Dreaming Invisible Things

A New Politics of Hope for Difficult Times

The age that could be understood by Marxism is over.

Of course, there never was a time when any single philosophy of history and events was true or real; but since the beginning of the capitalist era it was only by Marxism or Marxism plus something else (psychology or critical philosophy) that some approximate grasp on what forces were at work could be established.

Now, things are different. Literally. *Things*, hard solid *things*, are different. Conspiracy theory is the new ruling 'class' of the world.

Not conspiracy. There is no single grand conspiracy, no 'Committee of 300', no 'Elders of Zion', no 'Reptilian blood cult' that is manipulating all significant events.

There are, of course, small scale and real conspiracies, even some pretty grand ones; it has always been so. From criminal conspiracies to rob banks, to political conspiracies conducted by secret services to influence other governments or their own. That is not what is ruling the world at present, certainly not any more than when the FBI's manipulation of possibly the greatest conspiracy theory of all – the 'Red Threat' – deeply informed global events.

No, this is not about aliens infiltrated into human communities, or intelligence agencies manipulating events and discourses; it is about conspiracy theory manipulating those events and discourses.

Conspiracy theory is the new ruling class of the world.

In an information society, information supplies both the primary agency in that society and the medium through which that agency is expressed. Conspiracy theory is the dominant information in a society dominated by information.

This was not inevitable. A number of factors have brought conspiracy theory to this position of power. Among those factors is a hybridization of digital technology with something much older: a de-regulatory trend that began in a small way with Mallarmé and the Symbolists, the detaching of words and other signs and symbols from their localised meanings, an extreme form of metaphor whereby an object or idea is invoked only by excluding all words or signs that describe or formulate that object or idea. This trend became generalised, from abstruse poetry to everyday exchange, through money; firstly by the detaching of paper money from the gold reserves that backed it (the 'gold standard'), and then by electronic money and the financial Big Bang.

What does this new ruling class look like? It looks like the deregulation of reality. The deregulation of everything. The reason we are talking about it and I am writing about it is that it has broken cover recently: mostly through a conspiracy theory about 'the Establishment'. In the past this theory was a relatively benign one mouthed by liberals and radicals who had not thought it through very well. Now, it refers to the secret malevolence of the political class in Washington and in Europe; it means that 'the West' is a plot against everyone including all

those who live as ordinary folk, just about managing, in 'the West'; a plot so wide and so open it is described every day by kids on computers in small Macedonian towns and journalists who don't believe a word they write in mass circulation newspapers. Whether by the sex abuse ring run by Hillary Clinton from the Comet Ping Pong pizza restaurant in Washington or by the EU bureaucrats' warring against the British Banger and the straight banana, 'the Establishment', in baroque detail as well as more openly in policy (pollution regulation, tax, anti-terror legislation), conspires variously against the citizens of the West.

The recent election in the US and the Brexit referendum in the UK were dominated, and dominated successfully in the terms of the ruling class of conspiracy theory, by conspiracy theory. This was seen explicitly in the US campaign (Trump fingering Ted Cruz's father for fraternising with Lee Harvey Oswald), or more subtly in Michael Gove's "people are tired of experts" or Boris Johnson's "a sense that British democracy was being undermined by the EU system".

Trump, unusually (and we are now in a new usual), personifies conspiracy theory; he personally subscribes to many of them. More commonly, contemporary politicians employ dog whistle politics in relation to conspiracy; hinting at dark, untouchable, manipulative forces that explain the personal misfortunes and failures of the individuals in their audiences.

The principles and dynamics of conspiracy theory are beginning to feed into other discourses. In the new 'post-truth' reality, when a false statement is made which is then clearly refuted, the refutation, even when acknowledged as true by the original perpetrators, can be ignored and the false statement continue to be upheld by its audience. This is an effect partly informed by the self-interests of the individuals in that audience and partly by a more common sense that anything that does not massage those self-interests, the sense of entitled disgruntlement and resentment, all the way up to white supremacism, is a false message from 'the Establishment'. I am not the first to notice that Carl Sagan's idea that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence has been hollowed and turned inside out; a lack of evidence for an extraordinary claim is now taken as evidence that information is being suppressed by a conspiratorial Establishment or by one of its powerful sub-sets and special interest groups.

