots as modes of resistance to capitalist relations. By contrast, Srnicek and Williams's accelerationism values new ways of abstraction (e.g. high-frequency trading) and the development of algorithms in capitalist culture, because they interpret them as inhuman spaces of experimentation and development which may accelerate human rational capabilities. Their positioning is that in order to recover the future and to achieve global emancipation, the left should contribute to an effective acceleration, which capitalism no longer brings about, and this requires an articulate criticism and politics with techno-scientific knowledge, and therefore planning.

From this diagnosis concerning the inability of the left to change the political and economic system, Srnicek and Williams present their 'Manifesto for an Accelerationist Politics' as a program of rejuvenation and a new way to achieve such change.

Manifesto is divided into three parts. In the first one (Introduction), they paint a pessimistic diagnosis of the contemporary situation alluding to climate and financial crisis and their effects. According to them, the automation of production processes shows the inability of capitalism to maintain current living standards. Faced with this catastrophe, they argue that current policy is unable to generate the necessary ideas or the models of organization to transform our societies and to stop those threats. With this paralysis of political imagination, the future is cancelled and, what is worse, the global hegemonic political ideology is neoliberalism. They propose a systematic approach to build a new economic model and structural changes in order to promote

solidarity, because without it, the working class is powerless and new social movements are complacent, parochial and unable to conceive a new ideological-political vision.

Before presenting their accelerationist political program, they introduce a critique by Nick Land (Interregnum). According to them, Land is wrong when he argues that the capitalist speed alone is capable of generating a transition to a technological singularity in which the human being will be overcome. We move quickly but within capitalist parameters and unchanged reterritorialization factors. However, acceleration requires an innovation in a universal space of possibilities.

The positioning of Srnicek and Williams is discussed in the third part of Manifesto (On future). Their thesis is that Marx and Land are the thinkers par excellence of accelerationism and that they recognized that, despite all its exploitation and its corruption, capitalism is the most advanced economic system; therefore, if the political left wants to have a future, it should adopt this accelerationist trend. For them, it is not enough to establish small spaces of noncapitalist social relations in order to deal with nonlocal, abstract and everyday enemies. An accelerationist policy must preserve capitalist achievements and simultaneously go beyond what is allowed by its value system and its power structures. The aim of their program is to liberate latent productive forces of technology, repressed and/or directed by capitalism toward ends which block their revolutionary potential target. This project does not require the destruction of the material basis of neoliberalism, but rather the rephrasing and acceleration of it in order to recognize its potential and to achieve postcapitalism. According to them, technology is necessary but not sufficient without any sociopolitical action. A post-capitalist system requires postcapitalist planning and an ecosystem of organizations. Therefore, they identify three objectives in order to generate a new hegemony and a new technical and postcapitalist social platform: (1) to build an intellectual infrastructure that includes a new ideology, new socioeconomic models and institutions to bring it about; (2) to reform the media and submit it to popular control and (3) to rebuild the various forms of class power and to integrate the various proletarian identities. This accelerationist program aims to free the potential alienated by capitalism and retrieve objectives like transcending earth and our limits.<sup>23</sup>

In short, it goes against Land's accelerationism, which believes that automatism of the desiring-capitalist machine brings emancipation: Srnicek and Williams's accelerationism is more enlightened and humanist. However, in Land, acceleration is an ontological process and in Srnicek and Williams, it is a political program. Both positions recognize the capitalist ratio and its perfectibility, the claim of the future and the questioning of the traditional left.

#### **4. Other strategies against the pathologies of modern acceleration**

I began this article presenting two great presuppositions, namely, that there is a transcendental relationship between time and politics (the experience of time conditionally affects the experience of politics and vice versa) and theology determines the understanding and experience of time and politics (therefore, a particular theological understanding of time is an index and factor for the specific understanding of politics; and the other way around; a particular theological categorization of politics presupposes and demands a certain approach and experience of temporality). One consequence is

that understanding contemporary politics requires taking into account the theological *arcanum* which frames its premodern sense and modern developments. The authors and texts examined help prove that these assumptions are persuasive: time and politics (both the concepts and experiences of both) are mutually dependent, that is, they hold a transcendental relationship with each other. Likewise, theology emerges as the theoretical *arcanum* that determines the concepts and experiences of time and politics. This shows that if we wish to understand the present, it is legitimate and necessary to develop a genealogy or conceptual history that goes back to a theological premodern past.

