With this second issue of Intersections, the Center for International Education (CIE) introduces its fourth cohort of Global Studies Research Fellows: Professors Ivan Ascher (Political Science), Rachel Buff (History/Ethnic Studies), Carolyn Eichner (History/Women’s Studies), Scott Graham (English), and Bernard Perley (Anthropology). Since 2000, CIE has been proud to support innovative research that redraws the boundaries of traditional globalization and internationalization studies by expanding cross-disciplinary dialogue and debate across the humanities, social sciences, and professions. In this issue, the Fellows provide an overview of the research projects that are their primary focus during this academic year, with topics spanning global economic systems, immigrant rights, feminist activism, the pharmaceutical industry, and indigenous economies. At CIE’s annual spring conference, the Global Studies Research Fellows will share their work with UWM students, faculty, and staff, along with scholars from around the world. This issue of Intersections provides a preview of only some of the important and engaging topics that will be addressed at the conference itself, this year dedicated to exploring the theme of “After Capitalism” and the political, economic, artistic, and social processes and practices of our time.

Patrice Petro - Vice Provost for International Education
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In 1848, the Manifesto of the Communist Party opened with the following words: “A specter is haunting Europe – the specter of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have formed a holy alliance to exorcise this specter – Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French radicals and German police spies. Where is the party in opposition that hasn’t been decried as communistic by its opponents in power? What is the opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?” From this, Marx and Engels claimed, two facts follow: First, Communism is “acknowledged to be itself a power.” Second, it is high time that Communists should openly publish their views and “meet this nursery tale of the Specter of Communism with a manifesto of the party itself” (Marx and Engels 33-34).

A hundred and fifty years after Marx and Engels met this nursery tale with a horror story of their own – the story of alienation and capitalist exploitation of the working class, a specter is once again haunting Europe and the world: the specter of capitalism. Where the ruling classes once needed to conjure the threat of a Communist revolution to keep themselves in power, the specter of a financial crisis now seems sufficient to enforce the discipline required by capital. Merkel and Hollande, the IMF and S&P, French Socialists and German Christian Democrats, all the powers of the new Europe have formed an alliance to exorcise this specter, evoking the threat of a credit-rating downgrade to impose ever-more stringent austerity measures on countries in Southern Europe and beyond.

Two things follow from this fact. First, that capitalism is believed to be itself a power – a power that is only strengthened, ironically, by the critique made by Marx and Engels in the Manifesto. Second, it is now necessary to meet these horror stories of capitalism with a different vision of capitalism – of what it is and what it can be.

Financial Derivatives and the Fetishism of the Security

In 1867, Karl Marx in Capital sought to present the capitalist mode of production in all its strangeness and monstrosity (Berman; Neocleous; Baldick). From an analysis that began with the appearance of wealth as a “monstrous collection of commodities,” Marx arrived at the demonstration that capital was but “dead labor,” which, like a vampire, only “lives by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks” (Marx, 257). Today, as the monstrosity of capitalism is being felt around the world and zombies are said to be at the gates, Marx’s analysis remains a helpful guide. But where in the 19th century capitalism produced and exchanged commodities, it seems that capital today deals only in financial derivatives; and while labor may once have been the source of all profit, wealth now seems to come from the management of risk. What is the nature of wealth in financial capital, and what does the exchange of derivative securities make possible? What violence does it conceal, what politics does it produce? Such are the questions I have been trying to address in my own work, through a reinterpretation of Capital that is, at the same time, a critique of capital itself.

Like the market for commodities, the market for derivatives is nothing new. Already in Ancient Greece, Thales speculated on the future price of olives, having observed the weather and anticipated its consequences for the next year’s harvest. Typically, derivatives serve specific functions for whoever chooses to buy them. But in the last forty years, as the market for derivatives has expanded dramatically, derivative contracts have come to be valued not for the specific advantages each of them provides but for what Marx might have called their “exchange value” – or more precisely, for their value in the construction of hedging portfolios with which to manage the risks entailed by other investments.

What is the nature of the value that is expressed in derivatives trading? If the commodities of yore had in common the fact that they were products of labor (and therefore, thought Marx, objects of value), what derivatives have in common is that they contain risk. They “contain” risk, that is, in both senses of the word: they serve to limit the potential damage created by the price volatility of an underlying asset, and they are therefore thought to contain a measure of abstract risk. Of course, it is not that we exchange derivatives because we think of them as “material integuments” of risk, but by exchanging them – i.e. by treating them as securities, so we effectively reduce all kinds of risk to the category of risk in general (Lee and LiPuma). Of course we know that this makes us all vulnerable to a potential systemic crisis (think of the “subprime crisis” of 2007-2008), yet we persist in doing so. Drawing from Marx, I call this the fetishism that attaches to financial contracts once they are produced as securities, when our socialized relations of risk appear to us as their obverse – i.e. as individual securities with which, we think, we can protect ourselves.

Moneybags Must Be So Lucky (or, How To Do Things With Words)

While the question of where value comes from may have been settled – or successfully circumvented – by modern finance, the nature and source of profit remains a mystery. After all, it remains a basic tenet of modern economics that securities are exchanged at their value, since the Black-Scholes model for options pricing rules out the possibility of “arbitrage” (Black and Scholes 637). How then can we account for the growing wealth of financiers, if the securities they trade are by definition exchanged at their value?

In 1867, Marx solved an equivalent mystery by following his friend the capitalist to the market: there, Mr. Moneybags was lucky enough to find a unique commodity, labor-power, which has the specificity of creating for the person acquiring it more value than is required to reproduce it. More concretely, of course, what Mr. Moneybags found was a mass of people in desperate need of a wage: individuals who were free to sell their
labor-power but were also compelled by poverty to do so. Today, Mr. Moneybags finds people in need of credit – individuals who are free to take on credit card debt (animals “with the right to make promises,” as Nietzsche put it), but have no choice but to do so if they wish to survive in this credit economy (Nietzsche 59; Lazzarato).

Why is Moneybags so happy? Much as workers once mixed their labor into the raw materials provided to them by their employer, so borrowers now mix their credibility or their probability into the promissory notes they sign every day. And in an age when consumption is mediated by credit, it is now possible for financial institutions to determine the probability that these debts will be repaid. Lenders can thus grant individuals precisely the credit line they need to reproduce themselves as borrowers, while simultaneously securitizing these debts and turning into profit whatever needs and aspirations had motivated them to borrow in the first place.

The Best of Architects and the Worst of Bees

Whether the securitization of debt makes possible the creation of value or merely that of profit remains an open question, but it is clear that it makes possible a new kind of society: one that draws on our ability to imagine a different world while thwarting our efforts to bring it about. As Marx famously put it, the worst of architects is superior to the best of bees in one thing at least: he imagines a house in his mind before building it in reality. But as Aristotle also points out, humans differ from bees in other ways as well. For instance, we are endowed with the faculty of speech and reason (logos), which allows us not only to develop notions “in common” but also to live as properly political animals (zoon politikon) (Aristotle 28). Indeed, we not only decide for ourselves what kind of city we wish to live in, we can even undertake to build it together. In doing so we take some chances, of course, we run the risk of failing, but that is why we make commitments.

