# \*\*\*1NC

# Off 1

## 1NC

#### they’re not topical. they don’t defend an action by the united states federal government.

#### Trangressing the rules isn’t revolutionary – they’re just the obscene supplement to debate’s topicality law. small tolerated illegalities like this are key to the smooth maintenance of authority.

ZIZEK 95

16 Cardozo L. Rev. 925

Superego is the obscene "nightly" law that necessarily accompanies, as its shadow, the "public" law. This inherent and constitutive splitting in the law is the subject of Rob Reiner's film, A Few Good Men, n1 the court-martial drama about two marines accused of murdering one of their fellow soldiers. In the film, the military prosecutor accuses two marines of premeditated murder. The defense, however, wins an acquittal, demonstrating that the defendants were just following "Code Red" orders, which authorize a clandestine nighttime beating of any fellow soldier who, in the opinion of his peers or of the superior officer, breaks the United States Marines' ethical code. The dual function of Code Red is extremely interesting; it condones an act of transgression - illegal punishment of a fellow soldier - yet, at the same time, it reaffirms the cohesion of the group, calling for an act of supreme group identification. Such a code must remain under cover of night, unacknowledged, unutterable; in public, everybody feigns ignorance, or even actively denies its existence. Code Red represents the community spirit in its purest form, exerting the strongest pressure on the individual to comply with its mandate of group identification; yet simultaneously, it violates the explicit rules of community life. The plight of the two accused soldiers is that they are unable to grasp this exclusion of Code Red from the "big Other" - the public law; they desperately ask themselves what they did wrong, since they simply followed a superior officer's order. [\*926] From whence does this splitting of the law into the written public law and its underside, the "unwritten," obscene secret code, come? From the incomplete character of the public law. Explicit, public rules do not suffice; they must be supplemented by a clandestine "unwritten" code aimed at those who, although they violate no public rules, maintain a kind of inner distance and do not truly identify with the "spirit of community." n2 Sadism thus relies on the splitting of the field of the law into law qua "ego-ideal": a symbolic order which regulates social life and maintains social peace, and into its obscene, superegotistical inverse. As has been shown by numerous analyses from Mikhail Bakhtin onwards, periodic transgressions of the public law are inherent to the social order inasmuch as they function as a condition of the latter's stability. n3 What most deeply holds together a community is not so much identification with the law that regulates the community's "normal" everyday circuit, but rather identification with a specific form of transgression of the law - of the law's suspension (in psychoanalytic terms, with a specific form of enjoyment).

#### These minor transgressions forsake a better possibility.

#### Radical obedience to the letter of the law is key – overidentifying with the topic is the most radical option
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The masochist changes the world, as Deleuze puts it, to the extent that she "questions the validity of existing reality in order to create a pure ideal reality, an operation which is perfectly in line with the judicial spirit of masochism" ("Coldness" 33). This "judicial spirit" is, in practice, intersubjective (based on contractual relations), judgmental, and assertive. Its power is directed over, even against, others—to educate, to persuade, to bring into agreement. Masochism's judicial spirit becomes most recognizably political when it sweeps the social field in the form of mass fantasy, so that in the case of oppressed groups it often takes the form of a kind of politically idealized suffering in the name of future rewards. 11 Social suffering serves as a prelude to, and in reality a warranty for, the achievement of future satisfaction. It is perhaps Janine Chasseguet-Smirgel who most boldly underscores the political—what she sees as the utopic—force of the so-called counterpleasures, when she associates "historical ruptures which give an inkling of a new world" (293) with the dynamics of perversion. A crucial point to bear in mind here, however, is that, like any tool for change, masochism can be put to both progressive and regressive uses, deployed as a political tactic for utopian change and, conversely, for cultural entrenchment and even gender violence.Deployed in the name of either revolutionary or retrograde causes, masochism works by calling into being the very Law—the limit or penance—that ostensibly blocks access to the ideal by thwarting what Lacan once called the "will to jouissance." So from outside the politico-libidinal matrix of master/slave, it looks [End Page 397] as if masochism involves only the sacrifice of one's own enjoyment. However, from within, the masochist reveals the truth of symbolic power: subordination to the exact letter of the Law, thereby exaggerating its obscene dimension, subverts the very meaning of regulation. The potential political value of this is significant, as Reik's example of the masochistic art of resistance reveals: Austrian railroad workers, protesting low wages and long working hours, go on strike, but rather than walk off the job, they carry it out with increased conscientiousness and punctuality, following the railway board's myriad bureaucratic regulations to the letter. The result is a total paralysis of train traffic, and with trains neither arriving nor departing, the company elites are forced to capitulate (108; cf. 154-59). The workers, through radical obedience to the law, are able to turn the misery of their working conditions into a politically satisfying conclusion. Closing the gap between the law and its realization, extreme submission has the precise effect of revealing the fantasmic support of the law in its full inconsistency. 12 As a mode of dissidence, masochism depends on a strategy of "passive resistance," evoking a constellation of other strategies for social change such as the hunger strike, sit-ins, and related forms of nonviolent passive protest. When deployed in these ways to expose the inconsistency of cultural protocols, masochism becomes fully political, a strategy of resistance, wherein "the masochist is a revolutionist of self-surrender" (Reik 156). Given masochism's primary function as defiant submissiveness ("victory through defeat" is Reik's famous formula), there are expedient reasons to conceptualize it across the limits of the sexual or the erotic, into the social.Masochism, despite remaining a slippery (and at times hotly contested) term in psychiatric and psychoanalytic discourses, 13 has emerged in recent critical treatments as a particularly flexible, even necessary, form of cultural critique. It is within this context that one of Deleuze's most valuable insights is intelligible as a fully political revelation: "[The masochist's] apparent obedience conceals a criticism and a provocation" ("Coldness" 88). Remarkably, the fundamentally utopian energy of masochism increases with cultural advancement. If masochism is indeed "unmistakably the most important culturally" among the usual perversions, it is so, to follow Reik, precisely because it is the chief register of culture, developing coterminously with it: as culture progresses, masochism increasingly becomes a psychic necessity (264; cf. 383). 14 But, as Reik himself rather presciently points out, masochism is fast evolving beyond its status as a psychic necessity to become something of a mental luxury, a political option (though admittedly never available to all) replacing what had once [End Page 398] been diagnosed strictly as a psychic condition simply suffered by desiring subjects beyond their own will. Despite its status as luxury, masochism appears no less urgent a tool for reimagining or remaking the self and the social. Leaving behind the limited notion of the masochist as a self-destructive subject, one to whom something is done, or on whom something is perpetrated, we are able to see the masochist as an idealizer par excellence, a revolutionary who seeks after a utopic condition that is never merely or only libidinal

#### VOTING ISSUE – reimagine the resolution as a STRICT contract. Explicitly delineated contracts of obedience such as the resolution are key to enact overidentification in the social. the hollow conventions of limits become invested with new radical possibility
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This concept of an alliance between the two parties is further emphasized by Deleuze's observation that a consensual pact, what he terms a "contract," must be reached between the masochist and the torturer. Often, this takes the form of an actual contract, which, whether written or verbal, has specific terms, limits, and stipulations. Moreover, it is the masochist him/herself who stipulates the "punishment": the masochist (and not his or her partner) dictates where, when, and how the blows should fall. As Deleuze puts it,"It is the victim who speaks through the mouth of his torturer, without sparing himself" (Deleuze, 22). In Deleuze's model, then, the language used in masochism is "persuasive." The other party, variously termed "dominant," "top," or "torturer," must be convinced to play his or her role, and taught how to do it, which implies careful and precise communication between the two parties. As I will show, convincing and teaching another how to play the desired role of "torturer" is a crucial element in Kono's narratives. It is also important in understanding how masochism plays with gender and power relations and how power can be paradoxically obtained through apparent" submission."

#### there is a submissive version of your aff. you can perform the entirety of the 1ac, but yoke your performance to the painful machinery of the resolution.

#### turns the case - a political stance of masochism becomes the only truly revolutionary possibility because of the prevalence of entrenched power relations and breakdown of the political
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Considered together, I think, these four books offer a cautious tale regarding the future of liberal humanism and leftist politics generally. The case could be made that this explains in large part their raisons d'être. On his last page, Savran somberly points out that, with the demise of Communism, the near-identity of the **[End Page 406]** Democratic and Republican parties, and the unceasing penetration of capitalism, "you are left with almost no real opposition" (320). It then becomes an urgent question how progressive opposition can be and actually is structured, both as fantasy and political reality. In his recent assessment of the crisis of the Left, Ernesto Laclau states bluntly that "there will be no renaissance of the Left without the construction of a new social imaginary" (211). Contra Savran, producing this new social imaginary must involve recognition of the diagnostic and liberatory potentials of masochism, as a practice and critical paradigm. As we witness masochism fast becoming a predominant mode of cultural commodification, reflected, for example, in S/M-theme marketing strategies (from Bass Ale to Gucci shoes to Winston cigarettes), in the popularity of reality TV (CBS's *Survivor* and MTV's *Jackass* are exemplary) and prime-time game shows (with BBC/NBC's *The Weakest Link* presenter Anne Robinson—whose affect conflates Rudolf Hess, Margaret Thatcher, and Sally Jessy Raphael—as everybody's favorite domme), and in gross-out movie comedies (Ben Stiller's self-zippered agony in *There's Something about Mary* [1998]), analysis of what is truly productive in masochism's social function becomes all the more necessary. Here, remarkably, a notion to which Savran passingly refers makes its presence deeply felt (254): Walter Benjamin's *Jetztzeit* (now-time), a utopianism of the present that masochism, I think, so brilliantly stages through converting binary opposites—pleasure and pain, power and powerlessness, public and private, and so on—into charged constellations whose potentially world-shattering force derives from the holding open of those binaries, the refusal to resolve them in the present moment. Masochism's now-time becomes thus an incitement to think the unthinkable, beyond the reach of the commodity, into the realm of the revolutionary.
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Culture and nature are always already entangled - the aff's move to distinguish nature as outside the social is the romantic ideal that assumes Nature is universal and transcendental - this pre-historical narrative guiding our actions elevates Nature to the big other, which depoliticizes it through a foreclosure of its multiplicity and unpredictability

Erik **Swyngedouw**, Geography, School of Environment and Development, University of Manchester A. Lewis Building, July/Dec. 20**11** "Whose environment? The end of nature, climate change and the process of post-politicization" Ambient. soc. vol.14 no.2 Campinas

2. The death of Nature: emergent natures

The death or the end of Nature has been announced many times1. The proclaimed end of Nature does not, of course, imply a de-materialization of human life, the apogee of modern "man's" quest to severe the ties that bind him to Nature. On the contrary, humans and non-humans are ever more entangled through myriad interactions and transformative processes (LATOUR, 1993). The death of Nature signals rather the demise of particular imaginings of Nature, of a set of symbolic inscriptions that inferred a singular Nature, at once external and internal to humans and human life.

