### 1

#### **Liberation is liquidated – politics is nothing more than a zombie on a bicycle – it appears to be moving forward but it’s already dead – the aff’s attempt to tweak the bicycle’s speed lock us into a permanent economy of dejection – their fundamental revisionism is no more than MOURNING for the zombie that they’ve killed**

Baudrillard, ‘08 (Jean Baudrillard, *Present Considerations: The uncertainty of all value* *systems*, journal of Baudrillard studies http://www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/vol5\_1/v5-1-article2-petit.html)

Baudrillard: Is this still political economy? I think the two terms, the economic and the political, have mingled their determinations and, so to speak, imploded into one another. We're in the postscript of a history or a political economy in which we're dealing with the waste products of two centuries of capital and production, includ­ing human waste. For thirty years or more we've been engaged in **the management of waste**, in a politics and an economy of dejection – which clearly involves a cer­tain abjection – in an interminable enterprise of recycling, cleansing and laundering, and this, once again, includes human material. And not only in its social dimension, but in the reprocessing of the genetic capital of the species. The whole system of modernity has embarked upon repentance and assumed a victim's perspective, as though we were dealing with a historical catastrophe of the human race that already existed, had already occurred, and the recycling of that catastro­phe. We're all impersonal victims of this virtual catastrophe, this backfiring of capital and history, from which we re-emerge as its symptoms and its multiple waste products. Hence the agonizing revision of modernity in which we're engaged, excluded from ourselves by the unconditional liberation of all our desires. In this sense, we're in a fundamentally revisionist society. The whole century is currently in mourning for, and repenting, all the libera­tions it has desired and accommodated, all the bounds it has burst – everything it was enslaved to and is now orphaned by. All the gains of modernity and liberation in recession – sex, tobacco, alcohol, speed, abortions: activities which are now clan­destine, doomed to prohibition and apartheid, refused a residence permit or cloistered in reserves. A general revisionist movement and a tide now flowing the other way – for future generations, this will all doubtless form part of what they never knew (happiness or hell!) For us, at least, those things still had the time to exist. But with the precession of the prohibition, they will disappear from circula­tion without even having appeared. Similarly, with all the ideals of modernity, the ideals of the Enlightenment, of happiness, well-being and freedom, their technical realization amounts to a violent desublimation. All that was liberated is currently being liquidated.

#### Engaging with politics is hopeless – the political system corrupts the social body – the aff is a fly caught hopelessly in a spider’s web slowing down their ability to escape – they’re a recycling of the negative, an absorption of all its disfunction that serves as nothing more than to feed the social

Baudrillard, ‘08 (Jean Baudrillard, *Present Considerations: The uncertainty of all value* *systems*, journal of Baudrillard studies http://www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/vol5\_1/v5-1-article2-petit.html)

Baudrillard: The State and political power sit atop all this in a very, very fragile position; they are, so to speak, like filigree-work upon a translucent society, like **a fiction** woven from multiple complicities. They allow themselves to be regenerated by **all who combat them**. The political class gets itself investigated and regenerated by the examining magistrates. It's as though there were a strategy here (the government putting itself in the position of victim), but in fact there isn't any political will at the top any longer. There's merely an internal perversion, an internal convolution of the system, which means that one can no longer be in an oppositional position. There is, then, a dangerous pretension on the part of the government to govern when it hasn't either the means or the will to do so any longer; but there's an even more deceitful and dangerous pretension among those who think they can reverse or overthrow the system, for even if they have the will to do so, they do precisely the opposite of what they intended. Now, the worst thing today is the lack of lucid­ity. When you're in a trap, you're in a trap. There's no point fighting on a terrain where the **models for neutralizing opposition are strongest**, where you're up against the spiralling trap of a system that is master both of the positive and of the negative. In that. Case you mustn’t look to some internal negativity any longer. You have to look either to the achievement, by saturation and concentration – by the system's excess of positivity – of a critical mass, and then it's no longer the negative but the more positive-than-positive that produces the upheaval; or to singularities, perfectly anomalous objects or events, which are neither inside nor outside. It's in this twisting of the system, in its automatic recycling by the negative, its absorption of all dysfunctions, that the essence of corruption and the baneful destiny of democracy lie. Petit: Listening to you, that destiny seems inescapable. It's no use asking what you think of those who are intent on refounding democratic citizenship. Baudrillard: At the current time, democracy is a social form that's about as ancestral as the symbolic exchange of primitive societies. And we dream of it in the same way. The political in general continues to be the waking dream of Western societies – of the exoteric societies where everything is expressed by technics. The esoteric societies, for their part (whether they are disinherited or traditional societies), long since brought politics into line with tribal arrangements. They have trapped and tamed the Western machinery of politics, law, democracy and the universal in their per­sonal structures and relations; they have integrated linearity and history into their own cycle. We may ask ourselves whether, on a much vaster scale and by the roundabout route of rationality, it isn't the same with our Western societies. Doesn't the political sphere obey impulses, obligations, challenges and fantasies that have lit­tle to do with public affairs? This incorruptible truth of evil, of the irrational, shows through in the very corruption of the political, which must therefore be interpreted positively as the impossibility of Political Reason realizing itself. This is what explains why the more imperative transparency becomes, the greater the corrup­tion. By wishing merely to take into account a politically correct human nature ­a fundamentally Rousseauist vision – the militants of the good democratic cause – of those who, more subtly, wish to rehabilitate the “essence” of the political – merely **feed this corrupt form of the social**. What is the point of setting a purpose for an enlightened dimension of the political and the social spheres, when it's becoming increasingly obvious, most particularly in the economic sphere, that these things are caught up with much stranger purposes, if not indeed with no purpose at all? There's a kind of savage delusion and – not to put too fine a point on it – stupid­ity, in stubbornly pressing on in the right direction when there is no direction, in wishing to change the form of the equation when it's equal to zero. Just look at all the battles everywhere on corrupt fronts: in the electoral system, where people are led to fight for equivalent castes; in the employment field, where everyone has to fight to find a place in a system of exploitation, a relatively favoured spot in a labour market which simultaneously serves the government as a black-mailing technique. Everywhere we're trapped in false problems, false alternatives, false issues, in which we lose out come what may.

