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## 1AC – The Voice of Woman

#### Language may be neutral, but discourse has power: the economy of the signifier of the Same is a historical process of representation that (re)produces the figure of the woman, the constant reaction and opposition to masculinity. The only ethical form of debate is to speak as woman - a practice of signification without one meaning, a gender that does not return to sex, the figure the regime cannot understand

Haney-Peritz 87. Janice Haney-Peritz, 1987, “Speculum of the Other Woman , and: This Sex which is Not One , and: Reading Lacan (review),” Minnesota Review, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/428728/pdf> sean!

According to Luce Irigaray, woman cannot be understood apart from the "historic causes" which have (re)produced her: "Property systems, philosophical, mythological, or religious systems, [and] the theory and practice of psychoanalysis" (129). Although at one point or another Speculum ofthe Other Woman touches on all of these systems, it emphasizes the connections between and internal workings of two discursive practices: Freudian psychoan- alysis and metaphysics. The book opens with a reading of Freud on femininity ("The Blind Reviews 123 Spot of an Old Dream of Symmetry"), moves through a middle section that includes chapters devoted to Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Descartes, Kant, and Hegel ("Speculum"), and closes with a stunning analysis of Plato's parable of the cave ("Plato's Hystera"). There, in Plato's cave, Irigaray discovers the womb that man would both appropriate and transcend by engendering a system of representation based on symmetry or the law of the Same. Working by analogy, Plato turns the womb into a sensible metaphor, a theater of fantasy set off against and ruled by the intelligible—the self-same eye of God. The truth of this metaphysical scenario is reinforced by a pedagogy through which other men—like Aristotle, Descartes, and Hegel—inherit the tools and tricks of the master's trade. Hence, in one way or another, they reproduce a scenario in which the conditions for representation are identity, sameness, and masterful "specul(ariz)ation." As Irigaray (re)presents it, Freud's discourse on female sexuality unwittingly participates in this economy of representation. In his story of how a female becomes a woman, the little girl begins as a "little man" and ends as a "man-minus" (27). Although this beginning and end generate numerous gaps and contradictions along the way, Freud sutures the gaps and covers up the contradictions by formulating a phallocentric theory of desire, a theory in which castration, the Oedipus complex, and penis envy are crucial. These formulas enable Freud to colonize the "dark continent" of female sexuality and in so doing, to make the unconscious a property of the master's discourse. Thus, he who was willing to challenge the rule of reason in the discourse of man reversed himself when it came to women's dreams, puns and fantasies. Failing to examine the "social dimension of sexual relations" (120) as well as the "historical determinants" (139) of both his discourse and his desire, Freud not only (re)produced an ideology of the feminine that "bailed out the current regimes of property" (121), he also engendered a practice of normalizing hysterics by seducing them into the position of the eternal feminine. In Speculum, Irigaray suggests that Freud and the philosophers have a stake in a certain economy of representation, one that upholds the rule of the Same by erasing the specificity of woman's relation to origins. In this system of representation, the "subject has always been appropriated by the 'masculine'" (133); woman functions as nothing more than an object or complement; she is the mirror of and for man. Lacking any "signifier" for a desire that is not already part of man's system of representation, woman is "ill prepared to mediate, metaphorize, or 'displace'" her specific "relation to generation" (1 10). All she has to "remind [her] of what has been" is her "body" (61). How then might it be possible for her to represent her desire, her difference, and her relation to an other—most especially to another woman? The possibility Irigaray both advocates and enacts in Speculum is a "disconcerting of language" (143). Not only does she play with words, she also engages in a "mimicry" that contests both the system of representation and the logic of the masters by overdoing and un(der)doing their discourse (142). In "The Bund Spot and Old Dream of Symmetry," Freud is permitted to deüver his lecture of "Femininity"—but not without interruptions from an impertinent questioner who notes contradictions, remarks on gaps, and engenders seeming- ly assymetrical connections and unauthorized analogies. In the second section of Speculum, the mimicry seems much less impertinent, for here Irigaray functions more or less like a passive mirror of man; the chapters devoted to Plato and Plotinus are entirely composed of extracts from each man's writings, while the chapters on Aristotle, Descartes, and Hegel are rather conventional mixtures of summary and commentary. However, this portion of Speculum opens and closes with two essays that establish a frame of reference for the mirroring, a frame different from the one each of the philosophers used; whereas they framed their remarks with reference to man, Irigaray frames her mirroring with reference to a female spectator or reader. And lest we forget that frame of reference, Irigaray interrupts her philosophical reflections to introduce a dazzling female, a figure who, in her utter abjection before God, becomes a "burning glass": "La Mystérique." Finally, in the closing essay on Plato's cave, Irigaray disconcerts the language of the master by painstakingly overdoing what many of us have come to associate with deconstructive analysis. Acting like a "toogood" student, she outdoes Plato by over-valuing his word: seizing on marginal details, she patiently unravels their implications, and in so doing, turns a short and seemingly lucid allegory into a frustratingly long and opaque text. At one point in Speculum, Irigaray writes that "now and again it is advisable to say things very clearly" (38). Under interrogation is Freud's notion of a "seduction fantasy." Having noted how Freud uses his law (the Oedipus complex) to defend against the "distress" he feels when his women patients tell him that they have been seduced by their fathers, Irigaray wonders how this censured psychoanalytical scene would ever make it possible for "the daughter [to] recognize herself in her desire, particularly her desire for her father." But no sooner has she posed this question than Irigaray decides to make it "clear" that her questioning "does not mean that the father necessarily makes love to his daughter" (38). At issue here are a matter of fact and a matter of necessity—matters which make it advisable for a feminist to speak clearly—at least now and then. Unlike Speculum, This Sex Which Is Not One is mostly a collection of occasional pieces in which Irigaray chooses to speak clearly. Indeed, of the eleven essays in the collection, only four deploy the deliberate mimicry that permeates Speculum; the rest either summarize ideas one might have gleaned from Speculum ("This Sex Which is Not One," "Psychoanalytic Theory: Another Look," "The Power of Discourse and the Subordination of the Feminine," and "Ques- tions"), or explicitly address matters of fact and necessity that often disconcert feminists: the traffic in women ("Women on the Market"), homosexual prejudice ("Commodities Among Themselves") and pornography ('"Frenchwomen, Stop Trying'"). Although much of what Irigaray has to say in these essays will not be "news" to American feminists, her forceful way of speaking about women reminds us that in an economy of representation based on the rule of the Same, some things clearly bear repeating. What is likely to seem different, if not entirely new, are Irigaray's attempts at "speaking (as) woman." Midway through the collection, there are two such attempts, both of which recall Irigaray's mimicry of Freud. "Cosi Fan Tutti" impertinently repeats Lacan's remarks on woman's lack in relation to the Other (Language), while "The 'Mechanic' of Fluids" exposes Lacan's specula(riza)tions on the object (a) in relation to the subject of desire. Both of these essays are extrordinarily difficult, not only because Lacan is at issue but also because in Speculum, Irigaray's discourse on woman seems to anticipate Lacan's. So why, one wonders, would Irigaray choose to mime Lacan in a way that calls such remarks and specula(riza)tions into question? Apparently, what disturbs Irigaray is that Lacan occasionally says things like the following: "There is no woman who is not yet excluded by the nature of things, which is the nature of words, and it must be said that, if there is something they complain a lot about at the moment, that is what it is—except that they don't know what they are saying, that's the whole difference between them and me" (87). As Irigaray (re)presents it, this way of talking for and about woman is inadvisable; not only does it aggrandize theoretical knowledge about the nature of words but in so doing it also devalues necessarily pragmatic attempts at "speaking (as) woman." Irigaray and Lacan may be caught up in each other's discourse; however, the two are not one and the same. In questioning language and the subject, Irigaray is concerned with both the nature of words and the power of discourse. Theoretically considered, language may be neutral; yet pragmatically speaking, discourse has power. Hence, even though Irigaray does not lack Lacan's knowledge, she remains committed to "speaking (as) woman." Irigaray flaunts that commitment in the two essays that frame This Sex Which is Not One. The opening essay re-views the Swiss film Les Arpenteurs in a way that is designed to uncover a possible space for woman, a place which lies on the other side of the looking glass. The closing essay, titled "When Our Lips Speak Together," projects the possibility that this space can be realized in and through a different language practice—a way of "speaking (as) woman" in analogy with an 'other' female body. The collection's title piece graphically describes the sex of this other body, a sex which is not one and the same (i.e., phallomorphic) but plural and heterogeneous: "two Ups in continuous contact" as well as "the breasts ... the vulva ... the posterior waU of the vagina ... the mouth of the uterus, and so on" (24; 28). Like this female body, "speaking (as) woman" would be something different, a heterogeneous practice in which signification does not return to one and the same meaning, to one and the same sex. Since Gillian Gill and Catherine Porter have done such a fine job of translating, it will now be possible to articulate the numerous points of contact between Irigaray and American feminist literary critics. So, for example, we might note the close connection between Irigaray's exposure of phallocentric discourse and Gilbert and Gubar's critique of patriarchal poetics. Similarly, we might relate Irigaray's ways of "speaking (as) woman" to Spacks's description of the female imagination, Gilbert and Gubar's identification of the female story, and Showalter's explorations of a female Uterary tradition. And finally, we might link Irigaray's remarks on a pre-Oedipal sexuality with the recent American interest in how a woman's writing figures her relationship to the pre-Oedipal mother. But even though numerous points of contact exist, articulating a relation with Irigaray will not be an unproblematic venture for American feminists. In Speculum as well as in This Sex Which Is Not One, Irigaray draws on both the practice and ideology of deconstructuve criticism. By exposing the interdependence and inequality of such structuring oppositions as same/other and male/female, deconstructive criticism seeks not only to reverse the metaphysical hierarchy that supports a certain economy of representation but also to displace this reversal. In consequence, such winning terms as "other" and "female" become conceptual disruptions—disconcerting figures which cannot be understood along the lines set down by the prior regime. In Irigaray's work, this deconstructive operation produces a fabulous figure: "speaking (as) woman." Although this woman exists, she does so only as a fiction. For those who believe that in reality there is a distinctive female imagination, female story, and female tradition, Irigaray's deconstructed figure is bound to cause problems.