In Ecology without Nature, Timothy Morton calls Nature "a transcendental term in a material mask [that] stands at the end of a potentially infinite series of other terms that collapse into it" (MORTON, 2007: 14). He distinguishes between at least three interrelated places or meanings of Nature in our symbolic universe. First, as a floating signifier, the 'content' of Nature is expressed through a range of diverse terms that all collapse in the Name of Nature: DNA, elephants, mineral water, The Andes, hunger, hart-beat, markets, desire, profits, CO2, greed, competition, ... . Such metonymic lists, although offering a certain unstable meaning, are inherently slippery, and show a stubborn refusal to fixate meaning consistently and durably. Slavoj Zizek makes a similar point when he states that "Nature does not exist"! (ZIZEK, (1992) 2002). His Lacanian perspective insists on the difference "between [a] series of ordinary signifiers and the central element which has to remain empty in order to serve as the underlying organizing principle of the series" (ZIZEK, 2000: 52). Nature constitutes exactly such central (empty or floating) element whose meaning can be gleaned only by relating it to other more directly recognizable signifiers. Nature becomes a symbolic tapestry, a montage, of meaning, held together with quilting points. For example, "biodiversity", "eco-cities", "CO2", or "climate change" can be thought of as quilting points (or points de capiton) through which a certain matrix of meanings of Nature is articulated. These quilting points are also more than mere anchoring points; they refer to a beyond of meaning, a certain enjoyment that becomes structured in fantasy (in this case, the desire for an environmentally balanced and socially harmonious order)2. In other words, there is always a remainder or excess that evades symbolization.

Second, Morton argues, Nature has "the force of law, a norm against which deviation is measured" (MORTON, 2007: 14), for example when Nature is summoned to normalize heterosexuality and to think queerness as deviant and unnatural or to see competition between humans as natural and altruism as a produce of "culture" (or vice versa), or when a particular climatic condition is normatively posited as ideal. Normative power inscribed in Nature is invoked as an organizing principle that is transcendental and universal, allegedly residing outside the remit allocated to humans and non-humans alike but that exercises an inescapable performative effect and leaves a non alienable imprint. This is a view that sees Nature as something given, as a solid foundational (or ontological) basis from which we act and that can be invoked to provide an anchor for ethical or normative judgments of ecological, social, cultural, political, or economic procedures and practices. Consider for example how the vision of a stable climate is elevated to a "public good", both by the British parliament and by the UNHCHR: "[T]he delivery of a stable climate, as an essential public good, is an immediate security, prosperity and moral imperative, not simply a long-term environmental challenge."3

And, third, Nature contains a plurality of fantasies and desires, like, for example, the dream of a sustainable nature, a balanced climate, the desire for love-making on a warm beach under the setting sun, the fear for the revenge of Nature if we keep pumping CO2 into the atmosphere. Nature is invoked here as the stand-in for other, often repressed or invisible, longings and passions - the Lacanian object petit around which we shape our drives and that covers up for the lack of ground on which to base our subjectivity (ZIZEK, 1999). It is the sort of fantasy displayed in calls for restoring a true (original but presumably presently lost) humane harmony by retro-fitting the world to ecological balance and in the longing for a Nature that functions as the big "Other", the one that suggests the pathway to redeem our predicament. Here, Nature is invoked as the "external" terrain that offers the promise, if attended to properly, for finding a truly harmonious life4, but also from which threat of disaster emanates if we perturb its internal functioning.

In sum, these three uses of Nature imply simultaneously an attempt to fixate its unstable meaning while being presented as a fetishized "Other" that reflects or, at least, functions as a symptom through which our displaced deepest fears and longings are expressed. As such, the concept of Nature becomes ideology par excellence and functions ideologically, and by that I mean that it forecloses thought, disavows the inherent slippery of the concept and ignores the multiplicities, inconsistencies, and incoherencies inscribed in its symbolization (MORTON, 2007: 24). For Slavoj Zizek, any attempt to suture the meaning of empty signifiers is a decidedly political gesture. The disavowal or the refusal to recognize the political character of such gestures, the attempts to universalize and suture the situated and positioned meanings inscribed metonymically in Nature lead to perverse forms of de-politicization, to rendering Nature politically mute and socially neutral (SWYNGEDOUW, 2007). The disavowal of the empty core of Nature by colonizing its meaning, by filling out the void, staining it with inserted meanings that are subsequently generalized and homogenized, is the gesture par excellence of de-politicization, of placing Nature outside the political, that is outside the field of public dispute, contestation, and disagreement. In addition, such symbolizations of Nature disavow the Real of natures, the heterogeneous, unpredictable, occasionally catastrophic, acting out of socio-ecological processes that mark the Anthropocene. It is these un-symbolized natures that haunt in their excessive acting: droughts, hurricanes, tsunamis, oil-spills, recombinant DNA, floods, globalizing diseases, disintegrating polar ice are a few of the more evocative markers of such socio-natural processes.

this romanticist ideology of ecology as a pristine pre-social Nature creates a withdrawal that leads to catastrophic imbalance that threatens existance

Zizek 07

Slavoj Zizek, Director of the Birkbeck Institute, November 26, 2007 "Censorship Today: Violence, or Ecology as a New Opium for the Masses" http://www.lacan.com/zizecology1.htm

No wonder, then, that the by far predominant version of ecology is the ecology of fear, fear of a catastrophe - human-made or natural - that may deeply perturb, destroy even, the human civilization, fear that pushes us to plan measures that would protect our safety. This ecology of fear has all the chances of developing into the predominant form of ideology of global capitalism, a new opium for the masses replacing the declining religion: it takes over the old religion's fundamental function, that of putting on an unquestionable authority which can impose limits. The lesson this ecology is constantly hammering is our finitude: we are not Cartesian subjects extracted from reality, we are finite beings embedded in a bio-sphere which vastly transgresses our horizon. In our exploitation of natural resources, we are borrowing from the future, so one should treat our Earth with respect, as something ultimately Sacred, something that should not be unveiled totally, that should and will forever remain a Mystery, a power we should trust, not dominate. While we cannot gain full mastery over our bio-sphere, it is unfortunately in our power to derail it, to disturb its balance so that it will run amok, swiping us away in the process. This is why, although ecologists are all the time demanding that we change radically our way of life, underlying this demand is its opposite, a deep distrust of change, of development, of progress: every radical change can have the unintended consequence of triggering a catastrophe.

It is this distrust which makes ecology the ideal candidate for hegemonic ideology, since it echoes the anti-totalitarian post-political distrust of large collective acts. This distrust unites religious leaders and environmentalists - for both, there is something of a transgression, of entering a prohibited domain, in this idea of creating a new form of life from scratch, from the zero-point. And this brings us back to the notion of ecology as the new opium for the masses; the underlying message is again a deeply conservative one - any change can only be the change for the worst - here is a nice quote from the TIME magazine on this topic:

Behind much of the resistance to the notion of synthetic life is the intuition that nature (or God) created the best of possible worlds. Charles Darwin believed that the myriad designs of nature's creations are perfectly honed to do whatever they are meant to do - be it animals that see, hear, sing, swim or fly, or plants that feed on the sun's rays, exuding bright floral colours to attract pollinators.

This reference to Darwin is deeply misleading: the ultimate lesson of Darwinism is the exact opposite, namely that nature tinkers and improvises, with great losses and catastrophes accompanying every limited success - is the fact that 90 percent of the human genome is 'junk DNA' with no clear function not the ultimate proof of it? Consequently, the first lesson to be drawn is the one repeatedly made by Stephen Jay Gould: the utter contingency of our existence. There is no Evolution: catastrophes, broken equilibriums, are part of natural history; at numerous points in the past, life could have turned into an entirely different direction. The main source of our energy (oil) is the result of a past catastrophe of unimaginable dimensions. One should thus learn to accept the utter groundlessness of our existence: there is no firm foundation, a place of retreat, on which one can safely count. "Nature doesn't exist": "nature" qua the domain of balanced reproduction, of organic deployment into which humanity intervenes with its hubris, brutally throwing off the rails its circular motion, is man's fantasy; nature is already in itself "second nature," its balance is always secondary, an attempt to negotiate a "habit" that would restore some order after catastrophic interruptions.

With regard to this inherent instability of nature, the most consequent was the proposal of a German ecological scientist back in 1970s: since nature is changing constantly and the conditions on Earth will render the survival of humanity impossible in a couple of centuries, the collective goal of humanity should be not to adapt itself to nature, but to intervene into the Earth ecology even more forcefully with the aim to freeze the Earth's change, so that its ecology will remain basically the same, thus enabling humanity's survival. This extreme proposal renders visible the truth of ecology.

The lesson to be fully endorsed is thus that of another environmental scientist who came to the result that, while one cannot be sure what the ultimate result of humanity's interventions into geo-sphere will be, one thing is sure: if humanity were to stop abruptly its immense industrial activity and let nature on Earth take its balanced course, the result would have been a total breakdown, an imaginable catastrophe. "Nature" on Earth is already to such an extent "adapted" to human interventions, the human "pollutions" are already to such an extent included into the shaky and fragile balance of the "natural" reproduction on Earth, that its cessation would cause a catastrophic imbalance. This is what it means that humanity has nowhere to retreat: not only "there is no big Other" (self-contained symbolic order as the ultimate guarantee of Meaning); there is also no Nature qua balanced order of self-reproduction whose homeostasis is disturbed, thrown off the rails, by the imbalanced human interventions. Indeed, what we need is ecology without nature: the ultimate obstacle to protecting nature is the very notion of nature we rely on.