#### Moving away from the disciplinary control of the virtual cyberworld ensures the human race is less reconciled with itself – embracing the immortal aspect of the human self - this engenders the ressentiment of the 1ac and ends in collective suicide through biological virulence

**Baudrillard, ’07** (Jean, International Journal of Baudrillard Studies; Volume 4, Number 2 (July, 2007), *Darwin’s Artificial Ancestors and the Terroristic Dream of the Transparency of the Good*, http://www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/vol4\_2/v4-2-baudrillard.html#\_edn2)

It seems that the more the human race **reconciles itself with nature, the less it is reconciled with itself**. Above and beyond the violence it inflicts on others, there is a violence specific to the human race in general, a violence of the species against itself in which it treats itself as a residue, as a survivor – even in the present – of a coming catastrophe. As if it too were ready to repent of an evolution which has brought it such privileges and carried it to such extremes. This is the same conjuncture as the one to which Canetti refers, in which we stepped out of history, except that here we have not stepped out of history, but have passed a point beyond which nothing is either human or inhuman any longer and what is at stake, which is even more immense, is the tottering of the species into the void. It is quite possible that, in this process, the species itself is commencing its own disappearance, either by disenchantment with – or ressentiment towards – itself, or out of a deliberate inclination which leads it here and now to manage that disappearance as its destiny. Surreptitiously, in spite of our superiority (or perhaps because of it), we are carrying over on to our own species the treatment we mete out to the others, all of which are virtually dying out. In an animal milieu which has reached saturation point, species are spontaneously dissuaded from living. The effects produced by the finite nature of the earth, for the first time contrasting violently with the infinity of our development, are such that our species is automatically switching over to **collective suicide**. Whether by external (**nuclear) violence** or internal (**biological) virulence**. We are subjecting ourselves as a human species to the same experimental pressure as the animal species in our laboratories. ~~Man~~ is without prejudice: he is using ~~him~~self as a guinea-pig, just as he is using the rest of the world, animate or inanimate. ~~He~~ is cheerfully gambling with the destiny of ~~his~~ own species as ~~he~~ is with that of all the others. In his blind desire to know more, ~~he~~ is programming ~~his~~ own destruction with the same ease and ferocity as the destruction of the others. ~~He~~ cannot be accused of a superior egoism. ~~He~~ is sacrificing himself, as a species, to an unknown experimental fate, unknown at least as yet to other species, who have experienced only natural fates. And, whereas it seemed that, linked to that natural fate, there was something like an instinct of self-preservation – long the mainstay of a natural philosophy of individuals and groups – this experimental fate to which the human species is condemning itself by unprecedented, artificial means, this scientific prefiguring of its own disappear­ance, sweeps away all ideas of a self-preservation instinct. The idea is, indeed, no longer discussed in the human sciences (where the focus of attention would seem, rather, to be on the death drive) and this disappearance from the field of thought signals that, beneath a frenzy for ecological conservation which is really more to do with nostalgia and remorse, a wholly different tendency has already won out, the sacrificing of the species to boundless experimentation. A contradictory dual operation: ~~man~~, alone of all species, is seeking to construct his immortal double, an unprecedented artificial species. ~~He~~ caps natural selection with an artificial super-­selection, claiming sole possession of a soul and a consciousness and, at the same time, ~~he~~ is putting an end to natural selection which entailed the death of each species in accordance with the law of evolution. In ending evolution (of all species including ~~his~~ own), ~~he~~ is contravening the symbolic rule and hence truly deserves to disappear. And this is without doubt the destiny he is preparing for ~~him~~self, in a roundabout way, in that, in his arrogant desire to end evolution, ~~man~~ is ushering in involution and the revival of inhuman, biogenetic forms. Here again, we have before us a reversive effect, running counter to any ideal or 'scientific' vision of the species. The idea running through the writings of Darwin that natural selection leads to a species capable of morally transcending natural selection is thoroughly specious. In aiming for virtual (technical) immortality and ensuring its exclusive perpetuation by a projection into artifacts, the human species is precisely losing its own immunity and specificity and becoming immortalized as an inhuman species; it is abolishing in itself the mortality of the living in favour of the immortality of the dead. It is immortalizing itself as the zero degree of a living species, as an operational artifact which no longer even obeys the law of species, except the law of artificial species, whose mortality is perhaps even more rapid. As a result, by going down these paths of artifice which were supposed to ensure its indefinite survival, it is perhaps hurtling even more quickly to its doom. The human species is currently domesticating itself, this time for good, by means of its technologies. It is submitting collectively to the same rituals as insepcts. Soon it will submit to the same controlled techniques of reproduction as the protozoa, will inflict on itself the same biogenetic (phylo- or ontogenetic) destiny to which it has subjected others. It no longer, in fact, sees itself as different from the others, in spite of its supremacy. It treats itself as a species that may be ruthlessly exploited, condemned to a brutalization and annihilation of its own. Here again, all the advances it has made and has forced others to accept have had a reversive effect upon it. To such an extent that it – the guardian, in its zoos, museums, reserves and laboratories, of condemned species – regards itself as a condemned species, and keeps an anxious eye trained on its biospheric destiny.

#### Expelling evil is counterproductive – the systems the aff engages with are fundamentally reversible – the 1ac muddles the object and the objective, confuses the murderer and the victim – it’s a suicidal process

Baudrillard, 08 (Jean Baudrillard, *Present Considerations: The uncertainty of all value* *systems*, International Journal of Baudrillard Studies <http://www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/vol5_1/v5-1-article2-petit.html>) – Ellipses to correct a typo