Combating the conspiracy theory ruling class in a post-truth world needs completely new tactics. The traditionally effective journalistic exposé or academic analysis, the rhetorical flourish that diminishes and humiliates the lie or demonstrations with counter-slogans – none of these work any more for an audience that reads all those messages, including those from a leftist populism, as the foreign language of an Establishment conspiracy.

In order to resist and confront and unseat the new ruling class, a new kind of irrationalism will be necessary; rationalist critiques like David Aaronovitch's *Voodoo Histories* or Francis Wheen's *How Mumbo Jumbo Conquered The World* are illustrative, but not combative. (But more of that in conclusion).

To understand what is being combated here, it is necessary to understand the history of conspiracy theory; not just the cultural forces (deregulation and information technology) and the social forces (post-industrialism, and so on) at work, but the detailed heritage of conspiracy theory itself. For conspiracy theory has not always been the discrete, independent and organic force it is now; it was, once, a production. The origins of the term itself seem largely accidental, though it is interesting to find a usage in the late nineteenth century to defend Madam Blavatsky's theosophy. It seems to have sprung into life as a unified idea (rather than simply about one theory about one conspiracy) in the mid-1960s at the time of intense concern around

the Kennedy assassination and the rise of a 'counter-culture' that was anxious not only to make a wholly 'other' society, but for a wholly 'other' explanation for mainstream reality. As a result, 'conspiracy theory' developed a doubleness that has been useful to its becoming independent and (in information terms, at least) sentient: it grew into a means of discrediting those who tried to knit together conspiracies into a coherent mesh, but at the same time served as a dark enticement to engage in the exact same knitting; it made 'critic' the same as 'idiot'. And now those 'idiots' are coming to power, and that suits conspiracy theory just fine…

The *actuality* of conspiracy theory is much older than the phrase. In terms of where we are right now, the crucial conspiracy production for us is that of the so-called 'Protocols of the Elders of Zion' by the Tsarist Secret Police (the Okhrana), the Department for Protecting the Public Security and Order. Not just because this kind of racist conspiracy theory is a crucial part of our contemporary ruling class, but because the organisation that created it is still effectively in existence and is an important wing of the new information ruling class.…

Before I move to a description of the genealogy of this 'organisation', explaining the dominance of conspiracy theory by reference to an actual conspiracy, let me just nod to Guy Debord and his fellow situationists who not only gave us the beginnings of a theory for what is going on now (the theory of the 'Society of the Spectacle' [which needs re-writing, popularising and updating for these new times]), but also had the insight and prescience to identify in 1988 how "a perfect democracy constructs its own inconceivable foe, terrorism. Its wish is to be judged by its enemies, not by its results. The story of terrorism is written by the state.… The spectators must certainly never know everything about terrorism, but they must always know enough to convince them that, compared with terrorism everything else must be acceptable, or in any case more rational and democratic" (p. 24, *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle*).

The Okhrana's three principal characteristics were its obsession with terror, its deployment of agents-provocateurs and its cultivation of an anti-semitic conspiracy theory for popular dissemination. It developed a politics of surveillance and repression justified in relation to the terroristic activities of tiny numbers of Nihilists and Anarchists, (generating a microcosmic 'post-truth' world of mirrors in radical politics, for an account of which the Symbolist Andrei Bely's *Petersburg* is outstanding). So there was already in place in the early days of the twentieth century a politics of dissimulation that we would call 'post-truth', founded on the fear of terror and underpinned by a narrative of a global plot conducted by a (racial) elite – all sustained by the deployment of fake agents who provoked fake events.

In 1917 this should have come to an end. But look at Stalin's brutality towards Soviet soldiers returning from prison camps or relief camps run by foreign powers, most notably after the second world war. These individuals might have expected to receive a hero's welcome, not the imprisonment, interrogation and often murder that befell most of them. Why this violence? Because it seems to have been Stalin's belief that no one could come out of imprisonment, and an encounter with the intelligence services of a foreign country, without a new (traitorous) mission. And his evidence for this belief? His own experience. As a Bolshevik activist from 1903 onwards, Stalin was repeatedly arrested and exiled to Siberia, escaping (or 'escaping') a number of times.

Did Stalin pursue Marxist-Leninism once he had taken over from Lenin or did he pursue the same 'Great Russia' nationalism as the Okhrana, but under the red flag of Lenin? Rather tellingly, Stalin issued a second edition of his manifesto book *Foundations of Leninism* after Lenin's death with one small change: from the passage that declared that "socialism is not

possible in one country" he had removed the word "not". The same politics of counter-terror, fake agents and conspiracy-theories-about-foreign-sabotage that had characterised the politics of the Okhrana now fed the show trials and filled the Gulag.

