## 1AC

is everybody in?  
is everybody in?  
the ceremony is about to begin[1](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote1sym)  
Wake up!  
You can't remember where it was  
Had this dream stopped?

The world is changing. I don't have to tell you that. Mark this down as inherency, if you must. Recently, an old friend reminded me that “**global society is delicately poised on a civilisational threshold** … **outmoded institutions, values, and systems of thought … are ripe for transcendence by more relevant systems of organization and knowledge** …**The foundations of the modern era (including … educational institutions) are under sharp scrutiny; ....** **old questions** … **come to the fore.** … **such as what and how we should learn.** … **times of crises** … **present new opportunities, create fresh imaginings and alternative meanings, metaphors and languages.****[2](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote2sym)** We have now been involved in dozens of debates as the year spans on. In them, people have located the problem: lack of leadership, no funding to the Muslim Brotherhood, psychic fear of the other for Christ's sake! They have located the solution, a thousand different policy prescriptions to stop regional war, patriarchal government, Saudi fill in. Representations of the revolts have largely fit into one of two camps, either those attempting to shun the revolutions because of the instability that they might create, or to pacify them due to the instability that they might create. There is little focus on the fact that, as a prophet said, “**these mobilities were politically effective...because of their multi-polar nature, which was able to saturate the urban terrain and outpace the state....this multitude never gestured toward … transcendent or superior authorization....just resonant bodies on the streets....these revolutions,...are opening widening lines of fracture within a crucial node of global imperial power. The global elites fear the speed of these revolutions, which is outpacing their ability to contain them and understand them....elites have been running several steps behind...contradicting themselves, making transparent their hypocrisy,”** [3](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote3sym)

Many have assumed the ultimate failure of the revolutions unless they adhere to the liberal policies of the Western state, however, *“***what revolutions teach us, and what we tend to forget, is that resonant bodies bring down states” .***[4](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote4sym)*This forgetting is one which seeks to recuperate the same answers to lost causes and questions. These moves make an active choice to dismiss all those failures which haunt us, in favor of the same old imperial projects.This is how pundits on the right and the left have been successful in establishing a cultural and political atmosphere that will be receptive to their beliefs. This is played out largely in media representations of the events whereby the media was unable to effectively interpret or predict them. They then had to digest everything the other said as though they were one long human centipede with Rachel Maddow, connected to Bill O'Reilly, ending with Fareed Zakaria. These presentations are listened in academia because of their supposed expertise status. They recreated the revolutions along the lines of those before them, i.e. the Western revolutions of the past, continuously erecting the monument of the West wherever they could, but **“even if the monument seems to be rock solid, the image that it portrays can never guarantee the return of the event or person to which the image refers … we can never know whether the future of which the monument speaks will ever arrive.”***[5](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote5sym)* The cause of their monumentalization is precisely that, *“***those large organizations of news networks don't live within the world at all. They frame...contagion in a very binary manner - good social media is collective, communal, productive, while bad social media and revolution is chaotic and destructive.”***[6](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote6sym)* This is true to of traditional research which pushes us towards an end orientation, rather than a process-based inquiry that is always underway.

Not to touch the earth  
Not to see the sun  
Nothing left to do, but  
Run, run, run  
Let's run[7](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote7sym)

These revolutions instead exist on the ground, in between the old and the new worlds of despotic regimes. And **“the revolutions of 2011 are teaching us that the synergy between unarmed multitudes on the streets and global networks of communication can outpace state velocities... forged through affective encounters on the streets yet expanding elsewhere at unparalleled speed…affects are...“projectiles just like weapons.”***[8](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote8sym)* They are effective because the revolution is reflective to the different forms that arborescent resistance takes. Centralized state power operates by way of a strategy, that follows a *“***codified way of dealing with a situation. Rather, every situation is different, and demands not a strategy, but tactics. And as the situation changes, th****ose tactics can and must change.**[*9*](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4#133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote9sym)” Rather than determining that politics must be scripted out in one uniform way, we instead operate through a method of contingency whereby form and content are co-constitutive.

Keep this in mind when you evaluate our affirmative – at this unique historical moment, politics is not just takes place on CNN or in Congress, but also, the politics that we produce in this room. We need to allow ourselves room so that our tactics can respond to the situation at hand. This means several things – first of all, you should think of and flow this year's debates differently. Rather than separating one page's content from another via the normal line by line flow, flow it straight down, substantively if you will. The striation of flows is simply a particular iteration of the mapping imperative of globalization. On that same note, hold all evidence to skepticism that is disinterested inquiry, i.e. static, structured or predetermined – especially evidence about what constitutes a political action today. Instead, we have to realize that these revolutions deny our ability to contain them within that frame. That is a form of interested inquiry which exists in the midst and rather than predict or determine those revolutions, affirms their unknow and unnamability.

This enables a better form of knowledge production that doesn't impose static assumptions upon the world, but is rather in the midst – it allows the world to reflect upon us. This exists in stark contrast to arborescent modes of thinking that “**have a global or total vision…”**rather, the current revolutions are “ **localised singularities flowing across Northern Africa and the Arabian Peninsula. These becomings seem political manifestations of … the rhizome. Initiated without heavyweight political figureheads or leaders … to confront … all the resources of state control at the disposal of decades old arborescent structures of authoritarian dictatorship.**”[11](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote11sym) The revolutionary contagion cannot be grasped, because “**every copy is at once a repetition but also a mutation, the more it spreads and copies the more it mutates. It's not that you could have a good revolution** **(democratic) that ought to be replicated, because the first good revolution is already not itself … there can be no rule in advance other than ongoing problem-solving.**”[12](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote12sym) The logic of the imperial West when the revolutions broke out was a hap hazard attempt to domesticate them via a process of naming - “the Jasmine Revolution”, “youth uprisings” “twitter revolution”, the list is endless. None of these were acceptable because the revolutions could not be contained. Like a rhizome they branched out, the moment one avenue was cut off, they found another, no more up front strategies of holding the fort, rather a tactical game of “**hold the street.**”[13](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote13sym) It was with this that the revolutionaries remained one step ahead of the arborescent fascists and their totalitarian governments attempts at pacification, they refused to be answerable to those calls. “**By their refusal** … **the protesters were able to conduct democracy along the avenues of … desiring-production: grouping and regrouping in different configurations from day to day, thus unleashing the democratic power inherent in people considered as concatenations of desiring machines.**

**By refusing so-called “representative democracy”,**…**the flows of democratising desire can be harnessed against the forces of political and economic repression.**”[14](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote14sym) It is through that refusal that revolution is kept alive. Constantly, whether it be the media, the government, academia at large or those in the debate community people constantly “**look for similarities and annul differences in order to show what happened once can happen again. We need only look at what is happening across the Arab world to see each situation in each of the countries is different, and also that it is unpredictable. The moment we understand a revolution, that is the moment we have killed it. It is dead.**”[15](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote15sym)

Thus, we affirm the singularity of the resolution. Resolved: Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its democracy assistance for one or more of the following: Bahrain, Egypt, Libya, Syria, Tunisia, Yemen. This singularity is always beyond our grasp and thus we can't continue to research, speculate or implement policy. It is precisely this singularity, that which cannot be named and indeed prefers not to be named, identified or integrated into the dominant capitalist and arborescent system. It constantly changes via a process of contagion. To name it would be both hubristic and dangerous. Affirming that singularity then, of “**The potential actualization of …, a global revolution, may reside in this question.**”[16](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote16sym)

