# Round 4 – NC

### 1NC – OFF

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend the hypothetical implementation of the resolution.

#### Resolved means a legislative policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Violation: Their advocacy states the aff as a general principle, which is not a fiated version of the aff

#### Standards:

#### Ground- we don’t get to read CPs or even DAs because those all are predicated upon the aff being a policy and they can spike out of links by saying we must prove the aff as a general principle is bad in a normative sense, kills fairness because none of my arguments stick and education because they can skirt questions of topic literature.

#### Burden of Rejoinder- the burden of the neg is to prove that the aff is a bad idea but we can’t do this when they’re a general principle because we become constrained to solely normative indicts and can’t test the aff from multiple angles. Kills neg flex and our ability to engage.

#### 3] SSD is good – it forces debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives. Non-T affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to ideological dogmatism. Even if they prove the topic is bad, our argument is that the process of preparing and defending proposals is an educational benefit of engaging it.

TVA: defend a fiated version of the resolution framed around laughter, insert memes, jokes, with your unique individual orientation of death.

#### Vote neg – they’ve destroyed the round from the beginning and topicality’s key to set the correct model of debate which means it comes first.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness is an impact—a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity, b] probability – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews which means the only impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins, c] it internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### Drop the debater because dropping the arg is severance which moots 7 minutes of 1nc offense

#### No rvis—it’s your burden to be fair and T—same reason you don’t win for answering inherency or putting defense on a disad.

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

### 1NC – OFF

#### Private sector innovation in the commercial space industry is high now.

**Smith 18** [Matthew Smith, 6-11-2018, "Commercialized Space and You," Science in the News, https://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/commercialized-space-and-you/]//DDPT

Step aside, NASA. The 20th century model of space exploration is running out of fuel, and private companies are now leading the race for human expansion across the galaxy. Elon Musk, Richard Branson, and Jeff Bezos are three of the billionaires leading this extraterrestrial adventure with their respective companies, SpaceX, Virgin Galactic, and Blue Origin. Bezos, the founder of Amazon and currently the wealthiest person in the world, has a vision of sending autonomous rovers to the Moon and helping to eventually create a Moon Village. He has explained that collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and other government agencies are encouraged and appreciated, but are no longer essential to achieve his goal. [Musk](https://www.geekwire.com/2018/jeff-bezos-blue-origin-space-venture-go-moon-settlements/), who co-founded Tesla, has already launched nine rockets within the first five months of 2018, one of which was the most powerful private spacecraft [ever sent into orbit](http://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/spacex-launches-falcon-heavy-rocket-successfully/). Looking forward, SpaceX aims to complete its first manned mission to Mars in 2024, almost a decade earlier than NASA’s projections. Even the current US president is encouraging this shift to private companies driving [innovation in space](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2018/02/11/the-trump-administration-wants-to-turn-the-international-space-station-into-a-commercially-run-venture/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d2c1eccab4ca). With almost [$1 billion](https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexknapp/2018/04/10/nearly-1-billion-was-invested-in-space-startups-in-1q2018-new-report-says/#5fdd019b285c) invested in space-focused startups in the first quarter of 2018, the commercialized space industry shows no sign of slowing down.

#### Private space appropriation is uniquely key to ensuring ongoing innovation towards space exploration and colonization.

**Cheng 20** [Dean Cheng, 09-16-2020, "Outer Space and Private Property," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/space-policy/commentary/outer-space-and-private-property]//DDPT

Fully 53 years after the Outer Space Treaty, however, this has begun to change. The success of SpaceX, Blue Origin, Virgin Galactic, and other private companies has led to what has been termed Space 2.0.

The Obama administration’s decision to rely on commercial space-launch services to resupply the International Space Station opened the door to expanding private enterprise’s role in space.

The innovation exhibited in the various Falcon launches, including the ability to reuse the booster rockets, has seen a significant drop in the cost of placing payloads into orbit. As a result, a real opportunity exists for companies to begin thinking about how to use space not simply to improve terrestrial operations, but to make money from space and its physical resources.

The uncertainty associated with private property rights, however, has had a constraining effect on the ability to exploit space more extensively. Companies are unlikely to be willing to risk capital and assets if they are not sure that they will be able to profit from their investments.

#### The private sector is the key internal link to space exploration and colonization.

**Sharma 9/7** [Maanas Sharma, 9-7-2021, "The Space Review: The privatized frontier: the ethical implications and role of private companies in space exploration," The Space Review, https://www.thespacereview.com/article/4238/1]//DDPT

In recent years, private companies have taken on a larger role in the space exploration system. With lower costs and faster production times, they have displaced some functions of government space agencies. Though many have levied criticism against privatized space exploration, it also allows room for more altruistic actions by government space agencies and the benefits from increased space exploration as a whole. Thus, we should encourage this development, as the process is net ethical in the end. Especially if performed in conjunction with adequate government action on the topic, private space exploration can overcome possible shortcomings in its risky and capitalistic nature and ensure a positive contribution to the general public on Earth.

The implications of commercial space exploration have been thrust into the limelight with the successes and failures of billionaire Elon Musk’s company SpaceX. While private companies are not new to space exploration, their prominence in American space exploration efforts has increased rapidly in recent years, fueled by technological innovations, reductions in cost, and readily available funding from government and private sources.[1] In May 2020, SpaceX brought American astronauts to space from American soil for the first time in almost 10 years.[2] Recognizing the greatly reduced costs of space exploration in private companies, NASA’s budget has shifted to significantly relying on private companies.[3] However, private space companies are unique from government space agencies in the way they experience unique sets of market pressures that influence their decision-making process. Hence, the expansion of private control in the space sector turns into a multifaceted contestation of its ethicality.