Under conditions of speculative capital, however, man’s very nature as political animal seems all but taken from him. Much as Marx worried that man’s productive activity was being dictated by capital and that the products of his labor confronted him as someone else’s property, so today the kind of polis we are able to build is increasingly dictated by a force outside ourselves – “the market,” and the various commitments we make – the various chances that we take, now confront us as so many options, treasury bonds and credit default swaps with which others can speculate, capitalizing not only on our successes but on our capacity to fail. Financial capital thus seems to prey not only on our future income, but on our very ability to imagine a future for ourselves and make commitments accordingly.

Beyond the Zombie Apocalypse

In such a context, what kind of political agency can we expect? Already in the 19th century, capitalism depended on the ideology of liberalism to isolate individuals from each other, pitting them against each other in a competition for ever-diminishing wages. Today, thanks to the rise of neoliberal governmentality and to advances in the field of probability, capital has become more cunning yet. Indeed, it seems that capital no longer needs a mass of laboring individuals (who might one day realize their potential as a revolutionary class), since it can simply construct a population of individuals, whose history can be captured as a distribution of risk profiles. Capital not only profits from existing inequalities among people’s level of vulnerability, but does so by pitting us against each other in new and invisible ways, since the mere act of using a credit card implicates us in the calculus of someone else’s credit score and, therefore, their ability to borrow.

In light of the above, it seems unlikely that we will soon see the emergence of the proletariat as a revolutionary subject – or even the consolidation of the “precariat” as unified class. At the same time, however, the new forms of protests that have been spawned by the recent financial crisis suggest that a new world is possible, provided that the very notion of possibility be rescued from the capitalist logic of securitization and risk management. As we have seen, contemporary capitalism draws on a vision of the future that is reduced to a set of possible events, the probability of which can be mathematically determined. While such a conception of the future may encourage a certain ethos of preparedness – evident in the emerging field of “risk management” or in the countless cultural references to the zombie apocalypse, it does little to address present inequalities and specific vulnerabilities. Risk, it turns out, does not exist as an abstraction. Like labor, it is what Karl Polanyi called a fictitious commodity. Simply put, risk is always risk to someone, even if it does not seem so from the perspective of the hedge fund manager who trades in securities. The market for risk is always embedded in actual social relations, and to pretend otherwise not only ensures that we do violence to the communities built on these relations; it also makes possible a form of alienation from which no amount of security can protect us.
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In 2006, an immigrant rights movement burst into public consciousness in the United States. Some commentators wondered whether this might be a new Civil Rights movement for the 21st century. But immigrants have organized against restrictionist policies since the Page Act first targeted Chinese migrants in 1875. Throughout the 20th century and into the 21st, immigrant rights advocates have collaborated with labor and civil rights activists. Immigrant rights, then, is a civil right movement for the 21st century. My study uncovers its deep roots in the twentieth.

Immigrant rights discourse in the mid-20th century contained myriad transnational imaginings of life after capitalism. Many of the foreign born individuals targeted for deportation in this period were, or had previously been, engaged in progressive causes through the broad pro-labor, anti-racist and anti-imperialist culture of the 1930s Popular Front. The cultural politics of the Popular Front included a vivid imagination of life after capitalism. Part of why the State Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service pursued the deportations of so many foreign-born activists in the early Cold War period was to disrupt these broadcasts of an alternative future.

Immigrant rights advocates broadcast their vision through movement as well as mass media. During the early Cold War, they were fairly successful in gaining a hearing for foreign born individuals targeted for deportation. Although many of those targeted were political radicals, advocates publicized their rights as workers, family members and, more broadly, as denizens of American communities. But by the time of immigration reform in 1965, and certainly in the present day, few readers of mass media are aware of either the scale of deportations or the names of any foreign born individuals struggling against it. This brief essay considers the stakes and the cause of this transition.

In April of 1958, the Immigration and Naturalization Service kidnapped Finnish American draftsman William Heikkila on his way home from work in San Francisco. Long targeted by INS Commissioner Joseph May Swing as a dangerous subversive, Heikkila was escorted by Assistant Northern California District INS Director Stan Olson to the airport. The two men flew to Vancouver, British Columbia, where Heikkila was held incommunicado in a local jail, under a fake name. The FBI questioned him. A friend phoned Heikkila’s wife to let her know what had happened. Well aware of the long federal campaign against her husband, Phyllis Heikkila immediately began calling the press and the immigration courts (Helenius).

After staying overnight in Vancouver, Heikkila and Olson boarded a Canadian Pacific flight bound across the North Pole to Helsinki. On the plane, they sat next to a Finnish Canadian logger who was also headed to Finland, to visit relatives. Heikkila spoke to the logger in Finnish and related the story of his kidnapping. When the plane was delayed for mechanical repairs, all the passengers except Heikkila were allowed to deplane. The logger called his family, who alerted the Canadian media. When the plane landed in Helsinki, Heikkila and Olson were greeted by an international array of journalists. Thus commenced a high profile scandal, in which the kidnapping of William Heikkila became a symbol of abuse of power by the INS.

Fifty-one years later, in August, 2007, Mexican American activist Elvira Arellano was arrested on the street outside of Our Lady Queen of Angels Church in Los Angeles. She had taken refuge in a sanctuary church in Humboldt Park, Chicago a year before. Arellano left Chicago to travel the nation and campaign for immigration reform. Upon her arrest, Arellano was taken to a federal detention center. She was then deported to her native Mexico, enduring separation from her eight-year-old American citizen son, Saul.

Sometimes referred to as the “most famous immigrant in America,” Arellano became an activist after she was among many undocumented airport workers arrested in Homeland Security sweeps in 2002. Working with national immigrant rights networks, Arellano intentionally drew publicity to her case. Her intent was to broadcast the dire situation of thousands of undocumented migrants targeted for deportation by the Department of Homeland Security.

The deportation of Elvira Arellano did not create a scandal of nearly the same proportion as did the kidnapping of William Heikkila. While it was noted in both Mexican and US media, coverage of Arellano’s deportation was infused by a sense that her status as an “illegal alien” justified her deportation. In the words of Chicago Spanish-language radio host Javier Salas, “I’m not happy that this happened, but it was bound to happen, because she was challenging the system” (Chicago Tribune).

Mass mediated structures of feeling about the deportations of “red aliens” during the early Cold War differed markedly from those about the deportations of “illegal aliens” after 9/11. As Ethnic Studies scholar Otto Santa Ana persuasively argued, the metaphors by which “everyday American public discourse” understands migrants crucially shapes public policy (xviii).

The difference in mass media responses to the two deportations can be largely explained by the increased power and circulation of the term “illegal alien,” first during Operation Wetback, and then after the Immigration Act of 1965. William Heikkila was an avowed communist, a “red alien” living in the United States during a widely publicized national security crisis in which communists were perceived to be the central threat. But the media depicted him as an individual, deserving of justice. In contrast, Elvira Arellano professed no “un-American” ideology. But her status as an undocumented Mexican-American woman undermined her attempts to claim rights or to solicit popular sympathy.
The removals of Heikkila and Arellano were separated by half a century. Both took place during periods of crisis over national security. But the contrast between mass mediated narratives about them is striking. Depictions of Arellano in even moderately sympathetic media coverage adhere to powerful narratives of “illegal aliens” as undeserving criminals. Given the racialized history of immigration exclusion, it stands to reason that Heikkila, as a European American/white man, was able to escape such portrayals. But in the same time period, the deportations of radicals of color, such as Trinidadian American Claudia Jones, Jamaican American Ferdinand Smith, and the Korean American intellectuals associated with the diasporic newspaper Korean Independence also occasioned some sympathy for these “red aliens.” Depictions of these foreign born activists contrast markedly with profoundly ambivalent mass media attitude towards Latino/a immigrant rights proponents like Arellano.