#### Now, listen to a woman speak:

#### [audio]

#### Space: the dream-destiny, the vertical axis pf patriarchy, the escape from capital: the resolution brings us to the question of private spaceflight, the extension of the spiderweb of Capital and masculinity to the cosmos. When a fly is caught in a spiderweb, he can’t change the web: he must abandon the fly. Can we leave our wings behind?

Russell 14. John Russell (the artist responsible for the show Sqrrl at the Bridget Donahue gallery, a feminist scholar studying the work of Irigaray, Haraway, and Grosz), 2014, “BRUCE WILLIS, IRIGARAY, AND THE AESTHETICS OF SPACE TRAVEL,” <https://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/bruce-willis-irigaray-and-aesthetics-space-travel> sean!

Aristotle’s theorising of ‘place’ and selection of the model of ‘topos’ as a lynchpin of his philosophical system,[22] develops from his characterisation of the ‘womb’ as the primary example of place, whereby ‘thing’ (masculine) and place (feminine) are gendered hierarchically: ‘Irigaray emphasizes that the relationship between woman’s function as a dwelling for the embryo and her vagina’s figuration as a place for the man’s penis are not discrete’.[23] This is replayed as a phallo-nostalgic tragedy, where man yearns to return to the Mother's body, whilst at the same time (dis)locating his origin away from the corporeal (from matter): ‘In all his creations, all his works, man always seems to neglect thinking of himself as flesh, as one who has received his body as that primary home…’[24] In this sense, the vagina, according to Irigaray, functions as a ‘perforation’ toward this ‘first place’ as coffin or tomb.[25] But at the same time female sexual and reproductive functions furnish the system with the concept-metaphors to define place as immobile, in order to give limits to ‘Man and to his things’.[26] Everything in its place. Or placed. And so we may look to the skies, squinting upwards like Plato’s philosophers escaped from the deceptive materialities of the womb-cave, blinking up at the divine immateriality of the sun and the ‘good’ as the dream-destiny of mankind and the ‘greatest ideas of our civilisation’.[27] Delineating the vertical axis of patriarchy, as the Father of form – the 'progressive erection that goes from quadruped to Homo-erectus.’[28] As a phallus spurting out cum at the sky. As a Fantasy-outside or excess coordinate articulated as both an ‘escape’ from Capitalism (as transcendence, Light, Knowledge, Enlightenment, Truth), and, at the same time, as part of its mechanisms of expansion, as described, for instance, in Rosa Luxemburg’s analysis where capitalism always needs a periphery, a non-capitalist outside to appropriate: new land, new resources, new investment opportunities.[29] This figures space exploration as the export of our [slowed] and deadly social relations across the galaxy like the escaping monsters in The Thing or Alien – ‘carriers’ of our diseased archaic structurings of time and place.[30] The expansion, militarisation, marketisation, flexibilisation of the Cosmos. Or this can be reversed around as a parasiting of the present by the future. Ray Brassier, in a recent discussion on JG Ballard’s short story, ‘The Voices of Time’, described the disjunction between adaptation for the future and being in the present: Ballard’s story revolves around an apocalypse, where ‘Time’ is coming to an end; in response, a number of animals begin undergoing strange morphological changes, rapidly evolving to meet a future rushing towards them (a spider that weaves its own neural net outside of its body, a toad with a lead shell, an anemone that hears light). Brassier regards these as examples of the ‘future’s maladaptation to the present’. In Brassier’s analysis this moment is catastrophic[31] – the introduction of a necessary trauma as adaption or orientation towards the future. He describes this as a rehabilitated Prometheanism or enlightened catastrophism where we grasp our destiny in the admittedly corporate/capitalist technologies of advanced science and its applications, for instance, Space Travel.[32] As he describes we have to do something with Time because ‘we know time will do something with us’. The problem here is the brief mention that we should 'refunction' or 'repurpose' the technologies of capitalistic production to 'emancipatory ends'. This is obviously the difficult bit. [33] Mickey Mouse, Barack Obama, Justin Timberlake, or Nicki Minaj are sitting in a car – flicking their eyes up at the rear view mirror – they move the car forward a few feet to get a better angle to reverse – the view is partly obscured – thinking about what they have to do that day, the events that will unfold in the next few hours – they reverse the car – there is a nasty crunching sound – suspended nauseously between past and future – and they know they’ve just run over next door’s one year old child who has crawled out onto the drive. The emotion of terror/sickness/wonder reminds them of […] This is reminiscent of the avant-garde aesthetic (trauma) where our experience of experimentation with the configurations of form and space, in the example of an actual object, for instance a cubist painting (the manipulation of materials, colour, planes and so on) predicts future spatial and temporal configurations and radically transformed conditions of experience. An actualisation of the future in the present moment, as a prophecy or promise, of the forthcoming transformation (or not) of relations of exchange between humans, objects and places including (potentially) the transformation of political systems and redistribution of the means of production. In extension, this is played out affectively, as a kind of terror-aesthetic where these proposed transformations predict our own absence or erasure in the sublime of human potential – that is, the modes of experience which make and construct us as humans would now be incomprehensible to us and us to them.[34] At worst a personalised, 'correlationist' bourgeois histrionics (horror vacui).[35] But if this is viewed from a Deleuzian/Bergsonian perspective – vitalist image of ‘the ‘force of life’ as difference – as the excessive drive to differ – set against the force of repetition of the same, on both human and cosmic scales.[36] As Elizabeth Grosz describes it, through her Irigarayan/Bergsonian analysis of Darwin, as the expression of freedom tied to the capabilities of our own transformable/ transforming bodies telescoping back through the multi-millenial, material, cosmic-queering of life from the bacterial through to the excessive animal-aesthetics of sexual selection. In the extravagant plummage of birds, the decadence of mating ritual and the frenzied dance of bees, then this aesthetic or affect can be splayed out as an oscillation between the ludicrous and the operational, form and informe, possible and impossible, drama and melodrama, present and the future. And always the stratification of or movement between revolution (including social revolution) and banality – potentially revolutionary as well as potentially trivial. Like a gif.[37] A NOTHING as mediation with the future, where mimicry and sophistry operate as the play of the ‘given’ and the ‘made’.[38] There’s an ‘I’ and a ‘U’ in LUVIN. Or to return to the idea of the trap which Elizabeth Grosz discusses with reference to the work of the biologist Jacob von Uexkull who describes the development of fly and spider (in terms similar to Singleton) as a kind of ‘mutual adaption’ or ‘harmonic coordination’ where the spider’s web exists as ‘a kind spatial counterpoint to the movements of the fly’. The fly is ‘already mapped, signaled, its place accommodated [bodily/spatially] in, for example, its inability to see the smooth unmoving threads of the web’.[39] Given this structure, one of the ways the fly might escape is to not be a fly. The exceptional thing here is not only to escape the trap but to express a freedom as other to the logic of the trap. That is, to change the rules of the game. And the conditions which create the spider and the fly. This is the production of an aesthetics which is always concerned with affective experience of ontological force, as a virtual and material force of transformation acting in and on the actual drives and flesh of our bodies, as they exist now (positioned by class, race and sexual/sexuated relation) and as they have transformed over Time. [40] Which is why aesthetics is like sci-fi and why Outer Space is so important to aesthetics and politics. Sub-troped as post-alien category 7/humanoid, deep space cleansing operative 7S1A/Amboina, including tentacle attachments and penis-vagina refurb, moving across the blackness – galaxy reflected in her visor. Meat suit with bio implants. Rotating above Entrance hatch x117. She sprouts wings at her sides. Golden scales reflecting bright white. As an intensity of mimicry and acting out of the cadavers of place. Miming mime itself. Gliding upwards. An angel. As a movement across the material and the divine. As both. The space between.

#### Thus, we affirm that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. A feminist affirmation of the resolution goes further than a value statement: an ethic of injustice must involve the mimicry and deconstruction of those discourses of power.

#### The “Wild West,” the “New Frontier,” the new signifiers of spaceflight are fully imbricated within the coloniality of patriarchy. What does it mean to mark that unjust?

#### Remember the opening act: language is neutral, but discourse has power. What does it mean to listen to a cyborg speak? We must ask ourselves how to use the technology of Empire against itself, the language of Empire against itself. The question of the resolution is not a question of appropriation, but rather, the question of the re-appropriation of the cyborg.

Banschbach 13. Sarah Banschbach (English professor at Texas Tech, PhD in English Literature, Masters from UT-PB), 2013, “Hi-Ho, Cyborg! Savages, Cyborgs, and Gender on the Science-Fiction Frontier” in “Contemporary Westerns,” edited by Andrew Patrick Nelson, I have the pdf [brackets are in the original] sean!