The most obvious ethical concern is the loss of human life. Critics contend that companies must answer to their shareholders and justify their profits. This contributes to a larger overall psyche that prioritizes cost and speed above all else, resulting in significantly increased risks.[4] However, the possible increase in mishaps is largely overstated. Companies recognize the need for safety aboard their expeditions themselves.[5] After all, the potential backlash from a mishap could destroy the company’s reputation and significantly harm their prospects. According to Dr. Nayef Al-Rodhan, Head of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy’s Geopolitics and Global Futures Programme, “because there were no alternatives to government space programs, accidents were seen to some degree as par for the course… By comparison, private companies actually have a far more difficult set of issues to face in the case of a mishap. In a worst case scenario, a private company could make an easy scapegoat.” [6]

Another large ethical concern is the prominence capitalism may have in the future of private space exploration and the impacts thereof. The growth of private space companies in recent years has been closely intertwined with capitalism. Companies have largely focused on the most profitable projects, such as space travel and the business of space.[7] Many companies are funded by individual billionaires, such as dearMoon, SpaceX’s upcoming mission to the Moon.[8] Congress has also passed multiple acts for the purpose of reducing regulations on private space companies and securing private access to space. From this, many immediately jump to the conclusion that capitalism in space will recreate the same conditions in outer space that plague Earth today, especially with the increasing push to create a “space-for-space” economy, such as space tourism and new technologies to mine the Moon and asteroids. Critics, such as Jordan Pearson of VICE, believe that promises of “virtually unlimited resources” are only for the rich, and will perpetuate the growing wealth inequality that plagues the world today.[9]

However, others contend that just because private space exploration has some capitalist elements, it is by no means an embodiment of unrestricted capitalism. A healthy balance of restricted capitalism—for example, private space companies working through contracts with government agencies or independently under monitoring and regulation by national and international agreements—will avoid the pitfalls that capitalist colonialism faced down here on Earth. Even those who are generally against excessive government regulation should see the benefits of them in space. Lacking any consensus on definitions and rights in space will create undue competition between corporations as well as governments that will harm everyone rather than helping anyone. To create a conducive environment for new space-for-space exploration, one without confrontation but with protection for corporate astronauts, infrastructure, and other interests, governments must create key policies such as a framework for property rights on asteroids, the Moon, and Mars.[7,10]

Another key matter to note is restricted capitalism in space “could also be our salvation.”[11] Private space exploration could reap increased access to resources and other benefits that can be used to solve the very problems on Earth that critics of capitalism identify. Since governments offset some of their projects to private companies, government agencies can focus on altruistic projects that otherwise would not fit in the budget before and do not have the immediate commercial use that private companies look for. Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor of aeronautics and astronautics at Stanford University, discusses how “this strategy allows the space agency to continue ‘exploring the fringe where there really is no business case’” but still has important impacts on people down on Earth.[12]

Indeed, this idea is a particularly powerful one when considering the ideal future of private companies in space exploration. Though there is no one set way governments will interact with companies, the consensus is that they must radically reimagine their main purpose as the role of private space exploration continues to grow. As governments utilize services from private space companies, “[i]nstead of being bogged down by the routine application of old research, NASA can prioritize their limited budget to work more on research of other unknowns and development of new long-term space travel technologies.”[13] According to the Council on Foreign Relations, such technologies have far-reaching benefits on Earth as well. Past developments obviously include communications satellites, by themselves a massive benefit to society, but also “refinements in artificial hearts; improved mammograms; and laser eye surgery… thermoelectric coolers for microchips; high-temperature lubricants; and a means for mass-producing carbon nanotubes, a material with significant engineering potential; [and h]ousehold products.”[2] Agencies like NASA are the only actors able to pursue the next game-changing missions, “where the profit motive is not as evident and where the barriers to entry are still too high for the private sector to really make a compelling business case.”[8] These technologies have revolutionized millions, if not billions, of lives, demonstrating the remarkable benefits of space exploration. It follows then that it is net ethical to prioritize these benefits.

This report concludes that the private sector, indeed, has a prominent role to play in the future of space exploration. Further, though private space exploration does bring the potential of increased danger and the colonization of space, these concerns can be effectively mitigated. Namely, strong government frameworks—particularly international ones—will minimize possible sources of ethical violations and ensure an optimal private sector role in space. This also allows government agencies to complete significantly more difficult, innovative projects which have transformative benefits for life on Earth.

#### Space exploration solves extinction and endless resource wars.

Collins 10 [Patrick Collins, professor of economics at Azabu University in Japan, and a Collaborating Researcher with the Institute for Space & Astronautical Science, as well as adviser to a number of companies, Adriano V. Autino is President of the Space Renaissance International; Manager, CEO/CTO, Systems Engineering Consultant / Trainer at Andromeda Systems Engineering LLC; and Supplier of methodological tools and consultancy at Intermarine S.p.A, Acta Astronautica, Volume 66, Issues 11–12, June–July 2010, “What the growth of a space tourism industry could contribute to employment, economic growth, environmental protection, education, culture and world peace”, Pages 1553–1562]

7. World peace and preservation of human civilisation

The major source of social friction, including international friction, has surely always been unequal access to resources. People fight to control the valuable resources on and under the land, and in and under the sea. The natural resources of Earth are limited in quantity, and economically accessible resources even more so. As the population grows, and demand grows for a higher material standard of living, industrial activity grows exponentially. The threat of resources becoming scarce has led to the concept of “Resource Wars”. Having begun long ago with wars to control the gold and diamonds of Africa and South America, and oil in the Middle East, the current phase is at centre stage of world events today [37]. A particular danger of “resource wars” is that, if the general public can be persuaded to support them, they may become impossible to stop as resources become increasingly scarce. Many commentators have noted the similarity of the language of US and UK government advocates of “war on terror” to the language of the novel “1984” which describes a dystopian future of endless, fraudulent war in which citizens are reduced to slaves.

7.1. Expansion into near-Earth space is the only alternative to endless “resource wars”

As an alternative to the “resource wars” already devastating many countries today, opening access to the unlimited resources of near-Earth space could clearly facilitate world peace and security. The US National Security Space Office, at the start of its report on the potential of space-based solar power (SSP) published in early 2007, stated: “Expanding human populations and declining natural resources are potential sources of local and strategic conflict in the 21st Century, and many see energy as the foremost threat to national security” [38]. The report ended by encouraging urgent research on the feasibility of SSP: “Considering the timescales that are involved, and the exponential growth of population and resource pressures within that same strategic period, it is imperative that this work for “drilling up” vs. drilling down for energy security begins immediately” [38].

Although the use of extra-terrestrial resources on a substantial scale may still be some decades away, it is important to recognise that simply acknowledging its feasibility using known technology is the surest way of ending the threat of resource wars. That is, if it is assumed that the resources available for human use are limited to those on Earth, then it can be argued that resource wars are inescapable [22] and [37]. If, by contrast, it is assumed that the resources of space are economically accessible, this not only eliminates the need for resource wars, it can also preserve the benefits of civilisation which are being eroded today by “resource war-mongers”, most notably the governments of the “Anglo-Saxon” countries and their “neo-con” advisers. It is also worth noting that the $1 trillion that these have already committed to wars in the Middle-East in the 21st century is orders of magnitude more than the public investment needed to aid companies sufficiently to start the commercial use of space resources.