The dissemination of the “illegal alien” as a racialized and threatening figure corresponded to a shift in mass mediated ideologies around immigrant rights. During the early Cold War, progressive immigrant rights advocates were able to draw on prior political and cultural alliances to conjure sympathy for foreign born progressives being deported. These individuals, along with the organizations representing them, had often been tarred by the accusation of communism. But even amidst the repressive atmosphere of this period, sympathy for the foreign born persisted. Historian Michael Denning explains the persistence of such sympathies as one effect of the long arc of the “cultural front”: the alliance created during the 1930s between workers and intellectuals, many of them foreign born or from second generation immigrant families. Many journalists working in the late 1940s and early 1950s would have been shaped by the experience of this cultural front. Further, Denning argues, the cultural front steeped mass media audiences in a structure of feeling that sympathized with workers and immigrants, identifying them as true and deserving Americans (64, 83).

By the post-9/11 homeland security era immigrant rights organizing had become more institutionalized, with some organizations situated in Washington DC. Activists mobilized huge marches in 2006. But, largely because of the trope of the “illegal alien” it was difficult for these organizations to mobilize broad-based public support for individuals like Elvira Arellano. The trope of the illegal alien mobilized deep fears about racial infiltration at the same time that it dehumanized immigrants.

The inauguration of a Department of Homeland Security (DHS) after 9/11 was accompanied by the acceleration of deportation sweeps. The evolving grammar of Homeland Security conflated unсанctioned border crossing with potential terrorist activity. In turn, this grammar drew on prior understandings of the criminality of “illegal aliens.” As historian Mae Ngai magisterially shows, these prior understandings drew on a long, white supremacist history of immigration restriction. The punch packed by the term “illegal alien” in the era of the DHS conflates criminality, immigration status, and racial identity. This particular distillation originated during the Cold War assault on Mexican migration in Operation Werback, and gathered force after the Immigration and Nationality Acts of 1965. Periodic panics about “illegal immigration,” from Operation Wetback to the present, indicate the ongoing power of the term.

The terms “red alien” and “illegal alien” are ideological distillations. They fix histories of struggle over belonging and rights into particular notions of threats to the body politic. As cultural critic Raymond Williams insisted, structures of feelings are mutable; they respond to the texture of everyday life. Mass mediated ideologies about the foreign born contained and drew on multiple structures of feelings regarding the presence of immigrants in American society. So, the figure of the “red alien” encapsulated the Cold War fear of communism with prior anxieties about “enemy aliens” that resulted in the unopposed internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. At the same time, the term “red alien” did not entirely proscribe sympathy for those in deportation proceedings, as the case of William Heikkila indicates. Immigrant rights advocates were able to mobilize structures of feeling that coexisted with fears of immigrants to create sympathy for individuals facing deportation and, to a lesser extent, to critique public policies towards the foreign born.

Increased circulation of the term “illegal alien” in large measure proscribed widespread sympathy for those targeted for deportation. The context of the contemporary homeland security state delimits sympathies for those deemed to be present “illegally.” But contemporary immigrant rights activists mobilize alternate structures of feeling against the construction of a monolithic ideology.

Mass media discourse about “red aliens” gestured toward the legal rights of those captive to McCarran law sweeps at the same time that it held those accused of subversion at arm’s length. Warmer in its treatment of Euro-Americans than non-whites and suspicious of transnational political affinities, this ambivalent embrace was nonetheless notable at a time of ascendant anti-communism. This ambivalent embrace was infused by residual structures of feelings connected to the popular front. It also drew crucially on the Cold War re-invention of the archaic but abiding American captivity narrative.

The ambivalent embrace of “red aliens” allowed for a wealth of stories in the mass media about the careers and fates of individual deportees. “Red aliens,” while suspected of subversion, were people. But the social fiction of the “illegal alien” carried an extraterritorial, extraterrestrial connotation. “Illegal aliens” acted as a mass, not as individuals. Stories about “illegal aliens” tended towards stories of invasion, rather than captivity and emancipation. Stories of invasion paralleled the terror of Soviet invasion. As a result, the notion of the “illegal alien” conjured fear rather than sympathy.

Media narratives of “red aliens” were displaced by the media triumph of mass deportations. The timing corresponds almost exactly to the counterinsurgency efforts of INS Commissioner Joseph M. Swing in “Operation Werback.”
Operation Wetback was promoted by the INS as a mass deportation effort aimed at getting a US–Mexico border plagued by undocumented crossings under control. Historian Kelly Lytle Hernandez describes the real work of Operation Wetback as a public relations triumph, an “explicit recoding of migration control as policing crime and punishing criminals (which) made the work of the immigration law-enforcement officers at the nation’s borders resonate with the discourses and panics regarding order and control in late twentieth century America” (170).

According to Hernandez, the discursive triumph of Operation Wetback in 1954 displaced previous border narratives portraying farmers and ranchers as protecting migrant workers from the raids and depredations of the Border Patrol. Consonant with the cold war captivity narrative, these primarily Anglo employers saw INS detention and deportation efforts as “Gestapo” tactics which used the “concentration camp” and “Korean-type wire stockade” to imprison migrants. After Operation Wetback, mass media narratives saw the Border Patrol as liberating migrant workers from the oppressive conditions of their employment.

The public relations success of Operation Wetback displaced the prior contradictory spaces of discursive agency for aliens in deportation proceedings. Portraying the Border Patrol as liberators of migrants foreclosed on the wellspring of sympathy for immigrants as captives. Further, whatever the realities of Mexican American involvement in labor and civil rights struggles, the phrase “illegal aliens” placed migrants affectively outside of the nation, foreclosing their claim on residual popular front ties. Finally, unlike the multiethnic McCarran Act deportation sweeps, the grammar of Operation Wetback was explicitly racialized, equating “illegality” with Mexican American identity.

The racialized mass deportations of Operation Wetback transformed immigrant rights advocacy. Historian David Gutierrzer notes that Mexican American civil rights organizations saw the devastating impact of the raids on communities and began to link immigrant and civil rights advocacy after 1954 (163-165). Josefina Yanez, executive secretary of the Eastside Branch of the Los Angeles Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, described how the raids struck “terror not alone to the non-citizen, but to Mexican-American citizens of the first, second and third generations” (236). The ACPFBB continued to invoke the language of the concentration camp to describe the spaces in which the foreign born were detained for deportation. But the emergence of “the wetback menace” and the widespread replacement of “red aliens” with “illegal aliens” foreclosed affective connections with those in deportation proceedings.

In the past couple of years, many of the young people active in the movement to pass the DREAM Act have “come out” as undocumented. The promise of the DREAM Act is to reward “blameless” undocumented students, brought here as children, with access to education and naturalization. In dramatizing their status, activists risk detention and deportation. They engage in performative protest actions, hunger strikes, and the casual wearing of t-shirts. For these young migrants, the American dream encapsulates brutality and risk, as well as abundance and success. Their activism takes place at a critical historical juncture, in which the juridical category of the “illegal alien” has expanded in mass media to obscure the long term existence, throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, of immigrant rights activism against the machinery of deportation. At the same time, the progress of neoliberal economic development challenges even established channels for claims through the rights of citizenship. Amidst the mediated fog created by the trope of the demonic and criminal illegal alien, DREAM activists create performative high-beams to illuminate their presence.

