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# \*\*KRITIK SHELLS\*\*

## Bataille

#### Life-making is a Western ideology which has driven the elimination of culture and degradation of the importance of expenditure.

Mayfair Yang, Professor of Religious Studies, 2013, “Two Logics of the Gift and Banquet: A Genealogy of China and the Northwest Coast.”

In today’s Wenzhou, I also discovered the state’s insistence on the value of focusing on life rather than death and the Afterlife beyond (Yang 2013). Traditionally, Chinese ritual expenditures were especially elaborated around death, so funerals were more important than weddings and birth rituals, and still often the case in rural Wenzhou today. Since the 1950’s, the Communist Party has had a policy of encouraging simple secular funerals, and the cremation of corpses (Whyte 1988), although it has not always been successful in the implementation. Elsewhere I have written about how in rural Wenzhou, there is a struggle between the local people and their insistence on elaborate funerals, earth burials, and stone tombs that dot the hillsides, and the state, which pushes them towards cremation (Yang 2004; 2013). From the state’s point of view, tombs take up the space of the living, land that could be used to build houses, shopping malls, and factories, even though tombs are located on mountainsides. In the mid-1990’s, the local government was still waging a campaign for more “civilized” ways of dealing with the dead. This involved turning the people away from their earth burials which supposedly take up arable land, and pursuing more modest funerals. The campaigns to impose cremation, first in urban, and then in rural Wenzhou, met with a lot of resistance among the local people. I heard some stories that, on the eve of instituting the ban on earth burials in rural areas in 2000, groups of old people committed suicide to protest the ban, and to make sure that their own bodies could enjoy an earth burial before the ban took effect. The ban meant the destruction of the coffin-making industry, and adversely affected the diviners, fengshui masters, and stone mason tomb-makers. Since traditional funerals are tied in with the rituals of burials, the ban on earth burials also affected the conduct of funerals. The absence of a body at the funeral took away some of the sacred atmosphere of the funeral, and removed the impetus for a grandiose and raucous funeral procession from the deceased’s home through public streets to the burial site. As people become increasingly prosperous in Wenzhou, there was a strong desire for ever more extravagant mourning and burial rituals, which was now thwarted by the state. It seemed that even in death, the modern Chinese state version of the Protestant Ethic that enjoins thrift, hard work, and non-trafficking with the divine world had to continue. Even in death, the people are not supposed to escape this earthly sovereignty for alternative divine sovereigns in the Netherworld.

Oddly enough, it turns out that these restrictions on lavish funerals and burials have a venerable history in China, and are not exclusive to modern times. Way back in ancient China, in the 5th or 4th century BCE, the philosopher Mozi (墨子) had already adopted the position of advocating “frugal burials” (薄葬) in debates with the Confucians, and opposed the Confucian support of “generous burials” (厚葬). The Confucians favored elaborate funerals and burials, in keeping with their emphasis on ritual propriety, filial piety, and reverence for ancestors. Mozi, however, attacked the Confucian position, with arguments that today sound strangely modern:

If we follow the rules of those who advocated elaborate funerals… then the funeral of a king or high minister will require several inner and outer coffins, a deep grave, numerous grave clothes, a large amount of embroidery for decorating the coffins, and a large grave mound. If the family of the deceased happen to be humble commoners the wealth of the family will be exhausted, and if they are feudal lords their treasuries will be emptied. Now if the rulers and high officials are to adopt [these lavish funerary practices], they cannot appear at court early and retire late, attend to the five ministries and six bureaus, encourage farming and forestry, and fill the granaries. Mozi: Basic Writings (Watson, trans. 1963: 67-68)

Mozi here pits the needs of the living against those of the dead, and clearly favors the former. He feared that excessive mourning and lavish funerals and burials would exhaust the living family members, distract state officials from their official duties, and impoverish the state. This kind of rhetoric sounds almost like a modern secularist argument to stop wasting money on the divine world and instead to focus on “this world.” Given that at that time, the human world as conceived was still extremely porous with divine other worlds and their divine beings, Mozi’s arguments must have represented a rather extreme position for his times. Certainly, archaeological evidence of the lavish tombs and luxury grave goods offered during the Warring States period shows that Mozi’s arguments had no impact on the burial practices of many wealthy and powerful families.

