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**We have reached the end of art and history – the patriarchal capitalist regime no longer relies on capital as production of material or extraction of labor but rather affective fuel – the 1ac is not in *opposition* to colonial control but is the *new normal***

James 14 (Robin James, Associate Professor of Philosophy at UNC Charlotte, Incandescence, Melancholy, and Feminist Bad Vibes: A Response to Ziarek’s Feminist Aesthetics and the Politics of Modernism, differences:A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, Vol. 25, No.. 2, p. 120-123, Duke University Press)

To use Jack Halberstam’s term, we like our women to “go gaga” because this incandescence, this “unpredictable feminine” (114) methodology allows us to eke even more light out of otherwise exhausted enlightenment modernity. If we’ve reached, as Ziarek discusses, the so-called end of art and the end of history (and the end of tonality and the end of representation and, well, the end of modernity), then the only way to find more resources is, like Pixar’s wall-e, by sifting through our vast piles of waste. And in that waste heap is abject femininity (what musicologist Susan Cook calls the feminized “abject popular”). Femininity is abject because its exclusion from patriarchy is what constitutes patriarchy as a coherent system. In both Ziarek’s aesthetics of potentiality and in resilience discourse, women artists do the cultural work of remaking abjection or constitutive exclusion into ecstatic radiance.13 In the former case, that work is revolutionary; in the latter case, that work normalizes. Resilience discourse transposes feminist revolution into a nationalist, patriarchal, white supremacist practice. Take, for example, Katy Perry’s “Firework,” in which the lyrics trace the affective journey from dejection to radiant exceptionality. The song begins by asking listeners to identify with feelings of irrelevance, weakness, loneliness, and hopelessness; it posits and affirms damage, suffering, and pain. But then Perry’s narrator argues that in spite and perhaps because of this damage, the listener has precisely the means to connect to others, to make a difference, to have hope: “[T]here’s a spark in you / You just gotta ignite the light and let it shine.” She uses the metaphor of fireworks (and their association with u.s. Independence Day celebrations) to describe the listener’s self-transformation from black dust to shining light: you may feel like trash, but if you can just light yourself on fire, that trash will burn with a dazzling radiance that lights up the sky, just as it lights up audiences’ faces. Here, Perry transforms abjection—feeling like trash, unmoored, socially dead—into incandescent triumph. In the song, the addressee’s personal triumph evokes u.s. nationalist narratives of overcoming colonization (i.e., the Declaration of Independence, celebrated on the Fourth of July). Feminine incandescence—the transformation of waste and melancholy into glowing potential—is no longer revolutionary. Not only parallel to u.s. nationalism, it is the very means for reproducing normativity. In resilience discourse, wild and crazy femmes—like, say, Ke$ha— reproduce normativity in the same way that deregulatory economic practices do (see Cardenas). Unlike Kant’s genius, who gives laws and generates order (i.e., regulation, giving a law) out of unruly materiality, the incandescent, “gaga” femme amplifies what feels like disorder by “resignif[ying] damaged bodies and objects previously expelled from the realm of meaning” (6). And to do this, incandescent femme geniuses use a specific type of experimentation, what Ziarek calls “a dynamic model of interrelation between literary form and material elements of the work of art” (6). This “dynamic interaction” between large-scale form and material details produces “effects” that are “unpredictable and unforeseeable” (Adorno qtd. in Ziarek 114). Experimental methods produce aleatory results.14 Neoliberalism, however, has systematized the aleatory; deregulatory practices are designed to control background conditions so that “dynamic interactions” between form and material produce a range of superficially random outcomes.15 Deregulation turns experimentation into the means of capitalist/hegemonic production. Brilliant gaga ecstasy is what fuels economic and social reproduction.16 So even though incandescent potentiality might be “the very opposite of the traffic in women” (Ziarek 119) figured as the exchange of commodities (e.g., in Irigaray and Rubin), it is quite consistent with neoliberal political and aesthetic economies. Who radiates with potentiality more than the resilient, entrepreneurial postfeminist woman? In the same way that feminized, blackened receptivity was the solution to modernist anxieties about alienation (e.g., the aforementioned Gooding-Williams), feminized, racially nonwhite resilience is taken as a solution to the problem of the “end of art.” Having transgressed all limits and prohibitions—for example, emancipating dissonance, making music out of noise—modernist art had no means of establishing its opposition to society/social normativity. Similarly, capitalism had colonized the globe, exhausting its ability to profit through simple expansion; with no new markets, with nothing else new to conquer, it needed a new method for generating surplus value. As Jeffery Nealon and others argue, capitalism has become a logic of investment and intensity. Instead of expanding and assimilating, it recycles waste and increases efficiencies. Thus, traditionally non- or devalued “women’s work” becomes the fastest growing sector of the service-and-care-work economy. And women’s art-making practices become the hottest new thing in the artworld: think of all the “feminist art” retrospectives and exhibits that have taken place in the past five or so years. Modernism’s constitutive outside becomes neoliberalism’s bread and butter; or, the abject is now central to the means of capital, political, and aesthetic production.17

#### The aff’s demands buy into the logic of the speed-elite – the push to make debate a site of activism and circulate knowledge about algorithmic capitalism mystifies their reliance on unethical modes of technology and communication that results in a cooption of their advocacy, redirecting it towards ends that are fundamentally military

**Hoofd 10** (Ingrid M. Hoofd, Assistant Professor in the Communications and New Media Programme at the National University of Singapore, Feb 2010, “The accelerated university: Activist-academic alliances and simulation of thought,” ephemera, http://www.ephemerajournal.org/contribution/accelerated-university-activist-academic-alliances-and-simulation-thought)