If we look at the concrete, that is, if we consider the positions on political institutions that are maintained by the authors and texts that we have examined, it is possible to synthesize the examined arguments into two antagonistic positions that share two convictions: to consider institutions as an index and factor of regulations and as a means to delay the anomie and, in parallel, to consider capitalism as an index and factor of anomie (deterritorialization, uprooting and anarchy). From here on, there are positions which defend the legitimacy of and the need for institutions and others which embrace the anomic state, either from transcendent/religious perspectives (which refer to messianic life) or from immanentists/marxist perspectives (which propose to use the capitalist anomie against capitalism, accelerating it to annihilate it).

The religious-messianic perspective (in its religious or secular version) means to consider all institutional mediations as illegitimate. In front of them, this unpolitical thought claims either a direct contact with the event of the absolute or an indefinite postponement thereof.<sup>24</sup>

In this context, while recognizing the diversity of theoretical positions which legitimate demo-liberal institutions, there is a more interesting critical analysis of novel accelerationist arguments, which seek to delegitimize and overcome them. In addition, as I will analyze, accelerationism presents a purely immanent account of the end, but its deterministic and teleological nature implies a theological dimension.

It is possible to identify several deficiencies in the various versions of contemporary accelerationism. The first one is this paradox: an anticapitalist position legitimizes capitalism as the only thinkable and possible horizon, and also encourages the acceleration of financial trends which are driven by cyber technologies. This proposal also reinforces the idea of capitalism as a dematerialization operator and minimizes (or idealizes) its dangers because it changes the image of the horror of the world of work in the *jouissance* of immersion into the acceleration of real forces, that is, machinic immersion. In short, the accelerationism granted to capitalism is a monopoly for imagining the future.<sup>25</sup>

This underestimation (even idealization) of dangers of capitalism is accompanied (and sustained) by a misunderstanding of capitalism itself. Contemporary accelerationists lack a solvent and informed analysis of capitalism, so their proposals are unfalsifiable and can only raise esthetic adhesions and not political adhesions. When we read some texts by accelerationists such as Nick Land or Sadie Plant, including Mackay, Wilkins or Wolfendale, to name a few authors I have already mentioned, it is easy to have the feeling that their diagnoses and proposals are anti-intuitive and inconsistent with the facts. That feeling is based on the absence of solid theoretical foundations for the analysis of the essence and foundations of capitalism. In general, the accelerationists

I have studied reduce capitalism to certain topics and clichés that always refer to overcoming what is human, namely: deterritorialization, displacement, dissolution, alienation and so on. Furthermore, they consider that these factors are positive, underestimating their dangers, and marginalizing and questioning other aspects of capitalism that are usually associated with freedom, progress, improvement of living conditions and so on. Also, they exaggerate deregulation, forgetting that the market is also full of rules; at the same time, they roundly defend the end of the sovereignty of nation states and the existence of a single global market in which productivity and economic transactions are totally unrelated to real work, that is, are absolutely abstract. But this is not true: productivity and wealth are still based, ultimately, on material work (although this is hidden sometimes in marginalized neighborhoods and countries), not only in virtual speculation and credit.

Along this line of thought, we can locate the postapocalyptic humanism of accelerationism, which identifies the redemption and disappearance of humanity. This apocalypse will not be generated by a transcendent reality but by the immanent tendencies of the present, for example, in the abstraction and algorithms of High Frequency Trading.<sup>26</sup> Contemporary capitalism is linked to a fetishism of the abstract, which is indifferent to human work and actual human beings, and accelerationists see this as a promise of redemption. But this promise is poor both epistemologically and politically. From the epistemological point of view, Noys invokes Raniero Panzieri's work<sup>27</sup> and Roman Alquati's work<sup>28</sup> to argue that accelerationism underestimates that technology is dead along with mechanized labor. The present is not correctly analyzed because accelerationism remains within a model of productive forces/production relations which aims to extract elements of acceleration of flows, which are inconsistent with reality. Against this, Noys attempts to develop a more realistic analysis of the present and to practice a method of tendency which better links base and superstructure. In his view, it is not possible to overcome the contradiction between labor and capital with a man-machine integration. The real challenge is to discover how to deny the forms of work which control our lives (accelerating them, commodifying them), but avoiding impossible dreams.<sup>29</sup>

