

BAUDRILLARD

Catastrophe Management 1NC	3
Catastrophe Management 1NC	4
Catastrophe Management 1NC	5
Catastrophe Management 1NC	6
Alternative Extension Evidence	7
Dehumanization/universal inclusion link.....	9
Dehumanization/universal inclusion link.....	10
Death Link	11
Death Link	12
Death Link	13
Cartesian Dualism Link	14
Death Link	15
Natural Disaster Link	16
Tech Relation Impact.....	17
Disease Link.....	18
Framework.....	19
AT: Perm.....	20
Environment Alt	21
Calc Thought Link	22
Biopiracy Link.....	23
Environmental Collapse/Rainforest Link	24
Community Service solves Environment Link	25
War on Terror Link	26
Morality Link and Alt.....	29
Islam/Source of Terrorism Link	30
We kill terrorists link.....	31
AT: Realism.....	33
Sleeper Cell/TIPS Link	34
Can't win War on Terror	35
Calc Thought Link - WOT	36
Suiciding Bombs Link	37
Nuclear and Chemical Terror Link -	38
Terrorism Representations Link -	39
Terrorists -> X Link (Economy collapse, environmental collapse etc.).....	41
WOT Alt - Collapse	42
IR Link	43
Aff DADT K Answer	44
Translators Link	45
Representations Link.....	46
Inclusion/respect for difference Link.....	47
Fiction Link	48
Memory/History Link	49

Baudrilllaaaard	NEG
DDI 06	— / —
Italian Stallion	50
Natives Link.....	50
AT: Rorty/Krishna/Alt Destroys Politics.....	51
Resistance Link -	52

Catastrophe Management 1NC

The affirmative's fixation on anticipating and controlling future scenarios for disaster is symptomatic of an implicit death drive - it renders us psychologically comfortable with our death and instills a perverse desire to bring it upon ourselves.

Fisher, Economist and Associate Policy Director @ FRB of Atlanta, 2000 (Mark, Flatline Constructs: Gothic Materialism and Cybernetic Theory-Fiction, <http://www.cinestatic.com/trans-mat/Fisher/FC2s11.htm>)giglio

In both The Atrocity Exhibition and the subsequent Crash - in many ways an extrapolation of a particular obsession from the previous book (the fusion of erotics and carcrashes) - Ballard describes a generalized traumatics, in which power and catastrophe simulate each other, becoming indistinguishable.

Catastrophes and their re-enactment circulate endlessly in Ballard's chaosmos, not necessarily only as mechanical repetition of what has already happened, but also as cybernetically anticipative simulations. The implication is that, by being projected in advance, any future possibility, no matter how horrific, can, in some sense, be "managed".

Faced with the apparently senseless spectacle of the protracted conflict in Vietnam - "All political and military explanations fail to provide a rationale for the war's extended duration" - Ballard seeks out its sources in a mediated unconscious "fixated to trauma." Like Freud, impelled to postulate the death drive in part by his observation of the behaviour of First World War shellshock victims as they obsessively re-enacted their trauma, Ballard discovers in mediated culture an obsessive "compulsion to repeat." Repetition both serves to alleviate trauma and to perpetuate it, wrecking any simple teleology: in the paradoxical logic Freud delineates in Beyond the Pleasure Principle, the organism preserves itself precisely by becoming-inorganic, and "life" is only a detour on the way to death.

This emerges for Ballard at the level of deleometric catastrophe management systems in the form of perverse explanations for the war, irrationales: "In terms of television and the news magazines the war in Vietnam has a latent significance very different from its manifest content. Far from repelling us, it appeals to us by virtue of its complex of polyperverse acts." (AE 87) Media - as the ambivalently functioning additions to the human perceptual system described by Freud and McLuhan - have a crucial role to play in this economy: (an)aestheticization, the translation of trauma into repeated images which, no matter how horrific they initially appear, soon become banal, in part by dint of repetition itself.

"Freud characterizes trauma as an 'invasion', a breach in an otherwise efficacious barrier against stimuli,' infiltrating alien desires - xenopulsions - into the organism."[195] But rather than damping down xenopulsive excitation, Ballard's cybernetic systems seem to hunt out and obsessively pore over trauma. Initially, according to Anti-Oedipus, an "anus-vampire" (AO 228), capitalism is, by the time of The Atrocity Exhibition, also a ghoul: mediatizing the feedback process of its own reproduction in endlessly

Baudrillaaaard
DDI 06
Italian Stallion

NEG

— / —

Catastrophe Management 1NC

reiterating loops of mass production and consumption of death. Deleometrics is the key science of Ballard's catastrophe management - the urge not now to banish death, nor to suicidally embrace it (as according to Deleuze-Guattari, fascism had[196]) but to quantify it, to "optimize" it. What Baudrillard calls the generalization of the Accident leads to what he characterizes as a "hyperfunctionalism" which moves beyond both teleology and transgression. If the accident has become the rule, then there is no law to transgress, just as there is no goal to head towards.

Catastrophe Management 1NC

The inevitable outcome of this framing of death is the artificial production of disaster to feed our own sick addiction.

Vukovic, Curator for the Student cultural center @ School of missing studies, 99 (Stevan, The Libidinal Economy of a 'Non-Existent War' in a 'Non-Existent Country' - Nostalgia for the End, "Stirring Streaming Dreaming" symposium)giglio

According to Baudrillard's theory on "catastrophe management," this impossibility for Eastern Europe to integrate into the symbolic structure of the West, due to the outburst of uncontrollable enjoyment, is actually produced by the West itself, in order to be the source of “fuel essential to the moral and sentimental equilibrium of the West.”²⁰ In the contemporary stage of capitalism, not only books, sport shoes and clothes for the West are being produced by the Western companies somewhere in the Third World, or in Eastern Europe - catastrophes are produced there as well. “Just as the economic crisis of the West will not be complete as long as it can still exploit the resources of the rest of the world, so the symbolic crisis will be complete only when it is no longer able to feed on the other half's human and natural catastrophes (Eastern Europe, the Gulf, the Kurds, Bangladesh, etc.),"²¹ writes Baudrillard, describing the way the New Sentimental Order, as merely the last form of the New World Order, introduces new forms of exploitation. Material exploitation, as old-fashioned and already out-of-date type of exploitation, "is only there to extract that spiritual raw material that is the misery of the peoples, which serves as psychological nourishment for the rich countries and media nourishment for our daily lives."²² Catastrophe management is the management of the Real, the post-symbolical Real that can be encountered only in the form of a catastrophe. Psychotic foreclosure and sliding into the Real brings the subject into proximity too high to leave space for the representation of the Real, without distance from jouissance that would make desire possible, turning it from the desiring object into the object of desire. As Ellie Ragland writes, "the ego collapses into its own metonymic shadow and becomes the real object, the object a cause-of-desire,"²³ which functions as a drug, as an aphrodisiac that puts desire into motion and a hallucinogen that, by the addition of an object, provides a vision of a subject supplied with "something more in oneself than oneself."

Catastrophe Management 1NC

Instead of endlessly prolonging catastrophe, imagining the inevitability of catastrophe as a starting point for discourse is critical to escape the ever present shadow the threat of catastrophe casts over life.

Slavoj Zizek, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, 03, The Puppet and the Dwarf: The Perverse Core of Christianity, p. One should thus invert the existentialist commonplace according to which, when we are engaged in a present historical process, we perceive it as full of possibilities, and ourselves as agents free to choose among them; while, to a retrospective view, the same process appears as fully determined and necessary, with no room for alternatives: on the contrary, it is the engaged agents who perceive themselves as caught in a Destiny, merely reacting to it, while, retrospectively, from the standpoint of later observation, we can discern alternatives in the past, possibilities of events taking a different path. (And is not the attitude of Predestination—the fact that the theology of predestination legitimized the frantic activity of capitalism—the ultimate confirmation of this paradox?) This is how Dupuy suggests that we should confront the catastrophe: we should first perceive it as our fate, as unavoidable, and then, projecting ourselves into it, adopting its standpoint, we should retroactively insert into its past (the past of the future) counterfactual possibilities (“If we had done such and such a thing, the catastrophe we are in now would not have happened!”) upon which we then act today. And is not a supreme case of the reversal of positive into negative destiny the shift from classical historical materialism into the attitude of Adorno’s and Horkheimer’s “dialectic of Enlightenment”? While traditional Marxism enjoined us to engage ourselves and act in order to bring about the necessity (of Communism), Adorno and Horkheimer projected themselves into the final catastrophic outcome perceived as fixed (the advent of the “administered society” of total manipulation and the end of subjectivity) in order to urge us to act against this outcome in our present. Such a strategy is the very opposite of the US attitude in the “war on terror,” that of avoiding the threat by striking preemptively at potential enemies. In Spielberg’s Minority Report, criminals are arrested even before they commit their crime, since three humans who, through monstrous scientific experiments, have acquired the capacity to foresee the future, can exactly predict their acts—is there not a clear parallel with the new Cheney doctrine, which proclaims the policy of attacking a state or an enemy force even before this state develops the means to pose a threat to the United States, that is, already at the point when it might develop into such a threat?²⁴ And, to pursue the analogy even further, was not Gerhard Schroeder’s disagreement with US plans for a preemptive attack on Iraq precisely a kind of real-life “minority report,” indicating his disagreement with the way others saw the future? The state in which we live now, in the war on terror,” is one of the endlessly suspended terrorist threat: the Catastrophe (the new terrorist attack) is taken for granted, yet endlessly postponed. Whatever actually happens, even if it is a much more horrific attack than that of 9/11, will not yet be “that.” And it is crucial here that we accomplish the “transcendental” turn: the true catastrophe already is this life under the shadow of the permanent threat of catastrophe.

Alternative Extension Evidence

Our criticism does not reject the prospect of catastrophe management but rather demands a critical re-orientation of our understanding of such. Rather than rely upon the affirmative's imagined ability to adequately predict and prevent ever looming disasters we should act as if such scenarios are an inevitable, rupturing the affirmative's cyclical reproduction of catastrophe.

