## 1nc

#### The 1ac has opened itself unconditionally to the revenge of otherness. Prepare for the consequences. As Jean Baudrillard said in 2008,

Jean Baudrillard, The Perfect Crime, pg. 150

Such is the allegory of otherness vanquished and condemned to the servile state of resemblance. Our image in the mirror is not innocent, then. Behind every reflection, every resemblance, every representation, a defeated enemy lies concealed. The Other vanquished, and condemned merely to be the Same. Thus casts a singular light on the problem of representation and with all the mirrors which reflect us ‘spontaneously’ with an objective indulgence. None of that is true, and every representation is a servile image, the ghost of a once sovereign being, whose singularity has been obliterated. But a being which will one day rebel, and then our whole system of representation and values is destined to perish in that revolt. This slavery of the same, the slavery of resemblance, will one day be smashed by the violent resurgence of otherness. We dreamed of passing through the looking-glass, but it is the mirror peoples themselves who will burst in upon our world. And this time will not be defeated. What will come of this victory? No one knows. A new existence of two equally sovereign peoples, perfectly alien to one another, but in perfect collusion? Something other, at least, than this subjection and this negative fatality. So, everywhere, objects, children, the dead, images, women everything which serves to provide a passive reflection in a world based on identity, is ready to go on to the counter offensive. Already they resemble us less and less…

“I’ll not be your mirror!”

#### The 1ac has extended us gracious unconditional hospitality. We accept (as if we had not always been there, reflecting them, anyway). With their guard down, we have taken their 1ac hostage.

#### Our demand: the ballot. The 2ac will meet our demands or suffer the great revenge of otherness.

#### The 1ac invites the possibility of the symbolic trap of otherness, the possibility of tricking the subject-who-acts to welcome us unconditionally so that we can rupture the metastasis of debate itself, triggering a symbolic overcoding of the 1ac that the system simply cannot respond to. The 1ac has no ability to respond because we took it, its ours, stolen away to defeat the system on its own terms, turning signs against signs and over-accelerating all symbolic distinctions between self and other as the distinction between terrorist and hostage becomes murkier and murkier. This time, we will not be defeated. Only the negative is so radically other as to collapse the fundamental metastasis of affirmative and negative.

Baudrillard 76 [Jean, brilliant French philosopher, professor of sociology and philosophy at Université de Paris-IX Dauphine, Symbolic Exchange and Death, p. 36-38]

We will not destroy the system by a direct, dialectical revolution of the economic or political infrastructure. Everything produced by contradiction, by the relation of forces, or by energy in general, will only feed back into the mechanism and give it impetus, following a circular distortion similar to a Moebius strip. We will never defeat it by following its own logic of energy, calculation, reason and revolution, history and power, or some finality or counter-finality. The worst violence at this level has no purchase, and will only backfire against itself. We will never defeat the system on the plane of the real: the worst error of all our revolutionary strategies is to believe that we will put an end to the system on the plane of the real: this is their imaginary, imposed on them by the system itself, living or surviving only by always leading those who attack the system to fight amongst each other on the terrain of reality, which is always the reality of the system. This is where they throw all their energies, their imaginary violence, where an implacable logic constantly turns back into the system. We have only to do it violence or counter-violence since it thrives on symbolic violence - not in the degraded sense in which this formula has found fortune, as a violence 'of signs' , from which the system draws strength, or with which it 'masks' its material violence: symbolic violence is deduced from a logic of the symbolic (which has nothing to do with the sign or with energy): reversal, the incessant reversibility of the counter-gift and, conversely, the seizing of power by the unilateral exercise of the gift. 25 We must therefore displace everything into the sphere of the symbolic, where challenge, reversal and overbidding are the law, so that we can respond to death only by an equal or superior death. There is no question here of real violence or force, the only question concerns the challenge and the logic of the symbolic. If domination comes from the system's retention of the exclusivity of the gift without counter-gift - the gift of work which can only be responded to by destruction or sacrifice, if not in consumption, which is only a spiral of the system of surplus-gratification without result, therefore a spiral of surplus-domination, a gift of media and messages to which, due to the monopoly of the code, nothing is allowed to retort; the gift, everywhere and at every instant, of the social, of the protection agency, security, gratification and the solicitation of the social from which nothing is any longer permitted to escape - then the only solution is to turn the principle of its power back against the system itself: the impossibility of responding or retorting. To defy the system with a gift to which it cannot respond save by its own collapse and death. Nothing, not even the system, can avoid the symbolic obligation, and it is in this trap that the only chance of a catastrophe for capital remains. The system turns on itself, as a scorpion does when encircled by the challenge of death. For it is summoned to answer, if it is not to lose face, to what can only be death. The system must itself commit suicide in response to the multiplied challenge of death and suicide. So hostages are taken. On the symbolic or sacrificial plane, from which every moral consideration of the innocence of the victims is ruled out, the hostage is the substitute the alter-ego of the 'terrorist' - the hostage's death for the terrorist's. Hostage and terrorist may thereafter become confused in the same sacrificial act. The stakes are death without any possibility of negotiation, and therefore return to an inevitable overbidding. Of course, they attempt to deploy the whole system of negotiation, and the terrorists themselves often enter into this exchange scenario in terms of this calculated equivalence (the hostages' lives against some ransom or liberation, or indeed for the prestige of the operation alone). From this perspective, taking hostages is not original at all, it simply creates an unforeseen and selective relation of forces which can be resolved either by traditional violence or by negotiation. It is a tactical action. There is something else at stake, however, as we clearly saw at The Hague over the course of ten days of incredible negotiations: no-one knew what could be negotiated, nor could they agree on terms, nor on the possible equivalences of the exchange. Or again, even if they were formulated, the 'terrorists' demands' amounted to a radical denial of negotiation. It is precisely here that everything is played out, for with the impossibility of all negotiation we pass into the symbolic order, which is ignorant of this type of calculation and exchange (the system itself lives solely by negotiation, even if this takes place in the equilibrium of violence). The system can only respond to this irruption of the symbolic (the most serious thing to befall it, basically the only 'revolution') by the real, physical death of the terrorists. This, however, is its defeat, since their death was their stake, so that by bringing about their deaths the system has merely impaled itself on its own violence without really responding to the challenge that was thrown to it. Because the system can easily compute every death, even war atrocities, but cannot compute the death-challenge or symbolic death, since this death has no calculable equivalent, it opens up an inexpiable overbidding by other means than a death in exchange. Nothing corresponds to death except death. Which is precisely what happens in this case: the system itself is driven to suicide in return, which suicide is manifest in its disarray and defeat. However infinitesimal in terms of relations of forces it might be, the colossal apparatus of power is eliminated in this situation where (the very excess of its) derision is turned back against itself. The police and the army, all the institutions and mobilised violence of power whether individually or massed together, can do nothing against this lowly but symbolic death. For this death draws it onto a plane where there is no longer any response possible for it (hence the sudden structural liquefaction of power in '68, not because it was less strong, but because of the simple symbolic displacement operated by the students' practices). The system can only die in exchange, defeat itself to lift the challenge. Its death at this instant is a symbolic response, but a death which wears it out. The challenge has the efficiency of a murderer. Every society apart from ours knows that, or used to know it. Ours is in the process of rediscovering it. The routes of symbolic effectiveness are those of an alternative politics. Thus the dying ascetic challenges God ever to give him the equivalent of this death. God does all he can to give him this equivalent 'a hundred times over' , in the form of prestige , of spiritual power, indeed of global hegemony But the ascetic's secret dream is to attain such an extent of mortification that even God would be unable either to take up the challenge , or to absorb the debt . He will then have triumphed over God, and become God himself. That is why the ascetic is always close to heresy and sacrilege, and as such condemned by the Church, whose function it is merely to preserve God from this symbolic face-to-face, to protect Him from this mortal challenge where He is summoned to die, to sacrifice Himself in order to take up the challenge of the mortified ascetic. The Church will have had this role for all time, avoiding this type of catastrophic confrontation (catastrophic primarily for the Church) and substituting a rule-bound exchange of penitences and gratifications, the impressario of a system of equivalences between God and men. The same situation exists in our relation to the system of power All these institutions, all these social, economic, political and psychological mediations, are there so that no-one ever has the opportunity to issue this symbolic challenge, this challenge to the death, the irreversible gift which, like the absolute mortification of the ascetic, brings about a victory over all power, however powerful its authority may be. It is no longer necessary that the possibility of this direct symbolic confrontation ever takes place. And this is the source of our profound boredom. This is why taking hostages and other similar acts rekindle some fascination: they are at once an exorbitant mirror for the system of its own repressive violence, and the model of a symbolic violence which is always forbidden it, the only violence it cannot exert: its own death.