In this area of epistemological deficiencies, but also with political significance, Ray Brassier has criticized accelerationism in general, and especially Land's accelerationism, which leads to a conceptually poor hyper-activism and hyper-pragmatism.<sup>30</sup> For Land, every thought is inadequate to grasp absolute intensity (death), and therefore he appeals to an inorganic carrier to reference that experience. Land gives a twist to Kantian transcendentalism: he does not give primacy to the ideal conditioning of the representation of matter, but to the material condition of the ideal representation. That is, thought becomes a function of materiality, that is, a process derived from primary material processes. In other words, he enters the Kantian transcendental synthesis in the material itself. Such rotation aims to go beyond the features of *Homo sapiens* (brain, body, earth, society and so on). For Land it is not a problem to explain how thought can access beings no representationally, because for him such thought is a production process, a *praxis*, and its standard is whether it accelerates or stops primary production. In other words, truth and falsehood are subordinate to the coupling of acceleration and deceleration. When this thesis moves to political practice, it is imperative to accelerate primary production and to object to everything that blocks it. Brassier complains that

matter cannot be subjectivized, that is, thought cannot be hypostatized in this regard. From his point of view, Land assumes a cosmic materialistic eschatology which is a pure impersonal machinic process and leads to the dissolution of humanity. This poses the question of whether there is a limit to absolute deterritorialization or if there is death or cosmic schizophrenia (deterritorialization or total dissolution), that is, the end of the human species as a mere phase of this process. The paradox is that in the schizoanalytic practice of deterritorialization, agency is irrelevant in the process, because every subject is dissolved into it. In other words, the paradox is to desire accelerating the inability of all desire and all acceleration.

Although the critical dimension of accelerationism is proof of its political relevance, the irrelevance of the subject in its acceleration and emancipation allows one to argue that in accelerationism the politics is displaced by an ontological process of deterritorialization in which for the liberation of man means the overcoming of what is human. On this subject, Toni Negri has detected a technological and political determinism in Srnicek and Williams's accelerationism. His argument is that, although the Manifesto is a post-workerism supplement which renews the communist program, it overvalues the trend toward virtuality and underestimates the cooperative dimension of production (and of the production of subjectivity). For Negri, this dimension is central for change to occur in the structure of capitalist exploitation, so that cooperation has got primacy over exploitation. In his view, the fight should be about this issue so that the proletariat can reappropriate and release power.<sup>31</sup>

In a similar approach to Negri, Franco 'Bifo' Berardi has denied that acceleration is the condition for the collapse of capitalist power. His argument is that such acceleration is the essential form of capitalist growth and that the power of capital is not founded on stability, but that it benefits from disaster and is not based on rational decisions but on automation incorporated in technical and administrative devices. Moreover, we cannot assume, as accelerationists do, that the potential contained in capitalism will necessarily display this. According to Berardi, accelerationism is a radicalization of Baudrillard's thesis according to which the only possible strategy is catastrophe and that acceleration will cause the derailment of the capitalist train. But this argument is wrong because capitalist governance captures and creates all subjectivity.<sup>32</sup>

The suspicion of teleological determinism is reinforced when we see that the achieving of the accelerationist proposal is not falsifiable, because it refers to the realization of the future and we can only estimate its probability if we keep the faith in the collapse of capitalism. In this context, it is significant that the accelerationist imagery is the same as science fiction imagery. Noys has analyzed signs of future deterritorialization which accelerationists already see in the present, that is, spaces which supposedly accelerate the infiltration of the future into the present and coexist with others which resist such acceleration, that is, which reterritorialize: the use of drugs, nightclubs, biotechnology, electronic music (especially Jungle, a metaphor for a dehumanized and deterritorialized rhizomatic city), cyberpunk fiction, etc.<sup>33</sup>

In short, accelerationism shares with classical compensation strategies (e.g. Carl Schmitt's invocation to *iuspublicumiuseuropaeum* as *katechon*, or the vindication of history in the works of Koselleck, Ritter, Rothacker, Conze or Gadamer, among others) concern for the dehumanizing consequences (deterritorializing, uprooting) of liberal capitalism. But unlike the Weberian and humanistic strategies of these authors, which

aimed to strengthen subjective dimensions with the goal of not succumbing to the demands of acceleration of industrial modernity and mass democracy, accelerationism applauds such acceleration and proposes to intensify it to the point, that paradoxically and contrafactually, it can achieve absolute deterritorialization and consequently the improvement of all human subjective identity thanks to its dissolution in the cosmic flow of particle and data.

