

Neoliberal Lumpen Abuse in the 2000s:  
A 25 Year Ethnographic Retrospective on Violence in the Americas

Philippe Bourgois

[I apologize for the length. I will be presenting a boiled-down excerpt from this at the conference on Violence and Citizenship in Post-Authoritarian Latin America. The **ALL CAPS BOLDED PHRASES** in brackets refer to powerpoint photos.]

It is a pleasure and an honor to be here. I am taking a 25-year retrospective look at my half-dozen fieldwork experiences to examine how I analyzed violence in the Americas during the historical era of the transition from the Cold War conflict to the global consolidation of corporate militaristic neoliberalism. I am especially interested in the periods of transition from revolutionary and war-time political violence to interpersonal delinquent violence and their overlaps. Most importantly, I want to offer some theoretical tools to address the rising salience of violence globally and locally. Over the years, I worried that I might be obsessed with violence, but unfortunately the topic imposed itself on me because violence is central to organizing everyday life and morphs its forms in confusing ways that fuel more violence. There is a danger, of course, as an ethnographer to contribute to a voyeuristic pornography of violence. But a bigger problem, I would argue, is NOT seeing violence where it exists. In this vein, I apologize because some of the pictures from my fieldwork sites are painful and may be shocking to some viewers.

Incidentally, all the good black and white pictures like this title photo are taken by my collaborator Jeff Schonberg. The mediocre color snapshots are mine except for 2 crack dealing shots by Susan Meiselas.

**[CONTINUUM OF VIOLENCE]** In a nutshell, I am beginning with a conceptualization of violence as operating along a continuum that Nancy Scheper-Hughes and I developed to show how the categories of structural violence, symbolic violence, everyday violence and intimate violence overlap.

Theoretical categorizations often obscure as much as they elucidate, but I have found these three categories of violence useful and these basic categories are not exclusive of dozens of other more specific forms and manifestations of violence. They are meant to be starting points for approaching violence in a way that facilitates recognizing the roots, links, tentacles, diversity and pervasiveness of violence's multiple forms and effects.

Structural violence comes out of marxism and liberation theology but was first formally coined by a social democrat, Johan Galtung, in Norway as a critique of the U.S. Cold War understanding of nationalist and socialist revolutionary movements. One of the most articulate contemporary proponents of the importance of focusing on structural violence in anthropology is of course Paul Farmer. His approach emphasizes an understanding of how historically-engrained large-scale political economic forces wreak havoc on the bodies of the socially vulnerable, including invisible institutions such as the unequal market-based terms of trade between industrialized and non-industrialized nations.

Bourdieu's theory of symbolic violence is the most complicated. Symbolic violence is the mechanism whereby the socially dominated naturalize the status quo and blame themselves for their domination, thereby rendering it legitimate. Most

importantly, symbolic violence does not just refer to insults: it is the process of misrecognizing that an insult is an accurate description of who you are and of thinking the way things need to be is because of who you are. For example, racism and blaming an individual for being poor do not constitute symbolic violence. Symbolic violence only occurs when individuals internalize racism or blame themselves for being poor.

Everyday violence was first coined by Nancy Scheper-Hughes to emphasize the production of social indifference to outrageous suffering through institutional processes and discourses. She identified, for example, the bureaucratic financing of coffins for newborns by the Mayor's office in a shantytown of Brazil as everyday violence normalizing the invisible genocide of malnourished babies. She also identified the rituals of humiliation by nurses and doctors in the daily care of psychiatric patients in asylums as everyday violence.

Nancy Scheper-Hughes and I developed the continuum of violence approach in the introduction to our edited Blackwell volume called *Violence in War and Peace*. I have added intimate violence to the 3 categories on the original formulation of the continuum of violence because I think it needs to be separated from everyday violence due to its invisibility and its key role in fomenting symbolic violence. I find these categories useful because they span moments of war and peace with great malleability. This overlapping malleability causes their continuities and relationships to become misrecognized by the general public and legitimizes oppressive power structures through individual blame and foments symbolic violence.