Although Facoltà di Fuga and Ricercatori Precari do not ally themselves explicitly with the alter-globalist movement, their call against neo-liberalism and for online thinking and research in service of the struggles of ‘the oppressed and marginalised’ makes them quite suitable for creating such alliances. This call for ‘knowledge in service of the oppressed’ is more explicitly present in Investigacció (Research), which was set up in order to combine the agendas of social movement activists with those of university researchers. In their flyer for their first international meeting on ‘Social Movements and Activist Research’ in 2004 in Spain, Investigacció likewise aptly accuses the neo-liberal privatisation of knowledge as the main cause for current social exclusion. Knowledge, in their view, instead should be produced from the ‘focal point of activist research’ which should entail the ‘actual subjectivities of research from and for social movements’, instead of from those who reside within the privileged space of academia (Investigacció, 2005: 1). The meeting is hopefully envisioned to be a ‘space of encounter and self-formation’ which ‘self-constitute[s] as a-disciplinary so that we can overcome the fictitious distinctions common to academicism’ (2005: 2). Knowledge will thus, according to Investigacció, be generated ‘from our own subjectivities (in contrast to aiming for scientific ‘objectivity’) without limitations or hierarchies’ (2005: 3). But far from an ‘a-disciplinary self-constitution’ that supposedly overcomes any fictitious distinction, Investigacció for one relies heavily on the common fictitious distinction between activism and academia to validate their praxis. By contrasting their initiative to the false objectivity of academicism, they **validate their own knowledge production** by **claiming to be in the margins** as opposed to **the ‘ivory tower’**, as if the latter is a stable area from which one can detach oneself from the outside world and hence **objectively analyse**. Also, **one could wonder to what extent one is actually speaking from the margins when one has the time, technologies, spaces and connections to organise an event** like Investigacció. The desire to generate knowledge from **‘one’s own subjectivity, without limitations’** (2005: 3**) is analogous to the mythical humanist narrative of breaking with and improving upon previous knowledge – a form of knowledge-innovation that the academic institution is also infused with.** The university of excellence as well as its doublings into projects like Investigacció are therefore an effect of its repetitions (with a difference) into the neo-liberal mythical space of progress and acceleration. The creation of more and more ‘spaces and mechanisms of production, exchange and collective reflection’ (2005: 3) is indeed precisely what late-capitalism seeks to forge, as long as such reflection generates an intensification of production. **The idea that subjectivities from social movements are in any way less produced by neo-liberal globalisation is highly problematic**. In fact, such an idea suggests a **rather positivist notion of the subject** – similar to that supposedly objective academic individual Investigacció seeks to dethrone. Investigacció then somewhat nostalgically narrates a subject untainted by power structures and technologies. In fact, the Investigaccióinitiative displays how the subject of activist research empowers her- or himself throughrecreating the fictitious distinction between activism and academia. S/he does so by reproducing this opposition, which in turn co-creates and accelerates these ‘new spaces’ – spaces that were created with the goal of facilitating global capitalism and its speed-elite, and that allow for the perfection of military power through technologies of surveillance. The call for participants to become active and productive in co-organising the international event – of course, without any monetary remuneration – is also much present in Investigacció’s rhetoric. They suggest that participants should engage with one another not only at the meeting, but especially through the online spaces Investigacció has created for the purpose of generating **activist research**. ‘**Take action!’ says their flyer**, ‘[...] **make it so the conference is yours**!’ This seductive appeal to the subject-individual as the centre of creative production is very common to neo-liberal consumerism and its emphasis on cybernetic interactivity. But it is also false in that it gives the participants a sense of control over Investigacció that they actually do not have – eventually, the main organisers (have already) set the agenda and handed out the stakes. In short, the organisers fail to situate themselves by pretending everyone is on the same level of privilege – for example, not requiring monetary compensation – in this project, and this failure is strangely an effect of their attempt at reviving a more democratic academic structure. Information Initially, one could think that Baudrillard’s assessment **confirms my analytical suspicion regarding activist-research projects**. In ‘The Implosion’, Baudrillard starts from the premise that the **increase of information** in our media-saturated society **results in a loss of meaning** because it ‘**exhausts itself** in the act of **staging communication’**. New media technologies **exacerbate the subject’s fantasy of transparent communication**, while increasingly what are communicated are mere copies of the same, a ‘recycling in the negative of the traditional institution’ (Baudrillard, 1994: 80). New technologies are simply the **materialisation of that fantasy of communication**, and the ‘**lure’** (1994: 81) of such a **technocratic system** resides in the requirement of **active political engagement to uphold that fantasy**. **This translates in a call to subjectivise oneself** – **to be vocal, participate, and to ‘play the [...] liberating claim of subjecthood’** (1994: 85). The result of the intensifying circular logic of this system, he says, is that meaning not only implodes in the media, but also that **the social implodes in the masses** – the construction of a ‘hyperreal’ (1994: 81). Contra the claim of Glocal Research Space that such praxes of alliance are ‘without an object’ (Glocal Research Space, 2003: 19), this does not mean that objectification does not take place at all. Instead, and in line with Baudrillard’s argument, the urge to subjectivise oneself and the objectification of the individual go hand in hand under speed-elitism – a double bind that locks the individual firmly into her or his technocratic conditions. Indeed, the argument in ‘Activist Research’ that ‘research [should be] like an effective procedure [which is] in itself already a result’ (2003: 19) describes the conditions of Readings’ ‘university of excellence’ where any research activity, thanks to technological instantaneity, translates immediately into the capitalist result of increased information flow (Readings, 1996: 22). **Active subjects and their others become the cybernetic objects of such a system of information flow**. The insistence in ‘Activist Research’ on free, travelling and nomadic research simply makes sure that this logic of increased flow is repeated. Because of this desire for increased flow and connection, **activist-research projects are paradoxically highly exclusivist in advocating the discourses and tools of the speed-elite**. The problem with projects like Edu-Factory or the **productive cross-over of activism and academia** is therefore not only that **their political counter-information means just more information** (**and loss of meaning**) **as well as more capitalist production**, but that **it puts its faith in precisely those technologies and fantasies of control, communication and of ‘being political’ that underlie the current logic of overproduction.** It is at this point that John Armitage and Joanne Roberts in ‘Chronotopia’ contend that such a **‘cyclical repetition’** (Armitage and Roberts, 2002: 52) is **particularly dangerous** because the fantasy of control remains exactly that, a **fantasy**. At the same time, this increasingly forceful repetition **can only eventually give way to ‘the accident’ because chronotopian speed-spaces are fundamentally and exponentially unstable**. Armitage and Roberts’ idea of ‘cyclical repetition’ through chronotopianism does thus not mean an exact repetition of the speed-elite’s quest for mastery – instead, I would argue that it is this **immanent quality of difference in repetition**, of the ‘**essential drifting due to [a technology’s] iterative structure** cut off from […] consciousness as the authority of the last analysis’ as Derrida calls it in ‘Signature Event Context’ (Derrida, 1982: 316) **that allows for the accident or true event to appear**. The difference through technologically sped-up repetition appears then perhaps as a potential, but only precisely as a growing potential that cannot be willed – in this sense, it will be an unanticipated event indeed. One could then speak of an intensification of politics in what is perhaps too hastily called the neo-liberal university, opening up unexpected spaces for critique in the face of its neo-liberalisation, which in turn points to **the fundamental instability of its enterprise**. Activist-research projects add to this intensification by virtue of their **techno-acceleration**. This intensification of politics is **no ground for univocal celebration**, since it remains also the hallmark of the neo-liberal mode of production of knowledge through the new tele-technologies as excellent, regardless of its critical content. The current university’s instability mirrors and aggravates the volatility of a capitalism marked by non-sustainability, a growing feminisation of poverty, the rise of a new global upper class, and **highly mediated illusions of cybernetic mastery**. **This nonetheless also opens up new forms of thought, if only appearing as ‘accidents’**. Derrida hints at this, but also at the university’s elusiveness, in ‘Mochlos, or: the Conflict of the Faculties’, when he claims that he ‘would almost call [the university] the child of an inseparable couple, metaphysics and technology’ (Derrida, 1993: 5, emphasis mine). Almost, but never quite – **here then emerges the possibility of truly subversive change**. But **this change will not be brought about by the mere content of the critique, but by the way it pushes acceleration to the point of systemic disintegration or implosion**. In Fatal Strategies, **Baudrillard calls this the ‘fatal strategy’ that contemporary theory must adopt: a sort of conceptual suicide attack which aims at pulling the rug out from under the speed-elitist mobilisation of semiotic oppositions, and which shows the paradox behind any attempt at structural predictions.** In ‘The Final Solution’, Baudrillard relates this intensification of the humanist obsession with dialectics, mastery, and transparency – the quest for immortality that is at the basis of techno-scientific research – to **destruction and the death drive** through the metaphor of and actual research around cloning, which strangely resonates well with Derrida’s investigation of the tele-technological archive in Archive Fever. **I read Baudrillard’s ‘Final Solution’ here as a metaphor for the duplication (cloning) of thought into virtual spaces outside the university walls proper**. If contemporary research seeks to make human cloning possible, argues Baudrillard, then **this endeavour is equivalent to cancer**: after all, cancer is simply automatic cloning, a deadly form of multiplication. It is of interest here to note that the possibility of creating an army of clones has likewise **garnered much military interest**, just **as academia today more and more serves military ends**. As the logic of cloning as automatic multiplication is typical of all current technological and humanist advancements, **the exacerbation of this logic can only mean more promise and death**. At this point my argument mirrors **the apocalyptic tone of the activist-research projects**. In the final analysis, the problem with Edu-Factory, Facoltà di Fuga, Investigacció, Universidad Nómada, Ricercatori Precari, and Glocal Research Space is that these projects entail a very specific form of subjugation with dire consequences for the slower and less techno-genic classes. Techno-scientific progress entails a regress into immortality, epitomised by a nostalgia typical of the current socio-technical situation, for when we were ‘undivided’ (Baudrillard, 2000: 6). I contend that Baudrillard refers not only to the lifeless stage before humans became sexed life forms, but also makes an allusion to psycho-analytic readings of the ‘subject divided in language’ and its nostalgia for wholeness and transparent communication. **The desire for immortality, like archive fever, is therefore the same as the Freudian death drive, and we ourselves ultimately become the object of our technologies of scrutiny and nostalgia**. **The humanist quest of totally transparency of oneself and of the world to oneself that grounds the idea of the modern techno-scientific university, is ultimately an attempt at (self-)destruction, or in any case an attempted destruction of (one’s) radical difference [alterity]. The urgent political question**, which Stiegler problematically avoided in Disorientation, then becomes: which selves are and will become caught up in the delusion of total self-transparency and self-justification, and which selves will be destroyed? And how may we conceive of **an ‘ethic of intellectual inquiry or aesthetic contemplation’** that **‘resists the imperatives of speed’**, as Jon Cook likewise wonders in ‘The Techno-University and the Future of Knowledge’ (Cook, 1999: 323)? It is of particular importance to note here that **the very inception of this question and its possible analysis, like the conception of the speed-elite, is itself again a performative repetition of the grounding myth of the university of independent truth, justice and reason**. Therefore, in carrying forward the humanist promise, this analysis is itself bound up in the intensification of the logic of acceleration and destruction, and that is then also equally tenuous. This complicity of thought in the violence of acceleration itself in turn quickens the machine of the humanist promise, and can only manifest itself in the prediction of a coming apocalypse – whether it concerns a narrative of the death of thought and the university, or of a technological acceleration engendering the Freudian death drive. **We are then simply the next target in the technological realisation of complete** γνωθι σαυτον (**know thyself) – or so it seems. Because after all, a clone is never an exact copy, as Baudrillard very well knows; and therefore, the extent to which activist-research projects hopefully invite alterity can thankfully not yet be thought.**