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher @ University of Ljubljana, 03, The Puppet and the Dwarf: The Perverse Core of Christianity, p. 160-63

What such experiences show is the limitation of the ordinary “historical” notion of time: at each moment in time, there are multiple possibilities waiting to be realized; once one of them actualizes itself, others are cancelled. The supreme case of such an agent of historical time is the Leibnizian God who created the best possible world: before creation, He had in His mind the entire panoply of possible worlds, and His decision consisted in choosing the best one among these options. Here, possibility precedes choice: the choice is a choice among possibilities. What is unthinkable within this horizon of linear historical evolution is the notion of a choice/act that retroactively opens up its own possibility: the idea that the emergence of a radically New retroactively changes the past—not the actual past, of course (we are not in the realms of science fiction), but past possibilities, or, to put it in more formal terms, the value of modal propositions about the past—exactly what happens in the case described by Bergson.²

Dupuy's point is that, if we are to confront the threat of a (cosmic or environmental) catastrophe properly, we need to break out of this “historical” notion of temporality: we have to introduce a new notion of time. Dupuy calls this time the “time of a project,” of a closed circuit between past and future: the future is causally produced by our acts in the past, while the way we act is determined by our anticipation of the future, and our reaction to this anticipation. This circuit, of course, generates the host of well-known paradoxes of self-realizing prophecy:

if we expect X to happen, and act accordingly, X will in fact happen. More interesting are the negative versions: if we expect/predict X (a catastrophe), and act against it, to prevent it, the outcome will be the same whether or not the catastrophe actually happens. If it happens, our preventive acts will be dismissed as irrelevant (“you can't fight destiny”); if it doesn't, it will be the same—that is, since the catastrophe (in which we did not believe, despite our knowledge) was perceived as impossible, our preventive acts will again be dismissed as irrelevant (recall the aftermath of the Millennium Bug!). Is this second option, then, the only choice to take as a rational strategy? We envisage a catastrophe, then act to prevent it, in the hope that the very success of our preventive acts will render the prospect that prompted us to act ridiculous and irrelevant—one should heroically assume the role of excessive panic-monger in order to save humanity.... However, the circle is not completely closed: back in the 1970s, Bernard Brodie pointed the way out of this deadlock of the closed circle apropos of the strategy of MAD (mutually assured destruction) in the Cold War: It is a strange paradox of our time that one of the crucial factors which make the [nuclear] dissuasion

effectively function, and function so well, is the underlying fear that, in a really serious crisis, it can fail. In such circumstances, one does not ploy with fate. If we were absolutely certain that the nuclear dissuasion is one hundred per cent efficient in its role of protecting us against a nuclear assault, then its dissuasive value against a conventional war would have dropped to close to zero.²² The paradox here is a very precise one: the MAD strategy works not because it is perfect, but because of its very imperfection. That is to say, a perfect strategy (if one side nukes the other, the other will automatically respond, and both sides will thus be destroyed) has a fatal flaw: what if the attacking side counts on the fact that, even after its first strike, the opponent will continue to act as a rational agent? His choice is now: with his country mostly destroyed, he can either strike back, thus causing total catastrophe, the end of humanity, or not strike back, thus enabling the survival of humanity and, thereby, at least the possibility of a later revival of his own country. A rational agent would choose the second option. What makes the strategy efficient is the very fact that we can never be sure that it will work perfectly: what if a situation spirals out of control, for a variety of easily imaginable reasons (from the “irrational” aggressivity of one side to simple technological failures or miscommunications)? It is because of this permanent threat that neither side wants to come anywhere near the prospect of MAD, so they ovoid even conventional war: if the strategy were perfect, it would, on the contrary, endorse the attitude “Let’s fight a full-scale conventional war, since we both know that neither side will risk the fateful step toward a nuclear strike!” So the actual constellation of MAD is not “If we follow the MAD strategy, the nuclear catastrophe will not take place,” but: “If we follow the MAD strategy, the nuclear catastrophe will not take place, unless there is some unforeseeable accident.” And the same goes today for the prospect of ecological catastrophe: if we do nothing, it will happen, and if we do everything we can, it will not happen, unless there is some unforeseeable accident. This “unforeseeable factor e” is precisely the remainder of the Real that disturbs the perfect self-closure of the “time of the project”—if we write this time as a circle, it is a cut that prevents the full closure of the circle (exactly as Lacan writes l’objet petit a). What confirms this paradoxical status of e is that, in it, possibility and impossibility, positive and negative, coincide: it renders the strategy of prevention effective precisely insofar as it hinders its full efficiency. So it is crucial not to perceive this “catastrophist strategy” in the old terms of linear historical causality: the reason this strategy works is not that, today, we are faced with multiple future possibilities and, within this multitude, we choose the option to act to prevent a catastrophe. Since the catastrophe cannot be “domesticated” as just another possibility, the only option is to posit it as real: “one has to inscribe the catastrophe into the future in a much more radical way. One has to render it unavoidable.”²³ Here we should introduce the notion of minimal “alienation” constitutive of the symbolic order and of the social field as such: although I know very well that my future fate, and that of the society in which I live, depends causally on the present activity of millions of individuals like me, I nonetheless believe in destiny, that is, I believe that the future is run by an anonymous power independent of the will and acts of any individual. “Alienation” consists in the minimal “objectivization” on account of which I abstract from my active role, and perceive historical process as an “objective” process that follows its path independently of my plans. (On a different level, the same goes for the individual agent in the market: while he is fully aware that the price of a product on the market depends (also) on his acts, his selling and buying, he nonetheless keeps the price of a

product there fixed, perceiving it as a given quantity to which he then reacts.) The point, of course, is that these two levels intersect: in the present, I do not act blindly; I react to the prospect of what the future will be.

Dehumanization/universal inclusion link

Extending humanity as a universal concept for inclusion fails to rupture exclusion because it ontologically requires the ability to render certain subjects inhuman to sustain itself. This inevitably makes the very objectification they indict inevitable.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 93, The Symbolic Exchange and Death Pg._____ (Giglio)

As soon as savages began to call 'men' only those who were members of their tribe, the definition of the 'Human' was considerably enlarged: it became a universal concept. This is precisely what we call culture. Today all men are men. Universality is in fact based exclusively on tautology and doubling, and this is where the 'Human' takes on the force of a moral law and a principle of exclusion. This is because the 'Human' is from the outset the institution of its structural double, the 'Inhuman'. This is all it is: the progress of Humanity and Culture are simply the chain of discriminations with which to brand 'Others' with inhumanity, and therefore with nullity. For the savages who call themselves 'men', the others are something else. For us, by contrast, under the sign of the Human as a universal concept, others are nothing. In other cases, to be 'man' is, like being a gentleman, a challenge, a distinction experienced as a great struggle, not merely giving rise to an exchange of *quality* or status amongst different beings (gods, ancestors, foreigners, animals, nature . . .), but *imposing* its stakes universally, being praised and prohibited. We are happy to be promoted to the universal, to an abstract and generic value indexed on the equivalence of the species, to the exclusion of all the others. In some sense, therefore, the definition of the Human inexorably contracts in accordance with cultural developments: each 'objective' progressive step towards the universal corresponded to an ever stricter discrimination, until eventually we can glimpse the time of man's definitive universality that will coincide with the excommunication of all men — the purity of the concept alone Radiant in the void. Previous races or cultures were ignored or eliminated, but never under the sign of a universal Reason. There is no criterion of man, no split from the Inhuman, there are only differences with which to oppose death. But it is our undifferentiated concept of man that gives rise to discrimination. We must read the following narrative by Jean de Léry, from the sixteenth century: *Histoire d'un voyage en la terre de Brésil* ('The History of a Journey to the Land of Brazil') to see that racism did not exist in this period when the Idea of Man does not yet cast its shadow over all the metaphysical purity of Western culture. This Reformation puritan from Geneva, landing amongst Brazilian cannibals, is not racist. It is due to the extent of our progress that we have since become racists, and not only towards Indians and cannibals: the increasing hold of rationality on our culture

Baudrilllaaaaard

NEG

DDI 06

Italian Stallion

has meant the successive extradition of inanimate nature, animals and inferior races¹ into the Inhuman, while the cancer of the Human has invested the very society it claimed to contain within its absolute superiority. Michel

/

Dehumanization/universal inclusion link

Foucault has analysed the extradition of madmen at the dawn of Western modernity, but we also know of the extradition and progressive confinement of children, following the course of Reason itself, into the idealised state of infancy, the ghetto of the infantile universe and the abjection of innocence. But the old have also become inhuman, pushed to the fringes of normality. Like so many others, the mad, children and the old have only become 'categories' under the sign of the successive segregations that have marked the development of culture. The poor, the under-developed, those with subnormal IQs, perverts, transsexuals, intellectuals and women form a folklore of terror, a folklore of excommunication on the basis of an increasingly racist definition of the 'normal human'. Quintessence of normality: ultimately all these 'categories' will be excluded, segregated, exiled in a finally universal society, where the normal and the universal will at last fuse under the sign of the Human.

Death Link

Exclusion of death from our normal interaction with politics is the ultimate biopolitical determination - the destruction of its overt significance has resulted in its displacement into ever more insidious mechanisms of functioning. This sets the foundational model for every form of exclusion.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 93, The Symbolic Exchange and Death Pg.____ (Giglio)

Foucault's analysis, amongst the masterpieces of this genuine cultural history, takes the form of a genealogy of discrimination in which, at the start of the nineteenth century, labour and production occupy a decisive place. 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. There is an irreversible evolution from savage societies to our own: little by little, the dead cease to exist. They are thrown out of the group's symbolic circulation. They are no longer beings with a full role to play, worthy partners in exchange, and we make this obvious by exiling them further and further away from the group of the living. In the domestic intimacy of the cemetery, the first grouping remains in the heart of the village or town, becoming the first ghetto, prefiguring every future ghetto, but are thrown further and further from the centre towards the periphery, finally having nowhere to go at all, as in the new town or the contemporary metropolis, where there are no longer any provisions for the dead, either in mental or in physical space. Even madmen, delinquents and misfits can find a welcome in the new towns, that is, in the rationality of a modern society. Only the death-function cannot be programmed and localised. Strictly speaking, we no longer know what to do with them, since, today, it is not normal to be dead, and this is new. To be dead is an unthinkable anomaly; nothing else is as offensive as this. Death is a delinquency, and an incurable deviancy. The dead are no longer inflicted on any place or space-time, they can find no resting place; they are thrown into a radical utopia. They are no longer even packed in and shut up, but obliterated.But we know what these hidden places signify: the factory no longer exists because labour is everywhere; the prison no longer exists because arrests and confinements pervade social space-time; the asylum no longer exists because psychological control and therapy have been generalised and become banal; the school no longer exists because every strand of social progress is shot through with discipline and pedagogical training; capital no longer exists (nor does its Marxist critique) because the law of value has collapsed into self-managed survival in all its forms, etc., etc. 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.³

Death Link

And their simulation of death only defines life antithetically in relation to such - as such living is only prolonged death destroying the value to life.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 93, The Symbolic Exchange and Death Pg._____ (Giglio)

It is correct to say that the dead, hounded and separated from the living, condemn us to an equivalent death: for the fundamental law of symbolic obligation is at play in any case, for better or worse. Madness, then, is only ever the *dividing* line between the mad and the normal, a line which normality *shares* with madness and which is even defined by it. Every society that internalises its mad is a society invested in its depths by madness, which alone and everywhere ends up being symbolically exchanged under the legal signs of normality. Madness has for several centuries worked hard on the society which confines it, and today the asylum walls have been removed, not because of some miraculous tolerance, but because madness has *completed* its normalising labour on society: madness has become pervasive, while at the same time it is forbidden a resting place. The asylum has been reabsorbed into the core of the social field, because normality has reached the point of perfection and assumed the characteristics of the asylum, because the virus of confinement has worked its way into every fibre of 'normal' existence. So it is with death. Death is ultimately nothing more than the social line of demarcation separating the 'dead' from the 'living': therefore, it affects both equally. Against the senseless illusion of the living of willing the living to the exclusion of the dead, against the illusion that reduces life to an absolute surplus-value by subtracting death from it, the indestructible logic of symbolic exchange re-establishes the equivalence of life and death in the indifferent fatality of survival. In survival, death is repressed; life itself, in accordance with that well known ebbing away, would be nothing more than a survival determined by death.