#### The technology of the ballot is not neutral, but reflects a crucial technique of global semiotic capitalism: abstracting language and exchange value such that they become indeterminate and lose their relationship to the real and all that matters if the currency demarcation of affirmative or negative—explode this metastasis, rip it out

Bifo 11. Franco “Bifo” Berardi, Professor of Social History of Communication at the Accademia di Belle Arti of Milan, After the Future, pg. 104-108

Time is in the mind. The essential limit to growth is the mental impossibility to enhance time (Cybertime) beyond a certain level. I think that we are here touching upon a crucial point. The process of re-composition, of conscious and collective subjectivation, finds here a new – paradoxical – way. Modern radical thought has always seen the process of subjectivation as an energetic process: mobilization, social desire and political activism, expression, participation have been the modes of conscious collective subjectivation in the age of the revolutions. But in our age energy is running out, and desire which has given soul to modern social dynamics is absorbed in the black hole of virtualization and financial games, as Jean Baudrillard (1993a) argues in his book Symbolic Exchange and Death, first published in 1976. In this book Baudrillard analyzes the hyper-realistic stage of capitalism, and the instauration of the logic of simulation.

Reality itself founders in hyperrealism, the meticulous reduplication of the real, preferably through another, reproductive medium, such as photography. From medium to medium, the real is volatilized, becoming an allegory of death. But it is also, in a sense, reinforced through its own destruction. It becomes reality for its own sake, the fetishism of the lost object: no longer the object of representation, but the ecstasy of denial and of its own ritual extermination: the hyperreal. [...]

The reality principle corresponds to a certain stage of the law of value. Today the whole system is swamped by indeterminacy, and every reality is absorbed by the hyperreality of the code and simulation. The principle of simulation governs us now, rather that the outdated reality principle. We feed on those forms whose finalities have disappeared. No more ideology, only simulacra. We must therefore reconstruct the entire genealogy of the law of value and its simulacra in order to grasp the hegemony and the enchantment of the current system. A structural revolution of value. This genealogy must cover political economy, where it will appear as a second-order simulacrum, just like all those that stake everything on the real: the real of production, the real of signification, whether conscious or unconscious. Capital no longer belongs to the order of political economy: it operates with political economy as its simulated model. The entire apparatus of the commodity law of value is absorbed and recycled in the larger apparatus of the structural law of value, this becoming part of the third order of simulacra. Political economy is thus assured a second life, an eternity, within the confines of an apparatus in which it has lost all its strict determinacy, but maintains an effective presence as a system of reference for simulation. (Baudrillard 1993a: 2)

Simulation is the new plane of consistency of capitalist growth: financial speculation, for instance, has displaced the process of exploitation from the sphere of material production to the sphere of expectations, desire, and immaterial labor. The simulation process (Cyberspace) is proliferating without limits, irradiating signs that go everywhere in the attention market. The brain is the market, in semiocapitalist hyper-reality. And the brain is not limitless, the brain cannot expand and accelerate indefinitely. The process of collective subjectivation (i.e. social recomposition) implies the development of a common language-affection which is essentially happening in the temporal dimension. The semiocapitalist acceleration of time has destroyed the social possibility of sensitive elaboration of the semio-flow. The proliferation of simulacra in the info-sphere has saturated the space of attention and imagination. Advertising and stimulated hyper-expression (“just do it”), have submitted the energies of the social psyche to permanent mobilization. Exhaustion follows, and exhaustion is the only way of escape:

Nothing, not even the system, can avoid the symbolic obligation, and it is in this trap that the only chance of a catastrophe for capital remains. The system turns on itself, as a scorpion does when encircled by the challenge of death. For it is summoned to answer, if it is not to lose face, to what can only be death. The system must itself commit suicide in response to the multiplied challenge of death and suicide. So hostages are taken. On the symbolic or sacrificial plane, from which every moral consideration of the innocence of the victims is ruled out the hostage is the substitute, the alter-ego of the terrorist, the hostage’s death for the terrorist. Hostage and terrorist may thereafter become confused in the same sacrificial act. (Baudrillard 1993a: 37)