The singularity is that which is a part of and a part from liberal capitalist democracy which we hold so dear in our community, going as far as to release “Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century”. We often encourage democracy in the classroom, abroad and in thought without an understanding of what that democracy is. It is not simply a self-congratulatory method of declaring that missions have been accomplished, it is a chore, but a joyful one. Forced resemblance or forced removal is not a choice. Instead, we prefer the affirmation of the singularity as that which can never be integrated into a system or frame regardless of the standards presented for that frame. For these “**regimes of quality control undermine the traditions of practice that are essential for the healthy development of disciplined and inter disciplinary learning and enquiry. Everyone in higher education should be in favour of quality, standards, lifelong learning, but these are in danger of becoming newspeak words: the more loudly they are trum­peted the more hollow they sound. … they can be related, … , to the rise of instrumental reasoning and to a growing preoccupation with procedure over substance or content.... Such tendencies harbour, … a kind of nihilism. …Objectivity becomes synony­mous with quantification. Standards themselves are thought to consist in such criteria. Without explicit criteria … it is presumed, we are back to ... the unfairness and inconsistency that that implies … To imagine that the only options here are mechanistic application of criteria … is not only to misrepresent the alternatives but to misunderstand the nature of an academic discipline. … What is needed to maintain standards … is above all the sustaining of such communities of scholars .”**

And then I woke up Jim!

for seven years, i dwelt  
in the loose palace of exile[18](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote18sym)

That exilic spot of thinking, the nomad, the non-place, the truth is, it doesn't really matter what you want to call it. We have to recognize our place in the naming process. “ **we as scholars...have to see these as events. If we compare them to earlier revolutions and try and calculate whether they are good or bad, then we are adopting a fixed historical and calculating viewpoint … desire IS revolutionary … there is an IDEA of revolution - all the revolutions we experience are distinct because none of them will exhaust the disturbing force of revolutionary power…each revolution has to be read not as the playing out of fulfillment of historical causality - but a rupture with causality.**”[19](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote19sym)

Instead, we think that “**Unknown situations,** … **demand a speculative approach for you can never be wholly sure what to expect,** … **it is the gesture of getting oneself ready** … **but also of scarifying the ground ... dissent desires to break with … expectation by willing into existence the unexpected”**[20](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote20sym)

To adhere to the modes of causality that have defined the status quo would be to impose ourselves, our thoughts, beliefs and opinions onto the world with force. This process of coding has been used in the past precisely to carry out the agenda of Orientalist arborescent politicians and humanists. This process of coding then becomes “**formulated, disseminated and ultimately naturalised.**”[21](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote21sym) This coding is internalized within the masses as a way of life, constantly exceeding, constantly pushing, breaking through! And it is this “**threatening - aspect of contemporary social politics in capitalist society … in which States, … exceed the power of the axioms in question. This leads towards new levels of domination, new ways to submit the members of … societies to historically unprecedented kinds of oppression.**”[22](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote22sym) Far from being simply a form of oppression distributed by state powers onto unsuspecting peoples throughout the world by a fascist politics of arborescence and naming, “**There is in fascism a realized nihilism...** **the Nazis announced to Germany what they were bringing: at once wedding bells and death, including their own death, and the death of the Germans.**...**the people cheered, not because they did not understand, but because they wanted that death through the death of others...****Suicide is presented not as a punishment but as the crowning glory of the death of others. One can always say that it is just a matter of foggy talk and ideology,** ... **But that is not true**. ...**They always contain the ... cry, *Long live death!,*even at the economic level, where the arms expansion replaces growth in consumption and where investment veers from the means of production toward the means of pure destruction.**...**Once triggered, its mechanism cannot stop at peace, for the indirect strategy effectively places the dominant powers outside the usual categories of space and time. . . .**...**Telegram 71 is the normal outcome: *If the war is lost, may the nation perish.***Here,**Hitler decides to join forces with his enemies in order to complete the destruction of his own people...** **It was this reversion of the line of flight into a line of destruction that already animated the molecular focuses of fascism, and made them interact in a war machine instead of resonating in a State apparatus. *A war machine that no longer had anything but war as its object*and would rather annihilate its own servants than stop the destruction. All the dangers of the other lines pale by comparison.**”[23](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&view=bsp&ver=ohhl4rw8mbn4" \l "133983de87fe11e9_sdfootnote23sym)
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## Full Text of Cards

**Gordillo. 2011. Gaston Gordillo. “The Speed of Revolutionary Resonance”. Critical Legal Thinking Online Journal. March 14, 2011. Accessed from:**[**http://www.criticallegalthinking.com/?p=2486**](http://www.criticallegalthinking.com/?p=2486)**– M.E.**

**These mobilities were politically effective not so much because of the speed of individual bodies,** which for the most part walked or ran, **but because of their multi-polar nature, which was able to saturate the urban terrain and outpace the state.** The systemic speed of this human swarm was enhanced by its myriad pulsations, widespread spatial dispersion, and bodily density. A gripping example are the videos ([here](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wuNOlFNIDBw) and [here](http://www.nowpublic.com/world/egypt-police-van-hit-run-video-police-run-over-protesters-2754164.html)) quickly posted on YouTube that show police vans and unmarked vehicles driving at very high speed amid large crowds without even trying to avoid them. On the one hand, these vehicles’ lightning speed made them run over and kill several bodies. On the other hand,this is a desperate velocity of escape from a hostile space controlled by resonant bodies. And **while the videos were posted online to highlight state brutality, they also signal a rapid retreat by the state from streets saturated by the multitude.**

**These rhizomic speeds are constitutive of an insurrection without leaders, hierarchical organizations, or parties** (most of which had been neutralized or decapitated by the regime). This non-hierarchical bodily form is the multitude as multiplicity. And as Stathis Gourgouris observed, **this multitude never gestured toward any transcendent or superior authorization. No leader, no vanguard, no revolutionary party, just resonant bodies on the streets.** The most popular slogan chanted in Egypt, Yemen, Bahrain or Libya has been and is, **“The people want to bring down the regime.”**Originated in signs and on Facebook pages in Tunisia, **this chanting by myriad resonant bodies materializes the constituent, leaderless power of the multitude.**

This wave of revolutionary expansion has been compared to that of 1989, which peaked between June (Tiananmen Square, electoral defeat of the Polish Communists) and December (fall of Ceausescu in Romania). But as Emily Bell noted on a panel organized by Al Jazeera, comparing the two: “We are now looking a much more compressed time frame. Six weeks instead of six months.” In addition to be spreading faster, **these revolutions,** unlike those of 1989, **are opening widening lines of fracture within a crucial node of global imperial power. The global elites fear the speed of these revolutions, which is outpacing their ability to contain them and understand them.** Since Tunisia, these **elites have been running several steps behind,** out of step, tripping into each other, out of words, **contradicting themselves, making transparent their hypocrisy, one day being vague and urging “orderly transitions” if protesters are murdered by states that are satellites to the United States** (Tunisia, Egypt, Bahrain, Yemen) **and, the next day, firmly condemning state violence if the regime is more hostile to, or independent from, imperial designs** (Iran, Libya). Similar anxieties have surfaced in pro-Gaddafi interventions by some self-ascribed revolutionary leaders like Daniel Ortega and Hugo Chávez, who now seem fearful of revolutions. In their different expressions, **these are all anxieties about the power of resonant multitudes to dissolve geopolitical formations that once seemed solid.**

**The state still counts on powerful weapon systems that allow it to destroy resonant bodies at unparalleled speed. The capacity of the state in Libya to unleash violence rapidly is, at a local and rudimentary scale, that of the global imperial machine, which is unrivaled in its power to murder or kidnap bodies practically anywhere on the planet, as the US does on a daily basis.** But **the revolutions of 2011 are teaching us that the synergy between unarmed multitudes on the streets and global networks of communication can outpace state velocities. This is fundamental for the success of revolutions committed,** like the Egyptian, **to non-violence.** This is the first time since the invention of the telegraph that non-state constellations of bodies have such an influence on instant forms of communication. **Hence the epochal nature of these revolutions, forged through affective encounters on the streets yet expanding elsewhere at unparalleled speed. And affects are,** as Deleuze and Guattari argued, **“projectiles just like weapons.”**

**The body is the only manufacturer and conduit of this affective weapon.** In Ethics, Spinoza wrote, “No one has yet determined the limits of the body’s capabilities: that is, nobody as yet has learned from experience what the body can or cannot do” (III, 2). In his book on Spinoza, Deleuze rightly argues that this is a provocation, an incentive for us to go farther, for **“we need to discover more in the body than we know.” What revolutions teach us, and what we tend to forget, is that resonant bodies bring down states.**