The United States is a country that has always looked westward for answers to political and social problems. Whether one is interested in the “Wild West” is irrelevant as the frontier pattern of expansion is ingrained in American culture. Though the West was officially “closed” in 1890, the saga of the cowboy, the Lone Ranger, the desperado, the settler, and the Indian lives on iconically in film and media. In more recent years these themes have been resurrected in science fiction, a genre that is no stranger to frontiers. Space and science are both considered the last frontiers of modern times and many films return to the history of the gunslinging West as a forecast of colonization on other planets. Though John Wayne’s West is the traditional movie depiction of the frontier, modern conceptions of the space and science frontier include the rough and tough lawlessness of the West but can also feature hallmarks of science fiction like aliens, robots, and cyborgs, robothuman hybrids. In the light of Donna Haraway’s seminal “A Cyborg Manifesto,” I examine what cyborgs tell us about these new frontiers of space and science by wedding her approach to the ideas of John Cawelti in order to guide an interpretation of the film Westworld (Michael Crichton, 1973) and the television series Firefly (2002) with its companion film Serenity (Joss Whedon, 2005). Focusing on how evolving conceptions of the positive and negative aspects of frontier cyborgs revise and resist the “John Wayne West” by questioning human power structures and morality, I claim that these new frontiers of space and science demand adherence to traditional Western motifs but that the science-fiction frontier also creates a technologically modified version of Cawelti’s savagery/civilization binary, which allows room for the resistance of cyborgs, especially female cyborgs, who, coded as sexual and maternal beings, resist the limitations of a purely technological mold and are the key to creating a lasting and working synthesis between binaries. In The Six-Gun Mystique Sequel Cawelti offers an extensive analysis of the Western, claiming that the genre is defined by three things: the setting, the types of characters, and the situation. 2 The setting includes not just geography but, even more importantly, the social and historical background of the time. He writes, The Western story is set at a certain moment in the development of American civilization, namely at that point when savagery and lawlessness are in decline before the advancing wave of law and order, but are still strong enough to pose a local and momentarily significant challenge. 3 Hence, the West is not just a place; it is a frame of mind and attitude. Though the geography gives a sense of place and sense of freedom, it is the social and political freedom that accompanies the new landscapes that is also appealing, for “the desert landscape of the West is seen as a terrain where individuals can escape from the past and the limits of tradition.” 4 However, maintaining traditions of personal integrity against the oppressive traditions of society is also part of the Western narrative. The characters of a Western are broken down into three camps: the townspeople/pioneers, which necessarily includes women; the hero, “the man with a gun” who “internalizes the conflict between savagery and civilization” and whose “personal honor and honor of the old wilderness” is the focal point of the story; and the savages who are “interchangeable between Indians and outlaws.” 5 The hero defends the townspeople and ultimately supports the town and “civilization,” while savages “usually have the capacity to live and move freely in the wilderness, [and have] mastery of the tools of violence and strong masculinity” as well as the propensity for pursuing “ruthless violence.” 6 One other vital aspect of the savage is the tendency toward madness since “both madness and savagery are forms of reaction against the lawful order of the town.” 7 Yet heroes and savages are both aligned with a strong “code of personal honor.” 8 Moreover, even though the hero defends the townspeople and ultimately supports the town and “civilization,” he is a character on the margins who “is something of an antihero to the self-made man and embodies strong feelings of hostility to the symbols and values of progress and success.” 9 Hi-Ho, Cyborg! 109 The situation or story line of the Western revolves around “the epic moment when society stands balanced against the savage wilderness.” 10 This relates back to place and setting and focuses on the conflict of the East and the West in the Western environment, also characterized as civilization against savagery or order against wildness. What is most important about this ritualized story is that it “affirmed the creation of America and explored not only what was gained but what was lost in the movement of American history.” 11 The romance of adventure is essential to the Western as well. 12 As the West closed and became a thing of the past, the space frontier opened up. Cawelti writes that “outer space can, of course, be treated as a frontier, and like the West in an earlier time, it is both a mythical landscape and a contemporary actuality.” 13 Fact and fiction find a place in the Western as well as in the science-fiction universe. On the science-fiction frontier, multicultural diversity and women play more active roles than they do in the Western. Carl Abbott states that “science fiction writers think historically when they envision path-dependent futures” since science fiction is about “the societal ramifications of change.” 14 Science-fiction and Western narratives have the similar motifs of expansion, new territory, homesteading, frontier environments, humans struggling with the forces of nature, “civilized” man contending with “natives” and “savages,” adventure, escape, possibility, and imperialism. Abbott points out that the West is important to an American understanding of the space frontier not only because of the motifs mentioned above, but also because the first wave of science-fiction films were shot in Western environments due to their strange, remote, and unfamiliar landscapes. 15 He cites President Kennedy as codifying space as the new Manifest Destiny for Americans when “he proclaimed that Americans stood ‘on the edge of a new frontier—the frontier of the 1960s—a frontier of unknown challenges and perils. . . . I am asking you to be new pioneers on that New Frontier.’” 16 With space exploration overtly linked with the Western mindset and with Western imagery, Cawelti’s concept of antithetical values clashing on a new frontier can easily provide both a narrative and interpretive framework for these new stories. As much as the science-fiction narrative draws from Western conventions, though, it also introduces the machine as a staple character. 17 How the hero interacts and interfaces with the machine becomes a new facet to be considered on two fronts. For one, in science fiction the machine is no longer subservient to humankind but rather moves toward equality or even superiority; and two, the machine enters the sci-fi narrative in the role of “other” or, relating back to the Western, as the “savage.” This new “savage” can be described in the same rhetoric as the Indian or outlaw as it is powerful in being unpredictable, is accepted by society as interesting and yet is held at arms’ length, incites a strange sense of pathos (think Roy Batty in Blade Runner), and has a strong (literal) personal code. And as with the original 110 Sarah Banschbach “savage,” the science-fiction hero must be able to recognize the potential of the machine and adapt/align himself to its forms in order to survive. However, as we will see, the initial masculinity associated with the “savage” in the Western will be questioned in the cyborg. The ultimate machine/human interface is the cyborg. Cyborgs are historically linked with the space frontier as the first instance of the term appears in the 1960 article “Cyborgs and Space” by Manfred E. Clynes and Nathan S. Kline. A cyborg’s purpose is to provide an “organizational system” in which mundane “problems are taken care of automatically and unconsciously, leaving man free to explore, to create, to think, and to feel.” 18 Further, a cyborg adapts “man to his environment, rather than vice versa.” 19 Through cyborgs, the space frontier is revised at the basic level of adaptation and cyborg science fictions allow “new technologies [to] have the potential to create new virtual worlds and transhuman beings.” 20 However, still in sync with traditional Western patterns, the cyborg is, at its inception on the space frontier, connected “to the rhetoric of colonization and conquest.” 21 Published in 1985, Haraway’s “A Cyborg Manifesto” creates a mythos for cyborg identity that is linked with this rhetoric of the space frontier. She views cyborgs as a fusion of “organism and machine” engaged in “a border war” over the “territories of production, reproduction, and imagination.” 22 Haraway writes that her “cyborg myth is about transgressed boundaries, potent fusions, and dangerous possibilities which progressive people might explore as one part of needed political work.” 23 Blurring boundaries of socially constructed ontologies, particularly in the realms of gender and race, is this political work of social revolution. Since dualities pose the possibility for dominance, such binaries must be removed and a new synthesis must take their place. Haraway looks for such a synthesis from science and technology because they are the “illegitimate” progeny of the current patriarchal society; because they reduce the world into a single language, the language of code; and because it is unclear “who makes and who is made in the relation between human and machine.” 24 A single language allows the reconstructing of identity without duality allowing for “disassembly, reassembly, investment, and exchange” while ambiguity of origin negates “universal” matrices and cycles.25 Cyborgs are the essence of this liminal reconstruction and “a cyborg world might be about lived social and bodily realities in which people are not afraid . . . of permanently partial identities and contradictory standpoints.” 26 Since “the cyborg looks to the past as well as the future” it is therefore “precisely this double nature that allows cyborg stories to be imbricated within cultural narratives while still wrenching them in a new direction.” 27 Wrenching narratives in a new direction is facilitated by the speculative world of science fiction, where the ramifications of the past, present, and future can be safely explored as societal values, morality, and power structures are examined. Due to the increasing integration of society with technology, dystopian, cautionary cyborg tales give way to more positive yet still instructive cyborg narratives. Early science-fiction works immediately identified women with the machine, such as Fritz Lang’s 1927 film Metropolis, but the traditional deleterious treatment of the “other” prevails. Though not exclusively dealing with women, the human domination of cyborgs in Westworld also fits this pattern. The negative aspects of the cyborg are the main focus of the film Westworld, which predates “A Cyborg Manifesto” by twelve years, while a slow progression or revealing of the positive aspects mentioned in Haraway’s manifesto is present in the later Firefly series as it investigates the transformative possibilities of the female and the machine. The following discussion of films evoking the Western genre, space frontiers, and (re)visionary cyborgs illuminates the shift of perspective in posthuman and cyborg evolution. Set in the not-too-distant-future, Michael Crichton’s film Westworld stars Yul Brynner as a gunslinger robot in a Wild West–themed amusement park. Brynner was chosen for this role because of his iconic cowboy role in The Magnificent Seven (John Sturges, 1960). In the film, the Delos Company’s amusement park has three branches: Romanworld, Medievalworld, and Westworld. For $1,000 a day, patrons of the park live and interact in a world populated by computer-controlled robots dressed and programmed for the respective time period. Appearing as perfect humanoids, the robots act as humans but may be used and abused with impunity by the patrons. Guests can live out their violent, lustful, or adventurous fantasies in a safe and historically authentic setting. As the intro to the film states, “Yes, the robots of Westworld are there to serve you and to give you the most unique vacation experience of your life.” Guests rave, “It’s the realest thing I’ve ever done! I mean that!” The attraction to Westworld is the childhood fantasy of cowboys and Indians and making one’s own rules. Treating the robots as nonhuman humans creates a scenario where, morally, anything goes. Because humans have the power in this situation yet do not understand how the nonhuman humans work, they abuse the cyborgs. Cawelti’s comments on the interaction between settlers and frontier “savages” are an apt comparison. The traditional Western concern of civilization versus the savage is present but is taken to a new level to incorporate society’s simultaneous fear of and desire for technology. Like Frontierland of Disneyland, which offers guests a nostalgic, sanitized experience of life in the Old West, the sci-fi Westworld represses “the legacies of the past and the dangers of the present that threaten the future.” 