### 1

#### Academia de-fangs their radicalism—they preach to the choir and maintain interpassivity

Occupied UC Berkeley 9 (The Necrosocial: Civic Life, Social Death, and the UC; http://anticapitalprojects.wordpress.com/2009/11/19/the-necrosocial/, 11/19 //shree)

He and his look forward to a reproduction of the logic of representative governance, the release valve of the university plunges us into an abyss where ideas are wisps of ether—that is, meaning is ripped from action.  Let’s talk about the fight endlessly, but always only in their managed form: to perpetually deliberate, the endless fleshing-out-of—when we push the boundaries of this form they are quick to reconfigure themselves to contain us: the chancellor’s congratulations, the reopening of the libraries, the managed general assembly—there is no fight against the administration here, only its own extension. Each day passes in this way, the administration on the look out to shape student discourse—it happens without pause, we don’t notice nor do we care to. It becomes banal, thoughtless.  So much so that we see we are accumulating days: one semester, two, how close to being this or that, how far?  This accumulation is our shared history.  This accumulation—every once in a while interrupted, violated by a riot, a wild protest, unforgettable fucking, the overwhelming joy of love, life shattering heartbreak—is a muted, but desirous life.  A dead but restless and desirous life. The university steals and homogenizes our time yes, our bank accounts also, but it also steals and homogenizes meaning.  As much as capital is invested in building a killing apparatus abroad, an incarceration apparatus in California, it is equally invested here in an apparatus for managing social death.  Social death is, of course, simply the power source, the generator, of civic life with its talk of reform, responsibility, unity.  A ‘life,’ then, which serves merely as the public relations mechanism for death: its garrulous slogans of freedom and democracy designed to obscure the shit and decay in which our feet are planted. Yes, the university is a graveyard, but it is also a factory: a factory of meaning which produces civic life and at the same time produces social death.  A factory which produces the illusion that meaning and reality can be separated; which everywhere reproduces the empty reactionary behavior of students based on the values of life (identity), liberty (electoral politics), and happiness (private property).  Everywhere the same whimsical ideas of the future. Everywhere democracy. Everywhere discourse to shape our desires and distress in a way acceptable to the electoral state, discourse designed to make our very moments here together into a set of legible and fruitless demands. Totally managed death. A machine for administering death, for the proliferation of technologies of death. As elsewhere, things rule. Dead objects rule. In this sense, it matters little what face one puts on the university—whether Yudof or some other lackey. These are merely the personifications of the rule of the dead, the pools of investments, the buildings, the flows of materials into and out of the physical space of the university—each one the product of some exploitation—which seek to absorb more of our work, more tuition, more energy. The university is a machine which wants to grow, to accumulate, to expand, to absorb more and more of the living into its peculiar and perverse machinery: high-tech research centers, new stadiums and office complexes. And at this critical juncture the only way it can continue to grow is by more intense exploitation, higher tuition, austerity measures for the departments that fail to pass the test of ‘relevancy.’ But the ‘irrelevant’ departments also have their place.  With their ‘pure’ motives of knowledge for its own sake, they perpetuate the blind inertia of meaning ostensibly detached from its social context.  As the university cultivates its cozy relationship with capital, war and power, these discourses and research programs play their own role, co-opting and containing radical potential.  And so we attend lecture after lecture about how ‘discourse’ produces ‘subjects,’ ignoring the most obvious fact that we ourselves are produced by this discourse about discourse which leaves us believing that it is only words which matter, words about words which matter.  The university gladly permits the precautionary lectures on biopower; on the production of race and gender; on the reification and the fetishization of commodities.  A taste of the poison serves well to inoculate us against any confrontational radicalism.  And all the while power weaves the invisible nets which contain and neutralize all thought and action, that bind revolution inside books, lecture halls.

