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# Flow 1:

### 1: Inherency

#### A. Students from Latin America are returning home

#### **Heigh-ho, heigh-ho**

#### **It's home from work we go**

#### **(whistle)**

#### **Heigh-ho, heigh-ho, heigh-ho**

#### B. Lack of immigration reform means educated immigrants are being sent home.

Is this home?

Am I here for a day or forever?

### 2: Harms

#### A. Right now we're just following the leader and falling behind in our work force.

“Following the leader, the leader, the le ader

We're following the leader wherever he may go”

#### B. The sooner we reaffirm our leadership, the better.

“Oh, I just can't wait to be king!”

#### C. Having leadership allows us to say ridiculous things and get away with it.

“Oh, supercalifragilisticexpialidocious!

Even though the sound of it

Is something quite atrocious

If you say it loud enough

You'll always sound precocious

Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious!”

#### D. We must be prepared to take the next step in engagement with Latin America.

“Be prepared!

Yes, our teeth and ambitions are bared

Be prepared!”

#### Thus the plan:

**The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic engagement toward Cuba, Mexico, or Venezuela by wishing upon a star that nature provides us with a whole new world of economic engagement opportunities that are virtually and unanimously accepted by the public.**

### 3: Solvency

#### A. The best things comes from nature.

“Look for the bare necessities

The simple bare necessities

Forget about your worries and your strife

I mean the bare necessities

Old Mother Nature's recipes

That brings the bare necessities of life”

#### B. Wishing upon a star means we get one hundred percent solvency, like always.

“When you wish upon a star

Makes no difference who you are

Anything your heart desires

Will come to you”

#### C. Our plan opens up new energy perspectives we could never have imagined.

“A whole new world

A new fantastic point of view

No one to tell us no

Or where to go

Or say we're only dreaming

A whole new world

A dazzling place I never knew

But when I'm way up here, it's crystal clear

That now I'm in a whole new world with you

Now I'm in a whole new world with you”

All lyrics from above are a property of the Walt Disney Company and were found at:

Song Lyrics Database, Soundtrack Lyrics, “Disney Lyrics”, Accessed 20 January 2013 at <http://www.stlyrics.com/songs/d/disney6472.html>

Of course we aren't really serious about all this. What we've just done is shown the fantasy world that debate has become. Our performance is a dramatization of current debate practices. We realize that singing Disney songs is going a bit too far, but it makes us consider the consequences of this type of rhetoric. We’ll clarify.

# Flow 2:

### 1: What is this?

#### The real is being replaced by the hyperreal, a giant metaphorical Disney World, where images replace reality and become eternal and infinitely repeating in the virtual universe, where the real has become a spectacle, but instead of being outside looking in, we are the spectacle, constant participants in a reality show of violence.

**Baudrillard 96** (Jean, Professor of philosophy of culture and media criticism at the European Graduate School in Saas-Fee, Switzerland, March 4, "Disneyworld Company")