Industrial and financial groups which profit from monopolistic control of terrestrial supplies of various natural resources, like those which profit from wars, have an economic interest in protecting their profitable situation. However, these groups’ continuing profits are justified neither by capitalism nor by democracy: they could be preserved only by maintaining the pretence that use of space resources is not feasible, and by preventing the development of low-cost space travel. Once the feasibility of low-cost space travel is understood, “resource wars” are clearly foolish as well as tragic. A visiting extra-terrestrial would be pityingly amused at the foolish antics of homo sapiens using long-range rockets to fight each other over dwindling terrestrial resources—rather than using the same rockets to travel in space and have the use of all the resources they need!

7.2. High return in safety from extra-terrestrial settlement

Investment in low-cost orbital access and other space infrastructure will facilitate the establishment of settlements on the Moon, Mars, asteroids and in man[/woman]-made space structures. In the first phase, development of new regulatory infrastructure in various Earth orbits, including property/usufruct rights, real estate, mortgage financing and insurance, traffic management, pilotage, policing and other services will enable the population living in Earth orbits to grow very large. Such activities aimed at making near-Earth space habitable are the logical extension of humans’ historical spread over the surface of the Earth. As trade spreads through near-Earth space, settlements are likely to follow, of which the inhabitants will add to the wealth of different cultures which humans have created in the many different environments in which they live.

Success of such extra-terrestrial settlements will have the additional benefit of reducing the danger of human extinction due to planet-wide or cosmic accidents [27]. These horrors include both man-made disasters such as nuclear war, plagues or growing pollution, and natural disasters such as super-volcanoes or asteroid impact. It is hard to think of any objective that is more important than preserving peace. Weapons developed in recent decades are so destructive, and have such horrific, long-term side-effects that their use should be discouraged as strongly as possible by the international community. Hence, reducing the incentive to use these weapons by rapidly developing the ability to use space-based resources on a large scale is surely equally important [11] and [16]. The achievement of this depends on low space travel costs which, at the present time, appear to be achievable only through the development of a vigorous space tourism industry.

### Case

### FWK

#### The standard for the ROB should be maximizing expected well-being.

#### 1. Death is bad and outweighs – agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security which constrains every ethical theory

#### 2. Intuitions outweigh - since they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why

#### 3. Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs

#### 4. **Extinction is a unique ontological phenomenon that outweighs under every ethical theory.**

Burke et al., Associate Professor of International and Political Studies @ UNSW, Australia, ‘16

(Anthony, Stefanie Fishel is Assistant Professor, Department of Gender and Race Studies at the University of Alabama, Audra Mitchell is CIGI Chair in Global Governance and Ethics at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, Simon Dalby is CIGI Chair in the Political Economy of Climate Change at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, and, Daniel J. Levine is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Alabama, “Planet Politics: Manifesto from the End of IR,” Millennium: Journal of International Studies 1–25)

8. Global ethics must respond to mass extinction. In late 2014, the Worldwide Fund for Nature reported a startling statistic: according to their global study, 52% of species had gone extinct between 1970 and 2010.60 This is not news: for three decades, conservation biologists have been warning of a ‘sixth mass extinction’, which, by definition, could eliminate more than three quarters of currently existing life forms in just a few centuries.61 In other words, it could threaten the practical possibility of the survival of earthly life. Mass extinction is not simply extinction (or death) writ large: it is a qualitatively different phenomena that demands its own ethical categories. It cannot be grasped by aggregating species extinctions, let alone the deaths of individual organisms. Not only does it erase diverse, irreplaceable life forms, their unique histories and open-ended possibilities, but it threatens the ontological conditions of Earthly life.

IR is one of few disciplines that is explicitly devoted to the pursuit of survival, yet it has almost nothing to say in the face of a possible mass extinction event.62 It utterly lacks the conceptual and ethical frameworks necessary to foster diverse, meaningful responses to this phenomenon. As mentioned above, Cold-War era concepts such as ‘nuclear winter’ and ‘omnicide’ gesture towards harms massive in their scale and moral horror. However, they are asymptotic: they imagine nightmares of a severely denuded planet, yet they do not contemplate the comprehensive negation that a mass extinction event entails. In contemporary IR discourses, where it appears at all, extinction is treated as a problem of scientific management and biopolitical control aimed at securing existing human lifestyles.63 Once again, this approach fails to recognise the reality of extinction, which is a matter of being and nonbeing, not one of life and death processes.

Confronting the enormity of a possible mass extinction event requires a total overhaul of human perceptions of what is at stake in the disruption of the conditions of Earthly life. The question of what is ‘lost’ in extinction has, since the inception of the concept of ‘conservation’, been addressed in terms of financial cost and economic liabilities.64 Beyond reducing life to forms to capital, currencies and financial instruments, the dominant neoliberal political economy of conservation imposes a homogenising, Western secular worldview on a planetary phenomenon. Yet the enormity, complexity, and scale of mass extinction is so huge that humans need to draw on every possible resource in order to find ways of responding. This means that they need to mobilise multiple worldviews and lifeways – including those emerging from indigenous and marginalised cosmologies. Above all, it is crucial and urgent to realise that extinction is a matter of global ethics. It is not simply an issue of management or security, or even of particular visions of the good life. Instead, it is about staking a claim as to the goodness of life itself. If it does not fit within the existing parameters of global ethics, then it is these boundaries that need to change.

9. An Earth-worldly politics. Humans are worldly – that is, we are fundamentally worldforming and embedded in multiple worlds that traverse the Earth. However, the Earth is not ‘our’ world, as the grand theories of IR, and some accounts of the Anthropocene have it – an object and possession to be appropriated, circumnavigated, instrumentalised and englobed.65 Rather, it is a complex of worlds that we share, co-constitute, create, destroy and inhabit with countless other life forms and beings.

The formation of the Anthropocene reflects a particular type of worlding, one in which the Earth is treated as raw material for the creation of a world tailored to human needs. Heidegger famously framed ‘earth’ and ‘world’ as two countervailing, conflicting forces that constrain and shape one another. We contend that existing political, economic and social conditions have pushed human worlding so far to one extreme that it has become almost entirely detached from the conditions of the Earth. Planet Politics calls, instead, for a mode of worlding that is responsive to, and grounded in, the Earth. One of these ways of being Earth-worldly is to embrace the condition of being entangled. We can interpret this term in the way that Heidegger66 did, as the condition of being mired in everyday human concerns, worries, and anxiety, to prolong existence. But, in contrast, we can and should reframe it as authors like Karen Barad67 and Donna Haraway68 have done. To them and many others, ‘entanglement’ is a radical, indeed fundamental condition of being-with, or, as Jean-Luc Nancy puts it, ‘being singular plural’.69 This means that no being is truly autonomous or separate, whether at the scale of international politics or of quantum physics. World itself is singular plural: what humans tend to refer to as ‘the’ world is actually a multiplicity of worlds at various scales that intersect, overlap, conflict, emerge as they surge across the Earth. World emerges from the poetics of existence, the collision of energy and matter, the tumult of agencies, the fusion and diffusion of bonds.