Although it is problematic to identify liberal capitalism with the alternation of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, dissolution and identity recomposition, it is possible to share the concern about its dehumanizing effects and, however, try not to fight them with unfalsifiable and counterfactual strategies, which are also allied with it, as in an accelerationist strategy, or others which are mere moralism which is powerless in practice and deficient in theory, such as the containment of consumption, support for local power/decentralization against globalization, the rejection of technology and so on.

For that reason, the priority is to develop a more rigorous analysis which identifies dehumanizing effects in contemporary societies. In this regard, the author who can guide us is Hans U. Gumbrecht. His knowledge of theories of compensation and of contemporary philosophy makes his work on some of these issues particularly intriguing. Gumbrecht can help us think of an alternative because he has also diagnosed modern society with having an accelerated and dis-incarnated life, abstract and rootless. In addition, he has described the human species as a species always under threat of losing the intensity of its energy and ending its evolutionary journey.

Specifically, Gumbrecht's position on this issue (which is close to Agamben, Esposito or Nancy) is to maintain that the pathology of accelerated modernity is the same as the pathology which contemporary globalization has inherited: devaluation of the body as a constituent part of subjectivity.<sup>34</sup> In his view, the modern defense of thought as a principle of subjectivity, paradigmatically present in the Descartes' cogito argument, converted time into the basic structure of such subjectivity; this allows one to concentrate on the future and to convert a guarantee of the future into a guarantee of existence. Globalization would be the consequence of these premises because it technically ensures that the world is full of communication and allows a subject, which is pure thinking, to feel himself always active in the infinite circulation of meaning and capital, thus avoiding imagining a final or positive utopia, moreover identifying accelerated mobilization as a utopia. Significantly, Gumbrecht holds that both deconstruction and Deleuze's thesis on virtuality are key categories of globalization understood as endless circulation of meaning, a permanent flow of communication.

Based on this thesis, José Luis Villacañas has argued that Modernity is not the overcoming of gnosis (against Blumenberg), but it and its global result are an emphasis on gnosis.<sup>35</sup> His argument is that both refer to the assertiveness of human thought and so they develop the basic premise of Gnosticism: the ability to deny, to form and to technify the body. Gumbrecht also defends that the virtual space of the network (a non-place which is the basis and consequence of globalization) shows that the gnostic experience is the feature of our time. The intensification of the culture of meaning marginalizes desires and other universal existential dimensions, that is, globalization ignores presence, physical spaces and face-to-face meetings. Gumbrecht does not defend the deconstruction of meaning or maintaining the mere assertion of presence,

but supports the harmonization of meaning and body. Against immersion in communication flows, which are brought about by new technologies and that are idealized by accelerationists, he claims a compensatory presence of bodies. In particular, he stresses the value of rituals in which the present is affirmed through celebration experiences that have no other purpose than themselves: sports, museum visits and so on. Such experiences are not legitimized by looking into the past not because they lead to a future, but because they aim to keep all simultaneities available. With such experiences, there is no desire to reconcile thought and body, but only to identify a framework from which to continue resisting, thinking, changing and living.

From my point of view, an experience of time and a type of politics that avoids the paradoxes contained in messianism and accelerationism, which hide problematic theological inheritance (determinism, teleology, institutional anti-radicalism, etc.), should not give up their sense and meaning, as seems to be suggested by Gumbrecht, but need to claim the experience of the body as the primary source of meaning and significance. That is, the goal could be to overcome reductionism that only values the body and action as a means to achieve a purpose. In other words, the aim is to consider the body as pure appearance, event, disposition, exposition (*ex-peau-sition*, if we use an intelligent expression of Jean-Luc Nancy). And, in the same way, to consider action as a mere gesture that vindicates nothing but itself. Behind these objectives what is hidden is the desire to stop the idolatry of the will, the desire to suspend (even momentarily, in specific and fleeting experiences) the myth of action, the *ratio* of the means–ends analysis (and the theology hidden in it). And this is to say that the-body-that-we-are need not be redeemed, it is required and does not need to be saved. This perspective means that we attach value to all things, that is, that we use things but do not treat them as a means but as an end. Thus, distinction between rationality of means and rationality of ends is exceeded. Therefore, we do not give up a transcendence that gives meaning to life, but we place it on things themselves.