Baudrillard: It's a diagnosis. Our society has expelled violence (at the same time as it has expelled evil, illness, negativity and death – I don't mean it has eliminated them, but it has expelled them **from its system of values**). All forms of wildcat, spontaneous violence, historical and political, have been stifled or neutralized. Just as all forms of concrete freedom are being absorbed into the only freedom which remains, the freedom of the market and of market values, and the assumption of these into glob­alism, so all forms of violence are reduced and muzzled to the exclusive advantage of the terrorist and police-style violence of the new world order. The system has the monopoly of violence: a monopoly of the extermination of any singularity, any negativity, of death itself, and of real violence in the virtual violence of generalized pacification, fundamentalist [intégriste] violence (the only violence, that of the sys­tem, not that of terrorists, which remains small-scale and blind). Against this, new forms of violence are arising; or, rather, new forms of anony­mous, anomalous virulence – a reactive, reactional vehemence against the dominant thrust of society, **against any dominant system** – which is no longer a historical vio­lence of liberation, but **a violence from the confines** of a sacrificed destiny, from the confines of a sacrificed symbolic order, from the confines of the perfect crime or, in other words, of total integration (the integrism of the system) and even **of the democratic aspects of the system** (enforced liberation, enforced interactivity in all its forms) – that is to say, **the absence of destiny**. This new violence is no longer directed against the absence of freedom and against oppression, but against the absence of destiny and the democratic leukaemia of all our cells. Petit: An absence like that ,exhibited by H.B., the hostage-taker at the Neuilly Infants’ school, in 1995. In a book which – sadly – passed unnoticed, Alain Brossat Wrote of him: What the public will hot forgive the “monster” is his directly exhibiting ... what is basi­cally at stake in the crisis: not the economy, but living beings, not objects, but human relations, not car sales figures, but whether or not the life-world is fit to live in ...5 Baudrillard: He's right, because that violence on the part of H.B. or Florence Rey6 is no longer a political violence with a determinate objective (political violence has been absorbed and transformed into transpolitical energy for the benefit of the sys­tem). It's a violence cut off from its object and turning back against that object itself – against the political and the social. It's no longer anarchistic or revolution­ary, it's worse because its objective is no longer to set the system to rights or to transform the world by violently and historically. bringing something new into being; it takes the system itself as its object, aiming at systematic destabilization. It's not interested in the system's internal contradictions; it targets the very principle of the social and the political. It spontaneously takes a viral, temperamental form. It's an esoteric form which is its own justification, an exclusive violence which is merely the correlative of a system of exclusion. It answers the systematic exclusion our society practices by even more exclusion, cutting itself off from the social world by indifference or hatred. For it may be aggravated or apathetic: it may take the form of **an active terrorism or** that of **the inertia and irrepressible conformism of the masses**. No longer having ,either **object or objective**, it willfully (like all forms of virus arid virulence) **confuses the murderer and the victim**, **in an immense Stockholm syndrome**, precisely reflecting in this the system itself and its “perfect crime” – that is to say, its current ideal operation in which we are all simultaneously victims, murderers and accomplices (this is the truth of consensus, interactivity, and every­thing cycling back on itself). Taking a lofty, otherworldly view of the whole process – the process of the system and that of the violence which opposes it while reflecting its characteristic features (exclusion, autarky, anomaly, virulence) – one might conclude that it's an immense suicidal process, suicide being the perfect crime, inasmuch as in that act **murderer and victim are one**. In the history of humanity, then, the various lethal forms of violence are com­ing increasingly to resemble one another, as the terms are mingled and the roles merged (a confusion opened up irreversibly by the nuclear and by all the forms of complicity in pollution and death) to the point of wiping out, in the logical func­tioning of the system, any demarcation line between accomplice and victim (as any demarcation line between subject and object is being wiped out in philosophy and the sciences), and giving the image of a collective suicide, in which the attribution of responsibility becomes entirely secondary. Petit: But the threshold you speak of at which we break with this can, it seems, have only a clandestine existence. How are we to go on living in your world, our world, without being compromised? Baudrillard: **The only exception** is singularity. Singularity is the singularity of that anom­alous violence I'm referring to, the singularity which stands opposed to real violence, to the violence of any reality principle. For the basic violence, the basic deception, is the violence of the reality principle. Now, the system produces more and more reality, more and more of the social, more and more politics, more and more sex, more and more information, etc. That is its own peculiar violence. But at the same time, and in the same process, it **paradoxically produces more and more singularity** (of beings, of unidentified, refractory, excluded forces, which have no need of it to exist and are definitively exiled from the system). The example of the social sphere is fantastic. One day soon, that sphere will be fully realized, and the only people remaining will be the “excluded”. In a perfectly conformist sociality, only anomalous individuals and desocialized categories will be left, and they **won't** even **have any relationship**, dialectical or otherwise, **with** the social **institutions**. This is what's happening today at an increasingly rapid rate. As the social sphere is completed, with the discourse on “the social” playing its part, it expels everyone from the game (the homeless, the unemployed, vagrants, etc., and all the desocialized categories one after the other). In the end, the only people left in die[the] social sphere will be sociologists and social workers, all those for whom the “social” their stock in trade, and they will be left grappling with their object, which, though fully realized; has now become virtual. Retrospectively, it will be seen that the social sphere was only ever invented as a place to park the have-nots, and that today they're even being gradually expelled from there, like the Indians being driven off their reservations, thus allowing the better-off classes to occupy the social sphere as a second home. A strange contradictory movement, this, in which there's a growing mismatch between an idealistic, voluntaristic, expert dis­course, in which everything's getting better and better by pressing on regardless with imaginary solutions, and the real (if I dare use the term) state of affairs, in which everything's getting inexorably worse. The most disturbing thing is that the two are developing contradictorily and in, parallel, with the same irresistible dynamism. Flourishing social provision and galloping exclusion. Educational progress and mental, retardation. Perhaps there isn't even a contradiction or distor­tion here, merely a twist in the, same phenomena? This distortion can be seen everywhere: one day the construction of Europe will finally be completed, and there will really be no countries left to be part of it; it will in fact be constructed by successive exclusions and extraditions. It might even be the case, in the end, that when globalism has fully taken shape, and the cycle of information is perfectly inte­grated, there won't be anyone left on the networks any more. This is the perfect rule – the one where **there are only exceptions**. The perfect crime: the one in which there are only victims and accomplices, but no murderers (our present con­dition). The perfect social sphere: the one in which everyone is among “the excluded”. Perfect communication (the ecstasy of communication): when no one speaks to anyone any more.

#### The strategy of the aff is fundamentally dissuasive – placing the advocacy as the next step in the story pushes speed into hyper-reality. – beginning with the question of speed replicates the acceleration of messages and processes