Worlds erupt from, and consist in, the intersection of diverse forms of being – material and intangible, organic and inorganic, ‘living’ and ‘nonliving’. Because of the tumultuousness of the Earth with which they are entangled, ‘worlds’ are not static, rigid or permanent. They are permeable and fluid. They can be created, modified – and, of course, destroyed. Concepts of violence, harm and (in)security that focus only on humans ignore at their peril the destruction and severance of worlds,70 which undermines the conditions of plurality that enables life on Earth to thrive.

#### Lbl:

#### On predictability – death is and always has been bad that’s the most predictable

#### On Short term – we shouldnt take decisions that cause death this interp would justfiy things like murder extortion and many other bad things

#### On util relies on limited ideology – wrong

#### Bataille fails – infinite transgression re-entrenches utilitarian logic and numbs people to anything valuable about life

Shadia B. Drury, Research Chair in Social Justice at the University of Regina, Canada, ’94

(*Alexandre Kojève: The Roots of Postmodern Politics,* pg. 120-123)

It is not difficult to sympathize with Bataille's disenchantment with the mechanization and routinization of life in modern society. Nor is it difficult to share Bataille's love of life's exuberance and vitality But despite its imaginative energy and its beguilements, Bataille's thinking is seriously Rawed. I will argue that **Bataille's philosophy has the effect of undermining precisely that which he holds in the highest esteem** I will make four criticisms as follows.

First, instead of jettisoning the instrumentalism of modernity, Bataille succumbs to a crude form of means/ends rationality. Bataille's celebration of everything useless, wasteful, and sovereign is itself dependent on the utilitarian distinction between means and ends. I think that Bataille is right in thinking that we cannot understand a civilization unless we focus on that which it values above all else. However, this understanding is not best served by relying on the utilitarian categories of means and ends or associating production with the means and consumption with the ends. What a civilization holds in high esteem is usually a way of life which cannot be understood as a thing intended to be consumed Understood as that which is wasted or consumed, **an end is reduced to a static or given thing to which all life, action and energy are mere means.** Contrary to what Bataille thinks, the ends of a civilization are not cathedrals, ornaments, and idle monks. If the end is understood as a way of life, then it cannot be absolutely distinguished from the means necessary to achieve it. In other words, means are often constitutive of the ends that they supposedly serve. Bataille’s preoccupation with the means/end distinction reveals the extent to which he is **subject to the** very modes of thought **that he dearly wishes to escape.** Besides, his conception of sovereignty is absolutely arbitrary. He pronounces whatever he likes to be sovereign, and when it loses favor, he decides that it had a purpose after all, and denounces it. So, even though he declared that war was one of the supremely sovereign activities of man, he surmised that the violence of the fascists was not sovereign enough. And that the wars of bourgeois civilization were intended only to avoid stockpiling.

Second, instead of promoting man’s freedom and autonomy, Bataille’s philosophy celebrates the total servility of man to the impersonal forces of nature. The key to Bataille's way of thinking rests in his conception of life and its vitality; for it is in light of the latter that he judges modernity to be stagnant, castrated, and deathlike. **For all his “abhorrence of nature,” Bataille uses nature as the model of human life and vitality.** For Bataille, life is a "tumultuous movement that bursts forth and consumes itself an "effusion" that is "completely contrary to equilibrium, to stability."71 Life in exuberant, lavish, magnificent, and completely "untouched by the defilement of merit or intention."72 Life is a "perpetual explosion" that requires that the "spent organisms give way to new ones, which enter the dance with new forces." Life is a "costly process" exemplified by "expenditures that are finally excessive."7' **Death illustrates the ruinous extravagance of life.** Life is a fantastic expenditure of energy toward a summit that is not. Life has no purpose other than death or nothingness. In the context of the "general economy," which has absolutely nothing to do with producing at the least expense, death is the ultimate "luxury." It is a testimony to the sovereignty of life—an expenditure without purpose or utility. Besides, death makes room for new life and in so doing, accounts for "the youth of the world."74 It is the secret to the ceaseless prodigality and splendor of nature. And far from lamenting this world of nature as our "accursed share," Bataille bids us **embrace and emulate it.**

Bataille's vision of life is the model he uses to understand sexuality, civilization, history, and his own inner psychic torments. All these phenomena are subject to the same laws of nature, the laws of the "general economy.' Sexual eroticism is a microcosmic enactment of nature—it is an outlandish expenditure of energy toward a summit that is nothing by the same token, every civilization (except modern industrial civilization) is defined by **ruinously wasteful expenditures**—**human sacrifices, conquests, monks, monasteries, and Gothic cathedrals** The human psyche itself mirrors the paradoxical nature of life; man longs for a Dionysian loss of individuation and a oneness of being that is possible only in death History follows the same laws of the "general economy'—**it is nothing more than a costly effort to reach a summit that is the death of man.**

Despite his efforts to establish a distance between man and nature, a distance intended to underscore man's freedom from the impersonal and instinctive forces of nature. Bataille ends up using nature as the model of human life and freedom Bataille's work on eroticism, history, and civilization succeeds merely in illustrating that the laws of the "general economy" to which nature is subject are also the laws to which human life and history are equally subservient. **Far from understanding man** (properly so-called) as distinct from nature and animality, Bataille reduces him to a manifestation of the same tumultuous laws of the "general economy."

Third, **Bataille intended to celebrate life, but he ends up glorifying death instead**. Bataille's longing for self-abnegation and mortification as well as his thirst for death and annihilation is radically contrary to a joyful and exuberant celebration of life. Bataille's atheistic mysticism, if it makes any sense, must be deemed the worst of all possible worlds because it combines the nihilism and meaninglessness of atheism with the self-abnegation and mortification to which theism is inclined.75

Fourth, Bataille was determined to replace the cold indifference of modernity with a profound, even violent intensification of life. He experienced the modem world as a living death from which he needed to be rescued. He thought that only a cycle of extremes could dispel the spiritual and emotional vacuum from which he suffered. He believed that he could give life a renewed vitality by embarking on a program of perpetual negation and ceaseless overturning. However, Bataille's means frustrate his ends. Instead of magnifying the vitality and intensity of life, **Bataille's strategy of perpetual negation incites a** cold nihilism and a profound indifference. Bataille's literary work is a case in point. His novels often read like scripts for grade B horror films **The latter try to terrify their audience, but elicit laughter instead**. By the same token, Bataille's efforts fail to arouse our archaic horror, provoke a feverish delirium, or simulate a sense of sacrilege. Instead of driving us to distraction, **Bataille's literary work** deadens the senses. For it is difficult to be morally horrified by characters whose conduct is as arbitrary or as “sovereign” as bolts of lighting.