Perhaps this Mohist position was too radical for its time, when life after death was too important, and people feared retribution from the discontented souls of the dead. Nor did Mozi’s populism and antipathy to the wealthy and aristocratic powers help his cause, for his writings were banned by the Legalists in the subsequent Qin Dynasty and by the state Confucianists in the Han Dynasty and beyond. It may be that what the growing power of Legalist discourse in the Warring States era sought was a more persuasive strategy of argument for moderation in burials. About two centuries later, a new text also addressed the issue of lavishness or moderation in burials, in the Spring and Autumn of the Lu Clan (《呂氏春秋》). The writing of this argument on burials was organized by the Legalist merchant and official Lu Buwei (呂不韋) around 239 BCE. By this time, Confucianism had already started to come under Legalist influence, and perhaps more Confucians were open to more utilitarian modes of thinking. In this text, we find an attempt to reconcile and combine Mohist and Confucian arguments together into a new synthesis (Riegel 1995: 328). While decrying lavish burials, the text also used arguments that appealed to Confucian sentiments, in a seeming effort to persuade Confucian interlocutors. The selected passages below from two chapters of the Spring and Autumn of the Lu Clan mount an extended argument in favor of more moderate funerals and burials, decrying the lavish expenditures that were the rule of the day among aristocratic families. In the gross disorder of our vulgar age rulers are ever more extravagant. Thus in their burials their thoughts are not directed at taking precautions for the dead but instead have to do with how the living can outdo each other. Extravagance is considered glorious, frugality demeaning. They are not motivated by what is of convenience to the dead but simply devote themselves to what the living might blame or praise.” Spring and Autumn of the Lu Clan (Riegel, trans. 1995: 307-08) As states grow larger and families richer, burials become more elaborate. Such a burial includes a pearl put in the mouth of the corpse, a jade shroud that covers the body like fish scales, silk cords and bamboo documents, trinkets and treasures, bronze goblets, tripods, pots, and basins, horse-drawn carriages, clothes and coverlets, as well as halberds and swords—all too numerous to count. Every utensil required to nurture the living is included. The chamber is constructed of stacked wood, the coffin and vault are in several layers, and these are surrounded on the outside by a pile of stones and a heap of charcoal.” Spring and Autumn of the Lu Clan (Riegel, trans. 1995: 308-09) In the funeral processions of our vulgar age, a huge carriage transports the coffin: there are plumes, flags, pennants and banners, as well as the sides and top of the carriage painted in a cloud design, all of which screen the coffin from view; pearls and jade adorn it, embroideries and insignia embellish it; and it is moved by two ropes, each one pulled by myriad men, who are arranged in military formation. Only when all is like this is the funeral procession thought appropriate. This makes a beautiful and extravagant spectacle for the world to see but it is inappropriate treatment of the dead.” Spring and Autumn of the Lu Clan (Riegel, trans. 1995: 309-10) A burial mound of the present day is made as tall as a mountain and the trees planted on it are like a forest. The towers and courtyards that are erected, the chambers and halls that are constructed, and the guest stairway that is fashioned, make the burial resemble a city. These features make a spectacle for the world to see and are a means by which to display one’s wealth, but to employ such features as a way to treat the dead is improper.” Spring and Autumn of the Lu Clan (Riegel, trans. 1995: 310) In the above passages, written before the Qin Dynasty got under way, we see that the wealthy tried to outdo each other in the amount of luxury goods, jewels, and precious weapons with which they buried their dead, in the lavish funeral processions that carried the corpse to the burial place, and the elabo-rate burial chamber and huge burial mound and funeral parks they constructed with great expenditures of labor. Unlike Mozi who favored the needs of the living against the dead, the main objection here is that, instead of expressing true and sincere concerns for the comfort and peace of the dead, these extravagant expenditures only benefit the social standing and prestige of the living. This text also pointed out that lavish burials were inconsiderate towards the dead, because such riches attracted tomb robbers, and sooner or later, the tomb would be plundered, disturbing the peaceful abode and rest of the dead. Thus, it suggested that people who insisted on lavish burials were selfish and only thinking of their own rivalries with other families and their own social prestige. It implied that sincere and filial Confucians would want to give priority to the needs of the dead, and ensure that their ancestors would enjoy an eternity of peace and rest in undisturbed graves. It would seem that for much of Chinese imperial history, this sort of argument predominated over the radical utilitarianism of Mohism. However lonely and isolated was the Mohist voice throughout much of Chinese history, it was an ancient indigenous Chinese force that had already prepared the ground against overindulgence in trafficking with the divine world, and focusing people’s energies on the temporal life of production. The merging of Confucian and Legalist voices that are expressed in the Spring and Autumn of the Lu Clan can be seen as paving the way for late imperial Confucian gentry condemnations of overindulgence in ritual wastefulness. It took the powerful modern secularizing forces of the 20th century, to render Mozi’s ancient argument no longer radical, but widely shared and systematically adopted and implemented.