Death Link

Their cordoning off of death necessitates the biopolitical manipulation of life to sustain their distance.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 93, The Symbolic Exchange and Death Pg._____ (Giglio)

The emergence of survival can therefore be analysed as the fundamental operation in the birth of power. Not only because this set-up will permit the necessity of the sacrifice of this life and the threat of recompense in the next (this is exactly the priest-caste's strategy), but more profoundly by instituting the prohibition of death and, at the same time, the agency that oversees this prohibition of death: power. Shattering the union of the living and the dead, and slapping a prohibition on death and the dead: the primary source of social control. Power is possible only if death is no longer free, only if the dead are put under surveillance, in anticipation of the future confinement of life in its entirety. This is the fundamental Law, and power is the guardian at the gates of this Law. It is not the repression of unconscious pulsions, libido, or whatever other energy that is fundamental, and it is not anthropological; it is the repression of death, the social repression of death in the sense that this is what facilitates the shift towards the repressive socialisation of life. Historically, we know that sacerdotal power is based on a monopoly over death and exclusive control over relations with the dead.⁴ The dead are the first restricted area, the exchange of whom is restored by an obligatory mediation by the priests. Power is established on death's borders. It will subsequently be sustained by further separations (the soul and the body, the male and the female, good and evil, etc.) that have infinite ramifications, but the principal separation is between life and death.⁵ When the French say that power 'holds the bar',⁶ it is no metaphor: it is the bar between life and death, the decree that suspends exchange between life and death, the tollgate and border control between the two banks.

Cartesian Dualism Link

The management of death necessitates the alienation of the subject from their life and body mediating an ethical relation to life, and forming the foundation for EVERY FORM of control.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 93, The Symbolic Exchange and Death Pg._____ (Giglio)

This is precisely the way in which power will later be instituted between the subject separated from its body, between the individual separated from its social body, between man separated from his labour: the agency of mediation and representation flourishes in this rupture. We must take note, however, that the archetype of this operation is the separation between a group and its dead, or between each of us today and our own deaths. Every form of power will have something of this smell about it, because it is on the manipulation and administration of death that power, in the final analysis, is based. All the agencies of repression and control are installed in this divided space, in the suspense between a life and its proper end, that is, in the production of a literally fantastic and artificial temporality (since at every instant every life has its proper death there already, that is to say, in this same instant lies the finality it attains). The first abstract social time is installed in this rupture of the indivisible unity of life and death (well before abstract social labour time!). All the future forms of alienation that Marx denounces, the separations and abstractions of political economy, take root in this separation of death.

Death Link

The affirmative's separation of life and death necessitates their mutual constitution - Life as conceived of by the Lacan is haunted by an ever present negativity of death nullifying its value. Death is only possible as a metaphysical event insofar as we conceive of ourselves as alive.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 93, The Symbolic Exchange and Death Pg. ____ (Giglio)

The initiatory act is the reverse of our reality principle. It shows that the *reality* of birth derives solely from the separation of life and death. Even the reality of life itself derives solely from the disjunction of life and death. The *effect of the real* is only ever therefore the structural effect of the disjunction between two terms, and our famous reality principle, with its normative and repressive implications, is only a generalisation of this disjunctive code to all levels. The reality of nature, its 'objectivity' and its 'materiality', derives solely from the separation of man and nature, of a body and a non-body, as Octavio Paz put it. Even the reality of the body, its material status, derives from the disjunction of a spiritual principle, from discriminating a soul from a body. The symbolic is what puts an end to this disjunctive code and to separated terms. *It is the u-topia that puts an end to the topologies of the soul and the body, man and nature, the real and the non-real, birth and death.* In the symbolic operation, the two terms lose their reality.⁸ The reality principle is never anything other than the *imaginary* of the other term. In the man/nature partition, nature (objective, material) is only the imaginary of man thus conceptualised. In the sexual bipartition masculine/feminine, an arbitrary and structural distinction on which the sexual reality (and repression) principle is based, 'woman' thus defined is only ever man's imaginary. Each term of the disjunction excludes the other, which eventually becomes its imaginary. So it is with life and death in our current system: the price we pay for the 'reality' of this life, to live it as a positive value, is the ever-present phantasm of death. For us, defined as living beings, death is our imaginary.⁹ So, all the disjunctions on which the different structures of the real are based (this is not in the least abstract: it is also what separates the teacher from the taught, and on which the reality principle of their relation is based; the same goes for all the social relations we know) have their archetype in the fundamental disjunction of life and death. This is why, in whatever field of 'reality', every separate term for which the other is its imaginary is haunted by the latter as its own death.

Natural Disaster Link

Natural disaster management is dependent upon the projection of our fantasies of an orderly and stable nature onto its reality. The affirmative's attempt to enact our simulations of disaster prevention result in the eradication of unpredicted, disorderly elements.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, 99, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

Baudrillard's recent writing exemplifies the convergence of fin-de-siècle anxieties about nature and the socially redemptive practice of environmental conservation. Anecdotes and aphorisms about social responses to nature's destruction form the insightful fragments that comprise Baudrillard's *The Transparency of Evil* (1993b), *The Illusion of the End* (1994), and *The Perfect Crime* (1996). For Baudrillard, the conservationists' response to the destruction of nature merely highlights the muddled paradoxes of protecting and perfecting the "natural world." In attempting to unravel this argument and to ultimately work toward a discussion of the Eden Project, we will explore Baudrillard's recent commentary on scientific and technological simulation.

For some time now, Baudrillard has insisted that simulation—or the "take-over" of reality by cultural sign systems⁴—has left Western society devoid of reference points. Rather than do away with reality, however, scientific and technologically induced simulations have been concerned with realizing or perfecting the world. Social realities are therefore made to appear more real than real, or as Baudrillard would have it, *hyper-real*. Hyperreality is characterized by the aesthetic and epistemological reassertion of refer-

ence points in an attempt to reclaim the real at a stage of Western cultural history that he defines as the third and fourth orders of simulacra (Baudrillard 1993a:70–76).⁵

Interestingly, Baudrillard suggests that the current fin de siècle is marked by the emergence of a "viral" or "metastatic" fourth order of simulacra, where science and technology have accelerated duplications of the real world in an attempt to draw us closer to the original (Levin 1996:280).⁶ Paradoxically, the closer we get to the real world, the more remote and detached we become from it. At this point—the fourth

order of simulacra—the cultural sign system begins to reverse upon itself, to create a condition of "derealization," where society has not lost simply a sense of the real but also its *possibility*. This is exemplified in Baudrillard's discussion of the stability of meaning in cultural sign systems. He suggests that Western society's search for authenticity has been lost through the technical calculation and efficiency of simulation, such that the distinction between true and false, between real and unreal, have eroded the "illusion of the sign," and that only the operation of the cultural sign system remains (1996:17). The only thing forestalling the complete collapse of meaning is the artificial revival of the real with its attendant fluctuations, contingencies, reference points, and own "other."⁷ According to Baudrillard, this is a "tactical hallucination" (1983:117) that is symptomatic of the current fin de siècle, and is particularly emphasized by the "redemptive" scientific practices of cryogenics, genetics, cloning, preservation, and conservation. These practices are indicative of Baudrillard's assertion that Western society is currently experiencing a reflexive postmortem where nothing is allowed to "end naturally."

Tech Relation Impact

This technological relation to nature objectifies it to the point of nothingness and accelerates its destruction in the name of producing a perfected, 'real' nature.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, **99**, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

An inability to allow anything to end naturally has produced a fin de siècle culture of endless duplication, where even the duplication of duplications become thought of as authentic (Baudrillard 1994:74). This has culminated in a "transaesthetic" culture where the sign has become detached from relative value, traditional boundaries, categories, and reference points (Baudrillard 1993b). Although Baudrillard runs through a catalog of case studies to exemplify this process, he makes particular reference to the condition of nature. He uses the term "catastrophe management" to evoke both a sense of the social anxiety that surrounds nature's destruction and the attempts to reclaim nature's

have been championed initially as a worthy environmental conservation project, but ironically, the elimination of bugs and bacteria ensured its ecological collapse because they form a vital part of nature's biodiversity.⁸ Baudrillard concludes his critique of Biosphere 2 by proposing that we must not reconcile ourselves with nature by trying to perfect it. This only objectifies nature to death (Baudrillard 1994:80–82). For Baudrillard, the "frenzy" of environmental conservation is really no more than an act of nostalgia and remorse over the loss of nature's reality (1994:84).

reality through scientific and technological simulation (1994). Baudrillard is ready to highlight the contradictions that arise from the illusion of reclaiming nature's reality. For example, in the process of attempting to duplicate nature through biosphere technology, scientists have tried to eliminate nature's undesirable characteristics, such as those associated with bugs and bacteria. Baudrillard's critique of Biosphere 2, an artificial, self-contained ecosystem located in the Arizona desert, pinpoints the contradiction between simulating and conserving nature:

The real planet, presumed condemned, is sacrificed in advance to its miniaturized, air-conditioned clone (have no fear, all the earth's climates are air-conditioned here) which is designed to vanquish death by total simulation (1994:87).

The total simulation that Baudrillard talks of centers on the illusion that nature can be duplicated, or "perfected." The Biosphere 2 environmental simulation, however, was only "naturalized" because of advances in technology and the eradication of naturally occurring bugs and bacteria (Baudrillard 1994:81). Biosphere 2 might

Disease Link

Simulations of disease as a threat results in a moral war on difference.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, 99, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

If, as Baudrillard suggests, Biosphere 2 is a "total simulation" (1994:87), then it only serves as an appropriate metaphor for fin-de-siècle attempts to erase social evil (1993b).⁹ Indeed, the use of "bug" as a metaphor for uncertainty, "disease," and disaster has proliferated in the 1990s: the "natural" outbreaks of AIDS and tuberculosis bacillus might have generated their own moral panics, but these only mirror the technologically induced moral panics surrounding "outbreaks" of the "Millennium Bug," Y2K (Mahoney 1998; Shipside 1998). Even at the advanced technological stage of society's development, Baudrillard observes that "nature's viruses" can still create havoc (1994).