In conclusion, it is my contention that Bataille is the father of post-modernism. First, he has bequeathed to postmodernism a Dionysian madness rooted in the abhorrence of reason. Following Bataille, post-modern writers like Foucault believe that all the drabness and homogeneity of modern life has its source in an excess of rationality, order, and restraint. Accordingly, they follow Bataille in urging man ot “escape from his head” like a condemned man from a prison.76 Second, postmodernism owes a great deal to Bataille’s use of gnostic as well as romantic motifs. The alluring power of postmodernism lies in its capacity of pose as the liberator of what has been hidden, repressed, vanquished, and downtrodden. Third, Bataille has bequeathed to postmodernism an appetite for endless negation and “ceaseless overturning.” Starting from Kojève’s assumption that negativity is the distinctive and glorious quality of man, Bataille reached the logical conclusion that negativity must be celebrated. What are postmodernism and its projects of genealogy and deconstruct ion if not a perpetual negation and unmasking of the given— the 'hegemonic" or "logocentric' discourse, whatever it may be. In politics as in thought, the postmodern ethos consists of negation for the sake of negation and revolt for the sake of revolt. This explains the self-contradictory and self-refuting character of the postmodern enterprise. Like Bataille, postmodernism affirms only the exhilaration of unmasking and overturning, and it assumes that perpetual negation will empower and revitalize a drab and homogeneous world. But **in the end, postmodernism is bound to succumb to the same fate as Bataille's literary efforts, instead of a heightened sense of vitality, intensity, and exhilaration, it will engender only** indifference, numbness, and nihilism.

#### 4) - you link as well - you think there's one correct interpretation of death - this just devolves to indexicals where multiple worlds can be true at the same time, which shouldn't matter given the role of the debate is to determine which of those worlds is more true - we'll win that util is truetil and should generally be followed. preserving racism isn't ever the most ethical option because morality isn't contingent on the actor's personal beliefs lmao. 5) - its fine, we'll win death is bad and we shouldn't do things that cause it, but specificity outweighs on topic education - we have infinite debates to learn about our relationship to death but only 2 months to learn about space appropriation so the debate should be about that

### Contention

Lbl

All their criticisms are on the basis of governments taking actions to mitigiate extensional threats – that isnt the same thing as gov not taking an action because it would hurt people

All we say is that we should not take actions that cause preventable death and that death is bad not that we should do whatever we can to prevent death whenever we can – it is morally apphorent to make that choice for people knowing that people will die its messed up all of this just so that we can re orient outselves to death in another way –

#### Dobbs 80 – card from 4 decades ago saying we will die tomorrow –we’ve survived 40 years means that we should not take actions that cause death only the negative does this.

#### Bataille 1985 card is wrong- Batailles history of consumption is backwards – ancients founded consumption on definitive concepts of wealth and class – the aff reinforces class binaries

Ishay Landa, Ph.D., Dept. of History, Philosophy and Judaic Studies, Open University of Israel, ’14

(“Bataille’s Libidinal Economics: Capitalism as an Open Wound,” Critical Sociology ﻿1-16)

From Capitalism to the Sun

Bataille’s economic conception – as unfolded in The Accursed Share – has the strange effect that while pretending to submit capitalism, ‘the restricted economy’, to a radical critique from the point of view of ‘general economy’ – the laws of circulation of energy in the cosmos, which he claims to have fathomed – **it rather ends up** projecting capitalism, particularly its specific failings – its irrationality, its wastefulness, its crises – **onto nature**. Here again capitalism is provided with an indirect apologetic outlet, inasmuch as attention is diverted from society and history to natural, and hence insurmountable, ‘deeper’ causes which humanity can hardly expect to control.

Accompanying such move is a related elimination of the historically positive contribution of capitalism – its unprecedented development of the productive forces – and a belittling of human creativity, manifested in labor. **The result is deeply pessimistic, with** debilitating consequences **for human agency, since both human culpability and capability are downplayed**.

Let us first address the way capitalism is naturalized. General economy to start with attributed to nature the crucial feature of capitalist production, the very creation of a surplus, the ‘excess’ of ‘the accursed share’. ‘I will begin,’ Bataille apodictically claims, ‘with a basic fact: the living organism … ordinarily receives more energy than is necessary for maintaining life … On the surface of the globe, for living matter in general, energy is always in excess; the question is always posed in terms of extravagance. The choice is limited to how the wealth is squandered’ (1991: 21–23, emphasis in the original). General economy is thus all about wealth, and how best to consume it. Economic crisis, according to Bataille, is therefore primarily a result of alienated humanity causing a bottleneck in the overflowing channels of cosmic energy. Stingy humanity is finally overwhelmed by the lavish gifts showered on it by nature. Bataille contrasts the ‘Poverty of Organisms or Limited Systems and the Excess Wealth of Living Nature’. Humanity myopically tries to turn the boons of nature into capitalist profits at all costs, without realizing that squandering the surplus is inevitable. The result of such misapprehension is economic crisis, and often catastrophic wars, forcing the system to vomit the excess: ‘The final dissipation cannot fail to carry out the movement that animates terrestrial energy.’ (Bataille, 1991: 22) In that way, Bataille ascribes to nature both the historical achievements of human beings – the creation of wealth – and their failures: the inability of the system they have created to sustain growth. For wealth is anything but natural; plenty and surplus, even on a very small scale, is an extremely rare phenomenon, and far from pertaining to the ‘living organism’ as such it is specifically human. Moreover, for almost the entire course of their existence on ‘the globe’ human beings, too, hardly had to deal with an excess, accursed or otherwise. If we consider that humanity’s early forefathers, the first hominines, first walked the earth about six million years ago, and that homo sapiens is about 125,000 years old, **we can see that wealth of any form, for humanity, is a striking historical novelty.** Indeed, placed on the time scale of historical humanity (to say nothing about that of living matter), the ‘ancient’ civilizations that Bataille takes for his examples of extravagant consumption, conducted in intuitive synchrony with nature, such as the Aztec empire, happened merely seconds ago, themselves being examples of humanity at an **extremely advanced and sophisticated historical phase.** For almost the entire course of their long trajectory humans lived from hand to mouth, and could only dream of significant surplus, which they knew neither how to produce nor – in times of particularly favorable natural conditions – how to store. Excess is therefore not a cosmic natural gift living organisms ‘receive’ but a product of humanity advancing through history in an arduous struggle with a rather tight-fisted and indifferent nature, that has left humanity to fend for itself (these are conscious anthropomorphisms of nature, meant to dialogue with Bataille’s).7

Wealth is thus a colossal human achievement**, due primarily not to nature but to labor working on nature:** a point which Bataille, furiously resisting the master-slave dialectic, was keen to downplay. In his alternative scheme, the cowardly slave was denied not only heroism – which Hegel, too, regarded as the prerogative of the master – **but also ingenuity, creativity and productivity. It is as if the base labor of the slave is to be erased out of the picture altogether**, leaving consumption as a strictly aristocratic interplay between the master and the life-giving sun. Bataille so radically transfigured the dialectic to the point that the master does not consume the slave’s labor as much as he consumes the slave himself, whom he sacrifices.

