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## 1

### NC

#### First, the subject constrains the ethic – a theory which attempts to prescribe action must account for the nature of the self which takes action.

#### Transcendent subjecthood fails – differentiation through time makes instability constitutive.

Spangenberg **9** – Yolanda Spangenberg (Department of Philosophy, University of Pretoria). “‘Thought without an Image’: Deleuzian philosophy as an ethics of the event.” Phronimon 10:1, 2009

According to Deleuze, a general category of things is necessarily still excluded due to the particular form of recognition. In other words, due to the fact that recognition proceeds by objectifying and comparing the new with what is already known or what has already been experienced. To put this differently, recognition operates by objectifying and referring difference back to that which has already been recognised and experienced. It discounts the new and virtual qualities of pure difference. For Deleuze, the problem with recognition lies in the fact that recognition necessarily depends on representation. To be able to recognize the object of a faculty, we have to consider the object in terms of an identity that we can conceive of, an analogy that we can judge, an opposition that we can imagine and a similarity that we can perceive (Williams 2005). According to Deleuze, the representational ‘image of thought’ perpetuates a reductive and damaging illusion that hides reality seen in terms of pure difference or difference ‘in itself.’ For Deleuze, pure difference exists in the form of intensities or forces and it is the virtual condition for (the possibility of) all actual identities; it is necessary for the explanation of significance and sensation in the realm of actual things. Although pure difference is nonidentifiable and is forever eluding the present, it underlies all identities and allows us to explain their actualizations, transformations and evolutions. The sense and significance that pure difference gives rise to involve incomparable events and movements that, for Deleuze, are uniquely significant to individuals. This pure difference that underlies all actual and trivial differences is objectified and excluded by representation. Representation cuts us off from the creativity afforded by virtual and intensive multiplicities. Deleuze’s opposition to identity is directed at the falsifying power and separative nature of identity in representation. Identity is opposed to the virtual intensities of pure difference in that these intensities are nonidentifiable, unrepresentable, uncountable and not open to a reductive logical or mathematical analysis. Deleuze’s critique of identity aims at correcting the mistake we make whenever we think merely in terms of actual things. In privileging identities and extended magnitudes we tend to overlook the intensive genesis of these identities and magnitudes. Identity works against and covers up the forces and virtual intensities of pure difference that are part of processes of becoming and transformation. Rather than existing as fixed and separate beings with identifiable and limited essences or predicates, all things are, according to Deleuze, connected to uncountable, non-identifiable and dynamic processes. Deleuze does not deny that recognition occurs and that identity and representation fulfil an important and necessary function. His answer however, is that thinking as well as communication is not only, or even primarily, a matter of identifying; it is in a crucial sense also expressive. “Its expressive momentum carries a charge of potential too great to be absorbed in any particular thing or event: too much to be born(e)” (Massumi 2006: xxxii). Although we represent what we think and talk about, a series of non-identifiable processes are always at work ‘behind’ that representation. For Deleuze, neither identity nor representation would’ve been possible without pure differences standing in the background as a condition for the illusory appearance of a pure, well-determined identity. Apart from the orderly, structured and representational way of our habitual thinking, there are always the chaos of chance happenings, and the irrationality and complexity of their ever-shifting origins and outcomes. We try to deal with the chaos and contradictory nature of pure difference by imposing structures, creating hierarchies, conceiving of things as ‘the same’ from one moment to the next, using definitions to limit meanings, and ignoring new and potentially creative experiences (James Williams in Parr: 2007).

#### There are two models of desire:

#### First, desire as lack views the present as a dark shadow of the completed future – this forces us to annihilate difference and reinforce the boundaries between the world and ourselves.

#### Second, desire as productive views the subject as becoming – our subjectivity is unstable because it is relational.

#### Thus, the standard is to embrace desire as productive. Prefer:

#### 1 – Indeterminacy – There is nothing inherent in a rule that mandates following a specific interpretation. They are always subject to interpretation by the observer, which means an objective moral rule would get interpreted differently by different agents.

#### 2 – Cruel Optimism – Only affect can bridge the gap between discursive regimes and the material world.

**Schafer 13** – Schaefer ’13. Schaefer, D. "The Promise of Affect: The Politics of the Event in Ahmed's The Promise of Happiness and Berlant's Cruel Optimism." Theory & Event 16.2 2013. Project MUSE