28 At least until the robots gain control. Iterated in the Firefly episode “Heart of Gold,” which explores a scenario similar to Westworld, control of technology allows control of one’s environment, often allowing the realm of fantasy to play out. The character Nandi states that playboy/tyrant Rance Burgess “keeps people living like this so he can play cowboy, be the one with the best toys. Turned this world into a gorram theme park.” 112 Sarah Banschbach The illusion of control in Westworld deteriorates due to the abuse and misunderstanding of the human interface with technology. As breakdowns in the robots become more frequent, control room scientists puzzle over the possible and probable causes of the malfunctions, with the head scientist suggesting that the breakdowns are spreading in a pattern similar to how infectious diseases affect human populations. The other scientists scoff at this idea, demonstrating their inability to acknowledge the humanoid component of the machines they have created. A concerned scientist explains that “these are highly complicated pieces of equipment almost as complicated as living organisms. In some cases, they’ve been designed by other computers. We don’t know exactly how they work.” Since the scientists do not know how the robots work, they cannot fathom the possibility that the cyborgs are gaining sentience and willpower. Nor can they foresee that the human abuse of technology could turn the robots into vengeful killers. As the main characters John Blane (James Brolin) and Peter Martin (Richard Benjamin) play out their sexual and violent fantasies in Westworld, they repeatedly cross paths with the black-clad Gunslinger (Brynner). In their first two encounters, the more effeminate and timid Martin is able to dispatch the Gunslinger in clichéd confrontations. But once the cyborg gains consciousness, the Gunslinger breaks from the script and shoots dead the macho robot-abuser Blane. Martin, who initially had moral qualms about using and even killing robots, flees from the untiring Gunslinger. In the meantime, Westworld’s technicians accidentally seal themselves inside the control room and run out of air, leaving the robots as the only survivors. In a chilling moment of role reversal, the vacationers in each of the park’s three worlds are massacred by the robots. Martin cannot shake the Gunslinger since he can read Martin’s heat signature. In accord with Cawelti’s observation that the hero can only defeat the savage by using his own tools against him, Martin can only defeat the Gunslinger by using a torch to set the cyborg avenger on fire. Martin exhibits disgust at this painful and prolonged act of killing and leaves before the Gunslinger’s collapse. What Martin does not count on is the tenacity of the robot who, as a charred carcass, sneaks up on Martin. In these final moments of the film, it seems that the cyborg refuses to be killed and insists upon giving up his life on his own. Its charred mechanical fingers reach out to Martin before its whole body topples off the stairs. Martin is left alone in the theme park with no way of contacting the outside world. As the viewer sees from aerial takes of the park, he is alone in the middle of a theme park situated in the midst of a genuine Western wilderness. Westworld is about to become real for Martin if he wants to return home to Chicago. In this film, the terrors of cyborg technology are exposed but also challenged because the terror is brought about by the misunderstanding, abuse, and unequal treatment of technology and cyborgs. Who is really to blame for the massacre? Those in power who created an amoral vacation spot founded upon exploitation, or those who, though robots, demanded proper treatment? The responsible use of technology is explored here in Westworld, as the synthesis of the open-ended world of sci-fi and the relatable world of the American West dovetail to create a revised paradigm to probe the issues of power, morality, and humanity. Though Westworld uses cyborgs and microcosms to discuss serious topics, it does not challenge the phallocentric constructions of the Western genre. The Western paradigm remains intact since the focus of the film remains on the interactions of men. Female cyborgs make an appearance only as sexual objects, such as when Martin and Blane visit a brothel where the conventional script of the “powerful” madam vs. the macho patron plays out. Many feminist critics hypothesize that for cyborgs to achieve any kind of resistance, there needs to be a predilection for the female gender. Ann Balsamo proposes that male cyborgs do not challenge the status quo and in fact tend more toward support of dualities because the stereotype of the rational masculine mind is already aligned with science and technology. 29 Female cyborgs, however, are “coded as emotional, sexual, and often, naturally maternal. It is these very characteristics which more radically challenge the notion of an organic-mechanical hybrid. Female cyborgs embody cultural contradictions which strain the technological imagination.” 30 Though Westworld falls into a support of dualities, there is a foretaste of Haraway’s and Balsamo’s future in the first hints that something is amiss with the cyborgs: a female robot falls over and will not respond, a rattlesnake bites Blane (snakes being a longstanding symbol of sex; hence sex striking back), and a Medieval maiden resists the forceful advances of a patron contrary to her programming. As Haraway suggests, “Cyborg writing is about the power to survive, not on the basis of original innocence, but on the basis of seizing the tools to mark the world that marked them as other.” 31 In Westworld the male Gunslinger attempts this challenge but is defeated because, as male, he does not challenge stereotypes enough. He is still acting according to the rules of cultural programming. Such will not be the case with the more contemporary female cyborg in Firefly who proves Balsamo’s point that the contradictions of the female allow her to successfully subvert dominating systems. In the context of the Western genre in which women are generally relegated to sexual objects or to the role of domesticating the hero, cyborg science-fiction narratives of space frontiers allow female cyborgs to resist the closing of the frontier, which could lead to limiting binaries once again. Female cyborgs, embodying as they do the otherness of race and gender, offer a most profound revision of the Western genre. The positive aspects of the frontier West and Manifest Destiny are promoted by the female cyborg while the negative aspects are acknowledged and revised. This possibility is exemplified in the character River Tam (Summer Glau) in the Westernthemed science-fiction TV series Firefly and its companion film, Serenity. 114 Sarah Banschbach Set aboard the Firefly class spaceship Serenity in the year 2517 in a newly discovered star system and following a civil war in which settlers of new planets fought for self-government against the Alliance (a fusion of China and the United States), the show is about, as director Joss Whedon claims, “nine people looking into the blackness of space and seeing nine different things.” The diverse crew of different races and genders smuggle contraband goods through the galaxy but try to remain on the border planets where the Western and pioneer lifestyle allows for more independence. The captain of the ship, Malcolm “Mal” Reynolds (Nathan Fillion), has one goal: to keep flying. This series laden with more-than-overt Western themes opens with pilot Hoban “Wash” Washburne (Alan Tudyk) speaking for his two toy dinosaurs in a playful (but very knowingly predictable) “imperialist versus savage” dialogue: “Yes . . . yes. This is a fertile land, and we will thrive. We will rule over all this land, and we will call it . . . This Land.” “I think we should call it your grave!” “Ah! Curse your sudden but inevitable betrayal!” The pivotal character on board the ship is River Tam, a brilliant teenage girl on the run from the Alliance. Mal unknowingly allows her on his ship (she is in cryogenic stasis), but soon takes an interest because the Alliance is tracking her. Mal, a former commander for the Browncoats who were on the losing side of the civil war, would do anything to undermine or just plain irritate the Alliance. Over the course of the series, River’s backstory unravels and her real nature is revealed to herself and to the viewer. Throughout the series, the viewer is told that River was tricked into attending a government school, where she was held captive and endured years of testing by the authoritarian Alliance to strip her amygdala in order to heighten her psychic powers. What is not revealed until the film Serenity is that these tests were intended to turn River into a weapon. 32 The Alliance took a human, commodified her, and turned her into a weapon controllable by computer code. River thus becomes a psychic cyborg weapon. She is unaware of this, however, and suffers from “paranoid schizophrenia,” according to her physician brother, Simon. Though River has a past, the first time we see her is in a cryogenic box. She is naked and in the fetal position and her “new birth” as a psychic cyborg takes place without father or mother in a spaceship on the frontiers of space. She is coveted by the Alliance for her qualities as a cyborg, not as a human. River and the Reavers, a group of animalistic scavengers who appear at inopportune moments throughout the series, are aligned not only through Hi-Ho, Cyborg! 115 alliteration but also through Cawelti’s theme of savage madness. Both are creations of the Alliance and have a different sense of embodiment (Reavers mutilate themselves and sew their victims’ skins into their clothing). River is initially unable to control her body, like the Reavers who “ain’t men—or they forgot how to be,” but through reconnecting with humans, she is able to create a new identity. It takes a long time for the Serenity crew to accept River. Even the affable mechanic Kaylee is skeptical of River because of her unexpected abilities: “Not nobody can shoot like that that’s a person.” In the series, River constantly questions her identity as a human while becoming aware of her cyborg capabilities. She asks Simon, “What am I?” (my emphasis) and states, “I hate the bits. The bits that stay down. And I work. I function like I’m a girl. I hate it because I know it’ll go away. The sun goes dark and chaos is come again. Bits. Fluid.” Due to her cyborg nature, River’s perception of embodiment is different from the rest of the crew and she is never bounded by her surroundings even as she acknowledges them. Even her name is in motion and is fluid. In the episode “Safe,” River “communes” with the cargo of cattle Mal intends to sell on one of the border planets. She says, “They weren’t cows inside. They were waiting to be, but they forgot. Now they see sky, and they remember what they are.” For her, borders and boundaries don’t exist except in the mind. In the episode “Bushwhacked,” she and Simon don spacesuits and cling to the outside of the ship Serenity while the Alliance searches for them within. Simon is terrified to look out to space, but River revels in the freedom of that openness. Her later assertion “Also . . . I can kill you with my brain” gives hired gun Jayne Cobb pause since even he can recognize she is more than just a girl. The episode “Objects in Space,” the series finale, particularly stresses River’s embodiment. It begins with the camera moving through the internal “organs” of the ship Serenity before focusing on the sleeping River, thus directly associating her with a mechanic/organic hybrid. This opening sequence concludes with River dream-walking through the ship and inhabiting the minds of the crew. She picks up a leafy stick lying on the floor and says, “It’s just an object. It doesn’t mean what you think”; but she wakes up to the crew shouting at her for holding a gun and pointing it around. What she perceived as organic in her dream state was actually machine. Mal asks if she understands how dangerous a gun is and River answers, speaking of herself in the third person, “She understands. She doesn’t comprehend,” raising a question of the significance of objects as they are perceived in current systems. Based on these equivocal associations, she makes what seem to be viable statements later in this episode when she hides from a bounty hunter and speaks through Serenity’s intercom, claiming to be “incorporeally possessing” the spaceship and that (speaking of herself in third person) “she melted. Melted away.” Because of the opening overtones, never 116 Sarah Banschbach for a moment does the viewer, or even the crew for that matter, doubt that River actually became the ship Serenity. By the time River is presented in the film Serenity, she has become a member of the crew and participates in jobs where her psychic sensibilities warn the crew of danger. However, her further abilities as weapon are suddenly discovered in a border planet bar when an Alliance code is broadcast over the entertainment system and River becomes a wild killing machine. Mal exclaims to Simon: “You had a gorram time bomb living with us! Who we gonna find in there when she wakes up? The girl, or the weapon?” Though River suffers the setback of discovering she is controllable by computer code, by the climax of the film Serenity she takes control in the standoff between the crew and the Reavers and single-handedly vanquishes the killers. She is only able to accomplish this heroic act by becoming, like the Western hero, analogous to the savage, yet she maintains personal integrity as she controls herself instead of being controlled by a computer. By showing this kind of power over and for her cyborg self, she proves she is capable of becoming the next pilot of a ship of space cowboys. River reworks the Western theme by showing the negative aspects of centralized power and expansion. Constant are the references to colonization and the moral failures of the Alliance to treat people as humans in their efforts to create “a better world.” The only place River can create her own identity is by staying on the frontier where, if not “meddled” with, she discovers the truth about herself and the moral component of her powers. By accepting her cyborg mind and appropriately interfacing it with her human body, River becomes her own source of power and helps bring about justice for the victims of the Alliance’s human experimentation on the planet Miranda. At the end of Serenity, it does not matter that River is a “ninety-pound girl”; what matters is how she resists categorical classification to the benefit of the crew. Hence River, in the blend of space and the West, takes on all aspects of “other” and “savage” by virtue of being female and yet cyborg and creates new, empowering possibilities of embodiment to create her own story free of stereotypes. To reiterate Haraway again, “Cyborg writing is about the power to survive, not on the basis of original innocence, but on the basis of seizing the tools to mark the world that marked them as other.” 33 Bruce Bethke notes in his article “Cut ’Em Off at the Horsehead Nebula!” that “only in the West was what you did of more immediate importance than where you came from.” 34 With the case of cyborgs in the Western genre, this is a crucial statement. Cyborgs do not have a past; what they do defines them. From Westworld to Serenity, there has been a vast change in perception of what cyborgs do. Cyborgs, then, find a place in the Western genre, but they resist the stereotypes of “savage” and “other” by refusing to close borders and be only one thing. Synthesis or compromise might be achieved, but never closure. Since the West is what Americans know of frontiers, the Western genre and expectations are applicable to the space frontier since “the frontier West is a place of rebirth, of shedding the constraints of the past and civilization and becoming American.” 35 Science fiction’s use of Western and frontier motifs allows Americans the nostalgia of the good ol’ days of American optimism and manliness but also asks readers or viewers to reconsider Manifest Destiny and reconsider history so that past mistakes are not repeated.36 Cyborgs ask us to reconsider the entitlement approach humans take toward organisms different from yet created by humans. These films show how cyborgs, and especially female cyborgs, are able to resist categories of genre and expectation to achieve a fusion of cybernetics and organicism to prevent frontiers of space, time, embodiment, and narrative from closing.