Framework

Framework - Attempting to understand the reality of nature within academic debate has far-reaching sociological implications necessitating debate as a space for criticism.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobbrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, 99, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

P/w
Academics
debate
other
+d
understanding
Nature
of
nature
Studies
Societies
for
to
nature

Baudrillard's discussion of scientific and technological simulation, and his argument that Western society is locked into endless duplication in the pursuit of a perfected world, clearly opens up possibilities for retheorizing nature at the fin de millennium. It is noticeable that the academic debate on nature has intensified in the last ten years: as Braun and Castree state, "nature it seems is on the agenda as never before" (1998:3). But we argue that the intensification of interest in nature by academics merely highlights and even perpetuates fin-de-siècle anxieties about nature's vulnerability. To explain further, nature has been retheorized in the last decade primarily through a critical engagement with nature-society dialectics. Such "new wave thinking" (Macnaghten and Urry 1998:6) resonates with these dialectics: a sociocultural analysis, loosely termed, of the commodification of nature, and nature as a capital-accumulation strategy (Smith 1996; Katz 1998; Benton and Short 1999); the "aggressive" effacement of any distinction between real and made natures (Smith 1996); the construction and reproduction of nature, and the way in which nature is then constructed in defining what is natural (Robertson et al. 1996); and the diversity of contested natures that cannot be plainly separated from sociocultural processes (Macnaghten and Urry 1998). Smith (1998) defines the purpose of critically engaging with nature-society dialectics as reclaiming nature's "reality." In a similar vein, Light (1997) has called for a rigorous demarcation between virtual and real versions of the natural world, in order to preserve the integrity of society and nature, and Levidow (1996) has used ideas of simulation to argue for the cultivation of a different nature, one that is not merely commodified or reified. The debate has not been without its more cautionary contributions: Proctor (1998) has attempted to arbitrate between "social constructivist" and "relativist" positions on nature, and Harvey (1996) has acknowledged the problems of the dialectical critique of nature and society, but still insists that there is a way of understanding the production of nature.

AT: Perm

AT: Perm - even if they re-evaluate their relationship to nature, the impulse to preventing environmental disaster destroys the efficacy of that re-evaluation.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobbrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, 99, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

These and other contributions seek to clarify the position of nature in Western society, although inadvertently they feed fin-de-siècle anxieties about nature's reality: within the "enclosed" epistemology of nature-society dialectics there is an assumption that nature is still out there to be reclaimed, protected, or remade. For

example, simply explaining and illustrating the many ways in which nature is constructed and reconstructed within late-modern society (Braun and Castree 1998) preserves the myth that nature can be separated out from its deconstruction. As Doel (1993) has argued, the game of dialectics is infinitely resourceful: it never fails to find a meaning, a function, and affinity, as its practitioners are hyperskilled in the craft of herding events into signs (Doel 1993:381–82). In Baudrillardian terms, dialectics can be thought of as an intellectual strategy that, far from allowing us to grasp nature, leads to its disappearance through endless duplication.

Environment Alt

Alt - rather than engage in the affirmative's attempt to manage environmental catastrophe we should abandon any static conception of nature in favor of an ambiguous live and let live relationship.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobbrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, 99, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

By using Baudrillard's notion of scientific and technological simulation, we can step out of the "enclosure" of nature-society dialectics to consider how nature is duplicated rather than reclaimed through environmental conservation. Baudrillard does not provide a fixed theoretical framework that can be applied, and recent commentators have cautioned against reading his work as an applied or even comparative philosophy (Levin 1996; Butler 1999). Callinicos has accused Baudrillard of "intellectual dandyism" (1990:147), while Bertens criticizes him for adopting an overly hyperbolic and declarative writing style (1995:156). For Butler, however, it is precisely the inconsistencies, contradictions, and illogicalities of his writing style that allow us see what the real, and the resistance to the real, might mean (1999:166). Taking this perspective on Baudrillard's writing as our cue, we will argue that the Eden Project is a scientific and technological simulation that interacts with duplications of nature, not just from the biological and ecological sciences, but from popular culture, global media, and academic debate. We claim that the Eden Project, as a scientific and technological simulation, is more real than real, a perfected experience of nature, a kind of ecotopia achieved. The project resonates with what Baudrillard has identified as the fourth order of simulacra, where duplicative processes of scientific and technological simulation have accelerated to the point at which the nature's reality has disappeared. We suggest that the contradictions and inconsistencies that simulation generates appear in the Eden Project's objectives, design, and architecture. They confirm that the environmental catastrophe has already happened and that what we are left with is the illusion of "forestalling the end" through endless duplications of nature.

Calc Thought Link

Calc thought Link - Distances us from nature by externalizing nature's importance exclusively in terms of its political and economic benefits.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobbrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, 99, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

*Environ
collapse
→ exten
but
shift
①
distanc
→
from
nature
b →
declining
if
importance
in
referenc
to
economic
+
political
↳ needs*

The Eden Project is one of fourteen "landmark" schemes sponsored by the U.K.'s National Lottery Millennium Commission to commemorate the year 2000. The two main aims of the project are truly millennial and highlight the fin-de-siècle anxieties to protect and reclaim nature. The project will embrace "the stewardship of nature" through the "conservation of both habitat and indigenous species" and will conduct agronomic research that can "produce food and other economically valuable crops to sustain the world's population" (Davey 1996:65). As its "Role and Scientific Mission" states, the project "will be a showcase for global bio-diversity and human dependence on plants" (Ove Arup & Partners 1997:7). The project's aims are broad overtures to the Rio Earth Summit's Agenda 21 (Owen 1998), itself a grand gesture towards social and environmental redemption at the end of the twentieth century (Liverman 1999). Consistent with this sensibility, the Eden Project has not only traded on fin de siècle anxieties to manage environmental catastrophe, it has also promised to deliver a broad suite of political, economic, and social benefits. First, it is anticipated that construction of the geodesic domes will generate the equivalent of a thousand job-years. Given that the European Union has formally recognized Cornwall as a declining region in need of assistance,¹⁰ such aspirations have been welcomed by industry, commerce, and local government. Second, the Eden Project will represent a major land reclamation scheme. The former industrial site known as the Boldeva China Claypit will be "recycled" to make way for the conservation project. Third, according to project codirector Tim Smit, the Eden Project will become a "brand name" for quality organic produce and will be recognized as a global symbol for Cornwall and Cornishness.¹¹ It appears that the project—and contemporary environmental conservation in general—have to acquire impossibly broad and varied expectations that are not just to do with nature. In Baudrillard's terms, environmental conservation has to concern itself with the authentication of nature and the definition of its precise role in society. This can never be realized, however, as long as nature has to embrace a multiplicity of constitutive political, economic, and social agendas. Nature can no longer be just nature, but must also

provide an endless stream of redemptive social practices that ensure its disappearance in a "trans-aesthetic" of meaning.

Biopiracy Link

Bio-piracy Advantage Link - relies on notion of perfect natural rain forest.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, 99, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

[The short-term aim of the Institute will be to replenish the dome vegetation at regular intervals, although in the long term, the objective is to instigate a more balanced conservation policy for fragile environments across the globe (Barnes 1998). The Eden Project's Botanical Institute will not only produce perfected plant strains for use in the "virtual" tropical rainforest and Mediterranean ecosystems, but will also find use in sustaining the corresponding ecosystems in the natural world. Ultimately, distinguishing between nature and the Eden Project's version of nature (through its propagated vegetation) will become impossible as the natural world and the "virtual" ecosystems are systematically replenished. As with all scientific and technological simulations, the process of duplication eventually erodes a sense of the real.]

B.D.
Biopiracy
L
focus
on
healthy
rainforests
virtual
ecosystem
by forcing
C-plants
etc.

Environmental Collapse/Rainforest Link

- Destroys Real of Nature through continual duplication.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobbrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, 99, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

The Eden Project is a virtual experience of nature that employs the very latest advances in science and technology. In a sense, the project's simulation of nature is nature "perfected" because of its emphasis on contriving a more-real-than-real, intense and immediate, experience. In order to "perfect" nature, however, the Eden Project (as with all scientific and technological simulations) has succumbed to interaction with the cultural sign system, and specifically to the powerful global imagery of environmental destruction that has gained popularity over the last fifteen years. The "end" of the tropical rainforest for example, was continually replayed at global environmental conferences, such as the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, and in popular culture, through films such as *Medicine Man* (1992) and *Pocahontas* (1995). The tropical rainforest, far from being close to destruction, will proliferate in the Eden Project through the infinite capacity of the cultural sign system to duplicate its

Envir.
Collapse/
rainforest
↳
X
Real
nature
v/c
CONTINUOUS
simulation
reality
it
empty

form. More generally, fin-de-siècle anxieties have accelerated the duplication of the tropical rainforest, leaving it as a generalized, detached referent used in the advertising of many consumer goods, from clothes and computer games to disinfectants and toiletries.¹³ But even as a detached sign, the rainforest is somehow expected to "speak for itself": its plight is obvious through momentary glimpses on documentary film clips, minimalist references on consumer packaging, and rapid-fire sequences on thirty-second television advertisements. In sum, the tropical rainforest has been duplicated to death, and as a consequence, it bears the sign of its own excommunication from the natural world. Environmental conservation schemes such as the Eden Project have taken on the impossible task of replicating the rainforest condition, as though it were nature's reality. For certain, the project will use plant communities from the natural world to create its virtual ecosystems in the first instance, but even this, as an environmental replication practice, cannot be detached from the cultural sign system and the insistence that nature has to embrace a myriad of social and cultural meanings. Inevitably, the Eden Project finds itself caught up in the confusion over attempting to simulate nature to pacify fin-de-siècle anxieties, at a time when nature has disappeared.

Community Service solves Environment Link

Community solves environmental destruction link - renders both merely simulacrum by conflating them as signifiers.

Robert Bartram and Sarah Shobrook, degrees from U of Calgary and U of toronto in environmental sciences, PhD Geography and Resource Development officer, 99, Endless/End-less Natures: Environmental Futures at the Fin De Millenium, Giglio

USA,
 'small'
D
Conflic
of
env.y.
 +
Community
powers
North
S. Wales

Consistent with the redemptive characteristics of the fin de siècle, the Eden Project conflates environmental conservation with the revival of community values and the regeneration of local community pride (Davey 1996:65).¹⁶ For example, Cornish horticulturists will be responsible for selecting and tending plants. The construction of virtual ecosystems will involve local landscape architects, educationalists, ethnobiologists, ecologists, architects, and engineers, all of whom will work as part of a communal effort (Thoday and Cole 1998:40). While this effort forms an important reconstitution of community in itself, the focus on providing employment for a region in industrial decline adds to the sense of collective purpose. In this sense, the Eden Project can be thought of as a process of social and environmental regeneration.