I am deeply indebted to the inspired labors of Joe Boyle Walzer, who worked for me as a Project Assistant during the summer of 2012. The results of Joe’s dogged research efforts and intelligent historical insights are everywhere in this chapter.
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As consciousness of empire and an increasingly pervasive colonial culture grew in late nineteenth-century France, feminists began expanding their vision beyond Europe, examining the gendered worlds of France’s colonies. The more radical activists – anarchist feminists, revolutionary socialist feminists, and republican socialist feminists – perceived France's imperial agenda as the export and maintenance of the hierarchical status quo, the extension of the gendered, racial, and class inequities present in the nation both in practice and theory. Striving to alter these power imbalances at home and to halt their imposition on the colonies, these women contested the French state’s approach to empire. Yet they did not all reject imperialism per se. Some saw imperialism as a potentially liberatory tool, a means to bring progressive change to the colonies. These women advocated diverse feminist imperialisms, differing politics rooted in varied ideologies, temporalities, and methods. But they and the anti-imperialist feminists shared a common goal: to staunch the spread of patriarchal capitalism, while envisioning and promoting alternatives to it for France and its colonies.

My project, *Feminism’s Empire: Race & Gender Beyond France*, analyzes the complex and far-reaching interrelationships between feminisms, imperialism, capitalism, and race. Looking specifically at the Francophone context, my study investigates the ways in which feminists who began to address imperialism in the late nineteenth-century engaged with and challenged the era’s dominant, intersecting socio-economic and political structures and forces. Feminists saw empire both as a transmitter of capitalism, spreading it to colonies, and – through feminist appropriation – as the potential means to eliminate it. Examining their critiques provides an understanding not only of the ways in which nascent capitalist relations impacted and altered each colonial context, but also of their visions of an egalitarian post-capitalist world.

My book focuses on four activist women as exemplars of the era’s range of feminisms. All of them contested France’s imperial program, its gender order, and – to differing degrees – its assumptions of French racial superiority. Among the era’s first feminists to consider empire, these women each traveled beyond Europe, experiencing first-hand the ongoing consequences of, and responses to, imperialism. They focused specifically on Algeria, by 1870, officially a part of “Greater France,” and New Caledonia, a much more physically and culturally remote penal colony. The two societies provide contrasting contexts to examine the four women’s differing ideological and methodological approaches to bringing feminist challenges to empire.

Their particular politics drove both their experiences and their interpretations. Olympe Audouard, a liberal feminist and travel writer, was the only one of the four women to defend the existing socio-economic order and support the maintenance of class privilege. Hubertine Auclert, a republican socialist feminist, lived and worked in Algeria for four years, publishing her feminist newspaper “La Citoyenne” from the colony. The revolutionary socialist feminist Paule Mink traveled to Algeria on a propaganda speaking tour, during which she advocated the overthrow of the French imperial authority and its concomitant socio-economic, racial, and gender hierarchies. And the revolutionary anarchist feminist Louise Michel was exiled to a penal colony in New Caledonia, where she encountered Algerian revolutionaries deported there for attempting to rise against French domination. Michel later fulfilled a promise to these Algerians in traveling to their country to promote anti-imperial insurrection.

*Feminism’s Empire* is grounded in the published and unpublished manuscripts, correspondence, journalism, and police files of the women under study. The book opens with an Introduction that presents the context in which French feminists began to question empire in late nineteenth-century France. It establishes the historical and political worlds of France and its colonies, elucidating the deeply gendered, racialized, and class-based milieus in which French feminism and imperialism intertwined. Explicating the development of multiple and diverse feminisms in this period, the Introduction probes the varied ways in which feminist politics challenged the entrenchment and spread of capitalism, engaged the era’s racial ideologies, and contested historically situated patriarchies. It considers the contrasting manifestations of these politics in three profoundly dissimilar milieus: metropolitan France and its colonies Algeria and New Caledonia. This section also introduces the ideological and personal histories of Audouard, Auclert, Mink, and Michel, four of the earliest feminists to consider questions of empire in late nineteenth-century France.

Chapter One, “Civilizational Temporalities in Distant Geographies,” looks at feminists’ politically and socially constructed senses of time, temporal frameworks that emerged at the intersections of race, religion, and class, and through which they simultaneously viewed Paris and the colonies. Analyzing the four feminists’ understandings of civilization and race, the chapter examines their anthropologically-influenced conceptualizations of the relative and shifting nature of cultural development and the concomitantly fluid character of racial hierarchies. It places them within the context of the era’s conflicting civilizational and racial theories. Activist women promoted a range of differing programs, from an assimilationist imperialism intended to establish republican rights at the expense of indigenous culture in Algeria, to an anti-imperialist reification of indigenous culture at the expense of gender equity in New Caledonia. They cautioned that without improved gender equity in France, the nation faced the threat of slipping back to a pre-civilized, barbaric age; historical time could move both ways. The combination of the literal spatial and perceived temporal differences complicated and pluralized feminist analyses of hierarchies and power relations within the context of imperial expansion.
“La Citoyenne in the World: Expanding Feminist Journalism,” the second chapter, examines France’s first feminist periodical to address imperialism. Founded and edited by the republican socialist Hubertine Auclert, La Citoyenne (“The Female Citizen”) reported on the lives of women in the colonies, as well as in other nations and cultures, comparing them with the circumstances of French women. Through frequently concluding that French women held a preferable position, Auclert and her fellow writers also emphasized aspects of “uncivilized” women’s lives and status that compared positively to those in France. La Citoyenne explicitly questioned France’s level of civilization under a legal code that disenfranchised and subjugated its entire female population, reified property rights, and marginalized the working class. The journalists thus disrupted the absolutes of supposedly civilized France and uncivilized colonies. They developed a feminist imperialism that challenged the oppression of women and the poor in both metropole and colonies. Feminist imperialists felt they had the right and duty to uplift their colonial “sisters,” believing that their efforts to advance gender and class equity could counter the French imperial project and expedite colonized people’s historical evolution.

One constant emerged among left-wing feminists: their denunciation of the changes capitalism brought to colonies, and their desire to eradicate these socio-economic relations. The widely known anarchist feminist and revolutionary Louise Michel was deported to the New Caledonian penal colony in 1873, guilty of participation in the 1871 revolutionary civil war known as the Paris Commune. Chapter Three, “The Deportation Lens: Images of Exile and Empire,” explores how Michel’s experience living on the remote South Pacific islands shaped her imperial critique. Michel regularly encountered the indigenous Canaque people, whose culture she came to admire and with whom she developed a strong affinity. In sharp contrast, the French colonial authority viewed the Canaques with hostility, disdain, and fear, perceiving them as savages and as the “lowest” of their colonial subjects. Michel aggressively challenged France’s imperial presence in New Caledonia, condemning the imposition of a racialized hierarchy and the introduction and escalation of economic structures in which abstract capital controlled human lives. Both Michel’s letters from exile and her later publications provide a lens through which we can perceive the changes imperialism and emergent capitalist relations produced in a particular culture and society, and how these changes were returned to and reflected in her analysis of French political culture.