At a recent talk at the University of Pennsylvania, Lauren Berlant was asked a question about the relationship between her work—she had just finished a lecture on the theme of flat affect in Gregg Araki's 2004 film Mysterious Skin—and the political. "Because I work on affect," she responded, "I think everything is realism" ([Berlant: 2012](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b3)). Like the dense introductory segments of each of her chapters—thick but fast-moving genealogical waterslides—I think that unpacking statements like this from Berlant is best repaid by taking them in a low gear. When Berlant maps her method as affect theory, she is suggesting that the works she examines in her capacity as a scholar of literature cannot be divorced from the political-material contexts out of which they emerge, but at the same time must be recognized as incarnations of aparticular embodied iteration within this field. **Texts are produced by bodies that are both enmeshed in their political worlds and trying to negotiate those worlds in their own** **distinct way. Everything we do is realism: Berlant's textual objects of study are mediations, attempts to work something out, exhibitions of tensed, embodied, affective realities**.[1](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#f1) This is the promise of **affect theory, the possibility sliding together analytical tools used to pick apart both highly individuated and highly social contact zones—bodies and histories—as incarnated realities. Affect theory wants to maintain the insights of high theory, the doctrinaire approach that says "historicize everything," while** at the same time **thinking of how bodies inject their own materiality** into spaces. This means using language that enters the orbit of the biological. In the introduction to their 1995 edited volume Shame and Its Sisters: A Silvan Tomkins Reader (later reprinted in Sedgwick's Touching Feeling)—one of the earliest manifestoes of contemporary affect theory— Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Adam Frank acerbically catalog what theory "knows today," first and foremost that 1: The distance of [an] account from a biological basis is assumed to correlate near precisely with its potential for doing justice to difference (individual, historical, and cross-cultural), to contingency, to performative force, and to the possibility of change ([Sedgwick: 2003, 93](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b11)). And 2: Human language is assumed to offer the most productive, if not the only possible, model for understanding representation ([Sedgwick: 2003, 93](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b11)). **Affect theory in this vision is designed to explore[s] the "crucial knowledges" of bodies outside a purely theoretical determination, outside** the traditional **domains of humanist scholarship—reason, cognition, and language** ([Sedgwick: 2003, 114](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b11)). **Affect**, for Lauren Berlant, **is** thus understandable as "sensual **matter that is elsewhere to sovereign consciousness but** that **has** historical **significance in domains of subjectivity**" ([Berlant: 2011, 53](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). **Affect theory is about how systems of forces circulating within bodies**—forces not necessarily subsumable or describable by language—**interface with histories**. It is about how discourses form ligatures with pulsing flesh-and-blood creatures. Two recent texts, Sara Ahmed's The Promise of Happiness ([2010](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)) and Berlant's Cruel Optimism ([2011](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)), can be seen as developing this strand, and in particular, of indicating new ways of feeling out politics through the membrane of affect theory. Both of these authors suggest that the repertoire of the analytics of power ([Foucault: 1990](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b6)) must be supplemented with resources from the affective turn. Recent critiques of affect theory[2](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#f2) have focused on a branch of affect theory heavily informed by Gilles Deleuze's reading of Spinoza. In this strand, affect is rendered as a set of ontological properties, as an ensemble of mutable attributes.[3](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#f3) Contemporary Deleuzians such as Brian Massumi[4](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#f4) and William Connolly[5](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#f5) have been targeted by these critics for their attempts at absorbing scientific research into the Spinozistic discourse of affect. But Spinoza and Deleuze are second-tier characters in Ahmed and Berlant's work—which is perhaps why Ahmed situates herself in a lineage—stretching back to Sedgwick—that she calls "feminist cultural studies of affect"[6](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#f6) ([Ahmed: 2010, 13](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). Where the Deleuzian strands focuses on affect as the raw material of becoming, as the play of substances, Ahmed and Berlant locate **affect theory [is]** as a **phenomenological, rather than ontological** enterprise. It is in the phenomenology of the political that Ahmed and Berlant ground their projects. For Ahmed, this comes in the form of a new attention to happiness as an object of analysis. This does not mean a circumscribed exploration of happiness as a thing, but rather programmatically asking the question "what does happiness do?" ([Ahmed: 2010, 2](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). **Happiness is not autonomous,** Ahmed argues, **but a relationship of evaluation that creates the horizon of the self.** For Ahmed, the "near sphere" of **the self is constituted by a perimeter studded with "happy objects." This cluster** of objects **is what gives the field of mobile operations of the self its shape**. In this "drama of contingency," we "come to have our likes, which might even establish what we are like" ([Ahmed: 2010, 24](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). But for Ahmed, happiness as an affective field settling in proximity to bodies is not necessarily transparent in its shape or its function to the self. Happiness often takes the form, she suggests, of a promise, of a deferred possibility. Taking the phenomenological tradition of Edmund Husserl as a springboard for a discussion of time-consciousness, she suggests that happiness as a promise—from the Latin verb promittere, "to let go or send forth"—is an anticipation rather than a felt presence ([Ahmed: 2010, 38](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). Rather than simply an affect that circulates between bodies and objects, happiness is also a promise that is passed around. This analysis of the promise of happiness underpins the genealogy Ahmed organizes in the opening chapter of the book: an exploration of the contemporary "happiness turn" in scholarship and the "happiness industry" emerging in parallel in popular media marketplaces. This discourse, she suggests, moves happiness further away from its etymological origin point—in the Middle English hap or fortune, cognate with "perhaps" and "happenstance"— suggesting chance to a sense of happiness as a scheme, a program that, if followed, leads to ultimate good ([Ahmed: 2010, 6](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). This sense of the promise of happiness is the elimination of contingency by guaranteeing the futurity of happiness: "The promise of happiness takes this form: if you have this or have that, or if you do this or do that, then happiness is what follows" ([Ahmed: 2010, 29](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). Happiness as a guarantee—a promise that circulates through power-knowledge regimes—but one that defers happiness rather than making happiness present, is one of the mechanisms by which happiness is translated into the skin of a political organism, an "affective community"—such as a family or a society. Through the promise of happiness, bodies are brought together by a shared expectation of future comfort. But because this is a promise rather than immediate happiness, an interstice is formed between this promise and individual experiencing bodies— an interstice that can either be full and complete or disconnected. The family, for instance, does not share a happiness, but a happiness deferred, a promise or image of happiness to-come ([Ahmed: 2010, 46](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). It is in this interstice, either blockaded or fluid, that Ahmed articulates the need for a politics of killing joy, of breaking down the promise of happiness as a regime that demands fidelity without recourse. For Ahmed, the discourse of happiness is performative: it produces a politics of promise (or nostalgia) that suffocates alternative promises and alternative explorations. Here Ahmed produces biographies of a range of "affect aliens," bodies that are called on to be silent and accept the happiness that has been promised, while their actual desires and hopes are out of joint with the world around them: feminist killjoys, unhappy queers, melancholic migrants. The promise of happiness, Ahmed suggests, must be interrupted to make room for emancipatory politics. "I am not saying that we have an obligation to be unhappy," she writes, "I am simply suggesting that we need to think about unhappiness as more than a feeling that should be overcome" ([Ahmed: 2010, 217](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). In the closing passage of the book she writes that since "the desire for happiness can cover signs of its negation, a revolutionary politics has to work hard to stay proximate to unhappiness" ([Ahmed: 2010, 223](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). Political change, Ahmed contends, is paralyzed by the imperative to be happy, to stay within the narrow guidelines of happiness's promise. Where Ahmed's background is in a western philosophical lineage that leads up to contemporary questions of affect, the immediate theoretical precursor of Lauren Berlant's Cruel Optimism is Kathleen Stewart's Ordinary Affects ([2007](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b12)), which develops the notion of the "ordinary" as a felt reality. "Ordinary affects," Stewart writes, "are the varied, surging capacities to affect and to be affected that give everyday life the quality of a continual motion of relations, scenes, contingencies, and emergences" ([Stewart: 2007, 1f](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b12)). Berlant is interested in particular in how the ordinary comes to take the form of a sort of affective impasse, a set of felt relationships that cannot be moved through. Cruel Optimism is a focused study of a particular category of impasse, what she calls "cruel optimism." **Cruel optimism**, she explains at the book's outset, refers to a relation that **emerges "when something you desire is actually an obstacle to your flourishing**. It might involve food, or a kind of love; **it might be a fantasy of the good life, or a political project**" ([Berlant: 2011, 1](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). Berlant explores a range of situations where **these attachments emerge, as a response to trauma or out of the ongoing pressures of the ordinary**, in particular through the parameters of what she calls "genres of precarity," a range of aesthetic practices and styles—"mass media, literature, television, film, and video"—that ... emerge during the 1990s to register a shift in how the older state-liberal-capitalist fantasies shape adjustments to the structural pressures of crisis and loss that are wearing out the power of the good life's traditional fantasy bribe without wearing out the need for a good life ([Berlant: 2011, 7](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). Realism: texts always reflect an affective situation, a force field of desires, a labile contact zone between bodies and intersecting historical frames. Framing literary criticism (broadly construed) as a practice of **tracing the connective tissue between bodies and situations is** what lets Berlant speak to **the political use**s **of affect**. She suggests that affect theory is a "another phase in the history of ideology theory," that it "brings us back to the encounter of what is sensed with what is known and what has impact in a new but also recognizable way" ([Berlant: 2011, 53](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). **Affect**—especially ordinary affect—**is the missing link between discursive regimes and bodies, the arterial linkages through which power is disseminated. "The present" is not an assemblage of texts and knowledges, bloodless discursive inscriptions on the body, but a felt sense out of which political circumstances emerge. "We understand nothing about impasses of the political," she writes, "without having an account of the production of the present"** ([Berlant: 2011, 4](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). Cruel optimism as a byproduct of political situations colliding with bodies plays out in ongoing, semistable routines, in ordinariness. This focus on the ordinary frames Berlant's conception of the political as a slow-motion reaction rather than a series of staccato punctuations. This comes out, for instance, in her exhortation to move away from trauma theory as a way of "describing what happens to persons and populations as an effect of catastrophic impacts" ([Berlant: 2011, 9](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). Rather, Berlant suggests that trauma is only one facet of the ordinary, a precursory event that yields new historical trajectories lived out in slow-motion. "Trauma," she writes, ... forces its subjects not into mere stuckness but into crisis mode, where they develop some broad, enduring intuitions about the way we live in a now that's emerging without unfolding, and imagining a historicism from within a discontinuous present and ways of being that were never sovereign ([Berlant: 2011, 93](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). Rather than the instantiating event, Berlant is interested in the fallout of politics, the long-running reverberations. It is in these interwoven aftermaths following in the wake of bodies that Berlant locates the tropic of cruel optimism. Optimism, she is careful to point out, can "feel" any number of different ways, can come clothed in any number of affective orientations. "Because optimism is ambitious," she writes, "at any moment it might not feel like anything, including nothing: dread, anxiety, hunger, curiosity, the whole gamut from the sly neutrality of browsing the aisles to excitement at the prospect of 'the change that's gonna come'" ([Berlant: 2011, 2](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). **Rather than a singularly identifiable feeling, optimism takes the phenomenological form of a "knotty tethering to objects, scenes, and modes of life that generate so much overwhelming yet sustaining negation" (**[**Berlant: 2011, 52**](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)**). Optimism binds bodies to "fantasies of the good life," to horizons of possibility that may or may not be defeated by the conditions of their own emergence. Cruel optimism is the outcome of this circumstance of tethering confused by itself, of Möbius-strip cycles of ambition and frustration.** The ordinary, precisely because of its complexity, can contain the intransigent contradictions of cruel optimism ([Berlant: 2011, 53](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). It is the space of the rubble, the hovering dust, the shockwaves that follow the event rather than the piercing clarity of the punctum itself. Berlant is interested in the ways that habits form out of situations of impossibility—for instance, in her reading of Gregg Bordowitz's documentary filmHabit (2001), about the body rituals that structure the daily lives of a gay man living with AIDS and his partner in New York City in the 1990s. Bordowitz's work maps a crisis that reflects Berlant's delineation of the field of the political: with the new availability of anti-retroviral drugs in the 1990s, AIDS ceased to be "a death sentence," and thus "turned fated life back into an ellipsis, a time marked by pill- and test-taking, and other things, the usual" ([Berlant: 2011, 58](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). For Berlant, the event is a rarity, and is only secondarily the zone of the political, which is itself constituted by ongoing patterns of response and desire—slow-motion echoes producing new forms as they cross-cut and interfere with one another ([Berlant: 2011, 6](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). In this sense, Berlant explains, her work meshes with Sedgwick's queer reading of affect as the histories that make us desire in unexpected, perverse ways. "The queer tendency of this method," Berlant writes, "is to put one's attachments back into play and into pleasure, into knowledge, into worlds. It is to admit that they matter" ([Berlant: 2011, 123](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). Berlant sees the terrain of the political emerging out of this tissue of affectively-embroidered histories. Although both Ahmed and Berlant write about the uses of affect as a phenomenological bridge to the political, and the slipperiness of happiness or the good life—the way that pleasure can be wrapped up with a strain of unease— there is a distinction between their respective scopes of inquiry. Where Ahmed's book is about frustration/promise/deferral, Berlant's is about addiction. When I asked my students to come up with examples of **cruel optimism**, they brainstormed the following list: heroin, abusive relationships, candy, horcruxes. Each of these instances **suggests a vital but destructive need, an ambivalent compulsion—an addiction**, where the tectonic plates of the body's affects shift in friction with one another. **Cruel optimism indexes these moments where a body desires and needs an arrangement of the world that is also frustrating or corrosive**. Politics is one of these zones of fractious attraction. Berlant writes, for instance, that Intensely political seasons spawn reveries of a different immediacy. People imagine alternative environments where authenticity trumps ideology, truths cannot be concealed, and communication feels intimate, face-to-face" ([Berlant: 2011, 223](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). **Politics produces fantasies, tethers that draw us forward to particular attachments in the form of images, narratives, bodily practices**. But **these fantasies also contain the elements of their own frustration or refusal.** President George W. Bush, for example, is able to use the affective elements of statecraft (a practice which, Berlant assures us, is decidedly non-partisan) to create a façade that diverts attention from his flailing foreign and economic policies ([Berlant: 2011, 226](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). Berlant's focus in Cruel Optimism is on politics as a field of attachments, a skein of affectively pulsing tissues linking bodies together. "Pace Žižek," she writes, ... the energy that generates this sustaining commitment to the work of undoing a world while making one requires fantasy to motor programs of action, to distort the present on behalf of what the present can become. It requires a surrealistic affectsphere to counter the one that already exists, enabling a confrontation with the fact that any action of making a claim on the present involves bruising processes of detachment from anchors in the world, along with optimistic projections of a world that is worth our attachment to it ([Berlant: 2011, 263](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b2)). Berlant looks at how politics pulls on bodies using the ligaments of affect, how politics becomes irresistible, even when it is self-frustrating. Ahmed's focus is very different: she is interested in thinking through politics as the space of unhappiness and deferment. In a section of Chapter 5 entitled "The Freedom to Be Unhappy," Ahmed writes that revolutionary practices may need to follow from the willingness to suspend happiness, to dissolve the imbricated promises of happiness that produce hermetically sealed political systems. Affect aliens are forged in the pressure of unfulfilled or unfulfillable promises of happiness, sealed in a relationship of anticipation pinned to the guarantee of ultimate good. Thus Ahmed writes that "any politics of justice will involve causing unhappiness even if that is not the point of our action. So much happiness is premised on, and promised by, the concealment of suffering, the freedom to look away from what compromises one's happiness" ([Ahmed: 2010, 196](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). The revolutionary politics Ahmed wants to advance is willing to put happiness at risk, to dissolve promises of happiness. Ahmed is clear, though, that this is not to make politics about unhappiness: It is not that unhappiness becomes our telos: rather, if we no longer presume happiness is our telos, unhappiness would register as more than what gets in the way. When we are no longer sure of what gets in the way, then 'the way' itself becomes a question ([Ahmed: 2010, 195](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). Neither happiness nor unhappiness is the telos of revolutionary politics. Rather, Ahmed wants to connect the political back to the "hap" of happiness. Rather than a critique of happiness, I would suggest that the broader channel of her project is best understood as a critique ofpromise. Thus she ends Chapter 5 with the later work of Jacques Derrida, indicating the need to keep politics open to the event, to the unexpected possibilities to-come. She proposes a vision of happiness that "would be alive to chance, to chance arrivals, to the perhaps of a happening" ([Ahmed: 2010, 198](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). Where for Berlant the event is in the past, the ancestor of our tensed bodily habits today, for Ahmed, the event is ahead, the always-anticipated but radically unknown future. There is also a complementarity to these books, a sense in which both come at the relationship between affect and the political from different sides of the problem, but are nonetheless hurtling towards a common point of impact. Is Ahmed describing scenes where cruel optimism unravels under the internal pressure of a frustrated promise? Is cruel optimism the deferral of happiness implicit in the temporal structure of the promise? These are not fully resolved or resolvable questions, in part because Ahmed and Berlant roll their theoretical lens over such a wide range of circumstances. I would suggest that deepening the conversation between these approaches will hinge in part on exploring the relationship between affect and time—a question that is surfaced by both of these texts but not resolved. Ahmed wants to play inside the deconstructive thematics of the promise that allows us to view affect as a state of deferral. But Ahmed comes closest to Berlant when she writes that "[i]f we hope for happiness, then we might be happy as long as we can retain this hope (a happiness that paradoxically allows us to be happy with unhappiness)" ([Ahmed: 2010, 181](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). Is deferred happiness really divided from happiness? What if fantasies—what Silvan Tomkins calls "images"[7](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#f7)—are so crucial to the production of affect that to save and savor fantasies in one's near sphere is "worth" their eventual frustration? What if a promise deferred is itself a form of happiness—even if the deferral turns out, in retrospect, to have been endless? What happens while we wait? This is in no way to acquiesce to those situations, sketched by Ahmed in the inner chapters of the book, where promises are made that produce affect aliens— investment in a community of promise that will never materialize as happiness. But it is to suggest that the economic flows of affect are more complex than a simple binary of presence/deferment. There may be a clearer divergence in Berlant and Ahmed's respective emphases on the felt temporality of politics. Ahmed suggests that political transformation happens by orienting us to the perhaps, towards an evental horizon constituted by uncertainty, rather than promise. Berlant seems more skeptical about the possibility of untethering ourselves from an orientation to future happiness. As in her response to Žižek, she emphasizes the intransigence of fantasy, especially as a conduit that can produce political energy. I wonder if Berlant's answer here points to a different way of resolving the problem of temporality hovering over Ahmed's work: what if the dissolution of promise did not leave us at the mercy of a pure politics of hap, of chance, but opened us up to new horizons of hope—neither guaranteed nor radically accidental? This dynamic interfaces with an equally provocative question lodged early on and left unresolved in Berlant's book: "I have indeed wondered," she writes in her Introduction, "whether all optimism is cruel, because the experience of loss of the conditions of its reproduction can be so breathtakingly bad, just as the threat of the loss of x in the scope of one's attachment drives can feel like a threat to living on itself" ([Berlant: 2011, 24](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/509908#b1)). In mapping affectively mediated politics, how do we assess the cruelty of hope? What are the singular psychic costs of disappointment that must be risked or countenanced in the production of a politics without promise? These books are profoundly important contributions advancing the still-new and in some ways still-tentative field of affect theory. They open up two distinct but interrelated methodological templates for thinking through issues of globalization, race, gender and sexuality, media, philosophy, and religion: the thematics of frustration and of addiction in the moving affectsphere of the political. What both Ahmed and Berlant demonstrate is that **affect theory offers a crucial set of resources for thinking through the relationship between bodies and discourses.** The enterprise of thinking politics, of mapping the enfolding of bodies by power, cannot move forward without affect.