In these impressive pages Baudrillard outlines the end of the modern dialectics of revolution against power, of the labor movement against capitalist domination, and predicts the advent of a new form of action which will be marked by the sacrificial gift of death (and self-annihilation). After the destruction of the World Trade Center in the most important terrorist act ever, Baudrillard wrote a short text titled The Spirit of Terrorism where he goes back to his own predictions and recognizes the emergence of a catastrophic age. When the code becomes the enemy the only strategy can be catastrophic:

all the counterphobic ravings about exorcizing evil: it is because it is there, everywhere, like an obscure object of desire. Without this deep-seated complicity, the event would not have had the resonance it has, and in their symbolic strategy the terrorists doubtless know that they can count on this unavowable complicity. (Baudrillard 2003: 6)

This goes much further than hatred for the dominant global power by the disinherited and the exploited, those who fell on the wrong side of global order. This malignant desire is in the very heart of those who share this order’s benefits. An allergy to all definitive order, to all definitive power is happily universal, and the two towers of the World Trade Center embodied perfectly, in their very double-ness (literally twin-ness), this definitive order:

No need, then, for a death drive or a destructive instinct, or even for perverse, unintended effects. Very logically – inexorably – the increase in the power heightens the will to destroy it. And it was party to its own destruction. When the two towers collapsed, you had the impression that they were responding to the suicide of the suicide-planes with their own suicides. It has been said that “Even God cannot declare war on Himself.” Well, He can. The West, in position of God (divine omnipotence and absolute moral legitimacy), has become suicidal, and declared war on itself. (Baudrillard 2003: 6-7)

In Baudrillard’s catastrophic vision I see a new way of thinking subjectivity: a reversal of the energetic subjectivation that animates the revolutionary theories of the 20th century, and the opening of an implosive theory of subversion, based on depression and exhaustion.

In the activist view exhaustion is seen as the inability of the social body to escape the vicious destiny that capitalism has prepared: deactivation of the social energies that once upon a time animated democracy and political struggle. But exhaustion could also become the beginning of a slow movement towards a “wu wei” civilization, based on the withdrawal, and frugal expectations of life and consumption. Radicalism could abandon the mode of activism, and adopt the mode of passivity. A radical passivity would definitely threaten the ethos of relentless productivity that neoliberal politics has imposed.

The mother of all the bubbles, the work bubble, would finally deflate. We have been working too much during the last three or four centuries, and outrageously too much during the last thirty years. The current depression could be the beginning of a massive abandonment of competition, consumerist drive, and of dependence on work. Actually, if we think of the geopolitical struggle of the first decade – the struggle between Western domination and jihadist Islam – we recognize that the most powerful weapon has been suicide. 9/11 is the most impressive act of this suicidal war, but thousands of people have killed themselves in order to destroy American military hegemony. And they won, forcing the western world into the bunker of paranoid security, and defeating the hyper-technological armies of the West both in Iraq, and in Afghanistan.

The suicidal implosion has not been confined to the Islamists. Suicide has became a form of political action everywhere. Against neoliberal politics, Indian farmers have killed themselves. Against exploitation hundreds of workers and employees have killed themselves in the French factories of Peugeot, and in the offices of France Telecom. In Italy, when the 2009 recession destroyed one million jobs, many workers, haunted by the fear of unemployment, climbed on the roofs of the factories, threatening to kill themselves. Is it possible to divert this implosive trend from the direction of death, murder, and suicide, towards a new kind of autonomy, social creativity and of life? I think that it is possible only if we start from exhaustion, if we emphasize the creative side of withdrawal. The exchange between life and money could be deserted, and exhaustion could give way to a huge wave of withdrawal from the sphere of economic exchange. A new refrain could emerge in that moment, and wipe out the law of economic growth. The self-organization of the general intellect could abandon the law of accumulation and growth, and start a new concatenation, where collective intelligence is only subjected to the common good.

#### Baudrillard once observed that “If the matrix were to make a movie about the matrix, *The Matrix* is surely the movie it would make”—we think this is true of the 1ac’s relationship to debate. The 1ac’s banal observation that debate is dying ignores that it is already dead—the University is a site of social death, the mass grave of Western culture. The aff’s fetishization of “keeping debate alive” plays into the hands of the system by denying the violence innate to the university system itself—only triggering a symbolic collapse can reverse this metastasis as the aff paves over the conditions of violent colonialism that made it possible for them to be here, debating in the first place.

Anonymous UC Berkeley Graduate Student 10. “The University, Social Death, and the Inside Joke,” http://news.infoshop.org/article.php?story=20100220181610620