Now for the ethnography.

**[ME WITH GUN]** My first fieldwork was as an applied anthropologist for the Agrarian reform ministry in Nicaragua during the first 3 years of the Sandinista Revolution, from 1979 through 1981. **[MISKITU VILLAGE]** It was an idealistic moment in the Cold War that I thought was building independent peace, shepherded by charismatic utopian socialist politicians with a message of redemptive populist political agency. **[SOLDIERS]** But instead I watched an inspiring mass mobilization for indigenous rights turn into bloody civil war in a racist and cultural nationalist idiom. A cultural nationalist guerilla fighter movement among Miskitu Amerindians emerged in the democratic space opened by the Sandinista revolution. It was initially a genuine mass movement rebelling against the structural and symbolic violence of internal colonialism of Nicaragua: specifically the racism of Latinos against Indians and people of Afro-Caribbean descent. The violence was on one level a response to the structural violence of internal colonialism. But more importantly, it was primarily driven by a rejection of symbolic violence. Internalized racism was inverted as cultural nationalism on both sides of the conflict between Latino government and indigenous guerillas. Latinos were thrown out from Miskitu territory and the Miskitu language returned to urban centers.

This spawned interpersonal brutality in the name of politics because the operationalizing of rejecting symbolic violence is often bloody. For example, indigenous traitors and spies were mutilated by the Indian contra guerillas cutting off their ears and tongues. One sees that in Iraq with U.S. collaborators. In reference to the Algerian revolution and war of independence against France, Franz Fanon argued that overcoming the internalized racism of colonialism (i.e., the symbolic violence of colonialism) precipitates bloody violence and Sartre argued that that violence against symbolic violence is necessary and liberating. History has showed us the limits of Sartre's romantic

interpretation of liberatory violence and **[KID WITH T-SHIRT]** in the Cold War context of revolutionary Nicaragua, the CIA financed and organized the indigenous conflict, exacerbating the bloodiness of their mobilization against symbolic violence and internal colonialism. In nationalist response (and nationalism is also often an expression of mobilization against symbolic violence), the Sandinista Latino troops burned down indigenous villages and jailed both grassroots and CIA-funded leaders. Tragically, the area was flooded with international mercenaries funded directly and indirectly by the CIA. After two and a half years of fighting, the Sandinistas changed their policy towards the Miskitus and granted regional autonomy in the Moskitia. By Latin American standards, it was a relative success for indigenous rights and respect for cultural rights. The Miskitus stopped fighting and abandoned their CIA allies when they received regional autonomy, in contrast to the Latino contras who took direct orders from the CIA up to the very bloody end. I took this picture of a Miskitu refugee in Honduras with a U.S. "Green Berets Never Die" insignia in 1984, just as regional autonomy was granted at the height of the fighting. The Sandinistas invited me back almost with an apology.

**[FINCA 97]** In my second fieldwork, 1981-1984 I continued the themes of the experience of internal colonialism and institutionalized racism **[BACHE]** while living in the worker's barracks of a 6000 person US banana plantation spanning the borders of Panama and Costa Rica. The plantations were in the midst of violent labor struggles including occasional killings by the government of strikers. **[PACKING PLANT]** It was during a period of peace, but labor leaders were killed by the Costa Rican government police. There was also a great deal of domestic violence and the drunken brawling that I did not document. I did document structural violence, reporting the repression as human rights violations and as class struggle (which they were) but I did not report systematically the domestic violence, which I saw as a state of exception rather than a state of rule. **[PUERTO VIEJO]** And I did not link these forms of violence. I hadn't yet read Taussig's distillation of Walter Benjamin or Primo Levi's Holocaust gray zone. I did not realize that every day is a state of emergency for the structurally vulnerable. I did not yet theorize violence.