#### The role of the ballot is to endorse an ethic of relationality. What is the subject but an interaction with the Other? Only the 1AC’s cyborgian ethic can operate in the “interval between” subject and discourse that disrupts patriarchal signification.

For spec purposes:

* The pre/post-fiat distinction makes no sense, we’ve made a claim about the resolutions relations to shaping subjectivities
* The role of the ballot uplayers theory or at least controls the direction of what theory impacts matter
* Determining a winner is based off of the flow. We think that performance and debate are intertwined which means that separating the two makes no sense
* If you want anything else, ask in cross, we’ve done more than we should have to.

Toye 12. Margaret Toye (Associate Professor; Women and Gender Studies at Wilfred Laurier University), 2012, “Donna Haraway's Cyborg Touching (Up/On) Luce Irigaray's Ethics and the Interval Between: Poethics as Embodied Writing,” Hypatia, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41328904> sean!

Much of Irigaray's work passes under the radar as ethics because her ap- proach is foreign to those who understand ethics more traditionally as a focus on issues of "choice," "individual will," or "the good life." Even within more contemporary ethical discussions, it can be difficult to place her work, since the ethical turn that started in Anglo- American theory in the late 1980s includes very different discourses under the umbrella term "ethics." In order to make sense of these very different ethical discourses, I have mapped out how post- structuralist ethics has a seeming dual focus in terms of an ethics of the rela- tionship the self has with itself, and an ethics of the relationship the self has with the Other (Toye 1999). Irigaray's ethics plays an important role in decon- structing this seeming binary opposition, helping to reveal that poststructuralist ethics is actually about both. Irigaray's ethics foregrounds an ethics of "rela- tionality" between multiple selves and others. In her explicit ethical tome, An Ethics of Sexual Difference, Irigaray cites He- idegger, claiming that "each age has one issue to think through, and one only" (Irigaray 1993, 5). She names "sexual difference" as "probably the issue in our time which could be our 'salvation' if we thought it through" (5), arguing that we need a revolution in both thought and ethics, and that this revolution would involve rethinking space, time, and what she calls the "interval between" (7). While most critics focus on the specific naming of "sexual difference" as her most important concept, this element should be placed within a more gen- eral appeal for a "revolution in thought and ethics" to take place. It is through the specific rethinking of space, time, and the "interval between" that this rev- olution in thought and ethics will occur.9 Irigaray explains the implications of such a call, not only in terms of the rethinking of subjectivities but also with regard to relations between all selves and others: "We need to reinterpret ev- erything concerning relations between the subject and discourse, the subject and the cosmic, the microcosmic and the macrocosmic" (8). She sketches a list of subjects and ethical relations that need to be rethought in her declaration that "A new age signifies a different relation between: - man and god(s), - man and man, - man and world, - man and woman" (9). It is the emphasis on rethinking this intertwined tripartite of space, time, and the "interval between" that makes Irigaray's ethics an ethics of embodi- ment. Since male and female subjects have such different relationships to their bodies because of the opposing spatio-temporal relationships they have been accorded, a revolution in ethics must elaborate not one but two (or what Eliz- abeth Grosz constantly describes as "at least two") embodied ethics, based in these different bodies. A crucial and significant component of her work is her emphasis on both men and women needing to rethink their relationships both to their bodies and to transcendence; her concept of "the sensible transcen- dental" helps to reconceptualize both sides for both sexes. A conceptual revolution in space-time and its relationship to an embodied ethics is a large and broad endeavor; I noted in the introduction my desire to focus on the third item that Irigaray lists, that of the "interval between." Iriga- ray's ethics is based on what she has termed "between two," which is a subjectivity that is not about being but about becoming, and which is always becoming in relation. It is the "interval between" that mediates and determines the possibilities for an ethical relationship between these two subjects. As such, it gives us not just a relational ethics but also an ethics of mediation. As Mar- garet Whitford points out, "The between is a way of rethinking this space-time organization which detaches it from the spatio-temporality of the phallus" (Whitford 1991, 163). Irigaray underlines that within a phallocentric economy, this interval is embodied by the male morphological figure of the phallus, and therefore all relations between subjects are determined by the mediating economy determined by this reigning figure. Irigaray has provided multiple al- ternatives for thinking about this interval, and many of these figures are based instead in the female body, such as the two lips, placenta, and mucous. But she also has investigated other concepts such as the angel, wonder, love, and most recently yoga and the breath. This part of her philosophy can be difficult to negotiate because part of Irigaray's critique of phallogocentrism involves a de- sire not to repeat its way of thinking. Merely replacing the phallus with one of these other figures would be to participate in the phallogocentric economy of sameness and substitution. Instead, as Whitford has concisely described (Whitford 1991, 179), Irigaray thinks along the lines of metonymy, a trope that emphasizes difference, association, and contiguity, unlike its cousin, metaphor, a trope that emphasizes sameness, substitution, and similarity. Irigaray's revo- lution in ethics is therefore not only rooted in rethinking embodiment, but is also intimately tied to a revolution in aesthetics in terms of demanding a chal- lenging shift in understanding the world through an alternative economy of representation. That Irigaray's work is also fundamentally rooted in a feminist politics renders her revolution in ethics as one that includes a revolution that rethinks ethics, bodies, aesthetics, and politics together, or what I will discuss as upoethics." Irigaray also argues that we do not just need to generate alternate mediating figures to occupy the interval, but that the interval itself needs to be reconcep- tualized. This space of ethical mediation between subjects of the "interval between" has to be rethought along different spatio-temporal lines. Krzysztof Ziarek explains that the new economy Irigaray proposes is a radical economy of proximity: "a non-metaphysical economy of relating, predicated on the ethico- discursive notions of proximity and nearness" (Irigaray 2000, 151). The inter- val between the two subjects becomes both a space and not a space, in that to be in an ethical relationship is not to be in a one-plus-one relation, but instead, it is to enter into a whole other ontology, one of "between two." This concept, like so much of Irigaray's work, is a challenging one. Sometimes Irigaray stresses the space of distance that the "interval between" provides, which allows each entity, on either side of the relationship, to be a subject, with a space between them that prevents the reduction to the other's projections. At other times, Irigaray emphasizes the nearness in the concept. Critics struggle to make sense of this duality. Deutscher suggests that generally, the first stage of Irigaray's career is considered to be focused on "an ideal of being submerged in the other in a loss of boundaries between us" (Deutscher 2002, 81), whereas the second stage on the ethics of mediation stresses distance. However, Deutscher points out that a careful reading of Irigaray's earlier work reveals the presence of this "politics of mediation" as well, especially in terms of the mother/daughter re- lationship. Krzysztof Ziarek similarly argues: "proximity, mediation, and the interval is enacted as the trajectory of almost all of Irigaray's books and essays" (Ziarek 2000, 145). He suggests that instead of continuing to read Irigaray as a philosopher of difference, that we consider how much this concept provides us with "a new mode of thinking relation: one that would be attuned to nearness rather than difference, to the interval rather than opposites, and to the trans- formative opening rather than negation" (Ziarek 2000, 134). Donna Haraway Touches up/on Luce Irigaray's Interval Between10 In the introduction, I indicated that situating the cyborg within Irigaray's eth- ics might help us to theorize a particular feminist ethics of embodiment where the cyborg could be considered to be a crucial contemporary ethical figure that occupies what Irigaray describes as the "interval between" in our contemporary information age. As such, the cyborg is the figure that best describes what me- diates our relations to each other, to ourselves, and to our world in this context. I propose that we consider that the ethical subjectivity of the cyborg is this concept of the "between two" of the interval. In the "Cyborg Manifesto," Har- away indicates that the cyborg deconstructs troubling dualisms of self/other, mind/body, culture/nature, and so on, which are governed by the notion of a "One" that is autonomous, powerful, and godlike, but which is actually based in an illusion. Instead, she suggests a notion of subjectivity founded in other- ness, which is "to be multiple, without clear boundary, frayed, insubstantial" (Haraway 1991a, 177). She then introduces a compelling phrase to describe cyborg subjectivity: "One is too few, but two are too many" (177) - a phrase that recalls Irigaray's notion of female sexuality as both multiple and as that which is not yet represented in the title of her collection This Sex Which Is Not One (1985). I propose that we take this notion of a cyborgian subjectivity, where one is too few and two are too many, and transfer it over to Irigaray's discussion of ethics. Irigaray's ethics is based in a Levinasian notion of ethics as first philosophy, where before "being," there is the Other. There is never a solo subject, and therefore, one is too few, because subjectivity is created in rela- tionship - we cannot be without the other. For the same reason, there can never two completely individual self-contained subjects. Although Irigaray ar- gues that women as well as men need to establish their own subjectivities, she also stresses how they are nevertheless connected by the "interval between" as a conjoined entity, and therefore the concept of two completely self-contained subjects is "too many." A cyborgian ethics would explain the interconnected- ness, not only between other humans, but also between animals, the environment, and the tools that mediate our existence and relations with one another. Undoing the opposition between nature and culture, Haraway's cyborg stresses that we do not conceive of these tools as wholly other, but as a part of ourselves, and that we relate to them in terms of "proximity." We need to hold our tools close to us, but we also have to consider them from an appro- priate distance in order to see them for what they are. Our technologies have not appeared independently and out of nothing. We have always been in re- lationship to our tools, but this relationship has not always been foregrounded as such, nor has it always been conceived as a relationship "between two." In my discussion of the concept of "between two," I have stressed its spatial components. However, Irigaray's revolution in ethics is a temporal one as well. Ewa Ziarek explains that Irigaray deconstructs Hegel to create a disruptive temporality that is linked with the Imaginary, and this "inaugural temporality has to be linked with the becoming of the body" (Ziarek 1998, 61). For Ewa Ziarek, Irigaray's tropes that invoke the imaginary such as touch and the two lips "do not merely indicate the constitution of the female body beyond the scopic economy of the image . . . but, precisely, link embodiment with tempore ality." Ewa Ziarek indicates that what is read as the "porosity and fluidity of female embodiment," in terms of an "attribute of the sexed body," could be considered "as an effect of the temporal structure of becoming" (61).11