### Contention

#### 1 – The affs move to resist private appropriation forecloses productive expressions of desire.

**Forner** – “Raquel Forner, Icaru, 1944.” Raquel Forner, ICARU, 1944, <https://airandspace.si.edu/multimedia-gallery/rforner2jpg>, Agastya

For artist Raquel Forner, the subject of space exploration was a **compelling way to explore the dueling senses of loss** and hope that characterized her long life. First came the sense of loss: Forner was born in Argentina but travelled extensively—not only to Paris to study painting, but also to her ancestral homeland of Spain, to which she developed an especially deep philosophical and emotional connection. When the Spanish Civil War broke out in 1936, Forner saw places from her childhood memories drowned in violence. The war, and the subsequent world war that followed several years later, profoundly affected the tone of her creative work. At the beginning of the Spanish Civil War, Forner mused that only then did she “grasp the atmosphere of the world”—and the atmosphere had little hope.

The paintings that poured from Forner in the subsequent years were fittingly shadowed and brooding. Forner made use of the surreal styles popularized in Paris at the time by artists such as Salvador Dali, melting the physics of reality to match the destructive violence she saw around her. She populated her paintings in this era with archetypal female figures, oversized and posed as symbols of recurring suffering. They stood in desolate landscapes and warned of future war, a message that increased in desperation with each work. By the 1950s, Forner’s imaginings were so macabre that they teetered on the edge of apocalyptic.

Something changed in 1957. Forner became interested in international efforts in the space program and took note of the all-male, military-trained programs. The subject of space travel then slowly began to creep into her work—something about its thematic content gripped her, and the dark, war-torn landscapes in her older work started to recede. In their place, Forner created a storybook mythology, brightly colored, and filled with abstracted figures. With these first few paintings, she became one of the earliest artists to depict outer space in paintings, and she continued to create images of space almost exclusively until her death in 1988. Her painting, Return of the Astronauts, showcases this new subject matter, as she combined elements of real life—the work was a reference to the Apollo 11 mission to the Moon—and her own imagination.

Return of the Astronauts depicts a genderless figure plummeting toward Earth. The astronaut is partially gray, though containing a colorful face in their stomach that appears to be sending color shooting into their limbs. Forner’s painting includes the kind of conflict that characterized her early work, but now she presents it as more of an inconvenience, that’s overcome by the help of others. She paints the main figure in the midst of falling; it hurtles down from space past a kaleidoscope sunset and toward an ominously solid Earth. In the face of this danger, three faces, personifying a parachute, catch the plummeting astronaut. Rays emanate from them like streaming sunbeams, and their communal support promises to save the falling figure, as a red thread binds  their reaching hands. As the astronaut falls, they keep their left hand pointing up, a reminder to viewers, and to Forner, of the possibilities that await them beyond the horizon, in the land of dreams. The parachute, a common symbol in Forner’s earlier war work, here symbolizes safety.

Forner portrays **space is a place where human beings** could go to **reinvent themselves, a catalyst** to transform our species into something more peaceful. In order to make this happen, Forner saw the need for a guide. And so, in her works depicting space, like Relación cósmica, grayscale figures often encounter colorful forms—the colorless figures represent humans just beginning their journey away from the Earth, whereas the second group are still human, but from the far future. The future-humans have returned, bending time and space to give their less advanced selves a hand. They pass on color and knowledge, imparting a kind of mystical enlightenment to their still-maturing, Earth-bound cousins. These figures are an evolution of her archetypal representations of war, and place her work in the realm of science fiction.

Many of the works in the National Air and Space Museum’s art collection explore the kind of fictional storytelling seen in Forner’s work. For example, Chesley Bonestell created space scenes set in the far future, loosely based on astronomical photographs. His work is based on such scientific accuracy that even he was disappointed when, following the Apollo 11 landing, he discovered that the surface of the Moon did not mirror his paintings.[[1]](https://airandspace.si.edu/stories/editorial/creativity-space-age-raquel-forners-vision-interconnection" \l "_ftn1) Another artist in the collection, Robert T. McCall, was a key figure in shaping our vision of science fiction, creating concept art for Stanley Kubrick’s 2001: A **Space Odyssey**, as well as a number of Star Trek movies. In a time where the present was becoming increasingly uncertain, artists became more and more interested in **imagined utopian worlds beyond Earth**. (This corresponds with the way science fiction also started to become more commercially successful during the second half of the twentieth century, as media like Star Trek gripped the public imagination.) Each image of the future in the Museum’s art collection is, in its own unique way, as fantastical as Forner’s. But many disguise fantasy, covering it up it through the deceptive use of a realistic painting style, to the extent that their work could conceivably be used as a scientific illustration of the Moon, or for a live-action science fiction television show.

On the other hand, Forner deliberately paints scenes that the viewer would not think they could walk directly into. She never illustrates flashy pieces of futuristic technology or alien landscapes outside the range of a viewer’s familiarity. Her figures only meet other versions of themselves. Her tumultuous brushstrokes and **cacophonous shapes intentionally evoke the creative potential of space, while suggesting that such a world is within our grasp. She proposes that the challenges in space mirror the challenges still here on Earth—conflict and suffering—and both are worthy of our attention. To imagine a future sleek enough to have no problems is, in many ways, a distraction to the work that still needs to be done to get there. Exploration, creative and literal, can be a tool for self-examination.**

**The symbolic language seen here shows the way depictions of space could be used to imagine a utopian future. With her abstract space-related works, Forner joined a growing artistic movement within Latin America that saw an off-world future as a place where people impacted by violence in the world—war, colonialism, and other forces—could flourish. In space, humankind could start over, creating new systems of government and connection.** Much like the way the colorful future-humans do for their grayscale younger selves, Forner gives viewers the means to picture that kind of utopian world, in the hopes that they could then bring it about in their daily lives.

Despite her unique approach to space and style, Raquel Forner remains an understudied artist, particularly in America. However, she was a vital creative and political force, exhibiting widely both across Argentina and abroad. She also imparted her vision onto a subsequent generation of artists—Ana Kozel, one of her many students, also appears in the National Air and Space Museum’s collection.

Forner’s humanistic vision remains important, because it was a crucial note of optimism during the uncertain period of Cold War politics. Forner created a blueprint for confronting conflict, for commemorating beliefs, for translating the messages of external events into personal hopes. Her paintings enliven the subject of space, paradoxically bringing the subject closer, making it more immediate and believable. Through her work, we are able to see the way Forner recognized freedom; it could not be found in images of a **destroyed past but rather in the depictions of dreams, as her imagination leapt beyond Earth to find meaningful connection in the cosmos.**

#### 2 – Neg Offense Choice for NC/AC Framing – Key to robust Phil debates and prevents splitting the debate which promotes clash and prevents a 2AR collapse that wins off judge psychology.
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#### The Space Race is simulacra – the mythos of a distinction between institutional space flight and the market fuels the image-machine.

**Dickens and Ormrod 16** – Peter Dickens, Senior Research Associate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge, member of the Red-Green Study Group in London, James S Ormrod, Principal Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton, 2016, “Introduction: The Production of Outer Space” in The Palgrave Handbook of Society, Culture and Outer Space, pp 5-6, footnote 4 included in curly braces

An argument can be made that ‘the space race’ – as a material technological project, as a discourse about the conquest of space, and as an imagined competition – clung on to the older conceptions of space that were being abandoned in so many other areas of social life (while, it should be noted, embracing some of the developments Kern identifies). The space race was historicized and spatialized by its protagonists, by academics, and by the public, in largely consensual terms on both sides of the iron curtain (‘consensual’ in the sense that all agreed on how the race was to be understood). Indeed, for Baudrillard (1994), this was one of the keys to understanding the space race. Its aim was not to put a man on the Moon. The Moon landings functioned as models of rational, calculated control, in relation to which all earthly activity was to become oriented. As in nuclear proliferation,4 ‘[t]heir truth is to be models of simulation, the model vectors of a system of planetary control (where even the superpowers of this scenario are not free – the whole world is satellized)’ (1994, p. 35). Viewed in this way, the space race was a conspiracy, albeit one that nobody had charge of.

{4. Baudrillard believed the space race played the same role as the Cold War arms race that preceded it. In his understanding, nuclear deterrence was not aimed at containing a real threat from the other side, just as the aim of the space race was not to put a man on the Moon. Rather, the former represented a pretext ‘for installing a universal security system whose deterrent effect is not at all aimed at an atomic clash … but, rather, at the much greater probability of any real event, of anything that would be an event in the general system and upset its balance’ (p.33). Baudrillard sees the Cold War and space race as taking place in the cause of rationalization of the world and the exclusion of pre-modern forms: ‘[B]ehind this simulacrum of fighting to the death and of ruthless global stakes, the two adversaries are fundamentally in solidarity against something else, unnamed, never spoken, but whose objective outcome in war, with the equal complicity of the two adversaries, is total liquidation. Tribal, communitarian, precapitalist structures, every form of exchange, of language, of symbolic organization, that is what must be abolished, that is the object of murder in war – and war itself, in its immense, spectacular death apparatus, is nothing but the medium of this process of the terrorist rationalization of the social – The murder on which sociality will be founded, whatever its allegiance, Communist or capitalist’ (p.37)}

Because of this conspiracy, there now exists a standard account of the space race, and of the history of the American space programme. Histories of the Soviet programme are still being produced (see, for example, Siddiqi, 2010), but these do not necessarily challenge this standard account. A very condensed account runs as follow. Wernher von Braun, the Nazi rocket scientist, had been taken back to the United States in 1945 as part of Operation Paperclip, to later use what he had learnt working on the V-2 in the services of the American space programme. The launch of Sputnik in 1957 by the Soviet Union had shocked the United States. Eisenhower had then created NASA in 1958, and Kennedy had announced the decision to send a human to the Moon in 1962 in the wake of the embarrassment of the Bay of Pigs invasion. The United States had beaten the Soviet Union to the Moon by 1969.5

Kennedy (1962) had attempted to assert that the reasons for conquering space were noble and involved ‘new knowledge to be gained and new rights to be won … for the progress of all people’. However, he also made it clear that it was crucial for America to secure these victories. It was meant to be understood that the space race was intimately connected with the Cold War, although academics disagreed about exactly how (see Dickens & Ormrod, 2007b). The space race was nonetheless about the extension of the space of the nation state, whether this was physical space or the space of national prestige. It was also well understood that the space race, civilian and military, had to do with the proper or improper ‘meshing’ of the spaces of government, business and politics (see Chapter 3 by Wills, this volume). The existence of a military-industrial complex of some kind is widely accepted, even if historians and social scientists have been left arguing about which interests were the most significant (see, for example, Baran & Sweezy, 1966).

#### This war of images plays on the terms of simulation – the aff reinforces technological forms and refashions a new space race headed by the government.

**Dickens and Ormrod 16** – Peter Dickens, Senior Research Associate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge, member of the Red-Green Study Group in London, James S Ormrod, Principal Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton, 2016, “Conclusion: The Future of Outer Space” in The Palgrave Handbook of Society, Culture and Outer Space, pp 446-449

An argument can be made that the conquest of outer space has represented the ultimate victory of abstract space (see also Shaw, 2008, p. 115). Any meaningful distinction between terrestrial space and the rest of the cosmos has been eroded. This is not to say that the whole of outer space has been humanized, which of course it has not, but that space has come to be reconceptualized and re-experienced as a space for accumulation like any other. It is a space thoroughly colonized by terrestrial knowledge and practice (whether considered primarily capitalist, male, white or anything else).