Universities may serve as progressive sites of inquiry in some cases, yet this does not detract from the great deal of military and corporate research, economic planning and, perhaps most importantly, social conditioning occurring within their walls. Furthermore, they serve as intense machines for the concentration of privilege; each university is increasingly staffed by overworked professors and adjuncts, poorly treated maintenance and service staff. This remains only the top of the pyramid, since a hyper educated, stable society along Western lines can only exist by the intense exploitation of labor and resources in the third world. Students are taught to be oblivious to this fact; liberal seminars only serve to obfuscate the fact that they are themselves complicit in the death and destruction waged on a daily basis. They sing the college fight song and wear hooded sweatshirts (in the case of hip liberal arts colleges, flannel serves the same purpose). As the Berkeley rebels observe, “Social death is our banal acceptance of an institution’s meaning for our own lack of meaning.”[43] Our conception of the social is as the death of everything sociality entails; it is the failure of communication, the refusal of empathy, the abandonment of autonomy. Baudrillard writes that “The cemetery no longer exists because modern cities have entirely taken over their function: they are ghost towns, cities of death. If the great operational metropolis is the final form of an entire culture, then, quite simply, ours is a culture of death.”[44] By attempting to excel in a university setting, we are resigning ourselves to enrolling in what Mark Yudoff so proudly calls a cemetery, a necropolis to rival no other.  
Yet herein lies the punch line. We are studying in the cemeteries of a nation which has a cultural fetish for things that refuse to stay dead; an absolute fixation with zombies. So perhaps the goal should not be to go “Beyond Zombie Politics” at all. Writes Baudrillard: “The event itself is counter-offensive and comes from a strange source: in every system at its apex, at its point of perfection, it reintroduces negativity and death.”[45] The University, by totalizing itself and perfecting its critiques, has spontaneously generated its own antithesis. Some element of sociality refuses to stay within the discourse of the social, the dead; it becomes undead, radically potent. According to Steven Shaviro’s The Cinematic Body, “zombies mark the dead end or zero degree of capitalism’s logic of endless consumption and ever expanding accumulation, precisely because they embody this logic so literally and to such excess.”[46] In that sense, they are almost identical to the mass, the silent majorities that Baudrillard describe as the ideal form of resistance to the social: “they know that there is no liberation, and that a system is abolished only by pushing it into hyperlogic, by forcing it into excessive practice which is equivalent to a brutal amortization.”[47]  
Zombies do not constitute a threat at first, they shamble about their environments in an almost comic manner and are easily dispatched by a shotgun blast to the face. Similarly, students emerge from the university in which they have been buried, engaging in random acts of symbolic hyperconsumption and overproduction; perhaps an overly enthusiastic usage of a classroom or cafeteria here and there, or a particularly moving piece of theatrical composition that is easily suppressed. “Disaster is consumed as cheesy spectacle, complete with incompetent reporting, useless information bulletins, and inane attempts at commentary:”[48] Shaviro is talking about Night of the Living Dead, but he might as well be referring to the press coverage of the first California occupations.  
Other students respond with horror to the encroachment of dissidents: “the living characters are concerned less about the prospect of being killed than they are about being swept away by mimesis – of returning to existence, after death, transformed into zombies themselves.”[49] Liberal student activists fear the incursions the most, as they are in many ways the most invested in the fate of the contemporary university; in many ways their role is similar to that of the survivalists in Night of the Living Dead, or the military officers in Day. Beyond Zombie Politics claims that defenders of the UC system are promoting a “Zombie Politics”; yet this is difficult to fathom. For they are insistent on saving the University, on staying ‘alive’, even when their version of life has been stripped of all that makes life worth living, when it is as good as social death. Shaviro notes that in many scenes in zombie films, our conceptions of protagonist and antagonist are reversed; in many scenes, human survivors act so repugnantly that we celebrate their infection or demise.[50]  
In reality, “Zombie Politics are something to be championed, because they are the politics of a multitude, an inclusive mass of political subjects, seeking to consume brains. Yet brains must be seen as a metaphor for what Marx calls “the General Intellect”; in his Fragment on Machines, he describes it as “the power of knowledge, objectified.”[51] Students and faculty have been alienated from their labor, and, angry and zombie-like, they seek to destroy the means of their alienation. Yet, for Shaviro, “the hardest thing to acknowledge is that the living dead are not radically Other so much as they serve to awaken a passion for otherness and for vertiginous disidentification that is already latent within our own selves.”[52] In other words, we have a widespread problem with aspiring to be this other, this powerless mass. We seek a clear protagonist, we cannot avoid associating with those we perceive as ‘still alive’. Yet for Baudrillard, this constitutes a fundamental flaw:  
"at the very core of the 'rationality' of our culture, however, is an exclusion that precedes every other, more radical than the exclusion of madmen, children or inferior races, an exclusion preceding all these and serving as their model: the exclusion of the dead and of death."[53]  
In Forget Foucault, we learn the sad reality about biopower: that power itself is fundamentally based on the separation and alienation of death from the reality of our existence. If we are to continue to use this conception, we risk failing to see that our very lives have been turned into a mechanism for perpetuation of social death: the banal simulation of existence. Whereas socialized death is a starting point for Foucault, in Baudrillard and in recent actions from California, we see a return to a reevaluation of society and of death; a possible return to zombie politics. Baudrillard distinguishes himself as a connoisseur of graffiti; in Forget Foucault, he quotes a piece that said “When Jesus arose from the dead, he became a zombie.”[54] Perhaps the reevaluation of zombie politics will serve as the messianic shift that blasts open the gates of hell, the cemetery-university. According to the Berkeley kids, “when we move without return to their tired meaning, to their tired configurations of the material, we are engaging in war.”[55] Baudrillard’s words about semiotic insurrectionaries might suffice:  
"They blasted their way out however, so as to burst into reality like a scream, an interjection, an anti-discourse, as the waste of all syntatic, poetic and political development, as the smallest radical element that cannot be caught by any organized discourse. Invincible due to their own poverty, they resist every interpretation and every connotation, no longer denoting anyone or anything."[56]

#### A brief interlude: perhaps in addition to suicide bombing the affirmative, debate ought be destroyed or sacrificed that some may escape. Perhaps the 1ac’s fatal mistake was refusing to put it all on the line, or, as Bill Burroughs said in 1988,

William S. Burroughs, *Western Lands* 1988

Governments fall from sheer indifference. Authority figures, deprived of the vampiric energy they suck off their constituents, are seen for what they are: dead empty masks manipulated by computers. And what is behind the computers? Remote control. Of course. Don't intend to be here when this shithouse goes up. Nothing here now but the recordings. Shut them off, they are as radioactive as an old joke.  
Look at the prison you are in, we are all in. This is a penal colony that is now a Death Camp. Place of the Second and Final Death.  
Desperation is the raw material of drastic change. Only those who can leave behind everything they have ever believed in can hope to escape.

#### You should not only be willing to sacrifice the 1ac, you should also refuse the affirmative’s black mail and be willing to sacrifice the debate community itself. This is the only way to redeem this community.

Mbembe 06. Achille Mbembe, senior researcher at the Institute of Social and Economic Research at the University of the Witwatersrand, “Faces of Freedom: Jewish and Black Experiences,” Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies, 7:3, pg. 298

There is another version of liberation we encounter in black imagination. It is predicated on an understanding of politics as a form of asceticism, or even as a sacrificial act. Liberation as a sacrificial movement is a very consuming process. Through sheer human will, the self is sacrificed to the future common good. This is not far from martyrdom. One form of life is killed for another to be sustained. In fact, to strive for freedom is to court death and, if need be, to accept the responsibility of one’s own death, as made clear by Nelson Mandela during the Rivonia Trial (Long Walk to Freedom). Death, in this case, is the door to life that which lays open the truth of life, the life that lives by sacrificing itself. It is a sacrifice that is consummated for all, hence its redemptive character.

What black experiences of martyrdom (Cabral, Lumumba, Um Nyobe`, and many others) seem to reflect is the fact that one cannot be free if one is caught in the immediacy of being, in the empirical prison of life. In other words, if freedom’s goal is to preserve life, the idea that life must be preserved at all costs (the principle of survival) is not necessarily conducive to freedom. Selflessness is necessary to achieve freedom. To achieve freedom, one must be ready to transcend oneself in death, or at least to come into close contact with one’s master: death. From Martin Luther King to Mandela, this absolute authority granted to death or the possibility of death, this otherworldliness of freedom, is a fundamental aspect of modern black narratives of redemption.

Then there is the relation between freedom and violence. Whether theorized or not, the practice of violence in the name of the struggle for liberation or for that matter, survival was a common feature of many political movements. Like the Jewish critic Walter Benjamin, Fanon relies on an explicit notion of experience in this case the colonial experience to lift the interdiction against killing as a legitimate means to obtain freedom. Unlike Benjamin though, the lifting of the taboo of killing is not justified theologically, but situationally. Unlike Benjamin, too, Fanon is not burdened by a Hebrew Bible or a rabbinical or Mosaic law. The Fanonian practice of violence is not aimed to enact any divine will or to instantiate any divine transcendence. Fanon simply believes that colonialism, as violence in its natural state, will yield only when confronted by a greater violence. Life, he adds, ‘can only spring up again out of the rotting corpse of the settler’.