**Thanem. 2001. “All that is Solid Melts into Air: Ephemera and the Monument”. Torkild Thanem. Ephemera: Critical Dialogues on Organization. Volume 1. Issue 1. Pgs 30 – 35. ISSN 1473-2866. Pgs 31 – 32. - M.E.**

The power of monuments and their ability to transcend time is not however just a matter of celebratory commemoration, remembrance and memory creation. **Monuments are not merely historical edifices directed towards the past.** Perhaps more importantly, **they are** also **directed towards the future.** This is what Deleuze and Guattari suggest in a rather complex argument put forward in What is Philosophy? (1994). Although the monument is created by the preservation of materials such as bronze and stone within a certain expressive form, Deleuze and Guattari insist that the monument is also about the preservation of sensation. More specifically, they say, it is about preserving the percepts and affects that are produced by materials that pass into sensation and start speaking to us as images. And as such, **the monument is dissociated from any real relations with materials and instead becomes “a bloc of present sensations that owe their preservation only to themselves”** (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 167). Consequently, these blocs are never like the past really was or ever will be. In other words, **they do not reflect or imitate events or people themselves. Rather than making us remember the past,** Deleuze and Guattari argue that **they make us fabulate.** And since they make us fabulate, **they do not** so much **make us think about the past as they make us think about the future.** Since they transcend time by projecting the future (rather than the past) into the present,**the real function of the monument is** not so much to commemorate a great historical event or person. It is more **to influence the thinking and action of the present population in such a way that a similar great event or person may return in the future.** In other words, **it is about shaping the past so that we can shape the present and the future.**

But **in order to be effective**in transcending time, projecting the future into the present and influencing how people think and how they act, **the monument must transcend space.**As this makes the actual visibility and image of the monument crucial, Deleuze and Guattari’s emphasis on blocs of sensation must be complemented with a discussion of the material constitution or make-up of the monument. **In order to have a place in time, the monument must be visible and have a place in space.** As well as being visible outside its own time of creation, **the monument and the image it portrays must be visible outside its own spatial point of location.** This is a matter of size and shape. But in order to endure temporarily in space, **size does not necessarily mean that bigger is better.** Against winter storms and riots roaming the streets, for example, **a smaller monument may stand stronger and longer.**With regards to temporal endurance in space, it is also important that the materials applied in the construction of the monument possess a minimal degree of solidity, and that they are assembled with techniques that secure the solidity of the monumental construction as a whole. This is crucial if the monument is to resist abuse over time from spatial forces such as wind, humidity, weather and pollution, as well as withstand pressure from changing cultural sentiments.

However, **even if the monument seems to be rock solid, the image that it portrays can never guarantee the return of the event or person to which the image refers.** The image only actualises the possibility that a certain event or person will return and **we can never know whether the future of which the monument speaks will ever arrive.**This is first, because **monuments and the images expressed on their surfaces are always freely interpreted by spectators,**and second, because not even monuments are rock solid.

**Colebrook and Ely. 2011. Claire Colebrook is a PhD of Philosophy and Professor at Penn State, she has written articles on visual culture, poetry, literary theory, queer theory and contemporary culture, interviewed by Michael Ely, who is basically just a giant asshat. Claire Colebrook: The Joy of Debate - A Conversation. Accessed from:**[**http://www.kdebate.com/colebrook.html**](http://www.kdebate.com/colebrook.html)**– J.N.**

**ME: Gaston Gordillo recently published an article titled “The Speed of Revolutionary Resonance”. In it, he describes the idea that revolution is contagious and that the recent revolutions in the Middle East and North Africa spread virally in the way that Deleuze and Guattari describe ideas infecting a populous. You have written in the past, that their thought is one that does not attempt to determine or represent the world but rather lives within** it. **How can we** as scholars **think within the middle of revolutions, particularly those that are represented in such biased ways by the media,** **for instance, the way in which large news organizations speak through natives within a given place or reporters of a certain national background?**

**CC: Yes, but those large organizations of news networks don't live within the world at all. They frame** social media **contagion in a very binary manner - good social media is collective, communal, productive, while bad social media and revolution is chaotic and destructive. The**real **idea of**the **viral is not that things spread but how they spread. Every copy is at once a repetition but also a mutation, the more it spreads and copies the more it mutates. It's not that you could have a good revolution** **(democratic) that ought to be replicated, because the first good revolution is already not itself - it becomes what it is by destroying and taking over, and there can be no rule in advance other than ongoing problem-solving.**

**Gordillo. 2011. Gaston Gordillo. “The Speed of Revolutionary Resonance”. Critical Legal Thinking Online Journal. March 14, 2011. Accessed from:**[**http://www.criticallegalthinking.com/?p=2486**](http://www.criticallegalthinking.com/?p=2486)**– M.E.**

**These mobilities were politically effective not so much because of the speed of individual bodies,** which for the most part walked or ran, **but because of their multi-polar nature, which was able to saturate the urban terrain and outpace the state.** The systemic speed of this human swarm was enhanced by its myriad pulsations, widespread spatial dispersion, and bodily density. A gripping example are the videos ([here](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wuNOlFNIDBw) and [here](http://www.nowpublic.com/world/egypt-police-van-hit-run-video-police-run-over-protesters-2754164.html)) quickly posted on YouTube that show police vans and unmarked vehicles driving at very high speed amid large crowds without even trying to avoid them. On the one hand, these vehicles’ lightning speed made them run over and kill several bodies. On the other hand,this is a desperate velocity of escape from a hostile space controlled by resonant bodies. And **while the videos were posted online to highlight state brutality, they also signal a rapid retreat by the state from streets saturated by the multitude.**

**These rhizomic speeds are constitutive of an insurrection without leaders, hierarchical organizations, or parties** (most of which had been neutralized or decapitated by the regime). This non-hierarchical bodily form is the multitude as multiplicity. And as Stathis Gourgouris observed, **this multitude never gestured toward any transcendent or superior authorization. No leader, no vanguard, no revolutionary party, just resonant bodies on the streets.** The most popular slogan chanted in Egypt, Yemen, Bahrain or Libya has been and is, **“The people want to bring down the regime.”**Originated in signs and on Facebook pages in Tunisia, **this chanting by myriad resonant bodies materializes the constituent, leaderless power of the multitude.**

This wave of revolutionary expansion has been compared to that of 1989, which peaked between June (Tiananmen Square, electoral defeat of the Polish Communists) and December (fall of Ceausescu in Romania). But as Emily Bell noted on a panel organized by Al Jazeera, comparing the two: “We are now looking a much more compressed time frame. Six weeks instead of six months.” In addition to be spreading faster, **these revolutions,** unlike those of 1989, **are opening widening lines of fracture within a crucial node of global imperial power. The global elites fear the speed of these revolutions, which is outpacing their ability to contain them and understand them.** Since Tunisia, these **elites have been running several steps behind,** out of step, tripping into each other, out of words, **contradicting themselves, making transparent their hypocrisy, one day being vague and urging “orderly transitions” if protesters are murdered by states that are satellites to the United States** (Tunisia, Egypt, Bahrain, Yemen) **and, the next day, firmly condemning state violence if the regime is more hostile to, or independent from, imperial designs** (Iran, Libya). Similar anxieties have surfaced in pro-Gaddafi interventions by some self-ascribed revolutionary leaders like Daniel Ortega and Hugo Chávez, who now seem fearful of revolutions. In their different expressions, **these are all anxieties about the power of resonant multitudes to dissolve geopolitical formations that once seemed solid.**

**The state still counts on powerful weapon systems that allow it to destroy resonant bodies at unparalleled speed. The capacity of the state in Libya to unleash violence rapidly is, at a local and rudimentary scale, that of the global imperial machine, which is unrivaled in its power to murder or kidnap bodies practically anywhere on the planet, as the US does on a daily basis.** But **the revolutions of 2011 are teaching us that the synergy between unarmed multitudes on the streets and global networks of communication can outpace state velocities. This is fundamental for the success of revolutions committed,** like the Egyptian, **to non-violence.** This is the first time since the invention of the telegraph that non-state constellations of bodies have such an influence on instant forms of communication. **Hence the epochal nature of these revolutions, forged through affective encounters on the streets yet expanding elsewhere at unparalleled speed. And affects are,** as Deleuze and Guattari argued, **“projectiles just like weapons.”**