**Baudrillard, ’92** (Jean, *Pataphysics of Year 2000*, [online])

Outside of this gravitational pull which keeps bodies in orbit, all the atoms of meaning lose themselves or self-absolve in space. Every single atom follows its own trajectory towards infinity and dissolves in space. This is precisely what we are living in our present societies occupied with the **acceleration of all** bodies, all **messages, all processes** in all possible senses and wherein, via modern media, each event, each narrative, each image gets endowed with the simulation of an infinite trajectory. Every political, historical, cultural fact is invested with a kinetic energy which spreads over its own space and thrusts these facts into a hyperspace where they **lose all meaning** by way of an inability to attain their meaning. It is useless to turn to science-fiction: from this point on, from the here and now, through our computer science, our circuits and our channels, this particle accelerator has definitively disrupted and broken the referential orbit of things. With respect to history, the narrative has become impossible since by definition it is the **potential re-narrativization of a sequence of meaning**. Through the impulse of total diffusion and circulation **each event is liberated for itself only** — each event becomes atomized and nuclear as it follows its trajectory into the void. In order to diffuse itself *ad infinitum,* it has to be fragmented like a particle. This is the way it attains a speed of no-return, distancing it from history once and for all. Every cultural, eventual group needs to be fragmented, disarticulated to allow for its entry into the circuits, each language must be absolved into a binary mechanism or device to allow for its circulation to take place — not in our memory, but in the electronic and luminous memory of the computers. There is no human language or speech (*langage*) that could compete with the speed of light. There is no event that could withstand its own diffusion across the planet. No meaning stands a chance once offered the means of its own acceleration. There is no history that will resist the centrifugal pull of facts or its short-circuiting in real time (in the same order of ideas: no sexuality will resist its own liberation, not a single culture will foreclose its own advancement, no truth will defy its own verification, etc.). Even theory is no longer in the state of "reflecting" on anything anymore. All it can do is to snatch concepts from their critical zone of reference and transpose them to the point of no return, in the process of which theory itself too, passes into the hyperspace of simulation as it loses all "objective" validity, while it makes significant gains by acquiring real affinity with the current system. The second hypothesis, with respect to the vanishing of history, is the opposite of the first, i.e., it pertains not to the acceleration but to the slowing down of processes. This too is derived directly from physics. Matter slows the passage of time. More precisely, time seems to pass very slowly upon the surface of a very dense body of matter. The phenomenon increases in proportion to growth in density. The effect of this slowing down (*ralentissement*) will raise the wavelength of light emitted by this body in a way that will allow the observer to record this phenomenon. Beyond a certain limit, time stops, the length of the wave becomes infinite. The wave no longer exists. Light extinguishes itself. The analogy is apparent in the way history slows down as it brushes up against the astral body of the "silent majorities". Our societies are governed by this process of the mass, and not only in the sociological or demographical sense of the word, but also in the sense of a "critical mass", of going beyond a certain point of no-return. That is where the crucially significant event of these societies is to be found: the advent of their revolutionary process along the lines of their mobility, (they are all revolutionary with respect to the centuries gone by), of their equivalent force of inertia, of an immense indifference, and of the silent power of this indifference. This inert matter of the social is not due to a lack of exchanges, of information or of communication; on the contrary, it is the result of the multiplication and saturation of exchanges. It is borne of the hyperdensity of cities, of merchandise, messages and circuits. It is the cold star of the social, a mass at the peripheries of which history cools out. Successive events attain their annihilation in indifference. **Neutralized and bullet-sprayed by information**, the masses neutralise history retrospect and act as a screen of absorption. They themselves have no history, no meaning, no conscience, no desire. They are potential residues of all history, of all meaning, of all desire. By **inserting themselves into modernity**, all these wonderful things managed to invoke **a mysterious counterpart**, the misappreciation of which has unleashed all current political and social strategies. This time, it's the opposite: history, meaning, progress are no longer able to find their speed or tempo of liberation. They can no longer pull themselves out of this much too dense body which slows down their trajectory, slows down their time to the point from whereon perception and imagination of the future escapes us. All social, historical and temporal transcendence is absorbed via this mass's silent immanence. Already, political events no longer conduct sufficient autonomous energy to rouse us and can only run their course as a silent movie in front of which we all sit collectively irresponsible. That is where history reaches its end, not because of the lack of actors or participants, not due to a lack of violence (with respect to violence, there is always an increasing amount), not due to a lack of events (as for events, there will always be more of them thanks to the role of the media and information!) — but because of a slowing down or deceleration, because of indifference and stupefaction. History can no longer go beyond itself, it can no longer envisage its own finality or dream of its own end, it shrouds or buries itself in its immediate effect, it self-exhausts in special effects, it implodes in current events. Essentially, one can no longer speak of the end of history since it has no time to rejoin its own end. **As its effects accelerate, its meaning inexorably decelerates**. It will end up stopping and extinguishing itself like light and time at the peripheries of an infinitely dense mass... Humanity too, had its big-bang: a certain critical density, a certain concentration of people and exchanges that compel this explosion we call *history* and which is none other than the dispersal of dense and hieratic cores of earlier civilizations. Today, we are living an effect of reversal: we have overstepped the threshold of critical mass with respect to populations, events, information, control of the inverse process of inertia of history and politics. At the cosmic level of things, we don't know anymore whether we have reached this speed of liberation wherein we would be partaking of a permanent or final expansion (this, no doubt, will remain forever uncertain). At the human level, where prospects are more limited, it is possible that the energy itself employed for the liberation of the species (acceleration of birthrates, of techniques and exchanges in the course of the centuries) have contributed to an excess of mass and resistance that bear on the initial energy as it drags us along a ruthless movement of contraction and inertia. Whether the universe infinitely expands or retracts to an infinitely dense and infinitely small core will hinge upon its critical mass (with respect to which speculation itself is infinite in view of the discovery of newer particles). Following the analogy, whether our human history will be evolutionary or involuted will presumably depend upon the critical mass of humanity. Are we to see ourselves, like the galaxies, on a definitive orbit that distances us from each other under the impact of a tremendous speed, or is this dispersal to infinity itself destined to reach an end, and the human molecules bound to draw closer to each other by way of an inverse effect of gravitation? The question is whether a human mass that grows day by day is able to control a pulsation of this genre? Third hypothesis, third analogy. But we are still dealing with a point of disappearance, a point of evanescence, a *vanishing-point,* this time however along the lines of music. This is what I call the stereophonic effect. We are all obsessed with high fidelity, with the quality of musical "transmission" (*rendu*). On the console of our channels, equipped with our tuners, our amplifiers and our baffles, we mix, regulate and multiply soundtracks in search of an infallible or unerring music. Is this, though, still music? Where is the threshold of high fidelity beyond the point of which music as such would disappear? Disappearance would not be due to the lack of music, it would disappear for having stepped beyond this boundary, it would disappear into the perfection of its materiality, into its own special effect. Beyond this point, neither judgement nor aesthetic pleasure could be found anymore. Ecstasy of musicality procures its own end. The disappearance of history is of the same order: there too, we have gone beyond this limit or boundary where, subjected to *factual* and *information-al* sophistication, history as such ceases to exist. Large doses of immediate diffusion, of special effects, of secondary effects, of fading — and this famous Larsen effect produced in acoustics by an excessive proximity between source and receiver, in history via an excessive proximity, and therefore the disastrous interference of an event with its diffusion — create a short-circuit between cause and effect, similarly to what takes place between the object and the experimenting subject in microphysics (and in the human sciences!). All things entailing a certain radical uncertainty of the event, like excessive high fidelity, lead to a radical uncertainty with respect to music. Elias Canetti says it well: "as of a certain point", nothing is true anymore. This is also why the soft music of history escapes us, it disappears under the microscope or into the stereophony of information.

#### They built Disney World – the map the 1ac wrote is meant for nothing more than intellectual tourism – this writes a script for the irruption of the New into the present and annihilates its uniqueness and singularity.