**Speed-elitism has outpaced Eurocentrism as the primary nexus of power – their reliance on affective tropes of redemption and resilience bolster’s the state’s extractive colonial capacity**

Hoofd 10 (Ingrid M. Hoofd, Assistant Professor in the Communications and New Media Programme at the National University of Singapore (NUS). The accelerated university: Activist academic alliances and the simulation of thought, ephemera, Feb 2010, 2010 ephemera 10(1): 7-24)

Neoliberal capitalism is hence a system in which the most intimate and fundamental aspects of human social life – in particular, forms of thought and linguistic difference – are formally subsumed under this system by being **circulated** as capital. In “Resisting the Neoliberal Discourse of Technology’, Armitage elaborates on this theme of circulation by pointing out that the current mode of late-capitalism relies on the continuous extension and validation of the infrastructure and the optimistic discourses of the new information technologies. Discourses that typically get repeated in favour of what I designate as the emerging speed-elite are those of connection, instantaneity, liberation, transformation, multiplicity and border crossing. **Speed-elitism**, I therefore argue, **replaces Eurocentrism** today as the primary nexus around which global and local disparities are organised, even though it largely builds on the formalisation of Eurocentric conceptual differences like doing versus thinking, and East versus West. Under speed-elitism, the utopian emphasis on the transparent mediation through technologies of instantaneity gives rise to the *fantasy* of the networked spaces ‘outside’ the traditional academic borders as radical spaces, as well as **the desire for** a productive dialogue or alliance between activism and academia. This would mean that activism and academia have become *relative* others under globalisation, in which the (non-Western or anti-capitalist) activist figures as some kind of *hallucination* of radical otherness for the Western intellectual. This technological hallucination serves an increasingly aggressive neo-colonial and patriarchal economic state of exploitation, despite – or perhaps rather *because of* – such technologies of travel and communication having come to figure as tools for liberation and transformation. So the discourses of techno-progress, making connections, heightened mobility and crossing borders in activist-academic alliances often go hand in hand with the (implicit) celebration of highly mediated spaces for action and communication between allied groups. Such **discourses** however **suppress** the **violent colonial, capitalist and patriarchal** history of those technological spaces and the subsequent unevenness of any such alliance. More severely, they **foster an oppressive** sort of **imaginary ‘collective’ or ‘unity of struggles’ through the myth of ‘truly’ allowing for radical difference and multiplicity within that space** – a form of **techno-inclusiveness that** in turn **excludes** a variety of **non-technogenic groups and slower classes**. That these highly mediated spaces of thought and knowledge production are exclusivist is also shown by Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades’ study of the transformation of higher education in ‘The Academic Capitalist Knowledge/Learning Regime’. Slaughter and Rhoades argue that new technologies allow the neo-liberal university to precisely cross the borders of universities and external for-profit and non-profit agencies in the name of development, production and efficacy, resulting in ‘new circuits of knowledge’. These ‘opportunity structures’ (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004: 306) that the neoliberal economy creates, I in turn argue, become precisely those spaces of imagination that come to signify as well as being resultant of the university’s humanist promise of reaching-out to alterity. This paradoxically also **leads to** what Slaughter and Rhoades accurately identify as a ‘**restratification among and within** **colleges** and **universities’** (2004: 307). *Thought* is then increasingly exercised in, and made possible through, spaces that are just as much spaces of acceleration and militarisation. The increasing complicity of the humanities in the applied sciences within the contemporary university, and hence the integration of critical thinking and neo-liberalist acceleration, is also a major theme running through Jacques Derrida’s *Eyes of the University*. Derrida there suggests that neo-liberalisation entails a militarisation of the university, claiming that ‘never before has so-called basic research been so deeply committed to ends that are at the same time military ends’ (Derrida, 2004: 143). The intricate relation between the military (‘missiles’) and the imperatives of the humanities (‘missives’) also pervades Derrida’s ‘No Apocalypse, Not Now’, in which he argues that the increasing urgency with which intellectuals feel compelled to address disenfranchisement and crisis **paradoxically** leads to a differential acceleration of such oppression through technologies of instantaneous action. But the relationship between new technologies and the subject’s *perception* of and subsequent desire for the incorporation of otherness that speed-elitism engenders, is best illustrated through Derrida’s *Archive Fever* and *Monolingualism of the Other*. Derrida’s concerns here are not so much directly with the contemporary university, but rather with the link between how thought is situated in technologies of communication (like language) and the emergence of authority as well as (academic and activist) empowerment.