**The body is the only manufacturer and conduit of this affective weapon.** In Ethics, Spinoza wrote, “No one has yet determined the limits of the body’s capabilities: that is, nobody as yet has learned from experience what the body can or cannot do” (III, 2). In his book on Spinoza, Deleuze rightly argues that this is a provocation, an incentive for us to go farther, for **“we need to discover more in the body than we know.” What revolutions teach us, and what we tend to forget, is that resonant bodies bring down states.**

**Deamer and Ely 2011. “The Moment We Understand a Revolution”. David Deamer is a Deleuzian Scholar at the University of Manchester Metropolitan University. Co-founder of the Deleuze Journal “AV”. Michael Ely is an asshat. Accessed from:**[**http://www.kdebate.com/deamer.html**](http://www.kdebate.com/deamer.html)**– M.E.**

Q: I was also hoping to talk to you about the methods by which we can employ these different strategies in real life. In “A Thousand Plateaus” section “1227: Treatise on Nomadology – The War Machine” (pg 389) Deleuze and Guattari speak of the way that we should abandon certain notions of strategy for more tactical approaches (go instead of chess). How might we use these tactical approaches to subvert totalitarian regimes that exist and are being challenged now and how effective can they be against those forces? Along that same line, is there a way that we as scholars can utilize that strategy in the academic arena when analyzing these various revolutions.

A: What is **a strategy**? It **is a codified way of dealing with a situation. With every situation. Rather, every situation is different, and demands not a strategy, but tactics. And as the situation changes, those tactics can and must change.**

You are right to say ‘subvert’ rather than replace totalitarian regimes. **Every regime is totalitarian in a sense.** The absolute crucial aspect, for me, of Deleuzian **politics is that it is just this, a subversion. Replacing a totalitarian regime with a Deleuzian regime is nonsense… it would just become a new totalitarianism.**The question is difficult, because it goes without saying that that a political level **some regimes seem worse than others. Yet is this the case? Look at what the documents found in Libya have shown us about the way in which the US, UK and Libya were involved in rendition and torture.** In this way, **aren’t these totalitarian governments also rhizomatic? Look at the connections they made! Look at these lines of flight. Look at their deterritorialisations!**

How can we challenge, how effective? Again, we cannot say. **No tactic is for all time. No tactic is guaranteed to work.**

And you performed a wee slip in your question (no doubt you will find slips in my responses), you ask ‘is there a way that we as scholars can utilize that strategy in the academic arena’… a strategy? Of tactics? However, **it is crucial to realise that we as scholars and academics as part of the university system are part of the totalitarian system.** We operate through power networks of marking and peer reviews, etc. What can we do? **We must all find a way to subvert our own involvement,** I guess. I have my ‘strategic tactics’… how effective are they? Sometimes very. Sometimes not at all. Sometimes they backfire…

**Deamer. 2011. David Deamer. “After the Flood: Deleuze, Rhizomatics and Arborescence in the Arab Spring”. Dr David Deamer is associate lecturer on cinema at Manchester Metropolitan University. He has recently published in Bell and Colebrook’s Deleuze and History (Edinburgh, 2009), Deleuze Studies and A/V, the online Deleuze journal. At present he is preparing a book on Deleuze, Japanese cinema and the atom bomb for Continuum. He also regularly blogs on Deleuze and new film releases as part of his cineosis project. Pg 11 – 12. - M.E.**

**Take another conceptual series, that of territorialisation, deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation. These concepts emerge in *Anti-Oedipus* (1977) play their part in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987) and orientate the chapter on politics in *What is Philosophy?*(1994). A territory is territorialised earth, a moment and area of organisation, spatio-temporal stasis. In this sense, territorialisation is always a reterritorialisation, a territorialisation of a deterritorialising earth.**

**Territorialised thought: the classical image of thought, arborescence…**

**Deterritorialised thought: the new image of thought, rhizomatics…**

**Yet deterritorialisation has two aspects: the relative and the absolute. The former is actual, the latter virtual. The former occurs in states of affairs and bodies, the latter is a certain freedom of thought. Any rhizomatic, revolutionary event has these two dimensions. But the tendency is always that the rhizomatic moment will be reintegrated into the arborescent, that the revolutionary moment will be captured by the state. However, it seems that the philosophical moment has more resilience than the political. This split, as we will go on to see, is crucial. First…]**

IV Deleuze and politics

**In a famous conversation between Deleuze and Michel Foucault, Deleuze states:**

**Power necessarily has a global or total vision. What I mean is that every form of repression today, and they are multiple, is easily totalised, systematised from the point of view of power (‘Intellectuals and Power’: 210)**

**Power is the state of things, the State is arborescent. Accordingly, Deleuze and Guattari write**

**We are compelled to say there has always been a State (1000P: 397)**

**Democracy, fascism, or socialism, which of these is not haunted by the Urstaat as a model without equal (AO: 261)**

**[and]**

**States have neither the same development nor the same organisation (1000P: 425)**

**In short, Deleuze does not align the rhizomatic event with a political system at the level of the state. Any state political system is by its very nature a classical image of thought, representative, an arborescent tree-diagram, a reterritorialisation, be it totalitarian or democratic, be it Communist or Mercantilist, be it socialist, capitalist, and so on… ‘On Capitalism and Desire’:**

***Actuel*: One last question: can there ever be such a thing as a collective and lasting expression of liberated desire at some point in history?**

**Deleuze: If we knew the answer to that, we wouldn’t be discussing it, we would just go out and do it (‘On Capitalism and Desire’: 269).**

**Given these moments of liberated desire are ephemeral, they cannot be sustained, they cannot by their very nature become systematised, the question is always, what happens next? In an article titled ‘May ’68 Did Not Take Place,’ Deleuze begins by articulating the possibility of revolution:**

**[OPTIONAL: May ’68 is more of the order of a pure event, free of all normal, or normative causality. Its history is a “series of amplified instabilities and fluctuations.” There were a lot of agitations, gesticulations, slogans, idiocies, illusions in ’68, but this is not what counts.] What counts is what amounted to a visionary phenomenon, as if society suddenly saw what was intolerable in it and also saw the possibility for something else. It is a collective phenomenon in the form of: “Give me the possible, or else I’ll suffocate…” The possible does not pre-exist, it is created by the event. It is a question of life. The event creates a new existence, it produces new subjectivity (‘May ’68 Didn’t Happen’: 233-4).**

**However the possible of revolution is ephemeral:**

**Following ’68 in France, on the contrary, the authorities did not stop living with the idea that “things will settle down”. And indeed, things did settle down under catastrophic conditions… French society has shown a radical incapacity to create a subjective redeployment on a collective level, which is what ’68 demands; in light of this, how could it now trigger an economic redeployment (‘May ’68 Didn’t Happen’: 234).**

**It is this ‘subjective redeployment on a collective level,’ one that creates an ‘economic redeployment’ that is crucial (a freedom of thought, absolute deterritorialisation):**

**When a social mutation appears, it is not enough to draw the consequences or effects according to lines of economic or political causality. Society must be capable of forming collective agencies of enunciation that match the new subjectivity, in such a way that it desires mutation. That’s what it is, a veritable redeployment (‘May ’68 Didn’t Happen’: 234).**

**If this didn’t happen in France after May ’68, the question becomes, of course, has this ever happened? Deleuze writes:**

**The American New Deal and the Japanese boom corresponded to two very different examples of subjective redeployment, with all sorts of ambiguities and even reactionary structures, but also with enough initiative and creativity to provide a new social state capable of responding to the demands of the event (‘May ’68 Didn’t Happen’: 234).**

**Deleuze leaves it at this, and no doubt some real work needs to be done (in the future!) to unfold this statement. However, the critical aspect is this, the rhizomatic moment may have dissipated, arborescent structures taken over, but that moment has enacted a transformation, which of course is itself transitory. Yet before we are too quick to assume that subjective redeployments are in essence revolutionary, Deleuze also sees such collective enunciations in reactionary forces. In ‘We Invented the Ritornello,’ Deleuze writes**

