

Twitter Thread by WORKSHOP

WORKSHOP

@zineworkshop



A super dieend quick de-reading of Naomi Klein's (?) book entitled Lo Nogo in n episodes.*

So the general mode in "consumer"-capitalism is what we literally see is wares and their prize only. Images (situationists) or brands (Klein) took over. What one

A super dieend quick de-reading of Naomi Klein's (?) book entitled Lo Nogo in n episodes. First things first. "It was twenty years ago tonight". We, me and us never read it. Why? Because there is a premise in there as we and I know it - knew it beforehand. No incorporation pic.twitter.com/d8FMFenFrp

— WORKSHOP (@zineworkshop) [January 6, 2021](#)

can see to - hey, phenomenology! - the divisions and disassociations: people separated from their products. Branding comes in at this point. Only Klein does depict but does not explain. Explanation tries to find laws or logics in a way abstractions can be used to

discuss their possible use for a modification of society. There is nothing new in the fact of a ruling classes ruling. The abstract incorp therefore rules and so does the state which can (not _must_) be the rulers "instrument". Lo nogo wants a social a good state. State and

nation are results within the "project" of competing capitals. Klein argues contra the "McDonaldization of society" and the market. In her fairy tale companies are the kings here and market is the land. The new new thesis the market would be the horses and the kings would be

the riders claims a sort of trade capitalism that is not existing except in second order not predominantly. No logo lo nogo has no idea or better no concept of the sources of the processes in this trading world. As money buys politics Klein

makes up a phantasmagoria in which politics is corrupted but _was_ historically good and subjunctively _was_ a good thing if only there was no buying and selling - the world. It is an oligarchy world which lo nogo draws.

A transnational capitalism in concreto. Today so called trade wars clarify that (not only how) national capitals fights each other and needs the competitors too. The logo is only the sign of a sign as for Klein it is the sign for money. She re-fetishizes (logos rule = companies

rule) the fetish (money talks) in order to... so what exactly? To write some apologetic text about the deconstructions of identities of these signs of signs. Close to the form of the ware logo is unable to explain how the commodity "works". It does not work at all. It is

This scaling-up of the **logo**'s role has been so dramatic that it has become a change in substance. Over the past decade and a half, **logos** have grown so dominant that they have essentially transformed the clothing on which they appear into empty carriers for the brands they represent. The metaphorical alligator, in other words, has risen up and swallowed the literal shirt.

This trajectory mirrors the larger transformation our culture has undergone since Marlboro Friday, sparked by a stampede of manufacturers looking to replace their cumbersome product-production apparatus with transcendent brand names and to infuse their brands with deep, meaningful messages. By the mid-nineties, companies like Nike, Polo and

only a "message" (Klein) but with a real outcome be it a t-shirt or bread or rice or a car. But Klein mixes up brand company and commodity (ware). Very similar to the Frankfurt School in a way. The ware does NOT carry the brand. The ware "carries" value (but is no medium!).

to be continued

@threadreaderapp unroll