## K

#### The 1AC is the New Tower of Babel – aiming for the unification of humanity using dominant models of thought such as communication and transparency to inform a political project that colludes with capitalism and the state. The only ethical option is to join the conspiracy of Dark Deleuze that confounds the language of the Tower and descends into the crypt. We must welcome the apocalyptic war machine.

**Culp 16** Andrew, Visiting Assistant Professor of Emerging Media and Communication at the University of Texas, Dallas Dark Deleuze, University of Minnesota Press, p.22-24, C.A.

**The most immediate instance of lightness, connectivism, is the realization of the techno-affirmationist dream of complete transparency**. The fate of such transparency is depicted in Fritz Lang’s Metropolis. **In it, the drive for complete communicability elevates transparency in the false transcendence of a New Tower of Babel**. Deep in the shadows of the Lower City labors the working class, enslaved to the machines that automation promised to eliminate. **Only in the catacombs does the secret rebellion commence**. But instead of ending in Lang’s grand Hegelian mediation, **it would be better to listen to the Whore of Babylon in Metropolis, who says, “Let’s watch the world go to hell**.” **Such an untimely descent into darkness begins with a protest: lightness has far too long been the dominant model of thought.** **The road there descends from the chapel to the crypt. Crypts are by their very nature places of seclusion. Early Christians facing public persecution fled to the underground catacombs below Rome, where they could worship in secret** (“Essay upon Crypts,” 73–77). Early basilicas contain crypts as a “second church” under their choirs, featuring a vaulted ceiling, many columns, several aisles, and an altar (Lübke, Ecclesiastical Art, 24–25). Some great churches even included a second crypt dedicated to a particular saint (26). At times, when sacred objects are of special interest, crypts of especially renowned saints have inspired mass pilgrimages (Spence-Jones, Early Christianity and Paganism, 269). Deleuze notes that these spaces fold in on themselves, simultaneously expressing the “autonomy of the inside” and the “independence of the façade” as an inside without an outside or an outside without an inside, depending on how you approach it (L, 28). Looking at El Greco’s great baroque mannerist painting The Burial of Count Orgaz, we are given the choice. Above the great horizontal line, a gathering of saints ascends to the height of Jesus, whose own ascension grants the heavens eternal lightness. Below, a communion of cloaked, pale men crowd together to lay the count to rest under a dark background illuminated only by torchlight. The painting reveals the baroque truth of knowledge: “**for ages there have been places where what is seen is inside: a cell, a sacristy, a crypt, a church, a theater, a study, or a print room”** (L, 27–28). **So beyond the association of crypts with rot and death, it is a projection of subterranean architectural power**. **From the crypt, Dark Deleuze launches a conspiracy. It is fueled by negativity**, but not one of antimonies. Following Freud, negation is not a necessary by-product of consciousness. The lesson to be drawn from him is that negation is finding a way to say “no” to those who tell us to take the world as it is. **To this end, the path forward is Deleuze’s nondialectical negation, the “contrary,” which operates as the distance between two exclusive paths** (LS, 172–80). Klossowski **identifies the goal of the conspiracy as breaking the collusion between institutionalized morality, capitalism, and the state** (“Circulus Vitiosus”). He then shows how Nietzsche’s laughter can be used as an experimental instrument to dissolve all identities into phantasms. A number of commentators have tried to rehabilitate the conspiracy on the basis of an esoteric/exoteric distinction, whereby exoteric discourses are the mere public face to a deeper paranoia whose desire is concealed in an esoteric code. To the extent that it is true, in his book Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle, Klossowski warns that the esoteric tradition must be avoided because it “demystifies only in order to mystify better” (131). The point is not to replace angelic messages with arcane ones. This raises an important question: what is an appropriately cryptic language? Deleuze and Guattari note that “the man of war brings the secret: he thinks, eats, loves, judges, arrives in secret, while the man of the state proceeds publicly” (TP, 543–44). Fortunately, **in our conspiratorial world of phantasms, one does not hold a secret but instead becomes a secret. Even if she ends up spilling everything, it turns out to be nothing**. Why? **The secret first hides within dominant forms to limit exposure, yet what it smuggles inside is not any specific thing that needs to evade discovery**. Rather, it is a perception of the secret that spreads under the shroud of se crecy: perception + secret = the secret as secretion. **Conspiracies do not remain limited to a few furtive missives; their creeping insinuations are part of a universal project to permeate all of society** (TP, 286–89). **The best conspiracy is when it has nothing left to hide. There is an affective dimension to our conspiracy. Pessimism becomes a necessity when writing in an era of generalized precarity, extreme class stratification, and summary executions of people of color**. The trouble with the metaphysics of difference is that it does not immediately suggest a positive conception of alienation, exploitation, or social death. To the extent that those who affirm difference and its intensifications do make such violence thinkable, it appears as the consequence of deprivation. As a result, they cannot explain the simultaneous connection–separation of a body alienated from their own powers. Such joyousness makes no place for Marx’s theory of exploitation in which one class systematically extracts profit by expanding the capacities of another. **The conspiracy offers a way out. On the affective level, it takes the ambivalence of hatred to grasp how one’s own capacities are the yoke of his oppression. On the level of strategy, it takes deep, labyrinthine paths to develop a cryptography**. To do so myself, I reenact Winston’s trips to the shallow alcove of his apartment in 1984 to keep our own illicit diary of slogans. **This is how I learned to find my own way to say DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER**” and “If there is hope, it lies with the proles” (181). **This is because the ultimate task of Dark Deleuze is but a modest one: to keep the dream of revolution alive in counterrevolutionary times**.

#### We no longer live in disciplinary societies which set rigid boundaries, but control societies which offer us the illusion of progress that is grounded through an enactment of power that is staged by anti-black violence. We must embrace habits of negativity which produce vacuoles of non-communication that antagonizes the foundation of control societies.

**Barber 16** Daniel Colucciello, Department Member ICI Berlin Institute for Cultural Inquiry The Creation of Non-Being, Rhizome, Issue 29, <http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html>, C.A.

