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#### justification for the demand for truth and control

Foucault 1978, (Michel, Former director @ the Institut Francais at Hamburg. The History of Sexuality Volume I. 1978. pgs 59-67)

In any case, next to the testing rituals, next to the testi­mony of witnesses, and the learned methods of observation and demonstration, the confession became one of the West’s most highly valued techniques for producing truth. We have since become a singularly confessing society. The confession has spread its effects far and wide. It plays a part in justice, medicine, education, family relationships, and love relations, in the most ordinary affairs of everyday life, and in the most solemn rites; one confesses one’s crimes, one’s sins, one’s thoughts and desires, one’s illnesses and troubles; one goes about telling, ~with the greatest precision, whatever is most difficult to tell. One confesses in public and in private, to one’s parents, one’s educators, one’s doctor, to those one loves; one admits to oneself, in pleasure and in pain, things it would be impossible to tell to anyone else, the things people write books about. One confesses—or is forced to confess. When it is not spontaneous or dictated by some internal imperative, the confession is wrung from a person by vio­lence or threat; it is driven from its hiding place in the soul, or extracted from the body. Since the Middle Ages, torture has accompanied it like a shadow, and supported it when it could go no further: the dark twins.2 The most defenseless tenderness and the bloodiest of powers have a similar need of confession. Western man has become a confessing animal. Whence a metamorphosis in literature: we have passed from a pleasure to be recounted and heard, centering on the heroic or marvelous narration of “trials” of bravery or saint­hood, to a literature ordered according to the infinite task of extracting from the depths of oneself, in between the words, a truth which the very form of the confession holds out like a shimmering mirage. Whence too this new way of philo­sophizing: seeking the fundamental relation to the true, not simply in oneself—in some forgotten knowledge, or in a certain primal trace—but in the self-examination that yields, through a multitude of fleeting impressions, the basic certainties of consciousness. The obligation to confess is now relayed through so many different points, is so deeply ingrained in us, that we no longer perceive it as the effect of a power that constrains us; on the contrary, it seems to us that truth, lodged in our most secret nature, “demands” only to surface; that if it fails to do so, this is because a constrain holds it in place, the violence of a power weighs it down, an it can finally be articulated only at the price of a kind c liberation. Confession frees, but power reduces one to silence; truth does not belong to the order of power, but share an original affinity with freedom: traditional themes in philosophy, which a “political history of truth” would have to overturn by showing that truth is not by nature free—nor error servile—but that its production is thoroughly imbue with relations of power. The confession is an example of this.

#### the aff’s forces women to put their bodies on display through their discursive performances, this reifies the same types of objectification that cause sexual violence in the first place Ruffino, 2007

[Annamaria, MA Thesis @ LSU Dept of Comm. Studies, “UNCOMFORTABLE PERFORMANCES: DISCOVERING A SUBVERSIVE SCENARIO FOR RAPE DISCOURSE.” Online, <http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-04042007-131147/unrestricted/THESIS.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

Judith Butler, in Gender Trouble, also articulates this point: “discourse becomes oppressive when it requires the speaking subject, in order to speak, participate in the very terms of that oppression” (147). Here the speaking subject (the rape survivor) must speak in a confessional mode of discourse that puts her experience and body on display. Bridget Kelly’s story then becomes a spectacle to be consumed by the television audience of America, instead of a subject speaking for political change.

#### 4th, Ignoring the role of power allows the sovereign to reinscribe the silent war inequality. This turns your project.