**Baudrillard, ’01** (Jean, *Dust Breeding*, http://www.egs.edu/faculty/jean-baudrillard/articles/dust-breeding/)

Destiny – modern man is left with an endless experimentation of himself

Our reality has become experimental. Without destiny, modern ~~man~~ is left with an endless experimentation of ~~himself~~. Let's take two recent examples. The first one, the Loft Story show, is a media illusion of live reality. The second one, the case of Catherine Millet’s book, is a phantasmatic illusion of live sex. The Loft show has become a universal concept: a human amusement park combined with a ghetto, solitary confinement (huis-clos), and an Angel of Death. The idea is to use voluntary seclusion as a laboratory for synthetic conviviality, for a telegenetically modified society. In this space, where **everything is meant to be seen** (as in "Big Brother", other reality-TV shows, etc.), we realize that there is nothing left to see. It becomes a mirror of dullness, of nothingness, on which the disappearance of the other is blatantly reflected (even though the show alleges different objectives). It also reveals the possibility that human beings are fundamentally not social. **This space becomes the equivalent of a "ready-made**" just-as-is (telle quelle) transposition of an "everyday life" that has already been trumped by all dominant models. It is **a synthetic banality, fabricated in closed circuits and supervised by a monitoring screen**. In this sense, the artificial microcosm of the Loft Story is similar to Disneyland which gives the illusion of a real world, a world out-there, whereas both Disney's world and the world outside of it are mirror images of one another. All of the United States is (in) Disneyland. And we, in France, are all inside the Loft. No need to enter reality’s virtual reproduction. We are already in it. The televisual universe is merely a holographic detail of the global reality. Even in our most mundane activities we are deep into experimental reality. And this explains our fascination with immersion and spontaneous interactivity. Does it mean that it is all pornographic voyeurism? Not at all. Sex is everywhere else to be found, but that's not what people want. What people deeply desire is a spectacle of banality. This spectacle of banality is today's true pornography and obscenity. It is the obscene spectacle of nullity (nullité), insignificance, and platitude. This stands as the complete opposite of the theater of cruelty. But perhaps there is still a form of cruelty, at least a virtual one, attached to such a banality. At a time when television and the media in general are less and less capable of accounting for (rendre compte) the world's (unbearable) events, they rediscover daily life. They discover existential banality as the deadliest event, as the most violent piece of information: the very location of the perfect crime. Existential banality is the perfect crime. And people are fascinated (but terrified at the same time) by this indifferent "nothing-to-say" or "nothing-to-do," by the indifference of their own lives. Contemplating the Perfect Crime --banality as the latest form of fatality-- has become a genuine Olympic contest, the latest version of extreme sports. What makes it worse is the fact that the public is mobilized as the judge of all this. The public has become Big Brother. We are well beyond panopticism, beyond visibility as a source of power and control. It is no longer a matter of making things visible to the external eye. It is rather a question of making things transparent to themselves, through **the diffusion of control into the masses**, a mode of control which by the same token erases the marks of the system. Thus, the audience is involved in a gigantic exercise of negative counter-transference (contre-transfert), and this is once again where the dizzying attraction of this kind of spectacle comes from. In fact, all this corresponds to the inalienable right or desire to be nothing and to be regarded as such. There are two ways to disappear. Either you demand not to be seen (the current issue with image rights); or you turn to the maddening exhibitionist display of your insignificance. You make yourself insignificant in order to be seen as such. This is the ultimate protection against the need to exist and the duty to be oneself. But this situation also creates the contradictory demand to simultaneously not be seen and to be perpetually visible. Everyone must have it both ways. No ethic or law can solve this dilemma. There is no possibility to adjudicate between the unconditional right to see and the unconditional right not to be seen. Complete information is a basic human rights requirement. And this necessity brings with it the idea of forced visibility, including the right to be over-exposed by the media. Foucault used to refer to self-expression as the ultimate form of confession. Keeping no secret. Speaking, talking, endlessly communicating. This is a form of violence which targets the singular being and ~~his~~ secrecy. It is also a form of **violence against language**. In this mode of communicability, language loses its originality. Language simply becomes a medium, an operator of visibility. It has lost its symbolic and ironic qualities, **those which make language more important than what it conveys**. The worst part of this obscene and indecent visibility is the forced enrollment, the automatic complicity of the spectator who has been blackmailed into participating. The obvious goal of this kind of operation is to enslave the victims. But the victims are quite willing. They are rejoicing at the pain and the shame they suffer. Everybody must abide by society's fundamental logic: interactive exclusion. Interactive exclusion, what could be better! Let’s all agree on it and practice it with enthusiasm! If everything ends with visibility (which, similar to the concept of heat in the theory of energy, is the most degraded form of existence), the point is still to make such a loss of symbolic space and such an extreme disenchantment with life an object of contemplation, of sidereal observation (sidération), and of perverse desire. "While humanity was once according to Homer an object of contemplation for the Gods, it has now become a contemplation of itself. Its own alienation has reached such a degree that humanity’s own destruction becomes a first rate aesthetic sensation" (Walter Benjamin). Everywhere the experimental takes over the real and the imaginary. Everywhere, principles of scientific evidence and verification are introduced. Under the scalpel of the camera, and without recourse to any symbolic language or context, **we are vivisecting and dissecting social relations**. The case of Catherine Millet is another example of experimental reality, another type of vivi-sexion. In her book, the sexual imaginary is blown away. All that’s left is a principle of unlimited verification of sexual operations. It is a mechanism which is no longer sexual. A double misinterpretation is taking place. The idea of sexuality is turned into the ultimate reference. Whether it is repressed or it is displayed, sexuality is at best nothing more than a hypothesis. It is incorrect to take a hypothesis for a truth or a solid reference. It may well be that the sexual hypothesis is nothing more than a fantasy. In any case, it is through its repression that sexuality has gained such a strange power of attraction. Once it is played out, sexuality loses its postulated quality. Hence, it is absurd and misplaced to act it out and to systematically call for sexual "liberation." One never liberates a hypothesis. And how sad is the idea of demonstrating sexuality through the sexual act! As if displacements, deviations, transfers, and metaphors had nothing to do with sex. Everything is in the filter of seduction, in détournement. Not the seduction in sex and desire, but the seduction of playing with sex and desire (le jeu avec the sexe et le désir). This is exactly what makes impossible the idea of "live sex." The concepts of live death or live news are just as naively naturalist. They are all linked to the pretentious claim that everything can happen in the real world, that everything craves to find its place inside an all encompassing reality. After all, this is the essence of power too: "**The corruption of power is to inscribe into reality what was only found in dreams**."

#### Death functions in the reduction of things to inert objects of knowledge defined by their exchange value. Universal equivalence only proves no unique value. Information itself only serves as a testimony to the grand meaninglessness of our civilization. Buried under mountains of information, all the world has become a museum, death

**Baudrillard 76** [Jean, “Symbolic Exchange and Death”, p. 185]

Pursued and censured everywhere, death springs up everywhere again. No longer as apocalyptic folklore, such as might have haunted the living imagination in certain epochs; but voided precisely of any imaginary substance, it passes into the most banal reality, and for us takes on the mask of the very principle of rationality that dominates our lives. Death is when everything functions and serves something else, it is the absolute, signing, cybernetic functionality of the urban environment as in Jacques Tati's film Play-Time. Man is absolutely indexed on his function, as in Kafka: the age of the civil servant is the age of a culture of death. This is the phantasm of total programming, increased predictability and accuracy, finality not only in material things, but in fulfilling desires. In a word, death is confused with the law of value -- and strangely with the structural law of value by which everything is arrested as a coded difference in a universal nexus of relations. This is the true face of ultra-modern death, made up of the faultless, objective, ultra-rapid connection of all the terms in a system. Our true necropolises are no longer the cemeteries, hospitals, wars, hecatombs; death is no longer where we think it is, it is no longer biological, psychological, metaphysical, it is no longer even murder: our societies' true necropolises are the computer banks or the foyers, blank spaces from which all human noise has been expunged, glass coffins where the world's sterilised memories are frozen. Only the dead remember everything in something like an immediate eternity of knowledge, a quintessence of the world that today we dream of burying in the form of microfilm and archives, making the entire world into an archive in order that it be discovered by some future civilization. The cryogenic freezing of all knowledge so that it can be resurrected; knowledge passes into immortality as sign-value. Against our dream of losing and forgetting everything, we set up an opposing great wall of relations, connections and information, a dense and inextricable artificial memory, and we bury ourselves alive in the fossilised hope of one day being rediscovered. Computers are the transistorised death to which we submit in the hope of survival. Museums are already there to survive all civilisations, in order to bear testimony. But to what? It is of little importance. The mere fact that they exist testifies that we are in a culture which no longer possesses any meaning for itself and which can now only dream of having meaning for someone else from a later time. Thus everything becomes an environment of death as soon as it is no longer a sign that can be transistorised in a gigantic whole, just as money reaches the point of no return when it is nothing more than a system of writing.