Alan Weisman's The World Without Us is a vision of what would have happened if humanity (and ONLY humanity) were suddenly to disappear from the earth - natural diversity blooming again, nature gradually regaining human artefacts. We, humans, are reduced to a pure disembodied gaze observing our own absence. (As Lacan pointed out, this is the fundamental subjective position of fantasy: to be reduced to a, the gaze which observes the world in the condition of the subject's non-existence - like the fantasy of witnessing the act of one's own conception, the parental copulation, or the act of witnessing one's own burial, like Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn. A jealous child likes to indulge in the fantasy of imagining how his parents would react to his own death, putting at stake his own absence.) "The world without us" is thus fantasy at its purest: witnessing the Earth itself retaining its pre-castrated state of innocence, before we humans spoiled it with our hubris. The irony is that the most prominent example comes from the catastrophe of Chernobyl: the exuberant nature taking over the disintegrating debris of the nearby city Pripyat which was abandoned, left the way it was.

The alternative is to accept the political variability of natures - this is so radical that no permutation can solve

Erik **Swyngedouw**, Geography, School of Environment and Development, University of Manchester A. Lewis Building, July/Dec. 20**11** "Whose environment? The end of nature, climate change and the process of post-politicization" Ambient. soc. vol.14 no.2 Campinas

6. Conclusion: From Environmentalizing Politics to Politicizing the Environment

Taking the environmental and climatic catastrophe seriously requires exploding the infernal process of de-politicization marked by the dominance of empty signifiers like Nature, and urges us to re-think the political again. The claim made above to abandon Nature in no way suggests ignoring, let alone forgetting, the Real of natures or, more precisely, the diverse, multiple, whimsical, contingent and often unpredictable socio-ecological relations of which we are part. Rather, there is an urgent need to question legitimizing all manner of socio-environmental politics, policies and interventions in the name of a thoroughly imagined and symbolised Nature or Sustainability, a procedure that necessarily forecloses a properly political frame through which such imaginaries become constituted and hegemonised, one that disavows the constitutive split of the people by erasing the spaces of agnostic encounter. The above re-conceptualisation urges us to accept the extraordinary variability of natures, insists on the need to make 'a wager' on natures, forces to chose politically between this rather than that nature, invites us to plunge in the relatively unknown, expect the unexpected, accept that not all there is can be known, and, most importantly, fully endorse the violent moment that is inscribed in any concrete socio-environmental intervention.

Indeed, the ultimate aim of political intervention is to change the given socio-environmental ordering in a certain manner. Like any intervention, this is a violent act, erases at least partly what is there in order to erect something new and different. Consider, for example, the extraordinary effect the eradication of the HIV virus would have on sustaining livelihoods (or should we preserve/protect the virus in the name of biodiversity?). Proper political interventions are irredeemably violent engagements that re-choreograph socio-natural relations and assemblages, both distant and nearby; that always split the consensus and produce in-egalitarian outcomes. Engaging with natures, intervening in socio-natural orders, of course, constitutes a political act par excellence, one that can be legitimised only in political terms, and not - as is customarily done - through an externalised legitimation that resides in a fantasy of Nature. Any political act is one that re-orders socio-ecological co-ordinates and patterns, reconfigures uneven socio-ecological relations, often with unforeseen or unforeseeable, consequences. Such interventions signal a totalitarian moment, the temporary suspension of the democratic, understood as the presumed equality of all and everyone qua speaking beings in a space that permits and nurtures dissensus. The dialectic between the democratic as a political given and the totalitarian moment of policy intervention as the suspension of the democratic needs to be radically endorsed. While the democratic political, founded on a presumption of equality, insists on difference, disagreement, radical openness, and exploring multiple possible futures, concrete environmental intervention is necessarily about closure, definitive choice, a singular intervention and, thus, certain exclusion and silencing. The democratic political process dwells, therefore, in two spheres simultaneously. Jacques Rancière (RANCIÈRE, 1995; MARCHART, 2007) define these spheres respectively as 'the political' and 'the police' (the policy order). The (democratic) political is the space for the enunciation and affirmation of difference, for the cultivation of dissensus and disagreement, for asserting the presumption of equality of all and everyone in the face of the inegalitarian function of the polic(y)e order. Any policy intervention, when becoming concretely geographical or ecological, is of necessity a violent act of foreclosure of the democratic political (at least temporarily), of taking one option rather than another, of producing one sort of environment, of assembling certain socio-natural relations, of foregrounding some natures rather than others, of hegemonizing a particular metonymic chain rather than another. And the legitimation of such options cannot be based on corralling Nature into legitimizing service. The production of socio-environmental arrangements implies fundamentally political questions, and has to be addressed and legitimized in political terms. Politicizing environments democratically, then, become an issue of enhancing the democratic political content of socio-environmental construction by means of identifying the strategies through which a more equitable distribution of social power and a more egalitarian mode of producing natures can be achieved. This requires reclaiming proper democracy and proper democratic public spaces (as spaces for the enunciation of agonistic dispute) as a foundation for and condition of possibility for more egalitarian socio-ecological arrangements, the naming of positively embodied ega-libertarian socio-ecological futures that are immediately realisable. In other words, egalitarian ecologies are about demanding the impossible and realising the improbable, and this is exactly the challenge the Anthropocene poses. In sum, the politicization of the environment is predicated upon the recognition of the indeterminacy of nature, the constitutive split of the people, the unconditional democratic demand of political equality, and the real possibility for the inauguration of different possible public socio-ecological futures that express the democratic presumptions of freedom and equality.
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#### Energy metaphors look like science but aren’t – they’re the ILLUSION of explanation
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Without knowing exactly what the metaphor1 of Freud’s cathectic-theoretical statements stands for so that ‘‘in consequence admitted metaphors such as ‘energy’ . . . have no specific content and can be filled to suit one’s fancy’’ (Nagel, 1959, p. 41) his formulations present unresolved riddles. Unresolved riddles do not solve problems, but as Kubie (1947), S. 511) states, the metaphor of ‘‘quantitative variations gives us a feeling of scientific maturity.’’ This feeling, however, is ‘‘in fact . . . premature and illusory’’ (1947, S. 511) because the ‘‘energy-distribution model,’’ as Habermas (1968/ 1972, p. 253) correctly argues, ‘‘only creates the semblance that psychoanalytic statements are about measurable transformations of energy,’’ and that they ‘‘imply observability of the events they are about. But these events are never observed\*nor can they be observed.’’ Although economic-energetic statements cannot explain any of this, being metaphorical and tautological in nature, some authors are in favour of holding onto the energetic-economic model, their main arguments being as follows: . One day in the future, psychical energy will be measurable. . At some point in the future, the model will allow a connection with other sciences, especially neurophysiological science. . We are in need of this model to provide order and to systematise clinical data. . It is leading to new insights. The first two arguments are contradicted by the fact that energy distributions can never be measured by the language-bound psychoanalytic method, and that a metaphorical model never can substitute for a metatheory. It is only via such a metatheory that insights into the same object from different science disciplines could be adequately mediated. The reasoning in the third argument overlooks the fact that a metaphorical ordering and systematization of clinical data can only yield apparent knowledge of that data’s interrelations, and in reality this is as remote from their real interrelations as, for instance, the anger of gods is remote from the conditions of lightning in a thunderstorm. Therefore, metaphors cannot provide us with new insights and can only offer us other metaphors. Furthermore, if we content ourselves with these metaphors as explanations, we have not only satisfied ourselves with a false understanding, but also become blind to the real problems and the need for explanations that are more pertinent to the issues.

#### Misapplications of energy metaphors are the worst form of scientism

Clarke 1

Energy Forms:

Allegory and Science in the Era of Classical Thermodynamics

Bruce Clarke is Professor of Literature and Science at Texas Tech University

Scientism has formerly been conceptualized according to what Bruno Latour calls the diffusion model of the sociological field. In this model, science is privileged over other discourses as a ground of epistemological origin and sealed off from the irrationality of the rest of culture. On the diffusion model, scienrism is an epiphenomenon of real science, the relatively irrational social excess of scientific production. The diffusion model enforces a regime of sociological separatism; it produces an erroneous "belief in the existence of a society separated from technoscience.\*\*1 This diffusionist model of scientism is itself a relic of the social sciences\* own scientists bid for intellectual authority, lain Cameron and David O. Edge's classic exposition of scientism operates within the diffusionist framework, in which all scientistic commerce is conceived as a one-way outflow from a privileged scientific source: "Scientism is present where people draw on widely shared images and notions about the scientific community and its beliefs and practices in order to add weight to arguments they are advancing, or to practices they are promoting. . . . Those who use scientistic language acknowledge and respect the authority of the scientific community, and wish to capitalize on that authority.... In so doing, they reinforce and consolidate that authority.\*\*2 From this perspective, the modern proliferation of physical, biological, and mathematical scicntisms is seen as a relatively vitiated part of the cultural interaction among well-demarcated disciplinary realms of science, technology, and society. Diffusionist scientisms are illegitimate offspring of science that cobble to a extrascientific object the cultural aura of science's own epistemological prestige, typically by an extension of scientific terminology, imagery, and/or methodology. This adaptation can be deliberate or unwitting, earnest or satirical. It can be more or less successful as an intellectual or a social gambit. But irrespective of its discursive success or failure, scientism on the diffusion model is a sloppy affair, the random "spillover" of science into society, an inappropriate and at worst abusive extension of scientific terms or practices. For instance, the pioneering sociologist Max Weber "criticized positivism and scientific naturalism, singling out the social energeticists—Ernest Solvay and Wilhclm Ostwald—for their 'umstiilpung,' or spillover, of the 'world picture' of scientific disciplines into the 'worldviews' of the social sciences, where they ought not have a place."5 On the diffusion model, such extensions of scientific concepts are illicit displacements of authority from science to nonscientific matters, a transfer, sometimes a plunder, of science's social prestige. Scientisms are aberrant discourses circulating through social channels free of scientific control yet demanding some level of literal credence for what are at best overworked figurative conceptions. These abuses bottom out in "pseudoscience"—bogus representations or active misuses of scientific ideas. In sum, as a repository for derivative and deformed conceptions scientism has typically been a term of bad intellectual repute.