[1] **Anti-blackness operates axiomatically**. This is the case, at least, insofar as we speak of what Frank B. Wilderson, III, has called "the world" (Wilderson 2003: 234).[[1]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-1) The aim of this essay is to address the consequences of this axiomatic operation for some rather classical terms of reference within continental philosophy, such as **being, analogy**,[[2]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-2) **communication, possibility, and knowledge**. Such terms are the means by which the world claims to grant itself coherence; they form the grammatical ground, the structuring condition, of the world. If the "gratuitous violence" of anti-blackness extends into the very "grammar" of the world (Wilderson 2010: 38, 131),[[3]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-3) then the aforementioned terms—**far from providing retreat** into a "metaphysical" domain unaffected by the historical and material—**serve as points for the articulation of antagonism toward anti-blackness.** In fact, the gratuity of such violence—its irreducibility to purposive meaning—entails a refusal of the coherent ground that these very terms claim to supply. This is to say that **being**—or the possibility thereof—**grounds itself** not through its own coherence, but **through an enactment of power that is staged by anti-black violence**. Power precedes grammatical ground. [2] Maurizio Lazzarato's analysis of contemporary capitalism approaches the anti-blackness analyzed by Wilderson. Lazzarato argues that **capitalism is not grounded in any coherent science of economy, but is an enactment of the power to make indebted beings**. It is by way of this emphasis on power that he links a purportedly secular capitalism to the theological structure of Christianity—that is, to a being that acts gratuitously, or without ground. Yet Lazzarato, I argue, ultimately wards off an encounter with anti-blackness through reliance on a coherence implicit in "the indebted man" (Lazzarato 2012: 8). I elaborate this argument by drawing on Gilles **Deleuze's concept of "difference in itself"** (Deleuze 1994: 36-89). This concept, on my reading, **ungrounds the purported coherence of being by way of** a logically prior differentiality, which is expressed as **non-being**. **Essential to this** argument **is** the task of **articulating such non-being without conversion to an affirmation of the world.** Non-Being: Deleuze Against Affirmation [3] **Deleuze's philosophy has come to be associated with habits of affirmation, where "habits" indicate the practices or operations by which reality is experientially and experimentally enacted**.[[4]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-4) This association could be attributed to Deleuze's invocation of concepts such as the rhizome, which appears to advocate teeming, emergent, multiplicitous movement in excess of all boundaries. In such a landscape of fluidity and flux, Deleuze's notion of creation then becomes associated with the affirmation of alternative possibilities. **This association may also be attributed to Deleuze's rigorous refusal of the being of negativity.** He contends that negative being plays no role in the determination of reality, that it is in fact an illusion that conceals the force of differential immanence. Given the centrality of this contention, any association of Deleuze's thought with habits of affirmation would have to depend on the following claim: the refusal of negative being entails the refusal of habits of negativity, in favor of habits of affirmation.[[5]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-5) [4] **Yet it is fundamentally mistaken to conflate the refusal of negative being with the refusal of negative habits**. The call for habits of affirmation is theoretically illegitimate: **if all habits are real, and if reality has no negative being, then all habits**—precisely because they are real—**do not involve negative being**; the reality that is habituated—regardless of whether this habituation is characterized as affirmative or negative—has no negative being. If the call for habits of affirmation is therefore not entailed by Deleuze's refusal of negative being, then from where does this call arise? If habits of affirmation are imperative, then from where does this imperativity draw its mandate? To begin to answer these questions, one must address the ways in which habits of affirmation are logically consistent—and ultimately politically complicit—with the contemporary conjuncture of capitalism. [5] This conjuncture, which has been variously described in terms of "**late capitalism**," "postfordism," or "communicative capitalism," **is marked by an affirmation of mobility, innovation, fluidity, possibility, and creativity**. **Deleuze analyzed this** conjuncture **in terms of control societies, which he distinguished from disciplinary societies**. **Control establishes domination** not by setting up in advance strict boundaries, but rather **by a kind of unending encouragement, or motivated permissiveness: control establishes and expands itself by establishing and expanding possibilities of communication**. Domination "no longer operate[s] by confining people but through continuous control and instant communication" (Deleuze 1997: 174). Whereas discipline names the prohibition of excessive mobility and innovation, control names the "modulation" of the possibilities implied in such mobility and innovation (Deleuze 1997: 179).[[6]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-6) [6] With control, **domination remains** not despite, nor in opposition to, but **precisely as possibility, which is modulated through a communicability that is ever more fluid and receptive in its listening in order to be ever more innovative in its surveilling**.[[7]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-7) Following Deleuze's analysis of control, habits of affirmation—of multiplicitous possibilities, or of the possibility of being-otherwise—are not resistant to, but actually constitutive of, control's modulation. **Control is marked by "endless postponement"** (Deleuze 1997: 179), meaning that **the future**—as that which breaks with the present—**never takes place**. The present is extended into the future, and so the future becomes a modulation of the present; an essential incommensurability between present and future remains unthinkable.[[8]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-8) Given Deleuze's analysis, it is not by accident that he increasingly experimented with habits of negativity. In his last book, What is Philosophy? – co-written with Félix Guattari, and published one year after his analysis of control—one can observe, for instance, his attentiveness to "shame" (Deleuze and Guattari 1996: 107), which was motivated by his reading of Primo Levi, or his indication of agreement with the negative dialectic of Theodor Adorno.[[9]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-9) [7] One finds, in the same book, a polemic against communication and a concomitant positioning of creation as distinct from and incommensurable with the communicative.[[10]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-10) Simply put, Deleuze's increased attention to control, or communication, directly corresponds to his increased attention to the negative—not as being but as experience and experiment, as habit. Thus it is not only that Deleuze's refusal of negative being cannot be conflated with habits of affirmation, it is also that **Deleuze, when attending to control, attempts to articulate habits of negativity**. What is Philosophy? concludes with an articulation of the No of chaos, the non of thought that enables creation: philosophy must attain "an essential relationship with the No that concerns it"; philosophy does "not need the No as beginning, or as the end in which [it] would be called upon to disappear by being realized, but at every moment of [its] becoming or [its] development" (Deleuze and Guattari 1996: 218). [8] The creation named by Deleuze's philosophy is thus in immanence with the No, and it is this No-creation immanence that begins to articulate antagonism toward communication: "Creating has always been something different from communicating" (Deleuze 1997: 175). This divergence between communication and the No of creation is utter, essential, and irredeemable. There is no possibility of emancipating communication, nor is there any affirmative basis for creation—for the base is communication. **There is nothing to affirm, and so creation is immanent with the negativity of the non: "The key thing may be to create vacuoles of noncommunication**" (Deleuze 1997: 175).

#### Our alternative is an apocalyptic conspiracy to end the world. This writes disaster into the liberal prophetic narrative of hope. This is a method of shattering the suffocating urgency of the affirmative in order to revive the war machines that manifests through insubordination, rioting, and guerilla warfare. This line of escape begins with making thought itself a war machine which begins to rupture the fascist ideologies that permeate spaces like debate giving way to state co-option.

**Culp 16** Andrew, Visiting Assistant Professor of Emerging Media and Communication at the University of Texas, Dallas Dark Deleuze, University of Minnesota Press, p.22-24, C.A.