#### The 1AC performance ruptures the molar representations that overdetermine status quo ontologies – a focus on form and performance is necessary to understand the epistemological impact of speeches and the interzones of class, control, and violence.
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Haraway has arguably been the most influential of this group. In a leading text from this literature she famously stated, as the very last line in her groundbreaking 1985 essay “A Manifesto for Cyborgs” that she would rather be a cyborg than a goddess, favoring the postmodern technologized figure of techno-human over the reclamation of a racialized, matriarchal past, thus implicitly invoking this binary between intersectionality and assemblage (Haraway 1985). Several theorists have critiqued Haraway’s use of the trope of “woman of color” to denote a cyborg par excellence, including Chela Sandoval and Schueller (who has argued that women of color function as a prosthetic to the cyborg myth, which, as I point out earlier, is not unlike how WOC function in relation to intersectionality) (Sandoval 2000; Schueller 2005). Even though Haraway’s cyborgs are meant to undermine binaries—of humans and animals, of humans and machines, and of the organic and inorganic—a cyborg actually inhabits the intersection of body and technology. Dianne Currier writes: “In the construction of a cyborg, technologies are added to impact upon, and at some point intersect with a discrete, non-technological ‘body.’ . . . Thus, insofar as the hybrid cyborg is forged in the intermeshing of technology with a body, in a process of addition, it leaves largely intact those two categories—(human) body and technology—that preceded the conjunction.” Currier argues that despite intending otherwise, the theorization of cyborgs winds up unwittingly “reinscribing the cyborg into the binary logic of identity which Haraway hopes to circumvent” (Currier 2003, 323). Haraway does not actually approach a human/animal/machine nexus, though more recent theorizations of the nature/ culture divide, by Luciana Parisi for example, demarcate the biophysical, the biocultural, and the biodigital (Parisi 2004, 12). Still, the question of how the body is materialized, rather than what the body signifies, is the dominant one in this literature. “Assemblage” is actually an awkward translation of the French term agencement. The original term in Deleuze and Guattari’s work is not the French word assemblage, but agencement, a term that means design, layout, organization, arrangement, and relations—the focus being not on content but on relations, relations of patterns (Phillips 2006, 108). In agencement, as John Phillips explains, specific connections with other concepts is precisely what gives them their meaning. Concepts do not prescribe relations, nor do they exist prior to them; rather, relations of force, connection, resonance, and patterning give rise to concepts. As Phillips writes, the priority is neither to “the state of affairs [what one might call essence] nor the statement [enunciation or expression of that essence] but rather of their connection, which implies the production of a sense that exceeds them and of which, transformed, they now form parts” (ibid., 108). The French and English definitions of assemblage, however, both refer to a collection of things, a combination of items and the fact of assembling. The problematic that haunts this traversal from French theoretical production to U.S. academic usage is about the generative effects of this “mistranslation.” Phillips argues that the enunciation of agencement as assemblage might be “justified as a further event of agencement (assemblage) were it not for the tendency of discourses of knowledge to operate as statements about states of affairs” (ibid., 109). One productive way of approaching this continental impasse would be to ask not necessarily what assemblages are, but rather, what assemblages do. What does assemblage as a conceptual frame do, and what does their theoretical deployment as such do? What is a practice of agencement? For current purposes, assemblages are interesting because they de-privilege the human body as a discrete organic thing. As Haraway notes, the body does not end at the skin. We leave traces of our DNA everywhere we go, we live with other bodies within us, microbes and bacteria, we are enmeshed in forces, affects, energies, we are composites of information. Assemblages do not privilege bodies as human, nor as residing within a human animal/nonhuman animal binary. Along with a de-exceptionalizing of human bodies, multiple forms of matter can be bodies—bodies of water, cities, institutions, and so on. Matter is an actor. Following Karen Barad on her theory of performative metaphysics, matter is not a “thing” but a doing. In particular, Barad challenges dominant notions of performativity that operate through an implicit distinction between signification and that which is signified, stating that matter does not materialize through signification alone. Writes Barad: A performative understanding of discursive practices challenges the representationalist belief in the power of words to represent preexisting things. Performativity, properly construed, is not an invitation to turn everything (including material bodies) into words; on the contrary, performativity is precisely a contestation of the excessive power granted to language to determine what is real. Hence, in ironic contrast to the monism that takes language to be the stuff of reality, performativity is actually a contestation of the unexamined habits of mind that grant language and other forms of representation more power in determining our ontologies than they deserve (Barad 2003, 802).[10] Barad’s is a posthumanist framing that questions the boundaries between human and nonhuman, matter and discourse, and interrogates the practices through which these boundaries are constituted, stabilized, and destabilized. Signification is only one element of many that give a substance both meaning and capacity. In his book A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity, Manuel DeLanda undertakes the radical move to “make language last” (DeLanda 2006, 16). In this post-poststructuralist framing, essentialism, which is usually posited as the opposite of social constructionism, is now placed squarely within the realms of signification and language, what DeLanda and others have called “linguistic essentialism.” Karen Barad writes: “Language has been granted too much power. The linguistic turn, the semiotic turn, the interpretative turn, the cultural turn; it seems that at every turn lately every ‘thing’ is turned into language or some other form of cultural representation. . . . There is an important sense in which the only thing that does not seem to matter anymore is matter” (Barad 2003, 801). Categories—race, gender, sexuality—are considered events, actions, and encounters between bodies, rather than simply entities and attributes of subjects. Situated along a “vertical and horizontal axis,” assemblages come into existence within processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. In A Thousand Plateaus, Deleuze and Guattari problematize a model that produces a constant in order to establish its variations. Instead, they argue, assemblages foreground no constants but rather “variation to variation” and hence the event-ness of identity (Deleuze and Guattari 1987). DeLanda thus argues that race and gender are situated as attributes only within a study of “the pattern of recurring links, as well as the properties of those links” (DeLanda 2006, 56). Using the notion of assemblage (note the translation of agencement as “arrangement” here), Guattari elaborates the limits of “molar” categories such as class: Take the notion of class, or the class struggle. It implies that there are perfectly delimited sociological objects: bourgeoisie, proletariat, aristocracy. . . . But these entities become hazy in the many interzones, the intersections of the petite bourgeoisie, the aristocratic bourgeoisie, the aristocracy of the proletariat, the lumpenproletariat, the nonguaranteed elite. . . . The result: an indeterminacy that prevents the social field from being mapped out in a clear and distinct way, and which undermines militant practice. Now the notion of arrangement can be useful here, because it shows that social entities are not made up of bipolar oppositions. Complex arrangements place parameters like race, sex, age, nationality, etc., into relief. Interactive crossings imply other kinds of logic than that of two-by-two class oppositions. Importing this notion of arrangement to the social field isn’t just a gratuitous theoretical subtlety. But it might help to configure the situation, to come up with cartographies capable of identifying and eluding certain simplistic conceptions concerning class struggle. (Guattari 2009, 26)