#### Energy transfer into the social order was the height of scientific determinism

Clarke 1
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. The mode! of energy presented by this vision of universal heat death is perhaps the supreme expression of the Victorian allegory of thermodynamics. The North British scientists of energy fashioned an influential discourse of thermodynamic scientism that infused physical concepts—energy, dissipation, and equilibration—with moral contents— life, sin, and death.20 Early moralizations of thermodynamics were also part of the nineteenthcentury vogue for global continuities—a conceptual conviction that greatly aided the formation of vigorous scientisms. The ontological gaps between physical and moral laws, material and cultural effects, were cither dismissed or finessed through crude or refined forms of dialectical resolution.21 Smith notes that for Maxwell and Thomson, "dissipation of energy . . . linked together the natural and moral orders."22 In 1868 their colleagues Balfour Stewart and Norman I.ockyer penned an article, "The Place of Life in a Universe of Energy," that offered a similar dose of energy theology, collapsing the physical and the social and placing cosmic as well as personal redemption in the hands of God: "As in the social world a man may degrade his energy, so in the physical world energy may be degraded; in both worlds, when degradation is once accomplished, a complete recovery would appear to be impossible, unless energy of a superior form be communicated from without."23

#### Scientism leads to extinction and displaces crucial ACTUAL science

Hedge 6

Belle M Hegde The Middlesex Hospital Medical School, University of London, UK Northern Colorado University, USA, Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, Shimla, India MAHE University, Manipal, India <http://www.kma.org.kw/KMJ/Issues/des2006/PDF-Dec-06/Editorial%20Article/78-05%20Science%20Vs%20Scientism.pdf>

Scientism, on the contrary, is like a powerful religion that tries to influence people’s understanding of this Universe in the accepted norms. Any attempt to show evidence to the contrary is being hushed up with all the might at their command. Scientism was helped by the early successes of technology based on the present scientific paradigm. Society venerates science for the simple reason that we have the telephone, electricity, easy transportation, satellites, space ships, nuclear war heads and the computers *et cetera*, thanks to the conventional scientific paradigm. In addition, there is this big money business in scientific technology. Powerful countries are sold to scientism because they have been able to build destructive weapons, thanks to scientism. These weapons give the countries enormous powers to dominate the world. The lure of medals and prizes and the large amount of money involved in some of the prizes like the Nobel have even made people fake re s e a rc h findings or plagiarize them from others without acknowledging the original source[2]. That is how science got a clean chit from society. Let us examine the present strong pillars of science to see how strong and solid they are. The Big Bang, origin and evolution of the human species, the relativity theory and, quantum mechanics are those four pillars[3]. Reductionism and statistics are the pillars of medical science and biology[4]. Darwin’s theory of evolution is found wanting in many areas. *Evolution inside a species is different from evolution of a new species; a bird from a fish, for example*. The latter needs thousands of biochemical reactions that individually will have no *survival advantage* when the ultimate new species arrives by accident[5]. The efforts by Richard Dawkins to sell Darwinism to the public are not very scientific either. One example of the very complicated eye developing from a small depression in the earlier species looks rather too simplistic[6]. The relativity theory, first developed by a German physicist, Lorenz along with the French mathematician, Poincare, had a significant contribution also from the famous Irish mathematician, Fitzgerald[7]. Albert Einstein, the deified guru of physics, had very little to do with it. Einstein, however, had contributed immensely to Brownian movement, photoelectric effect and movement of ions in solutions[8]. Einstein giving away his Nobel Prize money to his first wife, whom he had divorced by then, gives credence to the view, held by some close confidents, that the original Nobel paper of Einstein did have his wife’s name as the first author, which must have disappeared later[9]. Be that as it may, the question raised by Professor Dingle of the London University about the theory remains unanswered so far[ 1 0 ]. The assumption in the theory that there is same velocity of light independent of the direction of measurement with respect to the motion of the earth has recently been found to be inconsistent[11]. The jewel in the crown of physics, the quantum theory, does not seem to have much connection to reality. We still do not have answers to questions like a) what is a wave function, b) In the Schrödinger’s equation what are the waves “of” and what are the waves “in”, and third c) what is an electron[12]. The basic problem in the theory of evolution would be, if we accept that there is no design and t h e re is no t e l e o l o g y as sold by the scientific establishment, to explain the prior existence of the DNA! The accepted laws of chemistry need chance collisions between simpler constituents[13]. Darwin’s book Descent of Man makes it mandatory for us to discount any design. Dawkin’s book The Blind Watchmaker makes an effort to whitewash these questions![14] Lamarck must have had his last laugh in his grave when he came to know that rats developed diabetes following destruction of their pancreas by drugs: they then passed the disease on to their offsprings - evolution through inheritance of acquired characteristics - Lamarckism[15]. One would benefit a lot by understanding the word Entelechy - spontaneous development of order, as opposed to entropy - disorder, first coined by the German biologist, Driesch (1867-1941)[16]. NASA claims that there is no life anywhere outside the Earth, but they could not discount bacterial life deep down the surface of Mars. There are some indicators to that possibility in the recent works. Mathematics, the foundation of all sciences, including the King of sciences, physics, cannot explain many of our experiences in life. Let me quote Albert Einstein himself here: “Insofar as the propositions of mathematics give an account of reality, they are not certain; and insofar as they are certain, they do not describe reality”[17]. If there is no d e s i g n , how could a high school student, Ramanujam, write down large number of new and original theorems, some of which he could prove but, some others he simply stated as true, and were later proved by other mathematicians at the Cambridge University?[18]. The remarkable picture of that gigantic explosion, the Big Bang that began the Universe: the latter expanding ever since, is understood even by a school boy/girl. What happened before the Big Bang?[19]. Maddox, the then editor of Nature, in 1989 did write that Big Bang theory would be forgotten by 2000 AD. Edwin Hubble did put forward arguments against the theory but the big one bangs on![20]. The Tired Light hypothesis shows that the Universe is not expanding. All that we can say about the universe today is that it is very, very old. The million dollar question as to how the world began remains unanswered![21]. Big bang and the Black holes make good material for lay books that are sold like hot cakes and make their authors very rich, but most of that stuff is still in the realm of science fiction![22, 23]. Science deals with our five senses only. What the senses cannot measure and observe does not make science in the present paradigm. However, the observers’ consciousness impinges on the findings. An electron is what it is depending on who looks at it! When no one is looking at the electron, no one knows what the electron does![24, 25]. There are a lot of things in this universe that our five senses cannot realize and they exist all the same. Science does accept that what is known today could be proven wrong or replaced by a new theory tomorrow, but to say that what we don’t know today (or what does not fit into the present paradigm) is unscientific is illogical. But that is exactly what scientism is trying to do. To give a few day-to-day examples: we are not able to measure our thoughts, our emotions, and many of our actions based on those emotions and thoughts. Do they, then, fall out side the realm of science? Do thoughts exist? Do emotions have any role in human physiology?[26]. If the answer is yes, then we need a change of paradigm in science, at least in medical science, where the RCTs (randomized controlled studies) have been sold as the last word in medical re s e a rch. The truth is that there is everything wrong with this approach. No two human beings could be compared based on a few of their phenotypical features. The results are there for all to see. Most, if not all, RCTs have given unre l i a b l e results in the long run. But look at the following in the encyclopedia of RCTs published by the establishment! “A major difficulty in dealing with trial results comes from commercial, political and/or academic pressure. Most trials are expensive to run, and will be the result of significant previous research, which is itself not cheap. There may be a political issue at stake (cf. MMR vaccine) or vested interests (cf. homoeopathy). In such cases there is great pressure to interpret results in a way which suits the viewer, and great care must be taken by researchers to maintain emphasis on clinical facts. Most studies start with a ‘null hypothesis’ which is being tested (usually along the lines of ‘Our new treatment x cures as many patients as existing t reatment y’) and an alternative hypothesis (‘x cures more patients than y’). The analysis at the end will give a statistical likelihood, based on the facts, of whether the null hypothesis can be safely rejected (saying that the new treatment does, in fact, result in more cures). **Nevertheless this is only a statistical likelihood, so false negatives and false positives are possible**. These are generally set at an acceptable level (e.g., 1% chance that it was a false result). However, this risk is cumulative. **There is a tendency for these two to be seized on by those who need that proof for their point of view**.”[27]. Before we do more damage to mankind by blindly following the reductionist paradigm, at least in medical sciences, let us think of a new paradigm. Let research be directed to find out the myths and dogmas in the present paradigm and to replace them with newer ideas and findings that might make life easier for mankind. Of course, it might destroy our “rice bowl” for the moment, but we might get a bigger bowl in future. Scientific temper should make us identify the false dogmas and enable us to destroy them. Science is change and what does not change is not science. Professor John O’M Bockris so beautifully describes the new paradigm shift that is needed in science in his classic *The New Paradigm*[3]. What does not change becomes religion. That is why I sometimes feel, that scientism is a kind of religion we are made to follow blindly. Present science is excited about nanobots but does not bother about our giga problems like e n v i ronmental pollution, abject poverty of the majority, preventable illnesses which kill the poor and unemployment of the majority! It is preposterous that medical science does not worry about health promotion, while it goes overboard about disease interventions, many of which make the patient worse! Sir William Osler had warned us not to intervene when the patient is doing *well*, but that is exactly what we do today! Medicine does not believe in the wellness concept. Everyone is ill unless proved otherwise is the p resent paradigm, thanks to the total body scanners. Routine check up is the biggest medical industry, while we know that predicting the future is impossible in a dynamic human system using a few data of the initial state. Even changing those parameters might not hold good as time evolves[28]. Changing those parameters might even harm patients in the long run, while it is mandatory to do so, if the patient is syptomatic and is suffering, because doctors are here to “*cure rarely, comfort mostly but to console always*.” The effort here is not to belittle the *great* strides science has made in the last two centuries. The stress here is to let the reader know that there is so much noise in this area that almost drowns the signal! Unless we silence those noises and try to pick the signals, science will not progress and mankind will still be in the dark[29, 30]. Even if one person is stimulated to think on those lines, the purpose of writing this will have been achieved, despite the fact that 99% of the readers would be angry or unhappy about the contents. Conventional journals would hesitate to publish this piece for obvious reasons - their peer reviewers will not permit it and the editors dare not take the re s p o n s i b i l i t y themselves!