#### Moten is wrong – the university no longer functions by discouraging formation of alternatives but operates through the formation of connections outsides its institutional walls. The 1ac feeds the sentimental fantasy of the enlightenment university, wherein techno-capitalism extracts academic labor with greater efficiency than before

Hoofd 10 (Ingrid M. Hoofd, Assistant Professor in Department of Communications and New Media @ National University of Singapore, “The Accelerated University: Activist Academic Alliances and the Simulation of Thought”, Ephemera, theory & politics in organization)

In ‘The Academic Speed-up’, Fred Moten and Stefano Harney address precisely the way contemporary academia is engaged in what they call ‘the internalization of a cybernetics of production’ (Moten and Harney, 1999: 18) and its background in an imperialist Cold War logic. Moten and Harney are rightly wary of crisis-talk that assumes crisis is unique to the contemporary moment – rather, they claim, crisis is always part and parcel of capitalism, and hence of any academic project that needs to justify and re-produce itself within such an economic logic. Nostalgia for some lost ‘golden age’ of academia is therefore not only misplaced, but also dangerous, as it seeks to mobilize grounds for resistance in the illusions of academic independence, equal collaboration and autonomy. Instead, these illusions are themselves effects of the academic mode of production and of how the latter engenders new forms of in- and exclusion, creating a ‘way to organize hopeful ideas, and ... real rewards’ (1999: 12, italics mine). According to Moten and Harney, the progression from the assembly-line type of academic work towards the contemporary speed-up involves newer and more efficient ways of extracting academic surplus labour through out-sourcing, just-in-time production and flexibility in which academics are asking to ‘link a series of sites of production’ (1999: 13). While they suggest that this ‘recombination of time and space discourage[s] the formation of alliance with alternatives’ (1999: 16), I instead conclude from their lucid analysis that the academic speed-up precisely encourages the formation of connections ‘outside’ its former institutional walls, especially since many of these activities are unsalaried. Such alliances namely facilitate capitalist acceleration – and therefore ‘relative immisseration’ (1999: 17) – because the cybernetic space signifies the imaginary potential for ‘pure and radical thought’ under neoliberal capitalism. In ‘Doing Academic Work’, Harney and Moten ask the crucial question: whom or what the increase of knowledge production, which ‘would always seem to be a good thing’, (Harney and Moten, 1998: 165, italics mine) finally serves. This enquiry leads them to conclude that within post-war academia, ‘newly produced knowledge contributes to the force of production’ (1998: 166) and hence, I would claim, to accelerated exploitation, not only within academia itself, but especially through those spaces that double its mandate. The way in which I argue that many new university and activist-research projects paradoxically contribute to this global re-stratification of otherness through technological acceleration, also connects well with Bill Readings’ work on the contemporary university. In The University in Ruins, Readings argues that the change from the ‘university of reason and culture’ to the present-day ‘university of excellence’ means that the centre of power has shifted largely away from the nation-state (Readings, 1996: 22). To read power as residing primarily in the sum of ideological and repressive state apparatuses hence no longer makes sense. It would therefore not suffice to critique the university simply as an institution that functions as the nurturer of national culture and the cultured elites for the nation-state. Readings points out that it is telling that strong oppositional critiques of the university seem to become possible precisely at the moment where its centralising power and knowledge have vacated its premises. More importantly, the function of the university of excellence – one that successfully transforms it into yet another trans-national corporation – relies on the fantasy that the university is or should be still that university of reason and culture, and that it originally did pursue universal truth, justice and knowledge. So the invocation of the fantasy of an originary university of knowledge and truth to which Edu-Factory’s and other similar activist-academics carefully seek to be responsible, facilitates the doubling of the production of information – as if it were still knowledge and culture – into speed-spaces outside the university walls proper. According to Bernard Stiegler in Technics and Time 2: Disorientation, new technologies of acceleration therefore lead to a tension in contemporary university practices under neoliberalism: they make possible thought through continuous differentiation into the virtual, but likewise reduce and manage thought to its calculable double – thus creating non-thought. The point for Stiegler is then to bring about ‘epochal redoubling’ which synthesises the current tension into an affirmation of technology as well as humanity (Stiegler, 2009: 7). While I agree with Stiegler on the ambiguity and doubling at the heart of acceleration, his imagined solution is nonetheless suspect. This is due to his narrative of the heroic overcoming of this tension in which an analysis of the complicities of a politics of difference is glaringly absent – in other words, the conceptual problem in Stiegler, activist-research, and eventually also in this article, is one of discerning (or thinking) ‘good’ from ‘bad’ doubling. I claim for now rather, in line with Derrida and Armitage, that alter-globalist activism here in particular functions as the supposed ‘other’, and hence authentic locus of truth and justice, where that fantasy of the originary university – which is the mirror-image of the fantasy of some future utopian university – is allegedly to be re-found. Alterglobalism can have this function because it is itself largely structured by the concepts and technologies of neo-liberalism. The borderlands of the real and the virtual, of West and the non-West, of thinking and doing, as well as of ‘alternative’ global activism and academia, become highly productive sites in the expansion and quickening of neoliberal capital. Activist-research projects and alliances, as well as all narratives – like this one – that invoke the interplay between activism and academia as a positive means for the quest for truth and justice, are therefore symptomatic of the contemporary redefinition of the university, caused by the relative crisis of the nation-state in the face of trans-national globalisation. The university – if we still want to call it that – thus becomes in essence a nomad institution, able to vicariously pop up in various geographical and virtual spaces in the name of connecting to ‘truly liberating’ activists or non-Western peoples, as long as this facilitates technocratic (re)production. This technologically endowed dispersal and quickening of thought and expertise is paradoxically the effect of the desire for progress and liberation that humanist society seeks. The new activist-research endeavours are the latest productive results of this – productive, that is then, in the humanist and capitalist senses of the word. The emphasis in these initiatives on displacement and dispersal can thus once more be expected to valorise the terms and concepts of speed, such as mobility, flexibility, nomadism, transformation and creating connections, as well as a general rhetoric of autonomy and radicality, while expressing a strong allegiance to that project of justice that often goes under the heading of new social movements and technologies. The rhetoric of overcoming boundaries, both (inter)nationally and institutionally, plays a crucial role in the portrayal of such activity as liberatory or subversive. The romanticisation of certain forms of activism or otherness, as if they were harbouring ‘ultimate justice’, cross-bred with the appeal to the university of reason and culture as ‘original’, facilitates the emergence of technologically endowed nomad activist-academic-research initiatives as the new spaces and bodies for the generation of trans-national capital – as if that Enlightenment ‘subject of reason and autonomy’ still exists (or has ever existed). If one were to be unfriendly, one could perhaps say that through these projects, speed-elitist neo-liberalism parades as if it were justice.