**The conspiracy against this world will be known through its war machines**. A war machine is itself “a pure form of exteriority” that “explains nothing,” but there are plenty of stories to tell about them (TP, 354, 427). **They are the heroes of A Thousand Plateaus**—**Kleist’s skull-crushing war machine, the migratory war machine that the Vandals used to sack Rome, the gun that Black Panther George Jackson grabs on the run, and the queer war machine that excretes a thousand tiny sexes. “Each time there is an operation against the state—insubordination, rioting, guerilla warfare, or revolution as an act—it can be said that a war machine has revived”** (386). War machines are also the greatest villains of A Thousand Plateaus, making all other dangers “pale by comparison” (231)—**there is the constant state appropriation of the war machine that subordinates war to its own aims** (418), **the folly of the commercial war machine** (15), **the paranoia of the fascist war machine** (not the state army of totalitarianism) (230–31), **and, worst of them all, the “worldwide war machine” of capitalism, “whose organization exceeds the State apparatus and passes into energy, military–industrial, and multinational complexes” to wage peace on the whole world** (387, 419–21, 467). “**Make thought a war machine,**” Deleuze and Guattari insist. “**Place thought in an immediate relation with the outside, with the forces of the outside”** (TP, 376–77). Two important inventions follow: **speed and secrecy. These are the affects of the war machine, its weapons of war, which “transpierce the body like arrows”** (356, 394). **The resulting violence** is not so vulgar as to encourage blow-by-blow bloodletting or a once-and-for-all immediate killing but **institutes an economy of violence whose hatred is unlimited and therefore durable. The war machine engages in war along two poles: one forms a line of destruction “prolongable to the limits of the universe,” while the other draws a line of flight for the “composition of a smooth space and of the movement of people in that space”** (422). Deleuze and Guattari would prefer to promote the connectivist line by saying they “make war only on the condition that they simultaneously create something else” (423). But today, that path leads to collusion with capitalism’s drive toward creative destruction (Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism, Democracy, 87). This is certainly not lost on those in Silicon Valley who spread the mantra of “disruptive innovation.” We can thus take heed of Deleuze and Guattari’s warning against treating terms as having “an irresistible revolutionary calling” (387). **It is time to accept Nietzsche’s invitation to philosophize with a hammer, rendered here in the voice of Krishna: “I am become Time, the destroyer of worlds.” We must find an appetite for destruction that does not betray Deleuze and Guattari’s “abolitionist dream.” This takes the “progressive, anxiety-ridden revelation” that destroying worlds is just another way of “smashing capitalism, of redefining socialism, of constituting a war machine capable of countering the world war machine by other means”** (385, 417, 372). Indeed, it may be the only way to think the present in any significant sense. **To be clear: the suspension of the world is not a hunt for its conditions of reproduction or a meditative “rhapsody of sensations**” (DR, 56). **It is thought that treats the world as if struck by an unspecified disaster, where the best friends you have left are your own ideas. This is not the banal disaster movie, whose ambitions are usually limited to teaching us what are the bare essentials to survive. Writing the disaster is how we break free from the stifling perpetual present**, for the present carries **with** itself **a suffocating urgency**. The present imposes material limits. To it, the past and the future are the empty form of time, and they must endure the complications of having a body to become part of the present (LS, 146–47, 165). The past and the future exist in their own right only through representation—the former in history as the present memorialization of things passed and the latter in the yet to come as the projection of an image of the present (147). Such re-presentation is why the future appears with the distinct impression that “we have seen it all before” (Flaxman, Fabulation of Philosophy, 392). The productivist sees the event of thought as an eminently practical reorientation toward the present achieved while generating a new image of the future (WP, 58). In contrast, **those learning to hate the world must short-circuit the “here and now” to play out the scene differently. While still being in this world, they turn away from it**. This is the life of characters so agitated that they force the world to stand still—Dostoyevsky’s Idiot, the head of Kurosawa’s seven samurai (TR, 317–18). **Against bleating urgency that “there a fire, there’s fire . . . I’ve got to go,” they insist that everything could burn to the ground but nothing happens, because one must seek out a more urgent problem**!

#### Our line of escape is a matter of knowing to antagonize the inheritance of being, and to refuse the conversion of captive society. This escape from intelligibility through our creative force of pessimism provides us with the possibility to end the world. George Jackson provides us with an example of this black antagonism that cannot be satisfied via reform, but enacts non-being and unintelligibility as the destruction of the inheritance of slavery.

**Barber 16** Daniel Colucciello, Department Member ICI Berlin Institute for Cultural Inquiry The Creation of Non-Being, Rhizome, Issue 29, <http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html>, C.A.

[54] **The question of escape, or Deleuze's "line of flight," thus becomes a different matter when under the pressure of the Afro-Pessimist analysis, elaborated here in terms of inheritance**. **Captivity is not a space within the world, but the world itself; as the world is the very inheritance of being, the line of flight is less a matter of escape than a matter of knowing** – without inheritance—**to antagonize being as such. Escape, then, is not the** (ultimately inextinguishable) **appearance of a freedom of being. It is instead the (intrinsic) vertigineity of non-being**.[[34]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-34) The operations of the force immanent to this vertiginous non-being are indexed at an epistemic (rather than ontological) register: **non-being's absence**, its incommensurability with any being, **entails its essential enactment as a knowledge that is antagonistic toward conversion**. [55] **Conversion, in its specifically Christian formulation, was marked by a turn toward the salvific, transcendent being of Christ**. The term may be defined, within the logic of inheritance, as the act of turning toward any being that claims to save (and thus indebt), and that in doing so claims, more basically and by sovereign presumption, the power to damn. To be damned can be understood at the level of names, or in terms of what Louis Althusser famously conceived as "interpellation." In his account, he named interpellation—literally—in terms of conversion. Koerner cites the key passage, in which Althusser says of "the hailed individual" that "By this mere one-hundred-and-eighty degree physical conversion, he becomes a subject" (Althusser 2001: 118; Koerner 2011: 171). [56] Koerner cites this passage because it is the police who do such hailing, and whose doing so provides an Althusserian script for the occasion of Jackson's flight. Yet in contrast to Althusser's emphasis on naming as ideological, Jackson's being-named puts him under the gun, subject to a violence that exceeds any analogy between himself and that from which he runs—gratuity is, by definition, without the measure of analogy.[[35]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-35) In other words, **the conversion to which Jackson is subjected is not a scene whereby he is confronted with and constituted by an ideological name; it is a scene in which he is bound to an intensified modality of violence that is inseparable from his nameability as non-being**.[[36]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-36) [57] Jackson does not turn around or convert: he knows that he is being named, or damned—in this instance, unlike a purely "ideological" subject, it amounts to the same thing—by captive society's police; he knows that on the basis of this conversion, this "mere one-hundred-and-eighty degree" turn, he is subject to gratuitous predation. **Jackson's communicability is Jackson's capture. His antagonism has no name on which to base itself, for the only name it has is already damned**. **To not convert—to not turn around, to not have a name, to not communicate—is non-being**. Yet \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ knows this. And **this knowledge, while baseless rather than a basis, while negative rather than affirmative—an enactment of non-being rather than a conversion toward being-something—is real**. [58] Such immanence of non-being and knowledge, or "gnosis," is incommensurable with the inheritance of being.[[37]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-37) The inheritance of being is imposed, whether through Christ or the police, by external means. Yet gnosis is knowledge without inheritance, knowledge that is not acquired or possessed but rather baselessly enacted.[[38]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-38) In this sense, gnosis is not a matter of what Sharpe critically describes as a narrative "in which readable progress is proximity to whiteness, and where both come to signify as a gift, as (positive) inheritance" (Sharpe 2010: 13). Gnosis is without need of any gift of being, any grace of inheritance. [59] Jackson's knowledge enacts itself as knowledge of uninheritability.[[39]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-39) Such knowledge has nothing to do with being transcendent or prior to genealogy. **It immanently enacts non-being as negativity toward the given inheritance of slaveness. As Jackson remarks: "When I revolt slavery dies with me. I refuse to pass it down"** (Jackson 1994: 250; Koerner 2011: 157). When he "refuse[s] to pass it down," **Jackson refuses every alternative possibility, every being-something or being-otherwise, of inheritance: non-being against the being of kinship** and the kinship of being.[[40]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-40)

## O/V

The 1AC is a naīve attempt for transparency and communication – The 1AC misidentifies the way power operates – they presuppose that society is disciplinary – ie the state operates via overt regulations on bodies and thus the solution is to critique and protest those regulations in the hope of transparency and government reform – momentary acts of insurrection and resistance that end the moment the police show up