My third fieldwork interrupted my second fieldwork in 1981 and has continued to the present. **[MEN WITH GUNS ON BACK]** It was inspired by the revolutionary peasant movements that were occurring in the late 1970s and early 1980s. I purposefully sought to document the results of directly assaultive revolutionary and repressive political violence. I went into a territory controlled by FMLN Guerilla fighters during the Salvadoran civil war as an applied anthropologist to document human rights violations by a military government funded by the United States. **[LYING DOWN GUN]** I consider that I was doing applied anthropology par excellence. I was primarily driven by a concern for documenting human rights violations by the Salvadoran government financed by the U.S. and wanted ethnography to contribute to the efforts of revolutionary peasants to build a more equitable society.

**[WOMEN WITH NEWBORN]** I got trapped in a scorched earth campaign launched against a 40-square mile region of 12 hamlets by the military government and I fled for 14 days under fire with about 1500 civilians and about 150 guerilla fighters. **[HIDING]** About 250 of us were killed, including about 25 guerillas. The guerillas were the local peasants who were essentially trying unsuccessfully to defend their families. We ran during the night and hid during the day. The guerillas were the local peasants

who were essentially trying unsuccessfully to defend their families. **[AUNT WITH CHILD]** That 19-day old baby is not hers. It was her sister's. Her sister was blown up by a grenade but the baby was miraculously thrown from her and she picked her up and kept running. **[FAMILY PICTURE REFUGEES]** This boy is the older brother of the 19 day old baby who survived the grenade blast that killed their mother. That is the surviving girl and the father, a former guerilla fighter now a depressed peasant. **[BOY WITH FATHER]** 10 years after I took the picture the boy was killed in a work accident. He was a laborer pickaxing a dirt access road in rural El Salvador. The worker in back of him was swinging his pickaxe and it inadvertently struck him in the back of his head.

At the time I did not recognize that about a third of the fighters were under 18 and would not have recognized that had I not taken pictures. **[INSERT 15 SEC CLIP OF KIDS BEING TRAINED] [NO HUMAN RIGHTS CATEGORY OF CHILD SOLDIERS]** The category of child soldier as a human rights violation had not emerged.

**[RAVINE]** This was right after the biggest massacre on the fourth night. We had run through the enemy lines encircling us and they had machine gunned us at close range. No time but at that moment about 750 of us had hidden in a ravine and the sun had just risen and a Salvadoran government US huey helicopter, provided by President Carter as human rights military aid to El Salvador, was machine gunning stragglers who were visible on the ridge above us. But it was inefficient — it had to shoot through its open door. Later Reagan sent more maneuverable Dragonfly airpower with machine gun turrets installed that could place one bullet per square inch in an area the size of a football field in a matter of minutes to kill more civilians faster. The government was shooting into the sound of crying babies and at me with U.S. equipment and U.S. advisors.

I documented structural and symbolic violence but did not recognize everyday or intimate violence as theoretically useful categories. Most importantly, theoretically I did not see the ongoing interpersonal violence among the revolutionary fighters. At the level of theory, I was able to see it as a political violence that was defending the structural violence of El Salvador with its unequal terms of trade for coffee, cotton, and cattle dependent on U.S. technology and markets on underpaid migrant laborers. **[LEARNING TO USE GUNS]** I was able to see migrant laborers who were displaced peasants who became marxist revolutionary fighters. The violence of the peasant revolutionaries appeared to be solely redemptive. It was explicitly political and explicitly resisting the structural violence. Most importantly, it was also explicitly replacing the rampant everyday intimate violence that pervades rural peasant communities in El Salvador as they break down under international and local market forces. Hence I tape-recorded with nearby explosions in the background of the tape formerly illiterate peasant alcoholics who battered their wives reading poems about their fight for justice with a machine gun in their hand. It was beautifully moving and real, but the ongoing logics of the everyday violence that was being channeled politically were masked by the political idiom. I was only able to see the ongoing intimate and everyday violence after the Cold War ended under neoliberal peacetime.

**[\$ AND CRACK]** During my next fieldwork, from 1985 to 1991, I lived with my family next to a crack house in East Harlem in order to document the effects of what I call U.S. inner city apartheid by befriending a social network of crack sellers and their families. **[PEERING FULL VIEW]** At the time, I wasn't thinking of myself as researching violence and especially not delinquent and intimate everyday violence.