But the Disney enterprise goes beyond the imaginary. Disney, the precursor, the grand initiator of the imaginary as virtual reality, is now in the process of capturing all the real world to integrate it into its synthetic universe, in the form of a vast "reality show" where reality itself becomes a spectacle[vient se donner en spectacle], where the real becomes a theme park.The transfusion of the real is like a blood transfusion, except that here it is a transfusion of real blood into the exsanguine universe of virtuality. After the prostitution of the imaginary, here is now the hallucination of the real in its ideal and simplified version. At Disney World in Orlando, they are even building an identical replica of the Los Angeles Disneyland, as a sort of historical attraction to the second degree, a simulacrum to the second power. It is the same thing that CNN did with the Gulf War: a prototypical event which did not take place, because it took place in real time, in CNN's instantaneous mode. Today, Disney could easily revisit the Gulf War as a worldwide show. The Red Army choirs have already celebrated Christmas at Euro Disney. Everything is possible, and everything is recyclable in the polymorphous universe of virtuality. Everything can be bought over. There is no reason why Disney would not take over the human genome, which, by the way, is already being resequenced, to turn it into a genetic show. In the end[au fond], they would cryogenize the entire planet, just like Walt Disney himself who decided to be cryogenized in a nitrogen solution, waiting for some kind of resurrection in the real world. But there is no real world anymore, not even for Walt Disney. If one day he wakes up, he'll no doubt have the biggest surprise of his life. Meanwhile, from the bottom of his nitrogen solution he continues to colonize the world - both the imaginary and the real - in the spectral universe of virtual reality, inside which we all have become extras [figurants]. The difference is that when we put on our digital suits, plug in our sensorial captors, or press the keys of our virtual reality arcade, we enter live spectrality whereas Disney, the genial anticipator**,** has entered the virtual reality of death. The New World Order is in a Disney mode. But Disney is not alone in this mode of cannibalistic attraction. We saw Benetton with his commercial campaigns, trying to recuperate the human drama of the news (AIDS, Bosnia, poverty, apartheid) by transfusing reality into a New Mediatic Figuration (a place where suffering and commiseration end in a mode of interactive resonance). The virtual takes over the real as it appears, and then replicates it without any modification [le recrache tel quel], in a pret-a-porter (ready-to-wear) fashion. If this operation can be so successful in creating a universal fascination with only a tint of moral disapproval, it is because reality itself, the world itself, with its frenzy of cloning has already been transformed into an interactive performance, some kind of Lunapark for ideologies, technologies, works, knowledge, death, and even destruction.All this is likely to be cloned and resurrected in a juvenile museum of Imagination or a virtual museum of Information. Similarly, it is useless to keep searching for computer viruses since we are all caught in a viral chain of networks anyway. Information itself has become viral; perhaps not sexually transmissible yet, but much more powerful through its numerical propagation. And so it does not take much work for Disney to scoop up reality, such as it is. "Spectacular Inc.," as Guy Debord would say. But we are no longer in a society of spectacle, which itself has become a spectacular concept. It is no longer the contagion of spectacle that alters reality, but rather the contagion of virtuality that erases the spectacle. Disneyland still belonged to the order of the spectacle and of folklore, with its effects of entertainment [distraction] and distanciation [distance]. Disney World and its tentacular extension is a generalized metastasis, a cloning of the world and of our mental universe, not in the imaginary but in a viral and virtual mode. We are no longer alienated and passive spectators but interactive extras [figurants interactifs]; we are the meek lyophilized members of this huge "reality show."It is no longer a spectacular logic of alienation but a spectral logic of disincarnation; no longer a fantastic logic of diversion, but a corpuscular logic of transfusion and transubstantiation of all our cells; an enterprise of radical deterrence of the world from the inside and no longer from outside, similar to the quasi-nostalgic universe of capitalistic reality today. Being an extra [figurant] in virtual reality is no longer being an actor or a spectator. It is to be out of the scene [hors-scene], to be obscene. Disney wins at yet another level. It is not only interested in erasing the real by turning it into a three-dimensional virtual image with no depth, but it also seeks to erase time by synchronizing all the periods, all the cultures, in a single traveling motion, by juxtaposing them in a single scenario. Thus, it marks the beginning of real, punctual and unidimensional time, which is also without depth. No present, no past, no future, but an immediate synchronism of all the places and all the periods in a single atemporal virtuality. Lapse or collapse of time: that's properly speaking what the fourth dimension [la quatrieme dimension] is about. It is the dimension of the virtual, of real time; a dimension which, far from adding to the others, erases them all. And so it has been said that, in a century or in a millennium, gladiator movies will be watched as if they were authentic Roman movies, dating back to the era of the Roman empire, as real documentaries on Ancient Rome; that in the John Paul Getty Museum in Malibu, a pastiche of a Pompeian villa, will be confused, in an anachronistic manner, with a villa of the third century B.C. (including the pieces inside from Rembrandt, Fra Angelico, everything confused in a single crush of time); that the celebration of the French Revolution in Los Angeles in 1989 will retrospectively be confused with the real revolutionary event. Disney realizes de facto such an atemporal utopia by producing all the events, past or future, on simultaneous screens, and by inexorably mixing all the sequences as they would or will appear to a different civilization than ours. But it is already ours. It is more and more difficult for us to imagine the real, History, the depth of time, or three-dimensional space, just as before it was difficult, from our real world perspective, to imagine a virtual universe or the fourth dimension [la quatrieme dimension].