**People tend to confuse the quest for freedom with the embrace of capitalism. It seems doubtful that the joys of capitalism are enough to liberate a people (‘Ritornello’: 379).**

**And back to the ‘May ’68 Didn’t Happen’ essay:**

**The only subjective redeployment occurring on a collective level are those of unbridled American-style capitalism or even of a Muslim fundamentalism like in Iran, [OPTIONAL: or of Afro-American religions like in Brazil:] they are the reversed figures of a new orthodoxy (‘May ’68 Didn’t Happen’: 234).**

**Given this ‘subjective redeployment on a collective level’ is likely to fail, and even if it does succeed, be reintegrated into the state, be that with some transitory reserves of freedom or, more likely still, as reactionary forces (of Capitalism, of fundamentalism), the real danger is apathy and ambivalence. In a rant entitled ‘On the New Philosophers (Plus a More General Problem),’ Deleuze responds to his interlocutor on just this danger…**

**It was a competition to see who could piss on May ’68 the most. And they have constructed their expressing subject in terms of this hatred: “We were there in 68 (they were?). and we can tell you it was stupid, there is no point doing it again” This is all they have to sell: the bitterness of 68… everything is filtered through this grid: Marxism, Moaism, Socialism… THE revolution must be declared impossible – everywhere, and for all time (‘On the New Philosophers’: 144)**

**Apathy and ambivalence is the worst possible response to the ephemeral nature of the political rhizomatic event.**

**The revolutions currently taking place are singularities that challenge all the apparatuses of arborescent politics.**

**Deamer. 2011. “After the Flood: Deleuze, rhizomatics/arborescence and the Arab Spring”. David Deamer. Professor and Deleuze Scholar. Conferences at Copenhagen Business School, 4th International Deleuze Studies Conference. Abstract. Accessed from:**[**https://cypres.cbs.dk/index.php/deleuze/conf/paper/view/1243**](https://cypres.cbs.dk/index.php/deleuze/conf/paper/view/1243)**– M.E.**

**Events taking place in the Arab world are spontaneous yet sustained moments of revolution.** Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Syria, Yemen, Bahrain, etc., **localised singularities flowing across Northern Africa and the Arabian Peninsula. These becomings seem political manifestations of** Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of **the rhizome. Initiated without heavyweight political figureheads or leaders** and dispersed online and on the street, youth movements, women’s groups and religious sects are coming together**to confront**police, army, regime supporters and mercenaries, **all the resources of state control at the disposal of decades old arborescent structures of authoritarian dictatorship.**

**Colebrook and Ely. 2011. Claire Colebrook is a PhD of Philosophy and Professor at Penn State, she has written articles on visual culture, poetry, literary theory, queer theory and contemporary culture, interviewed by Michael Ely, who is basically just a giant asshat. Claire Colebrook: The Joy of Debate - A Conversation. Accessed from:**[**http://www.kdebate.com/colebrook.html**](http://www.kdebate.com/colebrook.html)**– J.N.**

**ME: Gaston Gordillo recently published an article titled “The Speed of Revolutionary Resonance”. In it, he describes the idea that revolution is contagious and that the recent revolutions in the Middle East and North Africa spread virally in the way that Deleuze and Guattari describe ideas infecting a populous. You have written in the past, that their thought is one that does not attempt to determine or represent the world but rather lives within** it. **How can we** as scholars **think within the middle of revolutions, particularly those that are represented in such biased ways by the media,** **for instance, the way in which large news organizations speak through natives within a given place or reporters of a certain national background?**

**CC: Yes, but those large organizations of news networks don't live within the world at all. They frame** social media **contagion in a very binary manner - good social media is collective, communal, productive, while bad social media and revolution is chaotic and destructive. The**real **idea of**the **viral is not that things spread but how they spread. Every copy is at once a repetition but also a mutation, the more it spreads and copies the more it mutates. It's not that you could have a good revolution** **(democratic) that ought to be replicated, because the first good revolution is already not itself - it becomes what it is by destroying and taking over, and there can be no rule in advance other than ongoing problem-solving.**

**Olivier. 2011. “Desire, democracy and Deleuze/ Guattari”. Bert Olivier. July 10, 2011. Professor of Philosophy at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in Port Elizabeth, South Africa. Thought Leader Online. Accessed from:**[**http://www.thoughtleader.co.za/bertolivier/2011/07/10/desire-democracy-and-deleuzeguattari/**](http://www.thoughtleader.co.za/bertolivier/2011/07/10/desire-democracy-and-deleuzeguattari/)**- M.E.**

But perhaps **the richest hermeneutic potential of Deleuze/Guattari’s process-ontology of desiring-production lies in** the political domain, specifically in **the understanding of democracy.** If democracy is always “still to come” (Derrida), it means that **the “deterritorialisation” of the body politic —** the breaking up of dormant, torpid political bodies-without-organs, and the liberation of democratic potential in the form of flows of desire **— is an urgent imperative, lest the truly democratic potential bound up in torpid representational structures remain untapped forever.**

**What happened on Tahrir Square recently exemplifies such a setting-free of the desiring-production process of deterritorialisation. By their refusal, even, of elected leaders** (which would enable their adversaries to force the process into stagnation), **the protesters were able to conduct democracy along the avenues of Deleuze/Guattari’s flows of desiring-production: grouping and regrouping in different configurations from day to day, thus unleashing the democratic power inherent in people considered as concatenations of desiring machines.**

**By refusing so-called “representative democracy”,**with its inherent tendency towards manipulation of the populace, and construing the body politic as an aggregate of desiring machines, **the flows of democratising desire can be harnessed against the forces of political and economic repression.**

**Deamer and Ely 2011. “The Moment We Understand a Revolution”. David Deamer is a Deleuzian Scholar at the University of Manchester Metropolitan University. Co-founder of the Deleuze Journal “AV”. Michael Ely is an asshat. Accessed from:**[**http://www.kdebate.com/deamer.html**](http://www.kdebate.com/deamer.html)**– M.E.**

Q: In “Deleuze and History”, Craig Lundy suggests that Deleuze, following Nietzsche, would have us think history as an oracle, as someone who lacks a history but has “the innocent-ignorant and arrogant-impudent abilities to create new experiences ” (193). What does it mean to think history as oracle within the modern world and how might we use this method of history to understand revolutions taking place today in relation to those of the past?

A: Craig and I shared the panel at Copenhagen when I presented my paper ‘After the flood: Deleuze, rhizomatics/arborescence and the Arab Spring (2011)’ ... indeed, the third speaker did not turn up, so we were the only speakers, our papers dovetailed and the audience was keen to discuss the issues we had put into play. We found our views on Deleuze and revolution had points of correspondence, most particularly around the ideas of tactics and that the rhizome is not good or bad and that intellectual scholars should not speak for others… or at least try not too! To answer the question above, I would ask you to speak to Craig. He’s cool…

However, for my own part, I have touched upon Deleuze and history after Nietzsche in ‘Cinema, chronos / cronos: becoming an accomplice to the impasse of history’. The crucial aspect to me, in Nietzsche’s analysis of universal history is the discussion of monumental history. **We look for similarities and annul differences in order to show what happened once can happen again. We need only look at what is happening across the Arab world to see each situation in each of the countries is different, and also that it is unpredictable.**

**The moment we understand a revolution, that is the moment we have killed it. It is dead.**

But, **we can’t help but want to understand it. To make it recognisable, to look for the causes and effects, to create those causes and effects.**

**This is the impasse of history.**

**Revolution is the affect presented by bodies allowing for a better politics. They move so quickly that we are always already unable to predict where they will end up. We distance ourselves from them and produce an arboreal politics when we name them.**

**Gordillo. 2011. Gaston Gordillo. “The Speed of Revolutionary Resonance”. Critical Legal Thinking Online Journal. March 14, 2011. Accessed from:**[**http://www.criticallegalthinking.com/?p=2486**](http://www.criticallegalthinking.com/?p=2486)**– M.E.**