For Benjamin and a host of others (from Klerkx, 2005, to Parker, 2009), the disinvestment in outer space exploration and development came as a result of the bureaucratization of NASA, and its engulfment within the military-industrial complex. With the development of the International Space Station (ISS) and the Space Shuttle (which according to some accounts were each the rationale for the development of the other), space exploration became routine and unexciting. Nothing fundamentally new appeared to be happening in space. Whether or not this is seen as true depends a great deal on perspective. Even if NASA budgets were being cut, this volume has hopefully made clear that a great deal was still happening in space. New space technologies continued to be developed, and these technologies were being integrated into terrestrial life in innumerable ways. But we believe it is also true (and this has been the emphasis of our work elsewhere, see Dickens and Ormrod, 2007) that these developments represent the continuation of terrestrial power relations and social dynamics. Space development is, to put it one way, business as usual. And crucially, any novelty to these developments was undermined by the representation of outer space in similar terms to the representation of terrestrial space. As evidenced in this book, political scientists, geographers and legal scholars had begun to talk about outer space as a knowable, if not actually known, space. The origins of this representation of space can be traced to Copernicus (MacDonald, 2009) and/or Kepler (Zubrin, 1996). But with the routinization of outer spatial practices (from increasing launch rates to the proliferation of satellite-receiving terminals, to the everyday use of satellite services to underpin military operations, communications, entertainment, navigation and so on), these representations were made manifest in the creation of a new social space.

The central problem with the final victory of abstract space was that it obliterated the very ‘absolute spaces’ on which it was founded, and from which it derived its emotional appeal. It is in a way surprising that the development of modern spaceflight was from its inception anchored in a religious or spiritual cosmology. This was true of both Russian and American contexts (see also Geppert, 2007, p. 599). The Russian programme has long roots in the tradition of Russian cosmism (Kohonen, 2009; Siddiqi, 2010). And, as Pop notes, Richard Nixon said to the Apollo 11 astronauts; ‘Because of what you have done, the heavens have become a part of man’s world.’ Pop goes on:

‘Are we today turning mythology into fact?’ – asked Joseph Campbell on the occasion of the Apollo programme. The astronauts walked on the real astronomical moon, as it was; but they walked on the mythical moon of each culture, as thought to be, as imagined. Their trip was physical and metaphysical. They walked through different cosmogonies; through different models of the universe.

(Pop, 2012, personal communication, see also ‘High Flight: A Spiritual History of the Space Age’, in preparation)

This continued relationship was not coincidental. As a number of contributions here show, the appeal of outer space lay in the promise of conquering the wondrous or Godly and hence the elevation of the status of humanity (or, rather more specifically, white men). This is not necessarily that dissimilar to the process Sims describes in his chapter, whereby myths ‘record time’. Ormrod illustrates this in his chapter through analysis of Tsiolkovsky’s science fiction in which the best human beings are able to fly like angels in space. As Kilgore notes in his chapter, Carl Sagan owed his continued appeal to his simultaneous reproduction of wonder as well as knowledge. The British celebrity cosmologist Brian Cox (see Mellor, this volume, for more on him) has arguably taken this even further, such that his popular shows and writing dedicate more time to what is unknown than to knowledge itself. These lacunae became spaces for wild imaginative projects – projects more captivating than any empirical knowledge. It is no wonder that the continued disenchantment and re-enchantment of the universe have become a major theme in recent work. Based largely on studies of astronauts’ experiences, Kilbryde (2015) argues that space exploration can potentially be a means of overcoming the dualism through which outer space is constructed as an object, and thus of experiencing unity. This is provided that the sense of awe and wonder it engenders is not sought as a ‘possession’ of the individual or as something to be subsequently rationalized.

It is the invocation of obstacles that produces space as something potentially unconquerable, and hence worth conquering. And yet the obliteration of the irrational or wondrous sweeps the ground from underneath such a project. To the extent that outer space has become an abstract space, it has been foreclosed as a frontier. It is a frontier, but a frontier without a future. In removing the possibility of an elsewhere, it serves only to secure terrestrial hegemony. In their own ways, both Baudrillard and Virilio present such a view of outer space. For Baudrillard, it was in any case a frontier that served as a model for terrestrial life, which set the permissible limits for struggle and confrontation within it. He concludes,

Through the orbital inscription of a spatial object, it is the planet earth that becomes a satellite, it is the terrestrial principle of reality that becomes eccentric, hyperreal, and insignificant. Through the orbital installation of a system of control like peaceful coexistence, all the terrestrial microsystems are satellized and lose their autonomy. (p. 35)

Everyone on Earth is neutralized and homogenized. The proliferation of space technology since he was writing, and the blurring of civilian and military technologies, has only broadened the potential of such an understanding. Parks and Schwoch (2012, p. 4), in the context of the ‘satellization’ of global security, refer to the satellites as ‘the ultimate rationalization and instrumentalization of the quest for global security and domination’.

For Virilio, there was such a homology between the technologies of war, the image of space as a battlefield and the political discourses about space that the future seemed equally foreclosed. He makes the claim that any space is constituted ‘from the outside’ (cited in Bormann, 2009, p. 80). That is to say, it is perceived on the basis of that which precedes it. Bormann is therefore able to argue that ‘nothing about outer space is “out there”, what we get to know about outer space is always socially, spatially and locally embedded’ (p. 80). Bormann, following Virilio, seems to believe that this is especially true of the vacuum of outer space:

[O]ther than the view there is no physical or physiological contact. No hearing, no feeling in the sense of touching materials, with the exception of an actual Moon landing. Thus the conquest of space, of outer space – isn’t it more the conquest of the image of space?

(Virilio & Ujica, 2003, cited in Bormann, 2009, p. 84)

Bormann reaches the pessimistic conclusion that ‘the perpetuation of outer space as a sphere of permanent war and its claims to weaponization will soon make no alternative possible’ (p. 84). This is the product, in the large part, of her assumption that ‘[w]hat we get to know about the space of outer space is dominated by information provided through the possibilities (and limits) of military technology’ (p. 81).

#### This culminates in unending war and environmental catastrophe.

Craven 19 [Matt Craven (Professor of International Law, SOAS University of London, United Kingdom). “‘Other Spaces’: Constructing the Legal Architecture of a Cold War Commons and the Scientific-Technical Imaginary of Outer Space”. European Journal of International Law, Volume 30, Issue 2, May 2019, Pages 547–572, Accessed 1/12/22. <https://academic.oup.com/ejil/article/30/2/547/5536739> //Xu]

Even in the aftermath of the pronounced ‘closure’ of the Cold War, the residue of the formation that was brought into play in space remains very much with us today. On the one hand, outer space has been progressively enveloped within the technological infrastructure of warfare and policing actions – the first Gulf War of 1990 ushering in a new era of ‘smart’ weaponry and GPS-configured surgical violence139 – anticipating, in the process, the ‘remote’ operations of the drone and cyber warfare of the contemporary era. The blurring of the demarcation between the (outer space) technologies of war and peace finds its contemporary parallels in the collapse of a range of other operative distinctions – between the virtual and the real, the combatant and the civilian, the battlefield and the battle space, the interstate and the intra-state. The juridical formations on which these depend, furthermore, have themselves become enveloped within the same strategic operations – ‘lawfare’ becoming the adjunct to a new form of totalized warfare stripped of any spatial determinacy. On the other side, outer space has increasingly become the terrain of speculative capitalism, which, following the growth of space tourism (pioneered by the Russian space administration in the 1990s140), has seen the active development of a range of commercial projects from the construction of sub-orbital ‘space planes’ to asteroid and lunar mining undertaken by both public and private agencies. The imaginative resources for such projects have come from various directions, but a common theme is that impending resource depletion on earth will soon bring such resources within commercial and technological reach, and that outer space will therefore provide a ‘spatial fix’ for a system of global capitalism that might otherwise run into the ground.141 There is, as Katarina Damjanov has noted,142 a deep parallelism here between the juridical opening of the seas (mare liberum), which served to stabilize the system of sovereignty within Europe in the 17th century by extroverting the site of conflict and competition,143 and the opening of outer space three centuries later as another prophylactic measure, even if, in this case, that which was to be guarded against was a planetary-wide, environmental catastrophe. Perhaps the deepest irony, here, is that the mode of salvation on offer is precisely the same as that which is the extant cause of crisis, which one may take to be a remorseless instrumentalization of nature.

#### We refuse to be for or against New Space. Vote negative to understand the space race as pure spectacle – anything else plays into the military industrial complex.

Shapiro 14– Alan, senior lecturer at the Offenbach Art and Design University in Germany, “Jean Baudrillard and Albert Camus on the Simulacrum of Taking a Stance on War”, IJBS Volume 11, Number 2 (May 2014), Special Issue: Baudrillard and War