Our argument is that power operates instead via capture – the nature of power constantly seeks to capture, to render things intelligible - the state exists as a process that imposes regimes of meaning via covert and unseen modes of censorship – bodies that are encoded can no longer serve resistance functions. This means the aff will inevitably co-opted – resistance cannot come in transparent forms that critique through communication because those modes of resistance are too easily captured – for example, when people vocalize discontentment on the internet, their complaints are then used to better market things to them or when BLM protest, Pepsi makes a commercial to make them seem “revolutionary”

The alternative is an apocalyptic conspiracy to end the world – a secret and covert revolutionary strategy that is unintelligible to encodings of power – refusing to let others know what we are doing, not only keeping secrets but becoming secrets . Alt solves case – power operates by mapping onto certain bodies to regulate and control – this isn’t applicable if we are invisible to the lines of identification

Other examples: Graffiti used by corporate ads, Buzzfeed founder wrote thesis on Marxism of DnG, Pepsi commercial,

Squatters, Zapatista – resist the overcodings of the state

## Link Analysis

The 1AC uses protests and speech and communication as a tool for liberation, as though if we protest more we will be more radical and force the state to reform, that if we contest neoliberalism, Wall Street bankers will give a shit – this is what we are critiquing – the state allows us to protest to make us feel good and then uses those protest to better market themselves – the university takes pictures of student protests to put on admissions pamphlets – these protests will never work – the 2003 global protest against the Iraq war was the biggest protest in history, and it did not change the course of the war

## Explanations

### War Machine

A war machine is a social assemblage that directs their energy against the state’s processes of determination and overcoding – becoming unintelligible to the state’s regimes of meaning. For example, squatters are a war machine.

## A2 Perm

1. The whole K says that communication and transparency kill any resistance potential because the state now knows what we are doing – doing both kills any chance of solvency because you have made us intelligible
2. The alternative is mutually exclusive with the 1AC – it necessitates the nomadic category of the ‘barbarian’ – refusal of the liberal values of tolerance and free speech and democratic discourse

**Culp 16** Andrew, Visiting Assistant Professor of Emerging Media and Communication at the University of Texas, Dallas Dark Deleuze, University of Minnesota Press, p.22-24, C.A.

**The nomads that will dissolve capitalism are** not cowboys but **barbarians**. Not self-attributed but a smear, the term barbarian was invented by Hellenistic Greeks as onomatopoeia for **the blabber of those who could not speak their language** (Padgen, Fall of Natural Man, 16). Lacking the capacity for reason, barbarian is used to paint certain foreigners as utterly black and without a single virtue. Not all strangers are vilified by the citizens of empire. Rather, **barbarians have two defining characteristics: they refuse to be educated in the language of the polis and they act with a savage roughness that exceeds the boundaries of appropriateness** (Crisso and Odoteo, Barbarians, 40– 42). **The first jams the usual logocentric means of recognition that would extend them the communal rights of being a human** (Padgen, Fall of Natural Man, 16); **the second banishes them to the uncivilized realm of beasts that lacks decorum, protocol, and restraint** (17– 18). **Nomads are perfectly satisfied with such a one-sided story**. **What initially appears as an insulting depiction of their limited capacities instead is a definition of how they avoid capture**. **Barbarians can continue their siege as long as the** likes of Hegel, “an **honest subject of the Prussian state**,” **cannot apprehend “a completely autonomous, sovereign, uncompromising opposition— a multiplicity that does not allow itself to be enrolled in any synthesis**” (Crisso and Odoteo, Barbarians, 14). **The outside to the new “socially conscious” economy, barbarians avoid the liberal trap of tolerance, compassion, and respect**. The only risk is that their ferocity will abate and their passion subside.

### A2 Vote aff to endorse the neg

1. The ballot isn’t the state recognition – getting the ballot is not the same as becoming intelligible to the state
2. Obviously if the K is true then we should not do the aff because it increases intelligible and communication – you just tell the state all of our radical potential

# Frontlines

## A2 Zanotti

1. Obviously you need to beat back the K to win this argument – the entire k is about refusing the goals of transparency and understanding the communication of the state – role playing as the state prevents this

## A2 Demand on the state

1. Yes, you are a demand on the state – you are just a transparent demand that the state will use to change itself and justify itself as peaceful - letting the states know your demands

## A2 Bleiker

1. We aren’t making a general root cause claim like “anthro root cause of racism”, which this would respond to, but rather a specific analysis of the way power operates
2. This evidence is in the context of IR models, which obviously doesn’t apply to the K

## A2 Materialism

1. The K is material – it is an analysis of how power operates and then provides a solution – power is Deleuzian and microscopic, that is how it operates, it’s about the material world – obscuring this is exactly what we are critiquing

## A2 Infiltration

1. This presumes that we want to become the ones in power which isn’t true – we don’t want to change the state because the very nature of the state means resistance is impossible

## A2 Bad groups use Deleuze

1. This is exactly our argument – war machines get coopted by the state and become tools of senseless destruction instead of for the purpose of deterritorialisation. This is distinct from autonomous war-machines, which are social assemblages who direct their energy against the state. They undermine the state by breaking down concentrated power, and replacing the striated space with smooth space. For example, the European squatters' movement, the Zapatista movement, Vietnamese resistance to American occupation. Those bad groups are not the alt, which resolves this.

## A2 State Inevitable

1. The state is not just an entity but rather a process – a continuous process of overcoding, of imposing regimes of meaning, of polcing – the alternative resist this
2. Not responsive – the alt isn’t saying “let’s end this world and then create a new one without the state”, but rather a continual process of subversion from the state

## A2 Empirical open protests have worked

## A2 Pappas – Particularism

1. Particular accounts of the world are necessary to be able to resolve particular instances of violence which means the K is the perfect combination – it explains why particular acts of violence happen and thus particular solutions

## A2 Aff gives people a chance to speak out

1. Way to miss the entire point of the K – relying on governmental recognition of voices is a bad thing – speaking out against the state is a bad thing

## A2 Progress is possible/Ontological

1. Put away your afropess blocks – we are not making an ontological claim like social death but rather an analysis of the systems of power itself – this card isn’t responsive
2. Of course capitalism tells you that progress is possible

## A2 Chomsky

1. YES – radical politics gets coopted, that is our entire argument – we explain that the reason they get co-opted is because they are transparent and intelligible – the alternative is the solution to that cooption
2. The card never prescribes policy change as a solution

## A2 Fluidity is inaccessible

1. This is a joke – the K isn’t even about of identity formation, it’s about how power operates – it’s a purely descriptive claim which means saying it is inaccessible makes no sense – that’s like me saying “my friend has red hair” and you saying “red hair is inaccessible”
2. Empirically denied – the Barber 2 evidence gives the example of George Jackson as an instantiation of our alternative – it can be used by those marginalized by the capitalist war machine

# Other cards

#### Specifically, we must conceive control societies according to captivity which realizes that the State and public spaces of representation rely on anti-blackness. Thus the only option is find lines of escape beyond this world which is a revolutionary call that searches for a weapon to fight against captive society.

**Barber 16** Daniel Colucciello, Department Member ICI Berlin Institute for Cultural Inquiry The Creation of Non-Being, Rhizome, Issue 29, <http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html>, C.A.