The problematic nature of abundance, for its part, is a still younger phenomenon than wealth. The key adjective ‘accursed’ belongs to indirect apologetics, since material growth only becomes a problem under a historically specific mode of production. Only under capitalism do we have crises of over-production, since here one produces precisely not in order to serve a useful purpose, as Bataille argues, but in order to make profit. And to understand over-production we need to examine the laws of motion of capitalism, not of nature or of terrestrial energy. Yet Bataille (1991: 24) proposed, on the contrary, to naturalize such problems, turn them into ahistorical givens. ‘These excesses of life force,’ he contended, ‘are in fact the most dangerous factors of ruination … Ancient societies found relief in festivals; some erected admirable monuments that had no useful purpose.’ **Already the ancients are said to have suffered from over-production** **and to have had to seek ‘relief’ from the burden of wealth, rather than to enjoyably consume such wealth**. Similarly, Bataille insists that the monuments the ancients built were useless, whereas actually their use was exactly the fact that they were ‘admirable’. **Such monuments** had the same use-value **for their contemporaries**, as countless goods that the moderns consume because they find them beautiful, pleasant, decorative, etc. In reality, one can turn against Bataille his admiration for ancient times where sacred sentiment was rife, and hence, allegedly, indifference to utility was great, as compared to profane modernity, obsessed with utility. One might argue exactly the reverse: precisely because they were religious the monuments the ancients built and their **extravagant practices were still useful in the sense of enticing or** placating the gods. Modern consumption, in that sense, is more deeply indifferent to ulterior consideration of benefits. **Think of a** cinema or a football stadium **as compared to an Aztec temple or a medieval cathedral. In the former, the pleasure from the consumer’s point of view is more properly sovereign than that of the ancient person, in thrall to his sovereign divinities**.

#### 

#### The “Bob” apocryphon – don’t base ur decision along a myth – even Bob would agree that not everyone should die a massive painful death rn and that we should prevent it

#### The clark 10 evidence is wrong - A plan of no plan is circular – you need defined policy orientation

Benjamin Noys, Reader in English at the University of Chichester, Through a Glass Darkly: Alain Badiou’s critique of anarchism, ‘8 <https://www.academia.edu/216175/Through_a_glass_darkly_Alain_Badiou_s_critique_of_anarchism>

Badiou’s critique of anarchism operates indirectly; it attacks what Daniel Bensaïd describes as ‘[a] neo-libertarian current, more diffuse but more influential than the direct heirs of anarchism …[which] constitutes a state of mind, a ‘mood’, rather than a well-defined orientation.’ (Bensaïd 2005: 170). One of Badiou’s examples of this tendency, targeted while he was still a Maoist, is Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s book Anti-Oedipus (1972). This book, with its vision of a flux of desire that can escape the constraints of both capitalism and the ‘prison’ of the Freudian Oedipus complex, not only had a significant influence on the libertarians of the movements after May 68 but also on later anarchists and postanarchists. Where anarchists have tended to celebrate their theories of the uncontrollable fluxes of desire Badiou sarcastically comments: ‘Unforeseeable, desiring, irrational: follow your drift, my son, and you will make the Revolution.’ (2004: 76). This point summarises Badiou’s general scepticism towards what he regards as the anarchist faith in the ‘pure’ movement of resistance, a movement that seems to operate without the need for aim or direction but will somehow still result in revolution.¶ Badiou refines this general scepticism in making a series of more precise criticisms of the ‘libertarian current’. He argues that the central problem of this current is that it sets up a simple-minded opposition between power and resistance (or revolt, or rebellion). The result is a sterile set of ‘static dualisms’, from which is derived ‘the catechism of the System and the Flux, the Despot and the Nomad, the Paranoiac, and the Schizo’ (Badiou 2004: 80). In this case Badiou is explicitly referring to a number of oppositions that structure the text of Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus , in which the second term is valorised at the expense of the first. The problem with such dualisms is that they fail to grasp the actual way politics operates: ‘power’ is not one monolithic whole, and neither is ‘resistance’. Instead the task of ‘doing politics’ involves a closer analysis of different forces and contradictions as well as, for Badiou, the formation of the party as a form to handle and organise these contradictions. Whatever we might think of the second point we can, I think, accept the first is well made. While there may be a polemically or motivational gain in presenting politics in terms of a grand opposition, and there may well be times where struggle operates in this form, more often matters are considerably more complex.¶ For Badiou these kind of oppositions are reflective of the limits of the French political scene of the 1970s: namely the opposition between the structuralist Marxism of Louis Althusser, which finds its model in the French Communist Party, and the philosophy of desire of Deleuze and Guattari that gave voice to, and which finds its model in the dispersion of the little groups of libertarians (‘groupuscules’). In the first we find the relentless and paralysing insistence on the power of structure and, in the second, the celebration of ‘pure’ revolt. We can see here the origin of Badiou’s later contention that the anarchist model mirrors the communist party model. Anarchists oppose their small groups to the supposedly ‘monolithic’ style of the communist party. What they fail to recognise are the fissures and contradictions that run through both power and resistance. In this period Badiou, and the UCFML, are groping towards a new party-form that would be able to negotiate a dialectical reading of politics that could engage with force and place, disruption and structure, without reifying one of the terms against the other.¶ The irony is that defenders of Deleuze and Guattari, or Michel Foucault, whom Badiou also attacks, will argue that they present a model of power and resistance as multiple, fluid, and unstable – precisely not a binary. Badiou, however, is correct to note a tendency to re-constitute new binaries in these modes of thinking: ‘Schizo vs. Paranoid’ (Deleuze and Guattari), ‘Pleb vs. Power’ (Foucault), or ‘Multitude vs. Empire’ (Negri and Hardt). In each case the attempts at anti-dialectical thinking risk becoming merely un-dialectical. Badiou himself certainly changes the terms of his own thinking, but he retains the mistrust of what he regards as this fundamental libertarian or anarchist schema. So, in the later Being and Event (2005) Badiou will critique what he calls ‘speculative leftism’, which believes in the ‘pure’ event of revolt – the miracle of revolt appearing out of nothing.2 Again his point here is there is a faith in the emergence of a force of revolt posed against a static sense of power, without any real attempt to analyse the possibilities and limits the forces that would compose this ‘revolt’. This faith in the miracle of the event of revolt is coupled, Badiou argues, with a sense of the inevitable defeat of such revolts by power. The result is that we are left in the situation of fighting an endless (losing) war – alternating between the eruption of revolt out of nothing and then its inevitable return to nothing.¶ More recently Badiou has focused his criticisms on the thinking of Antonio Negri (author, with Michael Hardt, of Empire (2000)), and his influence on the ‘movement of movements’. Badiou tends to conflate Negri with the ‘movement of movements’, and while it is true that the language and thinking of Negri has had considerable influence it has by no means passed uncontested. Badiou modulates his earlier general criticisms of anarchism / libertarian positions but stays within the same general frame: Negri is not truly opposed to capitalist ‘Empire’ but instead romanticises the power of capitalism:¶ As is well known, for Negri, the Spinozist, there is only one historic substance, so that the capitalist empire is also the scene of an unprecedented communist deployment. This surely has the advantage of authorizing the belief that the worse it gets, the better it gets; or of getting you to (mis)take those demonstrations – fruitlessly convened to meet wherever the powerful re-unite – for the ‘creation’ and the ‘multiform invention’ of new petit-bourgeois proletarians. (Badiou 2006: 45)¶ Therefore Negri cuts the ground from under any truly anti-capitalist politics by being overly fascinated with the mobile power of capital. At the same time he is overly hopeful about the powers of resistance on this ground, offering only a ‘dreamy hallucination’ (Badiou 2003: 126) of the power of the ‘multitude’, which lacks the discipline to properly detach itself from the state.¶ Badiou’s critique of anarchism ranges across a number of repeated and modulated criticisms. At the fundamental level it involves a constrained sense of the possibilities of politics that remains in a dualism of resistance versus power. This monolithic conception prevents a properly political assessment of the complex arrangements of political power and the means by which capitalist and state power might not only be resisted but also overthrown. This static dualism often leaves the origin of revolt unexplained or undetermined. It seems to come from nowhere and also to go nowhere; the ‘miracle’ of revolt is always doomed to defeat or recuperation. Also, this dualism leads to a structure of mirroring between anarchism and state or capitalist power. The invocations of drift and liberation found in the libertarian current are dangerously close to the ideological forms of capitalism itself. For Badiou, this means that anarchism lacks the ability to ‘construct new forms of discipline to replace the discipline of political parties’ (Badiou 2003: 126). Of course anyone knowledgeable of the history of anarchism will recognise these kinds of criticism, particularly as it has often been advanced by Marxists. But it is the vehemence with which Badiou poses these questions in the present context, and his choice of theoretical targets that make them worth considering as critical questions – especially since, as we will see, some voices within the movement have arrived at similar conclusions.