Chapter Four, “The Jewish Question,” investigates feminist attitudes toward Jews within the imperial context, studying Jews as a “bridge group,” spanning between France and colony, European and Orientalized Other, exploiter and exploited. Typically regarding Jews as a race rather than a religion, French feminists wrote and spoke of encounters with Jews, ideas about the place of Jews in society, and merely made passing remarks, some of which betrayed a deep cultural anti-Semitism. They displayed anti-Semitism with various degrees of frequency and levels of intensity. Analyzing activist women’s writings reveals that the spectrum of their class politics directly corresponded with the range of their anti-Semitism. For example, the liberal feminist Olympe Audouard displayed an often rabid anti-Semitism, including inverting accepted norms of gender, civilization, wealth; the republican socialist feminist Hubertine Auclert periodically iterated Jewish stereotypes equating Jews with capitalist exploitation or with foreignness; and the revolutionary anarchist Michel sympathetically identified Jews as an oppressed people. Broadly speaking, a fealty to liberalism and anti-Semitic sentiments were closely linked: the greater their opposition to the extant capitalist hierarchy, the greater their opposition to anti-Semitism.

Finally, chapter Five, “Exporting Revolution,” assesses radical left-wing feminists’ efforts to instigate colonial overthrow of the French imperial authority. Focusing on the revolutionary socialist feminist Paule Mink and the revolutionary anarchist feminist Louise Michel, this chapter considers not only the two women’s insurrectionary instigation in Algeria (for both) and New Caledonia (for Michel), but also examines their respective visions for post-imperial, post-capitalist societies. Self-described anti-imperialists, each woman nonetheless relied on aspects of Western culture to “help elevate” both Algerian Arabs and New Caledonian Canaques to their full, post-imperial, post-capitalist potential. Michel, who often presented a somewhat idealized image of gender relations in subjugated colonial cultures, advocated Western education as the means to establishing a post-revolutionary society rooted in egalitarian aspects of both colonial and metropolitan cultures. Mink, however, laid equal blame on imperial capitalism and on Muslim men. Consistently anti-clerical toward Catholic France and Muslim Algeria, Mink advocated the eradication not only of religious hierarchies, but also of religiously-based cultural forms. Her anti-imperial revolutionism took a more top-down approach than did Michel’s anarchist-based anti-imperial revolutionary politics. To differing degrees, each woman proposed post-colonial, post-capitalist worlds shaped by the radical ideologies intended to free those worlds. Even the most militant self-professed revolutionaries could not escape imposing aspects of their own ideology.

Building upon my first book, Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune, this project demonstrates the wide range and complexity of French feminisms and their integral and influential roles throughout nineteenth-century France. Feminists engaged intellectually and politically with the intricate currents of empire. Their experiences beyond France, interpreted and mediated through their ideologies and politics, both affected and helped fashion their positions on race, religion, class, and gender. These women engaged in criticisms of France’s socio-economic and political systems, its oppression of colonized peoples, and its modes of masculinity. Among the first French feminists to engage the ideas and realities of empire, their individual writings and speeches introduced their audiences – both supportive and oppositional, in both France and the colonies – to their multiple and complexly varied perspectives on empire, and to its elaborately enmeshed ideological, political, social, cultural, and economic undertow. They also envisioned post-colonial, post-capitalist worlds – for France, and for its colonies – societies developed from a mélange of the egalitarian aspects of the metropole and the specific colony’s indigenous culture.
There is a crisis of trust when it comes to global pharmaceuticals research and regulation. The most recent comprehensive public opinion poll indicated that in 2008 only 35% of respondents had a positive impression of the FDA's work ensuring the safety and efficacy of new prescription drugs (Harris Interactive). In 2011, the European Medicines Agency (which regulates prescription drugs in the European Union) was subject to a very public anti-fraud investigation (Laurance). The Therapeutic Products Directorate of Health Canada is under regular and vicious attack in the popular press (Lexchin). The World Health Organization is thought to have squandered a good deal of its credibility during its handling of the H1N1 pandemic (Boseley). And, while a surprisingly large percentage (just under 70%) of the British public trusts the work of their pharmaceuticals regulatory agency, the Medicines and Healthcare Products Agency shows a similar percentage of Britons deeply distrust the industry subject to that regulation (Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Agency; Phorum). Additionally, a spate of recently published articles and editorials in flagship journals such as Journal of the American Medical Association, The New England Journal of Medicine, the British Medical Journal, the Canadian Medical Association Journal, and The Lancet suggest that clinician trust in drugs regulation might be suffering even more than public confidence.

The reasons for this crisis of trust are manifold. Certainly multinational scandals like the Vioxx recall and the H1N1 pandemic-that-wasn't play a role. Ultimately criticisms of the health and pharmaceuticals regulatory process tend to come in three forms: 1) questions over the reliability of pharmaceutically-funded clinical trial results, 2) concerns over inappropriately close relationships between industry-representatives and federal regulators, and 3) worries over the impact of outside interference from lobbyists and elected officials in the regulatory process. Certainly, many of these concerns are not without merit.

A 2003 report by the British House of Commons found that 75% of studies published in major multinational medical journals were industry funded and that only a third of that research is being conducted at universities or public agencies (United Kingdom, Health Committee). Studies funded by pharmaceuticals manufacturers are 5.3 times more likely to return positive results (Abramson and Starfield). Furthermore, the phenomenon of “ghost authorship” has been long recognized as a cause for major concern in global pharmaceuticals research and regulation (Ngai, Gill, Gold, and Rochon). Ghost authorship is a frighteningly common practice where employees of major drug manufacturing firms conduct and write up research on their own products and then turn those writings over to academically-affiliated researchers for publication under their names and institutional affiliations (Gøtzsche et al). More recently, the
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existence of “ghost journals” has come to the attention of the popular press (Grant, “Elsevier;” Grant, “Merck”). Ghost journals, as the name suggests, are fraudulent medical publications funded by pharmaceuticals organizations and distributed by major publishing houses such as Elsevier. These publications give the illusion of rigorous peer-review, but largely serve as an outlet for drug companies to publish advertisements disguised as science (Grant, “Elsevier;” Grant, “Merck”).

Finally, there is much evidence indicating cause for concern regarding the prevalence of close industry-regulator ties. A 2002 US study indicated that as many as 59% of physicians involved in developing clinical guidelines have financial ties to the products they regulate (Choudhry et al). Similar concerns are often raised for the Canadian and EU contexts (Ferris and Lemen; Garattini and Chalmers). Finally, in regards to concerns over outside influence, much has been made of the detrimental impacts that can arise from the efforts of lobbyists and elected officials to intercede in the regulatory process (Wynia). All told, the pharmaceuticals industry’s funding of and influence on the entire process from clinical trials, through publication, and regulation, as my title suggests, constitutes a thoroughgoing vertical integration. This, of course, gives multinational pharmaceuticals a tremendous amount of control over global health policy and prescription drug activities ranging from ethically questionable clinical trials in developing nations and multinational regulatory practices in the EU to epidemics management and consumer behavior.