At the beginning of the 21st century, what can we learn from this an-cient debate over funerals and burials? While some of the common people back in ancient times might have sided with Mozi against the profligacy of the rich, at the same time, most of them probably would not have wished to shortchange their dead by skimping on their ritual honors. After so much modern destruction of traditional Chinese religious culture, our understanding of this ancient quarrel would be different from the ancients. From a Bataillean modern perspective, we might say, “What better way to waste and destroy wealth than burying precious goods deep into the ground in graves where they will never be used or enjoyed by the living?” Following Bataille, we can say that such “waste” of resources on death instead of life is an expression of otherworldly religiosity and a direct challenge to the modern focus on temporal and profane life. We now live a life that has condemned us to an incessant grindstone of production, and a way of thinking that is about rational-utilitarian maximization. This endless expansion of productivism is ultimately unsustainable, as environmental degradation, labor exploitation, and global climate change are all warning us. The modern world enjoins us to thrift, productivity, and maximization, but offers very little in the way of destructive release through ritual and festival to transcend this temporal world. Although Mozi’s populism can still speak powerfully to our modern world, the fact remains that today in China, it is usually rural, peasant, and small-town people, such as my fieldwork subjects in Wenzhou, who most insist on reviving traditional ritual expenditures, wasteful religious festivals, and lavish funerals and burials. Indeed, the desire for ritual expenditures in China is in direct relationship to the lack of exposure to modern formal education provided by the state. Urban Chinese have for the most part been absorbed into the consumerist expenditures that feed back into the productivism of the capitalist economy.

#### The mindset of utility reduces everything to its relation to production and reinvestment

Georges Bataille, not very lucid, 1933, “La notion dépense” *La Critique sociale.* éditions lignes. HHurt.

Every time the meaning of a discussion depends on the fundamental value of the word useful – in other words, every time the essential question touching on the life of human societies is raised, no matter who intervenes and what opinions are expressed – it is possible to affirm that the debate is necessarily warped and that the fundamental question is eluded. In fact, given the more or less divergent collection of present ideas, there is nothing that permits one to define what is useful to man. This lacuna is made fairly prominent by the fact that it is constantly necessary to return, in the most unjustifiable way, to principles that one would like to situate beyond utility and pleasure: honor and duty are hypocritically employed in schemes of pecuniary interest and, without speaking of God, Spirit serves to mask the intellectual disarray of the few people who refuse to accept a closed system.

Current practice, however, is not deterred by these elementary difficulties, and common awareness at first seems able to raise only verbal objections to the principles of classical utility – in other words, to supposedly material utility. The goal of the latter is, theoretically, pleasure - but only in a moderate form, since violent pleasure is seen as pathological. On the one hand, this material utility is limited to acquisition (in practice, to production) and to the conservation of goods; on the other, it is limited to reproduction and to the conservation of human life (to which is added, it is true, the struggle against pain, whose importance itself suffices to indicate the negative character of the pleasure principle instituted, in theory, as the basis of utility). In the series of quantitative representations linked to this flat and untenable conception of existence only the question of reproduction seriously lends itself to controversy, because an exaggerated increase in the number of the living threatens to diminish the individual share. But on the whole, any general judgment of social activity implies the principle that all individual effort, in order to be valid, must be reducible to the fundamental necessities of production and conservation. Pleasure, whether art, permissible debauchery, or play, is definitively reduced, in the intellectual representations in circulation, to a concession; in other words it is reduced to a diversion whose role is subsidiary. The most appreciable share of life is given as the condition – sometimes even as the regrettable condition – of productive social activity.

#### Absent the alternative, inherent surplus is expended through war as an investment in an unstable economy of conquest
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#### Impurity is contained to make the utopic “Affirmative World” seem benign, our alternative is not a rejection, but sullying of the image of the AC. Such an undoing of profanity reveals the contradictions of violence-as-peace in a visceral encounter with the ugly eroticism of death, which provokes the profound laughter of continuity
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#### 

## Black Nihilism

**Sustaining the coherence of the American political framework reproduces discourses of progress that result in the further accumulation of injured and murdered black bodies --- black nihilism is the only metaphysical framework capable of addressing this antagonism and unraveling the political**

Warren 15[Calvin K., Assistant Professor of American Studies at George Washington University, “Black Nihilism and the Politics of Hope,” *CR: The New Centennial Review*, Volume 15, Number 1, Spring 2015]