#### Policy debate turns the discussion to train us to see world in a backdrop for capitalist extraction all under the guise of saving the environment while homogenizing the rest of the world into the logic that we all have to save it – that presupposition that the Earth is ours to save mirrors the logic of the political economy wherein nature is always-already condemned to its intelligibility as an extractable value – the 1AC is a Bezos, Musk, and Branson fever dream not one of sustainability for sustainability but sustainability for profitability

Wallis, ’20 (Jason James Wallis, “The Holocene Simulacrum,” 10-27-2020, Educational Philosophy and Theory, GS)

A central argument of Jean Baudrillard’s The Mirror of Production (1975) pertains to how nature becomes subsumed under the model of political economy. Baudrillard argues that the event of nature’s reformatting can be traced to the 18th century wherein it becomes remade as a sign of production and value. In characteristically unpopular fashion, Baudrillard (1975) criticizes the revolutionary imaginary of Marxism for its complicity in this reformatting. As Baudrillard (1975) argues, Marx’s analysis of political economy produces the ‘rediscovery’ of nature within ‘all-too human’ relations of power. Baudrillard asserts that the model of production that Marx advances in his analysis of political economy begins by presupposing nature as value, and following, articulates in human labour processes for the extraction of such value. Baudrillard argues that Marx founds the idea of nature in dialectical relation to human labor and productivity, therein casting the pairing into permanent if unequal relation. Marx’s binding of nature to value and the dialectical liberation of value qua labour commits, Baudrillard claims, to the same teleological conquest of nature that his revolutionary thought attempts to critique (Poster, 1975). For Baudrillard, Marx’s conceptualization of nature as the dialectical counterpart to human labor constitutes an indictment against nature that ultimately perpetuates its disappearance under the sign of human productivity (Poster, 1975). Annexed into productivity, nature no longer constitutes a varied metaphysical or cosmological referent for the becoming of human life, but is reconceptualized as the passive material for human labor and significance. Throughout the 18th century, Baudrillard argues, nature is first ‘rediscovered’ then ‘liberated’ into the mirror of production, where it is made to work, amongst other things, as a raw “potentiality of powers, as a primordial source of life… as a deed projected into an a temporal past and an ideal future” (Baudrillard, 1975, p. 53). Where nature once constituted a morphologically rich universe of reference, its rediscovery within systems of production resign its significance to the ambit of man (Baudrillard, 2017). The profound consequences of such takeover are emblematic of the so-called Anthropocene era as it constitutes an index of the world’s presumed ‘givenness’ to human interest and design (see Jagodzinski, 2018). The fate of things Baudrillard’s speculation on the transformation of nature from its status as a reciprocal metaphysical referent to its ‘liberation’ into systems of production underwrites contemporary conceptualizations of environmental education and sustainability. Prominent amongst the issues that Baudrillard raises for thinking about environmental education is the idea that nature has been fundamentally reformatted under all-too-human models of productivity and labour. As Poster (1975) argues, the general problematic that Baudrillard evokes pertains to the investment of things with value in the first instance, and following, the obliteration of difference that extends from such reformatting (p. 5). It is an effect of nature’s reformatting that it collapses with what Baudrillard (2017) dubs the fourth phase of the simulacrum, where nature becomes wholly ‘disappeared’ into representation1 . Such a mutation is perpetrated throughout the field of education for sustainable development (ESD), wherein nature is neither ‘in itself’ or withdrawn from the ambit of man, but rendered meaningful ‘for us’ (Thacker, 2011). Nature continues to exist but through its horrific reimagining as a culture nature, reflected today in the engineering of the planet for the benefit of a minority of humans. Baudrillard’s critique of nature’s annexation into human significance concomitantly functions as a diagnosis of nature’s passage into simulation, where we scarcely encounter the transversal power of nature having now passed into human orders of relations and recognition. As Baudrillard conjectures in Fatal Strategies (1975), the fate of ‘things’ is today hinged to the unquestioned reference point of production and labour, where the object (i.e. the object that nature has become) is rallied to the ‘side of man’ (Baudrillard, 1975; Poster, 1975). The disappearance of nature into anthropic value, or that process Thacker (2015) dubs “anthropic subversion”, fulminates its simulation, herein according to the genetic idea of anthropocentrism and its expression in models of productivity that legitimate the operant control and exploitation of nature now commonplace at a planetary level. The relation of man’s teleology to the control and exploitation of nature occurs by way of production’s primacy as a central means of man’s self-comprehension, reifying in this way the image of production and its naturalization within capitalist political economy. Sustaining a human-centered world Baudrillard’s critique of nature’s annexation under the sign of value and productivity directly problematizes a number of scholarly