#### The battle for the public sphere is over—everyone lost. Conservatives and liberals are now two sides of the same coin, and any movement that actually promises radical change will be destroyed as soon as it becomes visible. An invisible movement has the most subversive potential—the only space left for radical thought is the non-sensical, that which is excluded by its very unintelligibility to the public sphere

**The Invisible Committee, ‘7** [an anonymous group of French professors, phd candidates, and intellectuals, in the book “The Coming Insurrection” published by Semiotext(e) (attributed to the [Tarnac Nine](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tarnac_Nine) by the French police), <http://tarnac9.noblogs.org/gallery/5188/insurrection_english.pdf>]

Whatever angle you look at it from, **there's no escape from the present. That's** not the least of its virtues. For those who want absolutely to have hope, it knocks down every support. Those who claim to have solutions are proven wrong almost immediately. It's understood that now everything can only go from bad to worse. "There's no future for the future" is the wisdom behind an era that for all its appearances of extreme normalcy has come to have about the consciousness level of the first punks. The sphere of political representation is closed. From left to right, it's the same nothingness acting by turns either as the big shots or the virgins, the same sales shelf heads, changing up their discourse according to the latest dispatches from the information service. Those who still vote give one the impression that their only intention is to knock out the polling booths by voting as a pure act of protest. And we've started to understand that in fact it’s only against the vote itself that people go on voting. Nothing we've seen can come up to the heights of the present situation; not by far. By its very silence, the populace seems infinitely more 'grown up' than all those squabbling amongst themselves to govern it do. Any Belleville chibani 1 is wiser in his chats than in all of those puppets’ grand declarations put together. The lid of the social kettle is triple-tight, and the pressure inside won’t stop building. The ghost of Argentina’s Que Se Vayan Todos 2 is seriously starting to haunt the ruling heads. The fires of November 2005 will never cease to cast their shadow on all consciences. Those first joyous fires were the baptism of a whole decade full of promises. The media’s “suburbs vs. the Republic” myth, if it’s not inefficient, is certainly not true. The fatherland was ablaze all the way to downtown everywhere, with fires that were methodically snuffed out. Whole streets went up in flames of solidarity in Barcelona and no one but the people who lived there even found out about it. And the country hasn’t stopped burning since. Among the accused we find diverse profiles, without much in common besides a hatred for existing society; not united by class, race, or even by neighborhood. What was new wasn’t the “suburban revolt,” since that was already happening in the 80s, but the rupture with its established forms. The assailants weren’t listening to anybody at all anymore, not their big brothers, not the local associations assigned to help return things to normal. No “SOS Racism which only fatigue, falsification, and media omertà 4 could feign putting an end. The whole series of nocturnal strikes, anonymous attacks, wordless destruction, had the merit of busting wide open the split between politics and the political. No one can honestly deny the obvious weight of this assault which **made no demands**, and had no message other than a threat which had nothing to do with politics. But you’d have to be blind not to see what is **purely political** about this **resolute negation of politics,** and you’d certainly have to know absolutely nothing about the autonomous youth movements of the last 30 years. Like abandoned children we burned the first baby toys of a society that deserves no more respect than the monuments of Paris did at the end of Bloody Week 5 -- and knows it. There’s **no social solution** to the present situation. First off because the vague aggregate of social groupings, institutions, and individual bubbles that we designate by the anti-phrase “society” has no substance, because there’s no language left to express common experiences with. It took a half-century of fighting by the Lumières to thaw out the possibility of a French Revolution, and a century of fighting by work to give birth to the fearful “Welfare State.” Struggles creating the language in which the new order expresses itself. Nothing like today. Europe is now a de-monied continent that sneaks off to make a run to the Lidl 6 and has to fly with the low-cost airlines to be able to keep on flying. **None of the “problems” formulated in the social language are resolvable**. The “retirement pensions issue,” the issues of “precariousness,” the “youth” and their “violence” can only be kept in suspense as long as the ever more surprising “acting out” they thinly cover gets managed away police-like. No one’s going to be happy to see old people being wiped out at a knockdown price, abandoned by their own and with nothing to say. And those who’ve found less humiliation and more benefit in a life of crime than in sweeping floors will not give up their weapons, and prison won’t make them love society. The rage to enjoy of the hordes of the retired will not take the somber cuts to their monthly income on an empty stomach, and will get only too excited about the refusal to work among a large sector of the youth. And to conclude, no guaranteed income granted the day after a quasi-uprising will lay the foundations for a new New Deal, a new pact, and a new peace. The social sentiment is rather **too evaporated** for all that. As their solution, they’ll just never stop putting on the pressure, to make sure nothing happens, and with it we’ll have more and more police chases all over the neighborhood. The drone that even according to the police indeed did fly over Seine-Saint-Denis 7 last July 14 th is a picture of the future in much more straightforward colors than all the hazy images we get from the humanists. That they took the time to clarify that it was not armed shows pretty clearly the kind of road we’re headed down. The country is going to be cut up into ever more air-tight zones. Highways built along the border of the “sensitive neighborhoods” already form walls that are invisible and yet able to cut them off from the private subdivisions. Whatever good patriotic souls may think about it, the management of neighborhoods “by community” is most effective just by its notoriety. The purely metropolitan portions of the country, the main downtowns, lead their luxurious lives in an ever more calculating, ever more sophisticated, ever more shimmering deconstruction. They light up the whole planet with their whorehouse red lights, while the BAC 8 and the private security companies’ -- read: militias’ -- patrols multiply infinitely, all the while benefiting from being able to hide behind an ever more disrespectful judicial front. The catch-22 of the present, though perceptible everywhere, is denied everywhere. Never have so many psychologists, sociologists, and literary people devoted themselves to it, each with their own special jargon, and each with their own specially missing solution. It’s enough just to listen to the songs that come out these days, the trifling “new French music,” where the petty-bourgeoisie dissects the states of its soul and the K’1Fry mafia 9 makes its declarations of war, to know that this coexistence will come to an end soon and that a decision is about to be made. This book is signed in the name of an imaginary collective. Its editors are not its authors. They are merely content to do a little clean-up of what’s scattered around the era’s common areas, around the murmurings at bar-tables, behind closed bedroom doors. They’ve only determined a few necessary truths, whose universal repression fills up the psychiatric hospitals and the painful gazes. They’ve made themselves scribes of the situation. It’s the privilege of radical circumstances that justice leads them quite logically to revolution. It’s enough just to say what we can see and not avoid the conclusions to be drawn from it.

**the university is a foul prison. For all of their arguments about the situation of specific identities, they are remarkably silent on what prefigures that: *where* those identities are articulated in the first place.**

#### The old liberal slogan “universities, not jails” implies a false dichotomy. To be coherently critical of the university within the university is always to recognize and be recognized *by it,* and therefore contained. They are the critical intellectual counterinsurgency that is worse than the status quo because the 1ac can be held up as an example of the neutrality of the university, allowing more radical theories to be disregarded as unprofessional. Remember this every time they claim we have no alternative.

**Harney and Moten 13.** Stefano Harney, Professor of Strategic Management Education at the Lee Kong Chian School of Business, Singapore Management University and a co-founder of the School for Study and Fred Moten, Helen L. Bevington Professor of Moden Poetry, “Politics Surrounded,” The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study, pg. 29

Introducing this labor upon labor, and providing the space for its de- velopment, creates risks. Like **the colonial police force recruited un- wittingly from guerrilla neighborhood**s, university labor may harbor refugees, fugitives, renegades, and castaways. But **there are good rea- sons for the university to be confident that such elements will be ex- posed or forced underground**. **Precautions have been taken, book lists have been drawn up, teaching observations conducted, invitations to contribute made**. Yet against these precautions stands the immanence of transcendence, the necessary deregulation and the possibilities of criminality and fugitivity that labor upon labor requires. Maroon communities of composition teachers, mentorless graduate students, adjunct Marxist historians, out or queer management professors, state college ethnic studies departments, closed-down film programs, visa- expired Yemeni student newspaper editors, historically black college sociologists, and feminist engineers. **And what will the university say of them? It will say they are unprofessional**. This is not an arbitrary charge. It is the charge against the more than professional. How do those who exceed the profession, who exceed and by exceeding es- cape, how do those maroons problematize themselves, problematize the university, force the university to consider them a problem, a dan- ger? The undercommons is not, in short, the kind of fanciful com- munities of whimsy invoked by Bill Readings at the end of his book. **The undercommons, its maroons, are always at war, always in hiding**.