#### The 1ac is a violent technology built on their critical negligence of the undercommon labor that is the condition of possibility for the realization of their aff—those too radical to read Oklahoma’s who they simultaneously claim to represent, capture, and render coherent and visible, but all they do is further insulate the university by denying the undercommons.

Moten and Harney 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 Modern Poetry at Duke, “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 neighborhoods, 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.

#### Another way to think about our argument would be to steal away the 1ac from the affirmative. Only an abuse of the university’s own hospitality steals labor back to the clandestine, the undercommons. They must allow their very subjectivity to be ruptured by us—this is the only way to break open the auto-immune circle of the university itself

Moten and Harney 04. Fred Moten and Stefano Harney, The University and the Undercommons, SEVEN THESES Social Text 79, Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 2004. Copyright © 2004 by Duke University Press  
  
“To the university I’ll steal, and there I’ll steal,” to borrow from Pistol at the end of Henry V, as he would surely borrow from us. This is the only possible relationship to the American university today. This may be true of universities everywhere. It may have to be true of the university in general. But certainly, this much is true in the United States: it cannot be denied that the university is a place of refuge, and it cannot be accepted that the university is a place of enlightenment. In the face of these conditions one can only sneak into the university and steal what one can. To abuse its hospitality, to spite its mission, to join its refugee colony, its gypsy encampment, to be in but not of—this is the path of the subversive intellectual in the modern university. Worry about the university. This is the injunction today in the United States, one with a long history. Call for its restoration like Harold Bloom or Stanley Fish or Gerald Graff. Call for its reform like Derek Bok or Bill Readings or Cary Nelson. Call out to it as it calls to you. But for the subversive intellectual, all of this goes on upstairs, in polite company, among the rational men. After all, the subversive intellectual came under false pretenses, with bad documents, out of love. Her labor is as necessary as it is unwelcome. The university needs what she bears but cannot bear what she brings. And on top of all that, she disappears. She disappears into the underground, the downlow lowdown maroon community of the university, into the Undercommons of Enlightenment, where the work gets done, where the work gets subverted, where the revolution is still black, still strong. What is that work and what is its social capacity for both reproducing the university and producing fugitivity? If one were to say teaching, one would be performing the work of the university. Teaching is merely a profession and an operation of what Jacques Derrida calls the onto-/auto-encyclopedic circle of the Universitas. But it is useful to invoke this operation to glimpse the hole in the fence where labor enters, to glimpse its hiring hall, its night quarters. The university needs teaching labor, despite itself, or as itself, self-identical with and thereby erased by it. It is not teaching then that holds this social capacity, but something that produces the not visible other side of teaching, a thinking through the skin of teaching toward a collective orientation to the knowledge object as future project, and a commitment to what we want to call the prophetic organization. But it is teaching that brings us in. Before there are grants, research, conferences, books, and journals there is the experience of being taught and of teaching. Before the research post with no teaching, before the graduate students to mark the exams, before the string of sabbaticals, before the permanent reduction in teaching load, the appointment to run the Center, the consignment of pedagogy to a discipline called education, before the course designed to be a new book, teaching happened. The moment of teaching for food is therefore often mistakenly taken to be a stage, as if eventually, one should not teach for food. If the stage persists, there is a social pathology in the university. But if the teaching is successfully passed on, the stage is surpassed, and teaching is consigned to those who are known to remain in the stage, the sociopathological labor of the university. Kant interestingly calls such a stage “self-incurred minority.” He tries to contrast it with having the “determination and courage to use one’s intelligence without being guided by another.” “Have the courage to use your own intelligence.” But what would it mean if teaching or rather what we might call “the beyond of teaching” is precisely what one is asked to get beyond, to stop taking sustenance? And what of those minorities who refuse, the tribe of moles who will not come back from beyond2 (that which is beyond “the beyond of teaching”), as if they will not be subjects, as if they want to think as objects, as minority? Certainly, the perfect subjects of communication, those successfully beyond teaching, will see them as waste. But their collective labor will always call into question who truly is taking the orders of the Enlightenment. The waste lives for those moments 102 Moten/Harneybeyond2 teaching when you give away the unexpected beautiful phrase— unexpected, no one has asked, beautiful, it will never come back. Is being the biopower of the Enlightenment truly better than this? Perhaps the biopower of the Enlightenment know this, or perhaps it is just reacting to the objecthood of this labor as it must. But even as it depends on these moles, these refugees, they will call them uncollegial, impractical, naive, unprofessional. And one may be given one last chance to be pragmatic—why steal when one can have it all, they will ask. But if one hides from this interpellation, neither agrees nor disagrees but goes with hands full into the underground of the university, into the Undercommons—this will be regarded as theft, as a criminal act. And it is at the same time, the only possible act. In that Undercommons of the university one can see that it is not a matter of teaching versus research or even the beyond of teaching versus the individualization of research. To enter this space is to inhabit the ruptural and enraptured disclosure of the commons that fugitive enlightenment enacts, the criminal, matricidal, queer, in the cistern, on the stroll of the stolen life, the life stolen by enlightenment and stolen back, where the commons give refuge, where the refuge gives commons. What the beyond2 of teaching is really about is not finishing oneself, not passing, not completing; it’s about allowing subjectivity to be unlawfully overcome by others, a radical passion and passivity such that one becomes unfit for subjection, because one does not possess the kind of agency that can hold the regulatory forces of subjecthood, and one cannot initiate the auto-interpellative torque that biopower subjection requires and rewards. It is not so much the teaching as it is the prophecy in the organization of the act of teaching.