developments in the field of education for sustainable development (ESD). While numerous scholars working in the field of ESD have remarked on the diversity of its definition and praxis, ESD inheres a litany of conceptual and theoretical commitments by which the image of a sustainable future is constrained. As a central preoccupation, ESD assumes that the rapidly transforming conditions of planetary life well established in climate science research might be reversed by revisioning schools and curricula as a fulcrum for the transformation of mental, social and planetary ecologies. However, the conditions upon which such change is envisioned remain in many instantiations of ESD entrenched within the model of productivity that Baudrillard (1975) symptomizes as a catalyst of our ecocidal present. For as a foundational presupposition, ESD presumes that the present course of climatological change and planetary exploitation can be averted through educational productivity. The model of cognitive labour that today dominates the landscape of teaching and learning is redoubled in ESD, which often purports as the telos of such cognitive productivity the salvation of a human-centered world. The presumption that nature’s meaning correlates to its meaning ‘for us’ is challenged in the environmental scholarship of Helen Kopnina (2014), who argues that ESD remains fundamentally entwined with “anthropocentric interests” that everywhere “overshadow” environmental issues (p. 74). In Revisiting ESD: Examining Anthropocentric Bias, Kopnina asserts that while a preponderance of literature in the field of ESD lauds “multiple perspectives and dialogue” on environmental issues, such perspectives remain dominated by an anthropocentric worldview that ultimately subverts ecocentric orientations to environmental challenges (p. 74). The very consideration of environmental issues in ESD are automatically routed through social and economic vantages that remit the significance of the environment to its value according to the metrics of human growth and progress (p. 77). The democratic empowerment sought by ESD’s advocacy for “multiple perspectives” is herein undercut by the very conceptualization of democracy within ESD as it fundamentally pertains to the democratic empowerment of a single species and the paradoxical disappearance of more-than-human or eco-centric realisms that insist at the heart of our most pressing ecological challenges. Sustaining life ‘as we know it’ The presupposition that planetary change might be catalyzed through the productive capacities of human labour draws from the same logic of exploitation that Baudrillard locates at the crux of political economy. Within the mirror of cognitive production that ESD correlates to its program of forging sustainable futures, nature becomes as it supposedly was in the revolutionary program of Marx- a passive material from which human labour extracts its value. The pedagogical applications of ESD demonstrate again the submission of nature within models of productivity in that a fundamental presupposition of ESD entails the unexamined correlation of human cognitive labour with the recuperation of planetary systems and conditions that suit best the continuation of life ‘as we know it’. To echo Kopnina (2014), a founding issue of ESD pertains to its image of harmonization in which human and environmental needs are somehow ‘magically’ equilibrated. This ideation, Kopnina assets, severely underestimates both the impact of economic and social development on the environment as well as advancing an improbable scenario in which ecosystem health might be harmoniously balanced with economic growth. A growing body of climatological research has actively resisted such images of equilibrium. As Richard Heinberg (2018) asserts in contrast to the “cheery” image of the future advanced by Breakthrough Institute co-founder Ted Nordhaus, the presumption of balancing economic and social progress with ecological health fails to recognize the affordances of planetary carrying capacity that by many accounts we have already exceeded. ESD’s presupposition that the ecocidal trajectories of planetary becoming might be circumvented through political economy reifies the status of nature as a value to be extracted or usevalue for the application of cognitive labour. That is, the eco-catastrophic realities of planetary transformation become in ESD the positive condition for educational productivity and activity. Captured in the mirror of productivity, nature is made intelligible, but as a thing to save. Critical of this salvationist protagonism, Snaza (2018) argues that the implicate presupposition that the earth is ‘ours’ to save is emblematic of the anthropocentric presupposition underpinning education, and perhaps by extension, educational considerations of environmental sustainability. Malone (2018) similarly conjectures that the contemporary moment is one prefigured by the dominion of nature, mastery of the biosphere, and investment in “God-like” technocratic solutions each corollary to the anthropocentric presupposition of the world’s ‘givenness’ to us. Signifying the ‘givenness’ of the planet ‘for us’, the presupposition that the Earth is ours to save mirrors the logic of political economy wherein nature is always-already condemned to its intelligibility as an extractable value. Here, an unexamined presupposition of ESD entails a failure to understand how the prevailing codes of education that ESD mobilizes as a vehicle for environmental change and conscientization are already entrenched within a genetic model of productivity and restlessness commensurate with the logic of capitalism (Larsen, 2010).