[50] Given this adumbration of the logic of inheritance, **non-being may be recapitulated**—in a sense irreducible to Deleuze's strictly conceptual articulation, and in accordance with Afro-Pessimism's analysis of the forceful negativity of blackness—**as that which is without the kinship** of being or the being of kinship.[[30]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-30) One consequence of this approach is the reformulation of control societies in terms of George Jackson's analysis of "captive society" (Jackson 1994: 4), the elaboration of which draws upon the indications of Michelle Koerner's "Line of Escape."[[31]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-31) **Conceiving control according to captivity has the analytic advantage of foregrounding anti-blackness in a way that control does not**: a slave society is also a captive society, and so to speak of control according to captivity is to speak of the perdurance of anti-blackness in the contemporaneity of control. Whereas control may be reduced to debt, and thus to the supposed universality of the indebted man, **the insistence on captivity breaks this universality through a position bound not to debt—the we of anti-black social life—but to gratuitous violence.** [51] If contemporary social life is constituted through what Jackson calls "neo-slavery,"[[32]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-32) then **any public space for mediating conflicts, much less any state as a space for mediating the representation of (conflictual) people, is inadequate to social antagonism.** As Koerner puts it, "Jackson asserts that, despite the theatrics of representational democracy, **the function of the state in 'captive society' is not exactly a political function but a policing one. The state here emerges not as the site of political power but as a weapon"** (Koerner 2011: 167). Police violence, as the weapon constitutive of captive society, thus indicates a violence logically prior to any public. The gratuity of such violence can be analyzed only insofar as it is connected to the violence of a slavery that – contrary to the progressive aspirations of a public—has not ended. [52] To observe this point is to redouble the refusal of any secular frame that purports to be distinct from Christian theological violence.[[33]](http://www.rhizomes.net/issue29/barber.html#footnote-33) This is because the inadequacy of the public sphere or the state is fundamentally an inadequacy of the secular. After all, **both the public sphere and the state are imagined by or as the secular, which presents itself as a space of neutrality** (at least in principle) for the mediation of conflicts. The secular claims this capacity for mediation insofar as it defines itself as fundamentally distinct from religion, which in turn is defined as the cause of the violence that sabotages the neutrality of secular space. As I have argued, however, secular capitalism should be understood as undivided from Christianity. This means that the secular, while correct in its claim that religion—specified as Christian damnation—is an index of violence, uses this very claim to disavow its own perpetuation and qualitative intensification of such gratuitous violence via anti-blackness. [53] Against the world's gratuitous violence, there is no means of mediation, no space of reasons. As Koerner remarks, "**Power, in** the terms of **Jackson's analysis, is** essentially predatory. And it is for this reason that Jackson conceptualizes the forces of **resistance in** 'captive society' in **terms of escape** and, above all, running" (Koerner 2011: 168). She observes that one of **Deleuze's central concepts, the "line of flight," is essentially a gloss on Jackson's writing**. "Jackson's name – always accompanied by the refrain, 'I may run, but all the while that I am, I'll be looking for a stick'—appears" in three of Deleuze's texts, and, "In each instance, **Jackson's line announces the idea that 'escape is revolutionary'"** (Koerner 2011: 160). **Escape, however, cannot be separated from antagonism: "a line of flight composes itself as a search for a weapon**" (Koerner 2011: 161). I contend that the connection between escape and weaponization, which remains indeterminate in Deleuze, should be addressed via the distinction between control and captivity: under conditions of control, flight may remain an imaginable possibility; **under conditions of captivity, the stakes of such flight involve the end of the possibility of this world.**

#### The 1AC assumes that the more dialogue and protests we have, the more radical they become which ignores the power of disconnection and the inevitable cooption of dissent – the global protest against the Iraq war was the largest protest in history and had no effect. Universities take photos of student protests and post it on their pamphlets under the slogan of diversity.

**Culp 16** Andrew Culp, Interview with Alexander R. Galloway Alexander R. Galloway and Andrew Culp "Ending the World as We Know It: An Interview with Andrew Culp" June 29, 2016 www.boundary2.org/2016/06/ending-the-world-as-we-know-it-an-interview-with-andrew-culp/