**You should vote negative in favor of the 1nc’s poetic, speculative research method that takes problem in visibility through rendering it visible – this is an ethics of intellectual inquiry that resists the imperative of speeding up the flow of information and instead performs the trick of fatal theory, engendering an accident in the infrastructure that brings about the possibility of the event. Our refusal of the affirmative’s will to knowledge beyond the point of speculation clones the the form of debate, causing the university to implode from within.**

**Hoofd 17** (Ingrid M. Hoofd, Assistant Professor in the Communications and New Media Programme at the National University of Singapore, 2017, “Higher Education and Technological Acceleration: The Disintegration of University Teaching and Research,” Palgrave Macmillan US, <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51409-7>, pg: 146-151)

The fundamental **instability of the university via its ‘self-deconstruction’** therefore also opens up new forms of thought and imaginative opportunities, if only for now appearing as disastrous yet perhaps fortuitous ‘accidents.’ Derrida in fact hints at this, but also at the university’s elusiveness, in “Mochlos, or: the Confl ict of the Faculties,” when he claims that he “would almost call [the university] the child of an inseparable couple, metaphysics and technology” (1993, 5; emphasis mine). Almost, but never quite—here then emerges the possibility of **truly subversive change**—in the **paradoxical gap** prised open between the machinery of transparency and its exceedingly stealthy theoretical, administrative, and methodological operations. This change however will then **not be brought about by the mere content of the critique, but by the way it disastrously pushes acceleration to the point of systemic disintegration or implosion**. In Fatal Strategies, Baudrillard calls this the **“fatal strategy”** that contemporary theory must adopt: a sort of **conceptual suicide attack which aims at pulling the rug out under the speed-elitist mobilisation of** a host of **problematic semiotic oppositions**, which also will illustrate the fundamental paradox behind any attempt at structural predictions. In another one of his ‘fatal’ book-chapters titled “The Final Solution,” Baudrillard relates this intensification of the humanist **obsession with dialectics, mastery, and transparency**—the quest for immortality that is at the basis of techno-scientific research—to destruction and the death drive through the metaphor of and actual research around cloning, which strangely resonates well with Derrida’s investigation of the tele-technological archive in Archive Fever. I read Baudrillard’s “Final Solution” at this stage also as a metaphor for the duplication **(cloning) of thought into virtual spaces** outside the university walls proper, without such a cloning ever succeeding to force its **compulsory optimism** on everyone and everything. If contemporary research seeks to make possible human cloning, argues Baudrillard, then this endeavour is equivalent to cancer: after all, cancer is simply **automatic cloning, a deadly form of multiplication**. It is of interest here to note that the possibility of creating an army of clones has likewise garnered much military interest, just as academia today more and more serves military ends. As the logic of cloning as automatic multiplication is typical of all current technological and humanist advancements, the **exacerbation of this logic can only mean more promise and death, or** perhaps **even promise through death**. Techno-scientifi c progress entails a regress into immortality, epitomised by a nostalgia typical of the current socio- technical situation, for when we were “undivided” (2000, 6). At this point such an argument in fact problematically mirrors the apocalyptic tone of, for instance, the activist-research projects as well as of Heidegger’s arguments. But I contend that Baudrillard refers not only to the lifeless stage before humans became sexed life forms, but also makes an allusion to psychoanalytic readings of the ‘subject divided in language’ and its **nostalgia for wholeness and transparent communication**. The **desire for immortality**, like archive fever, is therefore the same as the Freudian **death drive**, and we ourselves ultimately become the **object of our technologies of scrutiny and nostalgia**. The **humanist quest for total transparency of oneself** and of the world to oneself that grounds the idea of the modern techno-scientific university is therefore ultimately an attempt at (self-)destruction, or in any case an attempted **destruction of (one’s) radical difference** that needs to run its course. The urgent political question which Bernard Stiegler, for instance, as I showed in a previous chapter, problematically avoided in Disorientation , then becomes: which selves are and will become caught up in the **delusion of total self-transparency** and self-justification, and which selves will be destroyed? And how may we conceive of an “ethic of intellectual inquiry or aesthetic contemplation” that “**resist**s **the imperatives of speed**,” as Jon Cook likewise wonders in “The Techno-University and the Future of Knowledge” (1999, 323)? It is of particular importance to note here that the very inception of this question and its possible analysis, like the conception of the speed-elite mounted by this book, is itself again a **performative repetition** of the grounding myth of the university of independent truth, justice, and reason. Therefore, in carrying forward the humanist promise, this analysis is itself bound up in the **intensification of the logic of acceleration** and destruction, but is then also equally tenuous. This **complicity of thought in the violence of acceleration** itself in turn **quickens the machine of the humanist promise**, and can only manifest itself in the prediction of a **coming apocalypse**—whether it concerns a narrative of the death of thought and the university, or of a technological acceleration engendering the Freudian death drive. We academics are then simply the next target in the **technological realisation of complete** γνωθι σαυτον (‘**know thyself’**)—or so it seems . Because after all, **a clone is never an exact copy**, as Baudrillard very well knows; and therefore, the extent to which all the teaching and research projects discussed in this book hopefully invite alterity can thankfully **not yet be thought**. The work of Virilio is therefore helpful because it abandons the ‘compulsory optimism’ of standard academic rhetoric for a more **fragile optimism that seeks to affirm the fundamental unknowability** or sacredness that makes knowledge possible in the fi rst place. In this sense, Virilio and Baudrillard urge us, as Derrida described it, to ‘take a more originary responsibility’ in light of the current negative fallout of the aporetic ideals of the academic institution. And as I hinted at in Chap. 1, every form of idealism indeed eventually will be or needs to be subjected to its own critique, and perhaps eventually even needs to succumb to it. As much as the practices of these theories, centres, organisations, and left-wing academics are the outflow of a **logic of increased visibility and transparency**, they also render into visible form the **perverse logic of ‘incorporating’ and ‘connecting’** **everything** and everyone, which, for instance, some of the theorists that