between them to collectively disrupt today's global coloniality in the form of resurgent nationalism and multicultural silos? While these questions are beyond the scope of You's book, *Genre Networks and Empire* charts out an exciting area that scholars in decolonial studies, comparative rhetoric, and transnational studies can build on for a collective action to actualize a pluriversal future of rhetorical studies.

Hua Zhu
University of Utah

© 2024 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198.2023.2286133
Check for updates

Stuart J. Murray. *The Living from the Dead: Disaffirming Biopolitics.* Penn State UP, 2022. 218 pages. $27.50 paperback.

In *The Living from the Dead: Disaffirming Biopolitics*, Stuart J. Murray aims to disrupt neoliberal biopolitics by arguing for a critical stance of "disaffirmation"—a shared agony that hears and holds the incommensurable deaths tolerated as a so-called necessity of life. Building on Foucault's theorization of the rupture between sovereign power (the power to "take life or let live") and biopolitical power (the power to "make live or let die"), Murray calls upon readers to disaffirm biopolitics by interrogating our complicity within the sacrificial economy where state-sanctioned death is the cost of living. This important contribution to the RSA Series in Transdisciplinary Rhetoric offers a rhetorical critique of neoliberal biopolitics that significantly (refreshingly) is neither "for" or "against" biopolitics. Instead, Murray crafts, through a series of case studies, a stance of "disaffirmation" toward biopolitics and advocates for "an ethics of listening" to those we have let die so that others may live. Murray invites this ethics of listening by hearkening voices of the dead across several case studies, which form the structure of the book.

In chapter one, "The Cost of Living: On Pandemic Politics and Protests," Murray reads pandemic resistance and lives "sacrificed" in the "war" against COVID-19 alongside military suicides and suicide terrorism. This chapter confronts resistance to pandemic protocols (shelter-in-place and mask policies) and how such resistance contributed to the biopolitical sacrifice and abandonment of essential workers—the literal human capital—whose deaths fed our economic "health" during the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, Murray questions when exercising individual liberties (like refusing to wear a mask) infringe upon another's right to life and how such resistance (and the resulting deaths) might function as a form of pandemic terrorism that can be read alongside cases of military suicide and suicide terrorism. Though Murray is careful to clarify that none of these cases are commensurate, he argues that they do speak to and of deaths where life has become weaponized to support the state.

Chapter two considers the human right to die and the "speech that begins after death" by analyzing mass hunger strikes that occurred in prisons across California in 2013. In this chapter, Murray puts Foucault in conversation with J. L. Austin to unpack how the mass hunger strike—a performative speech act that rejects the state's biopolitical power to make life and let die—enabled prisoners to speak in protest of their living conditions, most notably solitary confinement. And yet, as Murray explores, a court order that authorized the

force-feeding of hunger-striking prisoners silenced the ghostly agency and voice of prisoners in favor of a standard biopolitical order where the state determines who lives and who dies.

Chapter three questions biopolitical thresholds for tolerable death by introducing two legal case studies of "untimely" and "preventable" childhood death. This chapter grapples with incompatible biomedical claims made by anti-vaxxers and Indigenous peoples and questions the medico-legal sovereignty (and culpability) of parents who treat minors with nonbiomedical therapies. This fascinating chapter compares the rhetorical posturing of parents who refuse vaccinations to Indigenous groups who exercise medico-legal sovereignty on the basis of tradition and ethno-cultural difference. Though different, the "untimely" and "preventable" deaths of Ezekiel Stephan and Makayla Sault strategically disaffirm neoliberal biopolitics through spatialized appeals to bodies, lands, and territories and who can rightfully claim biopolitical jurisdiction over such "spaces."

In chapter four, the final case study in the book, Murray considers "Racism's Digital Dominion" by reading video footage of the death of Jamel Dunn, a Black man who was recorded drowning in a retention pond in Florida in 2017. In the wake of growing footage of dying Black men whose witnesses do nothing to intervene, this chapter considers the biopolitical impulse to make live or let die and its connections to racism in our contemporary mediated culture. Murray is careful with his treatment of racism and white supremacy in this chapter. And though the meat of the analysis largely returns to traditional figures like Foucault and Heidegger, Murray does incorporate anti-racism forces such Saidiya Hartman, Alexander Weheliye, Sharon Patricia Holland, and Charles R. Lawrence III.