Culp: We should first nail down what affirmation means in this context. There is the metaphysical version of affirmation, such as Foucault’s proud title as a “happy positivist.” In this declaration in Archaeology of Knowledge and “The Order of Discourse,” he is not claiming to be a logical positivist. Rather, Foucault is distinguishing his approach from Sartrean totality, transcendentalism, and genetic origins (his secondary target being the reading-between-the-lines method of Althusserian symptomatic reading). He goes on to formalize this disagreement in his famous statement on the genealogical method, “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History.” Despite being an admirer of Sartre, Deleuze shares this affirmative metaphysics with Foucault, which commentators usually describe as an alternative to the Hegelian system of identity, contradiction, determinate negation, and sublation. Nothing about this “happily positivist” system forces us to be optimists. In fact, it only raises the stakes for locating how all the non-metaphysical senses of the negative persist. **Affirmation** could be taken to **imply a** simple **“more is better” logic** as seen in Assemblage Theory and Latourian Compositionalism. **Behind this logic is a principle of accumulation that lacks a theory of exploitation and fails to consider the power of disconnection**. The Spinozist definition of joy does little to dispel this myth, but it is not like either project has revolutionary political aspirations. I think **we would be better served to follow the currents of radical political developments over the last twenty years**, **which have been following a**n increasingly **negative path**. One part of the story is **a history of failure**. **The** February 15, **2003 global demonstration against the Iraq War was the largest protest in history but had no effect on the course of the war**. More recently, the election of democratic socialist governments in Europe has done little to stave off austerity, even as economists publicly describe it as a bankrupt model destined to deepen the crisis. I actually find hope in the current circuit of struggle and think that its lack of alter-globalization world-building aspirations might be a plus. My cues come from the anarchist black bloc and those of the post-Occupy generation who would rather not pose any demands. This is why I return to the late Deleuze of the “control societies” essay and his advice to scramble the codes, to seek out spaces where nothing needs to be said, and to establish vacuoles of non-communication. Those actions feed the subterranean source of Dark Deleuze‘s darkness and the well from which comes hatred, cruelty, interruption, un-becoming, escape, cataclysm, and the destruction of worlds. Galloway: Does hatred for the world do a similar work for you that judgment or moralism does in other writers? How do we avoid the more violent and corrosive forms of hate? Culp: Writer Antonin Artaud’s attempt “to have done with the judgment of God” plays a crucial role in Dark Deleuze. Not just any specific authority but whatever gods are left. The easiest way to summarize this is “the three deaths.” Deleuze already makes note of these deaths in the preface to Difference and Repetition, but it only became clear to me after I read Gregg Flaxman’s Gilles Deleuze and the Fabulation of Philosophy. We all know of Nietzsche’s Death of God. With it, Nietzsche notes that God no longer serves as the central organizing principle for us moderns. Important to Dark Deleuze is Pierre Klossowski’s Nietzsche, who is part of a conspiracy against all of humanity. Why? Because even as God is dead, humanity has replaced him with itself. Next comes the Death of Man, which we can lay at the feet of Foucault. More than any other text, The Order of Things demonstrates how the birth of modern man was an invention doomed to fail. So if that death is already written in sand about to be washed away, then what comes next? Here I turn to the world, worlding, and world-building. It seems obvious when looking at the problems that plague our world: global climate change, integrated world capitalism, and other planet-scale catastrophes. We could try to deal with each problem one by one. But why not pose an even more radical proposition? What if we gave up on trying to save this world? We are already awash in sci-fi that tries to do this, though most of it is incredibly socially conservative. Perhaps now is the time for thinkers like us to catch up. Fragments of Deleuze already lay out the terms of the project. He ends the preface to Different and Repetition by assigning philosophy the task of writing apocalyptic science fiction. Deleuze’s book opens with lightning across the black sky and ends with the world swelling into a single ocean of excess. Dark Deleuze collects those moments and names it the Death of This World. Galloway: Speaking of climate change, I’m reminded how ecological thinkers can be very religious, if not in word then in deed. Ecologists like to critique “nature” and tout their anti-essentialist credentials, while at the same time promulgating tellurian “change” as necessary, even beneficial. Have they simply replaced one irresistible force with another? But your “hatred of the world” follows a different logic… Culp: Irresistible indeed! Yet it is very dangerous to let the earth have the final say. Not only does psychoanalysis teach us that it is necessary to buck the judgment of nature, the is/ought distinction at the philosophical core of most ethical thought refuses to let natural fact define the good. I introduce hatred to develop a critical distance from what is, and, as such, hatred is also a reclamation of the future in that it is a refusal to allow what-is to prevail over what-could-be. Such an orientation to the future is already in Deleuze and Guattari. What else is de-territorialization? I just give it a name. They have another name for what I call hatred: utopia. Speaking of utopia, Deleuze and Guattari’s definition of utopia in What is Philosophy? as simultaneously now-here and no-where is often used by commentators to justify odd compromise positions with the present state of affairs. The immediate reference is Samuel Butler’s 1872 book Erewhon, a backward spelling of nowhere, which Deleuze also references across his other work. I would imagine most people would assume it is a utopian novel in the vein of Edward Bellamy’s Looking Backward. And Erewhon does borrow from the conventions of utopian literature, but only to skewer them with satire. A closer examination reveals that the book is really a jab at religion, Victorian values, and the British colonization of New Zealand! So if there is anything that the now-here of Erewhon has to contribute to utopia, it is that the present deserves our ruthless criticism. So instead of being a simultaneous now-here and no-where, hatred follows from Deleuze and Guattari’s suggestion in A Thousand Plateaus to “overthrow ontology” (25). Therefore, utopia is only found in Erewhon by taking leave of the now-here to get to no-where. Galloway: In Dark Deleuze you talk about avoiding “the liberal trap of tolerance, compassion, and respect.” And you conclude by saying that the “greatest crime of joyousness is tolerance.” Can you explain what you mean, particularly for those who might value tolerance as a virtue? Culp: Among the many followers of Deleuze today, **there are a number of liberal Deleuzians**. Perhaps the biggest stronghold is in political science, where there is **a committed group of self-professed radical liberals**. Another strain bridges Deleuze with the liberalism of John Rawls. I was a bit shocked to discover both of these approaches, but I suppose it was **inevitable given liberalism’s ability to assimilate nearly any form of thought**. Herbert **Marcuse recognized “repressive tolerance” as the incredible power of liberalism to justify the violence of positions clothed as neutral**. The examples Marcuse cites are **governments who say they respect democratic liberties because they allow political protest although they ignore protesters by labeling them a special interest group**. For those of us who have seen **university administrations calmly collect student demands, set up dead-end committees, and slap pictures of protestors on promotional materials as a badge of diversity**, it should be no surprise that Marcuse dedicated the essay to his students. An important elaboration on repressive tolerance is Wendy **Brown’s** Regulating Aversion. She **argues that imperialist US foreign policy drapes itself in tolerance discourse**. **This helps diagnose why liberal feminist groups lined up behind the US invasion of Afghanistan** (the Taliban is patriarchal) and **explains how a mere utterance of ISIS inspires even the most progressive liberals to support outrageous war budgets.** **Because of their commitment to democracy**, **Brown and Marcuse can only qualify liberalism’s universal procedures for an ethical subject**. Each criticizes certain uses of tolerance but does not want to dispense with it completely. Deleuze’s hatred of democracy makes it much easier for me. Instead, **I embrace the perspective of a communist partisan because communists fight from a different structural position than that of the capitalist.**

#### Protesting capitalism has now become capitalist – antiproductive acts of resistance are part of the counter culture of neoliberalism

**Culp 16** Andrew, Visiting Assistant Professor of Emerging Media and Communication at the University of Texas, Dallas Dark Deleuze, University of Minnesota Press, p.22-24, C.A.

They are expressed as vulnerability in the pervasiveness of trauma, as a constant low-level distress, and through a generalization of contingency. Demonstrating the significance of this shift: “go play outside” is a breath of fresh air to the bored but fails to make the depressive budge. Neoliberalism turns the depressive into the paranoiac through a program of exposure, which unfolds the subject to reveal new surfaces to penetrate. Despite this, the negative project of the process of schizophrenia (“collapsing a filthy drainage pipe”) is as necessary as ever (AO, 341). But just as Lenin declared the revolutionary affirmation “All the power to the Soviets!” counterrevolutionary after a certain time, it is time to retire the slogan “Liberate the flows!” **Militant discussions of infrastructure, blockage, and interruption are refreshing—since the first “free” laborers threw a shoe in the machine, sabotage has been an important tactic of resistance. But with the elliptical dynamics of capitalism, which poses its own limits only to overcome them for a profit, interruptions cannot be an end unto themselves** (230–31). Every economic system is “a system of interruptions” that works by breaking down (36–37, 151, 192). One needs to look behind the old social democratic criticism of productivism, “even pollution, cigarettes, prisons, logging, napalm, and nuclear warheads are counted in the Gross Domestic Production,” to see why (Kennedy, Remarks at the University of Kansas). **Antiproduction, which prevents specific realizations of value in a systematic way, is “at the heart of production itself, and conditioning this production**” (235). Potlatch and **ritualized warfare are indigenous means of antiproduction that prevent the hoarding that could lead to despotism** (Maus, The Gift; Clastres, Society against the State). Aristocratic glorious expenditure made sure that everything was owed to the king (Bataille, “Notion of Expenditure”). **Marx reminds us that capitalists dip into their own capital stock at the expense of expanded reproduction**, but **wasting money on the “political–military–industrial complex” guarantees the smooth advance of the system** as a whole (235). What interruption is revolutionary? The mold was set by Marx, who proposed “expropriating the expropriators” (Capital, chapter 32). “**Direct action at the point of production” would intervene in the apparatus of capture where the earth, activity, and objects are first coded by the state as territory, work, and money or decoded by capitalism as flows of land, labor, and capital** (TP, 437–60). But if “societies are determined by their mode of anti-production (and not a mode of production),” then **action should be taken at the points of capitalist antiproduction** (D, 135). Extending this line of argumentation, the **avant-garde taunts the world with a claim: “capitalism defeated traditional societies because it was more exciting than they were, but now there is something more exciting than capitalism, itself: its destruction”** (Bernadette Corporation, Get Rid of Yourself). Though this position is condemned by Leninists as infantile leftism, it is the realization of Deleuze and Guattari’s critique of therapy culture—clinicians say that one matures out of the depressive position by learning an ambivalent balance of love and hate, which helps delaygratification (Joseph, “Projective Identification,” 99). But is that not the alienation of the worker from the fruits of his labor, Deleuze and Guattari protest, the fundamental separation of a desiring subject from her means of satisfaction (AO, 70–75)? Think of an old German rock song, “Macht Kaputt, Was Euch Kaputt Macht” by Ton Steine Scherben, an anarchocommunist band connected to the squatter scene and the Red Army Faction (before it went underground). As cheap as it sounds, perhaps the cure for depressive disinterest is **the thrill of “destroying what destroys you.”**

#### There are two modes of resistance – “temporary autonomous zones” and “zones of offensive opacity” – the former is the 1AC – momentary acts of public insurrection and protest until the police come to shut it down. We affirm the latter, a constant refusal of the war machines of the world itself.