### 2: Reality if Forgotten

#### Our performance has an intrinsic value – language will never be a reference to the real. Instead, our performance can be used to bridge the gap between the Real and what can be individually accomplished.

**Baudrillard 95** (Jean, Professor of philosophy of culture and media criticism at the European Graduate School in Saas-Fee, Switzerland, April 19, "Radical Thought")

Our point is not to defend radical thought. Any idea that can be defended is presumed guilty. Any idea that does not sustain its own defense deserves to perish. But we have to fight against charges of unreality, lack of responsibility, nihilism, and despair. Radical thought is never depressing. This would be a complete misunderstanding. A moralizing and ideological critique, obsessed by meaning and content, obsessed by a political finality of discourse, never takes into account writing, the act of writing, the poetic, ironic, and allusive form of language, the play with meaning. This critique does not see that the resolution of meaning is right here, in the form itself, in the formal materiality of an expression. As for meaning, it is always unfortunate. Analysis is by its very definition unfortunate since it is born out of a critical disillusion. But language on the contrary is fortunate (happy), even when it designates a world with no illusion, with no hope. This would in fact be here the very definition of radical thought: an intelligence without hope, but a fortunate and happy form. Critics, always being unfortunate (unhappy) in their nature, choose the realm of ideas as their battle field. They do not see that if discourse always tends to produce meaning, language and writing on the contrary are always a matter of illusion. Language and writing are the living illusion of meaning, the resolution of the misfortune of meaning operated through the good fortune of language. This is the only political or transpolitical act that a writer can accomplish. Everyone has ideas, even more than they need. What matters is the poetic singularity of analysis. Only this witz, this spirituality of language, can justify writing. Not a miserable critical objectivity of ideas. There will never be a solution to the contradiction of ideas, except inside language itself, in the energy and fortune (happiness) of language. So the loneliness and sadness in Edward Hopper's paintings are transfigured by the timeless quality of light, a light which comes from some place else and gives to the whole picture a totally non-figurative meaning, an intensity which renders loneliness unreal. Hopper says: "I do not paint sadness or loneliness; I only seek to paint light on this wall." In any case, it is better to have a despairing analysis in a happy language than an optimistic analysis in despairingly boring and demoralizingly plain language. Which is too often the case. The formal boredom that is secreted by an idealist thought on values, or by a goal-oriented thought on culture, is the secret sign of despair for this thought - not despair with the world, but despair toward its own discourse. This is where the real depressing thought emerges. It emerges with those people who only talk about a transcendence or a transformation of the world, while they are totally unable to transfigure their own language. Radical thought is in no way different from radical usage of language. This thought is therefore alien to any resolution of the world which would take the direction of an objective reality and of its deciphering. Radical thought does not decipher. It anathematizes and "anagramatizes" concepts and ideas, exactly what poetic language does with words. Through its reversible chaining, it simultaneously gives an account of meaning and of its