**Power demands legality – the 1AC accepts Western common law’s understanding of itself – one in which power is willed into existence through faith. Their ideals crystallize the authority power requires to function.**

**Comaroff and Comaroff 07.** John Comaroff, Professor of African and African American Studies and of Anthropology, Oppenheimer Fellow in African Studies at at Harvard, and Jean Comaroff, Professor of African and African American Studies and of Anthropology, Oppenheimer Fellow in African Studies also at Harvard, “Law and disorder in the postcolony,” Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale (2007) 15, pg. 144

Nor is it just the politics of the present that are being judicialised. As we said earlier, **the past**, too, **is being fought out in the courts**. Britain, for example, is currently being sued for acts of atrocity in its African empire (Anderson 2005; Elkins 2005): for having killed local leaders, unlawfully alienated territory from one African people to another, and so on.33 **By these means is colonialism itself rendered criminal**. **Hauled before a judge, history is made to submit to the scales of justice at the behest of those who suffered it**. And to be reduced to a cash equivalent, payable as the official tender of damage, dispossession, loss, trauma. **What imperialism is being indicted for**, above all, **is its commission of lawfare**: **the use of its own penal codes, its administrative procedures, its states of emergency, its charters and mandates and warrants, to discipline its subjects by means of violence made legible and legal by its own sovereign word**. Also, to commit its own ever-so-civilised forms of kleptocracy. Lawfare – the resort to legal instruments, to the violence inherent in the law, to commit acts of political coercion, even erasure (Comaroff 2001) – is equally marked in postcolonies. **As a species of political displacement, it becomes most visible when those who ‘serve’ the state conjure with legalities to act against its citizens**. Most infamous recently is Zimbabwe, where the Mugabe regime has consistently passed laws to justify the coercive silencing of its critics. Operation Murambatsvina, ‘Drive Out Trash’, which has forced political opponents out of urban areas under the banner of ‘slum clearance’ – has recently taken this practice to unprecedented depths. Murambatsvina, says the government, is merely an application of the law of the land to raze dangerous ‘illegal structures’. **Lawfare may be limited or it may reduce people to ‘bare life’**; in Zimbabwe, **it has mutated into a necropolitics with a rising body count**. But **it always seeks to launder visceral power in a wash of legitimacy as it is deployed to strengthen the sinews of state or enlarge the capillaries of capital**. Hence Benjamin’s (1978) thesis that **the law originates in violence and lives by violent means**; that **the legal and the lethal animate one another.** Of course, in 1919 Benjamin could not have envisaged the possibility that lawfare might also be a weapon of the weak, turning authority back on itself by commissioning courts to make claims for resources, recognition, voice, integrity, sovereignty. But this still does not lay to rest the key questions: **Why the fetishism of legalities? What are its implications for the play of Law and Dis/order in the postcolony? And are postcolonies different in this respect from other nation-states?** The answer to the first question looks obvious. **The turn to law would seem to arise directly out of growing anxieties about lawlessness**. But **this does not explain the displacement of the political into the legal or the turn to the courts to resolve an ever greater range of wrongs**. **The fetishism**, in short, runs deeper than purely a concern with crime. It **has to do with the very constitution of the postcolonial polity**. Late modernist **nationhood**, it appears, **is undergoing an epochal move away from the ideal of cultural homogeneity**: **a nervous, often xenophobic shift toward heterogeneity** (Anderson 1983). The rise of neoliberalism – with its impact on population flows, on the dispersion of cultural practices, on geographies of production and accumulation – has heightened this, especially in former colonies, which were erected from the first on difference. And difference begets more law. Why? Because, **with growing heterodoxy, legal instruments appear to offer a means of commensuration** (Comaroff and Comaroff 2000): **a repertoire of standardised terms and practices that permit the negotiation of values, beliefs, ideals and interests across otherwise intransitive lines of cleavage**. **Hence the flight into a constitutionalism that explicitly embraces heterogeneity in highly individualistic, universalistic Bills of Rights, even where states are paying less and less of the bills. Hence the effort to make human rights into an ever more global, ever more authoritative discourse.