Initially I had a narrow understanding of delinquent violence as strictly local and assaultive and did not recognize it as a theoretical category related to other forms of violence (structural and symbolic). I began theorizing violence halfway through my fieldwork -- that is to say, structural, symbolic and intimate violence par excellence. **[DOORWAY]** For anyone who has read *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*, I hope you can guess who is Primo and who is Ceasar in this picture. Otherwise my character portrayal in that book failed. **[GIRLS AT FOUNTAIN]** That fountain represents structural and everyday violence. It stayed broken and full of garbage in the middle of a crowded housing project for over nine months due to public sector breakdown, i.e. underfunding and corrupt, racist, incompetent administrators and unions. **[KIDS IN FRONT OF CRACKHOUSE]**. Structurally, kids are attracted to hang out where there is action, such as in front of the crackhouse called the Game Room where I did my research. **[JUST SAY NO TO CRACK]**. This actually says, "Just say no to crack" and was painted by a crack seller right after Nancy Reagan coined the phrase "Just Say no to Drugs". I was forced to begin theorizing everyday interpersonal violence due to the fists and bullets in the households around me and among my friends and recognize its relationship to structural and symbolic violence, which is what I have been doing ever since in my new fieldworks (among other things). That fieldwork experience has motivated me to document violence on the level of theory in all my new fieldwork sites. **[PER CAPITA INCARCERATION SLIDE]** Remember it was during the consolidation of neoliberalism in the United States and the escalation of the War on Drugs, which made the U.S. the nation with the highest per capita incarcerated population after Rwanda. So theorizing criminal drug violence was key.

**[SEATED GANG MEMBERS]** My next fieldwork, from 1991 to 1993 was conducted jointly with Jim Quesada and Jeff Schonberg, with a network of neighborhood gang members on the block where I lived in San Francisco's Mission District. It consisted primarily of second generation teenagers of Central American descent who coexisted uneasily with adult new immigrant day laborers, many of whom were veterans of foreign wars who congregated on the same street corner. It was a gentrifying neighborhood and the ethnographic experience was not as intense or as segregated or as violent as East Harlem. **[GUN TO MY HEAD]** By our choice of site, **[WOMAN IN THE MIDDLE]** we were trying to link theoretically interpersonal violence in the United States **[WOMAN THROWING KID]** to the historical effects of U.S. military violence in Central America and the Middle East. That woman actually is not a gang member. She was breaking up a fight between one of the Salvadoran-American gang members, the son of refugee parents, and the Palestinian store owner who was also himself a war refugee from his natal land who had also served in the Jordanian military and carried a gun and who kept a gun by his cash register and was also a business major at San Francisco State University. The fight was over being carded for being under 21 when he tried to buy beer. She wanted to maintain access to the store — 30 year-old crack addict.

**[FRANK INJECTING BY FREEWAY]** My next fieldwork began in 1994 and is ongoing with Jeff Schonberg. We are theorizing the continuum of violence approach to develop a theory of lumpen abuse among a multicultural group of aging homeless heroin injectors and crack smokers in San Francisco. This picture, by the way, is a marxist infrastructural argument about the War on Drugs, in the context of ongoing overfunded federal suburban freeways in U.S. inner cities. The shadows of those

freeways are one of the few remaining subsidized public spaces where the homeless can inject heroin without immediately getting arrested. **[SLEEPING BAG]** That is a clean and neat encampment in the social network we have been following. **[SHACK]** Note the levels of abusive violence in this picture. On one immediately visible level, it is self-inflicted abuse — he is injecting into an abscess on his rear. But the filth of the setting and the frequency of his abscesses are due to the structural effects of the U.S. War on Drugs. The discarded computer screen demonstrates another structural force: the complete irrelevance of the homeless to Silicon Valley's dot-com biotech economic miracle. Hence, what I will be calling their lumpen status, a particularly vulnerable social category susceptible to violence.