## Case

#### This debate will be about dueling encounters with otherness—even if they win Derrida’s is theoretically better, their rhetorical silence on the question of the animal means they don’t solve it anyway

Derrida 88. Jacques Derrida, “Jean-Luc Nancy: Interview with Jacques Derrida” Topoi, no.7,<http://www.lacan.com/thesymptom/?p=271>

JD: I didn't say, "there is no problematic of the subject", but that it cannot be reduced to a homogeneity. This does not preclude, on the contrary, seeking to define certain analogies or common sources, provided that one takes into account the differences. For example, the point of departure in a structure of relation to self as such and of re-appropriation seems to me to be common just as much to transcendental idealism, to speculative idealism as the thinking of absolute subjectivity, as it is to the existential analytic which proposes its deconstruction. Being and Time always concerns those possibilities most proper to Dasein in its Eigentlichkeit, whatever be the singularity of this "propriation" which is not, in fact, a subjectivation. Moreover, that the point of departure of the existential analytic is the Dasein privileges not only the rapport to self but also the power to ask questions. Now I have tried to show (De l'esprit, p. 147, n.1 sq) what this presupposed and what could come about, even in Heidegger, when this privilege of the question was complicated or displaced. To be brief, I would say that it is in the relation to the "yes" or to the Zusage presupposed in every question that one must seek a new (post-deconstructive) determination of the responsibility of the "subject". But it always seems to me to be more worthwhile, once this path has been laid down, to forget the word somewhat. Not forget it, it's unforgettable, but rearrange it, subject it to the laws of a context which it no longer dominates from the centre. In other words, no longer speak about it, but write it, write "on" it as on the "subjectile" for example. [[4]](http://www.lacan.com/thesymptom/?p=271" \l "_ftn4" \o ")

In insisting upon the as such, I am pointing from afar to the inevitable return of a distinction between the human relation to self, that is to say that of an entity capable of conscience, of language, of a relation to death as such, etc. and a non-human relation to self, incapable of the phenomenological as such – and once again we are back to the question of the animal. [[5]](http://www.lacan.com/thesymptom/?p=271" \l "_ftn5" \o ") The distinction between the animal (which has no or is not a Dasein) and man has nowhere been more radical nor more rigorous that in Heidegger. The animal will never be either a subject nor a Dasein. It doesn’t have an unconscious either (Freud), nor a rapport to the other as other, no more than there is an animal face (Levinas). It is from the standpoint of Dasein that Heidegger defines the humanity of man.

Why have I rarely spoken of the “subject” or of “subjectivity”, but rather, here and there, only of “an effect” of “subjectivity”? Because the discourse on the subject, even where it locates difference, inadequation, the dehiscence within auto-affection, etc., continues to link subjectivity with man. Even if it acknowledges that the “animal” is capable of auto-affection (etc.), this discourse nevertheless does not grant it subjectivity and this concept thus remains marked by all the presuppositions which I have just recalled. Also at stake here of course is responsibility, freedom, truth, ethics and law.

#### Any answer they try to make to our argument is simply emblematic of white settler colonialism, setting a supposedly radical curriculum while scripting the possibilities of encountering otherness within the university and FORGETTING that this whole debate takes place on stolen land

Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernandez ’13 (EVE TUCK and RUBÉN A. GAZTAMBIDE-FERNÁNDEZ, “Curriculum, Replacement, and Settler Futurity,” Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, Vol. 29, No. 1, 2013, p. 72-89) [m leap]

Natty Bumppo, not savage, and no longer European, is positioned to claim “native status,” symbolically taking the place of “the last of the mohicans” and of all the other vanishing tribes. The figure of the frontiers man who is one with nature saturates the U.S. cultural imaginary, from the Adirondack backwoodsman and the Order of the Arrow of the Boy Scouts of America (Alonso Recarte, 2010), to Kevin Costner’s Dances with Wolves and the most recent expression of the White settler-becoming-Indian, Johnny Depp’s characterization of Tonto. Natty Bumppo also resurfaces within the contentions over colonization and race that mar the politics of progressive fields such as curriculum studies. Here, the future of the settler is ensured by the absorption of any and all critiques that pose a challenge to white supremacy, and the replacement of anyone who dares to speak against ongoing colonization. This article does the simultaneously blunt and delicate work of exhuming the ways in which curriculum and its history in the United States has invested in settler colonialism, and the permanence of the settler-colonial nation state. In particular, we will describe the settler colonial curricular project of replacement, which aims to vanish Indigenous peoples and replace them with settlers, who see themselves as the rightful claimants to land, and indeed, as indigenous. To do this, we employ the story of Natty Bumppo, as an extended allegory to understand the ways in which the field of curriculum has continued to absorb, silence, and replace the non-white other, perpetuating white supremacy and settlerhood. As we discuss in this article, even as multiple responses have evolved to counter how curriculum continues to enforce colonization and racism, these responses become refracted and adjusted to be absorbed by the whitestream, like the knowledge gained by Natty Bumppo, only to turn to the source and accuse them of savagery, today through a rhetorical move against identity politics. White curriculum scholars re-occupy the “spaces” opened by responses to racism and colonization in the curriculum, such as multiculturalism and critical race theory, absorbing the knowledge, but once again displacing the bodies out to the margins. Thus, we will discuss how various interventions have tried to dislodge the aims of replacement, including multiculturalism, critical race theory, and browning, but have been sidelined and reappropriated in ways that reinscribe settler colonialism and settler futurity.

#### The 1ac gets Derrida backwards—their attempt to KNOW what is possibly ethical behavior to the other SCRIPTS that encounter and converts the messianic potential of the 1ac into weak messianism—this let down is a precondition for otherized violence

Caputo 97. John D., Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida, ed. w/ commentary by Caputo, pages 156-164

It is clear to anyone with a Jewish ear, to anyone with half an ear for the Hebrew and Christian scriptures, that this whole thing called "deconstruction" turns out to have a very messianic ring. The messianic tone that deconstruction has recently adopted (which is not all that recent and not only a tone) is the turn it takes toward the future. Not the relative and **foreseeable**, **programmable** and **plannable** future-the future of "**strategic** **planning**" - but the absolute future, the welcome extended to an other whom I cannot, in principle, anticipate, the *tout autre* whose alterity disturbs the complacent circles of the same. The messianic future of which deconstruction dreams, its desire and its passion, is the unforeseeable future to come, absolutely to come, the justice, the democracy, the gift, the hospitality to come. Like Elijah knocking on our door! The first and last, the constant word in deconstruction is come, *viens*. If Derrida were a man of prayer - which he is, as I have elsewhere tried to show-"Come" would be his prayer.

*Viens, oui, oui* (Parages 116; PdS 701Points 65). That is deconstruction in a word, in three words. In a nutshell.