#### Knowledge is not objective fact, but rather constructed by the ideology of capital – the 1AC interpellates the discourses of power, becoming aware of the relationship to the other. This is an epistemological question that must come prior – everything you think you know about power is necessarily imbricated in the social fabric we exist within

Huston 11. Adam Huston (M.A. philosophy & religion – California Institute of Integral Studies), April 4, 2011, “Donna Haraway Diffracted: Interpellation, the Philosophy of Science and Modest Witnessing,” <https://iamadam.org/2011/04/04/donna-haraway-diffracted-interpellation-the-philosophy-of-science-and-modest-witnessing/> sean!

Interpellation is an incredibly provocative concept. A theory flowing from Althusser through Haraway to me, it considers how, “ideology constitutes its subjects out of concrete individuals by hailing them…interpellation occurs when a subject, constituted in the very act, recognizes or misrecognizes itself in the address of a discourse.”[2] I claim I am experiencing interpellation all the time. I am constituted by my subject positions: white, male, heterosexual, middle class, Christian, able-bodied – even beautiful, from the US – even powerful, and thoroughly educated. Some of my subject positions speak louder than the others; some speak before I’ve spoken; I am bound by all them – called out, hailed: interpellated. And even those subject positions are marginal when compared to what they equal in mass – I am more than the sum of my parts, more than those fragmented subjectivities. I’ll return to the demographics of self in a moment because they do not suffice to explain the full creativity of Althusser’s theory. Interpellation isn’t only about excavating the subject for the subject’s sake but more so about understanding how ideology lives and functions for some worlds and not others. Contained within Haraway’s book, Modest\_Witness, is Althusser’s example of interpellation which is worth quoting in its entirety: Althusser used the example of the policemen calling out, “Hey, you!” If I turned my head, I am a subject in that discourse of law and order; and so I am subject to a powerful formation. How I mis/recognize myself – will I be harassed by a dangerous armed individual with the legal power to invade my person and my community; will I be reassured that the established disorder is in well-armed hands; will I be arrested for a crime I too acknowledge as a violation; or will I see an alert member of a democratic community doing rotating police work? – speaks volumes both about the unequal positioning of subjects in discourse and about different worlds that might have a chance to exist. Althusser’s example provides that unfamiliar orientation, where I discover I am not alone – the foundation of ethical relationality and of politics. I am shaped by the ‘other’ both historical forces and the multitude of bodies with whom I share space. Attentiveness to ideology as it functions through interpellation becomes a work of responsibility. It requires attentiveness to structures of history that constitute the present in order to change it – to push it towards compassion. Becoming ‘aware’ is only marginally about fulfilling the liberal white dream of self-actualization, where everyone is ‘human’ and accepted; where the individual subject becomes the object of value worthy of investment and ‘integration’. Becoming ‘aware’ practices empathizing with the multiple positions both the subject and the context can inhabit, growing familiar with the unequal knowledge/power configurations that allow some worlds to live and force others to convert or parish and the discovery that few voices count, few histories are written, indeed, even the objects to study are always already – interpellated. Interpellation functions powerfully within the discourses of demographics. Returning again to the example of my body: my body signifies utter privilege – a body of global secular dominance, I fit the ‘universal’ subject. My body is an ‘object’ which shows up to count, research, map, organize and market – I am/become use-value. Within the second Christian millennium becoming the sum of my parts means fulfilling the liberal political order without remainder or retribution, counter-memory or critical discourse. Plug me in with out remorse because I have no memory. I am the fulfillment of both genetics and human reason pursuing perfection – never-mind legacies of violence, grief and mourning… we have better medicine, mobile labor, global capital and DuPont: “Building Better Worlds through Science.” The political power of interpellation goes much deeper now. Wielding responsible action out of theoretical concepts such as interpellation has occupied a central position in post-colonial and subaltern theory for some time. The relationship between theory and practice is still birthing new forms of consciousness. For example, I am interpellated in more than the dominant demographics that social science has developed over the last few hundred years – becoming the sum of my parts is always, already more than the quantified and qualified demographics I fulfill. This body, this subject, is also interpellated out of deep history, deep time – one that spans not only the formations of life on Earth but also the composition of the cosmos. A subject of stars, my DNA binds me to a history of organic evolution and constitutes living consciousness. Much more recently in the course of biotic time an envelope of human powers developed to unify productivity and purpose across semiotic-material landscapes. The possibilities of using a creative concept such as ‘interpellation’ expand beyond enlightenment reason to include intuitive leaps that birth different realities. Thinking the play of erstwhile superstitious concepts such as magic and myth and cutting the edge of biological determinism with theories like morphic resonance,[3] new contributions are often added to the possibility of understanding links between theory and practice, freedom and responsibility, the human and the divine. It is vital to sail our imagination toward post-enlightenment reason, counter-narratives and contested knowledge. Becoming the ‘modest witness’ of my own subject position requires provocative theories like Althusser’s “interpellation.” In order to wield the creative power of such concepts they must be loosed from the confines of modern convention. The concept helps the thinker think ideology but even the concept itself is ‘interpellated’ out of a world where ideology is another interconnected signifier – unissued and passing. I am moving towards thinking institutional figures and body politics – its semiotic-material relationality amidst cities and subjectivies. But first, in pursuit of free space to play with the politics of interpellation – of figuration and modest witnessing – thinking must critique bounded ideas, explore zones that will buffer the resistance against thinking new thoughts. I hope other life formations have a chance to live. In the next section the myth of certainty will be exposed to marginal praise and necessary critique. A Buffer to the Tyranny of Certainty Knowledge is better when it is wise and humble – call me a philosopher! Entertaining the buffers and bumpers that provide zones where wisdom might stand at the side of technoscience might be the most important work of the century. The purpose is to expose the tyranny of certainty to scrutiny, to suggest ‘other’ readings are possible that might satisfy more dimensions of the inter-experience we share and to extend the survival of our planetary era. The science of certainty, like every other human phenomenon, underwent a process of unfolding – at first its historical links can be readily traced, but its history eventually refracts back into an endless spectrum of events that make it like all other entities – traceless.[4] Despite the evolution of empiricism, mathematics, experimentation, and the secular liberal rationality, the Western culture of the past 500 years has been preoccupied by the most powerfully functioning myth ever formulated.[5] It colors interpretation while at the same time functions to suppress critical reflection. Indeed, Thomas Kuhn, goes to great lengths in demonstrating how scientific paradigms develop and shift. The whole of his work on the subject: The Structures of Scientific Revolutions, makes clear the point that, …historians (of science) confront growing difficulties in distinguishing the ‘scientific’ component of past observation and belief from what their predecessors had readily labeled ‘error’ and ‘superstition.’ The more carefully they study, say, Aristotelian dynamics, phlogistic chemistry, or caloric thermodynamics, the more certain they feel that those once current views of nature were, as a whole, neither less scientific nor more the product of human idiosyncrasy than those current today. If these out-of-date beliefs are to be called myths, then myths can be produced by the same sorts of methods and held for the same sorts of reasons that now lead to scientific knowledge.[6] Spirits do speak. It is important to recognize that the ‘authority’ given to ‘scientific rigor’ participates in the same mythical consciousness as did the ‘authority’ of 13th century theologians in Medieval Europe or the ‘authority’ of the primordial mythological sensibility captured in the epic Homeric poems the Iliad and Odyssey.[7] The technoscience mode of consciousness has become the most powerful mythos in our planetary era. Presently, technoscience is producing knowledge and machinery whose authority is practically non-negotiable. The confidence of technoscience culture to reach the heavens, secure labor and resources, improve health and speed, even fulfill moral imperatives provides this age with radical optimism in the future. Myths are both magnetic and magnificent; they occupy a space of religification and evangelization, where to be in critical relationship to scientific principles constitutes a position close to blasphemy. It is an understatement to remind the reader that the age of enlightenment was finished with modesty. Still, it is important, if not to worship, to make sure praise is given where praise is due. The Enlightenment – its power and success – is impressive. It was true that through rigor, experimentation, and the willingness to refine knowledge through mutual confirmation that our species could build foundations – knowledge/power would grow and yield great fruit through hard work. The heights of human engineering still climb and inspire. In an era that has brought a global awareness to humanity for the first time, when the planet Earth with all its inhabitants can be seen in its entirety in cosmic space as the single celestial body that it is, and when the universe has been revealed as a creative vastness expanding through millions of galaxies and billions of years of cosmic evolution from the big bang to the present, the collective consciousness now emerging recognizes as was never before possible that all participate in a single enormous history. At the same time, that history, for humanity and the Earth community, has reached a stage of rapidly deepening crisis and peril.[8] The blatant reification of mathematics, statistics, reductionism, and quantitative measurement has lead to the abstraction of a particular world torn away from the full presentational expression of concrete reality – of daily experience. “Such an abstraction arises from the growth of selective emphasis. It endows human life with three gifts, namely, an approach to accuracy, a sense of the qualitative differentiation of external activities, a neglect of essential connections.”[9] As technoscience increases its power, it looses sight of the results of its actions in a world of relationality. This mode of relation facilitates action that insists upon a ‘progress’ without ever considering that which is sacrificed for the progress; in the obsession with growth/addition/development a whole culture has lost the critical ability to subtract the difference that is annihilated in pursuit of ‘additive’ change. Let my critique not hinder the potential of future discovery, but be a modest witness that calls forth memories of compassion, injections of wisdom, and insists that it was only a recent discovery that all endeavors toward knowledge were and still are bound to the pursuit of wealth and the access to material and markets – thank you Karl Marx! In an implicated and globally dependent world the (contested) innocence science once operated within has eroded. Capitalism and its military-industrial growth complex do produce some worlds and not others. The growth of any significant power adheres toward arcs of increase and decrease – the science and certainty of our age is no exception. I am suggesting that only a serious relationship with humility and wisdom – calling forth the divine Sophia – will offer cause for hope against an increasingly mounting systemic crisis. Falling just short of claiming divine feminine status in this essay, Donna Haraway’s voice is a comforting, correcting presence that joins forces with another feminist philosopher’s of science, Sandra Harding, to rethink potential trajectories of technoscience. Harding, via Haraway’s book Modest\_Witness, insists on arguing for what she calls “strong objectivity” to replace and refine the standards that show up legitimating some facts and not others in the domain of scientific knowledge. By “strong objectivity” Harding is insisting that science admit that culture (ideology) plays as large a roll in shaping scientific research as determining ‘fact’ and methods; That “a stronger, more adequate notion of objectivity would require methods for systematically examining all of the social values shaping a particular research process…”[10] Haraway supports Harding’s claims that critical reflexivity must be a part of the continuing practice of science. Building buffer zones, where science meets its limits and Lady Wisdom has the opportunity to have a voice is a difficult matter. ‘Objectivity’ must finally admit that its existence is bound to relationality. As Bruno Latour goes to great lengths to remind us in his work, Science in Action – that the construction of facts is a collective process; that all knowledge must be witnessed or it passes into the void; infused with Haraway’s rigor we go further to insist that issues of race, class, gender, sex, nationality, religion – in short – culture – that culture shapes technoscience. Attempting to fuse practices of democracy and relationship to situated knowledges – cultures of value – redefines the possibilities of technoscience while at the same time admitting that, “Nothing comes without its world…”[11]