argue for ‘bottom-up learning’ outlined as a virtue, in an exceedingly staged **visual profusion of relative otherness**. Since academic productivity and activism find themselves wholly aligned with the perverse ideals of the university, raising its stakes would therefore not lie in the familiar recanting of ‘freedom,’ ‘empowerment,’ or ‘democracy,’ but in the **reinsertion of the (inter-)subjective and ‘noisy’ element** in all its teaching and research practices. This would entail an emphasis on the necessary respect for that ‘**unknown quantity’** that is **inherent in all meaningful learning** and interaction, a newfound acknowledgement of the magical aspects of the universe as foundational for all appreciation of it. As Virilio stresses in his second chapter of The Vision Machine, “**the presupposition of not-knowing** and especially not-seeing … **restores to every research project its fundamental context of prime ignorance**” so that we “need to admit that for the human eye the essential is invisible” (1994, 23). Baudrillard echoes Virilio’s insight in “The Theorem of the Accursed Share” by emphasising that indeed “Anything that purges the accursed share signs its own death warrant” (1990, 121). Perhaps the biggest mistake in the modern founding of the university then was the **denial and attempted erasure of the** religious or **spiritual aspect of the university**, so that, instead of being a vision machine, a ‘more originary responsibility’ would consist of letting it become a ‘humility machine’ in the spirit of its pre-Enlightenment ethics? In any case, the acknowledgement of the profound tension at the basis of the university and the ways it has intensified itself to such an extent today that more and more academics are starting to become disillusioned or confused about their calling, perhaps provides us usefully with the **return of that “fatalism” and “magic worldview**” that especially Freire so eagerly sought to eradicate. We may therefore want to welcome the **upsetting force of such a fatal attitude towards the ideal of ‘communication as community’** as the true antidote, or perhaps even the quintessential shadow, which has always secretly accompanied the university’s quest for total communication and transparency. The possibility of radicality via communication and its functionalist theories may then fi nally and surprisingly lie in its unexpected outcomes, both positive and negative. I will be ‘keeping the faith’ together with all these projects and academics then, since also owing to all these theories and projects, **the future may be more radically open** than ever before, as long as we seriously entertain the possibility that in **moving beyond the attempted erasure of fatality and unknowability by the compulsorily optimistic academic performance** lies the potential of that ‘more **originary’ responsibility**. One of the consequences of bringing back **fatality** and fatalism means to acknowledge that the **representational ideal of scientific and philosophical theory**—the fantasy that it not only must ‘describe’ reality as closely as possible, but also that such a description is possible or desirable at all— must be **abandoned in favour of a speculative poetics**. Likewise critical theory, which tradition this book has productively mobilised, after all falls, according to Baudrillard, in The Perfect Crime victim to the thwarted ideals of **omniscience and transparent communication**. As I noted in Chap. 3, it is for this reason that Genosko in “The Drama of Theory” rightly parallels the problem of theory with the problem of political theatre, suggesting that what Baudrillard proposes is not replicating the impotent attempts of a theatre seeking to convince by way of documentary realism, but of a ‘**reversed’ theatre in which** “**the object will have its revenge on Western metaphysics**” (1994, 295). Genosko in turn helpfully refers to Baudrillard’s usage of the metaphor of the ‘crystal,’ which I concur can be read as an idealisation of the perfectly transparent object and the ideal crystalline universe seemingly represented in scientifi c description, but just as much as a ‘crystal ball’ into which one “gazes in order to arouse a myriad of sensations”—not the least that sensation of uncertainty as well as an ambivalence concerning the fact that one is being **seduced by that object** (1994, 296). William Bogard usefully points out in “Baudrillard, Time, and the End,” that seduction indeed precisely consists of “the overcoming of defences (of ‘immunity’)” (1994, 333). Baudrillard also follows this logic of a ‘revenge of the crystal’ when he stresses in an interview with Nicholas Zurbrugg in Baudrillard Live on the possibilities of a renewed theoretical radicalism, that Perhaps **the only thing one can do is to destabilize** and provoke **the world around us**. We shouldn’t presume to produce positive solutions … one needs to make a kind of **detour through the strategy of the worst scenario**. **It’s not a question of ideas—there are already too many ideas!** (1993, 170–171; italics in original) To conclude then, to **let the auto-immune disease run its course** therefore would entail fi rstly seeing the university, from its very inception, for the **ridiculous scam** that it is: a marvellously absurd outgrowth of the **delusional ideals of Enlightenment humanism**. However, this also means that any representational theoretical critique like this one is just as much a scam of the authority of theoretical analysis, in which possibly, as Lyotard suggested, truth and technique have collapsed into one another. So this book, by partaking in the same ideals of visibility while exposing the problem of the contemporary university to scrutiny and visibility, suggests that we follow a strategy of **‘fatal’ consciousness-raising** in order **to** hopefully **plant the seeds of future radical events** regarding academia. An example here might be a staff and student exodus from the university’s current imperative, which would signify a notable **collapse** of **its prime beliefs towards a more mystical thinking** in the hard sciences and in the humanities. Perhaps **we should simply let the university bleed to death** for now. **Only** such **a**n apparent **‘solution’ that seeks not solve anything at all or make any predictions**, while seemingly absurd, may mean the hoped for **death of the** contemporary **university and its revival as a radically different entity**. This book must therefore fi nally **remain speculative and opaque**, and mount this fi nal chapter as a polemical provocation that does not seek to pre-programme what the next stage of the university should look like or which ideals need to be chanted, as doing so would itself fall prey to the problematic and ultimately **managerialist claim of transparent (fore)knowledge and** true **emancipation**. This book, in all its philosophical and analytical exposition, after all cannot even with certainty claim that it has represented the reality of the contemporary university in any kind of self-assured manner, or that it does not sneakily mix up the ‘observed pattern’ and the ‘pattern of observation.’ So is this book itself not simply just as much partaking in the delusion that the university always has been? To paraphrase Derrida once again: the university, truly, what an idea! Time perhaps to lay that cursed institution to rest for now and put down that alluring crystal ball, so that we all may rest too.