The maroons know something about possibility. They are the condi- tion of possibility of the production of knowledge in the university – the singularities against the writers of singularity, the writers who write, publish, travel, and speak. It is not merely a matter of the secret labor upon which such space is lifted, though of course such space is lifted from collective labor and by it. It is rather that to be a critical academic in the university is to be against the university, and to be against the university is always **to recognize it and be recognized by it**, and to institute the negligence of that internal outside, that unas- similated underground, a negligence of it that is precisely, we must insist, the basis of the professions. And **this act of being against al- ways already excludes the unrecognized modes of politics, the beyond of politics already in motion, the discredited criminal para-organiza- tion**, what Robin Kelley might refer to as the infrapolitical field (and its music). It is not just the labor of the maroons but their prophetic organization that is negated by the idea of intellectual space in an organization called the university. **This is why the negligence of the critical academic is always at the same time an assertion of bourgeois individualism**.

Such negligence is the essence of professionalization where it turns out professionalization is not the opposite of negligence but its mode of politics in the United States. It takes the form of a choice that excludes the prophetic organization of the undercommons – to be against, to put into question the knowledge object, let us say in this case the university, not so much without touching its founda- tion, as without touching one’s own condition of possibility, with- out admitting the Undercommons and being admitted to it. From this, a general negligence of condition is the only coherent position. Not so much an antifoundationalism or foundationalism, as both are used against each other to avoid contact with the undercom- mons. This always-negligent act is what leads us to say there is no distinction between the university in the United States and profes- sionalization. There is no point in trying to hold out the university against its professionalization. **They are the same**. Yet the maroons refuse to refuse professionalization, that is, to be against the uni- versity. The university will not recognize this indecision, and thus professionalization is shaped precisely by what **it cannot acknowl- edge, its internal antagonism, its wayward labor, its surplus**. **Against this wayward labor it sends the critical, sends its claim that what is left beyond the critical is waste**.

But in fact, **critical education only attempts to perfect professional education**. The professions constitute themselves in an opposition to the unregulated and the ignorant without acknowledging the unreg- ulated, ignorant, unprofessional labor that goes on not opposite them but within them. But if professional education ever slips in its labor, ever reveals its condition of possibility to the professions it supports and reconstitutes, **critical education is there to pick it up, and to tell it, never mind** – **it was just a bad dream, the ravings, the drawings of the mad**. Because critical education is precisely there to tell professional education to rethink its relationship to its opposite – by which criti- cal education means both itself and the unregulated, against which professional education is deployed. In other words, **critical education arrives to support any faltering negligence, to be vigilant in its negli- gence, to be critically engaged in its negligence. It is more than an ally of professional education, it is its attempted completion**.

**A professional education has become a critical education**. But one should not applaud this fact. It should be taken for what it is, not pro- gress in the professional schools, not cohabitation with the Univer- sitas, but **counterinsurgency, the refounding terrorism of law, coming for the discredited, coming for those who refuse to write off or write up the undercommons**.

#### To make resistance visible is to coopt it by giving it an object – this understanding allows resistance to be framed, to be declared a failure and prevents the immanence of imperceptible politics from coalescing around mundane academic practices and habitudes of existence. Within the situatedness of the university, the question is thus not, “what type of knowledge can be produced from a specific subject position?” but whether or not that knowledge is *reactive* and so *intelligible to* apparatuses of capture that will co-opt and contain it

**Tsianos et al. ‘8** Vassilis, teaches sociology at the University of Hamburg, Germany, Dimitris Papadopoulos teaches social theory at Cardiff University, Niamh Stephenson teaches social science at the University of New South Wales. “Escape Routes: Control and Subversion in the 21st Century” Pluto Press

In this sense **imperceptible politics does not necessarily differ from or oppose other prevalent forms of politics, such as state-oriented politics, micropolitics, identity politics, cultural and gender politics, civil rights movements, etc**. And indeed **imperceptible politics connects with all these various forms of political engagement and intervention in an opportunistic way: it deploys them to the extent that they allow the establishment of spaces outside representation**; that is, spaces which do not primarily focus on the transformation of the conditions of the double-R axiom (rights and representation) but on the insertion of new social forces into a given political terrain. In the previous chapter we called this form of politics outside politics: the politics which opposes the representational regime of policing. Imperceptibility is the everyday strategy which allows us to move and to act below the overcoding regime of representation. **This everyday strategy is inherently anti-theoretical; that is, it resists any ultimate theorisation, it cannot be reduced to one successful and necessary form of politics** (such as state-oriented politics or micropolitics, for example). **Rather, imperceptible politics is genuinely empiricist, that is it is always enacted as ad hoc practices which allow the decomposition of the representational strategies in a particular field and the composition of events which cannot be left unanswered by the existing regime of control. If imperceptible politics resists theorisation and is ultimately empiricist, what then are the criteria for doing imperceptible politics? There are** three **dimensions which characterise imperceptible politics: objectlessness,** totality, **trust**. **Firstly, imperceptible politics is objectless, that is it performs political transformation without primarily targeting a specific political aim (such as transformation of a law or institution, or a particular claim for inclusion**, etc). **Instead imperceptible politics proceeds by materialising its own political actions through contagious and affective transformations.** **The object of its political practice is its own practices. In this sense, imperceptible politics is non-intentional - and therein lies its difference from state-oriented politics or the politics of civil rights movements**, for example - **it instigates change through a series of everyday transformations which can only be codified as having a central political aim or function in retrospect**. Secondly, imperceptible politics addresses the totality of an existing field of power. This seems to be the difference between imperceptible politics and micropolitics or other alternative social movements: imperceptible politics is not concerned with containing itself to a molecular level of action; it addresses the totality of power through the social changes which it puts to work in a particular field of action. The distinction between molar and molecular (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 275) has only analytical significance from the perspective of imperceptible politics. In fact imperceptible politics is both molar and molecular, because by being local situated action it addresses the whole order of control in a certain field. Imperceptible politics is located at the heart of a field of power and at the same time it opens a way to move outside this field by forcing the transformation of all these elements which are constitutive of this field. In this sense, imperceptible politics is a driving force which is simul­taneously both present and absent. We described this in the previous chapter by exploring the importance of speculative figurations for the practice of escape. On the everyday level of escape (a level we called in this chapter imperceptible politics) speculative figuration can be translated into trust. This is the third characteristic of **imperceptible politics**; it **is driven by a firm belief in the importance and truthfulness of its actions, without seeking any evidence for, or conducting any investigation into its practices. This is trust. Imperceptible politics is driven by trust in something which seems to be absent from a particular situation. Imperceptible politics operates around a void, and it is exactly the conversion of this void into everyday politics that becomes the vital force for imperceptible politics.**

