## 1NR OV

Bataille’s politics of the sacred inevitably result in a fascist political methodology that culminates in violent exclusion of those outside the community of the sacred—that’s Heinamaki—it’s empirically proven by ethnocentric violence against Jews—

#### Causes cascading environmental destruction culminating in extinction—also no offense.

Slavoj Zizek ‘96, The Indivisible Remainder: An Essay on Shelling and Related Matters, p. 124-5

This notion of the modern, Cartesian subject *qua* the radical negativity of the double (self-relating) sacrifice also enables us to demarcate the paradoxical place of the theories of Georges Bataille, that is, of Bataille’s fascination with the ‘real’, material sacrifice, with the different forms of holocaust and the excessive destruction of (economic, social, etc.) reality.41 On the one hand, of course, Bataille’s topic is modern subjectivity, the radical negativity implied in the position of the pure transcendental subject. On the other hand, Bataille’s universe remains the pre-Newtonian universe of balanced circular movement, or – to put it in a different way – his notion of subjectivity is definitely pre-Kantian: Bataille’s ‘subject’ is not yet the pure void (the transcendental point of self-relating negativity), but remains an *inner-worldly, positive force*. Within these co-ordinates, the negativity which characterizes the modern subject can express itself only in the guise of a violent destruction which throws the entire circuit of nature off the rails. It is as if, in a kind of unique short circuit, *Bataille projects the negativity of the modern subject backwards, into the ‘closed’, pre-modern Aristotelian universe of balanced circular movement, within which this negativity can materialize itself only as an ‘irrational’, excessive, non-economical expenditure*. In short, what Bataille fails to take notice of is that the modern (Cartesian) subject no longer needs to sacrifice goat’s intestines, his children, and so on, since *his very existence already entails the most radical (redoubled, self-relating) sacrifice, the sacrifice of the very kernel of his being*. Incidentally, this failure of Bataille also throws a new light on the sacrificial violence, the obsession with the ultimate twilight of the universe, at work in Nazism: in it, we also encounter the reinscription of the radical negativity characteristic of the modern subject into the closed ‘pagan’ universe in which the stability of the social order guaranteed by some kind of repeated sacrificial gesture – what we encounter in the libidinal economy of Nazism is the modern subjectivity perceived from the standpoint of the pre-modern ‘pagan’ universe.42

Turns the case—hollows out being and leaves only military domination—paves the way for the exercise of violence the aff tries to prevent—fascism is the ultimate standing reserve because it reduces all difference to a singular national purpose—that makes all expenditure purposeful which negates Bataille’s political project.

## Link ext

Bataille’s emphasis on exceeding limits necessarily demands exceeding the limits of others—this imposition of violence yields fascism—that’s Heinamaki—

#### More ev—independently turns the case because it makes sacrifice purposeful and productive.

Heinamaki ‘9

Elisa, University of Helsinki, “Politics of the Sacred: Eliade, Bataille and the Fascination of Fascism,” Distinktion No. 19 · 2009: 59–80, AM

In the case of Bataille, we have an analysis of the sacred as an essentially ambiguous reality, attractive and repulsive, pure and impure, brought about according to the rhythm of human activity and expenditure. We also have an open complicity with the impure and transgressive sides of the sacred and with all the violence involved, as well as an explicit criticism of the channelling of the sacred energy for the benefit of any lasting instance of power. Despite such criticism, we have seen that a once-and-for-all differentiation of power and the sacred is not possible in the light of Bataille’s own theory. First of all, there is the difficulty of distinguishing the pure sacred from power; secondly, there is the ingredient of power (violence over others) inherent in the transgression itself. What emerges from all this ambiguity is a dual perspective. First of all, an emphasis on irreducible difference, a view of the sacred as an instance of pure intensity devoid of content, a moment of loss, felt together when limits, one way or the other, are transgressed. This idea of sheer, ‘meaningless’ intensity could be brought to bear on analyzing the attraction of various extreme (politico-)religious movements, thus avoiding the error of excessively rationalistic explanations that seek functions and profits from the outset. Secondly, a wider view emerges showing the sacred in all its otherness as paradoxically produced (by human activity and abandon) and susceptible to use. Bataille’s grappling with the problem of power directs the gaze at the near-impossibility and yet necessity to try and distinguish between different kinds of uses – good and bad – of the sacred. It also sheds some light on the amazing potential of religion for good as well as for evil.