** But there is something else at work too. A well-recognised corollary of the neoliberal turn, recall, has been the outsourcing by states of many of the conventional operations of governance, including those, like health services, policing and the conduct of war, integral to the management of life itself. **Bureaucracies do retain some of their old functions**, of course. **But most 21st century governments have reduced their administrative reach, entrusting ever more to the market and delegating ever more responsibility to citizens as individuals, as volunteers, as classes of actor, social or legal**. Under these conditions, **especially where the threat of disorder seems immanent, civil law presents itself as a more or less effective weapon of the weak, the strong and everyone in between**. **Which**, in turn, **exacerbates the resort to lawfare**. **The court has become a utopic site to which human agency may turn for a medium in which to pursue its ends.** This, once again, is particularly so in postcolonies, where bureaucracies and bourgeoisies were not elaborate to begin with; and in which heterogeneity had to be negotiated from the start. Put all this together and **the fetishism of the law seems over-determined**. **Not only is public life becoming more legalistic, but so, in regulating their own affairs and in dealing with others, are ‘communities’ within the nation-state**: **cultural communities, religious communities, corporate communities, residential communities, communities of interest, even outlaw communities**. **Everything, it seems,** **exists here in the shadow of the law**. Which also makes it unsurprising that a ‘culture of legality’ should saturate not just civil order but also its criminal undersides. Take another example from South Africa, where organised crime appropriates, re-commissions and counterfeits the means and ends of both the state and the market. The gangs on the Cape Flats in Cape Town mimic the business world, having become a lumpen stand-in for those excluded from the national economy (Standing 2003). For their tax-paying clients, those gangs take on the positive functions of government, not least security provision. Illicit corporations of this sort across the postcolonial world often have shadow judicial personnel and convene courts to try offenders against the persons, property and social order over which they exert sovereignty. They also provide the policing that the state either has stopped supplying or has outsourced to the private sector. Some have constitutions. A few are even structured as franchises and, significantly, are said to offer ‘alternative citizenship’ to their members.35 Charles Tilly (1985) once suggested, famously, that modern states operate much like organised crime. These days, organised crime is operating ever more like states. Self-evidently, **the counterfeiting of a culture of legality by the criminal underworld feeds the dialectic of law and disorder**. **After all, once government outsources its policing services and franchises force, and once outlaw organisations shadow the state by providing protection and dispensing justice, social order itself becomes like a hall of mirrors**. What is more, **this dialectic has its own geography. A geography of discontinuous, overlapping sovereignties**. We said a moment ago that **communities of all kinds have become ever more legalistic in regulating their affairs; it is often in the process of so doing**, in fact, that **they become communities at all**, the act of judicialisation being also an act of objectification. **Herein lies their will to sovereignty, which we take to connote the exercise of autonomous control over the lives, deaths and conditions of existence of those who fall within its purview – and the extension over them of the jurisdiction of some kind of law**. ‘**Lawmaking’**, to cite Benjamin (1978: 295) yet again, **‘is power making**.’ But ‘**power is the principal of all lawmaking’**. In sum, **to transform itself into sovereign authority, power demands an architecture of legalities. Or their simulacra**.

#### Nuclear war is an outdated fear – nuclear spread is either impossible or is already everywhere

Baudrillard 95. Jean Baudrillard, Simulacra and Simulation: The Precession of Simulacra, pg. 37-40