From this perspective, the challenge, then, is to locate, practices and bodily experiences that do not have any intention and are not instruments or the means for any purpose in the various areas of action. I mean practices and bodily experiences that transcend every principle, every order and every hierarchy. There are ranges of repetitive exercises, which are mechanical and allow the subject to transcend all purpose and to become absorbed: automatic writing, recitations, mantras and prayers, and even warming-up exercises in sports (calisthenics) etc. There are also self-absorbing art practices: hyper-abstract painting, jazz, etc. All examples that may be proposed are inadequate because the objective that we pursue is positive (i.e. to assert and vindicate the factuality of being – of body) but can only be achieved indirectly, that is, looking at experiences that are not easily linked to a purpose other than being themselves. Thus, these are only examples, but they can be considered as a historical action index which, unlike traditional political action, do not intend to either delay or accelerate the end of time (or the time of the end), but rather set it aside and, thus, also suspend all its principles, norms, institutions and hierarchies.

## Notes

1. Monod, *Querelle de La sécularisation*, 7ss.
2. Schmitt, *Political Theology*, 42–45; and Schmitt, *Nomos of the Earth*, 65.

3. Taubes, *Political Theology of Paul*, 70–75, 134; and Stimilli, *Sovranità e tempo messianico*, 260.
4. See Cohn, *Pursuit of the Millenium*.
5. See Galindo, *Política y mesianismo*.
6. Agamben, *The Time That Remains*, 10ss., 60ss.
7. Agamben, *The Time That Remains*, 30ss.; Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, 70ss.; and Agamben, *Mesías y el soberano*, 265.
8. Agamben, *The Time That Remains*, 30–50; and Agamben, *State of Exception*, 90ss.
9. Koselleck, *Futures Past*, 32.
10. Koselleck, *Futures Past*, 51ss., 119ss., 331ss.
11. Koselleck, *Los estratos del tiempo*, 109–111.
12. Koselleck, *Aceleración, prognosis y secularización*, 39–40; and Koselleck, *Futures Past*, 20ss., 55ss.
13. Koselleck, *Aceleración, prognosis y secularización*, 71.
14. Noys, *Persistence of the Negative*, IX–XI, 5–11.
15. Noys, *Malign Velocities*, 3–5; Pasquinelli, “Il lavoro dell’astrazione,” 44–51; and Wolfendale, “So, Accelerationism.”
16. Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 239.
17. Noys, *Malign Velocities*, 49–62.
18. Plant and Land, “Cyberpositive,” 308.
19. Mackay and Brassier, *Fanged Noumena*, 261–287, 289–318.
20. Land, “Machinic Desire,” 471–482.
21. Brassier, “Accelerationism.”
22. Johnson, *Dark Trajectories*, 135–155; and Mackay and Avanesian, *#Accelerate#*, 347–362.
23. A similar accelerationist proposal on the revolutionary possibility of a digital communism which avoids both machinic and humanist determinism, in Dyer-Witheford, “Piattaforme per una abbondanza,” 52–77.
24. Galindo, “Mesianismo impolítico,” 239–250; and Galindo, *Pensamiento impolítico contemporáneo*, 18–27.
25. Noys, *Malign Velocities*, 23, 49–62; Noys, *Pleasures and Pains*; and Williams, “Back to the Future.”
26. Parisi, “Holes in the Machine,” 126–133; Wilkins and Dragos, “Destructive Destruction?”; and Srnicek and Williams, “On Cunning Automata.”
27. Panzieri, “Surplus Value and Planning,” 4–25.
28. Alquati, “Organic Composition of Capital.”
29. Noys, “Days of Phuture Past”; and Noys, *Malign Velocities*, 63–72, 93–104.
30. Brassier, “Accelerationism”; and Mackay and Brassier, *Fanged Noumena*.
31. Negri, “Riflessioni sul Manifesto,” 29–38.
32. Berardi, “Time, Acceleration, and Violence”; and Berardi, “L’accelerazionismo in questione,” 39–51.
33. Noys, “Accelerate Europe.”
34. Gumbrecht, *Production of Presence*; and Gumbrecht, *Unsere breite Gegenwart*.
35. Villacañas, “Descubriendo polizones,” 11–30.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Notes on contributor

*Alfonso Galindo Hervás* is Assistant Professor of Political Philosophy and History of Political Ideas at The Faculty of Philosophy (University of Murcia). Some of his publications (only books):



*La soberanía. de la teología política al comunitarismo impolítico*. Murcia: Res Publica, 2003; *Política y mesianismo. Giorgio Agamben*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2005 (and Ujaldón, Enrique) *La cultura política liberal. Pasado, presente y futuro*. Madrid: Tecnos, 2014; *Pensamiento impolítico contemporáneo. Ontología (y) política en Agamben, Badiou, Esposito y Nancy*. Madrid: Sequitur, 2015; (and Ujaldón, Enrique) *Diez mitos de la democracia. Contra la demagogia y el populismo*. Córdoba: Almuzara, 2016.