Unlike other thinkers such as Noam Chomsky or Chris Hedges (whose positions are highly valuable in their own right), Jean Baudrillard is not ‘against war’. Baudrillard’s position is rather that of being ‘neither for nor against’ contemporary hyper-real mediatized wars, and seeing the imperative of choosing whether one is ‘for’ or ‘against’ war as being something of a forced and imposed simulacrum. To say that one is ‘against’ a specific war, or even all wars, would be to implicitly acknowledge the ‘reality’ of war(s), which have, to the contrary, drifted increasingly into the fakeness of virtuality, simulation, and an indeterminate hyperspace. Baudrillard, in his orientation of being ‘neither for nor against’ war, finds a strong predecessor in another great writer and thinker who wrote in French: Albert Camus. In his political theory and activist engagements, Camus was an independent hybrid anarchist-liberal (the very notion of hybrid, with which one can retrospectively illuminate Camus’ politics, has only emerged as a well-known concept in recent times, in the wake of, for example, Donna Haraway’s cyborg theory). Camus was a serious thinker who – like Plato, Nietzsche, Baudrillard, Deleuze and Philip K. Dick – had deep insights into the genealogy of image-making simulacra in and of Western culture. As a major figure of twentieth century French intellectual history, Albert Camus appears now in retrospect to have been way ahead of his time in his positions on ethics, aesthetics, virtuality, and political philosophy. The intention of this essay is not to claim that Baudrillard and Camus had ‘the same position’ on war or on simulacra. It is, rather, to make an initial attempt to outline important affinities between the two thinkers, hinting at a sort of ‘alliance’ between these two intellectual figures which has not been previously articulated in the academic literature in Baudrillard or Camus studies. The essay indicates certain key starting points for substantiating the affinity/alliance, but it should also be read in the spirit of suggesting fruitful directions for future research. The stance of opposition to a war undertaken by America’s ’military-industrial complex’ (MIC), as President Dwight D. Eisenhower termed it in his Farewell Address to the nation on January 17, 1961 after spending 8 years as President, seems to be based on the assumption of the discursive viability of projecting oneself into the imaginative space of being a sort of ‘shadow government of truth-speakers’, empowered by democracy into the democratic position of being able to make ‘better’ decisions for the body politic of democracy than those who hold institutional power in political economy and government. Most political discourse in the U.S., including the anti-war stance, seems to take for granted the idea that we should clarify ‘our politics’ by imaginatively putting ourselves ‘in the shoes’ of national strategists choosing among the policy options available. Jean Baudrillard expands our sense of what is history because he does not operate with a strict separation between what are ‘the facts’ and what are the engaging stories that we as a culture have written and enacted about important ‘historical’ events. Much of what we know about the Holocaust, the Second World War, and the Vietnam War comes from Hollywood films about the Holocaust, the Second World War, and the Vietnam War that we have seen. In his essay on Francis Ford Coppola’s 1979 blockbuster Vietnam War movie Apocalypse Now, Baudrillard writes that Coppola’s masterpiece is the continuation of the Vietnam War by other means. “Nothing else in the world smells like that,” says Lt. Colonel Bill Kilgore – played by Robert Duvall – in the 2 hour and 33 minute film. “I love the smell of napalm in the morning… It smells like victory.” The high-budget extravaganza was produced exactly the same way that America fought in Vietnam, says Jean Baudrillard of the film made by director Francis Ford Coppola (Baudrillard 1981: 89-91). “War becomes film,” Baudrillard writes of Coppola’s spectacularly successful cinematic creation. “Film becomes war, the two united by their shared overflowing of technology” (Ibid.: 89). There is implosion or mutual contamination between ‘film becoming Virtual Reality’ and War. Think also of Steven Spielberg’s Saving Private Ryan (1998): total immersion in the Virtual Reality of combat – an aesthetics of VR different from ‘critical distance’ – as a new kind of ‘testimonial position’ with respect to war and atrocities. In Vietnam-slash-Apocalypse Now, War is a Drug Trip and a God Trip, a psychedelic and pornographic carnival (Baudrillard 2010), a savage cannibalism practiced by the Christians, a film before the shooting and a shoot before the filming, a vast machine of excessive special effects, a ‘show of power’, a territorial lab for testing new weapons on human guinea pigs, and the sacrificial jouissance of throwing away billions of dollars – all these aspects alluded to or mentioned by Baudrillard. Coppola’s film, according to Baudrillard, is the carrying on of an undeclared, unfinished and unending War. An interminable Heart of Darkness. Jean Baudrillard is not ‘against war’, not even against specific wars like the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. He says this explicitly in “Le masque de la guerre,” published in the Parisian daily newspaper Libération, just prior to President George W. Bush’s invasion of Iraq in 2003. Ni pour ni contre. Neither for nor against. “This war is a non-event,” writes Baudrillard, “and it is absurd to take a stance on a non-event (Baudrillard 2003).” The non-events of the Iraq War and the War on Terror opposed themselves to the event of September 11th, 2001. Baudrillard’s two most explicit texts about war are The Gulf War Did Not Take Place (1991), written just before, during, and just after the Persian Gulf War of 1991 that was initiated by President George H.W. Bush, and The Spirit of Terrorism (2002), written just after 9/11. At the very beginning of the essay “The Gulf War Will Not Take Place,” the first of the three essays that comprise The Gulf War Did Not Take Place, Baudrillard explains that non-war – which is what the military-industrial complex or the (non-)war machine has become very adept at carrying out in the age of virtuality – “is characterised by that degenerate form of war which includes hostage manipulation and negotiation (Baudrillard 1995: 24). The Eisenhower-coined term of the military-industrial complex is used by Baudrillard in his essay "No Reprieve For Sarajevo," published in Libération, January 8, 1994. He sees the MIC as still operative yet in need of conceptual upgrading. “Hostages and blackmail,” Baudrillard continues in “The Gulf War Will Not Take Place,” “are the purest products of deterrence. The hostage has taken the place of the warrior. He has become the principal actor, the simulacral protagonist, or rather, in his pure inaction, the protagoniser (le protagonisant) of non-war” (Baurillard 1995: 24). And we, the television viewers of the non-war, are all in the situation of hostages, “all of us as information hostages on the world media stage” (Ibid.). Hostages of the screen, of the intoxication of the media, dragged and drugged into a logic of deterrence, "we are no longer in a logic of the passage from virtual to actual but in a hyperrealist logic of the deterrence of the real by the virtual” (Ibid.: 27). The post-structure [the successor to a sociological structure with less stability and with less of a center] of the (non-)war machine in the age of media virtuality has properties of binary/digital, simulation/modeling, viral metastasis, and complex intricate paradoxical topology. Let us consider all four of these properties as aspects of a Baudrillardian theory of war (or a theory of war in honour of Jean Baudrillard). First of all, the post-structure of the (non-)war machine in the age of media virtuality has the property of binary/digital. It presents itself to us through the dualistic structure of a forced binary choice, where the system obliges each of us to take a position ‘for’ or ‘against’ war, or ‘for’ or ‘against’ particular wars, as waged, for example, by the Pentagon, the EU ‘humanitarian’ forces, or the surveillance state’s War on Terror. It is this very binary logic of ‘yes’ or ‘no’ that is the news media discourse, the rhetoric of politicians, and the hybrid virtual-and-real-killing of the screen and the bomb. Today, of course, the Internet has superceded television as the prevailing universal media (although there is much convergence and combination of the two). And the Internet is much more interactive and participatory. There is much more response. There is much less of a ‘spectacle’ than there was when Guy Debord and the Situationists conceptualized their media theory in the 1960s. Yet everywhere that the ‘news media’ and the (non)-war machine still prevail, everywhere that they are still massively influential, everywhere that they still exercise their power, we are not quite liberated from the ‘speech without response’ described by the early Baudrillard. When Muammar Gaddafi, the former dictator of Libya, was brutally killed by rebel forces on October 20, 2011, during the Libyan Civil War, the event, having been filmed by a cell phone, was presented to worldwide viewers by almost all of the ‘news media’ as some kind of triumph for ‘justice’, even though it was clearly a loss for democratic principles and the possible coming to light of priceless information about the decades of atrocities committed by Gaddafi’s regime during a public trial which would never take place.

## 3
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#### Util is inextricably tied to ableism and the advantage negates – multiple internal links.

**Colebrook 17** – Claire Colebrook, 2017. Acclaimed Australian cultural theorist, currently appointed Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of English at Pennsylvania State University, “Lives Worth Living: Extinction, Persons, Disability,” <https://www.academia.edu/19843360/Lives_Worth_Living> //ACCS JM