A brief examination of the case of Vioxx is instructive here. Vioxx is a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medicine once produced and marketed by Merck Pharmaceuticals as a prescription-strength “Super Aspirin” (Abraham). A careful tracing of Merck’s influence across the entire innovation-regulation-distribution progression demonstrates the profoundly disturbing degree to which pharmaceuticals science and regulation has become vertically integrated and globally extended. While the complete analysis of this scandal is beyond the scope of this short essay, an illustrative case can be made through looking at three short episodes in the Vioxx saga: 1) Merck’s subtle financial influence on the FDA’s Arthritis Advisory Committee, 2) the publication of the Australasian Journal of Bone and Joint Medicine, and 3) Merck’s self-titled “neutralization” campaign.

In 1998 and 1999 Merck launched two clinical trials designed to compare the safety and efficacy of Vioxx to existing pain killers (Nesi). These trials are widely known by their acronyms VIGOR and ADVANTAGE. On April 20th, 1999, long before VIGOR and ADVANTAGE were completed, the FDA convened a special meeting of the Arthritis Advisory Committee to evaluate the safety and efficacy of Vioxx and to potentially approve it for market (United States Food and Drug Administration “Sequence of Events”). Vioxx was approved and US marketing began a mere month later (United States Food and Drug Administration “Sequence of Events”). A one-month turnaround time for such an approval with trials as of yet uncompleted is relatively rapid. As such it bears asking what may have led to this rapid approval. One possible reason may come from the fact that some portion of the Arthritis Advisory Committee had financial relationships with Merck. According to the FDA, 50% voting members held financial conflicts of interest (Arthritis Advisory Committee). On June 21st, 2003, results from the VIGOR trial were published in the Australasian Journal of Bone and Joint Medicine (“Therapeutic Decisions”). These results demonstrated high degrees of both safety and efficacy for Vioxx. This is especially interesting because it turns out that Merck paid Elsevier publishing to leverage one if its Australian subsidiaries to create—a whole cloth—an entirely fake journal with an illusory peer review process and editorial board (Grant, “Elsevier;” Grant, “Merck”). To be clear, the Australasian Journal of Bone and Joint Medicine is nothing more than a Merck marketing flyer, but one designed to give an illusion of peer review, and nine out of the 29 articles published in the second issue were for Vioxx. This “journal” was then freely distributed to physicians in Australia and the US.

During the entire process of scientific and regulatory review, Merck willfully engaged in a process internal company memos dub “neutralization” (Meier and Saul). The neutralization campaign involved the systematic targeting of researchers and physicians who had publically voiced their concerns about Vioxx. These clinicians and scholars would be funded, hired, or blackmailed into silence. Internal Merck memos indicate that the neutralization campaign memos begin as early as July 23, 1998, almost a year before Vioxx was approved by the FDA (Baumgartner). This clearly demonstrates that Merck was fully aware of the dangers of Vioxx form the very beginning.

Fortunately, with growing public recognition of scandals like the Vioxx debacle, the last five years have been marked by an unprecedented level of attention by regulatory agencies to conflicts of interest and the adverse effects of vertical integration in pharmaceuticals research and regulation. In 2007, Health Canada adopted its first conflict of interest policies (Yeats). In 2009, the US Institute of Medicine released a 436-page report on the dangers of conflicts of interest in medical research, education, and practice (United States Institute of Medicine). This report and subsequent congressional testimony paved the way for the Physician Payment Sunshine Act (passed in 2010 as part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Health Care Act), one of the most significant regulatory efforts to combat the influence of the pharmaceutical industry’s vertical integration. In 2011 the British regulatory agency completely overhauled their conflict of interest policies providing some of the strictest requirements in the world (Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Agency). In 2012, the European Medicines Agency followed suit, the World Health Organization issued a series of resolutions asking other organizations to adopt better conflict of interest policies, and the US Institute of Medicine published a discussion paper arguing that solving these problems will require a unified global (rather than mononational) approach (Lichter, et al.).

Despite both long-standing concerns over vertical integration in the critical/cultural scholarly community and the recent flurry of legislative and regulatory activity in this area, there is remarkably little evidence documenting the nature and extent of the
intersections
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Given this need for research on the effects of vertical integration in global health policy and pharmaceutical regulation, it is incumbent upon scholars in the humanities, social sciences, and critical/cultural studies to develop projects that begin building such an evidence base. But given the manifestly global nature of pharmaceuticals overreach, it is important that this scholarly agenda address the wide array of national and multi-national regulatory agencies involved. In the Anglophone world, the following agencies specifically recommend themselves for scholarly attention: 1) The US Food and Drug Administration, 2) Health Canada’s Therapeutic Products Directorate, 3) The UK’s Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Agency, 4) Australia’s Therapeutic Goods Administration, 5) The EU’s European Medicines Agency, and 6) The World Health Organization.

In recent years, each of these organizations have experienced high profile public scandals involving conflicts of interest. The Vioxx scandal, for example, crosses borders with at one time the drug being approved for use in over 80 countries. However, particular public outcry was notable in the US, Canada, and Australia. Similarly, the UK’s Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Agency endured lengthy controversy over the regulation of PIP Breast Implants, the approval of which was based, in part, upon manufacturing oversight conducted by a private German firm evaluating work in a French factory. And, of course, the world over ordered high volumes of the H1N1 vaccine based on pandemic warnings issued by World Health Organization officials with financial ties to the vaccine manufacturer. Whether it’s one of these cases, or the so-called “Revolving Door Scandal” at the European Medicines Agency or the Australia’s Fluvax controversy, there are many potential sites of analysis. The systematic interrogation of these cases constitutes an essential first step in establishing a solid base of evidence upon which effective conflicts of interest policy can be made.
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by Bernard Perley

All the Bells and Whistles

Lights were flashing all around us. Music blared and bells were ringing and clanging from thousands of video slot machines. The lights and sounds illuminated and rippled through four of us as we stood bewildered in the center of Mohegan Sun Casino in Uncasville, Connecticut. The four of us, visitors to the Mohegan homeland are all Native Americans—two Tuscarora, one Mohawk, and one Maliseet. We were not entranced by the glittering and flashing lights of the noisy slot machines. Instead, we were captivated by the motions of an animatronic wolf. We watched as it moved its head from side to side and after a few moments up and down. At one point, if you stand in the right place, the wolf will look directly at you. We watched for twenty minutes as the wolf went through its entire cycle of wolf animatronics. Meanwhile, hundreds of people were depositing thousands of dollars into the video slot machines. The four of us were not there to gamble. We were attending and presenting papers at the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA) conference hosted by Mohegan Sun Casino.

The convergence of Native American scholars and gamblers from New York, Boston, and all the metropolitan areas in between seem incongruous at first glance but the anomaly is momentary because the gamblers arrive every day at all hours of the day and night while the scholars were there for a few days. On most days, the Mohegan tribe of Connecticut (the owner-operators of the Mohegan Sun (casino) will be viewed by the Comaroffs as creative “ethno-preneurs” (65). The Comaroffs’ critical monographs. Such “headlines anthropology” creates the impression that the Comaroffs disparage American Indian gaming development initiatives as merely “Commodifying Descent, American-Style” (6-85). The authors amplify this disparagement by proposing “seven dimensions of the identity business” to expose the commodification of ethnicity as “the occult power of capital to manufacture identity” (69). Unfortunately, their textual analysis ignores much of the Casino activities that go unnoticed by casual critics and intellectuals alike. My work on language endangerment and language revitalization in Native American communities has given me opportunities to see another side of the casino “business” that headline seekers and casual scholars and critics overlook.