**[GROUP KIDS]** Simultaneously, from 2000 to the present I have been supervising a related fieldwork project undertaken by Jeff, Bridget Prince and Sarah Thibault among indigent homeless youth who inject heroin in San Francisco's gentrified and very white Haight Ashbury District. **[SLASHED WRIST]** The study has had to emphasize gendered domestic violence between addicted lovers on the street because that is what is most visible out there. Note not just her slashed wrist but the fact that her boyfriend's initials are proudly and romantically carved into her forearm **[BLACK MOHAWK]** We also keep our focus on the structural violence of racism and the War on Drugs **[GIRL SHRIEKING]** without losing sight of intimate embodied self-abuse, **[GIRL DRINKING]** as well as the joys of living and ecstasy that further mask everyday routine violence on the street to participants in it.

**[ME WITH PICTURES]** During all these years I have been revisiting the hamlets of the surviving revolutionary fighters and families in El Salvador. I had just given him picture from the invasion ten years earlier. **[MOTHER WITH PICTURE]** The country is now technically at peace but according to official statistics has a higher interpersonal delinquent murder rate than when the killings were explicitly political during the civil war. I saw how the politicized violence that mobilizes youth during socialist revolutionary and/or cultural nationalist eras co-exists or rather more specifically articulates with and fuels interpersonal and criminal violence under neo-liberalism in peacetime. **[ALCOHOLIC WILL BE KILLED]** This former guerilla fighter, for example, was disabled by stepping on a landmine that had been placed by fellow guerillas to disable government soldiers. Apparently the mine's location had been confused but there is suspicion that maybe it was placed by an infiltrated traitor, but he is convinced it was placed by his girlfriend's jealous ex-boyfriend. All are objective possibilities. After being demobilized in peacetime, he became a disabled peasant unable to farm his field located on a steep hill a mile away. He became an alcoholic who lived off of manipulating women. He was killed two years after I took the picture by his 14-year old little brother because he was beating up their mother in a drunken rage when she would not give him money. The little brother used his older brother's gun from the guerilla war to kill him. Worse yet, the little brother who killed him now lives in San Francisco and is covered with gang tattoos and scars. Last time I saw him was at an aunt's baptism party for a cousin's baby, **[INSERT PHOTO BAPTISM CHICO VICTORINA]** and he borrowed \$20 from me. I was too scared to refuse him the money and he ran off to smoke crack.

**[HIDING]** Returning to the scorched earth campaign in 1981 when I took this. Remember that the government was killing and torturing anyone suspected of being a

communist. That logic of repressive violence was mimicked on a smaller scale by the guerrillas who sometimes killed anyone suspected of being a traitor or a spy. There was a survival logic for the continuation of normalized everyday violence at the height of the war: when in doubt over an individual's loyalty, one could not take the risk of letting the accused person go free because that person might really be a spy and if he or she was a spy you would be killed later. Mutual killings of alleged infiltrators is a core component of civil wars that mobilize structurally vulnerable populations in a utopian idiom to volunteer to fight in times of economic crisis. Individuals who are rendered desperate by structural violence -- such as slowly starving former peasants forced to undertake part-time migrant labor that is paid on a piecework basis on the margins of export plantations -- are especially vulnerable to being both brutal victims and perpetrators. That is why the term "lumpen" is in the title of this talk, by the way — but I will expand on that in a moment.

First I want to expand on the interpersonal/structural violence relationship. The instrumental interpersonal internal killings among the guerillas often also followed patriarchal romantic patterns that can be understood as structural power relations around gender, as jealous jilted lovers killed ex-girlfriends or killed rival boyfriends by accusing them of being government spies. **[CUTE FIGHTER]** His surviving girlfriend, for example, said that he was sent by a commander to demine enemy mines towards the end of the war by a commander who was in love with her and she blames that commander for getting him blown up by one of the mines he was supposed to be demining. Multiple levels of structural violence: economic and ideological structural forces.

