# CD K – Adorno JF17

### Glossary

#### “Reification” = *thingification* of human social relationships. Transforming human subjects into objects (as in commodity fetishism, where e.g. friendships are understood as solely transactional) who are determined by things (human constructs, like money or the state). A specific form of alienation.

#### “Alienation” = the general condition of human estrangement from essential human nature as a result of losing one’s ability to conceive of oneself as the master of one’s destiny (e.g. being dependent on a job/manager/set of social expectations to survive) present in societies stratified by class.

#### “Commodity fetishism” = the perception of social relationships as economic relationships like among the money and commodities exchanged in trade. A specific form of reification.

#### “Object” = The concrete things we are talking about. The actual person standing in front of me, or the piece of artwork, or the Embassy building, or whatever. Represented via concepts.

#### “Subject” = The agency making judgments about particular objects. You, pretty much.

#### “Concept” = A general mental representation used to organize and group particular objects, such as a property (“red”) or an abstract idea (“freedom!”).

#### “Non-identity” = concepts incompletely represent objects. For instance, the idea “red” may draw out a feature of an apple, but it can’t in itself contain all the variety of “reds” that we might find on the skin of even one apple. Our idea of gender is another good example – the concepts we use, like “male” and “female,” only partially capture the uniqueness of each of our relationships to our bodies. A good metaphor for thinking about nonidentity is trying to catch water in cheesecloth – you may trap a lot of the object’s liquid, but it will always seep through and overflow our representations.

#### “Negative dialectics” = “dialectics” is the process of reconciling the difference between the object and the concept (their non-identity). Adorno uses the term “negative” dialectics to emphasize that we revise our concepts, rather than trying to force our objects to conform to them. If you have a shoe that doesn’t fit, you get a differently-sized shoe instead of squashing your foot in there.

*Adorno develops negative dialectics as a critique of Hegel’s dialectics, which emphasizes “sublation” (the reconciliation of a thesis and antithesis – two contradictory concepts – into a new concept) being applied to a particular object; the philosophical system transcends particularity. Adorno is a big fan of particularity, since he thinks that Hegel’s dialectic fails to accommodate the inevitable non-identity of object and concept. Concepts aren’t floating about in the Platonic ether, they’re historically determined tools & heuristics for our mental processes. So we should stop treating them as absolutes.*

## 1NCs

### 1NC – Gurevitch

I read the Gurevitch card once as a case turn to an aff, but I don’t think the O’Connor evidence fits very well with the rest of the K.

#### The aff’s concept of unfettered dialogue assumes that pure speech is in principle equally accessible and open to all… Yet their concept of free speech papers over primary non-identities: speech is interrupted and silenced along relations of domination; speech interrupts antecedent silences and silences difference. The 1NC’s negative dialectical analysis of free speech rejects the aff’s call for deliberative commonality, recognizing the limitations of conceptual knowledge and the critical promise of silence.

Gurevitch 01 [Zali Gurevitch (Faculty of Social Sciences Hebrew University of Jerusalem). “Dialectical dialogue: the struggle for speech, repressive silence, and the shift to multiplicity.” *British Journal of Sociology* Vol. No. 52 Issue No. 1 (March 2001) pp. 87–104. // WWXR]