# Case

## 1NC biopower

Democratic states won’t cross the threshold to mass murder

Dickinson 4 (Edward Ross, Univ of Cincinnati, Central European History Vol 37 No 1)

And it is, of course, embedded in a broader discursive complex (institutions, professions, fields of social, medical, and psychological expertise) that pursues these same aims in often even more effective and inescapable ways.89 In short, the continuities between early twentieth-century biopolitical discourse and the practices of the welfare state in our own time are unmistakable.

Both are instances of the “disciplinary society” and of biopolitical, regulatory, social-engineering modernity, and they share that genealogy with more authoritarian states, including the National Socialist state, but also fascist Italy, for example. And it is certainly fruitful to view them from this very broad perspective. But that analysis can easily become superficial and misleading, because it obfuscates the profoundly different strategic and local dynamics of power in the two kinds of regimes. Clearly the democratic welfare state is not only formally but also substantively quite different from totalitarianism. Above all, again, it has nowhere developed the fateful, radicalizing dynamic that characterized National Socialism (or for that matter Stalinism), the psychotic logic that leads from economistic population management to mass murder. Again, there is always the potential for such a discursive regime to generate coercive policies.

In those cases in which the regime of rights does not successfully produce “health,” such a system can —and historically does— create compulsory programs to enforce it. But again, there are political and policy potentials and constraints in such a structuring of biopolitics that are very different from those of National Socialist Germany. Democratic biopolitical regimes require, enable, and incite a degree of self-direction and participation that is functionally incompatible with authoritarian or totalitarian structures. And this pursuit of biopolitical ends through a regime of democratic citizenship does appear, historically, to have imposed increasingly narrow limits on coercive policies, and to have generated a “logic” or imperative of increasing liberalization. Despite limitations imposed by political context and the slow pace of discursive change, I think this is the unmistakable message of the really very impressive waves of legislative and welfare reforms in the 1920s or the 1970s in Germany.90

Of course it is not yet clear whether this is an irreversible dynamic of such systems. Nevertheless, such regimes are characterized by sufficient degrees of autonomy (and of the potential for its expansion) for sufficient numbers of people that I think it becomes useful to conceive of them as productive of a strategic configuration of power relations that might fruitfully be analyzed as a condition of “liberty,” just as much as they are productive of constraint, oppression, or manipulation. At the very least, totalitarianism cannot be the sole orientation point for our understanding of biopolitics, the only end point of the logic of social engineering.

This notion is not at all at odds with the core of Foucauldian (and Peukertian) theory. Democratic welfare states are regimes of power/knowledge no less than early twentieth-century totalitarian states; these systems are not “opposites,” in the sense that they are two alternative ways of organizing the same thing. But they are two very different ways of organizing it. The concept “power” should not be read as a universal stifling night of oppression, manipulation, and entrapment, in which all political and social orders are grey, are essentially or effectively “the same.” Power is a set of social relations, in which individuals and groups have varying degrees of autonomy and effective subjectivity. And discourse is, as Foucault argued, “tactically polyvalent.” Discursive elements (like the various elements of biopolitics) can be combined in different ways to form parts of quite different strategies (like totalitarianism or the democratic welfare state); they cannot be assigned to one place in a structure, but rather circulate. The varying possible constellations of power in modern societies create “multiple modernities,” modern societies with quite radically differing potentials.91

#### Biopower operates to sustain life, not kill it –rejecting it risks creating more atrocities

**Ojakangas**, 20**05** - PhD in Social Science and Academy research fellow @ the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies at the University of Helsinki [Mika, “The Impossible Dialogue on Biopower: Foucault and Agamben,” May 2005, Foucault Studies, No. 2, http://wlt-studies.com/no2/ojakangas1.pdf]

In fact, the history of modern Western societies would be quite incomprehensible without taking into account that there exists a form of power which refrains from killing but which nevertheless is capable of directing people’s lives. The effectiveness of bio‐power can be seen lying precisely in that it refrains and withdraws before every demand of killing, even though these demands would derive from the demand of justice. In bio‐ political societies, according to Foucault, capital punishment could not be maintained except by invoking less the enormity of the crime itself than the monstrosity of the criminal: “One had the right to kill those who represented a kind of biological danger to others.”112 However, given that the “right to kill” is precisely a sovereign right, it can be argued that the bio‐political societies analyzed by Foucault were not entirely bio‐political. Perhaps, there neither has been nor can be a society that is entirely bio‐political. Nevertheless, the fact is that present‐day European societies have abolished capital punishment. In them, there are no longer exceptions. It is **the very “right to kill”** that **has been called into question.** However, it is not called into question because of enlightened moral sentiments, but rather because of the deployment of bio‐political thinking and practice. For all these reasons, Agamben’s thesis, according to which the concentration camp is the fundamental bio‐political paradigm of the West, has to be corrected.113 The bio‐political paradigm of the West is not the concentration camp, but, rather, the present‐day welfare society and, instead of homo sacer, the paradigmatic figure of the bio‐political society can be seen, for example, in the middle‐class Swedish social‐democrat. Although this figure is an object – and a product – of the huge bio‐political machinery, it does not mean that he is permitted to kill without committing homicide. Actually, the fact that he eventually dies, seems to be his greatest “crime” against the machinery. (In bio‐political societies, death is not only “something to be hidden away,” but, also, as Foucault stresses, the most “shameful thing of all”.114) Therefore, he is not exposed to an unconditional threat of death, but rather to an unconditional retreat of all dying. In fact, the bio‐political machinery does not want to threaten him, but to encourage him, with all its material and spiritual capacities, to live healthily, to live long and to live happily – even when, in biological terms, he “should have been dead long ago”.115 This is because bio‐power is not bloody power over bare life for its own sake but pure power over all life for the sake of the living. It is not power but the living, the condition of all life – individual as well as collective – that is the measure of the success of bio‐power. Another important question is whether these bio‐political societies that started to take shape in the seventeenth century (but did not crystallize until the 1980s) are ideologically, especially at the level of practical politics, collapsing – to say nothing about the value of the would‐be collapse. One thing is clear, however. At the global level, there has not been, and likely will not be, a completely bio‐political society. And to the extent that globalization takes place **without** bio‐political considerations of health and happiness of individuals and populations, as it has done until now, it is possible that our entire existence will someday be reduced to bare life, as has already occurred, for instance, in Chechnya and Iraq. On that day, perhaps, when bio‐political care has ceased to exist, and we all live within the sovereign ban of Empire without significance, we can only save ourselves, as Agamben suggests, “in perpetual flight or a foreign land”116 – although there will hardly be either places to which to flee, or foreign lands.

#### Foucault’s theory of power is insufficient to explains how resistance occurs on a micro-level

BARKER 1996

(Stephen, Professor and Head of Doctoral Studies at The Claire Trevor School of the Arts, UC Irvine, “Signs of change: premodern, modern, postmodern,” Google Books, pg. 64-65)

From Deleuze and Guattari’s point of view, Baudrillard’s theory fails to account for the appearance or intervention of singularities, andonly allows the infinite replication of simulacra according to the exigencies of the code in an airless, hyperreal universe. In such a space all forms of political or critical resistance are out-of-date and short-circuited in advance precisely because they presuppose a scene of dramatic struggle and confrontation where now there is only obscene transparency. From Baudrillard’s point of view, Deleuze and Guattari’s theory is problematic for the same reason as Michele Foucault’s: whether it is the micro-politics of power (Foucault) or desire (Deleuze-Gauattari), what is unquestioned in both cases is the reality of this ultimate referent. For Baudrillard, then, concepts like power and desire, even when redefined to operate at the micro-cellular level of networks, grids, and assemblages, do not engage the current system in its essential functioning. By defining power as a relationship of forces manifest in and through institutional discourses, practices, and strategies, Foucault misses the scene of power’s most efficacious effects: in media signs and simulations, in their effect as seduction. Since in our society power and desire operate primarily through signs of power and desire, the referential finality or ultimate reality of what these signs point to can no longer be simply assumed. Finally, Baudrillard insists on a contradiction in Foucault’s and Deleuze-Guattari’s theories of “molecular” power and desire. In both, power or the law is geared down or miniaturized to a “microphysical” level, where is suddenly and unaccountably becomes “resistance” in Foucault and “revolutionary desire” in Deleuze and Guattari. In both cases Baudrillard senses a “complicity with cybernetics” and remains suspicious of a theory that would find freedom and resistance (“the molecular revolution”) in a space that the cyberneticists describe precisely as a matrix of coding and control.

The social is always-already permeated by race – the 1AC’s presumption of neutral return to nature obfuscates the position of the Slave – turns the case

**Wilderson ’10** (Frank III, Associate Professor at UC Irvine, PhD from UC Berkeley, Red, White, and Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms, Duke University Press, PV)

The Indian is not the pure embodiment of thanatology in either libi-dinal or political economy. Furthermore, the relation of negation between White and Black is absolute in that sentient beings positioned by exploitation and alienation are immune to accumulation and fungibility. For example, it is true that labor power is exploited and that the worker is alienated in it. But workers labor on the commodity, they are not the commodity itself, their labor power is. Tragic as alienation in labor power is, it does not resemble "the peculiar character of violence andthe natal alienation of the slave." "'The slave had no socially recognized existence outside of his master, he became a social nonperson— the definition of the slave, however recruited, (is) a socially dead person. Alienated from all 'rights' or claims of birth, he ceased to belong to his own right to any legitimate social order. All slaves experienced, at the very least, a secular¶ excommunication [The slave is] truly a genealogical isolate. Formally isolated in his social relations with those who live, he also was culturally isolated from the social heritage of his ancestors.He had a past, to be sure. But a past is not a heritage."