**Perverse juxtapositions structure our relation to the Political. This becomes even more apparent and problematic when we consider the position of blacks within this structuring**.1 On the one hand**, our Declaration of Independence proclaims, “All men are created equal,” and yet black captives were fractioned in this political arithmetic as three-fifths of this “man**.” **The remainder**, the two-fifths, **gets lost within the arithmetic shuffle of commerce** and mercenary prerogatives. We, of course, hoped that the Reconstruction Amendments would correct this arithmetical error and finally provide an ontological equation, or an existential variable, that would restore fractured and fractioned [End Page 215] black being. This did not happen. **Black humanity became somewhat of an “imaginary number” in this equation**, **purely speculative and nice in theory but difficult to actualize or translate into something tangible**. Poll taxes, grandfather clauses, literacy tests, and extra-legal and legal violence made a mockery of the 14th Amendment, and the convict leasing system turned the 13th Amendment inside out for blacks. Yet, **we approach this political perversity with a certain apodictic certainty and incontrovertible hope that things will (and do) get better. The Political**, we are told, **provides the material or substance of our hope**; **it is within the Political that we are to find**, if we search with vigilance and work tirelessly, **the “answer” to the ontological equation**—**hard work**, **suffering**, **and diligence** **will restore the fractioned three-fifths with its alienated two-fifths and, finally, create One that we can include in our declaration that “All men are created equal.” We are still awaiting this “event.”**Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. placed great emphasis on the restoration of black being through suffering and diligence in his sermon “The American Dream” (1965):And I would like to say to you this morning what I’ve tried to say all over this nation, what I believe firmly: that in seeking to make the dream a reality we must use and adopt a proper method. I’m more convinced than ever before that violence is impractical and immoral…we need not hate; we need not use violence. We can stand up against our most violent opponent and say: we will match your capacity to inflict suffering by our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. Do to us what you will and we will still love you…we will go to in those jails and transform them from dungeons of shame to havens of freedom and human dignity. Send your hooded perpetrators of violence into our communities after night and drag us out on some wayside road and beat us and leave us half dead, and as difficult as it is, we will still love you. … [T]hreaten our children and bomb our churches, and as difficult as it is, we will still love you.But be assured that we will ride you down by our capacity to suffer. One day we will win our 3freedom, but we will not only win it for ourselves, we will so appeal to your hearts and conscience that we will win you in the process. And our victory will be double. **The American dream**, then, **is realized through black suffering**. **It is the humiliated, incarcerated, mutilated, and terrorized black body that serves as the vestibule for the Democracy that is to come**. In fact, **it almost becomes impossible to think the Political without black suffering**. According to this logic, **corporeal fracture engenders ontological coherence, in a political arithmetic saturated with violence**. Thus, nonviolence is a misnomer, or somewhat of a ruse. Black-sacrifice is necessary to achieve the American dream and its promise of coherence, progress, and equality. **We find similar logic in the contemporary moment**. **Renisha McBride, Jordon Davis, Kody Ingham, Amadou Diallo, Aiyana Stanley-Jones, Frederick Jermain Carter, Chavis Carter, Timothy Stansbury, Hadiya Pendleton, Oscar Grant, Sean Bell, Kendrec McDade, Trayvon Martin, and Mike Brown, among others, constitute a fatal rupture of the Political**; these **signifiers, stained in blood, refuse the closure that the Political promises**. **They haunt political discourses of progress**, **betterment**, **equality**, **citizenship**, **and justice**—**the metaphysical organization of social existence**. **We are witnessing a shocking accumulation of injured and mutilated black bodies**, particularly young black bodies, **which place what seems to be an unanswerable question mark in the political field: if we are truly progressing toward this “society-that-is-to-come** (maybe),” **why is black suffering increasing at such alarming rates**? In response to this inquiry, **we are told to keep struggling, keep “hope” alive, and keep the faith**. After George Zimmerman was acquitted for murdering Trayvon Martin, President Obama addressed the nation and importuned us to keep fighting for change because “each successive generation seems to be making progress in changing attitudes toward race” and, if we work hard enough, we will move closer to “becoming a more perfect union.” Despite Martin’s corpse lingering in the minds of young people and Zimmerman’s smile of relief after the verdict, we are told that things are actually getting better. Supposedly, the generation that murdered Trayvon Martin and Renisha McBride is much better than the generation that murdered Emmett Till. **Black suffering**, here, **is instrumentalized to accomplish pedagogical, cathartic, and redemptive objectives and, somehow, the growing number of dead black bodies in the twenty-first century is an indication of our progress toward “perfection.”** Is perfection predicated on black death? How many more [End Page 217] black bodies must be lynched, mutilated, burned, castrated, raped, dismembered, shot, and disabled before we achieve this “more perfect union”? In many ways, **black suffering and death become the premiere vehicles of political perfection and social maturation**.This essay argues that **the logic of the Political**—**linear temporality**, **bio-political futurity**, **perfection**, **betterment**, **and redress—sustains black suffering**. Progress and perfection are worked through the pained black body and any recourse to the **Political and its discourse of hope will ultimately reproduce the very metaphysical structures of violence that pulverize black being.** **This piece attempts to rescue black nihilism from discursive and intellectual obliteration**; rather than thinking about black nihilism as a set of pathologies in need of treatment, **this essay considers black nihilism a necessary philosophical posture capable of unraveling the Political and its devastating logic of political hope**. **Black nihilism resists emancipatory rhetoric that assumes it is possible to purge the Political of anti-black violence and advances political apostasy as the only “ethical” response to black suffering**.
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## Gender IR