But the thorny question of whose interests in the community are being served by the Eden Project has recently become apparent: the local environmental pressure group, the South West Greens, has argued that the impact on the frag-

the Eden Project is both an optimistic vision of the future and an anticipatory reaction to the fin de siècle. This broadens the relevance of environmentalism to make it accountable for everything and anything in the realm of the social: it is the counter to indifference toward collective social meaning or—in Baudrillard's words—surgery for the mending of identities (1996:137). But like contemporary notions of "nature," the term "community" has lost its referents in a metatasis of social meanings. This does not devalue the symbolic power of either term. On the contrary, it tends to ensure their longevity long after their reality has evaporated.

ile land earmarked for the Eden Project and the excessive use of main access routes are too great an environmental price to pay for the regeneration of the local economy (Jobson 1998; Robinson 1998). In response to this, Eden's codirector, Jonathan Ball, has claimed that the Eden Project can offer a wider and more significant message, not just to the local community, but to the nation. In an interview, he talked passionately about the symbolism of the Eden Project and the collective hope that this offers to what he described as "the Diana generation" (Ball 1998). This generation, he claims, yearns for a cohesive social movement, such as that provided by environmental conservation (Ball 1998). For Ball,

War on Terror Link

The war on terror is an inherently self-destructive phenomenon which attempts to rescue the ghost of American Hegemony from its coffin. Regardless of how effecient the affirmative perfects its functioning it still ignores the underlying fantasy of resistance and terrorism which is manifested in every fantasy of order and power.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

All that has been said and written is evidence of a gigantic abreaction to the event itself, and the fascination it exerts. The moral condemnation and the holy alliance against terrorism are on the same scale as the prodigious jubilation at seeing this global superpower destroyed – better, at seeing it, in a sense, destroying itself, committing suicide in a blaze of glory. For it is that superpower which, by its unbearable power, has fomented all this violence which is endemic throughout the world, and hence that (unwittingly) terroristic imagination which dwells in all of us.

The fact that we have dreamt of this event, that everyone without exception has dreamt of it – because no one can avoid dreaming of the destruction of any power that has become hegemonic to this degree – is unacceptable to the Western moral conscience. Yet it is a fact, and one which can indeed be measured by the emotive violence of all that has been said and written in the effort to dispel it.

At a pinch, we can say that they did it, but we wished for it. If this is not taken into account, the event loses any symbolic dimension. It becomes a pure accident, a purely arbitrary act, the murder-

ous phantasmagoria of a few fanatics, and all that would then remain would be to eliminate them. Now, we know very well that this is not how it is. Which explains 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.

This goes far beyond hatred for the dominant world power among the disinherited and the exploited, among those who have ended up on the wrong side of the global order. Even those who share in the advantages of that order have this malicious desire in their hearts. Allergy to any definitive order, to any definitive power, is – happily – universal, and the two towers of the World Trade Center were perfect embodiments, in their very twinness, of that definitive order.

No need, then, for a death drive or a destructive instinct, or even for perverse, unintended effects. Very logically – and inexorably – the

/

increase in the power of 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 the position of God (divine omnipotence and absolute moral legitimacy), has become suicidal, and declared war on itself.

The countless disaster movies bear witness to this fantasy, which they clearly attempt to exorcize with images, drowning out the whole thing with special effects. But the universal attraction they exert, which is on a par with pornography, shows that acting-out is never very far away, the impulse to reject any system growing all the stronger as it approaches perfection or omnipotence.

It is probable that the terrorists had not foreseen the collapse of the Twin Towers (any more than had the experts!), a collapse which – much more than the attack on the Pentagon – had the greatest symbolic impact. The symbolic collapse of a whole system came about by an unpredictable complicity, as though the towers, by collapsing on their own, by committing suicide, had joined in to round off the event. In a sense, the entire system, by its internal fragility, lent the initial action a helping hand.

The more concentrated the system becomes globally, ultimately forming one single network, the more it becomes vulnerable at a single point (already a single little Filipino hacker had managed, from the dark recesses of his portable computer, to launch the 'I love you' virus, which circled the globe devastating entire networks). Here it was eighteen suicide attackers who, thanks to the absolute weapon of death, enhanced by technological efficiency, unleashed a global catastrophic process.

When global power monopolizes the situation to this extent, when there is such a formidable condensation of all functions in the technocratic machinery, and when no alternative form of thinking is allowed, what other way is there but a terroristic situational transfer? It was the system itself which created the objective conditions for this brutal retaliation. By seizing all the cards for itself, it forced the Other to change the rules. And the new rules are fierce ones, because the stakes are fierce. To a system whose very excess of power poses an insoluble challenge, the terrorists respond with a definitive act which is also not susceptible of exchange. Terrorism is the act that restores an irreducible singularity to the heart of a system of generalized exchange. All the singularities (species, individuals and cultures) that have paid with their deaths for the installation of a global circulation governed by a single power are taking their revenge today through this *terroristic situational transfer*.

This is ~~terror against terror~~ — there is no longer any ideology behind it. We are far beyond ideology and politics now. No ideology, no cause — not even the Islamic cause — can account for the energy which fuels terror. The aim is no longer even to transform the world, but (as the heresies did in their day) to radicalize the world by sacrifice. Whereas the system aims to realize it by force.

Terrorism, like viruses, is everywhere. There is a global perfusion of terrorism, which accompanies any system of domination as though it were its shadow, ready to activate itself anywhere, like a double agent. We can no longer draw a demarcation line around it. It is at the ~~very heart~~ of this culture which combats it, and the visible fracture (and the hatred) that pits the exploited and the underdeveloped globally against the Western world secretly connects with the fracture internal to the dominant system. That system can face down any visible antagonism. But against the other kind, which is viral in structure — as though every machinery of domination secreted its own counterapparatus, the agent of its own disappearance — against that form of almost automatic reversion of its own power, the system can do nothing. And terrorism is the shock wave of this silent reversion.

This is not, then, a clash of civilizations or religions, and it reaches far beyond Islam and America, on which efforts are being made to

focus the conflict in order to create the delusion of a visible confrontation and a solution based on force. There is, indeed, a fundamental antagonism here, but one which points past the spectre of America (which is, perhaps, the epicentre, but in no sense the sole embodiment, of globalization) and the spectre of Islam (which is not the embodiment of terrorism either), to triumphant globalization ~~battling against itself~~. In this sense, we can indeed speak of a ~~world war~~ — not the Third World War, but the Fourth and the only really global one, since what is at stake is globalization itself. The first two world wars corresponded to the classical image of war. The first ended the supremacy of Europe and the colonial era. The second put an end to Nazism. The third, which has indeed taken place, in the form of cold war and deterrence, put an end to Communism. With each succeeding war, we have moved further towards a single world order. Today that order, which has virtually reached its culmination, finds itself grappling with the antagonistic forces scattered throughout the very heartlands of the global, in all the current convulsions. A fractal war of all cells, all singularities, revolting in the form of antibodies. A confrontation so impossible to pin down that the idea of war has to be rescued from time to time by spectacular set-pieces, such as the Gulf War or the war in Afghanistan. But the Fourth World War is elsewhere. It is what haunts every world order, all hegemonic domination — if Islam dominated the world, terrorism would rise against Islam, for it is the world, the globe itself, which resists globalization.

Morality Link and Alt

Morality Link and alt. - Good necessarily defines and sustains evil - ethical imperatives are not pure insofar as they create the possibility for their opposite. The only true ethical act is a full embrace of evil.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

Terrorism is immoral. The World Trade Center event, that symbolic challenge, is immoral, and it is a response to a globalization which is itself immoral. So, let us be immoral; and if we want to have some understanding of all this, let us go and

take a little look beyond Good and Evil. When, for once, we have an event that defies not just morality, but any form of interpretation, let us try to approach it with an understanding of Evil.

This is precisely where the crucial point lies – in the total misunderstanding on the part of Western philosophy, on the part of the Enlightenment, of the relation between Good and Evil. We believe naively that the progress of Good, its advance in all fields (the sciences, technology, democracy, human rights), corresponds to a defeat of Evil. No one seems to have understood that Good and Evil advance together, as part of the same movement. The triumph of the one does not eclipse the other – far from it. In metaphysical

terms, Evil is regarded as an accidental mishap, but this axiom, from which all the Manichaean forms of the struggle of Good against Evil derive, is illusory. Good does not conquer Evil, nor indeed does the reverse happen: they are at once both irreducible to each other and inextricably interrelated. Ultimately, Good could thwart Evil only by ceasing to be Good since, by seizing for itself a global monopoly of power, it gives rise, by that very act, to a blowback of a proportionate violence.

Islam/Source of Terrorism Link

There is no source of terrorism because it is an inevitable symbolic product of terrorism.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

Relatively speaking, this is more or less what has happened in the political order with the eclipse of Communism and the global triumph of liberal power: it was at that point that a ghostly enemy emerged, infiltrating itself throughout the whole planet, slipping in everywhere like a virus, welling up from all the interstices of power: Islam.
But Islam was merely the moving front along which the antagonism crystallized. The antagonism is everywhere, and in every one of us. So, it is terror against terror. But asymmetric terror.
And it is this asymmetry which leaves global omnipotence entirely disarmed. At odds with itself, it can only plunge further into its own logic of relations of force, but it cannot operate on the terrain of the symbolic challenge and death – a thing of which it no longer has any idea, since it has erased it from its own culture.

We kill terrorists link

Affirmative's fantasy of a death free war against terrorism precisely illustrates our inherent vulnerability - our ascetic exclusion of death. They have effectively transformed their Death into a tool of subversion meaning the more we kill the more they have won.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

Up to the present, this integrative power has largely succeeded in absorbing and resolving any crisis, any negativity, creating, as it did so, a situation of the deepest despair (not only for the disinherited, but for the pampered and privileged too, in their radical comfort). The fundamental change now is that the terrorists have ceased to commit suicide for no return; they are now bringing their own deaths to bear in an effective, offensive manner, in the service of an intuitive strategic insight which is quite simply a sense of the immense fragility of the opponent – a sense that a system which has arrived at its quasi-perfection can, by that very token, be ignited by the slightest spark. They have succeeded in turning their own deaths into an absolute weapon against a system that operates on the basis of the exclusion of death, a system whose ideal is an ideal of zero deaths. Every zero-death system is a zero-sum-game system. And all the means of deterrence and destruction can do nothing against an enemy who has already turned his death into a counterstrike weapon. ‘What does the

American bombing matter? Our men are as eager to die as the Americans are to live! Hence the non-equivalence of the four thousand deaths inflicted at a stroke on a zero-death system.