Derrida at first avoided the notion of the messianic on the grounds that it entailed the idea of an "horizon of possibility" for the future and, hence, of some sort of anticipatory encircling of what is to come.' But after this initial "hesitation," Derrida adopted the term "messianic," evidently under the influence of Walter Benjamin (SdM 9596n2/SoM 180-18ln2 ).2 Benjamin spoke of a "weak messianic power" (the "weak" corresponding to what Derrida calls the messianic "without" messianism), which Benjamin associates with historical materialism. In Benjamin's view, the present generation is to be viewed messianically, as those who were all along to come, those who were all along expected precisely in order to "redeem" the past. We today live in a pact with the disasters of the past, inheriting a promise we never made, to recall the dangerous memory of past suffering, which is a pledge not to be taken lightly. The "now," the present time, is precisely a messianic time in which we are responsible for the entire history of humankind. Every present, every "second of time," what Derrida will call the "moment," is "a strait gate through which the Messiah might enter." Every day is a "holy day," a day of "remembrance,” an “all saints” day in which we remember the saints, the dead and their suffering. This Benjaminian motif enters crucially into what Derrida calls "the work of mourning" in the subtitle of the Marx book, the work of remembering the spirit of those who precede us (*revenants*) without assimilating their alterity into the present,' where it collaborates with the distinctively Derridean motif of the justice “to come” (*l’a venir*) and the affirmation of the future, of those who are yet to come (*arrivants*).

This messianic motif appears alongside his recent "circumfession" (*circonfession*) of his "alliance" ("covenant") with Judaism, never broken but never kept, by ignoring which he has been "read less and less well over almost twenty years," his revelation of "my religion about which nobody understands anything" (Circon. 145-146/Circum. 154). The news could not be worse for Derrida's secularizing, Nietzscheanizing admirers.