Dialogue is an unstable state. In Adorno’s (1973) terms of negative dialectics [dialogue] it may be described as non-identity, the impossibility of the ultimate quiethood of harmony. The truth of harmony, for him, is in dissonance. This dialogic sensibility applies to all aspects of dialogue – it is forever either too much or too little, wavering and shifting sides which tilt not only toward understanding and open play but also away, and against, ‘agonisti- cally guided by contrary solicitations . . . the tension-laden constellation of forces pulling us at once in the direction of consensuality and in the direc- tion of dissent’ (Coles 1995: 31). The dialectical aspect of dialogue illuminates those tensions of non-identity, which both take place within a dialogical framework as well as threaten it. It reopens dialogue and troubles its assumed unity, taken for granted, common world, and even troubles its assumed or wished for plurality. In sociological theory dialogue was treated as a basic unit and dynamism of the social, which plays between that which is non-identity, open and con- tingent, and that which encapsulates and structures the social. George Herbert Mead (1934) was one of the rst to make the dialogic element of human sociality his leading concept. For Mead dialogue is basically gestural – a gesture with pragmatic charge that enables, through addressing itself to the other’s corresponding response, a common play, and eventually a rule governed game of self and society. His dialogic sociality indeed offers a certain openness of the social, which was developed by the Symbolic Inter- actionist project to the interpretability and negotiability of social facts. Generally, however, the tendency is toward an orchestrated dialogical whole, founded on the assumption of sameness as the condition for con- versation of gestures. This is also Schutz’s (1970) basic idealization (as he calls it), that dialogue works toward commonality and unification of the world as taken for granted. Ethnomethodology (e.g. Watson and Robert 1992) developed this idea in connection with language games and practical talk where dialogue or conversation1 expose the openness and fragility of ‘structure’, ‘rules’ and ‘facts’. The emphasis in these theories is mainly descriptive – dialogue is considered as a phenomenon to be discovered, which usually reveals the (supposed or constructed) unity or commonness of the social. Dialogue is referred to as a practice and site for constituting a unified world, where strangeness, difference and opposition are overcome by dialogical sociality, and assume away the critical importance of the split in dialogue (see Gurevitch 1988). In recent critical sociological theory the term ‘dialogue’ changes from a descriptive to a critical, corrective tool, pertaining not only to how social order is developed and maintained, but how a distorted sociality should be redeemed. Dialogue, in this way, is tantamount to an interrogation of authoritarian or distortive speech and with the project of restoring freedom, multiplicity, democracy, expression (see Gardiner, 1996). Bakhtin (1981) figures dialogue as the main corrective instrument and the goal in his attack against abstract and detached linguistic structures as well as monologic, authoritarian and totalistic forms. For Habermas (1984), in a different way, dialogue is a tool for the execution of rationality, ethics, and enlightenment, a corrective of distorted speech, and the restoration of reasoned understanding, the telos of communicative action. In this critical and corrective mode, dialogue tends to be idealized as the primordial element in human life, which is already an open and egalitarian enterprise. Since ‘life is by its very nature dialogical’ (Bakhtin 1984: 293), it is only in dialogue, whether the intimate unmediated encounter of Buber,2 the living plurality of language of Bakhtin, or the ideal speech community of Habermas, that humanity can fully come to the fore as an existential stance, a literary trope, or an ethical accomplishment. What is avoided, however, is the elemental problematic of dialogue itself. Rather than leave dialogue as a pure structure distorted by ‘external’ arrangements or ideologies and constrained by social and institutional factors (Voloshinov 1973), it is argued in the following that dialogue must itself be critically interrogated.3 This is also relevant in anthropology, where dialogue is the method of inquiry, stretching between the anthropologists and the social ‘other’ with whom, of whom, or for whom they speak. Recently, critical studies in anthropology (cf. Clifford and Marcus 1986; Rapport 1997) foregrounded the dialogic nature of anthropological knowledge, advocating it as critique against monologistic tendencies on the part of the ‘knowing’ anthropolo- gist and ‘objective’ knowledge. Yet even in this eld, as Crapanzano (1992: 188,197) comments, the problematic of dialogue itself has hardly been considered In the last few years there has been much talk about dialogue in anthropological circles. Some of it has a distinctly messianic tone. It heralds in a new paradigm . . . [but] dialogue not only reveals but often enough conceals the power relations and the desires that lie behind the spoken word . . . dialogue has a transformational as well as an opposi- tional dimension – an agonistic one. In the present essay I intend