#### **Their desire to isolate and expel the wrong kinds of speed feeds into a virulent form of opposition that produces a self-defeating violence – the system of values the 1ac maps will annihilate its own subjects – the only alternative is the logic of exception.**

Baudrillard, ‘08 (Jean Baudrillard, *Present Considerations: The uncertainty of all value* *systems*, International Journal of Baudrillard Studies <http://www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/vol5_1/v5-1-article2-petit.html>) – Ellipses to correct a typo

Baudrillard: It's a diagnosis. Our society has expelled violence (at the same time as it has expelled evil, illness, negativity and death – I don't mean it has eliminated them, but it has expelled them **from its system of values**). All forms of wildcat, spontaneous violence, historical and political, have been stifled or neutralized. Just as all forms of concrete freedom are being absorbed into the only freedom which remains, the freedom of the market and of market values, and the assumption of these into glob­alism, so all forms of violence are reduced and muzzled to the exclusive advantage of the terrorist and police-style violence of the new world order. The system has the monopoly of violence: a monopoly of the extermination of any singularity, any negativity, of death itself, and of real violence in the virtual violence of generalized pacification, fundamentalist [intégriste] violence (the only violence, that of the sys­tem, not that of terrorists, which remains small-scale and blind). Against this, new forms of violence are arising; or, rather, new forms of anony­mous, anomalous virulence – a reactive, reactional vehemence against the dominant thrust of society, **against any dominant system** – which is no longer a historical vio­lence of liberation, but **a violence from the confines** of a sacrificed destiny, from the confines of a sacrificed symbolic order, from the confines of the perfect crime or, in other words, of total integration (the integrism of the system) and even **of the democratic aspects of the system** (enforced liberation, enforced interactivity in all its forms) – that is to say, **the absence of destiny**. This new violence is no longer directed against the absence of freedom and against oppression, but against the absence of destiny and the democratic leukaemia of all our cells. Petit: An absence like that ,exhibited by H.B., the hostage-taker at the Neuilly Infants’ school, in 1995. In a book which – sadly – passed unnoticed, Alain Brossat Wrote of him: What the public will hot forgive the “monster” is his directly exhibiting ... what is basi­cally at stake in the crisis: not the economy, but living beings, not objects, but human relations, not car sales figures, but whether or not the life-world is fit to live in ...5 Baudrillard: He's right, because that violence on the part of H.B. or Florence Rey6 is no longer a political violence with a determinate objective (political violence has been absorbed and transformed into transpolitical energy for the benefit of the sys­tem). It's a violence cut off from its object and turning back against that object itself – against the political and the social. It's no longer anarchistic or revolution­ary, it's worse because its objective is no longer to set the system to rights or to transform the world by violently and historically. bringing something new into being; it takes the system itself as its object, aiming at systematic destabilization. It's not interested in the system's internal contradictions; it targets the very principle of the social and the political. It spontaneously takes a viral, temperamental form. It's an esoteric form which is its own justification, an exclusive violence which is merely the correlative of a system of exclusion. It answers the systematic exclusion our society practices by even more exclusion, cutting itself off from the social world by indifference or hatred. For it may be aggravated or apathetic: it may take the form of **an active terrorism or** that of **the inertia and irrepressible conformism of the masses**. No longer having ,either **object or objective**, it willfully (like all forms of virus arid virulence) **confuses the murderer and the victim**, **in an immense Stockholm syndrome**, precisely reflecting in this the system itself and its “perfect crime” – that is to say, its current ideal operation in which we are all simultaneously victims, murderers and accomplices (this is the truth of consensus, interactivity, and every­thing cycling back on itself). Taking a lofty, otherworldly view of the whole process – the process of the system and that of the violence which opposes it while reflecting its characteristic features (exclusion, autarky, anomaly, virulence) – one might conclude that it's an immense suicidal process, suicide being the perfect crime, inasmuch as in that act **murderer and victim are one**. In the history of humanity, then, the various lethal forms of violence are com­ing increasingly to resemble one another, as the terms are mingled and the roles merged (a confusion opened up irreversibly by the nuclear and by all the forms of complicity in pollution and death) to the point of wiping out, in the logical func­tioning of the system, any demarcation line between accomplice and victim (as any demarcation line between subject and object is being wiped out in philosophy and the sciences), and giving the image of a collective suicide, in which the attribution of responsibility becomes entirely secondary. Petit: But the threshold you speak of at which we break with this can, it seems, have only a clandestine existence. How are we to go on living in your world, our world, without being compromised? Baudrillard: **The only exception** is singularity. Singularity is the singularity of that anom­alous violence I'm referring to, the singularity which stands opposed to real violence, to the violence of any reality principle. For the basic violence, the basic deception, is the violence of the reality principle. Now, the system produces more and more reality, more and more of the social, more and more politics, more and more sex, more and more information, etc. That is its own peculiar violence. But at the same time, and in the same process, it **paradoxically produces more and more singularity** (of beings, of unidentified, refractory, excluded forces, which have no need of it to exist and are definitively exiled from the system). The example of the social sphere is fantastic. One day soon, that sphere will be fully realized, and the only people remaining will be the “excluded”. In a perfectly conformist sociality, only anomalous individuals and desocialized categories will be left, and they **won't** even **have any relationship**, dialectical or otherwise, **with** the social **institutions**. This is what's happening today at an increasingly rapid rate. As the social sphere is completed, with the discourse on “the social” playing its part, it expels everyone from the game (the homeless, the unemployed, vagrants, etc., and all the desocialized categories one after the other). In the end, the only people left in die[the] social sphere will be sociologists and social workers, all those for whom the “social” their stock in trade, and they will be left grappling with their object, which, though fully realized; has now become virtual. Retrospectively, it will be seen that the social sphere was only ever invented as a place to park the have-nots, and that today they're even being gradually expelled from there, like the Indians being driven off their reservations, thus allowing the better-off classes to occupy the social sphere as a second home. A strange contradictory movement, this, in which there's a growing mismatch between an idealistic, voluntaristic, expert dis­course, in which everything's getting better and better by pressing on regardless with imaginary solutions, and the real (if I dare use the term) state of affairs, in which everything's getting inexorably worse. The most disturbing thing is that the two are developing contradictorily and in, parallel, with the same irresistible dynamism. Flourishing social provision and galloping exclusion. Educational progress and mental, retardation. Perhaps there isn't even a contradiction or distor­tion here, merely a twist in the, same phenomena? This distortion can be seen everywhere: one day the construction of Europe will finally be completed, and there will really be no countries left to be part of it; it will in fact be constructed by successive exclusions and extraditions. It might even be the case, in the end, that when globalism has fully taken shape, and the cycle of information is perfectly inte­grated, there won't be anyone left on the networks any more. This is the perfect rule – the one where **there are only exceptions**. The perfect crime: the one in which there are only victims and accomplices, but no murderers (our present con­dition). The perfect social sphere: the one in which everyone is among “the excluded”. Perfect communication (the ecstasy of communication): when no one speaks to anyone any more.