fundamental illusion. Language gives an account of the very illusion of language as a definite stratagem and through that notes the illusion of the world as an infinite trap, as a seduction of the mind, as a stealing away of all mental capacities. While being a transporter of meaning, language is at the same time a supra-conductor of illusion and of the absence of meaning. Language is only signification's unintentional accomplice. By its very force, it calls for the spiritual imagination of sounds and rhythms, for the dispersion of meaning in the event of language, similar to the role of the muscles in dance, similar to the role of reproduction in erotic games. Such a passion for the artificial, a passion for illusion, is the same thing as the seductive joy (jouissance) to undo a too perfect constellation of meaning. It is also a joy (jouissance) to render transparent the imposture of the world, that is to say the enigmatic function of the world, and its mystification which supposedly is its secret. Doing this while perhaps rendering its imposture transparent: deceiving rather than validating meaning. This passion "wins" in the free and spiritual usage of language, in the spiritual game of writing. And it only disappears when language is used for a limited finality, its most common usage perhaps, that of communication. No matter what, if language wants to "speak the language" of illusion, it must become a seduction. As for "speaking the language" of the real, it would not know how to do it (properly speaking) because language is never real. Whenever it appears to be able to designate things, it actually does so by following unreal, elliptic, and ironic paths. Objectivity and truth are metaphoric in language. Too bad for the apodicticians or the apodidacticians! This is how language is, even unconsciously, the carrier of radical thought, because it always starts from itself, as a trait d'esprit vis-a-vis the world, as an ellipse and a source of pleasure. Even the confusion of languages in the Tower of Babel, a powerful mechanism of illusion for the human race, a source of non-communication and an end to the possibility of a universal language, will have appeared, finally, not as a divine punishment but as a gift from God. Ciphering, not deciphering. Operating illusions. Being illusion to be event. Turning into an enigma what is clear. Making unintelligible what is far too intelligible. Rendering unreadable the event itself. Working all the events to make them unintelligible. Accentuating the fake transparency of the world to spread a terroristic confusion, to spread the germs or viruses of a radical illusion, that is to say operating a radical disillusion of the real. A viral and deleterious thought, which corrupts meaning, and is the accomplice of an erotic perception of reality's trouble. Erasing in oneself any remaining trace of the intellectual plot. Stealing the "reality file" to erase its conclusions. But, in fact, it is reality itself which foments its own contradiction, its own denial, its own loss through our lack of reality. Hence, the internal feeling that all this affair - the world, thought, and language - has emerged from some place else and could disappear as if by magic. The world does not seek to have more existence, nor does it seek to persist in its existence. On the contrary, it is looking for the most spiritual way to escape reality. Through thought, the world is looking for what could lead to its own loss. The absolute rule, that of symbolic exchange, is to return what you received. Never less, but always more. The absolute rule of thought is to return the world as we received it: unintelligible. And if it is possible, to return it a little bit more unintelligible. A little bit more enigmatic.