### 1nc – presumption

#### Don’t vote aff unless they give you a methodology for each of these – This attack requires a materialist, informatic, cultural, and economic strategy. – From the first Beller 21 card in the 1NC

#### Vote negative on presumption –

#### scholars have been circulating their arguments outside of debate, and no change has happened. No reason the symbolic affirmation of voting AFF is key.

#### ask yourself the question who is aware as a result of the aff and why is awareness a necessary political strategy – the affirmative doesn’t propose a strategy for how to change the conditions of violence but instead advocates for normative understanding of thought that they don’t explain how it effectively spills out of debate to resolve any of the impacts they talk about past potentially themselves

### 1nc – turn

#### They’re the next big thing!

Frank 97– prof of American History at Univ of Chicago [Thomas The Business of Culture in the new Gilded Age Commodify Your Dissent: Salvos from The Baffler ed. By Frank and Weiland; “Why Johnny Can’t Dissent”; Pages 31-32)

CAPITALISM IS CHANGING, obviously and drastically. From the moneyed pages of the Wall Street journal to TV commercials for airlines and photocopiers we hear every day about the new order’s globe spanning, cyber-accumulating ways. But our notion about what’s wrong with American life and how the figures responsible are to be confronted haven't changed much in thirty years. Call it, for convenience, the “countercultural idea.” It holds that the paramount ailment of our society is conformity, a malady that has variously been described as over-organization, bureaucracy, homogeneity, hierarchy, logocentrism, technocracy, the Combine, the Apollonian. We all know what it is and what it does. It transforms humanity into “organization man,” into “the man in the gray flannel suit.” It is “Moloch whose mind is pure machinery, ”the “incomprehensible prison” that consumes “brains and imagination.” It is artifice, starched shirts, tailfins, carefully mowed lawns, and always, always, the consciousness of impending nuclear destruction. It is a stiff, militaristic order that seeks to suppress instinct, to forbid sex and pleasure, to deny basic human impulses and individuality, to enforce through a rigid uniformity a meaningless plastic consumerism. As this half of the countercultural idea originated during the 1990s, it is appropriate that the evils of conformity are most conveniently summarized with images of 1950s suburban correctness. You know, that land of sedate music, sexual repression, deference to authority, Red Scares, and smiling white people standing politely in line to go to church. Constantly appearing as a symbol of arch backwardness in advertising and movies, it is an image we find easy to evoke. The ways in which this system are to be resisted are equally Well understood and agreed-upon. The Establishment demands homogeneity; we revolt by embracing diverse, individual lifestyles. It demands self-denial and rigid adherence to convention; we revolt through immediate gratification, instinct uninhibited, and liberation of the libido and the appetites. Few have put it more bluntly than jerry Rubin did in 1970: “America says: Don’t! The hippies say: Do lt!" The countercultural idea is hostile to any law and every establishment. “Whenever we see a rule, we must break it,” Rubin continued. “Only by breaking rules do we discover who we are. ”Above all rebellion consists of a sort of Nietzschean antinomianism, an automatic questioning of rules, a rejection of whatever social prescriptions we 've happened to inherit. Just Do It is the whole of the law. But one hardly has to go to a poetry reading to see the countercultural idea acted out. Its frenzied ecstasies have long since become an official aesthetic of consumer society, a monotheme of mass as well as adversarial culture. Turn on the TV and there it is instantly: the unending drama of consumer unbound and in search of an ever-heightened good time, the inescapable rock 'n' roll soundtrack, dreadlocks and ponytails bounding into Taco Bells, a drunken, swinging-camera epiphany of tennis shoes, outlaw soda pops, and mind-bending dandruff shampoos. Corporate America, it turns out, no longer speaks in the voice of oppressive order that it did when Ginsberg moaned in 1956 that Time magazine was “always telling me about responsibility. Businessmen are serious. Movie producers are serious. Everybody 's serious but me.” Nobody wants you to think they’re serious today, least of all Time Warner. On the contrary: the Culture Trust is now our leader in the Ginsbergian search for kicks upon kicks. Corporate America is not an oppressor but a sponsor of fun, provider of lifestyle accouterments, facilitator of carnival, our slang-speaking partner in the quest for that ever-more apocalyptic orgasm. The countercultural idea has become capitalist orthodoxy, its hunger for transgression upon transgression now perfectly suited to an economic-cultural regime that runs on ever-faster cyclings of the new; its taste for self-fulfillment and its intolerance f1or the confines of tradition now permitting vast latitude in consuming practices and lifestyle experimentation. Consumerism is no longer about “conformity” but about “difference.” Advertising teaches us not in the ways of puritanical self-denial (a bizarre notion on the face of it), but in orgiastic, never-ending self'-fulfillment. It counsels not rigid adherence to the tastes of the herd but vigilant and constantly updated individualism. We consume not to fit in, but to prove, on the surface at least, that we are rock 'n' roll rebels, each one of us as rule-breaking and hierarchy-defying as our heroes of the 60s, who now pitch cars, shoes, and beer. This imperative of endless difference is today the genius at the heart of American capitalism, an eternal fleeing from “sameness” that satiates our thirst for the New with such achievements of civilization as the infinite brands of identical cola, the myriad colors and irrepressible variety of the cigarette rack at 7-Eleven. As existential rebellion has become a more or less official style of Information Age capitalism, so has the countercultural notion of a static, repressive Establishment grown hopelessly obsolete. However the basic impulses of the countercultural idea may have disturbed a nation lost in Cold War darkness, they are today in fundamental agreement with the basic tenets of Information Age business theory. So close are they, in fact, that it has become difficult to understand the countercultural idea as anything more than the self justifying ideology of the new bourgeoisie that has arisen since the 1960s, the cultural means by which this group has proven itself ever so much better skilled than its slow-moving, security-minded forebears at adapting to the accelerated, always-changing consumerism of today. The anointed cultural opponents of capitalism are now capitalism’s ideologues. The two come together in perfect synchronization in a figure like Camille Paglia, whose ravings are grounded in the absolutely noncontroversial ideas of the golden sixties. According to Paglia, American business is still exactly what it was believed to have been in that beloved decade, that is, “puritanical and desensualized.” Its great opponents are, of course, liberated figures like “the beatniks,” Bob Dylan, and the Beatles. Culture is, quite simply, a binary battle between the repressive Apollonian order of capitalism and the Dionysian impulses of the counterculture. Rebellion makes no sense without repression; we must remain forever convinced of capitalism's fundamental hostility to pleasure in order to consume capitalism’s rebel products as avidly as we do. It comes as little surprise when, after criticizing the “Apollonian capitalist machine” (in her book, Kamp.: 6' Tramps), Paglia applauds American mass culture (in Utne Reader), the preeminent product of that “capitalist machine,” as a “third great eruption” of a Dionysian “paganism.” For her, as for most other designated dissidents, there is no contradiction between replaying the standard critique of capitalist conformity and repressiveness and then endorsing its rebel products—for Paglia the car culture and Madonna—as the obvious solution: the Culture Trust offers both Establishment and Resistance in one convenient package. The only question that remains is why Paglia has not yet landed an endorsement contract from a soda pop or automobile manufacturer.