Today, Putin is an FSB (KGB) man through and through and continues those same politics, adding to them the manipulation of a pseudo-democratic, pseudo-political spectacle through the fabrication of fake parties and clown politicians above whom he rises magisterially (there have been three excellent articles by S D Tucker on these fabricated groups and individuals in the *Fortean Times*, recently). Liberal democrats are subject to the same rhetoric, treatment and assassination as Nihilists and Anarchists once were. All this is fuelled by the fear of Chechen and other terrorists, ramped up crucially by the apartment bombings of 1999 in which the FSB seems to have been involved.

So, the Okhrana put Donald Trump in the White House.

Or, to put it another way, whether they did or they didn't, the man in the White House is exactly who a nineteenth-century Okhrana agent would want to see there. To the new ruling class it makes no difference whether the genealogy is causal-conspiratorial or accidental-cultural; its only 'interest' is in its self-propagation and in its sustaining its own dominance. In that sense it is not disinterested, but has an Ayn Rand-like ideology of self-realisation in magnificence and self-sufficiency, free from the need for evidence or a supportive intellectual community for its self-belief, rather like Donald Trump himself.

Significantly, the nuts and bolts really don't matter, although they may be there; even their irrefutable exposure may have no effect at all because it would just be one more conspiracy theory and which ones you believe in and which ones you don't is up to you; the conspiracy theory ruling class wins every which way. For, perversely, the politics of conspiracy theory is far more about obsessive confession and meaningless exposure than effective secrecy.

Conspiracy theory never delivers for its believers; no conspiracy theorist ever got close to successfully exposing a plot and disgracing its organisers. Conspiracy theory is only safe because its believers must continue to believe in it; their gullibility and their unrelieved victimhood are only explainable by the expanding power and evil of the conspiracy. In their recent paper 'Mimesis and Conspiracy', Michael Vine and Matthew Carey point out that while conspiracy theories seem to point to a particularly expansionist bureaucratic form of dominance – "control and its extension is all that matters" – the exact same qualities re-emerge as those of conspiratorial thought itself. Conspiracism stands in for conspiracies rather than exposes them; it enters the fictional bodies of conspiracies and occupies them. It is as formalistic and repetitive and voracious as a malign bureaucracy.

The audiences for conspiracies are trapped in this grim loop. Willingly suspending scepticism in the name of scepticism, they have brought a deep and self-perpetuating power to the stage of democratic politics in a way that was not possible before the digital age. Gone are the liberal gatekeepers who once reserved the term "conspiracy theorist" as a weapon of last resort to be used against celebrity Marxians who pointed too closely to real conspiracies spanning financial, commercial, political and para-political sectors. Liberal gatekeepers could once hang onto the important separations of politics and big money, or the intelligence services and violence, by ignoring the connections in the name of BBC empiricism. But the web does not have liberal gatekeepers; instead the web has cleared the stage for conspiracy, and conspiracy is the pantomime of the web. Its narrative is intrinsically utopian and slippery, apparently fulfilling myth's function as a machine for reconciling contradictory realities.

Unfortunately for its believers, their role in the pantomime is as a *special* victim, a Cinderella who never gets to go to the ball, but instead is subject to the endless, dull mechanics of the magic: the clanking rat-dragging carpets and powerful trap doors of a world that is transformable at the push of a lever from Sherwood Forest to Wishy Washy's Laundry to the Royal Ballroom. This magic is bureaucratic, ordered, robotic, and repeatable. Its illusion is endlessly scalable and transferable; repeating over and over the same dark pantomime in which audiences are excited by their own terror, led to believe that tiny mishaps – a slip on a banana skin, a custard pie in the face, an infestation of rats – are the work of Princesses and Barons, of powerful Fairies and animal-human hybrids rather than the dull machinery of the theatre itself.

So what does a politics of resistance look like in this moment of the Conspiracy-Spectacle?