1 According to the Mohegan Sun website they boast—“Become immersed in the bells and whistles of the nearly 5,500 slot machines that will thrill your senses.” http://mohegansun.com/playing/slots.html accessed 12/05/2013.

2 Videos of one of the animatronic wolves are viewable on YouTube.
Coyote Capitalism

Coyote Capitalism is never what you think it is. My Mohegan Sun vignette describes how the convergence of two unexpected constituencies brought together in a casino for different reasons can produce very different capital returns; one goes after monetary capital in hopes of accumulating slot machine winnings while the other invests in critical conversations in return for the symbolic capital manifested in greater awareness and understanding of the states of indigenous experiences. This schismatic tension between monetary capital and symbolic capital is a phenomenon I describe as emergent processes of historically informed indigenous participation in global markets characterized by culturally grounded practices of economic development, cultural revitalization, and global cosmopolitanism. At best, we can capture a partial understanding of indigenous economic strategies as indigenous peoples go “after capital” according to the constraints of the global economy. Often, the success of such cases is measured by how much capital profitable ventures bring to indigenous communities. We can also describe and record a partial representation of indigenous investments of capital gains from economic and development projects as processes that bring significant returns in the form of symbolic capital to indigenous communities engaged in such investments (Bourdieu). The symbolic capital derived from such investments can be unexpected and innovative developments in cultural vitality, environment engagements, and language revitalization. These unexpected and innovative aspects of capital investment and symbolic returns are the shifting contours of coyote capitalism. Key to understanding coyote capitalism is recognizing the phenomenon as an emergent process that is hidden from the casual observer (gamblers and critics). This requires a critical focus on indigenous practices of leveraging the tensions of relative value between monetary capital and symbolic capital. Such leveraging is also a strategy of self-determination that anticipates multiple forms of capital returns while participating in the global economy.

Critical Expectations for Indigenous Economies

The current era of globalization has been described as an era unprecedented in human history in which the speed of global flows of ideas, economies, cultures, and populations traverse borders, oceans, and imaginaries (Appadurai). This era has been championed as an era of global economic growth and improvement in global health and quality of life (Smith). Too often, popular discourses extolling the benefits of globalization have marginalized if not ignored the detrimental effects globalization has meant for indigenous peoples. The UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples brings the lingering inequalities and suppression of indigenous lifeways into the global conversation on development and social justice in hopes that indigenous peoples across the globe may become the beneficiaries of international efforts recognizing their inherent indigenous rights distinct from universal human rights. There are reports of some successes for indigenous development initiatives but those same success stories (Cattelino; Greene; Hodgson) have also criticized indigenous entrepreneurs for successfully participating in global market expectations (Comaroff and Comaroff; Engle). Those same critiques condemn indigenous communities for profiting from their

ethnic, cultural, and environmental popularity in the global market for indigenous art, performance, tourism, and other commodities. Unfortunately, such criticism either makes a cursory acknowledgement or completely ignores the historical conditions that force indigenous communities to market ethnicity, culture, and landscape.

Indigenous entrepreneurs who practice coyote capitalism will never perfectly emulate “anglo-capital” to the satisfaction of non-indigenous critics because the colonial and settler society capitalists have historically (and continue to) imposed severe constraints on indigenous economic development efforts. The predictable outcome is that “ethno-capital” will always be susceptible to denigration from colonial/settler society critics. For example, the Comaroffs use clever terms such as “ethno-preneur” and ethno-capital” to describe indigenous economic development projects but, unfortunately, those clever descriptors also disparage indigenous economic strategies as either misapplied or deficient in their practice of “anglo-preneurship” and “anglo-capitalism.” Rather than denigrate “ethno-capital” as an imperfect reflection of “anglo-capital” we should appreciate the coyote ethos (or, trickster ethos [Deloria, 235]) that underlies the creative and emergent aspect of indigenous self-determination (Perley, “Gone Anthropologist”).

Self-determination is also an emergent process that includes symbolic capital development projects that are initiated by indigenous communities such as language and cultural revitalization, eco-tourism, gaming and related services, and indigenous arts performances. Grounding indigenous self-determination in the coyote ethos provides an indigenous perspective on the cultural, social, ethnic benefits that are gained from the profits of “ethno-capitalism.” Projects such as Bison ranching by the Cheyenne River Sioux of South Dakota (Braun), the ambivalent success of eco-tourism of the Maasai of Tanzania (Hodgson), to the success of the Mohegan Sun Casino are practices of coyote capitalism where indigenous re-investment of capital gains for the return of symbolic capital—in the forms of language and cultural revitalization, economic self-determination and assertions of sovereignty—is often at odds with expectations from neoliberal principles of “anglo-capitalism”.

The Language of Symbolic Capital

I have first-hand experience in observing and participating in indigenous investment of symbolic capital. My research on language revitalization at Tobique First Nation focused on community investments of symbolic capital into language and cultural revitalization as a strategy to forestall Maliseet language and cultural extinction (Perley, “Gone Anthropologist”; Perley, “Defying Maliseet Language Death”; Perley “Last Words, Final Thoughts”). The investment of monetary capital figured to be an important resource for planning, programming, and production of materials for language and cultural revitalization. Over the last decade and a half, it has become clear to me that monetary capital investment was not enough to keep language and culture a vital aspect of Maliseet daily life. Language revitalization required a great deal of symbolic capital to prompt community members into using their languages and cultural traditions in their everyday community activities. This is an ongoing process of economic, cultural, and
linguistic self-determination. It is too soon to assess the success of these investments but the good news comes in the increasing numbers of projects initiated by growing numbers of “ethno-preneurs” dedicated to leveraging both symbolic capital and monetary capital into the future solvency of the various domains of Maliseet economies—political, cultural, linguistic, and monetary.

An additional example of language and investments of symbolic capital is the “awakening” of the Miami language. Miami language activist, Daryl Baldwin, suggested that the “academics” were wrong to describe the Miami language as “extinct” (Miami Nation of Oklahoma). He preferred to think of the Miami language as sleeping. If, then, the language is sleeping the Miami people can awaken it. Baldwin’s innovative approach lead to the creation of a summer language camp, a Miami research center at Miami University of Ohio, and a growing community of language learners (Baldwin and Olds). The process required a great deal of symbolic capital from Baldwin and the Miami Nation of Oklahoma to solicit monetary capital from the tribal government and Miami of Ohio University to create a multifaceted program of Miami language awakening. This is in stark contrast to linguists who saw no capital to be gained from an extinct language.

The Maliseet and the Miami examples are indicative of the innovative and unexpected approaches to language, culture, and economies that make coyote capitalism a significant process for indigenous self-determination. Both cases may not seem to implicate processes of globalization but the long colonial process of linguistic colonialism had rendered the Maliseet language as “severely endangered” (UNESCO3) and the Miami language as “extinct.” Furthermore, the global discourses on language endangerment and extinction had all but relegated the Maliseet and Miami languages as hopeless cases. The audacity of the Maliseet and Miami communities to challenge prevailing wisdom creates the opportunities for creative solutions to imminent and/or proclaimed extinction of language, culture, and identity. Baldwin and members of the Miami Nation of Oklahoma have established summer camps, an alliance with Miami University of Ohio, and collaboration with linguists to awaken the Miami language. The community members of Tobique First Nation continue to find new domains of language use for the Maliseet language and practicing emergent vitalities of language, culture, and identity (Perley, “Remembering Ancestral Voices”). Both communities coordinate symbolic capital and monetary capital as everyday practices of coyote capitalism.