## Bibliography

- Agamben, G. *Homo Sacer*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Agamben, G. *The Time That Remains*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005a.
- Agamben, G. *State of Exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005b.
- Agamben, G. “El Mesías y el soberano” [The Messiah and the Sovereign]. In *La potencia del pensamiento* [The Power of Thought], edited by G. Agamben. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2008. English version: *Potentialities. Collected Essays in Philosophy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Alquati, R. 2013. “Organic Composition of Capital and Labour-Power at Olivetti.” *Viewpoint Magazine*, no. 3. <http://viewpointmag.com/2013/09/27/organic-composition-of-capital-and-labor-power-at-olivetti-1961/>
- Berardi, F. “Time, Acceleration, and Violence.” *E-flux*, no. 27 (2011). <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/time-acceleration-and-violence/>
- Berardi, F. “L’accelerazionismo in questione dal punto di vista del corpo” [The Accelerationism in Question from the Point of View of the Body]. In *Gli algoritmi del capitale. Accelerazionismo, macchine della conoscenza e autonomia del comune* [The Algorithms of the Capital. Accelerationism, Machinery of Knowledge and Autonomy of the Common], edited by M. Pasquinelli, 39–51. Verona: Ombrecorte, 2014.
- Brassier, R. 2010. “Accelerationism.” <https://moskvax.wordpress.com>
- Cohn, N. *The Pursuit of the Millennium*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Deleuze, G., and F. Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. New York: Penguin, 1977.
- Dyer-Witheford, N. “Piattaforme per una abbondanza rossa” [Platforms for a red abundance]. In *Gli algoritmi del capitale. Accelerazionismo, macchine della conoscenza e autonomia del comune* [The Algorithms of the Capital. Accelerationism, Machinery of Knowledge and Autonomy of the Common], edited by M. Pasquinelli, 52–77. Verona: Ombrecorte, 2014.
- Galindo, A. *Política y mesianismo. Giorgio Agamben* [Politics and Messianism. Giorgio Agamben]. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2005.
- Galindo, A. “Mesianismo impolítico” [Unpolitical Messianism]. *Isegoría*, no. 39 (2008): 239–250.
- Galindo, A. *Pensamiento impolítico contemporáneo. Ontología (y) política en Agamben, Badiou, Esposito y Nancy* [Contemporary Unpolitical Thought. Ontology (and) Politics in Agamben, Badiou, Esposito and Nancy]. Madrid: Sequitur, 2015.
- Gumbrecht, H. U. *Production of Presence: What Meaning Cannot Convey*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- Gumbrecht, H. U. *Unsere breite Gegenwart* [Our wide presence]. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2011.
- Hartog, F. *Regimes of Historicity, Presentism and Experiences of Time*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.
- Johnson, J., ed. *Dark Trajectories: Politics of the Outside*. Hong Kong: Name, 2013.
- Koselleck, R. *Los estratos del tiempo: estudios sobre la historia* [The Layers of Time: Studies on History]. Barcelona: Paidós, 2001.
- Koselleck, R. *Aceleración, prognosis y secularización* [Acceleration, Prognosis and Secularization]. Valencia: Pre-Textos, 2003.
- Koselleck, R. *Futures Past. On the Semantics of Historical Time*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Land, N. “Machinic Desire.” *Textual Practice* 7, no. 3 (1993): 471–482. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09502369308582177>.