**Foucault 2003**, (Michel, Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976,2003, p. 15-6)

Second—second off-the-cuff answer, if you like—if power is indeed the implementation and deployment of a relationship of force, rather than analyzing it in terms of surrender, contract, and alienation, or rather than analyzing it in functional terms as the reproduction of the relations of production, shouldn’t we be analyzing it first and foremost in terms of conflict, confrontation, and war? That would give us an alternative to the first hypothesis—which is that the mechanism of power is basically or essentially repression—or a second hypothesis: **Power is war, the continuation of war by other means**. At this point, **we can invert Clausewitz’s proposition~ and say that politics is the continuation of war by other means**. **This would imply three things**. **First, that power relations**, as they function in a society like ours, **are** essentially **anchored in a** certain **relationship of force that was established** in and **through war at a given historical moment that can be historically specified.** And **while it is true that political power puts an end to war and establishes or attempts to establish the reign of peace in civil society, it certainly does not do so in order to suspend the effects of power or to neutralize the disequilibrium revealed by the last battle** of the war. According to this hypothesis, **the role of political power is perpetually to use a** sort of **silent war to reinscribe that relationship of force**, **and to reinscribe** it in **institutions**, **economic inequalities**, **language, and** even the **bodies of individuals**. This is the initial meaning of our inversion of Clausewitz’s aphorism—politics is the continuation of war by other means. **Politics**, in other words, **sanctions and reproduces** the **disequilibrium of forces** manifested in war. Inverting the proposition also means something else, namely that **within** this “**civil peace**,” these political struggles, these clashes over or with power, these modifications of relations of force—the shifting balance, the reversals—in a political system, **all** these **things must be interpreted as a continuation of war**. And they are interpreted as so many episodes, fragmentations, and displacements of the war itself. **We are always writing the history of the same war, even when we are writing the history of peace and its institutions**.

**The aff’s politics of visibility turn rape victims and “those who give testimony and are hypervigiliant against masculinist oppression” into objects to be seen and manipulated**

**Ruffino, 2007**

[Annamaria, MA Thesis @ LSU Dept of Comm. Studies, “UNCOMFORTABLE PERFORMANCES: DISCOVERING A SUBVERSIVE SCENARIO FOR RAPE DISCOURSE.” Online, <http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-04042007-131147/unrestricted/THESIS.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

This project also throws into question the politics of visibility and invisibility specifically as questioned by Peggy Phelan. In her book, Unmarked, Phelan discusses the possible trap of visibility – recognizing that “the binary between the power of visibility and the impotency of invisibility is falsifying” (6). Visibility does not always lead to political efficacy and power, just as invisibility does not necessarily signify a weakened political stance. While this may not always be the case, Phelan argues that visibility can lead to a fetishization of the other. Mary Daly describes the process of fetishization of the female as a three part process, beginning with how a woman is “condensed into particular parts/organs of her mind/body. A woman thus shrunken/frozen is manipulable/manageable. Her fetishizers feel potency/power.... And exercise this negative and derivative potency to dis-place [sic] her energy further and further from her center, fragmenting her process, devouring her” (235). Speaking out can lead to voyeuristic fetishism of the woman, specifically the violated woman. When women speak out against sexual violence, their voices and their bodies, pushed into the realm of the visible, become seen – become objects “to be looked at” rather than political agents. Phelan claims “representation is almost always on the side of the one who looks and almost never on the side of the one who is seen” (26). By suggesting that representation is always a one-sided venture, how do we escape the trap of visibility, while still retaining the political impulses that drive consciousness-raising groups and the power and value of “speaking out”?

**The aff’s speaking out is a form confessional discourse that traps individuals within the confines of power, this narrativization is viewed as therapeutic which undermines its political power**

**Ruffino, 2007**

[Annamaria, MA Thesis @ LSU Dept of Comm. Studies, “UNCOMFORTABLE PERFORMANCES: DISCOVERING A SUBVERSIVE SCENARIO FOR RAPE DISCOURSE.” Online, <http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-04042007-131147/unrestricted/THESIS.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

When women seek therapy for their rape, they engage in a type of confessional discourse. These women turn to professionals in an attempt to find comfort, healing, or absolution. Here we come to a current problematic regarding speaking out: when used as a means of therapy or confession, rape discourse can make survivors take responsibility for the rape through very subtle means. In History of Sexuality: Volume One, Foucault problematizes confessional discourse: The confession is a ritual of discourse in which the speaking subject is also the subject of the statement; it is also a ritual that unfolds within a power relationship, for one does not confess without the presence (or virtual presence) of a partner who is not simply the interlocutor but the authority who requires the confession, prescribes and appreciates it, and intervene in order to judge, punish, forgive, console, and reconcile. (61) Confessional discourse remains a normative discursive practice that keeps women in a place without power. The power in a confessional relationship always falls on the figure of authority, and the survivor is always in a position to seek legitimacy. Speaking out in some public arenas evokes this confessional feel, by encouraging women to tell their stories, be it on television, in books, or in magazines. These stories similarly imply that the rape survivor needs to confess, or rather perform, her story to an audience, which thus becomes the virtual authority figure Foucault describes. The confessional nature of these stories implies that the rape survivor has some sort of remaining guilt that needs to be shared in order to receive absolution. Dana Cloud offers an excellent account of how the rhetorics of therapy and confession attempt to contain potential political discourse by shifting it to the realm of therapy, thus making it about the personal and private. She continues this line of argument in a chapter dedicated towards feminism, and problematizes Consciousness Raising as a tool of therapeutic discourse.