**[WOMAN WHO WAS LATER KILLED]** Women suffered the most because they were able to cross lines during the war. She was a revolutionary, a refugee in this picture. She went back to military territory to sell popsicles bringing back information for the guerillas. Her boyfriend thought she was having an affair and accused her of being a double agent. For all we know she might have been. Maybe she was caught on the other side and giving the option of being tortured or giving up guerilla information. The confusing experience of the combination of heroic idealism with petty mutual deadly betrayals creates post war dynamic of symbolic violence—following Bourdieu's notion of self-blame through normalizing and naturalizing oppressive dynamics. This demobilizes, demoralizes and depoliticizes former fighters, facilitating transitions to delinquent and interpersonal crime. **[GRAFFITI]** I would like to know how much of the peacetime criminal violence is committed by former fighters on both sides of the conflict. That still needs to be documented empirically and theorized.

**[KIDS AND GARBAGE]** Let us return to the interface between structural violence and everyday violence in the United States. We saw that the U.S. has extraordinarily high violence rates and high levels of incarceration compared to other industrialized nations — that is structural violence. It also has a homicide rate that is 6 to 44 times higher than that of most other industrialized nations **[MURDER STATS BY NATION INSERT]** — that is intimate violence. I would argue that that this is because of the size of its lumpen sector. It gets interpreted as we are a violent people or a "diverse people." Cannot compare us to homogeneous societies like Sweden. That is symbolic violence. We do not kill across race lines, we are too racist.

**[LUMPEN DEFINITION]** Arguably, in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century there has been a dramatic increase in what Marx would call lumpenized populations -- that is to say,

people who have been or are being (usually tortuously) expelled from the economy (what Marx calls modes of production). They are the historical fall-out from large scale, long-term transformations in the organization of the economy. They have no productive relationship to the economy's means of production.

Marx's class category of lumpen was ill-defined. He often used it as an arbitrary political value judgment in his polemical writings and it has been much misused in the past hundred years by revolutionary rhetorics to justify killing people. But lumpen as an adjective, not a bounded category, is a useful term today. We need to reinterpret class as a modifying concept rather than an absolute bounded category by exploring Foucault's understanding of subjectivity, biopower and governmentality. Subjectivities are identities and senses of personhood that emerge in historical moments as if they are purposeful choices but in fact impose themselves on individuals and discipline them to be who they think they are. Biopower is the new form of state power that emerged during the modern era following a logic of maximizing the welfare and health of citizens and managing them efficiently through a dynamic that Foucauldians call governmentality – from vaccines that prevent death to prisons that rehabilitate to psychiatric social workers who render pathological people normal. He developed the concept to contrast it with the bloody repressive violence feudal kings extracted from subjects by torturing, drawing and quartering them.

Under social democratic governments governmentality is arguably overall a positive, productive process, and much of the control of citizens occurs through the internalization of discourses of knowledge and truth into the souls of people who want to be normal, healthy, modern and smart. **[WILL WORK FOR FOOD]** No time to elaborate, but my argument is that under contemporary neoliberalism, the effects of biopower combined with structural violence of huge sectors of the population being expelled from a changing labor market, have rendered governmentality **[HOGAN'S SCARS]** overwhelmingly abusive to most people, promoting violent subjectivities among increasingly large lumpenized sectors of the population.

In summary, the lumpen can be defined as those sectors of the population whose subjectivity has an abusive relationship to biopower and governmentality as well as a parasitical relationship to the mode of production that renders them violent. This man has multiple skin grafts on his body from multiple self-inflicted infections due to unsanitary injections. These scars and his depressed state (the blood on his bicep is an injection that missed that he is too depressed to clean up) are the product of the contradictory effects of the War on Drugs and high-tech medicine that is distributed to the indigent only when they are about to die.

**[INSERT ICU HUGGING]** In addition to killing themselves and battering their loved ones, people like this man who is being successfully revived from death from cirrhosis of the liver by high-tech medicine in a county hospital, i.e., biopower by excellence, disproportionately become fodder for state armies and for suicidal resistance when the symbolic violence weighing on them is inverted and when they are mobilized politically when they are younger as the patriotic sons of the nation (as in the United States military) or the chosen children of God (as in Iraqi suicide bombers).