#### The affirmatives understanding of international relations obscures gender as a structuring principle – this perpetuates false assumptions about state-behavior and makes causal explanations of war impossible

Sjoberg 13 (Laura, associate professor of Political Science @ University of Florida, University of Chicago; Ph.D., University of Southern California School of International Relations; J.D. Boston College Law School, “Gendering Global Conflict : Toward a Feminist Theory of War,” Introduction, online book, CMR)

Several scholars have proposed pieces of, or solutions to, the war puzzle. Scholars from the realist tradition have looked to the inﬂuence of international anarchy, shifts of power between states, technological advances that favor either offensive or defensive strategies, and alliances and/or power balancing.i3 Scholars from the liberal tradition have suggested that state regime type, domestic politics, trading interdependence, and bargaining are key predictors of propensities for war.” Constructivist scholars (and others) have suggested that cultural differences, state learning, nationalism, or the salience of norms are important variables in the choice and duration of wars.15 While these theoretical approaches suggest different, and important, pieces of the war puzzle, traditional work on the nature, causes, and consequences of war individually and collectively omits gender analysis.“ In fact, the great majority of studies seeking constitutive understandings of or causal explanations for war do not consider gender or gender subordination as potential causes or elements of war." This book argues that this omission is a grave error, because the meanings, causes, and consequences of war cannot be understood without reference to gender. Using gender as a category of analysis transforms the study of war.18 As scholars fit together pieces of the war puzzle, the missing pieces become more visible, and gender is among them. The feminist tradition in lR19 has demonstrated that the theory and practice of war have been gendered throughout modern history and that gendered elements are important causal and constitutive factors.20 Feminists have tried to communicate to the discipline that the gender “neutrality” of its work masks gender subordination rather than magically producing gender equality?‘ Feminist work has redefined core concepts of security, observed new empirical phenomena, and provided important accounts of specific conﬂicts and security dilemmas.22 This book aims to extend those critiques and reformulations to argue that war cannot be understood without the use of gender as a primary analytical category-that a speciﬁcally feminist approach to the study of war is crucial to learning more about the war puzzle.23
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# \*\*A2 KRITIKS\*\*

## A2 Bataille

#### Bataille’s erasure of prohibition and obsession with death leads to the worst forms of suffering and ideological dogmatism

**Friedrich, 12** – professor of Classics at Dalhousie (Rainer, “The Enlightenment Gone Mad (I) The Dismal Discourse of Postmodernism’s Grand Narratives,” http://www.bu.edu/arion/the-enlightenment-gone-mad-i-the-dismal-discourse-of-postmodernisms-grand-narratives/)//eek