Paul Virilio taught us about the political power of speed, and I draw on his ideas as well as on Deleuze and Guattari’s theory of flows (and of the smooth and striated spaces these flows create) to examine these novel patterns of revolutionary velocity. Yet since the speed of revolutions also involves bodily affectations, the infancy of a physics of speed lies in fact in Spinoza, who argued that **when bodies affect each other positively through good encounters they can create something powerful that increases their capacity to act,** an intensified bodily affect I call resonance. This essay explores the politically important yet complex question of the speed of these intensified affects in revolutionary situations: the mechanics of their spatial-temporal rate of expansion. **The potential actualization of that cherished chimera, a global revolution, may reside in this question.**

In Resonance and the Egyptian Revolution, I drew on Spinoza to analyze the resonance created in the streets of Egypt as the expansive empathy created by bodies coming together in their struggles to control space. I emphasized that **resonance is not a metaphor but the material bodily agitation that all reports coming from Tunisia, Egypt, Bahrain, or Libya agree in presenting as vibrant, expansive, and powerful.** And I argued that **a defining feature of resonance is its mobile and fluctuating nature, which makes its solidity elusive, hard to grasp, always displaced.** The **elites** that **fear this resonance see it as a “virus”** (as John McCain and the Yemeni President put it) **that expands through “contagion” or “hallucinogenic drugs”** (adds Gaddafi): a pathological, chemical chain-reaction that infects bodies against their will and turns them into zombies. Yet **revolutions are not chemical but physical processes created by bodies resonating with myriad other bodies and discovering their own agency and affirmative power.** In a recent piece, Alain Badiou called “poetic” the idea that the revolutions of 2011 are spreading through resonance and added: “Let’s name this resonance ‘event.’” Like many others, Badiou assumes that resonance cannot carry theoretical or political weight of its own, that it is a poetic way to name something else, presumably more real: an event. **Badiou distances himself from resonance right after discovering it and naming it, missing its power to turn previously atomized collectives of bodies into revolutionary vectors.**

**Colebrook and Ely. 2011. Claire Colebrook is a PhD of Philosophy and Professor at Penn State, she has written articles on visual culture, poetry, literary theory, queer theory and contemporary culture, interviewed by Michael Ely, who is basically just a giant asshat. Claire Colebrook: The Joy of Debate - A Conversation. Accessed from:**[**http://www.kdebate.com/colebrook.html**](http://www.kdebate.com/colebrook.html)**– J.N.**

ME: In “Deleuze and the Contemporary World” you write a section entitled “The Joy of Philosophy”. In it you describe Deleuze's idea of “going beyond the actual”. In this you conclude that we philosophize precisely because life is desire and in that questioning, we become imperceptible. What does it mean to become imperceptible?

CC: Bear in mind that these answers are interpretive. I would argue that **becoming imperceptible is tied**both **to the idea that we tend to think on a day to day level in terms of ourselves as bounded organic beings**- man as an animal **who acts to maintain his life, know the world, master the external milieu. We have an IMAGE of ourselves** - brain, mind, body and so on, **that takes pictures**of the world**in terms of what it knows.** But **if we tried to know the world AS SUCH,** outside our point of view and perspectives, **we'd recognize other ways of experiencing, perceiving. Becoming-imperceptible is an ideal or method of trying to think without assuming some already given figure**or image of man.

ME: **And what might we as scholars do in relation to events which seem spontaneous and**, at least too many in the Western world, imperceptible and **inexplicable such as the “Arab Spring”.**

CC: Good question. Concretely,**we have to see these as events. If we compare them** to earlier revolutions **and try and calculate whether they are good or bad, then we are adopting a fixed historical and calculating viewpoint.** But two remarks Deleuze and Guattari make: **desire IS revolutionary. Desire is not need** **meeting demands that already have an object**, defined as what has worked in the past (eg making sure revolutions go in the good democratic direction). Desire destroys our notion of what counts as (determined good and evil). **We have to re-live**, again, **the play of the world, and ask about problems and the formation of interests. They also say there is an IDEA of revolution - all the revolutions we experience are distinct because none of them will exhaust the disturbing force of revolutionary power. So each revolution has to be read \_ not as the playing out of fulfillment of historical causality - but a rupture with causality.**

**Standish 2002 (Paul Standish, Institute for Education and Lifelong Learning, University of Dundee, Disciplining the Profession: subjects subject to procedure. Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 34, No. 1, 2002)**

The short story I want to tell concerns ways in which current**regimes of quality control** undermine the traditions of practice that are **essential for the healthy development of disciplined and inter disciplinary learning and enquiry**. Everyone in higher education should be in favour ofquality, standards, lifelong learning, but these are **in danger of becoming newspeak words**: the more loudly they are trum­peted the more hollow they sound. These problems and their relationship to the growth of information technology were anticipated well by Jean Francois Lyotard in *The Postmodern Condition*(1984). More broadly they can be related, over at least the past century, to the **rise of instrumental reasoning** and to a growing **preoccupation with procedure over substance or content**. In ethics, for example, there has been a tendency, in the anglophone world at least, to consider the logic of moral reasoning rather than the nature of the good. In more everyday contexts, there is a tendency to shy away from the overt judgement of value. Such tendencies harbour, I shall argues **a kind of nihilism.** In higher education they have the effect of subjugating academic subjects to procedural criteria that are extraneous to the disciplines themselves. **In their semblance of rigour they obscure and hence threaten the rigour that is essential to those disciplines.**

The longer story I should like to tell seeks to explore more deeply questions of discipline and profession in the light of a recent paper of Jacques Derrida on the future of the profession (of university teaching). Although Derrida's argument has relevance to the role of the academic generally, he is particularly concerned with the position of the humanities. He seeks to explore ways in which it is the duty of those teaching and researching in the humanities to profess that is, at the very least, to do something more than to provide descriptions or accounts (empirical reports) of the way things are. He elaborates this in part through a return to the question of the relationship between the constative and the performative (in J. L. Austin's terminol­ogy). Derrida's position relates to ideas advanced by Emmanuel Levinas, and this connection can be fruitfully explored through the recent writings by John Liewelyn. This longer story is an attempt to elaborate on the concepts of discipline and profession especially in relation to these contemporary changes in higher education.

Raising Standards, Subject to Procedure

How then might current regimes of quality control be said to undermine the traditions of practice that are essential for the healthy development of disciplined and inter disciplinary learning and enquiry?

As an exemplum of the problem here, let us consider first the question of developing common standards in a subject. There are strong arguments in favour of endeavouring to develop such standards and the benchmarking that goes with them. It is on the face of it quite unjust if the student who receives a 2:1 in History at the University of Liverpool has had a much tougher time has worked much harder, has studied more, has engaged in more difficult reading and assignments .. (and there is no exhaustive list here) than the person who receives the same grade for the same subject at the University of Poppleton.2 Of course, this injustice is mitigated if the degree from Poppleton turns out to be less well regarded than the one from Liverpool, for then the expectation that this is the same qualification is at least partially removed. But higher education in the UK has not reached that position­not exactly and there are good reasons for resisting it anyway. Even where the universities in question are apparently of the same prestige, even within the same university, considerable problems concerning the establishment of common stan­dards in a subject arise from differences in paradigm and tradition. So, the argument seems to suggest, what we need are established criteria that clearly determine whether or not a student has reached the appropriate levels, and these must apply across paradigms and across the range of subject matter. Ideally such criteria should be spelled out in detail so that for any assignment there is a checklist against which assessment can be carried out rigorously and objectively. And rigour of course is a kind of discipline.

There are, however, various problems with this. First, there is the tendency towards behaviourism, to the reduction of the assessment to the particular perform­ance to the **neglect of the larger picture** that might otherwise be taken into account. Behaviourism has been roundly criticised in education and yet, somewhat like the head of the Hydra, it continues to raise its head in insidious ways, the current proliferation of skills and competences being an example of this. Second, the uniformity (or standardisation) that the check list promotes may be appropriate enough in some areas of learning in elementary courses in first aid, say but is detrimental to the critical thought and unsettling of orthodoxy that should charac­terise higher education. Third, there is the problem of the extent to which a narrowed set of behavioural criteria might encourage teaching to the test, with the muffling of intellectual engagement that that entails. Fourth, there is the probability that standardised procedures criteria for what are to count as appropriate criteria ­may ride rough shod over differences between subjects and all that their different contents and disciplines imply.