#### Bourdon - Maintaining the conditions of possibility for life is a prerequisite to ongoing experiences with death

Nidesh Lawtoo, Department of Comparative Literature, University of Washington, “Bataille and the Suspension of Being,” Lingua Romana : a journal of French, Italian and Romanian culture volume 4, issue 1 / fall ‘5

Bataille's notion of communication involves a dialectic with two positives (hence a non-dialectic) where two sovereigns confront death not in view of an end but as an end in itself: "confronting death," in fact, "puts the subjects at stake-"l'être en eux-mêmes [est] mis en jeu" (Sur Nietzsche 61). Further, Bataille affirms that "[p]ersonne n'est-un instant-souverain qui ne se perde" (OC VIII 429). It is the Nietzschean self-forgetfulness that is here evoked; a self-forgetfulness which implies a transgression of the limits of both communicating subjects. Again, for Bataille "[l]a 'communication' n'a lieu qu'entre deux êtres mis en jeu-déchirés, suspendus, l'un et l'autre penchés au-dessus de leur néant" (Sur Nietzsche 62). However, if according to Nietzsche, self-forgetfulness takes place in solitude, for Bataille it necessitates the presence of an "other."(5) Communication in fact, asks for "deux êtres mis en jeu" who participate in what he defines as "une fête immotivée" (Sur Nietzsche 31). There the sovereign loses himself (se perde) with the other, through the other, in the other, in a process of "mutual laceration" (Essential 105) which is simultaneously tragic and ludic. The emphasis on the other is Hegelian, but unlike dialectics, communication does not confront the subject with an object (Gegen-stand, something that stands against the subject). As Bataille puts it (apparently echoing Baudelaire), communication takes place with "un semblable," "mon frère" (OC VIII 289). And he adds: "Cela suppose la communication de sujet à sujet" (OC VIII 288). Bataille's notion of communication is not based upon a "violent hierarchy" (Derrida's term) but rather upon egalitarianism. Moreover, transgressing the limits of the subject implies that the two subjects already possess (in potential) the characteristics of sovereignty. Hence, the status of sovereign is not achieved as a result of a fight to the death, but requires the subject to be open to an other who is outside the limits of the self. Derrida speaks of the "trembling" to which Bataille submits Hegelian concepts (253). This trembling, I would argue, has its source in Nietzsche (6): "The figs fall from the trees" says Zarathustra, "they are good and sweet, and when they fall, their red skins are rent. A north wind am I unto ripe figs" (qtd. in Philosophy 135). If we apply this passage to Bataille's philosophy, we could say that inherent in this "fall" is an explosion of Hegelian concepts, and in particular, as we have seen, the notion of Herrshaft. Further, communication, for Bataille, involves a similar "fall" which rents (déchire) the skin of the subjects (their limits) exposing the red flesh which lies beneath the skin. According to the French philosopher, Nietzsche's critique of the subject is more radical than Hegel's, since, as he puts it in "Hegel, la mort et le sacrifice," Hegel's philosophy, and I would add Kojève's interpretation of it, is "une théologie, où l'homme aurait pris la place de Dieu" (OC XII 329). Hegel's "theology" preserves the identity of the subject. Now, Bataille makes his position to this "theology" clear as he writes: "I don't believe in God-from the inability to believe in self" (Essential 10). By establishing a direct link between the death of the subject and the death of God, Bataille extends his critique of "beings" into the larger, ontological, critique of "Being." Implicit in this theoretical move is the articulation of the ontology of sovereignty. Bataille's philosophy is Nietzschean insofar as it is grounded in experience and in the immanence of the body. Communication, for Bataille is first and foremost a bodily affair. Hence the interrogation of the limits of the subject starts from an interrogation of what we could call the "gates," or openings of the body: the mouth, the vagina, the anus and the eyes are for Bataille central places for philosophical investigation because at these gates, the integrity of the subject is questioned; its limits can be transgressed. They are spaces of transition where a "glissement hors de soi" (OC VIII 246) can take place. These bodily openings, which Bataille also defines as "blessures," (Sur Nietzsche 64) found his conception of the sovereign subject. In fact, each "blessure" can be linked to a specific dimension of communication which obsesses Bataille. His central themes match different bodily openings: the mouth connects to laughter; the vagina to eroticism; the eyes to tears; the anus to the excrements which he links to death. Through these openings the subject is traversed by different fluxes and its integrity, totality and stability is challenged. They allow for the possibility of a glissement of the subject's being. The same could be said of Bataille's corpus: it is a unitary entity, which, like a body, escapes the totalizing temptation of closure. Despite the fact that Bataille defines sovereignty in terms of the Kojèvian/Hegelian "nothingness" (Bataille's Rien), his conception of communication is built upon the Nietzschean ontological distinction between the Dionysian and the Apollonian. In fact, the ontological movement that takes place in communication "exige que l'on glisse" (OC VI 158) from an "insufficient" and "discontinuous" being to a reality of "continuity" that transcends binary oppositions (Erotism 13-14). To put it more simply, communication introduces a movement from the "many" to the "One"; from a "discontinuity of being" to a "continuity of being;" from separate "beings" to a common ontological ground ("Being"). The source of Bataille's ontology is clear: it stems from Nietzsche's The Birth of Tragedy which in turn, is construed upon Schopenhauer's distinction between will and representation. "As a sailor sits in a small boat in a boundless raging sea," writes Schopenhauer," surrounded on all sides by heaving mountainous waves, trusting to his frail vessel; so does the individual man sit calmly in the middle of a world of torment, trusting to the principium individuationis" (Birth 21) .