#### Commodification d/a-Speaking out can be empowering but ALWAYS runs the risk of being recuperated by dominant discourses- only a risk of offense-it gets taken up by the psychiatric establishment to establish “victim personalities” and gets exploited

Alcoff 93

[Linda Alcoff, 1993, Professor of Philosophy at Hunter College, 19th and 20th Century Continental Philosophy; Foucault; Epistemology; Feminist Epistemology; Feminist Theory; Critical Race Theory, Post-Colonial Theory, SURVIVOR DISCOURSE: TRANSGRESSION OR RECUPERATION?, <http://www.alcoff.com/content/survdis.html>, uwyo//amp]

On the other hand, the speaking out of survivors has been sensationalized and exploited by the media, in both fictional dramatizations as well as "journalistic" forums such as the Rivera and Donahue Shows. The media often use the presence of survivors for its shock value and to pander to a sadistic voyeurism among viewers. The depiction of survivors and of sexual violence has often been eroticized for the purpose of titillating the audience in order to boost ratings.7¶ Survivor discourse has also been used, in some cases, by the psychiatric establishment to construct victim- and woman-blaming explanatory theories, e.g., the argument that some people have a "victim personality." These discursively constituted subjectivities are then made dependent upon expert advice and help. In short, survivor discourse has, paradoxically, appeared to have empowering effects even while it has in some cases unwittingly facilitated its own recuperation by dominant discourses.
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#### Compassion fatigue independently turns the aff

Bruckner, 1986

(Pascal, "The Tears of the White Man: Compassion as Contempt." Pg 48-50)

To convince the skeptical, the media stop at nothing, and the excesses of exhibitionism are added to the accusation that we are worse than the Nazis. The camera shrinks at nothing, and no censorship can be imposed upon horror. Every image\_must shock by crossing a new frontier in outrage. We are invited to watch the "extraordinary, that which has never been seen before, and then we see even more than that. Famines, floods, earthquakes—all get instant replay for the cameras. It is celluloid suffering; a continuous stream of images flows from those who produce pageants of others' deaths for a worldwide audience. It is a pornographic display, in that it gives us the right to see everything. And of all our impulses, the only one that stimulates voyeurism, because the the producers believe that, in order to get people's attention, the show has to be increasingly crude. The aim becomes that of showing mutilations, torture, and sicknesses that have never before been seen on the television screen.10 It is not enough to show swollen-bellied children: they have to be displayed as skeletons. If this doesn't work, they are shown as a bundle of skin and bones. Blood, wounds, running sores, globs of pus, eviscerated bellies, spilled guts. . . . Only excess will shake up the public and concern them with these problems. If apathy persists, it is believed it is because the scenes have not been outrageous enough. There are no limits to the excessive display of grisly details. This leads inevitably to the perversion of voyeurism. We get a taste for this game, and want more and more, and our threshold The cataloguing of poverty is itself poor, and has to rehash the same figures constantly. We have been brought face to face with hell, but all excesses have a saturation point, and after months and years of this sort of experience, we inescapably are led in our disgust to lump together the people these images depict. Our shock has no. consequence, no result; it appears and vanishes at the same moment. In this morass of disasters that are supposed to preclude business as usual, how can the viewing public avoid getting lost? The media succeed in making us indifferent to things over which we have no control, in making tolerable the intolera­ble. *We* go through opposite experiences at the same moment— we experience horror in the form of epidemics and mass murders at the same time that we experience satiation, because we cannot take any more and these images are unbearably repetitive. Value judgments aside, there are the two impressions that linger with the viewing public: a slight feeling of nausea and a feeling of shame and frustration. At the beginning, these broadcasts are special, but they quickly become routine. Their violence becomes stale and their repetitiveness reduces the strength of their accusations. So over­taxed emotions lead straight to inertia. In a world where all coun­tries seem like a nightmare painting from Hieronymus Bosch, in which men become more and more sophisticated in their murder­ous cruelty, our sense of guilt goes from depression to lassitude. The abnormal becomes banal, and our reason no longer tries to express itself, but "insanity rationalizes," in the apt phrase of Giinter Grass.12 The result is a terrible paradox. The more widespread hunger is, the greater is our indifference to its ravages. Pathetic appeals to our conscience and manipulation by shock are reiterated by the tireless television. The phrase "You are all murderers" does not mobilize people, it makes them yawn. What remains is a guilty conscience that has no strength and no will. We have passed from being tragically ignorant of the Third World to being tragically inured to it. When it was not normally mentioned, famine was deeply touching whenever it was. What is remarkable today is that it is too well known, too much a part of the norm.. Rather than a blackout there is a welter of studies, statistics, and calls to alarm on these burning topics. Our emotional appetites are beset from all sides, and rather than bemg misled by propaganda, we are being told far too much. When catastrophe becomes an everyday thing, it ceases to be catastrophe.