The simultaneity of two events in the month of July 1975 illustrated this in a striking manner: the linkup in space of the two American and Soviet supersatellites, apotheosis of peaceful coexistence - the suppression by the Chinese of ideogrammatic writing and conversion to the Roman alphabet. The latter signifies the "orbital" instantiation of an abstract and modelized system of signs, into whose orbit all the once unique forms of style and writing will be reabsorbed. The satellization of language: the means for the Chinese to enter the system of peaceful coexistence, which is inscribed in their heavens at precisely the same time by the linkup of the two satellites. Orbital flight of the Big Two, neutralization and homogenization of everyone else on earth. Yet, despite this deterrence by the orbital power - the nuclear or molecular code - events continue at ground level, misfortunes are even more numerous, given the global process of the contiguity and simultaneity of data. But, subtly, they no longer have any meaning, they are no longer anything but the duplex effect of simulation at the summit. The best example can only be that of the war in Vietnam, because it took place at the intersection of a maximum historical and "revolutionary" stake, and of the installation of this deterrent authority. What meaning did this war have, and wasn't its unfolding a means of sealing the end of history in the decisive and culminating historic event of our era? Why did this war, so hard, so long, so ferocious, vanish from one day to the next as if by magic? Why did this American defeat (the largest reversal in the history of the USA) have no internal repercussions in America? If it had really signified the failure of the planetary strategy of the United States, it would necessarily have completely disrupted its internal balance and the American political system. Nothing of the sort occurred. Something else, then, took place. This war, at bottom, was nothing but a crucial episode of peaceful coexistence. It marked the arrival of China to peaceful coexistence. The nonintervention of China obtained and secured after many years, Chinas apprenticeship to a global modus vivendi, the shift from a global strategy of revolution to one of shared forces and empires, the transition from a radical alternative to political alternation in a system now essentially regulated (the normalization of Peking - Washington relations): this was what was at stake in the war in Vietnam, and in this sense, the USA pulled out of Vietnam but won the war. And the war ended "spontaneously" when this objective was achieved. That is why it was deescalated, demobilized so easily. This same reduction of forces can be seen on the field. The war lasted as long as elements irreducible to a healthy politics and discipline of power, even a Communist one, remained unliquidated. When at last the war had passed into the hands of regular troops in the North and escaped that of the resistance, the war could stop: it had attained its objective. The stake is thus that of a political relay. As soon as the Vietnamese had proved that they were no longer the carriers of an unpredictable subversion, one could let them take over. That theirs is a Communist order is not serious in the end: it had proved itself, it could be trusted. It is even more effective than capitalism in the liquidation of "savage" and archaic precapitalist structures. Same scenario in the Algerian war. The other aspect of this war and of all wars today: behind the armed violence, the murderous antagonism of the adversaries - which seems a matter of life and death, which is played out as such (or else one could never send people to get themselves killed in this kind of thing), behind this simulacrum of fighting to the death and of ruthless global stakes the two adversaries are fundamentally in solidarity against something else, unnamed, never spoken, but whose objective outcome in war, with the equal complicity of the two adversaries, is total liquidation. Tribal, communitarian, precapitalist structures, every form of exchange, of language, of symbolic organization, that is what must be abolished, that is the object of murder in war - and war itself, in its immense, spectacular death apparatus, is nothing but the medium of this process of the terrorist rationalization of the social - the murder on which sociality will be founded, whatever its allegiance, Communist or capitalist. Total complicity, or division of labor between two adversaries (who may even consent to enormous sacrifices for it) for the very end of reshaping and domesticating social relations. "The North Vietnamese were advised to countenance a scenario for liquidating the American presence in the course of which, of course, one must save face." This scenario: the extremely harsh bombardments of Hanoi. Their untenable character must not conceal the fact that they were nothing but a simulacrum to enable the Vietnamese to seem to countenance a compromise and for Nixon to make the Americans swallow the withdrawal of their troops. The game was already won, nothing was objectively at stake but the verisimilitude of the final montage. The moralists of war, the holders of high wartime values should not be too discouraged: the war is no less atrocious for being only a simulacrum - the flesh suffers just the same, and the dead and former combatants are worth the same as in other wars. This objective is always fulfilled, just like that of the charting of territories and of disciplinary sociality. What no longer exists is the adversity of the adversaries, the reality of antagonistic causes, the ideological seriousness of war. And also the reality of victory or defeat, war being a process that triumphs well beyond these appearances.