First of all, it includes a disinterest in actual conspiracy theories; very few real conspiracies achieve very much, although they may temporarily cover up criminal activities like the Tuskegee syphilis experiments on black males by the US Public Health Service from the 1930s to the 1970s. Rather than achieving immediate short-term ends, they are much more effective in the long term, by sucking oppositional politics and activists into a conspiracy-mush. So, there is nothing to be achieved by rushing off to research whether Stalin was really an Okhrana agent or not. What is important is that their policies were perpetuated by Stalin, for whatever reason, are still alive and practised by Putin, and are about to be at least partially echoed from within the White House. So, abandon any hope you may have that the Trump presidency will be brought down by some revelation of conspiracy; such revelations are already rejected by his supporters as themselves conspiracies. Don't be dragged into that mush. If such a thing happens, so be it, and count your lucky stars, but that isn't resistance – resistance means side-stepping the conspiracy-mush entirely and concentrating on the continuance of practices.

A politics of resistance to conspiracy theory *does* include an interest in conspiracy theorists and the most pernicious – the likes of David Icke – should receive the same attention and scrutiny as conventional fascist ideologues.

Will protest marches and demonstrations against the Trump and Brexit results have any effect on the conspiracy theory ruling class? Well, they do indicate to resisters that there are numbers in resistance; so they are useful for that alone. Yet, they also tend to be demoralising events, because at present they are unlikely to take place within a narrative (compared with the Civil Rights marches of the 1960s where there was a clear organisation with cogent demands and a manipulation of strategy). A politics of space – for the Civil Rights marchers it was about black people being able to occupy space without violence – is necessary for a meaningful march, but unless they aim for some kind of occupation of space their meaning is brief and transitory. What kind of occupation? The vulnerability of the politics of occupation which informed the Arab Spring and Occupy was exposed and we are living with that legacy now. In the case of Occupy the initiatives were 'normalised' and domesticated and the activists returned home, while in the case of the Arab Spring the occupations were militarised and either crushed or transformed into wars with sectarian borders rather than democratic interiors. So, perhaps there is not much mileage in street politics, then. Small violent protests may arise, and may serve as invitations for exemplary crackdowns. Then, who knows... but there is not the organisation in the US or UK, as there was say for Civil Rights or Irish Republicanism, which could sustain violent politics or politics in the context of violence; and the lesson of the defeat of the Arab Spring is that violence can quickly step sideways from the city squares to the

battleground and put warlords in charge. The Civil Rights Movement's politics of non-violent resistance was about sustainable strategy as much as ethics.

Activism through the democratic parties – the Labour Party in the UK, the Democrats in the USA, the new popular-left parties like Syriza and Podemos – is, paradoxically, far more important. Paradoxically, because participating in bourgeois democracy and bureaucracy is dull and 'Establishment'. These are, after all, parties of the state; but we need to address the state, in defence of public spaces and public services, and in support of democratising the control of the state. Many activists demobilise themselves by their disgust with the state; dimly influenced by Lenin's 'State and Revolution' argument, they back away from the state as a ground for action. The 'war on two fronts' strategy has never been more timely; defending the gains of public-ownership from the forces of the private sector (and supporting those politicians who are willing to do so) while battling with the managers of the state for democratisation. The FSB did not interfere in the US election for fun: they recognise the significance of democratic elections and they fear them; we need to defend located democracy, and oppose all electronic balloting. '*Habeas corpus*' – you have to present your body to have power and vote. I would even go so far as to end postal balloting if there is sufficient evidence of manipulation. We need to *physically* defend the *corporeal* process of voting with hands and feet and pencil and the tradition of counting the *vote by hand in the public gaze*. So, crucial tactic number one: *the return of the embodied voter in a process conducted in the public gaze*, as part of a general re-locating and re-embodiment of the citizen.

We remove ourselves as much as possible from the electronic monitoring of preference and we campaign for others to do so. We understand that algorithms are working tirelessly to monitor our preferences and turn them back on us in the forms of invitations and insistences to buy and behave in certain ways, creating a loop whereby we seamlessly and invisibly surrender subjectivity to the algorithm, while feeling 'never more myself' and empty. This means boycotting and withdrawing from all opinion surveys, Bake-Off voting, online quizzes, etc. This does not mean that we abandon social media, but continue to use it in a way that is less about self-expression than a floating free of our own ideas and narratives and images; in other words, we deploy the Symbolist deregulation of expression against the algorithm, by expressing ourselves through images and signs of everything else but ourselves. It means that we should use pseudonyms, not for the purpose of covert behaviour but for subjectivity-protection, and that we should not repeatedly release our own image online (without puritanically suppressing it entirely). We should cultivate a sceptical-gothic sensibility to self-expression: there is no true self but the one that never reveals itself. The other public selves are all good, but they need a hidden and night-time self that is never confessed and from which uniqueness comes, a rich darkness that resists the normotic personality of those who empty themselves of feelings in order to conform to exterior norms.