### 3: Struggle Against the Simulation

#### Our aff is a struggle against the simulation. Consumerism and economic growth are viewed as inherently good. Rampant consumerism’s logical end is showing through: viewing the very Earth we reside upon as disposable.

**Monbiot 10** (“After this 60-year Feeding Frenzy, Earth Itself has Become Disposable”, Published by [The Guardian/UK](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jan/04/standard-of-living-spending-consumerism), © 2010 Guardian News and Media Limited, January 5, 2010, http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/01/05-7 (HEG))

Who said this? "All the evidence shows that beyond the sort of standard of living which Britain has now achieved, extra growth does not automatically translate into human welfare and happiness." Was it a) the boss of Greenpeace, b) the director of the New Economics Foundation, or c) an anarchist planning the next climate camp? None of the above: d) the former head of the Confederation of British Industry, who currently runs the Financial Services Authority. In an interview broadcast last Friday, Lord Turner brought the consumer society's most subversive observation into the mainstream. In our hearts most of us know it is true, but we live as if it were not. Progress is measured by the speed at which we destroy the conditions that sustain life. Governments are deemed to succeed or fail by how well they make money go round, regardless of whether it serves any useful purpose. They regard it as a sacred duty to encourage the country's most revolting spectacle: the annual feeding frenzy in which shoppers queue all night, then stampede into the shops, elbow, trample and sometimes fight to be the first to carry off some designer junk which will go into landfill before the sales next year. The madder the orgy, the greater the triumph of economic management. As the Guardian revealed today, the British government is now split over product placement in television programmes: if it implements the policy proposed by Ben Bradshaw, the culture secretary, plots will revolve around chocolates and cheeseburgers, and advertisements will be impossible to filter, perhaps even to detect. Bradshaw must know that this indoctrination won't make us happier, wiser, greener or leaner; but it will make the television companies £140m a year. Though we know they aren't the same, we can't help conflating growth and wellbeing. Last week, for instance**,** the Guardian carried the headline "[UK standard of living drops below 2005 level](http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2009/dec/31/economic-growth-recession-uk)". But the story had nothing to do with our standard of living. Instead it reported that per capita gross domestic product is lower than it was in 2005. GDP is a measure of economic activity, not standard of living. But the terms are confused so often that journalists now treat them as synonyms. The low retail sales of previous months were recently described by this paper as "bleak" and "gloomy". High sales are always "good news", low sales are always "bad news", even if the product on offer is farmyard porn. I believe it's time that the Guardian challenged this biased reporting. Those who still wish to conflate welfare and GDP argue that high consumption by the wealthy improves the lot of the world's poor. Perhaps, but it's a very clumsy and inefficient instrument. After some 60 years of this feast, 800 million people remain permanently hungry. Full employment is a less likely prospect than it was before the frenzy began. In a new paper published in [Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophical_Transactions_of_the_Royal_Society), [Sir Partha Dasgupta](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/dec/28/economics-environment-gdp-climate-change) makes the point that the problem with gross domestic product is the gross bit. There are no deductions involved: all economic activity is accounted as if it were of positive value. Social harm is added to, not subtracted from, social good. A train crash which generates £1bn worth of track repairs, medical bills and funeral costs is deemed by this measure to be as beneficial as an uninterrupted service which generates £1bn in ticket sales. Most important, no deduction is made to account for the depreciation of natural capital: the overuse or degradation of soil, water, forests, fisheries and the atmosphere. Dasgupta shows that the total wealth of a nation can decline even as its GDP is growing. In Pakistan, for instance, his rough figures suggest that while GDP per capita grew by an average of 2.2% a year between 1970 and 2000, total wealth declined by 1.4%. Amazingly, there are still no official figures that seek to show trends in the actual wealth of nations. You can say all this without fear of punishment or persecution. But in its practical effects, consumerism is a totalitarian system: it permeates every aspect of our lives. Even our dissent from the system is packaged up and sold to us in the form of anti-consumption consumption, like the "[I'm not a plastic bag](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/magazine/6587169.stm)", which was supposed to replace disposable carriers but was mostly used once or twice before it fell out of fashion, or like the lucrative new books on how to live without money. George Orwell and Aldous Huxley proposed different totalitarianisms: one sustained by fear, the other in part by greed. Huxley's nightmare has come closer to realisation. In the nurseries of the [Brave New World](http://www.huxley.net/bnw/two.html), "the voices were adapting future demand to future industrial supply. 'I do love flying,' they whispered, 'I do love flying, I do love having new clothes ... old clothes are beastly ... We always throw away old clothes. Ending is better than mending, ending is better than mending'". Underconsumption was considered "positively a crime against society". But there was no need to punish it. At first the authorities machine-gunned the Simple Lifers who tried to opt out, but that didn't work. Instead they used "the slower but infinitely surer methods" of conditioning: immersing people in advertising slogans from childhood. A totalitarianism driven by greed eventually becomes self-enforced. Let me give you an example of how far this self-enforcement has progressed. In a recent comment thread, a poster expressed an idea that I have now heard a few times. "We need to get off this tiny little world and out into the wider universe ... if it takes the resources of the planet to get us out there, so be it. However we use them, however we utilise the energy of the sun and the mineral wealth of this world and the others of our planetary system, either we do use them to expand and explore other worlds, and become something greater than a mud-grubbing semi-sentient animal, or we die as a species." This is the consumer society taken to its logical extreme: the Earth itself becomes disposable. This idea appears to be more acceptable in some circles than any restraint on pointless spending. That we might hop, like the aliens in the film [Independence Day](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Independence_Day_(film)), from one planet to another, consuming their resources then moving on, is considered by these people a more realistic and desirable prospect than changing the way in which we measure wealth.