- Mackay, R., and A. Avanesian, eds. *#Accelerate#*. Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2014.
- Mackay, R., and R. Brassier, eds. *Fanged Noumena: Collected Writings 1987-2007*. Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2013.
- Monod, J.-C. *La querelle de la sécularisation. Théologie politique et philosophies de l'histoire de Hegel à Blumenberg* [The Complaint of Secularization. Political Theology and Philosophies of History from Hegel to Blumenberg]. Paris: Vrin, 2002.
- Negri, A. "Riflessioni sul Manifesto per una Politica Accelazionista" [Reflections on the Manifesto for an Accelerationist Policy]. In *Gli algoritmi del capitale. Accelazionismo, macchine della conoscenza e autonomia del comune* [The Algorithms of the Capital. Accelerationism, Machinery of Knowledge and Autonomy of the Common], edited by M. Pasquinelli, 29–38. Verona: Ombrecorte, 2014.
- Noys, B. *The Persistence of the Negative*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Noys, B. "Days of Phuture Past: Accelerationism in the Present Moment." Accelerationism- A Symposium on Tendencies in Capitalism, 2013. [https://www.academia.edu/5383550/Days\\_of\\_Phuture\\_Past\\_Accelerationism\\_in\\_the\\_Present\\_Moment](https://www.academia.edu/5383550/Days_of_Phuture_Past_Accelerationism_in_the_Present_Moment)
- Noys, B. *Malign Velocities. Accelerationism and Capitalism*. Winchester: Zero Books, 2014a.
- Noys, B. *The Pleasures and Pains of Accelerationism*. New York: Center for the Humanities at the Graduate Center, 2014b.
- Noys, B. "Accelerate Europe: the Geographical Imaginaries of Accelerationism." In *European Provocations*. London: Forum for European Philosophy, LSE, 2014c. [https://www.academia.edu/9635927/Accelerate\\_Europe\\_The\\_Geographical\\_Imaginaries\\_of\\_Accelerationism](https://www.academia.edu/9635927/Accelerate_Europe_The_Geographical_Imaginaries_of_Accelerationism)
- Panzieri, R. "Surplus Value and Planning: Notes on the Reading of Capital." *CSE Pamphlet*, no. 1 (1976): 4–25.
- Parisi, L. "The Holes in the Machine: An Interview with Luciana Parisi." *Nyx: A Nocturnal*, no. 7: "Machines" (2012): 126–133.
- Pasquinelli, M. "Il lavoro dell'astrazione. Sette tesi su marxismo e accelazionismo" [The work of abstraction. Seven Thesis on Marxism and Accelerationism]. In *Gli algoritmi del capitale. Accelazionismo, macchine della conoscenza e autonomia del comune* [The Algorithms of the Capital. Accelerationism, Machinery of Knowledge and Autonomy of the Common], edited by M. Pasquinelli, 44–51. Verona: Ombrecorte, 2014.
- Plant, S., and N. Land. "Cyberpositive." In *#Accelerate#*, edited by R. Mackay and A. Avanesian, 303–313. Falmouth: Urbanomic, 1994.
- Schmitt, C. *Political Theology. Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Cambridge: M. I. T. Press, 1985.
- Schmitt, C. *The Nomos of the Earth*. New York: Telos Press Publishing, 2003.
- Srnicek, N., and A. Williams. "Manifesto for an Accelerationist Politics." In *Dark Trajectories: Politics of the Outside*, edited by J. Johnson, 135–155. Hong Kong: Name, 2013a.
- Srnicek, N., and A. Williams. "On Cunning Automata: Financial Acceleration and the Limits of the Dromological." *Collapse VIII* (2013b).
- Stimilli, E. *Jacob Taubes. Sovranità e tempo messianico* [Jacob Taubes. Sovereignty and Messianic Time]. Brescia: Morcelliana, 2004.
- Taubes, J. *The Political Theology of Paul*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Villacañas, J. L. "Descubriendo polizones: H. U. Gumbrecht y su mirada sobre el presente" [Discovering Stowaways: H. U. Gumbrecht and His Gaze on the Present]. In *La ontología de la presencia. Aproximación a la obra de Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht* [The Ontology of Presence. Approach to the Work of Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht], edited by A. Rivera and J. L. Villacañas, 11–30. Valencia: Kyrios, 2012.
- Wilkins, I., and B. Dragos. 2012. "Destructive Destruction? An Ecological Study of High Frequency Trading." *Mute Magazine* 3.4. <http://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/destructive-destruction-ecological-study-high-frequency-trading#>
- Williams, A. "Back to the Future? Technopolitics and the Legacy of the CCRU." *Berlin*, no. 1 (2013). <http://www.orphandriftarchive.com/neofuture/ctm13-berlin.php>
- Wolfendale, P. 2014. "So, Accelerationism, What's All that About?" <http://deontologistics.tumblr.com/post/91953882443/so-accelerationism-whats-all-that-about>