The intellectual structure that relates both catalogues to one another is the antagonism of homogeneity versus heterogeneity. The second catalogue constitutes the realm of the homogeneous: modernity’s alienated/alienating, reifying, life-corroding, affect-suppressing, instinct-sapping, commodity-producing, community-destroying, fragmented/fragmenting, disenchanted, utilitarian, sanitizing/sanitized, and sterilizing/sterilized bourgeois world—the very “world of the civilized and its light” that Bataille says “it is time to abandon.” Heterogeneity, by contrast, epitomizing the elements of the first catalogue, subverts and negates the established realm of homogeneity. It is at the core of Bataille’s thought, the equivalent of the postmodern Other and its three D’s: Dementia, Desire, Death. It is in acts of transgression, the breaching of norms, that the heterogeneous asserts itself as the agent of Life’s energy and effervescence against the regime of reason by subverting its normative life-world, civilization. Civilization has totally homogenized Life by standardization, regulation, normalization, and sanitation—hence Bataille’s bidding to abandon it. His Grand Narrative presents transgressive heterogeneity as both negation and affirmation, by way of a philosophical litotes—negation of negation—similar to that operative in Nietzsche’s strong nihilism. It is the negation of the world of homogeneity, a world sustained by the homogenizing regime of reason that reduces its atomized members to calculating, encapsulated selves deprived of affects, effervescence, and intensity, and living “mere lives” in the servile pursuit of the limitless accumulation of goods. This negation is to remove what stands in the way of what transgressive heterogeneity affirms and espouses, and thus to clear the ground for a return to a pre-modern life-world: a tribal world—pre-reflective, pre-rational, pre-individualist, pre-moral—a life-world of instinctual and affective effervescence, exuberance, excess, intensity, and the sacred. In short, it is the world before the onset of individuation, denounced since Nietzsche by vitalist thinkers as the fons et origo of all modern evil.77 What is to replace the homogenizing world of the civilized goes by the name of “ecstatic community”—heterogeneity’s life-world. Bataille’s Grand Narrative advertises it as a restoration of communality, as a return to the sacred and to an originary sovereignty: it is the rediscovery of a lost Dionysian world, effecting the reawakening of the repressed instinctual forces and promising lived affective intensity. Its economy is one of expenditure and waste. Its members are to overcome their atomization through limit-experiences that give rise to unbearable sensations lacerating the conscious ego and shattering subjectivity. In collectivist orgies of self-immolation, they are to free themselves from their encapsulated selves. The ecstatic community was to be ultimately actualized through the Sadean “fiery and bloody revolution”; but one did not have to wait for it passively. Bataille and his circle of disciples experimented with a prefiguration of it. Its think-tank was the Collège de Sociologie,78 founded and run by Bataille and Roger Caillois; the college’s organ was Bataille’s journal Acéphale, “Headless.” To distinguish it from the academic “homogeneous” discipline of sociology, it went by the name of “sacred sociology.” As a “science of the sacred,” it was designed to explore the conditions and requirements for a re-enchantment of the world, a return of the sacred, through sacrifice, ritual, and myth; as well as to unleash, through Dionysian ecstasy, the energy of dark forces repressed by homogeneous civilization. In line with Nietzsche’s “God-is-dead” pronouncement, the College aimed at an atheological religion of myth and ritual. The lived prefiguration of the ecstatic community was Bataille’s neo-pagan sect sharing the name Acéphale with his journal. The sect’s logo was the invented mythic figure of the Headless Man, holding a sacrificial knife and a flaming sacred heart, “reuniting in the same eruption Birth and Death,” with a death’s head in place of the genitals, emblematic of the union of eros and thanatos. Headlessness, acéphalie, signified the liberation from the tyranny of reason: “Human life is exhausted from serving as the head of, or the reason for, the universe. . . . Man has escaped from his head just as the condemned man has escaped from his prison.”79 The sect’s apt totem was the praying mantis, the insect that during mating decapitates the male who then, once his headlessness has freed him from the anxiety-ridden brain, copulates with heightened intensity80—to the envy of intellect-hating intellectuals in their eternal quest for the effervescence of life. Acéphale was a secret society, so little is known of its practices. The little that is known is more than quaint. Its members met at “sacred places” marked by trees that had been struck by lightening, as the intersection of chthonian and celestial forces. Acéphale practiced animal sacrifice; in 1939, the sect had far advanced in preparations for a planned human sacrifice, with a willing victim already selected! The human sacrifice never took place, as the outbreak of World War II put an end to Acéphale and the Collège de Sociologie: for, as Roger Caillois commented on it: “The dark forces we had dreamed of unleashing had been freed on their own, and their consequences were not those we had expected.”82 Thus, the dark forces they tried to unleash turned out to be the very forces that drove fascism. The rites of Acéphale may be dismissed as the puerile antics of anti-intellectual intellectuals, overdosing on primitivism and ritualism, the opiates of the over-civilized and over-individuated. Fearing that sensuality passes them by due to their overdeveloped (as they deem) intellect, they try to rid themselves of it. This feeds right into postmodernism’s war on logocentrism; here madness and schizophrenia play the role of the cult of headlessness as the great liberator from oppressive reason and intellect. But seriously preparing a human sacrifice, and coming close to performing it, is something else. In the homogeneous world of prewar France and its guillotine (France’s chief executioner, le Monsieur de Paris, was of particular interest to the Collège de Sociologie),83 it would have ranked as plain murder. Acephale’s members could have ended up literally headless. Given the death-cult of the sect and its obsession with acephaly, they might not have viewed this as an altogether undesirable experience. One cannot help being reminded of a subject-annihilating collectivity in more recent history: the ecstatic community of Jonestown, founded and ruled by a sacred sovereign, the Reverend Jim Jones, in the jungle of Guyana, far away from homogenizing civilization.84 Here the reawakened sacred took the form of a fundamentalist religion fused with Leninism. In 1978, ordered by their sovereign, its members freed themselves of their enclosed selves in an orgy of self-immolation. The 918 corpses rotting in the torrid jungle heat testified to thanatocratic heterogeneity, negating in a drastic way the norms of the sanitized and disenchanted.