(7) Communication, for Bataille, as the Dionysian for Nietzsche, involves the shattering of the principium individuationis, a tearing down of the veil of Maya which constitutes, what Bataille calls, with a blink of the eye to Schopenhauer, the "illusion of a being which is isolated" (Essential 10; my emphasis). Communication, thus, involves an opening of the subject to the larger ground of Being. The sovereign's boat is constantly leaking. Yet, in order for communication to take place, the boat needs to keep floating. That is to say that for transgression to take place, the limits of the subject need to be preserved (Erotism 63; Foucault 34). The being of the sovereign subject is suspended upon the abîme-what Bataille also calls "une realité plus vaste" (OC II 246)-which means that the subject neither dwells safely within the limits of the "small, insufficient boat" of individuation, nor within the depth of the undifferentiated "raging sea," but in the space of contact in-between the two spheres. This precision is key in order to delineate the originality of Bataille's ontology of sovereignty. Bataille's conception of the communicating subject (i.e., of sovereignty) walks a thin line between its self-dissolution and its self-preservation. Hence the idea that he is above all a thinker of limits or borders. The sovereign's being, in fact, is "suspended" on the "bord de l'abîme" (Coupable V 355) but never actually falls, except, of course, in death. Hence, for Bataille, "[i]l s'agit d'approcher la mort" [it is approaching death] that is to say, the abîme, or the continuity of being, "d'aussi près qu'on peut l'endurer" [as close as one can endure] (337-338). The sovereign subject confronts death while preserving his life. His being is placed at the border between life and death. Hence, if Bataille defines philosophy as "existence striving to reach its limits" (Essential 146), it should be specified that the being of the subject is not found beyond its limits, as his use of "existence" seems to suggest (Ek-sistenz) since that would imply a total dissolution of the subject. Bataille's philosophy of transgression implies the preservation of the limits of the subject so that the sovereign can experience and endure death in life. The tension between self-expenditure (Nietzsche's Verschwendung) and self-preservation (linked to Hegel's Anerkennung) is analogous to the movement of a moth that is first attracted by the fire of a candle and subsequently distances itself from the fire in order to preserve its life.(8) This repeated back and forth movement recapitulates the movement of communication and is responsible for the underlying tension which traverses Bataille's philosophy. It is an inner (bodily) drive that attracts the moth to death and not, as it is the case for Hegel's master, a reasoned project in view of an end (recognition). The moth's self-sacrifice, in fact, is perfectly useless (it serves no purpose) and hence is truly sovereign. Bataille would call it "une négativité sans emploi." Or, as he says with respect to eroticism in his first and last interview before he died, "it is purely squandering, an expenditure of energy for itself" (in Essential 220). This movement forwards, towards the flame of self-dissolution (which takes place in death, eroticism, laughter…) and its retreat backwards, towards life and the limits it involves, epitomizes Bataille's notion of communication. A practice which for Bataille seems to have the characteristic of a fort-da game in which the subject is not in control of the movement. This movement, Bataille writes in the Preface to Madame Edwarda, happens "malgré nous" (III 11). Thus conceived the sovereign accepts the place of a toy in the hands of a child playing-a definition similar to Heraclitus' vision of life, which he defines as "a child at play, moving pieces in a game (Fragment 52, in GM 149). This view of communication is both tragic and joyful; violent and useless. A joyful tragedy, which challenges the limits of the subject; that puts the subject's being en jeu. If Bataille is deeply fascinated by death, decay and the dissolution of the subject in a continuity of being, he escapes the temptation to embrace death at the expense of life. His definition of eroticism sums up this fundamental tension: "Eroticism," he writes, "is assenting to life up to the point of death" (Erotism11). This applies not only to eroticism but also to all communicating activities such as laughter, play, tears, and ultimately to the ethos that sustains the totality of Bataille's philosophy. If Kojève defines dialectics as a "negating-negativity" (5), Bataille's communication can be read as an affirmative negativity. In fact, death is confronted and even invoked, but what is found in death is the ultimate affirmation of life. Negation of the integrity (the limits) of the subject leads to a radical affirmation of life. And if in the Preface to Madame Edwarda, Bataille can affirme "l'identité de l'être et de la mort" (OC III 10), let us also note that the identity of being and death is realized in life. Faithful to Nietzsche, Bataille does not become a negator of the will; a negator of life; a pessimist, a Buddhist or worse, a nihilist (some of the derogatory terms used by Nietzsche to retrospectively define his first and last master). Bataille remains truthful to life. While the ontological premises grounding sovereignty are taken from Schopenhauer (via Nietzsche), Bataille's conclusions are diametrically opposed to Nietzsche's first master. In fact, Bataille's philosophy can be seen as an affirmation of the will (he operates an inversion of values) through Dionysian practices (included sexuality which Schopenhauer condemned) that put the subject in touch with the ultimate ground of being, without dissolving him/her in it.