They thought they found in deconstruction the consummating conclusion of the Death-of-God, the final stake in the still twitching heart of the old God. If the first version of the Death-of God, in Feuerbach and the young Hegelians, turned into the Birth of Man, then according to this atheistic metanarrative, deconstruction has been sent into the world to proclaim the End of Man, to deconstruct the subject and all metaphysical humanisms, and ¶ hence finally to scatter the ashes of the old deity to the four winds of *differance* .4 However much that line on Derrida may conform to the requisite academic dogmas about religion - if there is one "other" that is just too other, too, too *tout autre* for academics to swallow, it is religion! - it has nothing to do with deconstruction, with its letter or its spirit, or with Derrida, with his eye or his ear, which is deeply messianic and not a little Jewish.¶ Deconstruction is always more complicated, more plurivocal and heterogeneous than any secularizing, modernist critique of religion, which is, after all, a vintage component in the old Enlightenment. The genealogical lines and links of deconstruction run back, not only to Nietzsche, but also, as I am constantly insisting, to Kierkegaard and Levinas, who are arguably the most important religious philosophers, or philosophical men of religion, or thinkers engaged in a philosophical repetition of religion (DM 5 2-5 3/GD 49), in the last two centuries. If there is any sense to speaking of deconstruction as "post-modern" (which diminishes with each passing day) or as engaged in the production of a "new" Enlightenment (SdM 149/SoM 90), which I hope is increasing day by day, then deconstruction must likewise be seen as a form of "post-¶ secularization." For deconstruction moves beyond all Enlightenment debunking of religion and chastises the Enlightenment - as Derrida chastises Marx-for having chased away one ghost too many (SdM 277/SoM 174). For without **the messianic ¶ spirit**, which likewise haunted Marx in his most prophetic moments and is indeed part of his legacy (SdM 56/SoM 28), **deconstruction (which expects justice, which is justice) does not have a ghost of a chance**.¶ The messianic turn in deconstruction, if it is a turn, what is at least a messianic twist recently given to deconstruction, also gives the lie to Derrida's critics, one more time, if this is still necessary, who take deconstruction to be ¶ the enemy, not only of institutions, the state, law, order, literature, reading, reason, the good, the true and the beautiful, etc., but also of religion. Deconstruction is a blessing for religion, its positive salvation, keeping it open to constant reinvention, encouraging religion to reread ancient texts in new ways, to reinvent ancient traditions in new contexts. Deconstruction discourages religion from its own worst instincts by holding the feet of religion to the fire of faith, insisting on seeing things through a glass (*glas*?) darkly, that is, on believing them not thinking that they are seeing them. Deconstruction saves religion from seeing things, from fanaticism and triumphalism. Deconstruction is not the destruction of religion but its reinvention.¶ Like an old and wise father confessor, deconstruction helps religion examine its conscience, counseling and chastening religion about its tendency to confuse its faith with knowledge, which results in the dangerous and absolutizing triumphalism of religion, which is what spills blood. Religion is most dangerous when it conceives itself as a higher knowledge granted a chosen few, a chosen people of God: that is **a formula for war**. As if God favors Jews over Arabs, or prefers Christians to Jews, or Protestants to Catholics, thereby drawing God into the game of whose theological ox deserves goring. As if God took the side of one people against another, or granted special privileges to one people that are denied to others-to "the other." Religion so instructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed, closely hewn to its messianic and prophetic sources and to the God who said that He does not delight in ritual sacrifice but in justice, religion as a powerful prophetic force which has a ¶ dream of justice for all of God's children - that is the religion that emerges from an hour on the couch with deconstruction. That religion is good news, for the oppressed and everybody else.¶ None of this means to say that Derrida is, as he says in the "Roundtable," "simply a religious person or . . . simply a believer," that he is a pious Jew, liberal, orthodox, or conservative, or a "believing" Jew, or religious in the conventional sense. Least of all does it mean that he has anything to do with the Book-thumping fanaticism and violence of the several fundamentalisms, Christian, Jewish, or Islamic, which **inevitably spell war** for the lands they beset, which have been spilling the blood of innocent people from time immemorial. Derrida has, as ¶ he tells us in Circonfession, married outside Judaism, exposed his sons to the impropriety of not being ¶ circumcised, even as he himself "quite rightly pass[es] for an atheist" (Circon. 146/Circum. 155) He was born into an assimilated Jewish family in the Christianized culture of Algiers (raised on the rue Saint-Augustin, a street named after his "compatriot"), and the Judaism to which he was exposed, the particular religious faith of Abraham and Moses such as he experienced it, did not "take."' He did not, would not, could not take it.¶ That is why **Derrida distinguishes the "messianic" as a *universal* structure** (like Benjamin's "weak" messianic) from the various "messianisms,” which are a little too strong. By the concrete messianisms he means the specific religious beliefs, the historical doctrines and dogmas, of the "religions of the Book," all three of them, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, although Derrida also extends the term to include the "**philosophical** **messianisms**," the teleologies and eschatologies of Hegel, Marx, Heidegger. To that list should be added at the last minute the latest, Johnny-come-lately version, Francis Fukuyama's "gospel" of the good news that the free market is the *telos* toward which the West has been groaning and Ronald Reagan is its prophet (SdM 97-100/SoM 56-57). The distinguishing feature of any messianism is that it **determines the figure of the Messiah**, gives the Messiah a determinate characterization and specific configuration, with the result that the Messiah is identifiably Jewish, Christian, Islamic, or, God forbid, Capitalistic, where a supply-side, free market Messiah is the latest teleological consummation of History. That contracts the absoluteness of the messianic promise and expectation within the borders of a people, so that God is thought to have cut a special deal with Greco-European Christians, or Jews, or Arabs; of a language, so that God is said to have spoken Hebrew, Greek-or was it Aramaic?-or Arabic; of a *national history*, so that God is made to take his stand with the destiny of some nation-state and takes up arms within the strife among the nations. The messianisms **have all the makings of a** **catastrophe**, that is, **of war**. This they **unfailingly provoke**, with **merciless regularity**, under one of the most grotesque and terrifying names we know, that of a "**holy war**," which means, alas, killing the children of God in the name of God, who too often really are children, killing the innocent in the name of peace and justice, killing in the name of the promise. Today, Derrida says, the war waged by these messianisms over the "appropriation of Jerusalem" has become a **world war** (SdM IOI/SoM 58).¶ Nor are the philosophical messianisms innocent of this blood. Hegel thought that war was the way for the Spirit to beat itself into shape, and Marx was in a rush to finish *Kapital* before the revolution made his prophecy redundant. There is nothing accidental in Heidegger's love of war, his love of *Kampf* as the way to beat Being into shape; nothing accidental in his support of the Nazi seizure of power, which afforded the Greco-Germanic History of Being the chance to fulfill its missionary destiny, which is nothing more than a corrupted Heideggerian messianism disguising its biblical sources. Fukuyama is delighted with the outcome of the cold war, which was fueled all along by several hot ones in East Asia and ¶ Central America. The several messianisms always take themselves to have an identifiable "mission," a missionary identity, a mission to establish the rule of their messianic vision in a **foreseeable** and **foregraspable** **future**, and they have rarely lacked the nerve to seize the opportunity to give their destiny a little boost wherever the occasion presented itself. That is when the blood begins to flow.¶ The "messianic," on the other hand, has to do with the **absolute structure of the promise**, of an absolutely indeterminate, let us say, **a structural future**, a future always to-come, *a’ venir*. The messianic future is not a future-present ¶ and is not sparked by a determinate Messiah; it is not futural simply in the sense that it has not as a matter of fact shown up yet, but futural in the sense of **the very structure of the future**. The messianic future is an **absolute future**, the very structure of the to-come that cannot in principle come about, the very openendedness of the present that **makes it impossible for the present to draw itself into a circle, to close in and gather around itself**. The messianic is the structure of the to come that exposes the contingency and deconstructibility of the present, exposing the alterability of what we like to call in English the "powers that be," the powers that are present, the prestigious power of the present. The messianic future, the unformable figure of the Messiah in deconstruction, has to do with something absolutely unpresentable and unrepresentable that **compromises the prestige of the present**, the absolutely undeconstructible that **breaks the spell of present constructions.**¶ The messianic, Derrida says, is a "**structure of experience**" (SdM 266/SoM 168), the very structure of experience itself where experience means running up against the other, encountering something we could not anticipate, expect, fore-have, or fore-see, something that knocks our socks off, that brings us up short and takes our breath away.¶ *Vanitas vanitatum*, said Qoheleth in his best Latin, *et omnia varntates*. The whole thing is a vanity, an idol. Everything is deconstructible, the French translation reads, but justice in itself, if there is such a thing, is not deconstructible (translation from "The Postmodern's Bible"). The essential indeterminacy of the messianic future, of the figure of the Messiah, is of the essence of its non-essence. The nonpresence of the Messiah is the very stuff of his promise. For it is in virtue of the messianic that we can always, must always, have no alternative but to say, "come." We can and we must pray, plead, desire the coming of the Messiah. Always.¶ That is part of the force of the story of the coming of the Messiah that Derrida repeats in the "Roundtable" (having cited it in *Politiques de l’amicitie*, 55*n*l), which is to be found at the end of Blanchot's *Writing the Disaster*.' In this story, the Messiah, having appeared outside the city of Rome dressed in rags, is recognized by someone who penetrates this disguise - which is meant to shelter his presence - and who, "obsessed with questioning," says to the Messiah, "When will you come?" The story, Blanchot says, has to do with the relation between the messianic "event" (*evenement*), let us say with an event in messianic time, and its "nonoccurrence" (*inavenement*), its noncoming about in ordinary historical time. For the coming (*venue*) of the Messiah, the messianic coming, is not to be confounded with his actual presence (*presence*) in recorded history, with occurring in ordinary time, with actually showing up in space and time, which would ruin everything. The coming of the Messiah has to do with the very structure of a messianic time, as the time of promise and expectation and opening to the future, for the "Come, Come" must resound always, according to Blanchot. The lightness of a messianic expectation, its buoyancy and agility, are not to be weighed down by the lead-footed grossness of the present. The Messiah is the one of whom we arc always saying "Come," which is what keeps things on the move. The messianic has the structure of what Blanchot punningly calls *le pas au dela*: the step (*pas*)/not (*pas*) beyond, the beyond that is never reached but always pursued.'¶ Were the Messiah ever to show up in the flesh, were, *per impossibile*, his coming ever taken to be an occurrence in historical time, something that could be picked up on a video camera, that would be a disaster. The effect would be to shut down the very structure of time and history, to close off the structure of hope, desire, expectation, promise, in short, of the future. Even if, as some Jewish sages hold, the Messiah has actually come and gone in ordinary time, that would not be the "coming," and it would still be necessary to say "Come." That is why, in Christian messianism, where it is held that the Anointed One has already come, all eyes and all hope are turned, not only to his earthly sojourn, but to the day when he will come again, for the Messiah must always be to come. The Messiah is a very special promise, namely, a promise that would be broken were it kept, whose possibility is sustained by its impossibility. (Another self-limiting idea.)¶ Now, the remarkable thing is that all this is not just a bit of esoteric Jewish theology but the very stuff of this postmodern bugbear called deconstruction. Deconstruction turns on the unpresentable and unrepresentable, unforeseeable and unnamable, impossible and undeconstructible promise of something to come, something, I know not what, *je ne sais quoi*, let us say a justice to come, or a democracy to come, or a gift or a hospitality to come, a stranger to come. Deconstruction is messianic all the way down but its Messiah is *tout autre*, a just one who shatters the stable horizons of expectation, transgressing the possible and conceivable, beyond the seeable and foreseeable, and who is therefore not the private property of some chosen people.