This is partly why support by all for anti-racist struggle is fundamental; it is crucial because institutional and popular malevolence is where conspiracy theory rules most intensely; it is crucial because we must win the right of everyone to define and diffuse their identity in terms of their deep interior and not by a categorisable appearance or simplified genealogy, and because the extension of the cosmopolitan canopy where there is "acceptance of the space as belonging to all kinds of people" (Elijah Anderson) is how we win; giant spaces safe from the conspiracy theory machines.

But the new politics will have to be more creative than that. For each of us – in response to a post-truth Spectacle and subject to invasive algorithms tied into a commercial system of preference manipulation – will now begin to re-make the world.

The first step is the rejection of *faith* in utopian planning, benevolent or malevolent, local or global. Instead, we are soft guerrillas in the spaces left by planning's contradictions. One of the elements that still survives from the burning wreckage of Marxist ideas is 'contradiction'. Nothing ever quite turns out as planned: a signature building in the City of London combines with the rays of the sun to incinerate investment bankers' sports cars, guided tours of the Falls Road and the Shanklin are conducted by former paramilitaries... Whether a capitalist or an information ruling class is in charge, there is no sealed dystopia. Instead, there is just as much a mess as there ever was. There is plenty to play for, but there is not all to play for. Ditch any remaining utopian illusions of 'complete change'. Change is never completed. Nothing ever starts and nothing ever ends. The mass of the universe is constant; change is what it is. Planned homogeneity throws up unexpected voids, large and tiny. So, while we should defend and support any planned economy that resists neo-liberalism and campaign for its most democratic transformation possible, at the same time that defence/support comes without illusions and we must be opportunistic and parasitic.

Opportunism should be part of how we describe our resistance. Not in relation to exploiting each other, but in relation to how we counter-exploit the terrain, both planned and neo-liberal, the physical 'grounds' of our being; seizing on whatever accidents occur, whatever falls plunge, whatever voids and sinkholes open up. Just as the Trump-FSB nexus has constructed a discourse of lies under the protective dome of conspiracy theory, so we will construct a geo-grounds of fantasy in *exactly* the same context and under exactly the same architectural and informational conditions as 'post-truth'. That way we can eat the Spectacle from the inside out.

Our watchwords will be real freedom and post-pilgrimage.

Stuff the country, we want our souls back.

Together and separately, we're going to make empathy great again. So great.

Let us explore this world made alien and conspiracy-theoretical, seek spaces where the gaps and voids and contradictions and cosmopolitan canopies afford a variegated individual an escape from malevolent gazes. Seek out these spaces and share their presence with other post-pilgrims; try to expand those spaces where freedom is possible; where personal preference (harming no one) can be expressed without algorithmic exploitation, where spiritual identity (that is exclusive of no one else's) can be explored without dogma, and where we are free of that fake 'freedom' (of the Brexit, miserablist, resentful kind) which 'frees' us from our responsibility for each other. Nothing new here, but instead of legislating this liberalism, we should inscribe localised sites with it.

In Sidmouth (of all places) there is a "Dissenters Wall" outside an old protestant chapel, where people are invited to sit and share dissident opinions. Let us propagate such spaces invisibly; share maps of the less explicit and more accidental ones. To begin, nothing need change in these spaces but your understanding of them. Take your friends to visit them.

I am talking here about the construction of a secret architecture, a giant glassy structure without glass, a structure of many imaginary structures, to all appearances transparent and non-existent, immense and wholly subjective, multiple in its forms – beginning with the Chapel Perilous of Robert Anton Wilson, with the giant invisible forms that appear at the end of Jeff Nichols's movie 'Midnight Special', with the different kinds of 'chorastic' spaces described by

Julia Kristeva and Elizabeth Grosz, and so on. One thing that held back the situationists in their opposition to the Spectacle was their hatred of art and image. The invisible post-pilgrimage that I am proposing, with its raising of a shared invisible architecture, is both more and less iconoclastic; for it is uninhibited about drawing on any art source, while shunning mimesis and leaving no exploitable trace of its own.

This post-pilgrimage is not an attempt at a counter-culture, but an invisible anti-empire that sits to the side of, or folded within the organism of, a living world of things about which we renounce all ideas of ownership.