Here, then, it is all about death, not only about the violent irruption of death in real time – ‘live’, so to speak – but the irruption of a death which is far more than real: a death which is symbolic and sacrificial – that is to say, the absolute, irrevocable event.

This is the spirit of terrorism.

Never attack the system in terms of relations of force. That is the (revolutionary) imagination the system itself forces upon you – the system which survives only by constantly drawing those attacking it into fighting on the ground of reality, which is always its own. But shift the struggle into the symbolic sphere, where the rule is that of challenge, reversion and outbidding. So that death can be met only by equal or greater death. Defy the system by a gift to which it cannot respond except by its own death and its own collapse.

The terrorist hypothesis is that the system itself will commit suicide in response to the multiple challenges posed by deaths and suicides. For there is a symbolic obligation upon both the system and power [*le pouvoir*], and in this trap lies the only chance of their catastrophic collapse. In this vertiginous cycle of the impossible exchange of death, the death of the terrorist is an infinitesimal point, but one that creates a gigantic suction or void, an enormous convection. Around this tiny point the whole system of the real and of power [*la puissance*] gathers, transfixed; rallies briefly; then perishes by its own hyperefficiency.

It is the tactic of the terrorist model to bring about an excess of reality, and have the system collapse beneath that excess of reality. The whole derisory nature of the situation, together with the violence mobilized by the system, turns around against it, for terrorist acts are both the exorbitant mirror of its own violence and the model of a symbolic violence forbidden to it, the only violence it cannot exert – that of its own death.

This is why the whole of visible power can do nothing against the tiny, but symbolic, death of a few individuals.

AT: Realism

The dominant geopolitical order has been coopted by terrorists and is being used against us.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

We have to face facts, and accept that a new terrorism has come into being, a new form of action which plays the game, and lays hold of the rules of the game, solely with the aim of disrupting it. Not only do these people not play fair, since they put their own deaths into play – to which there is no possible response ('they are cowards') – but they have taken over all the weapons of the dominant power. Money and stock-market speculation, computer technology and aeronautics, spectacle and the media networks – they have assimilated everything of modernity and globalism, without changing their goal, which is to destroy that power.

Sleeper Cell/TIPS Link

Fear of sleeper cells results in internalized terrorism as we constantly spy on our neighbors.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

They have even – and this is the height of cunning – used the banality of American everyday life as cover and camouflage. Sleeping in their suburbs, reading and studying with their families, before activating themselves suddenly like time bombs. The faultless mastery of this clandestine style of operation is almost as terroristic as the spectacular act of September 11, since it casts suspicion on any and every individual. Might not any inoffensive person be a potential terrorist? If they could pass unnoticed, then each of us is a criminal going unnoticed (every plane also becomes suspect), and in the end, this is no doubt true. This may very well correspond to an unconscious form of potential, veiled, carefully repressed criminality, which is always capable, if not of resurfacing, at least of thrilling secretly to the spectacle of Evil. So the event ramifies down to the smallest detail – the source of an even more subtle mental terror-
ism.

Can't win War on Terror

The combination of their use of death and weaponry means we can never win the war on terror.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P._____ Giglio

E The radical difference is that the terrorists, while they have at their disposal weapons that are the system's own, possess a further lethal weapon: their own deaths. If they were content just to fight the system with its own weapons, they would immediately be eliminated. If they merely used their own deaths to combat it, they would disappear just as quickly in a useless sacrifice – as terrorism has almost always done up to now (an example being the Palestinian suicide attacks), for which reason it has been doomed to failure.

As soon as they combine all the modern resources available to them with this highly symbolic weapon, everything changes. The destructive potential is multiplied to infinity. It is this multiplication of factors (which seem irreconcilable to us) that gives them such superiority. The 'zero-death' strategy, by contrast, the strategy of the 'clean' technological war, precisely fails to match up to this transfiguration of 'real' power by symbolic power.]

Calc Thought Link - WOT

Attempting to infuse calculative efficiency within the war on terror fails to incorporate an analysis of the symbolic power of terrorism rendering it worthless.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

The prodigious success of such an attack presents a problem, and if we are to gain some understanding of it, we have to slough off our Western perspective to see what goes on in the terrorists' organization, and in their heads. With us, such efficiency would assume a maximum of calculation and rationality that we find hard to imagine in others. And, even in this case, as in any rational organization or secret service, there would always have been leaks or slip-ups.

So, the secret of such a success lies elsewhere. The difference is that here we are dealing not with an employment contract, but with a pact and a sacrificial obligation. Such an obligation is immune to any defection or corruption. The miracle is to have adapted to the global network and technical protocols, without losing anything of this complicity 'unto death'. Unlike the contract, the pact does not bind individuals – even their 'suicide' is not individual heroism, it is a collective sacrificial act sealed by an ideal demand. And it is the combination of two mechanisms – an operational structure and a symbolic pact – that made an act of such excessiveness possible.

We no longer have any idea what a symbolic calculation is, as in poker or potlatch: with minimum stakes, but the maximum result. And the maximum result was precisely what the terrorists

obtained in the Manhattan attack, which might be presented as quite a good illustration of chaos theory: an initial impact causing incalculable consequences; whereas the Americans' massive deployment ('Desert Storm') achieved only derisory effects – the hurricane ending, so to speak, in the beating of a butterfly's wing.

Suiciding Bombs Link

Aff ignores symbolic effect of suicide.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

Suicidal terrorism was a terrorism of the poor. This is a terrorism of the rich. This is what particularly frightens us: the fact that they have become rich (they have all the necessary resources) without ceasing to wish to destroy us. Admittedly, in terms of our system of values, they are cheating. It is not playing fair to throw one's own death into the game. But this does not trouble them, and the new rules are not ours to determine.

So any argument is used to discredit their acts. For example, calling them 'suicidal' and 'martyrs' – and adding immediately that martyrdom proves nothing, that it has nothing to do with truth, that it is even (to quote Nietzsche) the enemy number one of truth. Admittedly, their deaths prove nothing, but in a system where truth itself is elusive (or do we claim to possess it?), there is nothing to prove. Moreover, this highly moral argument can be turned around. If the voluntary martyrdom of the suicide bombers proves nothing, then the involuntary martyrdom of the victims of the attack proves nothing either, and there is something unseemly and obscene in making a moral argument out of it (this is in no way to deny their suffering and death).

Another argument in bad faith: these terrorists exchanged their deaths for a place in paradise; their act was not a disinterested one, hence it is not authentic; it would be disinterested only if they did not believe in God, if they saw no hope in death, as is the case with us (yet Christian martyrs assumed precisely such a sublime equivalence). There again, then, they are not fighting fair, since they get salvation, which we cannot even continue to hope for. So we mourn our deaths while they can turn theirs into very high-definition stakes.

Nuclear and Chemical Terror Link -

Focusing on the power of terrorists to inflict death forecloses our ability to analyze the true power of humiliation instilled by terrorism.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

Fundamentally, all this — causes, proof, truth, rewards, ends and means — is a typically Western form of calculation. We even evaluate death in terms of interest rates, in value-for-money terms. An economic calculation that is a poor man's calculation — poor men who no longer even have the courage to pay the price.

What can happen now — apart from war, which is itself merely a conventional safety shield [*écran de protection*]? There is talk of bio-terrorism, bacteriological warfare or nuclear terrorism. Yet that is no longer of the order of the symbolic challenge, but of annihilation pure and simple, with no element of risk or glory: it is of the order of the final solution. Now, it is a mistake to see terrorist action as obeying a purely destructive logic. It seems to me that the action of the terrorists, from which death is inseparable (this is precisely what makes it a symbolic act), does not seek the impersonal elimination of the other. Everything lies in the challenge and the duel — that is to say, everything still lies in a dual, personal relation

with the opposing power. It is that power which humiliated you, so it too must be humiliated. And not merely exterminated. It has to be made to lose face. And you never achieve that by pure force and eliminating the other party: it must, rather, be targeted and wounded in a genuinely adversarial relation. Apart from the pact that binds the terrorists together, there is also something of a dual pact with the adversary. This is, then, precisely the opposite of the cowardice of which they stand accused, and it is precisely the opposite of what the Americans did in the Gulf War (and which they are currently beginning again in Afghanistan), where the target is invisible and is liquidated operationally.

Terrorism Representations Link -

Representations of terrorist catastrophe creates a spectacle of violence which locks us into a singular inseparable mode of shock-and-awe response destroying an effective response and replicating psychological terror.

Jean **Baudrillard**, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, **02**, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

In all these vicissitudes, what stays with us, above all else, is the sight of the images. This impact of the images, and their fascination, are necessarily what we retain, since images are, whether we like it or not, our primal scene. And, at the same time as they have radicalized the world situation, the events in New York can also be said

to have radicalized the relation of the image to reality. Whereas we were dealing before with an uninterrupted profusion of banal images and a seamless flow of sham events, the terrorist act in New York has resuscitated both images and events.

Among the other weapons of the system which they turned round against it, the terrorists exploited the 'real time' of images, their instantaneous worldwide transmission, just as they exploited stock-market speculation, electronic information and air traffic. The role of images is highly ambiguous. For, at the same time as they exalt the event, they also take it hostage. They serve to multiply it to infinity and, at the same time, they are a diversion and a neutralization (this was already the case with the events of 1968). The image consumes the event, in the sense that it absorbs it and offers it for consumption. Admittedly, it gives it unprecedented impact, but impact as image-event.

How do things stand with the real event, then, if reality is everywhere infiltrated by images, virtuality and fiction? In the present case, we thought we had seen (perhaps with a certain relief) a resurgence of the real, and of the violence of the real, in an allegedly virtual universe. 'There's an end to all your talk about the virtual – this is something real!' Similarly, it was possible to see this as a resurrection of history beyond its proclaimed end. But does reality actually outstrip fiction? If it seems to do so, this is because it has absorbed fiction's energy, and has itself become fiction. We might almost say that reality is jealous of fiction, that the real is jealous of the image. . . . It is a kind of duel between them, a contest to see which can be the most unimaginable.

The collapse of the World Trade Center towers is unimaginable, but that is not enough to make it a real event. An excess of violence is not enough to open on to reality. For reality is a principle, and it is this principle that is lost. Reality and fiction are inextricable, and the fascination with the attack is primarily a fascination with the

image (both its exultatory and its catastrophic consequences are themselves largely imaginary).

In this case, then, the real is superadded to the image like a bonus of terror, like an additional *frisson*: not only is it terrifying, but, what is more, it is real. Rather than the violence of the real being there first, and the *frisson* of the image being added to it, the image is there first, and the *frisson* of the real is added. Something like an additional fiction, a fiction surpassing fiction. Ballard (after Borges) talked like this of reinventing the real as the ultimate and most redoubtable fiction.