The "Savage" on the other hand, though a genocided object, is not "agenealogical isolate" The modality of genocide which positions the "Savage" coexists with the modality of sovereignly which also positions him or her.The genoeided object cannot sustain a heritage; like the accumulated and fungible object it had a past, not a heritage. Sovereignly, on¶ the other hand, rescues the "Savage" from the genealogical isolation of the Slave.Sovereignty has the capacity to embrace the ethical dilemmas of both the "social heritage of . . . ancestors" and "social relations with those who live." Sovereignty, however battered or marginalized, is not a form of "borrowed institutionality." it requires no structural adjustment.¶ Therefore, the relation of negation between Red and White cannot be¶ sustained as an absolute. While White exploitation and alienation can no¶ more secure structural articulation between their modalities and those¶ of Red genocide than they can with accumulation and fungibility, they¶ can (and historically do) secure such articulation with Red sovereignty.This push and pull of positional tension between Settler and "Savage"¶ is as much a marker of modernity as is the slave coffle. From Father Vicente Valverde s late sixteenth-century invocation of papal bulls before¶ Atahualpa, "attempting to convince the Great Inca... that Pope Alexander¶ had the authority to grant dominion over Peru to the Spanish monarchy" and Atahualpa's rejoinder that "he could not conceive how a foreign¶ priest should pretend to dispose of territories which did not belong to¶ him"; to the School of Salamanca's meditations on "Savage" dominium;¶ to the late eighteenth-century tracing of the US. constitution along the¶ contours of Iroquois governance; to the emergence of new formations of¶ engendered White masculinity by way of early nineteenth-century marriages to Choctaw and Cherokee "princesses"; all the way up to Deloria's¶ meditations on the myriad articulations between Indigenous cosmology¶ and the tenets of Jung, modernity is laced with this network of connec¶ tions, transfers, and displacements between the ontological capacity of¶ the "Savage" and the ontological capacity of the Settler. Herein, for most¶ metacommentators on "Savage" ontology there lies the possibility of ascendancy from genocide's ontological isolation.\*' \_ j

But the Slave can hold out no such ascendant hope to the "Savage" To put a finer point on it: What prevents the Indian from slipping into Blackness? Redness regains the coherence that the a priori violence of modernity ripped from her or him by way of its capacity to be free from, or at least partially immune to accumulation and fungibility. Simple enough one has only not to be... Again, the Indian's immunity is not from historical experience—thousands of Indians were enslaved—but rather from accumulation and fungibility as positioning modalities Indians and Whites can be caught in the grip of slavery without transforming and rcracializing the institution itself. But Blackness cannot disentangle itself from slaveness.

The moment in Western history when the recognition of alternative worlds becomes possible—in the Spanish encounter with the Aztecs—is also the moment when humanism achieves hegemony."1' Let us bear in mind a lesson from Antonio Gramsci: Hegemony is not the imposition of decrees. Hegemony is influence, leadership, and consent; it is the influence of a ruling social group, the leadership of ideas, of an ensemble of questions such as "meritocracy" and "individualism"; and it is the subalterns' spontaneous consent to be lead by the ruling group's ensemble of questions. Antonio Gramsci is simply wrong when he asserts, like Marx and Lenin before him and like Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt after him, that relationality between subalterns and rulers who form a historic bloc by way of subaltern consent to the leadership of ruling class questions is an antagonistic relationality. The "Savage'/Settler historic bloc formed by Humanism's hegemony over the "Savage's" "alternative world"" would form the basis of an antagonism if the bloc's capacity were not both barred to and vouchsafed by the Slave. 'The bloc does not recognize the Slave's world as an alternative or competing world because the violence that produces the Slave makes it impossible to think "Slave" and "world" together. As such, the Slave's consent is immaterial to modernity's "Savage"/Human bloc because Slave consent cannot be recognized and incorporated, 'therefore, the moment in Western history in which Humanism becomes hegemonic (and detrimental to the Indian's way of life) is not a moment in which the Slave achieves relationality (even as a subaltern) except in that his or her negativity stands now in relation not only to the Settler/Master, but to the "Savage" as well, and so becomes all the more nonrecuperable and all the more isolated.

This state of affairs is more than a little disturbing, for it suggests that¶ the relativity of the Indian's relative isolation and relative humanity, the¶ push and pull of Indians' positional tension, is imbricated with—if not¶ dependent on—the absolute isolation of the Slave. Central to the trian-¶ gulation of antagonisms is a structural antagonism between the 'Savage"¶ and the Settler, as well as structural solidarity, or capacity for articulation¶ (contlictual harmony) • between the "Savage" and the Master. This soli¶ darity or antagonism totters on that fulcrum called the Slave.

Venture capital shifting to grid modernization now

NBC 12 [Dinah Wisenberg Brin, award-winning writer with a strong background producing financial, healthcare, government news, “Clean Tech Investing Shifts, With Lower-Cost Ventures Gaining Favor” March 1, http://www.cnbc.com/id/46222448/Clean\_Tech\_Investing\_Shifts\_With\_Lower\_Cost\_Ventures\_Gaining\_Favor]

**For many investors, that change means shifting funds from capital-intensive alternative-energy technologies**, such as solar panels, **to lower-cost ventures focused on energy efficiency and “smart grid” technologies** that automate electric utility operations.¶ “We continue to be very optimistic about things like the smart grid and the infusion of information technologies and software services” into old lines like electricity, agriculture and the built environment," says Steve Vassallo, general partner in Foundation Capital. “We’re very bullish on what I would consider the nexus of information technology and clean tech.”¶ Foundation, based in Menlo Park, Calif., reflects this in investments such as Sentient Energy Inc., a smart-grid monitoring company that allows utilities to remotely find power outages, and Silver Spring Networks, which provides utilities a wireless network for advanced metering and remote service connection.¶ Another holding, EnerNOC [ENOC 10.13 -0.22 (-2.13%) ], a demand-response business with technology to turn off noncritical power loads during peak periods, went public in 2007.¶ EMeter, a one-time Foundation investment, was recently acquired by Siemens Industry [SI 93.09 0.23 (+0.25%) ].¶ To be sure, investors have not abandoned costlier technologies with longer-term horizons, but many — put off, in part, by last year’s bankruptcy and shutdown of solar power firm Solyndra — now favor smaller infusions in businesses with a quicker potential payoff.¶ Rob Day, partner in Boston-based Black Coral Capital, says his cleantech investment firm maintains some solar holdings, but he sees a shift from an emphasis on those types of plays to more “intelligence-driven, software-driven, web-driven businesses.” These technologies can be used to improve existing businesses, he says.¶ One Black Coral smart-technology investment is Digital Lumens of Boston, which makes high-efficiency, low-cost LED lighting for warehouses and factories. Software and controls are embedded in the fixtures, which can cut lighting bills by 90 percent, providing customers a two-year payback, says Day. ¶ U.S. venture capital investment in cleantech companies hit $4.9 billion last year, down 4.5 percent in dollar terms but flat in the number of transactions, according to Ernst & Young LLP, which analyzed data from Dow Jones VentureSource. Cleantech companies raised 29 percent more capital last year than in 2009, E&Y said recently.¶ Most of that decline, however, came from less investment in sectors that were once hot.¶ Investment in energy and electric generation, including solar businesses, fell 5 percent to $1.5 billion, while that of industry products and services companies plunged 34 percent to $1 billion, according to E&Y's analysis of equity investments from venture capital firms, corporations and individuals.¶ The energy efficiency category leads the diverse industry in deals with 78 transactions worth $646.9 million. Energy-storage companies raised $932.6 million, a 250 percent increase and 47 percent deal increase.¶

#### Smart Grid Solves Grid Collapse

Barbara Vergetis Lundin, Energy Analyst, 12 [“Could U.S. utilities be the next to say "if only?" FierceSmartGrid, August 6, http://www.fiercesmartgrid.com/story/could-us-utilities-be-next-say-if-only/2012-08-06?page=0,3]

Growing Demands Mean Growing Smart Grid¶ A modern grid is critical in the U.S. and globally. Growing energy issues demand viable solutions even today, as well as the scalability for tomorrow.¶ A 22-year-old native of India (specifically, Jaipur) and graduate of the University of California could have the answer to India's (and the United States') power reliability issues, according to The Times of India.¶ Yashraj Khaitan's philosophy lies at the very heart of the smart grid -- an 'eyes and ears connected to a brain' which monitors consumption, generates a demand-supply response, and eliminates losses.¶ Making its debut two months ago, Khaitan launched Gram Power with the strategy of setting up solar power plants at the village level and linking them to the start-ups' smart grid system.¶ U.S. utilities have what it takes to prevent outages -- with smarter networks, focused maintenance, and a better understanding of and greater load control.¶ Technologies exist today to anticipate and prevent issues before they occur. The reality is that this is not always possible. When unplanned outages do occur, grid outage management systems can reroute power to minimize the outage, analyze needed repairs and dispatch crews more effectively to get the job done faster and more efficiently.¶ The U.S. has traditionally had enough reserve capacity of both transmission and generation to support its needs. Losing sight of looming generation and transmission issues, and neglecting to compensate for retired power plants, could place the U.S. in the same daunting situation as India.¶ "As we ramp down baseload generation and ramp up variable generation the supply situation, at times, will get closer to what India faces on a daily basis," Houseman contends.¶ Smart grid technologies will serve as an increased buffer between supply and demand to minimize some of the issues facing India and, potentially, the United States.
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#### THE STANCE OF MARTYRDOM BEFORE THE LAW IS A NECESSARY CONDITION TO DISRUPT ITS ILLUSION; SHOWING ITS OBSCENE SUPPLEMENT BY JUST LOVING THE TOPIC’S DISCIPLINE UNDERMINES ITS NEUTRALITY
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My research brings together psychoanalysis, critical and political theory, and film, as reflected particularly in my recent work on Slavoj Žižek. I am currently developing a research project which draws on Lacanian epistemology and dialectics to explore the potential foundations of a post-capitalist theory of society. As co-director of the [Žižek Centre for Ideology Critique](http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/euros/research/researchcentres/zizekcentre/index.html), I welcome enquiries and proposals for postgraduate research on Žižek, psychoanalysis, film and critical theory.