to explore such elements of opposition, coercion, fear and struggle as inherent in dialogic encounter, and to con- sider the possibility of egalitarian plurality and multiplicity as possible dia- logic shifts rather than imposed ideology. At first, the aspect of opposition and struggle in dialogue will be explored as a condition for recognition. In this struggle, speech fights against another speech, voice against voice, to the point of I or Thou, enslaving the Other speech in order to attain a master’s voice. This dialectical aspect is mitigated both in social life and in theory with counter forces, either those who (e.g. Taylor 1992) lay more stress on the Other’s right for recognition, or those who accentuate dia- logue’s primordial plurality. The first type is more clearly an ethical approach, advocating justice and freedom, while the second (like Bakhtin’s approach) is more concerned with plurality as dialogic play. The struggle for recognition, and the two responses to it, namely, the ethical and the plural will be considered in the following as three dialogic ‘moments’. I will begin with a dialogical reading of Hegel’s figures of Master and Slave. These gures succinctly portray the problematic of the struggle for recognition and the dialectics of the ‘middle term’ between Self and Other. They imply issues such as power relations, authoritarian- ism, centrism, and enforced silence within dialogue. Following that, I will relate specifically to repressive silence and its vicissitudes, and then discuss ethical dialogue that balances mastery and repressive silence by shifting from Self to the giving of recognition, respect, and listening to the Other. Finally, I will turn to the third moment of multiplicity – where dialogue questions the oppository mode, highlighting sociable play rather than a drama of recognition. Each of these moments will be particularly explored by a different theoretical approach pertaining to specific types of social situations and the way they connect to each. I shall follow each moment separately, and as they develop, respond to, and shift from one to the other, portraying together an idea of the ‘social’ as a critical dialogic stance with its inherent dialectical betweenness and potential opening and expanding multiplicity. THE MIDDLE TERM BETWEEN MASTER AND SLAVE Translated into dialogical terms, Hegel’s (1977 [1807]) figures of Master and Slave relate the tension between speakers who strive for recognition, independence and mastery. The struggle of the Master and the Slave may be understood as a struggle within consciousness, or, in a more anthropologized and social way, as Kojève (1969) presented it, and as I tend to use it here, between two consciousnesses. In this process of attainment of self-consciousness, one must go through negation. Self-consciousness has to win recognition and recognition by an other. To be in dialogue in a dialectical way would mean the individual consciousness getting out of itself, negating itself, and meeting another consciousness, which threatens (in its very strange and external existence) to tear and disavow the Self. The Other must, therefore, be eventually negated again, and superseded, won over, to return to the unified Self. This is how consciousness splits. For Hegel this split is the ‘middle term’ where the encounter is brought to its fundamental split as a setup for duel. It is winning or dying. The middle term becomes a point of inner distance, where one must ‘stretch’ one’s consciousness to the limit of Otherness in order to meet the external, ‘alien’ Other who does the same and is met at the moment of his/her own extreme self-distance The middle term is self-consciousness which splits into the extremes; and each extreme is this exchanging of its own determinateness and an absolute transition into the opposite. Although, as consciousness, it does indeed come out of itself, yet, though out of itself, it is at the same time kept back within itself. . . Each is for the other the middle term, through which each mediates itself with itself and unites with itself. . . They recog- nize themselves as mutually recognizing one another. (Hegel 1977: 112) The encounter is, then, a moment of two ‘Selves’ who have become ‘Other’ but must hold on to their unity and supersede that moment, that is, super- sede the other and their own threatening Otherness. The question becomes that of risking one’s life, like in playing ‘chicken’ – how far can one go out of oneself to win the other, taking the risk of not coming back. The one who yields out of fear, and turns back rst, loses. The winner becomes the speaker, the Master’s voice, and the loser loses the right of speech. The silenced looser in fact there and then endows recognition in silence, admitting the other’s last word.4 In this way, the human moment of encounter turns into a fight unto death. It is one or the other, and thus the only path possible is either kill the other or be killed. The middle term, that delicate moment of imbal- ance at the heart of human encounter, where one is dangerously out of one’s shell, becomes a decisive moment of masterly freedom or else of defeat and loss of Self – that is, if we understand ‘Self’ as desire for pres- ence and voice and as fear of humiliation and death. The fight may take the form of controversy, dispute or contest, with poss- ible knockouts, sometimes below