What is the relationship between extinction and disability? One of the ways in which we might think about disability and disability studies is as requiring an expansion of conditions of justice; this is how Martha Nussbaum has criticized the liberal tradition of fairness and personhood. We should, she argues, extend considerations of fairness to include those who care for others. If we think about a world that enables human capacities and flourishing, then we need to look be-yond autonomous and self-defining individuals. Disability considerations would both enhance and extend the range of political compassion, enabling a notion of persons that is not merely that of the abstract political subject, but a being with capacities and dignity; capacities are richer and more varied than our narrow notion of person currently allows (2006). For Nussbaum we will live in a better world if we expand our notion of capacity and what counts as a flourishing human life. In what follows I want to reverse this relation, and rather than expand capacities and justice to allow for disability (with disability being the secondary consideration), I want to see disability as the primary or transcendental condition from which the supposedly “normal” person derives, and further to see the long history of the “normal” subject as directly intertwined with the accelerated extinction of humans and non-humans. If one considers the subject of capacities from which Nussbaum begins her critique – the liberal person, blessed with reason, autonomy, “favorable” social conditions and an enlightened milieu of political deliberation – one would need to recognize the long history of enslavement (of humans and non-humans), exploitation, appropriation and colonization that made even the thought of the just society possible. Disability is not an add-ed on concern but is precisely what orients, if silently, the problem of extinction. One might say, that “human” existence is constitutively disabled (or, to follow Bernard Stiegler, that its default condition is dependence upon a broad network of technologies and archives that have never been equally distributed (Stiegler 1998, 122). Further, the capacities that enable the “able” person have cost, and continue to cost, the earth. Those lives that are (to borrow from Nick Bostrom [2013]) “technologically immature”, may perhaps not be lamentable and to be avoided at all costs, but perhaps offer a trajectory for life that is not necessarily that of extinction. Even though the specific concepts of extinction and disability are rarely explicitly linked the two concepts are inextricably intertwined in discussions of what counts as a life worth living. Indeed, the grand Socratic notion that the unexamined life is not worth living, is not only normative (which is almost unavoidable) but normalizing: to privilege the life of examination is to open up a history that will generate the individual, reflective, deliberative and rational subject, but to make a claim about a life not worth living is to hint at the long history that will extinguish, eliminate, harness and evaluate unworthy lives, and will do so precisely by way of capacity. Outside explicit work on extinction and outside the rich field of disability studies it is possible to find constant and complex linkages between the question of the worth of life (its capacity or ability) and whether such a life ought to exist. Many such arguments are utilitarian; and while utilitarianism might seem to be but one branch of (analytic) philosophy, part of my argument will be that as a conception of the liberal subject of capacity gains ascendency and takes on increasing value in neo-liberal arguments for autonomy, and as the planet faces accelerated and mass extinction, a utilitarian logic be-comes increasingly dominant. Utilitarianism is a motif that will necessarily haunt questions of extinction and capacity: as re-sources and the capacity to survive become threatened decisions will need to be made regarding the worth of life. Precisely in this respect it is utilitarianism that has also articulated the most offensive position on disability. By offensive, here, I am not referring to an affect or emotion, but rather – as in the manner of a military offensive – a direct and forthright targeting of what has been set aside as “disabled. Here, it might seem that a utilitarian approach is partial, and that there are other ethical paradigms, which of course there are; but I want to argue that the extreme positions that utilitarianism has yielded, bring to the fore what is implicit in a broader history of ethics focused on personhood and a life worth living. One of the objections to calculations of utility would be by way of a deeper or inviolable conception of the person, but this too relies upon distinguishing between what counts as “utility” and what would warrant a mode of “dignity” beyond calculation. For Nussbaum, the key stakes of justice lie in considering what counts as a dignified life, where dignity includes capacities that extend beyond social utility and mutual advantage. Her claim is that dignity should be the basis for social entitlements, and that we attribute dignity not for rational and active powers, but for “our” animal fragility: “bodily need, including the need for care, is a feature of our rationality and our sociability; it is one aspect of our dignity, then, rather than something to be contrasted with it” (2006, 160). This is perhaps why Nussbaum’s title refers to “species membership,” as though feeling and caring for one’s kind (which would, in part, include non-human animals) is not only a recognition of dignity, but dignifies one’s own life. To suffer, to be fragile is to possess a life worth living. Here, Nussbaum refers to the value and enhancement (beyond strict utility) of caring for others, and of having social relationships with those whose capacities are not those of the classic rational individual; her approach on capacities “includes the advantage of respecting the dignity of people with mental disabilities and developing their human potential, whether or not this potential is socially “useful” in the narrower sense. It includes, as well, the advantage of understanding humanity and its diversity that comes from associating with mentally disabled people on terms of mutual respect and reciprocity” (2006,147). Nussbaum presents her account as a broadening of theories of human justice by way of a more classical conception of the life worth living, one not reduced to narrow notions of mutual advantage. Even though her discourse and disciplinary terrain might appear to be strictly philosophical, the very mode of posing the question of what we owe to a life is really (ultimately) the question that presses itself upon human civilization now, and always. As “we” look to the future and the sixth great extinction event the question of who and what survives will be imposed upon us. Utilitarian approaches to this question are, as I have already suggested, offensive, but they are because they disclose something offensive – or combative, violent, conquering – in the philosophical tradition of dignified humanity and the life worth living. In this respect, disability is neither a recent nor a local concern: the very formation of the Greek polity is based on the exclusion of those with lesser capacities. Even though, as Lennard Davis (2013) has argued, the notion of the “normal” body is very recent and is quite different from earlier cultures’ conception of an ideal body that no actual member of the species achieves, the exclusion of those who do not possess the proper potentiality of political humanity has been at the basis of the history of the Western polity. When Nussbaum argues for an expanded sense of capacities she nevertheless, and necessarily, maintains the question of the life worth living. This classic philosophical question always and necessarily invokes ability, or, more accurately, disability, and this in two respects. Not only are subjects defined by way of powers (of reason, deliberation and empathy), those capacities in turn are enabled by a history of technologies and archives upon which “able” subjects are increasingly dependent. At the very least, definitions of proper political persons rely upon quite specific capacities that, even in expanded scenarios are not all-inclusive. More importantly, the quite specific concept of the liberal, deliberative, rational and empathetic subject depends upon a history of “enlightenment” that disabled many lives, either by way of exclusion, colonial-ism, resource depletion, or expropriation. In a world where not all lives matter to the same extent, the concept of disability is precisely what enables political inclusion, privilege and person-hood. When Peter Singer argues, in a manner that appears to be exceptional, and exceptionally offensive that rationality and autonomy (and not species membership) are the capacities that would preclude us from being right in killing another humaon being, he is taking part in a far broader offensive that is definitive of the philosophical epoch oriented around the question of the life worth living. Not only is the question of the life worth living offensive (in its implicit generation of an unworthy life), the life worth living is a life of dependence and incapacity, generated through a history of enlightenment that is a history of appropriation, plundering, brigandry, excessive consumption and energy profligacy. Could we have the able political subject of deliberation and reason without the planet-destructive history of industrialism and globalism that at once enables and disables what has come to be known as humanity? Could there have been a tradition of “the life worth living” without a global industry that generated unworthy and dis-abled lives? And is not the question of the life worth living, the capable life, intertwined essentially with dependence and incapacity? What I want to question here is whether such a question can have any coherence at all in an epoch of extinction: to ask about lives worth living is necessarily to be offensive, asserting some lives over others, and thereby waging violence (however slow) against some forms of life. If, as I would also argue, any epoch of thriving and fecundity takes place at the expense of some lives, then all ages are ages of extinction. What makes our time – the sixth mass extinction – more intense is that questions that have always haunted political personhood are now becoming more explicit. The interrelated problem of capacity and extinction has not only determined the human lives that are deemed to be worth living, but has also generated the liberal political person whose autonomy, productivity, super-intelligence and heightened capacity for urbanity is the “Anthropos” of the Anthropocene, the “man” whose cost to the planet is too exorbitant to reckon (Luke 2015). When (today) utilitarian arguments are explicitly offensive, or make the claim that some lives ought not be lived, they reveal the offensive (combative, polemical, violent, barbaric, sacrificial) nature of what has called itself civilization. If this civilization, today, is facing extinction and therefore pressed – more than ever – to consider ways of “weighing lives,” it may either continue with ever more nuanced and expanded conceptions of the worth of life, or it may regard this question itself as an indictment of the very rationality it seeks to save. Phrased differently, we might say that the problem of disability runs to the very heart of the extinction-logic that enables the political tradition of the person. Both those who assume that the human species – because of certain capacities – has a prima facie right to survive, and those who calculate that human life as such is not worth living (for all their seeming extremity) are expressions of a broader logic of the proper potentiality of a highly normative conception of human flourishing. As an example of the prima facie “right to humanity,” I would cite Rebecca Newberger Goldstein’s defense of Sellars and philosophical progress. The rational image we have of ourselves, even when at odds with scientific evidence about the irrational causes of our behavior, will generate on ongoing history of coherence and inclusion, where the rational “we” extends itself to value others: Gregarious creatures that we are, our framework of making ourselves coherent to ourselves commits us to making ourselves coherent to others. Having reasons means being prepared to share them—though not necessarily with everyone. The progress in our moral reasoning has worked to widen both the kinds of reasons we offer and the group to whom we offer them. There can’t be a widening of the reasons we give in justifying our actions without a corresponding widening of the audience to which we’re prepared to give our reasons. Plato gave arguments for why Greeks, under the pressures of war, couldn’t treat other Greeks in abominable ways, pillaging and razing their cities and taking the vanquished as slaves. But his reasons didn’t, in principle, generalize to non-Greeks, which is tantamount to denying that non-Greeks were owed any reasons. Every increase in our moral coherence—recognizing the rights of the enslaved, the colonialized, the impoverished, the imprisoned, women, children, LGBTs, the handicapped ...—is simultaneously an expansion of those to whom we are prepared to offer reasons accounting for our behavior. The reasons by which we make our behavior coherent to ourselves changes together with our view of who has reasons coming to them. And this is progress, progress in increasing our coherence, which is philosophy’s special domain. In the case of manumission, women’s rights, children’s rights, gay rights, criminals’ rights, animal rights, the abolition of cruel and unusual punishment, the conduct of war—in fact, almost every progressive movement one can name—it was reasoned argument that first laid out the incoherence, demonstrating that the same logic underlying reasons to which we were already committed applied in a wider context. The project of rendering ourselves less inconsistent, initiated by the ancient Greeks, has left those ancient Greeks, even the best and brightest of them, far behind, just as our science has left their scientists far behind. This kind of progress, unlike scientific progress, tends to erase its own tracks as it is integrated into our manifest image and so becomes subsumed in the framework by which we conceive of ourselves (Newberger Goldstein 2014). For all its manifest worthiness the notion of a progressive “self-image” that gains in progressive global coherence, alongside scientific progress, sees its path of self-correction as improving with more and more human life taking part in the journey of development. One could make the rather obvious point that such a notion of “progress” by way of inclusion and ongoing “self-image” precludes other ways of thinking about human and non-human life that do not involve self-image (or some shared normative conception of “the human”); but in addition to the colonialist mentality of self-justification, one might ask about the price paid for such a history of philosophical progress. Would not other modes of life – such as those without an over-investment in “self-image” or “the” human – have generated a quite different history of the planet? Such a question cannot be asked if a certain mode of human reason is an unquestioned good. But just as the inflation of human personhood precludes asking the question of the loss and extinction of other lives with other capacities, certain arguments for the extinction and annihilation of part or all of humanity also assume the value of the person – a single life with its specific coherence, value and meaning. (Not only is such a notion historically and culturally specific, and tied to a highly normative conception of human self-awareness; it is also this self with an unquestioned right to the “good life” of reflection, reason and self-determination that has generated the Anthropocene.) When this prima facie right to life has been questioned it has, more often than not, been by way of the same norms of capacity, will, autonomy and personhood that supposedly make life worth living. David Benatar has argued that the human species as such should – after rational consideration -- decide that it ought not exist. If we were to calculate the pleasures and pains of human existence, then not only would we decide on non-existence as the best way to ensure the reduction of suffering; we would also realize that while there is an imperative to eliminate suffering there is no symmetrical imperative to bring persons into being to generate pleasures or well being. Benatar does not see a performative contradiction in being a will who decides that it is better not to exist as a willing being; once we come into being there is a rational reason to persist in our being and live as well as possible, but that does not entail that we should will other lives to come into being. Benatar’s argument is an intensified form of an argument that has profound implications for disability (Benatar 2006). Peter Singer has argued that being human is not sufficient to justify a life worth living, and that the calculus of pain, suffering and living well should prompt us to choose the life of some animals -- who could enjoy lives free of suffering -- over the lives of some humans, whose quality of life would not count as living well. It is for this reason that Singer can at once argue that animals ought not be killed for human consumption, and that some forms of infanticide are legitimate. For Singer, it is the lack of rationality, autonomy and a certain appreciation of life (rather than being human) that renders life not worth living: “the fact that a being is a human being, in the sense of a member of the species Homo sapiens, is not relevant to the wrongness of killing it; it is, rather, characteristics like rationality, autonomy, and self-consciousness that make a difference. Infants lack these characteristics. Killing them, therefore, cannot be equated with killing normal human beings, or any other self-conscious beings” (Singer 1993, 182). Singer expands on this point by considering a specific type of disability and what it precludes: “to have a child with Down syndrome is to have a very different experience from having a normal child. It can still be a warm and loving experience, but we must have lowered expectations of our child’s ability. We cannot expect a child with Down syndrome to play the guitar, to develop an appreciation of science fiction, to learn a foreign language, to chat with us about the latest Woody Allen movie, or to be a respectable athlete, basketballer or tennis player’’ (Singer 1994, 213). This degree of disability does not necessarily warrant infanticide or abortion, but what does count is development; the more capacity a being develops the less ethical it is to terminate a life. If parents choose to abort an “abnormal” fetus, then they do so at a stage prior to the development of the capacities that would make killing unethical; the same applies to infanticide. It is not species membership but capacity that counts. Both Benatar and Singer rely upon a strict utilitarianism; species and sentiment aside, one should decide on whether a life is worth living in general, where worthiness can (at the very least) be determined by an absence of suffering. In contrast with arguments that begin from the sanctity of the person, one begins with a calculus: a good life is a free self-determining life. If one accepts the premise of a life worth living then certain lives become candidates for non-being (for Singer this is the profoundly disabled, while for Benatar it is humanity as such). It seems that questions of utility, or of what counts as a life with a sufficient degree of pleasure (or meaningfulness, or autonomy) lead inevitably to questions of human non-being: are there some lives that simply should not be? One might respond to this by objecting that the calculus of decision presupposes that which it claims to have justified; the subject who is doing the calculating, who is deciding on what ought to survive and how lives ought to be weighed is – needless to say – a certain type of subject. This subject has the following capacities: a sense of ‘a’ life, a sense of capacity (with rationality and autonomy being of significant importance), a sense of ‘humanity’ as a global whole of which one is a member, and a manner of looking at life in terms of worthiness. One should not need too much training in anthropology, history or critical race studies to discern the highly specific nature of these capacities. This is not just to make a point about the poverty and brutality of Western reason and its normalizing gestures; it is also to say that many of the critiques of that same universal subject – such as those who argue for the worth of other lives, or those who value life as such for whatever reason – nevertheless take part in a rationing of life that is offensive. Here, I draw again on the necessarily offensive/combative character of any assessment of the worth of life. Even if the worth of life is defined by less strictly utilitarian categories such as “meaning” or “dignity” a certain capacity for calculus, for considering something like human life as such, and then the value of “a” life, allows for the claim that certain lives being extinguished, and enables a life of high-capacity (high-production, high reason, high technology) that has precipitated the sixth mass extinction. The calculations of Singer and Benatar are different in important ways and related in important ways. For Benatar, a lot depends on pleasure and pain not being symmetrical: even if most of my life were one of enjoyment, the non-being of enjoyment is not a loss, whereas the being of suffering is a loss. Not existing, and therefore the absence of pleasure is not a straightforward negative in the way that suffering is: when one is suffering it makes sense to want to eliminate suffering, to will suffering away. But it does not make the same sense, in a state of non-being, to will pleasure (and the existence it would require) into being. Singer, by contrast, is concerned with non-being not because he deems human life to be worthless but because – quite the contrary -- he accepts a certain worthiness of some modes of existence. There are some forms of human life that are so impoverished or incapacitated that “we” who exist and have developed reason are permitted not to bring them into being: “Shakespeare’s image of life as a voyage is consistent with the idea that the seriousness of taking life increases gradually, parallel with the gradual development of the child’s capacities that culminate in its life as a full person” (Singer 1996, 216). The unit of life by which we calculate who lives and who dies (what counts as suffering) begs the question: should we really be able to decide that some lives (ranging from all human life to disabled human lives) ought not exist? One could say, following Kant, that being able to make such a calculus -- being able to ask about what life ought to be -- destroys any unit that would allow lives to be weighed in relation to each other. Rather than have a measure that would negotiate who lives, one would value life precisely because it is without measure. Indeed, our lament or preliminary mourning for the possible