In any case, the pacification (or the deterrence) that dominates us today is beyond war and peace, it is that at every moment war and peace are equivalent. "War is peace," said Orwell. There also, the two differential poles implode into each other, or recycle one another - a simultaneity of contradictions that is at once the parody and the end of every dialectic. Thus one can completely miss the truth of a war: namely, that it was finished well before it started, that there was an end to war at the heart of the war itself, and that perhaps it never started. Many other events (the oil crisis, etc.) never started, never existed, except as artificial occurrences - abstract, ersatz, and as artifacts of history, catastrophes and crises destined to maintain a historical investment under hypnosis. The media and the official news service are only there to maintain the illusion of an actuality, of the reality of the stakes, of the objectivity of facts. All the events are to be read backward, or one becomes aware (as with the Communists "in power" in Italy the retro, posthumous rediscovery of the gulags and Soviet dissidents like the almost contemporary discovery, by a moribund ethnology, of the lost "difference" of Savages) that all these things arrived too late, with a history of delay, a spiral of delay, that they long ago exhausted their meaning and only live from an artificial effervescence of signs, that all these events succeed each other without logic, in the most contradictory, complete equivalence, in a profound indifference to their consequences (but this is because there are none: they exhaust themselves in their spectacular promotion) - all "newsreel" footage thus gives the sinister impression of kitsch, of retro and porno at the same time - doubtless everyone knows this, and no one really accepts it. The reality of simulation is unbearable - crueler than Artaud's Theater of Cruelty, which was still an attempt to create a dramaturgy of life, the last gasp of an ideality of the body, of blood, of violence in a system that was already taking it away, toward a reabsorption of all the stakes without a trace of blood. For us the trick has been played. All dramaturgy, and even all real writing of cruelty has disappeared. Simulation is the master, and we only have a right to the retro, to the phantom, parodic rehabilitation of all lost referentials. Everything still unfolds around us, in the cold light of deterrence (including Artaud, who has the right like everything else to his revival, to a second existence as the referential of cruelty).

This is why nuclear proliferation does not increase the risk of either an atomic clash or an accident - save in the interval when the "young" powers could be tempted to make a nondeterrent, "real" use of it (as the Americans did in Hiroshima - but precisely only they had a right to this "use value" of the bomb, all of those who have acquired it since will be deterred from using it by the very fact of possessing it). Entry into the atomic club, so prettily named, very quickly effaces (as unionization does in the working world) any inclination toward violent intervention. Responsibility, control, censure, self-deterrence always grow more rapidly than the forces or the weapons at our disposal: this is the secret of the social order. Thus the very possibility of paralyzing a whole country by flicking a switch makes it so that the electrical engineers will never use this weapon: the whole myth of the total and revolutionary strike crumbles at the very moment when the means are available - but alas precisely because those means are available. Therein lies the whole process of deterrence.

It is thus perfectly probable that one day we will see nuclear powers export atomic reactors, weapons, and bombs to every latitude. Control by threat will be replaced by the more effective strategy of pacification through the bomb and through the possession of the bomb. The "little" powers, believing that they are buying their independent striking force, will buy the virus of deterrence, of their own deterrence. The same goes for the atomic reactors that we have already sent them: so many neutron bombs knocking out all historical virulence, all risk of explosion. In this sense, the nuclear everywhere inaugurates an accelerated process of implosion, it freezes everything around it, it absorbs all living energy.

The nuclear is at once the culminating point of available energy and the maximization of energy control systems. Lockdown and control increase in direct proportion to (and undoubtedly even faster than) liberating potentialities. This was already the aporia of the modern revolution. It is still the absolute paradox of the nuclear. Energies freeze in their own fire, they deter themselves. One can no longer imagine what project, what power, what strategy, what subject could exist behind this enclosure, this vast saturation of a system by its own forces, now neutralized, unusable, unintelligible, nonexplosive - except for the possibility of an explosion toward the center, of an implosion where all these energies would be abolished in a catastrophic process (in the literal sense, that is to say in the sense of a reversion of the whole cycle toward a minimal point, of a reversion of energies toward a minimal threshold).