the belt, aiming to silence the other, knock him/her down to the floor of silence. In more moderate terms, this is applicable to any conversation where an arena is set for the appearance of individual voices claiming recognition, the right of speech, speaking time, attention, even when ritualized and mannered. In this drama, speeches fight for the recognition of the Other, both the Other against whom the fight is on, and also for the recognition of a third party – siblings rivaling over parents, an audience, a friend, a lover, or (as in the story of Cain and Abel) God. In the same vein, Harold Bloom’s (1973) ‘anxiety of in uence’ is depicted as a dialectic of struggle for the word against the already given word When a potential poet rst discovers (or is discovered by) the dialectic of in uence, rst discovers poetry as being both external and internal to himself, he begins a process that will end only when he has no more poetry within him . . . for the poet is condemned to learn his profound- est yearning through an awareness of other selves. (op. cit.: 25–26) The struggle of speech for individuality and poetic strength is a struggle against in uence, against the threat of being faded by a stronger word that shadows one’s self existence. The poetic ‘strong’ voice is caught in a com- bative dialogue, where the bond is not weaker than the ght. The desire to free oneself of the forced hearing of the Other’s voice, only repeats that voice, albeit in ‘misreading’ and variation. Thus the struggle to get away from conversation is in conversation. This is true in the history of creation and writing, as in ordinary, actual conversation. Killer speech cannot avoid the middle term throughout. Killing the other ‘all together’ would have disastrous consequences even for the potential winner. The death of the other would destroy the prospect of victory, because who will survive to recognize the Master? The dependence of the Master, then, turns death into submission – and forms the gures of Master and Slave. Superiority and submission substitute for freedom and death. These are more acceptable socially as legitimate practices within orderly social encounter, especially in their contained forms of insti- tutionalized competition, authority and control. In the ordinary and hard- ened forms the struggle is embalmed in repression with its two prototypical sides – the repressor and the repressed. Consequently, the middle term is silenced and erased, and conversation becomes merely a conversation through things, which for the Master are a nuisance and for the Slave are blood, sweat and tears. The middle term of conversation and its vibrant silence becomes repressive and repressed silence. REPRESSIVE SILENCE Repressive silence implies that a struggle for speech had been decided, either by terror, through ‘fair’ ght, through internalized discipline or at the point of a gun, any gun, as the gun of humiliation, silencing doubt, fear, opposition. Out loud it comes as an order, such as a soft ‘hush!’ a more out front ‘Shut up!’ or simply ‘Silence!’ which aims to restrain, suf- focate, deaden, block presence, stop the voice from crying, cover up pain, and thus obsess inner talk. There are both ordinary and extreme, violent forms of such arrest of speech. It may begin with a very ordinary small event – like silencing someone because he or she is ‘making noise’, or ‘speaks out of line’ in phrases such as ‘Be quiet’, ‘Don’t say that’, or just ‘No!’ These repressive gestures are the hallmark of education’s whips operative in ever y classroom and home. But they are also part of everyday conversation, strewn among ordinary sentences and gestures. They may come in slight hints, a twitch of an eye, or a changing expression of a face, signs (so evident in intimate relations) that we tend to respond to almost with a re ex; and they may be overt, like not listening, turning to someone else, diverting a subject, not asking an expected question, or hurting with words against words, saying ‘it’ is worthless, and thus signaling speech to stop.5 The development of a speaker involves both speech and silence. Learn- ing to speak is also learning not to speak, partly as a way of restraint, and partly in terror, sometimes bleeding silently from a hurting remark, only not to risk our necks in the struggle. A rebellious thought might have already crept into our minds and subverted the talk that keeps on while we split off and are distracted. The unsaid and the turmoil around it may nd its way to a backstage conversation such as: Q: ‘Why don’t you tell her that?’ A: ‘I can’t.’ Q: ‘What are you afraid of? . . . just tell her . . . she will understand . . . and even if she . . .’ A: ‘I can’t tell her that!’ We close ourselves off or run away to the other side of the street from words we shirk from – afraid to utter or to hear.6 This may be the case face to face, or more easily when in a group of conversants, the dispersed atten- tion allows more shade for distraction. We become in part silenced speech, unheard, euphemized, or obsessive, carrying in our speeches a chain of repressions, fear, unstruggled for words, orders, chickenings, victories, from both sides of the Master–Slave equation. From the general phenomenon described above, the potentiality of abusive repression is the more troubling issue, and that which speci cally concerns critical theory. We shift from ubiquitous phrases of shutting up in social interaction to horrendous states where discipline as repressive silence becomes outright terror – a manifestation of evil. What distin- guishes evil repression from ordinary discipline of conversation is its uni- directionality – repression directed solely onto the other and never upon oneself in respect for the other. Political ‘critical’ writing focuses on exemplifying this in cases from con- temporary politics and their anti-conversational approach, erasing or repressing desire. These critics emphasize particularly the desire of ‘the Other’ that is forced into silence, threatened and banished from the kingdom of the spoken. Silence is used as a weapon of subjugation, an act of force against speech, the suffocation of the ‘Other’s’ voice and its poten- tial danger. ‘Above all the Dirty war is a war of silencing’, writes Taussig (1992: 26) about state terror. Masters, individual or systemic, silence their inferiors, the state its citizens, the anthropologists their ‘natives’, men women, adults children, doctors patients, knowledge alternative know- ledge. Sampson (1993) describes the importance of this issue in contemporary thinking in a summary form The postmodern era has witnessed the vigorous emergence of numerous social movements on behalf of the silenced seeking to gain a voice in the affairs of the day, and to name the terms of that voice . . . the women’s movement is one of the major forces leading this transformation joined as well by movements on behalf of people of color, people with different sexual orientations, people with different lifestyles and experiences, people concerned about ecology and environmental issues, and a whole range of emerging nationalistic movements. (op. cit.: 14) Silence here ‘shrouds’ itself (Felman 1992: 183) by asserting avoidance and a voiding of hearing and of acknowledging. Silenced speech is coupled with a silenced ear, which undercuts the possibility of testimony as a way to conversation. It is essentially the refusal to lend an ear to the other’s night- mare (Beckett’s Godot) Gogo: I had a dream. Didi: Don’t tell me! Gogo: I dreamt that – Didi: DON’T TELL ME! This is not to say that the broken voice, even in a secluded and petri ed way, is totally deteriorated. Remnants of an inner ear are never paralyzed. Speech lurks below the silenced and silence lurks below speech. Repressive silence is never fully ‘successful’. The silenced remain in the zone of whisper, spell, dream or haunted thoughts. The ear lets it be heard, the inscribed body memorizes, becomes voice, becomes speech, not always welcome (when the repressed returns in a demonic form). The result thus is more subtle than just a clear cut division between the said and the unsaid, the spoken and the restricted from speech or from hearing (Foucault 1984: 309): Silence itself – the things one declines to say, or is forbidden to name . . . is less the absolute limit of discourse, the other side from which it is sep- arated by a strict boundar y, than an element that functions alongside the things said. Repressive silence is thus not exactly what we would tend to call ‘silence’. It is not silent at all. It is rather tantamount with speech – a shout or an order not to speak, the speech under silence, and the convoluted and sub- versive speech that results. The dictating mouth is not silent and the silenced even less. Thus on both sides – of the silencer and the silenced – repressive silence or repressive speech are states of a distorted, broken, or violently cut conversation.7 As already mentioned, speech (every one’s speech, I presume) bears a history of silencing and being silenced, scarred with moments of aggression and insult and their accompanying feelings of shame, guilt, fear and rage. Yet speech is also born in moments of breaking the silence, which implies here unsilencing silence not only speech. Therefore, the speech that breaks the hardened shell of repressive silence is not a pure expression of an authentic voice, but an after-silence-speech – a critique of repressive speech. To resume conversation means, then, more than just claiming or giving the right of speech; it is the exposure of silence itself. Consequently, conversation requires not only the ability to speak, but the ability to be silent. Rather than repression – the inability to speak – it is free speech, which goes through silence – the ability not to speak. The resolution of repressive silence would be, then, not only the resurgence of speech but the return of silence – silence that makes space and proliferates speech. Hence, instead of the intuitive concept of ‘talk-talk’ as definitive of conversation, a more complex one is suggested, namely, ‘talk-silence-talk’, where talk is critical of its own inherent repression. Conversation is rendered as a form of critique, then, not in its knowledgeable statements, but in its ability to be silent that predicates the communicative act as an essential aspect of social knowledge.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who provides the best method for reconciling our conceptual models of the world with the objects they attempt to represent. Reworking our subjectivities and conceptual schemas to avoid appealing to a moral value or totalization of politics absent self-reflection is necessary to prevent the conditions of possibility of atrocities.