#### We must act rather than assume transgression will lead to change. Biles 07

Biles 7—prof of divinity at U Chicago (Jeremy, Ecce Monstrum: Georges Bataille and the Sacrifice of Form, 63-4)

Following the publication in 1943 of Bataille's book Inner experience, Bataille and Jean-Paul Sartre engage in a brief but mordant polemical volley in which Sartre accuses Bataille of being "a new mystic." As a term of derision, "mystic' here connotes for Sartre a person who has disengaged himself from life, retreating from the crucial choices that ensure an authentic human existence. Bataille's pursuit of a "rapturous escape from the self" amounts to cowardice, flagrant irresponsibility - a failure to exercise the free involvement with the world that defines authenticity. 141 He accuses Bataille of escaping engagement, evading meaningful action. 142¶ Though Sartre does not explicitly rely on Nietzsche in formulating his philosophical response to Bataille's mystical raptures, Sartre does pressuppose a certain reading of Nietzsche, his "Great predecessor" 143 - for Nietzsche emblematizes what Sartre refers to as authenticity, the antithesis of "bad faith." Drawing from the German philosopher's emphasis on free will and overcoming, Sartre formulates his brand of existentialist philosophy around a humanistic vision in which choice (the free act of the will) allows a person to live authentically - that is, with an eye to future possibilities. Nietzsche's philosophy becomes a "call for man to choose his own life, to take responsibility for it." 144 According to Sartre, existence is absurd unless humans engage in projects through which they project themselves into the future. It is this telically oriented life that Bataille seeks to challenge. 145
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## A2 Afropessimism (Wilderson and Black Nihilism)

#### Complete rejection of institutional logic of civil society crushes anti-white supremacy politics.

CRENSHAW 88 Law @ UCLA [Kimberle, RACE, REFORM, AND RETRENCHMENT: TRANSFORMATION AND LEGITIMATION IN ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAW 101 Harv. L. Rev. 1331 L/N]

Questioning the Transformative View: Some Doubts About Trashing

The Critics' product is of limited utility to Blacks in its present form. The implications for Blacks of trashing liberal legal ideology are troubling, even though it may be proper to assail belief structures that obscure liberating possibilities. Trashing legal ideology seems to tell us repeatedly what has already been established -- that legal discourse is unstable and relatively indeterminate. Furthermore, trashing offers no idea of how to avoid the negative consequences of engaging in reformist discourse or how to work around such consequences. Even if we imagine the wrong world when we think in terms of legal discourse, we must nevertheless exist in a present world where legal protection has at times been a blessing -- albeit a mixed one. The fundamental problem is that, although Critics criticize law because it functions to legitimate existing institutional arrangements, it is precisely this legitimating function that has made law receptive to certain demands in this area. The Critical emphasis on deconstruction as the vehicle for liberation leads to the conclusion that engaging in legal discourse should be avoided because it reinforces not only the discourse itself but also the society and the world that it embodies. Yet Critics offer little beyond this observation. Their focus on delegitimating rights rhetoric seems to suggest that, once rights rhetoric has been discarded, there exists a more productive strategy for change, one which does not reinforce existing patterns of domination. Unfortunately, no such strategy has yet been articulated, and it is difficult to imagine that racial minorities will ever be able to discover one. As Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward point out in their [\*1367] excellent account of the civil rights movement, popular struggles are a reflection of institutionally determined logic and a challenge to that logic. 137 People can only demand change in ways that reflect the logic of the institutions that they are challenging. 138 Demands for change that do not reflect the institutional logic -- that is, demands that do not engage and subsequently reinforce the dominant ideology -- will probably be ineffective. 139 The possibility for ideological change is created through the very process of legitimation, which is triggered by crisis. Powerless people can sometimes trigger such a crisis by challenging an institution internally, that is, by using its own logic against it. 140 Such crisis occurs when powerless people force open and politicize a contradiction between the dominant ideology and their reality. The political consequences [\*1368] of maintaining the contradictions may sometimes force an adjustment -- an attempt to close the gap or to make things appear fair. 141 Yet, because the adjustment is triggered by the political consequences of the contradiction, circumstances will be adjusted only to the extent necessary to close the apparent contradiction.
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## A2 Gender IR