#### When confronted with the ethical injunction of the aff, respond with “I would prefer not to”—vote neg on presumption

### Case

#### No solvency – SLAPPS means that even if the affirmative is able to create class-action lawsuits they go nowhere or get ridiculed and become more fuel for the climate-denier fire – even if they fail the affirmative plan gets held up in court for years – empirics

CLDC, ND (Civil Liberties Defense Center, xx-xx-xxxx, "Anti-SLAPP," <https://cldc.org/anti-slapp/>, GS)

CLDC lawyers have been successful in defending social and climate justice activists and organizations from SLAPPs (strategic lawsuits against public participation), which are designed to chill free speech — notably dissent. Deep-pocketed corporate bullies have a long, shameful track record of filing SLAPP suits to intimidate climate justice and other progressive activists and organizations. And they keep filing them, for the sole purpose of draining activists’ resources, wasting their time (which impacts the effort that people can contribute to social movements), and causing anxiety. All of these factors create a chilling effect that harms the exercise of free speech. Examples include defamation (libel and slander) lawsuits against people for simply speaking out against corporate wrongdoing. SLAPP suits typically charge the defendant-activist or organization with defamation or some other form of tortious misconduct, framing the lawsuit as legitimate when the actual goal is to intimidate and silence activists and target the right to free speech. The CLDC is a national expert in defending activists and their campaigns from the threat of unconstitutional SLAPP suits. We have a large brief bank and legal resources available for lawyers. If you are an attorney representing environmental or social change activists, please contact us. We are a proud, active, member of the national Protect the Protest coalition, which defends those attacked by SLAPP suits and educates activists and the public about them. Through this process we have conveyed, as a coalition, that we stand with one another, and that corporate bullies come after all of us when they come after one of us. CLDC lawyers got both Resolute Forest Products’ and Energy Transfer Partners’ (now known as Energy Transfer) SLAPP suits against climate justice activists thrown out for our clients. We also defeated the Eugene “Weed Nazi,” who attempted to SLAPP a Eugene-based antifascist activist when she was exposed as a white nationalist. CLDC lawyers also provided legal support for the “Weed 9,” and Water for Citizens of Weed, California (WCWC), members of the Weed community who faced a SLAPP suit brought by Roseburg Forest Products’ in their effort to control a local water source. That suit was also dismissed. We look forward to winning more victories against malicious SLAPPs! “Weed 9” Lawsuit: Water for Citizens of Weed California et al. v. Churchwell White LLP et al. In April 2020 CLDC filed suit against the Sacramento law firm Churchwell White LLP and two of its attorneys, alleging that they engaged in malicious and unlawful conduct when they (on behalf of their client, Roseburg Forest Products) filed a lawsuit against nine local activists and their community organization, Water for Citizens of Weed, California (WCWC) in May of 2017. The lawsuit against our clients was dismissed in December 2017 under California’s anti-SLAPP law, and Roseburg Forest Products was ordered to reimburse the activists and WCWC for legal fees. Such “strategic lawsuits against public participation,” or “SLAPP suits,” are frequently used by corporations to silence or intimidate critics. Roseburg Forest Products’ lawsuit came in response to the nine citizen activists voicing their concerns about their small city losing access to a vital public spring water source to the interests of the private logging company. RFP’s attorneys asserted that they were just trying to resolve legal ownership issues regarding the water supply, but neither WCWC nor the nine people RFP’s attorneys named in the suit had ever made any personal claim to the rights or title to the water supply — a fact the law firm admitted at the time. Yet even with that knowledge, the law firm appealed the court rulings and dragged the defendants through two more years of legal proceedings. Several of the nine activists are former mayors — some who are now in their 80s and 90s. The activists had participated in town meetings and taken other grassroots actions as members of WCWC, to educate their community about the threat to their water supply. After writing a letter requesting assistance from a state agency, and speaking out during a local meeting, they found themselves in court being sued by a $900 million timber company. We hope to move forward with the merits of the lawsuit soon. Protect the Protest Coalition The national Protect the Protest (PtP) coalition is a core CLDC partner. Comprised of more than 60 nonprofits across the country, and with a motto of “An attack on one is an attack on all,” PtP seeks to preserve our First Amendment right to protest by taking on corporate bullies who use strategic lawsuits against public participation (SLAPPs) to silence their critics. Lauren Regan, Executive Director & Senior Staff Attorney, directs the PtP legal working group. The coalition also provides important media and campaign support for the SLAPP litigation CLDC is currently leading, and for the activists and organizations targeted by SLAPP bullies.