**Culp 16** Andrew, Visiting Assistant Professor of Emerging Media and Communication at the University of Texas, Dallas Dark Deleuze, University of Minnesota Press, p.22-24, C.A.

“A truly dark path undoes everything that makes up this world. Deleuze and Guattari’s proposal to “accelerate the process” follows from R. D. Laing’s clinical prescription for more madness in our “veritable age of Darkness” (AO, 131). He supports the mad in turning “the destruction wrecked on them” into a force of dissolution against the “alienated starting point” of normality. This is **a method made for breaking with the inside, which “turns in on itself” when “pierced by a hole**, a lake, **a** flame, a tornado, **an explosion,” so that the outside comes flooding in** (132). Such a break can go one of two ways: **it can be a breakdown or a breakthrough** (239, 132). **The best “breakthrough” is “making a break for it.”** Deleuze is fond of repeating **Black Panther George Jackson**, who **writes from prison that “yes, I can very well escape, but during my escape, I’m looking for a weapon”** (DI, 277). **The phrase applies to far more than Jackson’s literal imprisonment in San Quentin—what he really wanted was liberation from the American capitalist system of racial oppression, which is truly what killed him during his final escape attempt (eleven years into his one-year-to-life indefinite sentence for robbing a gas station for $70).** **The necessity of weapons should be clear. Even the most terrifying nomadic war machine is overshadowed by the state, which calls its operations “keeping the peace”** (as documented by Foucault in his “Society Must Be Defended” lectures and beyond). Such violence has renewed meaning in 2015 as I write in the wake of a white supremacist massacre and as an outcry about racist police violence has finally started to generalize. **Jackson stands as a reminder that a revolutionary line of flight must remain active; revolution is not a system-effect, though capitalism** as a “system leaking all over the place” **establishes the terrain for “revolutionary escape”** (such as a propaganda system that can be infiltrated to attract outside conspirators or a legal system that provides lawyers who can smuggle subversive objects into controlled spaces) (DI, 270). The brilliant guerilla Che wrote the steps for one such dance, the minuet: **the guerrillas begin by encircling an advancing column and splitting into** a number of **“points,” each with enough distance to avoid** themselves **being encircled; a couple pairs off and begins their dance as one of the guerrilla points attacks and draws out the enemy, after which they fall back and a different point attacks—the goal is not annihilation but to immobilize to the point of fatigue** (Guevara, Guerilla Warfare, 58–59). **Escapism is the great betrayer of escape. The former is simply “withdrawing from the social,” whereas the latter learns to “eat away at [the social] and penetrate it,” everywhere setting up “charges that will explode what will explore, make fall what must fall, make escape what must escape” as a “revolutionary force”** (AO, 341). **The same distinction also holds between two models of autonomy: temporary autonomous zones and zones of offensive opacity**. **Temporary autonomous zones are momentary bursts of carnivalesque energy** **that** proponent Hakim Bey says “**vanish, leaving behind it an empty husk**” **when the forces of definition arrive** (Temporary Autonomous Zone, 100). Deleuze and Guattari suggest, contrary to orthodox Marxists, that **societies are defined by how they manage their paths of escape** (rather than their modes of production) (TP, 435). As such, “**psychotopological” distance established by temporary autonomous zones does not create a significant enough rupture to open into anything else and thus collapses escape into escape-ism**. Tiqqun’s **zones of offensive** **opacity** are an improvement, as they **oppose a wider web of cybernetic governance without packing maximum intensity into a single moment** (Anonymous, “De l’Hypothèse Cybernétique,” 334–38). **Opacity is its first principle,** something they learn **from the long tradition of** autonomists and **anarchists whose** most **militant factions would refuse all engagement with** parliamentary **politics, labor and unions, and news media**. **Offensive orientation is its second principle, though tempered by the famous line** from The Internationale, “la crosse en l’air,” **with the butts of our guns held high in the air: knowing we can take the fight to the trenches**, or even take power, **but refuse it anyway**. Tiqqun is well aware of **the difficult history behind the state assassinations of the Black Panther Party and the Red Army Faction, so they know to resist militarization lest they become an army or be liquidated. The advantage of this “strategic withdrawal” is autonomy**, especially as communism becomes its qualitative guide. **Posing communism as oppositional self-determination, it takes the whole social apparatus of capture as its contrary—against any temptation to engage the social, for whatever resources offered, arises a demand to be met by a parallel space of communism**. Flows: Interruption, Not Production The schizo is dead! Long live the schizo! **Schizo culture appealed to a society seized by postwar consumer boredom. “Can’t we produce something other than toasters and cars? How about free speech**, free school, free love, free verse!” It is no exaggeration to say that the events of May 19were sparked by a Situationist intolerance for boredom (“boredom is always counter-revolutionary,” says Guy Debord; “Bad Old Days Will End,” 36). In the time since the 1972 publication of Anti-Oedipus, capitalism has embraced its schizophrenia through neoliberalism. The schizo has become the paraphilic obsession of Nietzsche’s last man. Its flood of more and more objects has subjects able to muster less and less desire, as seen in the Japanese Lost Decade of stagflation, when a torrent of perversions coincided with a suicide epidemic. The dominant feelings today are probably anxiety or depression (Plan C, “We Are All Very Anxious”).

**Culp 16** Andrew, Visiting Assistant Professor of Emerging Media and Communication at the University of Texas, Dallas Dark Deleuze, University of Minnesota Press, p.22-24, C.A.

“**The end of this world is the third in a succession of deaths—the Death of God, the Death of Man, and now the Death of this World**. **This is not a call to physically destroy the world**. **The Death of God did not call for the assault of priests or the burning of churches**, **and the Death of Man did not propose** genocide or **the extinction of our species**. **Each death denounces a concept as insufficient, critiques those who still believe in it, and demands its removal as an object of thought**. **In the Death of Man, we learned that the human sciences were impotent in the face of the systemic injustices of this world.** Rather, **Foucault shows how expert inquiry makes exploitation, sexism, racism, poverty, violence, and war into the constitutive elements of how humanity defends itself**. He shows that **attempts to save this humanity created a biopower that “makes live and lets die,”** **which paradoxically administers life through “a power to expose a whole population to death” that tends toward wars of all-out destruction** (Foucault, History of Sexuality, 135–37). Elaborating on this condition, subsequent theorists say that **we have already been killed but have yet died, making us an “already dead” that makes us already ready to adopt a revolutionary orientation that sacrifices our current time and space for a new, not-yet-realized future** (Cazdyn, Already Dead, 9). Seen from this perspective, **runaway climate change, the Sixth Extinction, and many other impending catastrophes are all essential parts of this world**. **The Death of this World admits the insufficiency of previous attempts to save it and instead poses a revolutionary gamble: only by destroying this world will we release ourselves of its problems**. **This does not mean moving to the moon, but that we give up on all the reasons given for saving the world**. In my own announcement of the death of this world, **I propose critiques of connectivity and positivity**, a theory of contraries, **the exercise of intolerance**, **and the conspiracy of communism**. Contemporary Deleuze scholarship tends to be connectivist and productivist. **Connectivism is the world-building integration into an expanding web of things**. **As an organizational logic, it is the promiscuous inclusion of seemingly unrelated elements into a single body to expand its capacities.** Academics are not alone in endorsing connectivism—I argue that **connectivism drives Google’s geopolitical strategy of global influence, which proceeds through a techno-affirmationist desire to annex everything**. **Commentators use different names for their webs of connections, such as rhizomes, assemblages, networks, material systems, or dispositifs. I simply call them “this world” and plot for its destruction.**