There are also some false assumptions here. **This approach to the problem is fuelled by naïve assumptions about science and rigour. Objectivity becomes synony­mous with quantification. Standards themselves are thought to consist in such criteria.** Without explicit criteria of this kind, it is presumed, we are back to the subjectivity of impression marking, with all the unfairness and inconsistency that that implies. Yet the fact that any criterion, unless reduced to the most crude behavioural level, stands in need of application (hence judgment) is blithely ignored.

To imagine that the only options here are mechanistic application of criteria or the subjective vagaries of impression marking is **not only to misrepresent the alternatives but to misunderstand the nature of an academic discipline**. The rival paradigms and traditions that present a problem to bench marking are themselves constituted precisely by standards: a tradition depends on a community of scholars engaged in a common pursuit (with a history of addressing certain kinds of problems and reading certain kinds of texts), and there can be no common pursuit without some criteria, explicit or non explicit, for what counts as engagement in that pursuit. The idea of an academic pursuit is scarcely intelligible without there being some sense of what it is to engage in it well or badly. Standards are internal to the very notion of a discipline. **What is needed to maintain standards then is above all the sustaining of such communities of scholars**. Objective assessment is possible in the light of a growing familiarity with examples of good practice of the kind of essay that is taken to merit a 2:1, of the kind of paper worthy of a journal and with the kinds of judgement that are made about these.'

In March *1998,*the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in the UK published its third issue of *Higher Quality,*a consultation issue seeking responses to the Agency's agenda for quality, based on the proposals of the Dearing Report (a major enquiry into higher education in the UK published in*1997).*To the general approval of those in higher education in the UK, the Agency supported a continuation of the practice of external examining by peers. The document nevertheless pursued the idea that for such a system to work well, some standardisation was needed and with this a specification of the competence required of examiners:

They will need to be well versed in the various methods used for assess­ment of student performance, to be familiar with the tasks of verifying and calibrating standards and to possess a clear understanding of their role. The Agency has a responsibility to deal with these latter areas and must ensure that appropriate standards of technical competence are developed.

There is an air of rigour here that masks the fact that it is far from clear what these competencies amount to or even mean. Of the number of assumptions embedded here, let us consider two. First, there is the view that the nature of the technical competence that examiners will require amounts to a familiarity with the methodol­ogy of assessment, where this is understood in terms independent of particular subjects: thus they should be familiar with different modes of assessment, with the different forms that coursework can examination, with the possibilities of computer aided testing, and so on. There is no doubt that everyone other than the corrupt wants a basic kind of efficiency from examiners things must after all be done to a certain schedule and there is no doubt that no one wants examiners who are *incompetent*in this or other respects. But, important though these factors are, this miscasts the kind of competence that is most required. The word permits a kind of sleight of hand, a self deception perhaps, that *Higher*Quality and the Dearing Report to which it relates do not seem to avoid. For surely the competence that is wanted above all else is a competence in the subject being examined. Without this any amount of expertise in assessment methodology will be of little use. Indeed, it may be worse than useless in that it may surreptitiously cause the work to be driven by the nostrums of that methodology, with its substitute rigour, to the neglect of the requirements and the dynamics, indeed the true rigour, of the subject itself. The external examiner must above all be someone who is au fait with those requirements and that dynamics. The best examiners are subject experts. And it will not do to say in response that, of course, subject expertise is expected that surely this much is obvious. For it remains the case that the emphasis is on a new type of expertise a generalised skill of examin­ing that, on the one hand, deflects attention from what is most central and, on the other, is likely to impose unduly on elements in teaching and learning previously determined more exclusively by the demands of the subject matter of the course. This then is the second matter of concern: that the demands of a subject are more or less eclipsed from these documents. The subject is understood in procedural terms to the neglect of subject matter.

There is here, and for example in the development of the Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ILTHE)4, more than a suggestion that emphasis is deflected from the substance of what is taught and learned and on to the procedures that are involved. So also, from the student's point of view there is an emphasis on procedural values rather than on content: the student will gain infor­mation technology skills, enterprise skills, interpersonal skills, and above all transfer­able skills. For all the air of practicality this is a move in the direction of abstraction from the real.' It is no coincidence that ICT dovetails so nicely with a higher education understood in terms of banks of data and skills of information access (a reductive conception of learning how to learn). As content is surreptitiously down­graded, with consequences of which the student can scarcely be aware, the vacuum at the heart of higher education is progressively increased.

Unfortunately, the rhetoric of access and lifelong learning, admirable though the underlying aims are in many respects**, exacerbates the situation** here. For with the shift of focus from institutions to customers, advocated by the Fryer Report (1997) for example, the spotlight on systems **puts further in shadow the importance of what is actually learned**. And it is not as though the customers are likely to object. After all do we not live in a world in which the stance of neutrality has an unusual prominence where the maximal availability of consumer goods and life choices is a good that cannot be questioned, and thus where the flexibility of an efficient system seems only enabling while commitment to a particular content seems unduly burdensome? The point here is not the usual one more and more people have access to less and less. It is rather that **with this growing vacuum of content** we have a situation where fewer people will experience what the study of a subject at a higher level that is, the discipline of this amounts to.' And **soon we may have a generation of higher education managers who are themselves none the wiser**.

In resistance to the kind of weakening of institutions that is advocated by Fryer, **it was emphasised** above **that academic standards depend on the sustaining of communities of scholars**. In such communities students are the novices. A crucial factor in their learning will most probably be the kind of example that their teacher sets. For all the value of the kinds of skills that the ILTHE seeks to promote, it may be that what is most important is that the teacher be enthralled by her subject con­sumed with enthusiasm and gripped by its problems and this may be manifest in multiple ways. Such commitment is not well understood in terms of expertise in its methodologies or even comprehensive knowledge; it involves primarily a particular kind of fascination with the content of what is studied, even a kind of reverence for this. And such a teacher cannot be isolated. The kind of community to which she belongs ilay be one physically present in the common room or the canteen, but **it will surely extend beyond this through conferences and e mail probably but more importantly through the journals and publications that connect with others in the field, writing now and in the past. Even the most solitary research involves a partnership between the living, the dead, and the as yet unborn**. This is, in Michael Oakeshott's phrase, the conversation of mankind

**Cocker. 2009. “The Yes of the No!”. Emma Cocker. writer and a Senior Lecturer in Fine Art at Nottingham Trent University. produced during a writing residency at the artist-led project Plan 9 in Bristol, as part of the project The Summer of Dissent, 2009. Accessed from:**[**http://drainmag.com/the-yes-of-the-no/**](http://drainmag.com/the-yes-of-the-no/)**- M.E.**

*Fourth* – “Prepare for the unexpected”  
**Readiness is the state of being at the cusp of action,** mind and body poised, awaiting signal. **To be prepared is to anticipate the unforeseen future. Unknown situations,** however, **demand a speculative approach for you can never be wholly sure what to expect,** what skills will be required. Yet, certain practices can be rehearsed daily: using your eyes; creating secret signs; receptiveness; reading maps; judging heights and distances; simple doctoring; stalking; learning to hide; plant identification, differentiating provisions from poisons; imagination; free speech; making fire; building bridges; early rising; whistling; wood whittling; weather wisdom, finding the North. Practice does not make perfect, rather a precarious capacity with no goal other than to be continually practiced. **Repetition of a singular action creates thinking space in which to contemplate strategy –** learning how to aim an arrow straight is to comprehend the vertiginous dynamic of a line of flight, to conceptualize an escape route. **To prepare for the unexpected has a dual function: it is the gesture of getting oneself ready** (for anything) **but also of scarifying the ground, creating germinal conditions in which something unanticipated might arise. Emergency is both a state of crisis and the event of emergence, the brink of the new.Dissent desires to break with or defy expectation by willing into existence the unexpected or something unlike what has come before – the eruption of a form of thinking or being differently.**