Adorno 98 [Adorno, Theodor W. (1998) ‘Education after Auschwitz’, in his *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*, Columbia University Press, New York. // WWXR 2016-8-4]

The premier demand upon all education is that Auschwitz not happen again. Its priority before any other requirement is such that I believe I need not and should not justify it. I cannot understand why it has been given so little concern until now. To justify it would be monstrous in the face of the monstrosity that took place. Yet the fact that one is so barely conscious of this demand and the questions it raises shows that the monstrosity has not penetrated people’s minds deeply, itself a symptom of the continuing potential for its recurrence as far as peoples’ conscious and unconscious is concerned. Every debate about the ideals of education is trivial and inconsequential compared to this single ideal: never again Auschwitz. It was the barbarism all education strives against. One speaks of the threat of a relapse into barbarism. But it is not a threat—Auschwitz was this relapse, and barbarism continues as long as the fundamental conditions that favored that relapse continue largely unchanged. That is the whole horror. The societal pressure still bears down, although the danger remains invisible nowadays. It drives people toward the unspeakable, which culminated on a world-historical scale in Auschwitz. Among the insights of Freud that truly extend even into culture and sociology, one of the most profound seems to me to be that civilization itself produces anti-civilization and increasingly reinforces it. His writings Civilization and its Discontents and Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego deserve the widest possible diffusion, especially in connection with Auschwitz.1 If barbarism itself is inscribed within the principle of civilization, then there is something desperate in the attempt to rise up against it. Any reflection on the means to prevent the recurrence of Auschwitz is darkened by the thought that this desperation must be made conscious to people, lest they give way to idealistic platitudes. Nevertheless the attempt must be made, even in the face of the fact that the fundamental structure of society, and thereby its members who have made it so, are the same today as twenty-five years ago. Millions of innocent people—to quote or haggle over the numbers is already inhumane—were systematically murdered. That cannot be dismissed by any living person as a superficial phenomenon, as an aberra- tion of the course of history to be disregarded when compared to the great dynamic of progress, of enlightenment, of the supposed growth of humanitarianism. The fact that it happened is itself the expression of an extremely powerful societal tendency. Here I would like to refer to a fact that, very characteristically, seems to be hardly known in Germany, although it furnished the material for a best-seller like The Forty Days of Musa Dagh by Werfel.2 Already in the First World War the Turks—the so-called “Young Turk Movement” under the leadership of Enver Pascha and Talaat Pascha—murdered well over a million Armenians. The highest German military and government authori- ties apparently were aware of this but kept it strictly secret. Genocide has its roots in this resurrection of aggressive nationalism that has developed in many countries since the end of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, one cannot dismiss the thought that the invention of the atomic bomb, which can obliterate hundreds of thousands of people literally in one blow, belongs in the same historical context as genocide. The rapid population growth of today is called a population explosion; it seems as though historical destiny responded by readying counter-explosions, the killing of whole populations. This only to intimate how much the forces against which one must act are those of the course of world history. Since the possibility of changing the objective—namely societal and political—conditions is extremely limited today, attempts to work against the repetition of Auschwitz are necessarily restricted to the subjective dimension. By this I also mean essentially the psychology of people who do such things. I do not believe it would help much to appeal to eternal values, at which the very people who are prone to commit such atrocities would merely shrug their shoulders. I also do not believe that enlightenment about the positive qualities possessed by persecuted minorities would be of much use. The roots must be sought in the persecutors, not in the victims who are murdered under the paltriest of pretenses. What is necessary is what I once in this respect called the turn to the subject. One must come to know the mechanisms that render people capable of such deeds, must reveal these mechanisms to them, and strive, by awakening a general awareness of those mechanisms, to prevent people from becoming so again. It is not the victims who are guilty, not even in the sophistic and caricatured sense in which still today many like to construe it. Only those who unreflectingly vented their hate and aggression upon them are guilty. One must labor against this lack of reflection, must dissuad[ing]e people from striking outward without reflecting upon themselves. The only education that has any sense at all is an education toward critical self-reflection. But since according to the findings of depth psychology, all personalities, even those who commit atrocities in later life, are formed in early childhood, education seeking to prevent the repetition must concentrate upon early childhood. I mentioned Freud’s thesis on discontent in culture. Yet the phenomenon extends even further than he understood it, above all, because the pressure of civilization he had observed has in the meantime multiplied to an unbearable degree. At the same time the explosive tendencies he first drew attention to have assumed a violence he could hardly have foreseen. The discontent in culture, however, also has its social dimension, which Freud did not overlook though he did not explore it concretely. One can speak of the claustrophobia of humanity in the administered world, of a feeling of being incarcerated in a thoroughly societalized, closely woven, netlike environment. The denser the weave, the more one wants to escape it, whereas it is precisely its close weave that prevents any escape. This intensifies the fury against civilization. The revolt against it is violent and irrational.