Empirics are the frame and overwhelmingly conclude neg—even if the intent is benign the implementation is coopted—

Bataille’s politics were deployed in Romania as a way to justify fascist mysticism—that culminated in ethnocentric violence—that’s Heinamaki

## at: Nancy

#### Bataille’s politics is impossible—their claims of authenticity are non-falsifiable

Nancy ‘91

Jean-Luc, Professor of Political Philosophy and Media Aesthetics at the European Graduate School, "The Unsacrificeable," Yale French Studies, No. 79, Literature and the Ethical Question (1991), pp. 20-38, AM

Denunciations of economism and simulation run throughout the dialec- tical understanding of sacrifice, up to and including Bataille. Indeed-and here Bataille's contribution cannot be contested-a fascination with sacri- fice does not prevent one from remarking on a generalized "economism" and "mimeticism" in its dialectic. Sacrifice as self-sacrifice, universal sacri- fice, truth, and sublation of sacrifice, is itself the institution of the absolute economy of absolute subjectivity, which can only mimic (in the pejorative sense) a passage through negativity, from which, symmetrically, it cannot but reappropriate or trans-appropriate itself infinitely. Everything finally occurs as if the spiritualization/dialectization of sac- rifice could not operate without a formidable disavowal of itself. It disavows itself beneath the figure of an "old" sacrifice, which it pretends to know and which in reality it fabricates for its own purposes. And it approves of itself in the form of an infinite process of negativity, which it covers with the "sa- cred" name of "sacrifice." This double operation brings to the center, simul- taneously and in a painful ambiguity, the infinite efficacity of dialectical negativity and the bloody heart of sacrifice. To cast doubt upon this disavowal-this manipulation, rather-is to question this simultaneity, and to be forced to ask whether dialectical nega- tivity expunges blood or whether, on the contrary, blood must ineluctably continue to spurt. In his desire to put an end to dialectical process as come- dy, Bataille wanted blood to spurt. He wanted to weigh in the balance the horribly lacerated body and the look-distraught or ecstatic?-of a young Chinese being tortured, a famous photograph. But in so doing, Bataille was really working out the deep logic of the sublation of sacrifice, which would rescue it from its repetitive and mimetic character: because sublation is ultimately incapable of knowing what is truly involved in repetition and mimesis, and so in sacrifice. In return, this same logic, which claims to be both rupture with and mimetic repetition of sacrifice, wants, by this same movement, to be both the sublation and the truth of sacrifice. So we have to think that the victim of torture sublates into ecstasy the horror that renders him distraught. But how to think so in truth, if the eye that sees-and not the one that is here looked at-does not know what it is seeing, or even if it is seeing? How to think it, without the subject of this gaze having already appropriated, in himself, the dialectic of the distraught and the ecstatic? How to think it, that is, without having fascination constitute itself as mastery and dialectical knowledge of sacrifice? Bataille wound up declaring: "As for nostalgia for the sacred, it is time to admit that it necessarily comes to nothing, that it misleads: what today's world lacks is the proposing of temptations. Or the proposing of such hateful ones that they matter only on the condition that they deceive those whom they tempt," (Bataille, OC 11: 55). Undoubtedly, ambiguity does not disap- pear entirely from these phrases; their syntax is constructed so as to sustain it. On the one hand, today's world "lacks" truly sacred "temptations," ones that are given immediately and without recourse to nostalgia; on the other hand, the world "lacks"-in the sense, now, of being lacking-because its temptations are illusory. So sacrifice-or something about sacrifice-still cannot help be lacking.

## 2NC Aff is a double turn

The advocacy of the 1AC is a double turn—the specific words of the plan text code the rest of the 1AC as a utilitarian instrument for energy production—they’ve mashed two forms of Bataillan philosophy together and don’t have a defense of the tension—

Vote neg on presumption—the aff impact turns itself.

The 1AC explicitly says that, “Literature provides the optimal form of intimate expenditure”

They say:

They don’t gain anything:

That’s not true – they get things like pride, the ballot, a win, better odds of going to the NDT, etc. Debate is not a perfect analog for infinite expenditure because succeeding at debate has some clear benefits.

The poem was useless expenditure

Solvency deficit on the counterplan proves the poem does have value, it’s necessary for “solvency” and was deployed to win – the fact that they’ve changed it over the course of the year indicates there are better or worse ones

Even if that were true, the rest of the 1AC codes the poem within the larger process of winning debate rounds etc. – it represents the coopting of “useless” expenditure by utilitarian gain

## Sustainability

Solves environment collapse – extinction from energy use

Barry 11

(Glen, President and Founder of Ecological Internet. Ph.D. in "Land Resources" from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a Masters of Science in "Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development" also from Madison “EARTH MEANDERS: Ecological Internet: Being Green and Meaning It” 1/22/11 <http://www.ecoearth.info/blog/2011/01/ecological_internet_being_gree.asp>)