#### Our critique is not questioning the *imperative* to respond – but rather the unique ethical and politically exigent circumstances that undermine the efficacy of bearing witness as a liberating gesture.

Smaro Kamboureli, Canada Research Chair Tier 1 in Critical Studies in Canadian Literature University of Guelph, “Writing the Foreign in Canadian Literature and Humanitarian Narratives” University of Toronto Quarterly, 82(2), Spring 2013.

But Brand is not the kind of writer who would be content simply to offer a record of sufferings; as Vellino argues, Brand ‘disrupts the media, state, and other discursive frames that position’ (242) foreign others and their unease and fear in circumstances ranging from being illegalized and under surveillance to being unceremoniously incarcerated, tortured, or summarily killed. It is this disruption with which Spivak is concerned in this introduction’s epigraph. Because, she writes, ‘a response does not only suppose and produce a constructed subject of response; it also constructs its object’ (‘Terror’ 373), responding to war or a different state of emergency is not simply a matter of the kind of response we devise, but also of how we exercise our agency as subjects involved with the humanities. It is not, then, the imperative to respond that comes under question here but the ethical and political exigencies of bearing witness, as well as the risks involved when witnessing enters the realm of representation via narration.

#### The problem is not a lack of awareness of people’s narratives about discrimination- the problem is the unwillingness of the debate community to LISTEN to each other- narrative-focus creates insular politics that remains atomized and never starts a constructive dialogue

Powell ‘95

[(Anne, Lewis F. Powell, Jr. Prof of Law @ the University of Virginia from 1996-present, co-chair of the National Association of Women Lawyers Supreme Court Evaluation Committee and Amicus Committee, was Associate Professor of Law @ Vanderbilt Law School 1991-1995, “Regulating the Self:Autobiographical Performances in Outsider Scholarship, ”Virginia Law Review”, August edition)

An unexplored implication of the different voice thesis might ¶ suggest that not only law, but the very language(s) law employs, ¶ could never contribute to a program for social change. The ¶ dilemma, according to the premises of the different voice thesis, is ¶ not simply that traditional legal narratives are incapable of regis- ¶ tering the experiences of the socially marginalized, but that insiders ¶ and outsiders are deaf to each other's stories. In essence, each ¶ group tells its own stories to its own atomized group of willing lis teners, in its own personalized and idiomatic tongue. The dilemma ¶ that the different voice thesis exposes, but also reinforces, is that ¶ we seem to lack, and may even may feel obliged to denigrate, a ¶ shared language for debate. If the edifice of legal narrative ¶ appears monologically limited in terms of class, race, and gender, ¶ the different voice thesis would seem to establish the incorrigibility ¶ of this condition. No matter what voice, register or language law ¶ ultimately were to adopt, faith in the logical extension

of the differ- ¶ ent voice thesis would prevent outsiders and insiders from having a ¶ meaningful dialogue about precisely those experiences for which ¶ outsiders seek social and legal redress.