# Flow 3:

### Framework

**At the top of the flow, you as the judge needs to evaluate framework as which side provides the best education and clash of new ideas.**

We realize debate is a game designed to foster education. However, it’s more important to consider how we’re playing the game than who is winning within it – imaginary impacts don’t matter until there is a justification for their rhetoric. That’s best for debate because:

#### **First, it’s realistic.**

Fiat doesn’t exist; no plan will ever be passed at the end of the round regardless of which way you vote.

#### Second, traditional debate desensitizes us to the suffering of others; rather than proving a framework for activism, this speculative mindset of “fiat” only rewards oppression and suffering of others.

**Mitchell 98** (Professor of Communications @ Univ. of Pittsburg], “PEDAGOGICAL POSSIBILITIES FOR ARGUMENTATIVE AGENCY IN ACADEMIC DEBATE”, Page 3, Argumentation & Advocacy, Vol. 35 Issue 2, Page 43, 1998 (HEG)

The sense of detachment associated with the spectator posture is highlighted during episodes of alienation in which debaters cheer news of human suffering or misfortune. Instead of focusing on the visceral negative responses to news accounts of human death and misery, debaters overcome with the competitive zeal of contest round competition show a tendency to concentrate on the meanings that such evidence might hold for the strength of their academic debate arguments. For example, news reports of mass starvation might tidy up the "uniqueness of a disadvantage" or bolster the "inherency of an affirmative case" (in the technical parlance of debate-speak). Murchland categorizes cultivation of this "spectator" mentality as one of the most politically debilitating failures of contemporary education: "Educational institutions have failed even more grievously to provide the kind of civic forums we need. In fact, one could easily conclude that the principle purposes of our schools is to deprive successor generations of their civic voice, to turn them into mute and uncomprehending spectators in the drama of political life" (1991, p. 8).

#### Prefer our performance act over their rigid adherence to the political texts they hold sacred. With language rendered meaningless, our performative act attempts to reclaim the language that has been bankrupted by political discourse within policy debate.

**Artaud ’58**

**[**Antonin, French playwright, poet, and actor. “The Theater of Cruelty” from Theater and its Double pp. 89-90]

**We cannot go on prostituting the idea of theater** whose only value is in its excruciating, magical relation to reality and danger**.** Put in this way, **the question of t0he theater ought to arouse general attention**, the implication being that theater, **through its physical aspect, since it requires *expression in space*** (the only real expression, in fact), **allows** the magical means of art and **speech to be exercised organically and altogether**, like renewed exorcisms. The upshot of all this is that theater will not be given its specific powers of action until it is given its language. That is to say: **instead of continuing to rely upon texts considered to be definitive and sacred, it is essential to put an end to the subjugation of theater to the text, and to recover the notion of a kind of language half-way between gesture and thought.** The **language cannot be defined except by its possibilities for dynamic expression in space as opposed to the expressive possibilities of spoken dialogue.** And **what the theater can still take over from speech are its possibilities for extension beyond words, for development in space, for dissociative and vibratory action upon the sensibility**. This is the hour of intonations, of a word’s particular pronunciation. Here too intervenes (besides the auditory language of sounds) the visual language of objects, movements, attitudes, and gestures, but on condition that their meanings, their physiognomies, their combinations to be carried to the point of becoming signs, making a kind of alphabet out of these signs. Once aware of this language in space, language of sounds, cries, lights, onomatopoeia, the theater must organize it into veritable hieroglyphs, with the help of characters and objects, and make use of their symbolism and interconnections in relation to all organs and on all levels. **The question, then, for the theater, is to create a metaphysics of speech, gesture, and expression, in order to rescue it from its servitude to psychology and “human interest.**” But all **this can be no use unless behind such an effort there is some kind of real metaphysical inclination**, an appeal to certain unhabitual ideas, **which** by their very nature **cannot be limited or even formally depicted**. These ideas which touch on Creation, Becoming, and Chaos, are all of the cosmic order and furnish a primary notion of a domain from which the theater is now entirely alien. **They are able to create a kind of passionate equation between Man, Society, Nature, and Objects. It is not**, moreover, **a question of bringing metaphysical ideas directly onto the stage, but of creating what you might call temptations**, indraughts of air around these ideas. **And humor with its anarchy, poetry with its symbolism and its images, furnish a basic notion of ways to channel the temptation of these ideas.**