extinction of humans would lie in the anticipated loss not of our species being but of the intelligence that enabled the thought of our species being. Even a cursory glance at “end of world” narratives reveals that what presents itself as the end of “the” world is really the end of the “rational” world of capable persons. Post-apocalyptic scenarios present humans wandering aimlessly in resource-deprived landscapes, subjected (once again) to tribalism, despotism and the loss of all “reason.” (As one recent example one might think of Mad Max: Fury Road [2015] where the remaining populace has become nothing more than a multitude focused on mere survival. One feature of “post”-apocalyptic cultural production is that there is a world after the end of the world, but it is no longer the world of liberal affluent personhood; “we” are suddenly “all” living in third world conditions.) One might say that what would be lost in the end of the world – or that what we fear when we contemplate human extinction – is not the loss of the world, or of life (for both would continue) but the loss of what has come to count as “rational” or “intelligent” life. It is not so much calculated as calculating life that is worthy of living on, and while there are some general preliminary mourning rituals for the sixth mass extinction, cultural production seems to be more concerned with the extinction of Western middle-class urban capitalist life. One can think here of the large number of “end of world” narratives that are really “end of Manhattan” plots, from The Day After Tomorrow (2004) and Cloverfield (2008) to the book and documentary The World Without Us (2007) that begins by describing New York going through a slow decay after humans are no longer there to maintain the altered land-scape. So, yes, there is a broad perception of the looming extinction of more than human life, but it occurs in a context of an increasing focus on the loss of the only life worth saving, a life that is not calculable precisely because it is the life of the point of view of reason, where reason – in turn – is a highly specific (or species-defining) range of capacities. For Nick Bostrom (director of the “Future of Humanity Institute” at Oxford University) it is obvious, upon rational reflection, that the loss of intellectual life as such would be of a catastrophic order that far outweighs the tragedy of losing some or many humans. Bostrom follows Derek Parfitt in “demonstrating” that a loss of all rational human life, despite first assumptions, would be far far worse than losing nearly all rational life. Despite our first intuitions, events that appear to be profoundly catastrophic (like the Holocaust) are – ultimately – events from which “we” recover. What would be truly disastrous is a loss of rationality, rather than the loss of a very large number of humans. Bostrom calculates that all most of our efforts ought to be directed at the reduction of existential risk; minimizing the risk of the catastrophic loss of intelligence in general is a far greater priority (or ought to be) than - say -- reducing the risk of local catastrophes (such as the genocidal losses that humans have already sustained but which, on reflection, do not amount to that much of a loss in the scheme of things). So we might say that both for Benatar and for Bostrom, despite the seemingly opposed claims for human extinction (Benatar) or human survival at all costs (Bostrom), there is a prima facie value placed on human capacity defined as rationality of a certain mode: If we suppose with Parfit that our planet will remain habitable for at least another billion years, and we assume that at least one billion people could live on it sustainably, then the potential exist for at least 1016 human lives of normal duration. These lives could also be considerably better than the average contemporary human life, which is so often marred by disease, poverty, injustice, and various biological limitations that could be partly overcome through continuing technological and moral progress. However, the relevant figure is not how many people could live on Earth but how many descendants we could have in total. One lower bound of the number of biological human life-years in the future accessible universe (based on current cosmological estimates) is 1034 years. Another estimate, which assumes that future minds will be mainly implemented in computational hardware instead of biological neuronal wetware, produces a lower bound of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1071 basic computational operations) … If we make the less conservative assumption that future civilisations could eventually press close to the absolute bounds of known physics (using some as yet unimagined technology), we get radically higher estimates of the amount of computation and memory storage that is achievable and thus of the number of years of subjective experience that could be realised. Even if we use the most conservative of these estimates, which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonisation and software minds, we find that the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than the value of 1016 human lives (Bostrom 2013, 18). This is what connects Bostrom’s work on avoiding existential risk with his work on the importance of technological and cognitive enhancement: life is valuable because it is intelligent, and a maximally intelligent life is one that is pain-free, stupidity-free and death-free. If human life is worthy of existence only if it is pain-free or at least pain-free for the most part, then it follows that -- as Benatar argues -- the life that we have now is not worth living. Where Benatar and Bostrom differ is not over value -- both value life only in its maximally capable mode, as does Singer -- but in prediction: Bostrom sees human life at present as incapacitated, not yet technologically mature, and tragically subjected to a death and suffering that it ought -- rationally and upon reflection -- avoid. An extreme position, such as Benatar’s, that argues for willed extinction of the human species does at least follow from his premise that only a certain type of life is worth living. We might respond to such “reasoning” that we can, and should, avoid willed extinction (of ourselves, or of a version of ourselves, or others) by shifting ethical terrain. Liberalism in its best mode would not determine in advance what counts as a life worth living, and would therefore go so far as to include lives that were not only not super intelligent but also worthy, even if not capable of the high levels of reasoning that are demanded of autonomous political subjects. As we have already seen, Martha Nussbaum has argued that we ought to include those whose lives involve different capacities and needs, and accommodate those who must care for persons who would not meet the demands of traditional political subjects. One might even formulate a more nuanced mode of utilitarianism from such considerations: would a world in which “we” cared for those not able to care for themselves not be a more enjoyable world? Or would it not - at least -- suggest values other than those of enjoyment, such as the value of experiencing human dignity, love, compassion and care? If utilitarianism pushes us towards calculations of who ought to live, of whether life ought to be extinguished, and of weighing lives, then an expanded liberal conception of personhood would say that the very possibility of asking that question -- who should live? -- necessarily destroys calculus and pushes us to the question of how one ought to live, which in turn precludes the possibility of anyone having the expertise or measure of deciding on the being or non-being of other humans. What a relief. We have done away with the awful weighing of lives. We allow every person to decide what counts as being human. And for those not blessed with the power to decide, we also allow for those who must care for humans who don't quite meet the conditions of liberal personhood. Get rid of blindly rationalized utilitarianism and you get rid of the specter of extinction. Unfortunately, if some forms of rational calculus seem to foist the problem of human non-being before us, the problem of human non-being (or imminent extinction) drags us back into utilitarianism. This is very clear in more applied versions of utilitarianism and especially the discourse of health economics where distributions and doing good can be determined by calculating “qalys” (quality adjusted life years) or “dalys” (disability adjusted life years) [Murray 1996]; we might want to reject utilitarianism and health economics’ rationalizations, but I would suggest that luxury of refusing calculus has always been a luxury for some. Tim Mulgan (2011), in a thought experiment that writes the history of philosophy from the “broken world” of the future, argues that just as we look back with horror and puzzlement on Ancient Greece and its notions of philosopher kings and natural slaves, so the future “broken world” of resource depletion will look back with wonder at the world of free liberal personhood that could proceed without calculation or “survival lotteries.” This world (of ours, today) will appear as a bizarre exception to a future world that inevitably confronts questions of who ought to survive. Not everyone can live, and not all lives are viable. If we are faced with a world of limited resources, where the life of the liberal person and favorable conditions is simply not sustainable, then however we might want to avoid it, we will be forced to ask about what counts as a viable life. Mulgan's future broken world of survival lotteries, or a world in which some humans -- because of the sheer luck of the draw -- do not survive has not only already arrived: it has always been present. Was there ever a time when the world came even vaguely close to John Rawls’s “favorable conditions” where justice was the same for all? I would suggest, in a manner that differs from that of Benatar, that what has emerged as human, as man, is constitutively disabled, and that if there is anything like a sustainable life it is precisely the life that has been extinguished in the name of the valuably and capably (or super-intelligent) human. Rather, then, than reject utility and calculus because of the offensive it directs to those lives it deems to be incapable, disabled or unworthy, I would suggest that by its own calculus the “man” of liberal reason who both generates and refuses utility is maximally self-disabling. By the same token the figures of life that seem to demand non-being are perhaps the only forms of humanity that do not, by their own calculation, generate a calculus that leads inexorably to extinction. As a case study I would like to consider a case of extinction or genocide, where one group of humans decided that the human species could - possibly - benefit by eliminating one of its kind who was not quite of its kind. The use of the term genocide, or talking about the extinction of a race, has a recent and problematic history. One has to accept the concept of a genus of the human species in order to target distinct kinds of humans. A certain racial logic pertains both to targeted genocides, but also in more well-meaning claims that certain events of colonial violence are best thought of as events of genocide. In the case of the “last Tasmanian Aborigine,” there might seem to be some political value in identifying British colonialist strategy as a genocidal re-gime aiming to “breed out the color” of the Australian Aboriginal peoples. Mourning the loss of a people, and focusing on irrevocable loss might go some way to forcing contemporary Australians to realizing that the past is not the past, that the drive towards the extinction of a people is not extinct. In the conclusion of this chapter I want to question the genocidal logic that lies behind claims for lives worth living, and for human capacities that are distinct from species membership, while at the same time recognizing that the use of the term “genocide” for all its assumptions that humans can be grouped into species and genus, is always an offensive (agonistic) strategy. One thing that one has to deal with, or deal with to set aside in the discussion of genocide in Aus-tralia, is the kerfuffle that became known as the history wars. If you research online about the genocide or breeding out of the Aboriginal peoples, you will come across the highly informative website of Keith Windshuttle whose work is motivated by the desire to rid the Australian collective psyche of what he deems to be a pathological guilt and mourning (Windshuttle 2010). One of the motivating contexts for his work was the government report on the stolen generation, which de-tailed the ongoing strategy of removing Aboriginal children from their families. One way in which this strategy was understood was as an attempt to breed out color, and it is this notion that Windshuttle rejects: what occurred may have been lamentable and part of a broad strategy of colonialism but not genocide. If one wants to challenge Windshuttle’s account it would make sense to emphasize race, and not to say that deep down we are all human and therefore what took place was “merely” colonization. If one does not recognize race one is blind to racial strategy, and if one does not recognize genocidal strategy then one does not recognize the ongoing specter of a particular type of assimilationist violence. However, one further problem attends the strategy of claiming that genocidal intent was directed against Australian Aboriginal peoples: the mourning (by way of a highly languid television documentary) of the last Tasmanian not only dis-places colonial violence to a different time and place, it also maintains the notion of “a” race that could be isolated and extinguished, and implicitly claims that there are now no persons who might claim land rights on the basis of being tied to the land. The “extinction” of “the” Tasmanian Aborigine is at once a cultural fantasy about a violent colonization that is well and truly in the past, and an erasure of other modalities of being human that “we” mourn as lost. On the one hand, non-indigenous Australians need the notion of Aboriginals who are tied to land by way of a timeless dreaming, rather than ownership or filiation: there must be, somewhere, a sense of space and time that is not that of managerial capitalism. And yet, it is precisely that thought of another humanity -- one that was sufficiently other to the point that it could be extinguished -- that allowed claims that Tasmanian Aborigines were extinct (and therefore no longer a burden for land rights claims). Once again it is a certain type or form of subject that can look at the array of human lives and claim that “a” race has become extinct; this purveying eye that has a com-mand of history, anthropology, life and time both requires and erases any mode of “the human” other than its own capable kind. We seem to be poised, as liberal multiculturalism often is, between post-racial claims for a general humanity that does not need to be marked or set apart to achieve a right, and a politically astute account of the ways in which white colonizing capitalism achieved its universality by erasing and exterminating others, and creating them as other by way of strategies of cultural erasure. But I want to suggest that this seemingly intractable and universal problem is a problem for a portion of humanity, and a portion that has the logic of extinction at its heart. Let us go back to the first problem of who ought to live and why, or the question of how one ought to live, and what counts as a good life, or a life worth living. As I suggested, problems of extinction bring in, it seems, a form of utilitarianism: how do we manage the survival of life, maximizing life, and maximizing good life? At the same time, questions of utility seem to raise the specter of extinction: some lives might just not be worth living. But perhaps these questions are already racial, bound up with the “man” of Western reason who is not a species. From the Socratic elevation of the examined life, to the various forms of post-humanism that range from assuming that there is a prima facie value attached to the ongoing survival of thinking to the inclusion of non-humans as persons, White Western man does not have a race: but he does not have a race because he asks the question of the value of life, of what it means to live. He is at once the only man to face extinction -- for when we view contemporary cinema and television about the end of the world it is the end of this man (the man of libraries, familial man, post-racial man, the man of reason) who is threatened with extinction, or the world’s end. What we witness is not genocide, but the end of the world. It is because this man has always asked about “the good life” -- even if that is a liberal life that has no good other than the asking of the question -- that he can be the victim of extinction. Asking the question of the good life, of how “one” ought to live is both genocidal and extinction-generating. Since its invasion Australia was deemed to be terra nullius partly on the basis of rampant opportunism, but also because a form of (indigenous) life was not recognized as properly human. Not only were indigenous Australians not property-owning, industrious and industrializing developers of the land with a techno-science oriented to the maximization of a life they identified as human, and thereby not deemed worthy of recognition, the very logic of techno-science that could only recognize such cultures as minor and racial (distinct, enigmatic) would be the same planet-transforming “species” that now proclaims itself as author of the Anthropocene. The very possibility of utilitarian questions -- who ought to live, is this a life worth living, how might we live on maximally?-- is part of a logic of appropriation, extension, survival and calculus that divides species/genus questions. There are metaphysical questions -- about how “one” ought to live, and the life worth living -- and these are for man, who is not a species but a potentiality – a power of thinking and living that transcends any body. And then there are genus questions, how “we” negotiate different claims for survival. It makes sense to mourn the extinction of “the” Aboriginal people, for those people have a race that might survive only by way of blood, language, culture and a distinct archive. To conclude, I would note first that what counts as the individual of ability -- where self and ability are mutually constitutive -- is at the heart of the “Anthropos” who has precipitated itself and others into accelerated extinction. The self of technoscience can easily be tied to the pollution of the earth, but so can the universalizing self of liberal and utilitarian theory: I can kill, exterminate and save if I have the ability to think beyond myself to the curious value of life as such, of life that might be maximized and weighed. The self of disability might appear to be secondary or parasitic concern, but I would argue the contrary: it is organic disability that requires a body to generate techne, stored energy and archives; the more this dependence is mastered, the more a disequilibrium opens up between those who render themselves productively and theoretically able and those who possess different abilities and disabilities. I am not just saying that had “we” not developed all those abilities that are definitive of the liberal subject the earth would be better off, as though human excellence came at a price to non-humans, I am saying that the very questions of how one ought to live, of the value and meaning of life, of weighing life, creates a specific terrain and orientation that is now reaching its limit. It is not, then, that the self of liberalism and utilitarianism needs to expand and include other modes of the self, to be more caring to those not blessed with the same abilities; that self needs to be seen not as the basis of the species that must be saved, but as a genus tied inextricably to logics of extinction. One can only calculate the worth of living, at the expense or cost of other life, if one has a conception of life, and it is that general conception that is both historically and culturally odd, and that requires an anthropology. How did some living beings constitute themselves as an ability to evaluate life? How is it possible for a being to ask about the value of one life as opposed to another life? How is it that the agonistics of life became a calculus? I want to point out not only that there are many modes of being human for whom the overall existence and extinction of the human is not a problem, but that the modality for whom extinction of intellectual life is a problem, is a self of white, modern, calculative ability that is exceptional and not the default setting of the species - if there is such a thing. Gilles Deleuze, writing on Foucault, points towards the specificity of the man-form, that comes into being by way of a certain type of question (Deleuze 1988). What allows something like “man” to emerge is that rather than see his being as an aspect of a complex whole that he knows with some degree of clarity and distinction, he comes to know himself clearly and distinctly, and then places what is other than himself -- nature, life, the biological or species being of the human -- in parentheses. We are distanced from that life, but that distance or absence of foundation, allows us to become self-legislating, contractual, formally rational subjects. Life does not tell us what to do, and we are not simple expressions of life; the human, or man as question, must now labor over whether all life makes a claim to be, or whether the being who asks that question -- a being liberated from mere life -- has some privilege: do we save the local, indigenous, immediate and unreflective; or, does the capacity to ask that question create every other form of life as one expression of anthropological calculating man? When philosophers dispute about a life worth living, arguing for or against whether a life is able enough to live, they are part of the same voice that can observe fragments of the human species as a genus, or a particular kind of a general species, over which a single voice might range. End of the world narratives, and scenarios of catastrophic risk - such as those of Nick Bostrom -- contemplate the extinction of this “genus which is not one,” and assume both that this would be the catastrophe of all catastrophes, and that humanity is necessarily defined by a certain concept of personhood that is irreducible to the human species. Indeed, it is ability -- in Bostrom’s case, intelligence - that needs to be preserved; it is this life that would count as extinction as such, and not “merely” genocide. An anthropological and calculative “we” emerges by way of technologies that generate and calculate the worth of “a” life, and this life is the life of a person: a being who is distinct from nature, and who may even calculate something like their own right to life or cost to the earth by way of a carbon footprint, imagining that they might live on this earth but deftly erase any damage to their milieu. It is this same person, distinct by way of certain predicates, who might view and weigh other human non-persons as members of a genus, as instances of a way of life to be preserved, or not.