The concluding Refrain ends with an apostrophic address where Murray self-reflexively considers how to hearken the dead while problematizing the false consciousness of freedom that is central to neoliberal biopolitics. Such hearkenings include musings about Terri Schiavo's prosopopoeic citizenship, Mary Joe Frug's last essay, Patricia J. Williams' writing style as a Black feminist legal scholar, and George Floyd's public execution under the knees of law enforcement. As Murray explains, "The cases are not representative examples of neoliberal biopolitics so much as they are occasions to hear and to analyze situated disaffirmations … to surface some of the wider ethical tensions and collisions at play in the political project of making live and letting die" (20).

Throughout the book, Murray is preoccupied, in particular, with the rhetorical conditions that make it (im)possible for voices of the dead to speak and be heard. By encountering each of these case studies, the reader bears witness to the "sinister paradox of neoliberal biopolitics, namely, how making live, even as a humanitarian gesture, with the best of intentions, relies on and often reduplicates relations of inequality, domination, and death-warranting" (8). "Despite ourselves," Murray rightfully quips, "we, too, are agents of this aggressive world order" (8).

In *The Living from the Dead*, Murray brings theorizations of neoliberal biopolitics to contemporary case studies that intentionally shine light on the injustice experienced by those whose deaths are considered secondary to political, economic, or other structural interests. In doing so, he invites readers to not only rethink critiques of neoliberal biopolitics from outside of binary logics of resistance, but also to consider what responsibility and agency mean in the context of the public good. While the contributions of this book are primarily theoretical in nature, morality—indeed, our relationship to life itself (and therefore, necessarily, death)—is also at stake in Murray's disaffirmation of biopolitics. This book demands a gaze inward, where readers reckon with internal "collusion and complicity in systems that let die in the name of [one's] own livingness" (18).

Murray's work will be of interest to scholars of rhetorical studies, public memory, performativity, and social justice; however, the density and complexity of Foucauldian

biopolitics makes this text inappropriate for even the most advanced undergraduate-level learners. Nevertheless, Murray's extensive use of Foucault—in addition to Derrida, Austin, Blanchot, and others—makes this text an excellent companion for graduate students and scholars interested in studying death, power, humanhood, and/or the biopolitical apparatus. Readers should be aware, though, that the complexity of the topic is reflected in Murray's intentional use of paratactic prose, which at times can be dizzying. While clear, accessible prose does not sacrifice academic rigor or complexity, I read Murray's writing style as an attempt to provoke questions and resist easy conclusions.

The Living from the Dead centralizes Foucault in Murray's meticulous disaffirmation of neoliberal biopolitics, whereas future work on this topic might benefit from intentionally incorporating more diverse theorists, especially when drawing on case studies that foreground BIPOC experiences. Disaffirming biopolitics is impossible to accomplish without Foucault, it's true. But how might we make room for more diverse voices to (re)consider the right to make life or let die—and importantly—craft visions for alternative futures? Given some of the troubling trends in higher education (and the humanities in particular), it is vital for academics to consider the public purpose of the work we do and how we can make our work inclusive and accessible beyond the limited purview of the ivory tower and its canons. Higher education depends on it.

Biopolitics teaches us that life-and-death relations are mediated by an extensive regulatory apparatus that includes law, policy, medicine, education, technology, economics, politics, memory, and more. Stuart J. Murray's commendable task in *The Living from the Dead* is to hearken voices of the dead to craft a rhetorical critique of neoliberal biopolitics, inviting readers to interrogate the social norms and structural conditions through which we let die so that others may live. Indeed, as we emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic, we would all benefit from an open and earnest interrogation of our own compulsions in a sacrificial economy where our security, our wealth, and our livingness is contingent on the precarity, poverty, and death of others.

Brooke Covington
Christopher Newport University

© 2024 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198.2023.2286132
Check for updates