Our framework is best for Education:

A) Our framework provides the most real world education by challenging these impacts and discussing in relation to real world impacts

B) We allow for the education of sexist, racist, classist, or otherwise ideas without the automatic claim that they don't matter, opening up new realms of discussion.

C) Our framework provides a clash of new ideas within debate, rather than the same old politics or heg files we hear every year

Fairness

A) Don't allow them to say they don't have ground - our criticism is attacking the rules behind fiat, which is like challenging the warrant behind a claim, they are debaters and they have a chance to defend what they do

B) Even if you buy they don't have ground, -->

#### An assertion of predictable limits and ground are a fortification of the topic which situates itself against the unintelligible grid of the nothing. This exclusion allows us to speak from a position of radical otherness, which will inevitably resurge as a violent form of implosion.

**Baudrillard ’96**

(Jean, “The Perfect Crime: The Revenge of the Mirror People”, Verso 2008, translated by Chris Turner, pp. 149-150)

Here beings the great revenge of otherness, of all the forms which, subtly or violently deprived of their singularity, henceforth pose an insoluble problem for the social order, and also for the political and biological orders. “In those days the world of mirrors and the world of men were not, as they are now, cut off from each other. They were, besides, quite different; neither beings nor colours nor shapes were the same.Both kingdoms, the specular and the human, lived in harmony; you could come and go through mirrors. One night the mirror people invaded the earth. Their power was great, but at the end of bloody warfare the magic arts of the Yellow Emperor prevailed. He repulsed the invaders, imprisoned them in their mirrors, and forced on them the task of repeating, as though in a kind of dream, all the actions of men. He stripped them of their power and of their forms, and reduced them to mere slavish reflections. Nonetheless, a day will come when the magic spell will be shaken off … shapes will being to stir. Little by little they will differ from us; little by little they will not imitate us. They will break through the barriers of glass or metal and this time will not be defeated.”- J.L. Borges36 Such is the allegory of otherness vanquished and condemned to the servile fate of resemblance.Our image in the mirror is not innocent, then. Behind every reflection, every resemblance, every representation, a defeated enemy lies concealed. The Other vanquished, and condemned merely to be the Same.This casts a singular light on the problem of representation and of all those mirrors which reflect us ‘spontaneously’ with an objective indulgence. None of that is true, and every representation is a servile image, the ghost of a once sovereign being whose singularity has been obliterated. But a being which will one day rebel, and then our whole system of representation and values is destined to perish in that revolt. This slavery of the same, the slavery of resemblance, will one day be smashed by the violent resurgence of otherness.We dreamed of passing through the lookingglass, but it is the mirror peoples themselves who will burst in upon our world. And ‘this time will not be defeated’. What will come of this victory?No one knows. A new existence of two equally sovereign peoples, perfectly alien to one another, but in perfect collusion? Something other, at least, than this subjection and this negative fatality. So, everywhere, objects, children, the dead, images, women, everything which serves to provide a passive reflection in a world based on identity, is ready to go on to the counteroffensive. Already they resemble us less and less … I’ll not be your mirror ! **37**

C) We make teams responsible for their discourse - if fiat always outweighed, there would be no way to discuss sexist, racist, or otherwise ideas because they can just claim that nuclear war outweighs

D) New forms of education come first, debate is a key community in which we are allowed to discuss radical ideas that you find nowhere else, preferring fairness is the same as flipping a coin