### 1nc – galloway

#### Participation based political opposition legitimates cybernetic structures of control that undergird communication

Galloway 07 Alexander Galloway, professor of media, culture, and communication at New York University, Radical Illusion (A Game Against), Games and Culture 2:4, pg. 385

There exist causes from whose nature some effect does not follow. There exist causes that preempt their own effects from coming to be. In an early text from 1969, “Play and the Police,” Baudrillard (2001a) speaks of a “**principle of separation**.” This principle is how he rethinks repression not through the notions of negation, aggression, or vital forces being blocked but through the concepts of ambiance, integration, and participation. **The “unity of desire” is broken**, he suggests, into a **never ending series** of private-sphere negotiations. The question becomes **Am I liberated? not Are we?** “The separative cause, which bursts through the unity of desire and establishes human activity across several zones . . . is most effective at neutralizing energies” (Baudrillard, 2001a, pp. 18-19). Thus, in what Deleuze would describe later as **the distinction between discipline and control**, Baudrillard here posits a model of **repression through expression**, a **stunting of the drives** through the very **facilitation of those drives into new control spaces**. A **new ambiance permeates the social field**. Th**e masses are not repressed, no never, they are allowed to dream**! With reference to Marcuse’s concept of “repressive desublimation,” Baudrillard (2001a) calls this “**the repression of desire . . . through the emancipation of needs**” (p. 20). Again, “**they did it, but we wanted it**.” The separative cause reveals how **ideology and reification operate under neoliberalism**. Summarize it like this: **Exploitation is material, liberation is semiotic**. The material is the realm of **political failure**; the social is the realm of **utopian compromise**. In Baudrillard, the principle of separation is the principle by which the two are segregated and divided into two distinct domains, **the one to play the fool for the other**. The separative cause has two steps. To achieve some semblance of pedagogical coherence, I will telescope them into a cause-and-effect narrative, but to be precise, Step 1 and Step 2 both **happened at the same time**. **In Step 1**, the given phenomenon, which exists primordially as an undivided prob- lematic containing both progressive and reactionary political impulses, is first separated into (a) a material modality and (b) a social modality. For example, with global warming, there is **the material modality of carbon dioxide emissions**, automobiles and roads, the oil industry, and so on, while at the same time there is **the symbolic social modality of desiring clean air, “thinking green,” and the so-called awareness campaigns**. The principle of separation occasions the phenomenon first **through an alliance formed between the progressive political impulse** and **the domain of the social or public sphere**. A progressive moral horizon of significant magnitude **invests itself in the social sphere**. This moral plane develops its own independent logic and will likely experience **a flourishing cycle of achievement and resolution** but **always within the “symbolic” realm of the social or public sphere**. **From time to time, small material changes may be incorporated into the logic of moral resolution but only those minor enough not to impinge upon the superiority of the social. In Step 2, the progressive political impulse is negated and as negation finds its home in the domain of the material**. Thus **a reactionary political project blossoms** within the realm of the physical world. This project **realizes its ends, developing the necessary mechanisms and infrastructures required to continue and grow**. In Baudrillard, **the separative cause is this overall structure**. What the separative cause occasions, or “makes present,” is the ability for **both gratuitous exploitation and a heightened moral instinct to coexist within the same universe**. It is perhaps seen best in Baudrillard’s controversial critique of sexual liberation in Part 1 of Seduction. A structure of both liberation and deferral, of dazzlement and insight, of both ignorance and realization, of both expression and silence—**all sides unify together but only at the cost of a complete and incontrovertible segregation between the symbolic and the material**. **The progressive stance** of the one **allows for the reactionary stance of the other**. The **end result is the current state of affairs**: an **oil company that is nevertheless “green,”** a world **bathed in blood but devoted to peace**, a global consumer product that is still tagged “fair trade.” The separative cause occasions. But it occasions a “presence,” a presence that must be crossed out or held in suspension with quotation marks. The presence occasioned by **the separative cause is in fact an abatement of presence**, a **lessening of being**. What it makes present is a structure of suspension. A “subject” is the name given to those entities able to flourish within such a structure of suspension. As Baudrillard was able to see, **most all phenomena in contemporary life are occasioned through this “separative cause” or principle of separation**. The **environmental movement** is a perfect example. In today’s world, it is structurally impractical if not **outright impossible to be an environmentalist in any true sense**. Imagine: An activist drives to a rally against global warming. The contradiction is clear. His actual spiritual liberation is undercut by the tailpipe fumes of his own expression. **His intentions are good, but there is a physical base—that depraved automobile contraption—that creates conditions of impossibility that are symbolically if not practically insurmountable**. Of course, **many today refuse to participate in the global system of environmental exploita- tion by casting off all worldly possessions**. But this comes at the cost of complete withdrawal from the world system, a price too high to pay for most. **Like the computer at the heart of today’s planetary organization, the costs are thus binary in that they offer an all-or-nothing option, but only an “option” insofar as the nothing is reified into material reality and the all spins on into oblivion. This is how the separative cause operates.** Other examples include the curious and no doubt tense axis of inaction forged between the United Nations and American foreign policy after the new millennium on issues such as Darfur peace: **the symbolic assertion on the side of the United States that, in no uncertain terms, “this is genocide**,” flanked only by **a negation of that same claim in abandonment and blindness** within the realm of real material commitment. Or consider the structural adjustment agreements of the International Monetary Fund, which travel on wings of hope to the so-called backward economies of the globe but carry enclosed the harshest austerity measures, **leaving the infected country with a curse of legalized deterritorialization and fiscal and cultural subjugation for decades to come**. **Exploitation is material, liberation is semiotic**. This is how the separative cause occasions, or brings to presence, **certain phenomena in today’s global kingdom**. **The democratization of Iraq is realizable only through subjugation; clean air is realizable only through a futures market in “pollution credits”—and around and around**. **Might this separative cause be also known by a synonym twin, “civilization”? In Baudrillard, the term was simply the real. It occasions real human worlds by allowing them to come to be.**

### 1nc – worker

#### The university is nothing but a site of social death, the mass grave of culture – the imperative to “keep the system alive” and make it better plays into the hands of the project of modernity by denying the violence innate to the university system itself

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

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