#### That’s a voter – debating presupposes access to the activity and oppressed debaters cannot psychologically argue against repugnant arguments.

## 4

### T

#### Interpretation – affirmatives must defend the resolution as a general principle. This requires that you defend that the plan is a good idea in the abstract and don’t defend implementation.

#### Violation – they defend implementation.

#### 1 – Jurisdiction – it’s NSDA rules.

**NSDA 21** – 2021-22 Lincoln-Douglas Ballot, https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/Sample-Lincoln-Douglas-Debate-Ballot-Blank.pdf // JB

Each **debater** has the burden to **prove** their **side** of the resolution **more valid** as a **general principle**. It is **unrealistic** to expect a debater to prove **complete validity or invalidity** of the resolution. The **better debater** is the one who, on the whole, proves their side of the resolution **more valid** as a general principle.

#### Outweighs – It’s on the LD ballot which means whenever a judge submits the ballot it’s what they contractually abide by – operating outside of the rules would forfeit the judge’s ability to submit a decision.

#### 2 – Precision:

#### Resolved in LD is a statement of values.

**UPitt ND** – University Of Pittsburgh Communications Services Webteam, copyright 2015-21, "Basic Definitions," Department of Communication , <https://www.comm.pitt.edu/basic-definitions> CHO

Affirmative/Pro. The side that “affirms” the resolution (is “pro” the issue). For example, the affirmative side in a debate using the resolution of policy, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens, would advocate for federal government implementation of a poverty reduction program. Argument. A statement, or claim, followed by a justification, or warrant. Justifications are responses to challenges, often linked by the word “because.” Example: The sun helps people, because the sun activates photosynthesis in plants, which produce oxygen so people can breathe. Constructive Speech. The first speeches in a debate, where the debaters “construct” their cases by presenting initial positions and arguments. Cross-examination. Question and answer sessions between debaters. Debate. A deliberative exercise characterized by formal procedures of argumentation, involving a set resolution to be debated, distinct times for debaters to speak, and a regulated order of speeches given. Evidence. Supporting materials for arguments. Standards for evidence are field-specific. Evidence can range from personal testimony, statistical evidence, research findings, to other published sources. Quotations drawn from journals, books, newspapers, and other audio-visuals sources are rather common. Negative/Con. The side that “negates” the resolution (is “con” the issue). For example, the negative side in a debate using the resolution of fact, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production, would argue that global warming does not threaten agricultural production. Preparation Time. Debates often necessitate time between speeches for students to gather their thoughts and consider their opponent's arguments. This preparation is generally a set period of time and can be used at any time by either side at the conclusion of a speech. Rebuttal Speech. The last speeches in a debate, where debaters summarize arguments and draw conclusions about the debate. Resolution. A specific statement or question up for debate. Resolutions usually appear as statements of policy, fact or value. Statement of policy. Involves an actor (local, national, or global) with power to decide a course of action. For example, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens. Statement of fact. Involves a dispute about empirical phenomenon. For example, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production. Statement of value. Involves conflicting moral dilemmas. For example, Resolved: The death penalty is a justified method of punishment. Topic. A general issue to debate. Topics could be “The Civil War,” “genetic engineering,” or “Great Books.”

#### Is means is Definition of is (Entry 1 of 4) present tense third-person singular of BE dialectal present tense first-person and third-person singular of BE dialectal present tense plural of BE

Webster ND Definition of IS," Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is> IS

#### That requires logical coherence and implies no implementation.

Your Dictionary ND – "Dialectical Meaning," No Publication, <https://www.yourdictionary.com/dialectical> Cho

The definition of dialectical is a discussion that includes logical reasoning and dialogue, or something having the sounds, vocabulary and grammar of a specific way of speaking. An example of something dialectical is a Lincoln Douglass style of debate, where both parties argue a point in a logical order. Of, or pertaining to dialectic; logically reasoned through the exchange of opposing ideas.

#### Be is a linking verb, not an action verb so implementation is incoherent.

Grammar Monster ND – "Linking Verbs," Grammar Monster, <https://www.grammar-monster.com/glossary/linking_verbs.htm> CHO

What Are Linking Verbs? (with Examples) A linking verb is used to re-identify or to describe its subject. A linking verb is called a linking verb because it links the subject to a subject complement (see graphic below). Infographic Explaining Linking Verb A linking verb tells us what the subject is, not what the subject is doing. Easy Examples of Linking Verbs In each example, the linking verb is highlighted and the subject is bold. Alan is a vampire. (Here, the subject is re-identified as a vampire.) Alan is thirsty. (Here, the subject is described as thirsty.)

#### Outweighs: (A) They can arbitrarily jettison words which decks ground and preparation because there is no stasis point

#### 3 – Fairness – it prevents abusive PICs out of certain parts of the plan that steal aff ground by isolating a hyper-specific DA to the plan – solves topic education to read it as a DA and promotes critical thinking because you need to win the DA actually outweighs the plan.

**Fairness is a voter – Debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation.**

#### Reject the team: (A) No argument to drop and (B) Strongest internal link to better norms through deterrence.

**No RVIs: (A) Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe (B) Discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting (C) Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly (D) Its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments (E) Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory (F) They are the logic of criminalization that over-punish people-of-color for trying to create productive discourse.**

#### Competing interpretations: (A) Reasonability is arbitrary – impossible to know what is reasonable until you establish a brightline (B) Bites judge intervention – they have to gut check what they think is good (C) Collapses – you use offense/defense to evaluate offense under the brightline (D) Norms – you can sidestep norms by selectively choosing a different brightline you meet every round.

**1NC theory first – (A) If I was abusive, it was because the 1AC was (B) You have persuasive advantages in the 2AR on top of infinite prep time.**

## 5

### Theory

#### Interpretation – Affirmatives must define *private entities* in a delineated card in the 1AC.

UpCounsel ND – “Private Entity: Everything You Need to Know”. UpCounsel (interactive online service that makes it faster and easier for businesses to find and hire legal help). No Date. Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.upcounsel.com/private-entity> //Xu

A private entity can be a partnership, corporation, individual, nonprofit organization, company, or any other organized group that is not government-affiliated. Indian tribes and foreign public entities are not considered private entities.

Unlike publicly traded companies, private companies do not have public stock offerings on Nasdaq, American Stock Exchange, or the New York Stock Exchange. Instead, they offer shares privately to interested investors, who may trade among themselves.

Private Company vs. Private Entity

The Companies Act of 2013 governs the registration of private companies.

This type of company is formed by following the steps laid out by this law.

Private entities are determined not by this law but by ownership and holding. For example, sole proprietorships and partnerships are designed as private entities.

A private entity is not necessarily a private company, but all private companies are private entities.

How Private Entities Work

Although private companies can be of any size, they often include a small group of chosen investors who may include employees, colleagues, friends and family, and other interested parties. If this type of company needs funding to grow, it may seek it from venture capital firms or from large institutional investors. Some private companies eventually decide to go public with an initial public offering (IPO) of stock shares on a public exchange. Sometimes, public companies go private when a large investor buys a bulk of the outstanding stock shares and plans to remove them from public exchanges.

How FOIA Affects Private Entities

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is a federal law that requires certain agencies to provide certain types of records to any person who asks. Major government bodies such as federal courts and Congress are exempt from FOIA. Some state agencies are also exempt depending on state laws governing public records. In general, FOIA applies to:

Federal, state, and local government agencies, such as the Federal Communications Commission.

Certain state legislatures depending on the laws in those states.

Most private entities are not bound by federal FOIA laws. However, these laws may apply to private entities involved in government business. This situation occurred in Colorado in 2000, when a nonprofit corporation was required by the state's Court of Appeals to share documents related to a project it was working on with the city of Denver.

**Prefer:**

#### 1 – Stable Advocacy – they can redefine in the 1AR to wriggle out of DAs which kills high-quality engagement. We lose access to Tech Race DAs, Asteroid DAs, case turns, and core Process CPs that have varying definitions – outweighs on reversibility since the 2NR can’t compensate after absurd 1AR shifts.

#### CX can’t resolve this because (A) Not flowed so it’s non-verifiable

#### 2 – Real World – Policy makers must specify the entity that they are recognizing. It also means zero solvency – absent spec, private entities can circumvent since there is no delineated way to enforce the aff and means their solvency can’t actualize.

#### Independently, P-Spec isn’t regressive since (1) Determines the scope of the AFF which is core topic lit. Also, infinite regress tailors optimal norms which outweighs on duration.