**[NEEDLE IN MOUTH]** In the continuum of violence that marks war and peace, the lumpen disproportionately shift the practice of violence towards intimate routinized violence and that generates more symbolic violence. **[THEORY OF LUMPEN]**



**ABUSE]** Furthermore, violence then gets normalized among the socially vulnerable, because logically they engage in higher levels of intimate violence against themselves and the people closest to them than do populations that are not subject to abusive political and structural constraints. Worse yet, the redemptive political violence from war also fuels and feeds on this dynamic of everyday violence, channeling the symbolic violence that emerges out of the everyday violence in political directions that become violent.

Finally, a note of clarification on the word “abuse.” In popular parlance, “abuse” is most commonly thought of as operating at the level of interpersonal relations that can be emotional, psychological and/or physical and are often associated with trauma. This theory of abuse, however, links the individual traumatic level of abuse to social structural forces that are political, economic, institutional and cultural, and include embodied suffering such as addiction, morbidity, physical pain and emotional despair.

**[HANK WAVING FLAG]** Examining violence in its multiple forms on its continuum under advanced neoliberalism where a discourse celebrating market forces obscures a massive state expansion in violent military and carceral complexes, we can start to grasp the global implications of the phenomenon of lumpen abuse. Today, ever larger proportions of the world’s population survive precariously in refugee camps, rural and urban wastelands, shanty towns, housing projects, tenements, prisons, and homeless encampments due to economic forces, military interventions, and environmental degradation that is disproportionately directly caused by the United States. Ironically and sadly calling the U.S. the Great Satan is from a culturally relative perspective an arguably objective statement. Worse yet, the everyday violence the lumpen engage in, such as becoming addicted to drugs that destroy their bodies, becoming domestic batterers or suicide bombers makes them appear to be pathological kooks. And this fuels ultimately a symbolic violence that blames victims and persuades many of them that they are either worthless or are the chosen children of God going straight to heaven. It ultimately further legitimizes U.S.-style corporate and militaristic neoliberalism. Under contemporary neoliberalism, they are also disproportionately at risk of becoming fodder for state armies and for suicidal resistance when the symbolic violence weighing on them is inverted and when they are mobilized politically, especially when they are younger as the patriotic U.S. marines in the United States military, or the chosen children of God (as in Iraqi suicide bombers).

Schemas oversimplify and can be pompous. **[OVERLAPPING FLOWS OF VIOLENCE]** The point is that in the neoliberal era violence takes on particular salience, as it flows along its continuum and produces more of itself in overlapping but misrecognized forms with a directionality. And to break the cycle that generates symbolic violence against the structurally vulnerable, we need to understand the weighted directionality of the flow or else we participate in symbolic violence.

**[ICEBERG]** I use an iceberg image (i.e., global warming) with structural violence being the part of the iceberg that lies under the water, everyday violence being the cold that keeps the iceberg structurally sound, intimate violence being the only visible part of the iceberg and the melted water coming off of intimate violence when our eyes heat up the iceberg is symbolic violence which then falls back into the ocean, creating currents due to the increasingly heavy rate at which our eyes now heat up icebergs given global warming which represents the ideologies of neoliberal celebrations of inequality, free market forces, and punitive social interventions, and thereby melt more

and more symbolic violence off the visible intimate violence part of the iceberg. As the level of the ocean of symbolic violence rises, the salinity of the ocean changes and the iceberg floats higher and higher on itself, converting more of the structural violence into intimate violence and also pushing the iceberg around with its flows, forcing the larger boats that have less maneuverability than the smaller boats to crash into it and vulnerable populations are forced to travel in larger boats, whereas rich elite people travel in speed boats that can maneuver around anything. So the vulnerable people are the ones who crash and drown.

I will end here by apologizing for all this negative imagery, but it is meant to break us out of condemnations of individuals and recognizing structurally imposed cruelty.

Thanks.