#### Permutation do both – integrating gender into mainstream IR solves better than rejection

Hudson et al 10 [Valerie M. Hudson, Prof of Poli Sci at Texas A&M University, PhD in Poli Sci from Ohio State R. Charli Carpenter, Associate Prof of Poli Sci at the University of Massachussetts-Amherst, PhD in Poli Sci from the University of Oregon; Mary Caprioli, Associate Prof of Poli Sci and Director of the International Studies program at the University of Minnesota-Duluth, PhD from the University of Connecticut; “Gender and Global Security,” from The International Studies Encyclopedia, ed. Robert A. Denemark]

We acknowledge the important role played by some IR feminists in critiquing/expanding security studies to be more inclusive of women's needs. But it is also true that deploying gender as a variable and a category of analysis has contributed important insights to security studies, which must be taken seriously by security studies scholars not only for feminist reasons, but because security scholars – and policy makers – miss much of what is going on by ignoring gender. We reject the claim that IR feminist approaches require non-quantitative methods or a critical theoretical epistemology, a claim which has in the past been reified both by IR feminists (Tickner 2005) and by those writing within the IR mainstream (e.g., Carpenter 2003). As Mary Caprioli has argued, much quantitative work is also relevant to feminist questions (Caprioli 2004). We agree with Robert Keohane (1989) that gender as a category of analysis can contribute something to IR as conventionally defined, and it is this contribution which we explore in this essay.¶ In our view, seeking to integrate gender more fully into the discipline of security studies serves to validate the empirical insights yielded by many feminist IR scholars by taking them seriously within the mainstream. While methodologies and specification of explanans and explanandum may differ from the work cited above, such analysis can indeed be consistent with “rethinking security on feminist grounds.” By drawing on empirical insights from gender theory, while speaking to the major concerns of international security studies as a discipline, the literature on gender and security can speak to both IR feminists and security studies scholars. In this essay, we will concentrate on what this literature can say to mainstream security studies, whose primary concerns are, following Walt: “the conditions that make the use of force more likely, the ways that the use of force affects individuals, states and societies, and the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war (1991:212).¶ Taking a gender perspective need not entail a rejection of conventional concepts, methodologies, or questions that define the discipline. Unlike the critical feminist scholarship, which is skeptical of conventional methodologies, this literature review includes a range of empirical scholarship on gender, whether qualitative or quantitative, positivist or constructivist, that make a meaningful contribution to security studies.

#### Perm is key -- framing solutions in terms of state policy is the only way to solve
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#### Gendered critique of IR fails---state engagement key
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#### IR is not gendered
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**Theorizing can’t fix the world—we can’t end conflict, just manage it**
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# \*\*ROLE OF THE BALLOT/A2 K Tricks\*\*

## Extinction Focus Good

#### Moral equality means even a small risk of preventing extinction outweighs structural violence – future generations

Bostrom, 2012 (Mar 6, Nick, director of the Future of Humanity Institute at Oxford, recipient of the 2009 Gannon Award, “We're Underestimating the Risk of Human Extinction,” interview with Ross Andersen, freelance writer in D.C., <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/03/were-underestimating-the-risk-of-human-extinction/253821/>)

Some have argued that we ought to be directing our resources toward humanity's existing problems, rather than future existential risks, because many of the latter are highly improbable. You have responded by suggesting that existential risk mitigation may in fact be a dominant moral priority over the alleviation of present suffering. Can you explain why? Bostrom: Well suppose you have a moral view that counts future people as being worth as much as present people. You might say that fundamentally it doesn't matter whether someone exists at the current time or at some future time, just as many people think that from a fundamental moral point of view, it doesn't matter where somebody is spatially---somebody isn't automatically worth less because you move them to the moon or to Africa or something. A human life is a human life. If you have that moral point of view that future generations matter in proportion to their population numbers, then you get this very stark implication that existential risk mitigation has a much higher utility than pretty much anything else that you could do. There are so many people that could come into existence in the future if humanity survives this critical period of time---we might live for billions of years, our descendants might colonize billions of solar systems, and there could be billions and billions times more people than exist currently. Therefore, even a very small reduction in the probability of realizing this enormous good will tend to outweigh even immense benefits like eliminating poverty or curing malaria, which would be tremendous under ordinary standards.

## Policy Action Good
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