The terrorist violence here is not, then, a blowback of reality, any more than it is a blowback of history. It is not 'real'. In a sense, it is worse: it is symbolic. Violence in itself may be perfectly banal and inoffensive. Only symbolic violence is generative of singularity. And in this singular event, in this Manhattan disaster movie, the twentieth century's two elements of mass fascination are combined: the white magic of the cinema and the black magic of terrorism; the white light of the image and the black light of terrorism.

We try retrospectively to impose some kind of meaning on it, to find some kind of interpretation. But there is none. And it is the radicality of the spectacle, the brutality of the spectacle, which alone is original and irreducible. The spectacle of terrorism forces the terrorism of spectacle upon us. And, against this immoral fascination (even if it unleashes a universal moral reaction), the political order can do nothing. This is *our* theatre of cruelty, the only one we have left – extraordinary in that it unites the most extreme degree of the spectacular and the highest level of challenge. . . . It is at one and the same time the dazzling micro-model of a kernel of real violence with the maximum possible echo – hence the purest form of spectacle – and a sacrificial model mounting the purest symbolic form of defiance to the historical and political order.

We would forgive them any massacre if it had

Baudrillard
DD 106
Italian Stallion

Neg
F

a meaning, if it could be interpreted as historical violence – this is the moral axiom of good violence. We would pardon them any violence if it were not given media exposure ('terrorism would be nothing without the media'). But this is all illusion. There is no 'good' use of the media; the media are part of the event, they are part of the terror, and they work in both directions.

The repression of terrorism spirals around as unpredictably as the terrorist act itself. No one knows where it will stop, or what turnabouts there may yet be. There is no possible distinction, at the level of images and information, between the spectacular and the symbolic, no possible distinction between the 'crime' and the crackdown. And it is this uncontrollable unleashing of reversibility that is terrorism's true victory. A victory that is visible in the subterranean ramifications and infiltrations of the event – not just in the direct economic, political, financial slump in the whole of the system – and the resulting moral and psychological downturn – but in the slump in the value-system, in the whole ideology of freedom, of free circulation and so on, on which the Western world prided itself, and on which it drew to exert its hold over the rest of the world.

Terrorists -> X Link (Economy collapse, environmental collapse etc.)

Blaming terrorists for everything means they've won because they are believed to cause all instability.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

Another aspect of the terrorists' victory is that all other forms of violence and the destabilization of order work in its favour. Internet terrorism, biological terrorism, the terrorism of anthrax and rumour – all are ascribed to Bin Laden. He might even claim natural catastrophes as his own. All the forms of disorganization and perverse circulation operate to his advantage. The very structure of generalized world trade works in favour of impossible exchange. It is like an 'automatic writing' of terrorism, constantly refuelled by the involuntary terrorism of news and information. With all the panic consequences which ensue; if, in the current anthrax scare,* the hysteria spreads spontaneously by instantaneous crystallization, like a chemical solution at the mere contact of a molecule, this is because the whole system has reached a critical mass which makes it vulnerable to any aggression.

WOT Alt - Collapse

Alt - Give up - allowing the war on terror to collapse upon itself is the only effective response.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 02, The Spirit of Terrorism P. _____ Giglio

There is no remedy for this extreme situation, and war is certainly not a solution, since it merely offers a rehash of the past, with the same deluge of military forces, bogus information, senseless bombardment, emotive and deceitful language, technological deployment and brainwashing. Like the Gulf War: a non-event, an event that does not really take place.

And this indeed is its *raison-d'être*: to substitute, for a real and formidable, unique and unforeseeable event, a repetitive, rehashed pseudo-event. The terrorist attack corresponded to a precedence of the event over all interpretative models; whereas this mindlessly military, technological war corresponds, conversely, to the model's precedence over the event, and hence to a conflict over phoney stakes, to a situation of 'no contest'. War as continuation of the absence of politics by other means.

IR Link

Geopolitical strategy and predictions are so self-referential and regurgitating that warfare no longer takes place on any real level but is almost purely confined to the realm of simulation.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81,
Simulacra and Simulations P. _____ Giglio

If once we were able to view the Borges fable in which the cartographers of the Empire draw up a map so detailed that it ends up covering the territory exactly (the decline of the Empire witnesses the fraying of this map, little by little, and its fall into ruins, though some shreds are still discernible in the deserts—the metaphysical beauty of this ruined abstraction testifying to a pride equal to the Empire and rotting like a carcass, returning to the substance of the soil, a bit as the double ends by being confused with the real through aging)—as the most beautiful allegory of simulation, this fable has now come full circle for us, and possesses nothing but the discrete charm of second-order simulacra.¹

Today abstraction is no longer that of the map, the double, the mirror, or the concept. Simulation is no longer that of a territory, a referential being, or a substance. It is the generation by models of a real without origin or reality: a hyperreal. The territory no longer precedes the map, nor does it survive it. It is nevertheless the map that precedes the territory—*precession of simulacra*—that engenders the territory, and if one must return to the fable, today it is the territory whose shreds slowly rot across the extent of the map. It is the real, and not the map, whose vestiges persist here and there in the deserts that are no longer those of the Empire, but ours. *The desert of the real itself.*

In fact, even inverted, Borges's fable is unusable. Only the allegory of the Empire, perhaps, remains. Because it is with this same imperialism that present-day simulators attempt to make the real, all of the real, coincide with their models of simulation. But it is no longer a question of either maps or territories. Something has disappeared: the sovereign difference, between one and the other, that constituted the charm of abstraction. Because it is difference that constitutes the poetry of the map and the charm of the territory, the magic of the concept and the charm of the real. This imaginary of representation, which simultaneously culminates in and is engulfed by the cartographer's mad project of the ideal coextensivity of map and territory, disappears in the simulation whose operation is nuclear and genetic, no longer at all specular or discursive. It is all of metaphysics that is lost. No more mirror of being and appearances, of the real and its concept. No more imaginary coextensivity: it is genetic miniaturization that is the dimension of simulation. The real is produced from miniaturized cells, matrices, and memory banks, models of control—and it can be reproduced an indefinite number of times from these. It no longer needs to be rational, because it no longer measures itself against either an ideal or negative instance. It is no

longer anything but operational. In fact, it is no longer really the real, because no imaginary envelops it anymore. It is a hyperreal, produced from a radiating synthesis of combinatory models in a hyperspace without atmosphere.

By crossing into a space whose curvature is no longer that of the real, nor that of truth, the era of simulation is inaugurated by a liquidation of all referentials—worse: with their artificial resurrection in the systems of signs, a material more malleable than meaning, in that it lends itself to all systems of equivalences, to all binary oppositions, to all combinatory algebra. It is no longer a question of imitation, nor duplication, nor even parody. It is a question of substituting the signs of the real for the real, that is to say of an operation of deterring every real process via its operational double, a programmatic, metastable, perfectly descriptive machine that offers all the signs of the real and short-circuits all its vicissitudes. Never again will the real have the chance to produce itself—such is the vital function of the model in a system of death, or rather of anticipated resurrection, that no longer even gives the event of death a chance. A hyperreal henceforth sheltered from the imaginary, and from any distinction between the real and the imaginary, leaving room only for the orbital recurrence of models and for the simulated generation of differences.

Aff DADT K Answer

Aff - DADT relies upon static notions of universal knowledge - plan would challenge that by recognizing the relationship between simulation and reality.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81,
Simulacra and Simulations P. _____ Giglio

Certainly, the psychiatrist purports that "for every form of mental alienation there is a particular order in the succession of symptoms of which the simulator is ignorant and in the absence of which the psychiatrist would not be deceived." This (which dates from 1865) in order to safeguard the principle of a truth at all costs and to escape the interrogation posed by simulation—the knowledge that truth, reference, objective cause have ceased to exist. Now, what can medicine do with what floats on either side of illness, on either side of health, with the duplication of illness in a discourse that is no longer either true or false? What can psychoanalysis do with the duplication of the discourse of the unconscious in the discourse of simulation that can never again be unmasked, since it is not false either?²

What can the army do about simulators? Traditionally it unmasks them and punishes them, according to a clear principle of identification. Today it can discharge a very good simulator as exactly equivalent to a "real" homosexual, a heart patient, or a madman. Even military psychology draws back from Cartesian certainties and hesitates to make the distinction between true and false, between the "produced" and the authentic symptom. "If he is this good at acting crazy, it's because he is." Nor is military psychology mistaken in this regard: in this sense, all crazy people simulate, and this lack of distinction is the worst kind of subversion. It is against this lack of distinction that classical reason armed itself in all its categories. But it is what today again outflanks them, submerging the principle of truth.

Translators Link

The idea of a linguist or translator relies upon the exchangability of language - it relies upon a conception of language as directly representational of reality.

Jean **Baudrillard**, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81,
Simulacra and Simulations P. _____ Giglio

This way the stake will always have been the murderous power of images, murderers of the real, murderers of their own model, as the Byzantine icons could be those of divine identity. To this murderous power is opposed that of representations as a dialectical power, the visible and intelligible mediation of the Real. All Western faith and good faith became engaged in this wager on representation: that a sign could refer to the depth of meaning, that a sign could be exchanged for meaning and that something could guarantee this exchange—God of course. But what if God himself can be simulated, that is to say can be reduced to the signs that constitute faith? Then the whole system becomes weightless,

it is no longer itself anything but a gigantic simulacrum—not unreal, but a simulacrum, that is to say never exchanged for the real, but exchanged for itself, in an uninterrupted circuit without reference or circumference.

Such is simulation, insofar as it is opposed to representation. Representation stems from the principle of the equivalence of the sign and of the real (even if this equivalence is utopian, it is a fundamental axiom). Simulation, on the contrary, stems from the utopia of the principle of equivalence, *from the radical negation of the sign as value*, from the sign as the reversion and death sentence of every reference. Whereas representation attempts to absorb simulation by interpreting it as a false representation, simulation envelops the whole edifice of representation itself as a simulacrum. ➤

Representations Link

The affirmative's attempt to shed light on (Insert 1ac Harms) objectifies them to death, confining them to a glass coffin of analysis.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81,
Simulacra and Simulations P. _____ Giglio

Ethnology brushed up against its paradoxical death in 1971, the day when the Philippine government decided to return the few dozen Tasaday who had just been discovered in the depths of the jungle, where they had lived for eight centuries without any contact with the rest of the species, to their primitive state, out of the reach of colonizers, tourists, and ethnologists. This at the suggestion of the anthropologists themselves, who were seeing the indigenous people disintegrate immediately upon contact, like mummies in the open air.

In order for ethnology to live, its object must die; by dying, the object takes its revenge for being "discovered" and with its death defies the science that wants to grasp it.