My contention is that Pasolini’s masochism targets the structural imbalance of the law as a set of empirical prescriptive measures supplemented by superegoic (sadistic) stimuli. The point not to be missed is that, as Deleuze noted in Coldness and Cruelty, what supremely frustrates the sadistic executioner is the masochistic fervour of his victim: ‘a genuine sadist could never tolerate a masochist victim’.24 The immediate reason for this frustration is that masochism forces the sadist to acknowledge that the object of his desire — the body of the other — is already the object of the other’s desire, and as such it can only function as ‘ersatz enjoyment’. The point, therefore, is that the masochist martyr steals (and stages) the secret jouissance of the law, thus making visible the extent to which the law is enslaved to the lack that pertains to the economy of desire.25 The jouissance of the martyr affirms its speculative identity with the jouissance of the law-enforcing executioner, hence revealing the strict correlation between the neutral but self-affirming character of the law and the groundlessness of desire. From a slightly different angle we could say that the masochist effectively objectifies the law, turning it into an instrument for his own enjoyment — and this being reduced to an object is precisely what frustrates the law, compelling it to expose its obscene libidinal underside. As Lacan puts it at the beginning of Seminar XX, the law basically enjoys.26 If the law, in its deepest connotation, mobilises jouissance, this ultimately means that it is driven by a scandalous, irrational and strictly speaking unlawful will to enjoy. The crucial element that emerges from this picture is the law’s fundamental imbalance: its vulnerability and changeability. Pasolini understands that it is not enough to denounce the existence of, as he often put it, il palazzo (the ‘anarchy of Power’, the shadowy underside of the law); the only way to challenge the functioning of the law is by assuming, in a supreme act of masochistic expenditure, the Real of its obscene jouissance, the vertiginous dimension of enjoyment. We can now see how Pasolini turns around Kant’s claim that the moral law is the measure of the subject’s freedom: it is not that the unbearable pressure of the moral law coincides with disinterestedness and freedom, but that freedom can only be posited as an unbearable pressure to face the empty kernel of the law. The equation between freedom and martyrdom thus targets the tautological foundations of the law: the real scandal is that, as Deleuze put it apropos of Kant’s Critique of Practical Reason, ‘the law [...] is self-grounded and valid solely by virtue of its own form. [...] The object of the law is by definition unknowable and elusive.’ Such a perspective implies the psychoanalytic awareness that ‘the object of the law and the object of desire are one and the same, and remain equally concealed’;27 or, as Lacan put it at the end of Seminar XI, that ‘the moral law [...] is simply desire in its pure state, the very desire that culminates in the sacrifice, strictly speaking, of everything that is the object of love in one’s human tenderness — I would say, not only in the rejection of the pathological object, but also in its sacrifice and murder. That is why I wrote Kant avec Sade’.28

#### we can only break out of power structures by recognizing the obscene pleasure we derive from them – our political apporach is better on balance
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While Pasolini is often perceived as a Frankfurt-School type of intellectual intent on dissecting the contradictions of contemporary Western societies (and, for many, as falling prey to these contradictions himself), I argue that there is another way of approaching the core of his engagement, one which emphasises Pasolini’s uncompromising determination to identify the breaking point of ideology through a complex strategy involving the staging of masochism. The prospect of liberation from a given power mechanism can only emerge, according to Pasolini, after the subject has become aware of the obscene pleasure he or she derives from being caught in such a mechanism. Through references to key films such as Salò and Medea, the article shows how, in Pasolini’s universe, ‘liberation hurts’, since it implies the traumatic assumption of the unconscious attachment to that from which the subject wishes to be emancipated.

#### Overidentification allows reappropriation of the technology of control – PLAYACTING POWER IS THE ONLY WAY TO WRESTLE IT BACK, INSTEAD FO TRANSGRESSIVELY SIDESTEPPING IT ENTIRELY

Noyes 97

The Mastery of

Submission

Inventions of Masochism

Book Title: The Mastery of Submission: Inventions of Masochism. Contributors: John K. Noyes - author. Publisher: Cornell University Press. Place of Publication: Ithaca, NY. Publication Year: 1997. Page Number: 5.

John Kenneth Noyes, Professor of Germa, PhD, Cape Town, 1989

Masochism takes control of the technologies that produce subjectivity as cultural stereotypes. It develops elaborate strategies for framing the collapse of socially sanctioned identities, and it performs this collapse as a pleasurable abandonment of identity. These strategies aim specifically to pervert the disciplinary technologies our culture uses in its everyday operation. Sadomasochism produces subjectivity through the performance of a sexual technology. It relies upon the pleasurable disappearance — and controlled reappearance — of the subject.

Masochism also appropriates our culture's violent heroes and uses their identities to generate pleasure. "Vanessa," a practicing masochistic woman living in Germany, confided to the authors of a recent socioethnographic study of the contemporary German S&M scene that in the masochistic game, "the entire spectrum of popular culture and a wide body of historical sources serve as scripts. . . . These might be, for example, dungeon scenarios, maidservant games, or court proceedings and subsequent convictions, or the sado-masochistic experiences of the comic-book heroes Batman and Catwoman. . . . Not least, religious themes are used, such as crucifixions, or the modification of a passion-play." 8 The authors themselves later augment this list: "Slave auctions in the ancient world, crucifixions, the martyr scenes of the Christian saints, tortures from the Inquisition, or the scenario of a concentration camp are the stuff of which these fantasies are made." 9

Societies that develop political technologies to control and discipline the bodies of their subjects must reckon with the possibility that individuals will put these technologies to alternative uses. This is what happens in the case of masochism. It draws on stereotypes of violence and technologies of control in order to convert them into technologies of pleasure. In the process it perpetuates these stereotypes, but it does this — so its proponents would argue — in a way that renders them harmless, parodies them. Masochism is a techne erotike in the truest sense. Consequently, the struggles we have come to associate with masochism are struggles for a technology of control. The body of the masochist is caught in a tug-of-war between technologies that want to render it productive and others that seek to produce sexual pleasure.

#### overidentifcation is crucial to the reCLamation of agency among the oppressed – it’s a conscious revaluation THAT EXPLODES POWER BY MOCKING IT WITH DOWNCAST EYES

Uebel 2

Assistant Professor of English at the University of Kentucky, he teaches medieval literature and theory. He has published essays on the relationships among identity, perversion, and culture in medieval literature, and is completing a manuscript on the libidinal politics of masochism in postwar America.

*American Literary History* 14.2 (2002) 389-411

It is Gilles Deleuze who most sharply insists on the linkage between masochism as a practice of living and as a technique of political resistance. In his study of the quintessential novel of masochism, *Venus in Furs* (1869), Deleuze argues that Leopold von Sacher-Masoch, the author, became identified with the perversion not because he "suffered" from it, but rather because he created a new picture of it "by linking masochistic practices to the place of ethnic minorities in society and the role of women in those minorities: masochism becomes an act of resistance, inseparable from a minority sense of humor" ("On Philosophy" 142). Masochism, in important respects, is thus not a forfeiture of power, but an attempt to recuperate it within different social and libidinal economies, especially within those colored by a "humor" that is in fact not at all ludic, but expressive of what Tania Modleski calls "a militantly explosive derision" (155) aimed at symbolic sources of authority and discipline (e.g., the father, the political leader).

## no genocide

#### Genocide’s impossible

**O’Kane, 97** (“Modernity, the Holocaust, and politics”, Economy and Society, February, ebsco)

Chosen policies cannot be relegated to the position of immediate condition (Nazis in power) in the explanation of the Holocaust. Modern bureaucracy is not ‘intrinsically capable of genocidal action’ (Bauman 1989: 106). Centralized state coercion has no natural move to terror. In the explanation of modern genocides it is chosen policies which play the greatest part, whether in effecting bureaucratic secrecy, organizing forced labour, implementing a system of terror, harnessing science and technology or introducing extermination policies, as means and as ends. As Nazi Germany and Stalin’s USSR have shown, furthermore, those chosen policies of genocidal government turned away from and not towards modernity. The choosing of policies, however, is not independent of circumstances. An analysis of the history of each case plays an important part in explaining where and how genocidal governments come to power and analysis of political institutions and structures also helps towards an understanding of the factors which act as obstacles to modern genocide. But it is not just political factors which stand in the way of another Holocaust in modern society. Modern societies have not only pluralist democratic political systems but also economic pluralism where workers are free to change jobs and bargain wages and where independent firms, each with their own independent bureaucracies, exist in competition with state-controlled enterprises. In modern societies this economic pluralism both promotes and is served by the open scientific method. By ignoring competition and the capacity for people to move between organizations whether economic, political, scientific or social, Bauman overlooks crucial but also very ‘ordinary and common’ attributes of truly modern societies. It is these very ordinary and common attributes of modernity which stand in the way of modern genocides.

#### Empirics prove

**Dickinson**, associate professor of history – UC Davis, **‘4**

(Edward, Central European History, 37.1)

A comparative framework can help us to clarify this point. Other states passed compulsory sterilization laws in the 1930s — indeed, individual states in the United States had already begun doing so in 1907. Yet they did not proceed to the **next steps** adopted by National Socialism — mass sterilization, mass “eugenic” abortion and murder of the “defective.” Individual é gures in, for example, the U.S. did make such suggestions. But neither the **political structures** of democratic states nor their **legal and political principles** permitted such policies actually being enacted. Nor did the scale of forcible sterilization in other countries match that of the Nazi program. I do not mean to suggest that such programs were not horrible; but in a **democratic political context** they did not develop the dynamic of constant radicalization and escalation that characterized Nazi policies.
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#### unique side bias against critical affs – we have to prepare for a dozen obscure literatures – they just answer cap and framework – ditching T supercharges the EXPERTISE GAP

#### Logical decisionmaking –multiple forms of scrutiny create the most rigorous truth test in any framework – we all make decisions. A demand for fixed commitment is a formula for blind groupthink. THEY BAN THE BRAINSTORM.