Humanity’s fate is completely one with the natural world. Our genes and cells – like all other species’ – are part of the larger environment and ultimately the global ecological system – Earth System or Gaia, if you will. Earth is alive and her air, water, land and ocean ecosystems self-regulate this organism like our organs do for us. The human boom of clearing natural ecosystems for “development” – which has only been occurring for a few hundred years, an ecological blink of an eye – is destroying our shared ecosystem home. **Unless humanity transitions to a social, political and economic state devoted to global ecological sustainability; our future is apocalyptic ecosystem collapse as Earth becomes uninhabitable**. The Earth system is being destroyed by industrial capitalism’s emphasis upon growth as the measurement of well-being. As always poor people are being given the shaft by the rich. Ecosystems are treated like candies to be gobbled. And the environment is stopping working. As ecosystems collapse, we are reaching or passing the point where carrying capacities (ability to support life) and their lag times **are exceeded, and the ecological fabric of being frays to the point where the whole biosphere dies.** Perhaps some bacteria on the ocean floor continue living, and cockroaches and dandelions, but Gaia - an entirely revolutionary, complex, amazing ecological amalgam of naturally evolved life, and their patterns and processes **– is gone forever never to return**. Maybe there are other Gaias, or this one can repair herself after we leave, but that is inconsequential; because as of now we only know of the one biosphere we share, it is remarkable, and we and all known life are utterly dependent. Anyone with an iota of ecological knowledge and/or common sense can see the way we are treating Earth and her water, oceans, forests, climate and our shared biosphere is needlessly killing us all. Do some reading! Just consider with an open mind: 80% of natural primary forests gone, nearly all fisheries and most large ocean fish over-fished, abrupt climate change, water scarcity, militaristic resource grabs, surging population and over-consumption (albeit inequitable). Some know Earth in crises and still don’t care. You are sick if you are not blown away by not yet over-developed world living conditions, the inequity, the stench, the unfairness of trade in resources to import goods, ripping off locals for trees and gold, and dumping wastes. The rich world’s beautifully coiffed yet still smelly rich elite are more concerned with maintaining enormously consumptive lifestyles that don’t give a rat’s ass about anything else. We live in times of great social inequity and injustice, and the movement for global ecological sustainability must remedy these as well, if only to ensure our own success. Humanity Fucked if We Don’t Ecologically Transform Ourselves EI and ecological science's grim prophesy of global **ecological collapse is not without hope if we can transform our relationships with each other and Earth - but it must happen now,** **immediately, and with force**. We must first protect all natural remaining ecosystems – back to the land and taking to the woods and protecting and restoring natural ecosystems! Then onto ecological restoration as power still exists in seeds to recover Earth. Just enough intact core land, ocean and water ecosystems and remnants exist to reconstitute biosphere losses with ecological restoration. We can embrace energy use reduction as our mantra, and choose a steady state economy that favors all living well forever over a few plundering, causing suffering and death for all. Together we absolutely must act now to avoid global ecology collapsing - protecting and restoring natural ecosystems. We must all grow the ecological sustainability movement, organize including leaderless protest cells, and choose our own resistance tactics for which you are solely responsible. And we must overcome the grave disserve done to global ecology by corporate NGO greenwash of ecosystem diminishing extractive industries and techno-optimists considering geoengineering rather than human beings returning to living within nature. The same bunch of Neanderthal cretins leading the fouling of the Earth, and who have stopped action for decades, are resurgent and remain in power and are pushing this greenwash crap that doesn’t really do anything for ecology. But then again, it is not as if government under U.S. democrats, or for that matter a liberal democracy anywhere in the world, were making huge strides on climate and ecology. It is time for us all to join Earth’s team again and grow food, restore ecosystems, and be one with Gaia as you homestead with your eco-village family. I contend this is the only remaining road to global ecological sustainability and personal family/friend group survival. We can do it together. It is well past time to go around governments and use people’s power revolutionary tactics to achieve ecological sustainability. A soft revolution that makes clear there are certain activities that are no longer ecologically tolerable, and using all means with which you personally are comfortable to resist coal, old forest logging, tar sands, population growth, industrial agriculture, fish trawling, geoengineering, fracking etc. is needed immediately. I do not recommend harder revolutionary tactics at this time because well intentioned symbolic protest would be quashed. But we must prepare. If humanity dares to discuss geoengineering – the apex of human hubris to think we can engineer creation – we are certainly free to discuss insurgency and change of political structures and social norms for Earth. Radicalness in thought and action **is the way forward on global ecological sustainability as decades of compromise and accommodation have clearly failed to bring about the magnitude of ecological change necessary in the time we have. Humanity needs new ecology based ways of living.**