**Culp 16** Andrew, Visiting Assistant Professor of Emerging Media and Communication at the University of Texas, Dallas Dark Deleuze, University of Minnesota Press, p.22-24, C.A.

**Productivism links up with the autonomous, ceaseless autoproduction of the real**. The most naive productivists sentimentally cherish creation and novelty for their own sake, whether as dewy-eyed admiration for the complexity of nature or a staunch Voltairine defense of all types of diversity. **The productivists worthy of criticism are those who, in the name of “finding something about this world to believe in,” affirm what is given as if this wretched world already included all materials for a better one.** I find that **in relinquishing the power of destruction, they can only capitalize on production through the logics of accumulation and reproduction**. So **in founding a new world on the terms of the old, its horizon expands barely beyond what already exists. The alternative I propose is finding reasons to destroy this world**. **The greatest crime of joyousness is tolerance**. While mentioning tolerance may have marked one as a radical in Deleuze’s time, Wendy Brown argues in Regulating Aversion that **liberal tolerance is now essential to the grammar of empire’s “domestic discourse of ethnic, racial, and sexual regulation, on the one hand, and as an international discourse of Western supremacy and imperialism on the other**” (1, 7). Today’s **tolerant are to blame for a “liberal Deleuze,”** such as William Connolly, who names Deleuze as **an antirevolutionary** who inspires his belief that “transformation is neither needed nor in the cards today; what is needed is creative modes of intervention posed at several strategic sites in the service of reducing economic inequality, foster intra- and inter-state pluralism, and promoting ecological sanity” in his book on pluralism (Pluralism, 159). Deleuze criticized a similar position many decades ago when denouncing the media-hungry form of the Nouveaux Philosophes, who had “inscribed themselves perfectly well on the electoral grid . . . from which everything fades away” (“On the New Philosophers,” 40–41). **Liberal Deleuzians can be criticized accordingly—for endorsing the usual abstractions of the Law and the State that hide the workings of power; for denouncing Marxism “not so much because real struggles would have made new enemies, new problems and new means arise, but because THE revolution must be declared impossible”; and for reviving the subject as part of a general martyrology**. **What stands between liberalism and revolution is intolerance, but in a peculiar way**. **Intolerance arises out of this world as “something intolerable in the world” to prove that there is “something unthinkable in thought”** (C2, 169). Which is to say, **it is when we find it all unbearable that we realize “it can no longer think a world or think itself”** (170). This is where the Dark Deleuze parts ways with the joyful by inviting the death of this world. There are many fellow travelers of **revolutionary intolerance**, including Wendy Brown and Herbert Marcuse. Newton argues in his autobiography Revolutionary Suicide that the revolutionary task is to risk one’s life for the chance of “changing intolerable conditions” (5). In his essay **on** “**repressive tolerance**,” **Marcuse** **extends tolerance only to the left, subversion, and revolutionary violence and proposes a militant intolerance of the right**, this world, and “benevolent neutrality.” Together, **they express the dark truth of the intolerable as the lived present of being trapped by something so unbearable, so impossible, that it must be destroyed**. To be completely clear: **the point is not to grow obstinate but to find new ways to end our suffocating perpetual present. Darkness advances the secret as an alternative to the liberal obsession with transparency**. **Foucault smartly identifies transparency’s role in the “science of the police,” which is used in the task of maintaining order through the collusion between the state and capital from liberalism’s beginnings in the German notion of the police state through to contemporary biopolitics** (Security, Territory, Population). The conspiracy is against the consistency of everything being in its proper place, and the secret is the fact that nothing is as it seems. Such a conspiracy is not the pursuit of the ineffable or sublime, as it is neither esoteric nor mystical. **It circulates as an open secret that retains its secrecy only by operating against connectivism through the principle of selective engagement**. The lesson to be taken is that “we all must live double lives”: one full of the compromises we make with the present, and the other in which we plot to undo them. **The struggles to keep one’s cover identity from taking over**. There are those whose daily drudgery makes it difficult to contribute to the conspiracy, though people in this position are far more likely to have secret dealings on the side. **Others are given ample opportunities but still fail to grow the secret, the most extreme example being those who live their lives “with nothing to hide,” often declaring that they are “an open book.”** Some treat the conspiracy as a form of hobbyism, working to end the world only after everything else has been taken care of—the worst being liberal communists, who exploit so much in the morning that they can give half of it back as charity in the afternoon. And then there are those who escape. Crafting new weapons while withdrawing from the demands of the social, they know that cataclysm knows nothing of the productivist logic of accumulation or reproduction. **Escape need not be dreary, even if they are negative. Escape is never more exciting than when it spills out into the streets, where trust in appearances, trust in words, trust in each other, and trust in this world all disintegrate in a mobile zone of indiscernibility** (Fontaine, “Black Bloc”). It is in these moments of opacity, insufficiency, and breakdown that darkness most threatens the ties that bind us to this world.”

Alexander R. Galloway and Andrew Culp "Ending the World as We Know It: An Interview with Andrew Culp" June 29, 2016 www.boundary2.org/2016/06/ending-the-world-as-we-know-it-an-interview-with-andrew-culp/

**Affirmation could be taken to imply a simple “more is better” logic** as seen in Assemblage Theory and Latourian Compositionalism. Behind this logic is **a principle of accumulation that lacks a theory of exploitation and fails to consider the power of disconnection**. The Spinozist definition of joy does little to dispel this myth, but it is not like either project has revolutionary political aspirations. I think we would be better served to **follow the currents of radical political developments over the last twenty years, which have been following** **a**n increasingly **negative path**. One part of the story is **a history of failure**. **The** February 15, **2003 global demonstration against the Iraq War was the largest protest in history but had no effect on the course of the war**. More recently, **the election of democratic socialist governments in Europe has done little to stave off austerity**, even as economists publicly describe it as a bankrupt model destined to deepen the crisis. I actually find hope in the current circuit of struggle and think that its lack of alter-globalization world-building aspirations might be a plus. My cues come from the anarchist black bloc and those of the post-Occupy generation who would rather not pose any demands. This is why I return to the late Deleuze of the “control societies” essay and his advice to scramble the codes, to seek out spaces where nothing needs to be said, and to establish vacuoles of non-communication. Those actions feed the subterranean source of Dark Deleuze‘s darkness and the well from which comes hatred, cruelty, interruption, un-becoming, escape, cataclysm, and the destruction of worlds.