

UNBURY TOMORROW: against the normalisation of war-making as world-making

This world is not at war; it is constituted as war.

To co-inhabit this planet today is to inhabit a world configured as a space of confrontation—not along a single front, but across territories where frontlines proliferate through infrastructures and supply chains, through regimes of images protocols; classifications that decide who counts as “risk” who as “crisis” and who is rendered legible only as a “remainder” to be administered.

Militarisation has ceased to be an exceptional event; it has become an atmospheric condition, an ecology of normalised death.

Futures do not lie before us; they are buried beneath the present, interred within the now—a necro-ecology of the present.

To know that lives can be taken from a distance—decided upon, paid for, executed

in proximity and without—is terrifying and does not settle.

Today, wars seem endless, self-reproducing, self-justifying, and self-perpetuating. They persist, spill over, and pass into language, into everyday life, into the minor enactments of what is declared necessary—until weapons permeate the fabric of the everyday, constituting it into a space where life is differentially exposed to death.

War kills.

Yet killing bodies does not even exhaust its force. It proceeds through the selective targeting of worlds: attacking collective continuities, forms of relation, memory, sacred orders, and the conditions through which certain lives, regions, and histories endure. It reaches into the infrastructures of social, ecological, and cultural sustenance, while at the same time degrading the grounds from which life might regenerate—soils, seeds, and the fragile ecologies of growth. What is targeted is not only what exists, but also what might still have gone on living.

War reaches into intimacy – folded into what is shared, into the fragile space where closeness is held and may or may not endure.

It reorganises attention, binds perception, recalibrates expectation, and controls the field of urgency—not because other concerns lose their weight, but because the logic of war determines what must count as necessary and what as inevitable.

This logic does not remain abstract. It sediments into bodies—in gesture, tone,

and pause; enters conversation, passes through friendship, and renders proximity itself political.

Weapons of today are not solely lethal; they are epistemic. Militarisation does not only produce death; it produces an affective condition – disempathy. What happens when the very capacity to feel for the other is systematically undermined in this way?

Borders are militarised not just with fences and armed bodies but with ideology, with language, and with algorithmic regimes of classification. “Civilians” become “threats”, “refugees” become “crises”, and bombardment becomes “stabilisation efforts”. The political economy of contemporary war turns not only on extraction and destruction but also on the organised production of affective indifference.

War today is rarely absent. It is displaced, redistributed, and sustained elsewhere through the continuous mobilisation of fear, power, and control, through which perception narrows, spaces of possibility contract, and what comes to appear politically and socially necessary is conditioned in advance.

It worlds the ordinary infrastructures of life through an entanglement that grows ever deeper with the textures of the everyday.

From the sites where war is encountered through incessant images, information, and policy language rather than through immediate exposure to brutal violence, the terrifying visibility of war is constant.

The danger lies not in invisibility, but in the erosion of visibility's capacity to interrupt war-making as world-making—to break the continuity through which militarised “solutions” to political problems continue to accelerate, consolidate themselves as ordinary responses, and become legitimised across governments, institutions, and publics through the language of security.

Sustained through competing security regimes, each claiming its own necessity while colliding with others in ways that further intensify militarised response. What emerges is an escalating field of reciprocal securitisation in which almost every government becomes a war machine, almost every protest a potential threat, and conflicts are recoded as operations, surveillance, deterrence, and pre-emptive defence. Within this logic, destruction comes to appear as a condition of repair, violence as a means of security, militarisation as a responsible posture.

What kind of world is being produced when even this excess of visibility no longer interrupts but instead enters the very circulation through which language, images, and information govern affect, narrow response, steer it toward disempathy?

The danger lies not only in war itself but in the necropolitical logic that survives it.

Long after a war is declared over, this organising rationality settles into institutions, infrastructures, and increasingly predictive regimes through which life is reorganised around the anticipation of future death and conflict is prepared in advance. What returns is not violence alone, but the continuity of the

conditions that render its return necessary.

How, then, to interrupt this worlding when it now organises infrastructures, affects language, and grounds from which anything otherwise might still emerge?

What kind of world is being produced when even this excess of visibility no longer interrupts but instead enters the very circulation through which language, images, and information govern affect and steer response toward disempathy?

How might perception be demilitarised when even shock no longer interrupts the continuation of violence?

Under what conditions can language be demilitarised when words themselves are already enlisted to obscure harm?

What might it mean to live otherwise while taking on the contradictions of this world, without surrendering to the logic of war and to what follows it—the capitalisation of crisis and repair as a governing condition of life?

From where I stand, living otherwise seems inseparable from staying: recognising ever more clearly, the entanglements through which ordinary life remains bound to militarised continuity—not through the fantasy of getting everything right, but through the ongoing practice of becoming less complicit in what keeps war in motion. It begins with loosening dependencies, habits, conveniences, and inherited routines, while at the same time allowing attention to sustain other forms of world-making through which responsibility and care may gradually gather elsewhere.

This is not a transformation achieved at once. It unfolds unevenly across personal,

relational, infrastructural, and political layers of life, where every shift in how one moves, stores, consumes, relates, and remains accountable participates in wider conditions of continuity and change.

Perhaps unburying tomorrow begins there: not in the illusion of being untouched, but in the slow and situated practice of becoming less entangled with the totality of a world that has made militarised response appear as the ordinary answer to political problems, while remaining engaged in the slow persistence of other world-makings.

To live otherwise is not merely a cosmo-ethical choice, It is an ontological insurrection.