*Fifth* – “Make do”  
**The new or different is not something to passively anticipate** like next season’s shoes, better it be conjured from the conditions of the present, from what is already here and now. Surrendering to one’s circumstances does not mean to give in to the inevitable but rather to yield to the possibilities of what each specific situation brings – learning to be resourceful with what is to hand. **Reinvention is the practice of breaking down the familiar into a molten state in order to divert its flow,** of affecting a change in perception. **New economies emerge based on alternative principles of asymmetrical exchange – theft and piracy, gift giving and donation,** the art of losing one thing and finding something else. **Lending should be treated with** some **caution** however, for whilst **it suggests generosity it** often **expects more back in return.** To make do is not to manage with less nor hope for more, rather a call towards a life of creative action over dutiful consumption – an instruction to begin making and doing.[1](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=4b4a96ed4d&view=lg&msg=1339898ba268ef6c" \l "1339898ba268ef6c_sdfootnote1sym)

**Buchanan. 2006. “Space in the Age of the Non-Place”. Ian Buchanan. Leading Deleuzian and co-editor of the Deleuze Connections Series. Accessed from:**[**http://drainmag.com/index\_dete.htm**](http://drainmag.com/index_dete.htm)**– M.E.**

**Deterritorialisation names the process whereby the very basis of one's identity,** the proverbial ground beneath our feet,**is eroded,** washed away like the bank of a river swollen by floodwater - immersion.[[24]](http://drainmag.com/ContentDeterritorialization/Essay/Buchanan.html#_edn24) Although such transformations are often narrated as a discovery of oneself, **it would be** more **accurate to think of them in terms of loss, or, becoming-imperceptible,** as Deleuze and Guattari put it, by which they mean **ceasing to stand out, ceasing to be perceived as different, looking like everybody else, merging with the landscape.**[[25]](http://drainmag.com/ContentDeterritorialization/Essay/Buchanan.html#_edn25) The conclusion one might reach from the foregoing is that postmodern cities do not deterritorialize us in the way modern or pre-modern cities once did; but in fact the contrary would be true - even in his most rapturous moments **Flaubert wasn't deterritorialised by the Orient.** It did not change him, or open him to change. **This was** essentially **Said's point in Orientalism . Flaubert took his preformed assumptions and fantasies about the Orient to Egypt and returned with them** not only fully intact, but thoroughly **affirmed.** Said describes Flaubert's Orientalism as 'revivalist: *he*must bring the Orient to life, he must deliver it to his readers, and it is his experience of it in books and on the spot, and his language for it, that will do the trick.'[[26]](http://drainmag.com/ContentDeterritorialization/Essay/Buchanan.html#_edn26) Said rightly describes **Flaubert's writing** as cliché ridden and filled with grotesquerie (the lingering hospital scenes Said quotes being especially overripe), **but all importantly operating according to** a discernible logic, or as Deleuze and Guattari would put it, **code.** Flaubert writes in the expectation that his account of the Orient will be understood in a very particular manner - veils, hookahs, dates, the most mundane items betoken a fantasy world Flaubert is confident his readers will recognise and want to share. Effectively **Said's purpose** in *Orientalism***is to explain how this coding was formulated, disseminated and ultimately naturalised.**

**Roffe. 2006. “Art, Capitalism, Local Struggle: Some Deleuzean Propositions”. Jon Roffe. Drain Magazine. 2006. Accessed from:**[**http://www.drainmag.com/index\_dete.htm**](http://www.drainmag.com/index_dete.htm)**. - M.E.**

On the other, in *realizing*the axiomatic, **the State gives local and concrete form to the reduction of quality to quantity, of values** (in the most general sense) **to commodities,** and so forth. As expressions of the axiomatic, capitalist states are the local forms of the both the worst and the best results of this movement.

In fact, as Deleuze and Guattari go on to state, **this** latter - and really **threatening - aspect of contemporary social politics in capitalist society is the manner in which States, which realize the capitalist axiom in particular concrete situations, can exceed the power of the axioms in question. This leads towards new levels of domination, new ways to submit the members of these - our - societies to historically unprecedented kinds of oppression.**Like any virus, **capitalism only survives on the basis of the relative health of the host - but this does not render it harmless.**

**Deleuze and Guattari. 87. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. They fucked your mom. Is that a good enough qualification? “A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia Volume 2. 1987. ISBN: 08166140241987. University of Minnesota Press. Pg 230-231 – M.E.**

This brings us back to the paradox of fascism, and the way in which fascism differs from totalitarianism. For totalitarianism is a State affair: it essentially concerns the relation between the State as a localized assemblage and the abstract machine of overcoding it effectuates. Even in the case of a military dictatorship, it is a State army, not a war machine, that takes power and elevates the State to the totalitarian stage. Totalitarianism is quintessentially conservative.**Fascism,** on the other hand, **involves a war machine. When fascism builds itself a totalitarian State, it is**not in the sense of a State army taking power, but of**a war machine taking over the State.** A bizarre remark by Virilio puts us on the trail:in fascism, **the State is far less totalitarian than it is *suicidal.*There is in fascism a realized nihilism.** Unlike the totalitarian State, which does its utmost to seal all possible lines of flight, fascism is constructed on an intense line of flight, which it transforms into a line of pure destruction and abolition. It is curious that from the very beginning **the Nazis announced to Germany what they were bringing: at once wedding bells and death, including their own death, and the death of the Germans.** They thought they would perish but that their undertaking would be resumed, all across Europe, all over the world, throughout the solar system. And**the people cheered, not because they did not understand, but because they wanted that death through the death of others.** Like a will to wager everything you have every hand, to stake your own death against the death of others, and measure everything by "deleometers." Klaus Mann's novel, *Mephisto,*gives samplings of entirely ordinary Nazi speeches and conversations: "Heroism was something that was being ruled out of our lives. . . . In reality, we are not marching forward, we are reeling, staggering. Our beloved Fiihrer is dragging us toward the shades of darkness and everlasting nothingness. How can we poets, we who have a special affinity for darkness and lower depths, not admire him? . . . **Fires blazing on the horizon; rivers of blood in all the streets; and the frenzied dancing of the survivors,** of *those who are still spared,****around the bodies of the dead!"****32***Suicide is presented not as a punishment but as the crowning glory of the death of others. One can always say that it is just a matter of foggy talk and ideology,** nothing but ideology. **But that is not true**. The insufficiency of economic and political definitions of fascism does not simply imply a need to tack on vague, so-called ideological determinations. We prefer to follow Faye's inquiry into the precise formation of Nazi statements, which are just as much in evidence in politics and economics as in the most absurd of conversations. **They always contain the "stupid and repugnant" cry, *Long live death!,*even at the economic level,**where the arms expansion replaces growth in consumption and where investment veers from the means of production toward the means of pure destruction. Paul Virilio's analysis strikes us as entirely correct in defining fascism not by the notion of the totalitarian State but by the notion of the suicidal State: so-called total war seems less a State undertaking than an undertaking of a war machine that appropriates the State and channels into it a flow of absolute war whose only possible outcome is the suicide of the State itself. "The triggering of a hitherto unknown material process, one that is limitless and aimless. . . . **Once triggered, its mechanism cannot stop at peace, for the indirect strategy effectively places the dominant powers outside the usual categories of space and time. . . . It was in the horror of daily life**and its environment**that Hitler finally found his surest means of governing, t**he legitimation of his policies and military strategy; and it lasted right up to the end, for the ruins and horrors and crimes and chaos of total war, far from discharging the repulsive nature of its power, normally only increase its scope.**Telegram 71 is the normal outcome: *If the war is lost, may the nation perish.***Here,**Hitler decides to join forces with his enemies in order to complete the destruction of his own people**, by obliterating the last remaining resources of its life-support system, civil reserves of every kind (potable water, fuel, provisions, etc.)."33 **It was this reversion of the line of flight into a line of destruction that already animated the molecular focuses of fascism, and made them interact in a war machine instead of resonating in a State apparatus. *A war machine that no longer had anything but war as its object*and would rather annihilate its own servants than stop the destruction. All the dangers of the other lines pale by comparison.**