This is not the poisoned and infected ground imagined by the conspiracy theory ruling class as beneath its dome; this is the imaginary and real terrain of a heaven in Earth, where the only god is an un-god (which remains godlike, a nothing or darkness within us from which all creativity comes). This heaven in Earth, where the abiding myth is of individual self-respect and realisation, is characterised by a quest, with excitement and self-discovery and queer treasures, and an obligation to the stranger; its sub-plot is the underpinning meshwork of empathy and care for others, hence the importance of the apparently un-magical world of democratic politics and national health and care services. Yet, whatever success there is in such planning there will always be cracks in which to begin building the invisible.

This world is wholly different from the one you fear; it is wholly different from the dull and stodgy materials of conspiracy, repeating over and over; rather, it is the generous seat of your quest.

Woven within these reclamations of social space, everyone will be encouraged to make their own post-pilgrimage, modelled not on conventional pilgrimages to actual located shrines, but modelled on 'Pilgrim's Progress' or 'Sir Constant' or those medieval nuns' pilgrimages conducted in their imaginations from their cells, or the symbolic journeys of Symbolist plays like 'The Great Highway'. These are pilgrimages which may, or where possible should, be taken out onto the road, but they are most importantly Symbolist pilgrimages, in which the pilgrim makes her own route and invisible architectural hinterland from the neglected, abandoned, defaced and depredated landscape-within-the-landscape; those spaces from which the surplus has been sucked and to which the pilgrim, by imaginative means, restores meaning and pleasure. It is the mass transformation of ourselves from consumer-producers of 'social media' to the anti-artist-demiurges of a hidden Paradise Now. In the same moment, by recovering pleasure for ourselves by our presence in these magical and abject spaces, distant from the spectacle-images and the algorithm-addiction, we post-pilgrims are also reclaiming part of the surplus of pleasure stolen from us by the Spectacle, recovering the centeredness and peace robbed from us by the overwhelming and disempowering narrative of conspiracy.

This Symbolist post-pilgrimage-for-all should be proclaimed as a mass-participatory event that is already in progress; there is no particular need to disguise this conceit (nor to broadcast it) as in a post-truth world a counter-conspiracy, particularly a playful one, is suitable grounds for being taken seriously. We transcend all miserable criticism. The Symbolist post-pilgrimage-for-all is a mass spiritual act; it is a new, non-religious spirituality that embraces *any* spirituality and belief; it is an act of collective revolutionary dreaming in particular spaces and in particular bodies in resistance to the hatred and fear and racism of the conspiracy theory class. It will be almost impossible to detect and almost impossible to stop. Everyone will be able to practise it (except those whose lives are under constant surveillance – like Presidents); it will be a benevolent conspiracy against conspiracy; everyone will suspect that everyone else is doing it,

though only a fool would share the fact of their participation with anyone but their closest friend. As the world is full of fools, the meme will distribute widely.

By the same equation, by refusing and ignoring utopian planning, and by returning again and again to the invisibility of pilgrim-architecture, material fragments and splinters will be thrown off, unplanned and unpredictable, into the streets. By that refusal of 'real plans' and by our obsessive return to the invisible, these splinters will escape reading and incorporation into the narratives of Establishment and resentment: oblique things along new routes of freedom. Shards above the surface, buoyed on the back of gargantuan architectures of desire.

It is time to launch the pilgrimage; to assemble small groups of serious 'pranksters' who can write the founding documents, prepare the symbols, the images, the badges, the call signs, the maps.

We should be ready for conspiracies to thin and sag.

The available and exploitable energy for conspiracy narrative is not inexhaustible; it will begin to run out as its triggers and catalyses become more complex, entangled and inflexible. The enormous boost to misery and conspiracy narrative from digitisation will itself become a drain on their energies.

We should be ready for a time when our invisible architecture is in place, and awaiting the collapse of the conspiracy dome.

****

Although some of what has been written here has been stitched together from ideas I have articulated elsewhere, what is new, particularly the idea of the 'conspiracy theory ruling class' and the invisible counter-conspiracy architecture, came to me in a dream last night and since awaking I have been writing this document continuously in one sitting. It is written for the medium of dreams and it has come from a dream.

Here's to a new politics of invisible architecture; pilgrim-dreaming for a transformed terrain in the streets.

Mytho
January 2017