The Animatronic Wolf and the Promise of Coyote Capitalism

Mohegan Sun is a sight to behold. Native American themes are distributed throughout the complex from the abstracted “natural” lobby, to the “rocky tumble” of the avenue of trendy restaurants and shops, to the elaborately decorated “earth,” “sky,” and “wind” casinos where animatronic wolves observe gamblers and scholars alike. The Mohegan Sun complex dazzles and delights all gamblers in the promise of the full richness of monetary capital while paying dividends to Native American scholars in the returns of symbolic capital. But what does the animatronic wolf have to do with coyote capitalism? As the four Native American scholars watched the animatronic wolf, hundreds of gamblers were investing thousands of dollars to the Mohegan Sun Casino that, in turn, made it possible for indigenous scholars to have critical conversations about indigenous states of affairs. Causal critics and commentators view American Indian casinos as crass commodifications of ethnicity because they expect indigenous economies to be perfect emulations of “anglo-capital.” From the indigenous perspective, the goal is not to emulate “anglo-capital” in all its excessive glory. Rather, the goal is to tap into “anglo-capitalism” to promote the return of indigenous symbolic capital. Those returns include my participation in a NAISA conference at Mohegan Sun, my enjoyment of a reception dinner for Native American scholars at the Pequot Museum, and having given a keynote presentation at a Native American language revitalization conference at the Yavapai Nation’s Fort McDowell Casino at Fort McDowell, Arizona. All three venues are casinos operated by Native American tribes. Each one supported Native American language and cultural scholarship and revitalization projects. Each one contributed to the dissemination of critical indigenous commentaries and practices that benefit communities not directly affiliated with the casino/resorts. Causal analysis of popular media reports and other texts will not provide the necessary knowledge to understand that there is more to Native American casinos than the accumulation of monetary capital. The investment of monetary capital into language and cultural revitalization programs distributes the returns of symbolic capital back to indigenous communities. At Mohegan Sun, the animatronic wolf is a mechanical sentinel observing non-native gamblers invest their money into video slot machines while immersed in the creature comforts of gambling with all the bells and whistles. Meanwhile, the critical work of indigenous language and cultural revitalization, critical scholarship, and everyday practices of self-determination goes on in the background. The animatronic wolf was the mechanism that brought two constituencies together for a brief moment into a common space in the Mohegan Sun Casino. The results are uncertain but the hope for happy returns is the guiding principle for both constituencies. And, that is the true value of coyote capitalism.
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The Center for International Education at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee selected five Global Studies Fellows for the 2013/14 academic year. The Global Studies Fellows program, established in 2010, aids faculty in advancing their research on interdisciplinary topics relating to globalization, its cultural, political, social, economic, and environmental dimensions. Global Studies Fellows meet monthly to share their progress and devise research strategies. They also share their work at a series of colloquia, and participate in CIE’s annual conference.

In 1867, Karl Marx in *Capital* sought to present the capitalist mode of production in all its strangeness and monstrosity. From an analysis that began with the appearance of wealth as a “monstrous collection of commodities,” Marx arrived at the demonstration that capital was but “dead labor,” which, like a vampire, only “lives by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks.” Today, as the monstrosity of capitalism is being felt around the world and zombies are said to be at the gates, Marx’s analysis remains a helpful guide. But where in the 19th century capitalism produced and exchanged commodities, it seems that capital today deals only in financial derivatives; and while labor may once have been the source of all profit, wealth now seems to come from the management of risk. What is the nature of wealth in financial capital, and what does the exchange of derivative securities make possible? What violence does it conceal, what politics does it produce? Such are the questions Ivan Ascher addresses, through a reinterpretation of *Capital* that is, at the same time, a critique of capital itself.
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Scott Graham's research focuses on exploring the role of communication and persuasion in science-policy decision making. As a part of this research, he is particularly interested in the impact of industry conflicts of interest on pharmaceuticals policy deliberation. Graham is currently working on a book project which explores how different national and multi-national pharmaceuticals regulatory agencies around the world respond to public conflict of interest scandals. This project will provide comparative case-studies of scandal responses by 1) The US Food and Drug Administration, 2) Health Canada's Therapeutic Products Directorate, 3) The UK's Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Agency, 4) The EU's European Medicines Agency, and 5) The World Health Organization. Finally, the project will also offer a comparative evaluation of new conflict of interest policies enacted in the face of public outcry.

Carolyn Eichner's book project, *Feminists Race the Empire: Gender Takes on Imperial France*, analyzes the complex and far-reaching interrelationships between feminisms, imperialism, capitalism, and race. Looking specifically at the French context, the study investigates the ways in which feminists who began to address imperialism in the late nineteenth-century engaged with and challenged the era's dominant intersecting socio-economic and political structures and forces. Feminists saw empire both as a transmitter of capitalism, spreading it to colonies, and – through feminist appropriation – as the potential means to eliminate it. Examining their critiques provides an understanding not only of the ways in which nascent capitalist relations impacted and altered each colonial context, but also to their visions of an egalitarian post-capitalist world.

Bernard Perley's research project develops the concept *Coyote Capitalism* as a historically informed indigenous response to participation in global markets characterized by culturally grounded practices of economic development, cultural revitalization, and global cosmopolitanism. On one hand, indigenous economic strategies go “after capital” according to the constraints of the global economy and success is measured by how much capital profitable ventures bring to indigenous communities. On the other hand, indigenous investments of capital gains from economic and development projects bring significant returns in the form of symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1984). Such symbolic capital can be characterized as unexpected and innovative developments in culture, environment, and self-determination; or, coyote capitalism. Key to understanding coyote capitalism as an analytical concept is the exploration of the articulation of relative value of monetary capital in relation to symbolic capital in indigenous strategies of participating in the global economy.
The Center for International Education at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee fosters innovative approaches to understanding the challenges of living and working in our increasingly interconnected world. Interdisciplinary academic programs, education abroad, and overseas research and internships provide students with transformative learning experiences. Scholarly conferences and colloquia, publications, fellowships, course development and travel funding, and interinstitutional partnerships support faculty members’ research. International student recruitment, admissions, and immigration advising strengthen the quality and diversity of UWM’s faculty and student body and expand cross-cultural learning. Programs for educators, business, media, and the public engage community members in dialogue on contemporary world affairs. This comprehensive approach to international education aims to move UWM closer to the ideal of having an interculturally-competent citizenry that is able to thrive in today’s world.

After Capitalism
Center for International Education Annual Conference
Hefter Conference Center, April 25-26, 2014

Even though debate remains over the precise time and place capitalism began, the abstraction of capital in a market economy clearly has a human beginning, one tied to modern historical and global forms and networks of production. But what are the parameters and limits of this global economic/social system? This spring, the Center for International Education’s annual conference investigates questions about capitalism’s history, utility, transformations, and possible end.

The conference will feature presentations by 18 distinguished scholars from the US and abroad, and will take place Friday and Saturday, April 25-26. The conference is free and open to the public. More information will be available soon. Please check the CIE homepage regularly: www.international.uwm.edu
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