#### In an era of mass extinction, we risk losing touch with the world – the 1AC’s cyborg embraces an ethic of staying with the world that necessitates kinship and a fundamental understanding of our relationalities

Haraway 16. Donna Haraway (Donna J. Haraway is an American Professor Emerita in the History of Consciousness Department and Feminist Studies Department at the University of California, Santa Cruz, United States. She’s written tons of cool stuff), 2016, “Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Cthulucene,” Duke University Press, I have the pdf, sean!

It matters what thoughts think thoughts. It matters what knowledges know knowledges. It matters what relations relate relations. It matters what worlds world worlds. It matters what stories tell stories. Paintings by Baila Goldenthal are eloquent testimony to this mattering.17 What is it to surrender the capacity to think? These times called the Anthropocene are times of multispecies, including human, urgency: of great mass death and extinction; of onrushing disasters, whose unpredictable specificities are foolishly taken as unknowability itself; of refusing to know and to cultivate the capacity of response-ability; of refusing to be present in and to onrushing catastrophe in time; of unprecedented looking away. Surely, to say “unprecedented” in view of the realities of the last centuries is to say something almost unimaginable. How can we think in times of urgencies without the self-indulgent and self-fulfilling myths of apocalypse, when every fiber of our being is interlaced, even complicit, in the webs of processes that must somehow be engaged and repatterned? Recursively, whether we asked for it or not, the pattern is in our hands. The answer to the trust of the held-out hand: think we must. Instructed by Valerie Hartouni, I turn to Hannah Arendt’s analysis of the Nazi war criminal Adolf Eichmann’s inability to think. In that surrender of thinking lay the “banality of evil” of the particular sort that could make the disaster of the Anthropocene, with its ramped-up genocides and speciescides, come true.18 This outcome is still at stake; think we must; we must think! In Hartouni’s reading, Arendt insisted that thought was profoundly different from what we might call disciplinary knowledge or science rooted in evidence, or the sorting of truth and belief or fact and opinion or good and bad. Thinking, in Arendt’s sense, is not a process for evaluating information and argument, for being right or wrong, for judging oneself or others to be in truth or error. All of that is important, but not what Arendt had to say about the evil of thoughtlessness that I want to bring into the question of the geohistorical conjuncture being called the Anthropocene. Arendt witnessed in Eichmann not an incomprehensible monster, but something much more terrifying—she saw commonplace thoughtlessness. That is, here was a human being unable to make present to himself what was absent, what was not himself, what the world in its sheer notone-selfness is and what claims-to-be inhere in not-oneself. Here was someone who could not be a wayfarer, could not entangle, could not track the lines of living and dying, could not cultivate response-ability, could not make present to itself what it is doing, could not live in consequences or with consequence, could not compost. Function mattered, duty mattered, but the world did not matter for Eichmann. The world does not matter in ordinary thoughtlessness. The hollowed-out spaces are all filled with assessing information, determining friends and enemies, and doing busy jobs; negativity, the hollowing out of such positivity, is missed, an astonishing abandonment of thinking.19 This quality was not an emotional lack, a lack of compassion, although surely that was true of Eichmann, but a deeper surrender to what I would call immateriality, inconsequentiality, or, in Arendt’s and also my idiom, thoughtlessness. Eichmann was astralized right out of the muddle of thinking into the practice of business as usual no matter what. There was no way the world could become for Eichmann and his heirs—us?—a “matter of care.”20 The result was active participation in genocide. The anthropologist, feminist, cultural theorist, storyteller, and connoisseur of the tissues of heterogeneous capitalism, globalism, traveling worlds, and local places Anna Tsing examines the “arts of living on a damaged planet,”21 or, in the subtitle of her book, “the possibility of life in Capitalist ruins.” She performs thinking of a kind that must be cultivated in the all-too-ordinary urgencies of onrushing multispecies extinctions, genocides, immiserations, and exterminations. I name these things urgencies rather than emergencies because the latter word connotes something approaching apocalypse and its mythologies. Urgencies have other temporalities, and these times are ours. These are the times we must think; these are the times of urgencies that need stories. Following matsutake mushrooms in their fulminating assemblages of Japanese, Americans, Chinese, Koreans, Hmong, Lao, Mexicans, fungal spores and mats, oak and pine trees, mycorrhizal symbioses, pickers, buyers, shippers, restaurateurs, diners, businessmen, scientists, foresters, dna sequencers and their changing species, and much more, Tsing practices sympoietics in edgy times. Refusing either to look away or to reduce the earth’s urgency to an abstract system of causative destruction, such as a Human Species Act or undifferentiated Capitalism, Tsing argues that precarity—failure of the lying promises of Modern Progress— characterizes the lives and deaths of all terran critters in these times. She looks for the eruptions of unexpected liveliness and the contaminated and nondeterministic, unfinished, ongoing practices of living in the ruins. She performs the force of stories; she shows in the flesh how it matters which stories tell stories as a practice of caring and thinking. “If a rush of troubled stories is the best way to tell contaminated diversity, then it’s time to make that rush part of our knowledge practices . . . Matsutake’s willingness to emerge in blasted landscapes allows us to explore the ruins that have become our collective home. To follow matsutake guides us to possibilities of coexistence within environmental disturbance. This is not an excuse for further human damage. Still, matsutake show one kind of collaborative survival.”

#### Outer Space definition

DoC 16 [Department of Commerce; February 22, 2016; National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, “Where is Space?”, <https://www.nesdis.noaa.gov/news/where-space>] brett

But where is “space” exactly? This may seem like a simple question, but any answer beyond “up” may be more complicated than you think. Although most people are generally in agreement that space begins when Earth’s atmosphere ends— where exactly that is depends on who you ask.

International law states that outer space shall be free for exploration and use by all, but there is no definitive law stating where national air space actually ends and outer space begins. This leaves the door open for a variety of interpretations.

A common definition of space is known as the Kármán Line, an imaginary boundary 100 kilometers (62 miles) above mean sea level. In theory, once this 100 km line is crossed, the atmosphere becomes too thin to provide enough lift for conventional aircraft to maintain flight. At this altitude, a conventional plane would need to reach orbital velocity or risk falling back to Earth.

The world governing body for aeronautic and astronautic records, the Fédération Aéronautique Internationale (FAI), and many other organizations use the Kármán Line as a way of determining when space flight has been achieved.