#### Wrecks the judge space – if you reject objectivity, you reject minimum intervention and every debate becomes a referendum on your real belief, making you into the *WORST JUDGE EVER*

#### Intellectual humility – none of us KNOW the correct answers, so we engage in debate gaming as PROCESS not PRODUCT

#### Reject debate as *fixed personal advocacy* – we should NEVER be stuck with ideas as REAL belief.

#### Destroys switch side debate’s unique value as a lab for intellectual experiment

Muir 93

 (Department of Communications at George Mason, Star, “A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate,” Philosophy and Rhetoric 26(4), Gale Academic)JFS

A final indictment of values clarification education is that it encourages relativism, Stewart, for example, sees value clarification as individualistic, personal, and situational.^' He also characterizes values clarification as possessing a hidden set of values (an "absolute relativism") that includes purposefulness, strong beliefs, and thoughtfulness, among others. This "hidden curriculum" of values clarification formulates responses to situations while decrying such pre-judgment. In obvious ways, switch-side debate illustrates the same dilemma: No one value is seen as correct and unassailable, yet certain values get placed above others as a matter of procedure. Both features need to be explicitly addressed since both reflect directly on debate as a tool of moral pedagogy. The first response to the charge of relativism is that switch-side debate respects the existence of divergent beliefs, but focuses attention on assessing the validity of opposing belief systems. Scriven argues that the "confusion of pluralism, of the proper tolerance for diversity of ideas, with relativism—the doctrine that there are no right and wrong answers in ethics or religion—is perhaps the most serious ideological barrier to the implementation of moral education today. "^ The process of ethical inquiry is central to such moral education, but the allowance of just any position is not. Here is where cognitive-development diverges from the formal aims of values clarification. Where clarification ostensibly allows any value position, cognitive-development progresses from individualism to social conformity to social contract theory to universal ethical principles. A pluralistic pedagogy does not imply that all views are acceptable: It is morally and pedagogically correct to teach about ethics, and the skills of moral analysis rather than doctrine, and to set out the arguments for and against tolerance and pluralism. All of this is undone if you also imply that all the various incompatible views about abortion or pornography or war are equally right, or likely to be right, or deserving of respect. Pluralism requires respecting the right to hold divergent beliefs; it implies neither tolerance of actions based on those beliefs nor respecting the content of the beliefs. The role of switch-side debate is especially important in the oral defense of arguments that foster tolerance without accruing the moral complications of acting on such beliefs. The forum is therefore unique in providing debaters with attitudes of tolerance without committing them to active moral irresponsibility. As Freeley notes, debaters are indeed exposed to a multivalued world, both within and between the sides of a given topic. Yet this exposure hardly commits them to such "mistaken" values. In this view, the divorce of the game from the "real world" can be seen as a means of gaining perspective without obligating students to validate their hypothetical value structure through immoral actions.

#### J’accuse politics DA – forcing personal investment forces debaters to refute the SPEAKER to win – that incentivizes *ad homs* and *spying* on people – that’s both annoying and Stalinist

#### \_\_\_Their “profiling” analogy is terrible – debate doesn’t *have* cops. Authority stems from good argument, not biography or hierarchy.

#### Contradictory positions crucial to solve AUTHORITARIAN pedagogy and lead to critical thinking - outweighs because only education spills over

Lewis and Dehler 00

Journal of Management Education December 2000 vol. 24 no. 6 708-725

U Cincinnati College of Business, Professor Lewis is the Interim Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs and Professor of Management. She also leads the Kolodzik Business Scholars Program, as its themes of innovation, collaboration and globalization are closely linked to her research and teaching interests. Indeed, her work addresses paradoxes that impede and enable innovation. In particular, Dr. Lewis explores the need to manage paradoxes in three domains.

Gordon E. Dehler, PhD. Associate Professor. The College of Charleston. School of Business and Economics. Department of Management & Entrepreneurship

Teaching with paradox requires “walking the talk.” If students are truly going to be inspired to think outside the box, we need not only to help them critique the box of oversimplified, polarized frames but also to model paradoxical thinking ourselves. As Farson (1996) noted, paradoxical thinking taps the power of uncertainty and ambiguity: “Absurdly, our most important human affairs—marriage, education, leadership—do best when there is an occasional loss of control and an increase in personal vulnerability, times when we do not know what to do” (p. 38). Recalling our earlier discussion of the control/flexibility paradox, the paradox of teaching with paradox lies in the need to provide order and foster creative tension. In this regard, we have found that teaching with paradox offers a valuable learning opportunity for instructors as well as students. By being self-reflective ourselves, we have become highly conscientious of our own defenses—our desire to control the classroom—and the paradoxical need to allow, even cultivate, an element of confusion to enable more insightful experiences. This requires resisting the temptation to overuse teaching paradigm tactics, that is, refraining from merely telling students about paradoxes and regulating their experiences and instead constructing boundaries within which they may comfortably question inadequacies of their understandings. Such needs complement and extend those of other learning paradigm strategies. For instance, Mallinger (1998) recently wrote of the need to give up control, to maintain control when using collaborative learning approaches, whereas Dennehy, Sims, and Collins (1998) examined the conflicting needs of experiential learning. Ambiguity is necessary so that individuals are personally stretched to apply concepts to real situations. It may seem paradoxical that the pursuit of a conceptual model for debriefing is urged, yet ambiguity is also urged, to meet the subjective needs of individuals. Both requirements (structure and ambiguity), however, can be met if the management educator is cognizant of . . . the debriefing model and uses it as a road map to facilitate discussion so that all learning states are experienced. (p. 18) Barrett’s (1998) seven injunctions of the “Paradox Mind-Set” remind instructors to be purposeful, open, skeptical, contrary, paralogical, imaginative, and courageous, as they encourage students to do likewise. Modeling paradoxical thinking entails remaining focused on the process and objectives of intentional learning while displaying curiosity, honesty, and selfreflection. By provoking insightful debate, conflict can become a source of creativity, and playing devil’s advocate may help students identify their underlying assumptions and more complicated questions to move beyond which alternative is “right” (Dehler &Welsh, 1993). Critiquing oversimplified explanations and taken-for-granted, often nonsensical, conventions, students can be inspired to seek and accommodate opposing views, to creatively make sense of contradictions by transcending either/or logic and overcoming fears of sounding absurd. Finally, the potential value of students’ leaving the classroom with some confusion or dissatisfaction should not be overlooked as a constructive tactic. Palmer (1998) proposed that “good education is always more process than product . . . [and] may leave students deeply dissatisfied, at least for a while” (p. 94). Likewise, French (1997) explained that teachers may use anxiety to foster creative tension and energy while avoiding an excess that freezes students within their defenses. Using the learning space provided by paradox requires staying with the uncertainty long enough to explore contradictions rather than suppress them, examining the ambivalence of mixed feelings, conflicting demands, and uncertainty. Rather than providing oversimplified closure to a complicated discussion, leaving a class with unresolved questions may spur further exploration to reduce confusion and complexity. A degree of unresolved tension or “dissatisfaction may be a sign that real education has happened” (Palmer, 1998, p. 94).

# Energy Metaphors

## Impact

#### Scientism is the crucial enabling condition for racism and violent colonialism

Streski 95

University of California, Santa Barbara eui9ias@mvs.oac.ucla.edu Postmodern Culture v.5 n.3 (May, 1995) pmc@jefferson.village.virginia.edu Ivan Strenski is Holstein Family and Community Professor of Religious Studies. He has studied and traveled extensively in Europe, Mexico and South Asia, and has maintained close contact with scholars in those regions of the world. Although a US native, he took his BA from the University of Toronto and his PhD from the University of Birmingham (England), followed by post-doctoral study at Yale. <http://pmc.iath.virginia.edu/text-only/issue.595/review-7.595>

Todorov argues further that universalism is not the only villain in perpetuating colonialism. Any available justification will serve colonialist ambitions: if not universalism, then %Lebensraum%. Besides, Todorov argues, ideologies such as (ethnocentric) universalism seldom, if ever, "motivate" colonial enterprises; they merely serve as post-facto "self-legitimations." Indeed, for Todorov, universalism isn't even the primary legitimating mechanism for colonial violence--scientism is. "Scientism," he says, is the most "perverse" and the most effective ideological weapon in the armory of ethnocentrism and racism, because it so easily passes undetected. People are rarely "proud of being ethnocentric," whereas they often "take pride in professing a 'scientific' philosophy." Here, Diderot becomes a major exemplar of "scientific ethnocentrism," as do Renan, who makes a religion of science, and Gobineau, with his fully elaborated scientific racialism. Todorov's discussion of this aliance between the scientific and the colonial is on the whole fully persuasive. Certainly science has served the needs of modern racialism all too efficiently; both Hitler and Stalin, we must recall, boasted that their ideologies were strictly scientific.

#### These racist dichotomies grant states the power to exterminate – this is the root of all war

Mendieta, 2002

Eduardo Mendieta, 2002, “To Make Live and to Let Die – Foucault and Racism Associate Professor of Philosophy -State University of New York State at Stony Brook, **Ph.D.** - **New School For Social Research**. Philosophy. Areas of specialization are Critical Theory and Latin American Liberation Philosophy http://www.stonybrook.edu/philosophy/faculty/emendieta/articles/foucault.pdf

This is where racism intervenes, not from without, exogenously, but from within, constitutively. For the emergence of biopower as the form of a new form of political rationality, entails the inscription within the very logic of the modern state the logic of racism. For racism grants, and here I am quoting: “the conditions for the acceptability of putting to death in a society of normalization. Where there is a society of normalization, where there is a power that is, in all of its surface and in first instance, and first line, a bio-power, **racism is indispensable** as a condition to be able to put to death someone, in order to be able to put to death others. **The homicidal** [*meurtrière*] **function of the state,** to the degree that the state functions on the modality of bio-power, **can only be assured by racism** “(Foucault 1997, 227) To use the formulations from his 1982 lecture “The Political Technology of Individuals” –which incidentally, echo his 1979 Tanner Lectures –the power of the state after the 18th century, a power which is enacted through the police, and is enacted over the population, is a power over living beings, and as such it is a biopolitics. And, to quote more directly, “since **the population is nothing more than what the state takes care of for its own sake**, of course, **the state is entitled to slaughter it**, if necessary. So the reverse of biopolitics is thanatopolitics.” (Foucault 2000, 416). **Racism, is the thanatopolitics of the biopolitics of the total state.** They are two sides of one same political technology, one same political rationality: the management of life, the life of a population, the tending to the continuum of life of a people. And with the inscription of racism within the state of biopower, the long history of **war** that Foucault has been telling in these dazzling lectures has made a new turn: the war of peoples, a war against invaders, imperials colonizers, which turned into a war of races, to then turn into a war of classes, **has now turned into the war of a race**, a biological unit, **against its polluters and threats**. Racism is the means by which bourgeois political power, biopower, re-kindles the fires of war within civil society. Racism normalizes and medicalizes war. **Racism makes war the permanent condition of society**, while at the same time masking its weapons of death and torture. As I wrote somewhere else, **racism banalizes genocide** by making quotidian the lynching of suspect threats to the health of the social body. **Racism makes the killing of the other**, of others, **an everyday occurrence by internalizing and normalizing the war of society against its enemies.** To protect society entails we be ready to kill its threats, its foes, and if we understand society as a unity of life, as a continuum of the living, then these threat and foes are biological in nature.