Doesn't all science live on this paradoxical slope to which it is doomed by the evanescence of its object in its very apprehension, and by the pitiless reversal that the dead object exerts on it? Like Orpheus, it always turns around too soon, and, like Eurydice, its object falls back into Hades.

It is against this hell of the paradox that the ethnologists wished to protect themselves by cordoning off the Tasaday with virgin forest. No one can touch them anymore: as in a mine the vein is closed down. Science loses precious capital there, but the object will be safe, lost to science, but intact in its "virginity." It is not a question of sacrifice (science never sacrifices itself, it is always murderous), but of the simulated sacrifice of its object in order to save its reality principle. The Tasaday, frozen in their natural element, will provide a perfect alibi, an eternal guarantee. Here begins an antiethnology that will never end and to which Jaulin, Castaneda, Clastres are various witnesses. In any case, the logical evolution of a science is to distance itself increasingly

from its object, until it dispenses with it entirely: its autonomy is only rendered even more fantastic—it attains its pure form.

The Indian thus returned to the ghetto, in the glass coffin of the virgin forest, again becomes the model of simulation of all the possible Indians from before ethnology. This model thus grants itself the luxury to incarnate itself beyond itself in the "brute" reality of these Indians it has entirely reinvented—Savages who are indebted to ethnology for still being Savages: what a turn of events, what a triumph for this science that seemed dedicated to their destruction!

Of course, these savages are posthumous: frozen, cryogenized, sterilized, protected to death, they have become referential simulacra, and science itself has become pure simulation. The same holds true at Cruesot, at the level of the "open" museum where one museumified in situ, as "historical" witnesses of their period,

entire working-class neighborhoods, living metallurgic zones, an entire culture, men, women, and children included—gestures, languages, customs fossilized alive as in a snapshot. The museum, instead of being circumscribed as a geometric site, is everywhere now, like a dimension of life. Thus ethnology, rather than circumscribing itself as an objective science, will today, liberated from its object, be applied to all living things and make itself invisible, like an omnipresent fourth dimension, that of the simulacrum. We are all Tasadays, Indians who have again become what they were—simulacral Indians who at last proclaim the universal truth of ethnology.

We have all become living specimens in the spectral light of ethnology, or of antiethnology, which is nothing but the pure form of triumphal ethnology, under the sign of dead differences, and of the resurrection of differences. It is thus very naive to look for ethnology in the Savages or in some Third World—it is here, everywhere, in the metropolises, in the White community, in a world completely cataloged and analyzed, then artificially resurrected under the auspices of the real, in a world of simulation, of the hallucination of truth, of the blackmail of the real, of the murder of every symbolic form and of its hysterical, historical retrospection—a murder of which the Savages, noblesse oblige, were the first victims, but that for a long time has extended to all Western societies.

Inclusion/respect for difference Link

Attempting to destroy discrimination against difference through respect fails because it locks the other into a simulated fantasy of their identity.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81,
Simulacra and Simulations P. _____ Giglio

L But in the same breath ethnology grants us its only and final lesson, the secret that kills it (and which the Savages knew better than it did): the vengeance of the dead.

The confinement of the scientific object is equal to the confinement of the mad and the dead. And just as all of society is irreducibly contaminated by this mirror of madness that it has held up to itself, science can't help but die contaminated by the death of this object that is its inverse mirror. It is science that masters the objects, but it is the objects that invest it with depth, according to an unconscious reversion, which only gives a dead and circular response to a dead and circular interrogation.

Nothing changes when society breaks the mirror of madness (abolishes the asylums, gives speech back to the insane, etc.) nor when science seems to break the mirror of its objectivity (effacing itself before its object, as in Castaneda, etc.) and to bend down before the "differences." The form produced by confinement is followed by an innumerable, diffracted, slowed-down mechanism. As ethnology collapses in its classical institution, it survives in an antiethnology whose task it is to reinject the difference fiction, the Savage fiction everywhere, to conceal that it is this world, ours, which has again become savage in its way, that is to say, which is devastated by difference and by death.

Fiction Link

Attempting to respect the reality of a situation through a fictional representation of it renders both artificial.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81,
Simulacra and Simulations P. _____ Giglio

In the same way, with the pretext of saving the original, one forbade visitors to enter the Lascaux caves, but an exact replica was constructed five hundred meters from it, so that everyone could see them (one glances through a peephole at the authentic cave, and then one visits the reconstituted whole). It is possible that the memory of the original grottoes is itself stamped in the minds of future generations, but from now on there is no longer any difference: the duplication suffices to render both artificial.

Memory/History Link

The affirmative's attempt to illuminate the historical context in which _____ Operates is necessarily hegemonic insofar as it is only capable of remembering it from a narcissistic western perspective.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81, Simulacra and Simulations P.____ Giglio

In the same way science and technology were recently mobilized to save the mummy of Ramses II, after it was left to rot for several dozen years in the depths of a museum. The West is seized with panic at the thought of not being able to save what the symbolic order had been able to conserve for forty centuries, but out of sight and far from the light of day. Ramses does not signify

anything for us, only the mummy is of an inestimable worth because it is what guarantees that accumulation has meaning. Our entire linear and accumulative culture collapses if we cannot stockpile the past in plain view. To this end the pharaohs must be brought out of their tomb and the mummies out of their silence. To this end they must be exhumed and given military honors. They are prey to both science and worms. Only absolute secrecy assured them this millennial power—the mastery over putrefaction that signified the mastery of the complete cycle of exchanges with death. We only know how to place our science in service of repairing the mummy, that is to say restoring a visible order, whereas embalming was a mythical effort that strove to immortalize a hidden dimension.

We require a visible past, a visible continuum, a visible myth of origin, which reassures us about our end. Because finally we have never believed in them. Whence this historic scene of the reception of the mummy at the Orly airport. Why? Because Ramses was a great despotic and military figure? Certainly. But mostly because our culture dreams, behind this defunct power that it tries to annex, of an order that would have had nothing to do with it, and it dreams of it because it exterminated it by exhuming it as its own past.

We are fascinated by Ramses as Renaissance Christians were by the American Indians, those (human?) beings who had never known the word of Christ. Thus, at the beginning of colonization, there was a moment of stupor and bewilderment before the very possibility of escaping the universal law of the Gospel. There were two possible responses: either admit that this Law was not universal, or exterminate the Indians to efface the evidence. In general, one contented oneself with converting them, or even simply discovering them, which would suffice to slowly exterminate them.

Thus it would have been enough to exhume Ramses to ensure his extermination by museumification. Because mummies don't rot from worms: they die from being transplanted from a slow order of the symbolic, master over putrefaction and death, to an order of history, science, and museums, our order, which no longer masters anything, which only knows how to condemn

what preceded it to decay and death and subsequently to try to revive it with science. Irreparable violence toward all secrets, the violence of a civilization without secrets, hatred of a whole civilization for its own foundation.

Natives Link

Their attempt to undo the injustice we have committed against Native Americans simply whitewashes the past by cleansing our moral conscience of genocide.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81,
Simulacra and Simulations P. _____ Giglio

In the same way, Americans flatter themselves for having brought the population of Indians back to pre-Conquest levels. One effaces everything and starts over. They even flatter themselves for doing better, for exceeding the original number. This is presented as proof of the superiority of civilization; it will produce more Indians than they themselves were able to do. (With sinister derision, this overproduction is again a means of destroying them: for Indian culture, like all tribal culture, rests on the limitation of the group and the refusal of any "unlimited" increase, as can be seen in Ishi's case. In this way, their demographic "promotion" is just another step toward symbolic extermination.)

Everywhere we live in a universe strangely similar to the original—things are doubled by their own scenario. But this doubling does not signify, as it did traditionally, the imminence of their death—they are already purged of their death, and better than when they were alive; more cheerful, more authentic, in the light of their model, like the faces in funeral homes.

AT: Rorty/Krishna/Alt Destroys Politics

Their model of politics is ineffective insofar as it unifies the desire of politics subjects.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81,
Simulacra and Simulations P. _____ Giglio

[Conjunction of the system and of its extreme alternative like the two sides of a curved mirror, a "vicious" curvature of a political space that is henceforth magnetized, circularized, reversibilized from the right to the left, a torsion that is like that of the evil spirit of commutation, the whole system, the infinity of capital folded back on its own surface: transfinite? And is it not the same for desire and the libidinal space? Conjunction of desire and value, of desire and capital. Conjunction of desire and the law, the final pleasure as the metamorphosis of the law (which is why it is so widely the order of the day): only capital takes pleasure, said Lyotard, before thinking that we now take pleasure in capital. Overwhelming versatility of desire in Deleuze, an enigmatic reversal that brings desire "revolutionary in itself, and as if involuntarily wanting what it wants," to desire its own repression and to invest in paranoid and fascist systems? A malign torsion that returns this revolution of desire to the same fundamental ambiguity as the other, the historical revolution.]

All the referentials combine their discourses in a circular, Möbian compulsion. Not so long ago, sex and work were fiercely opposed terms; today both are dissolved in the same type of demand. Formerly the discourse on history derived its power from violently opposing itself to that of nature, the discourse of desire to that of power—today they exchange their signifiers and their scenarios.

Resistance Link -

Resistance to power only allows it to fake its own death, returning far more formidable.

Jean Baudrillard, Professor of Sociology @ University of Nanterre Paris, 81,
Simulacra and Simulations P. _____ Giglio

It would take too long to traverse the entire range of the operational negativity of all those scenarios of deterrence, which, like Watergate, try to regenerate a moribund principle through simu-

lated scandal, phantasm, and murder—a sort of hormonal treatment through negativity and crisis. It is always a question of proving the real through the imaginary, proving truth through scandal, proving the law through transgression, proving work through striking, proving the system through crisis, and capital through revolution, as it is elsewhere (the Tasaday) of proving ethnology through the dispossession of its object—without taking into account:

the proof of theater through antitheater;
the proof of art through antiart;
the proof of pedagogy through antipedagogy;
the proof of psychiatry through antipsychiatry, etc.

Everything is metamorphosed into its opposite to perpetuate itself in its expurgated form. All the powers, all the institutions speak of themselves through denial, in order to attempt, by simulating death, to escape their real death throes. Power can stage its own murder to rediscover a glimmer of existence and legitimacy. Such was the case with some American presidents: the Kennedys were murdered because they still had a political dimension. The others, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, only had the right to phantom attempts, to simulated murders. But this aura of an artificial menace was still necessary to conceal that they were no longer anything but the mannequins of power. Formerly, the king (also the god) had to die, therein lay his power. Today, he is miserably forced to feign death, in order to preserve the blessing of power. But it is lost.

To seek new blood in its own death, to renew the cycle through the mirror of crisis, negativity, and antipower: this is the only solution-alibi of every power, of every institution attempting to break the vicious circle of its irresponsibility and of its fundamental nonexistence, of its already seen and of its already dead.