#### Negative dialectics resolves the crisis Enlightenment thought poses—it negates concepts that subordinate particularity to the needs of the system, and empowers even bourgeois subjects to create the conditions of possibility for evading the harms of all-conceptuality. This method solves best for the ROB by addressing our conceptual models’ limitations.

O’Connor 4 [O’Connor, Brian (Hertford University). *Adorno’s Negative Dialectic*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004. Print. pp. 77–81// WWXR 2016-7-29]

Perhaps the most important of Adorno’s statements on the problem of Hegelian philosophy relates to the idea of negation. For Adorno, Hegel’s concept of negation almost captures a central part of the thesis of subject-object mediation: namely, that the priority of the object means that in mediation there is both identity and non- identity (or “negativity”) between subject and object. However, Adorno argues that Hegel’s version of negation ultimately fails to capture the ambiguous nature of the subject’s relation to objects as a consequence of an assumption that even nonidentity or negation is ultimately to be considered positive. It is positive, Hegel allegedly believes, since it can be interpreted as a mode of the subject’s identity with the object. Adorno argues, however, that “[t]he non-identical is not to be obtained directly, as something positive on its part, nor is it obtainable by a negation of the negative. The negation is not an affirmation itself as it is to Hegel” (ND 161/158). The basic thesis of absolute idealism is that there can be no ultimate nonidentity between thought and object. For post-Kantian German idealism, as a rule, the idea of the thing-in-itself is irrational, and on that basis—it is argued—there is nothing with which thought is not ultimately identical. For that reason Hegel’s apparently critical moment of thought, dialectic—in which the inadequacy of the concept is evinced by its own self-contradiction (EL §81)—is prejudiced by the assumption that the object must in the end be fundamentally identical with some concept (again this being the problem, as Adorno sees it, of Hegel’s architectonic). Adorno argues that, by assuming that all possible descriptions of the subject-object relation can be reduced to identity, Hegel vitiates the realist character of the dialectic: “At each new dialectical step, Hegel goes against the intermittent insight of his own logic, forgets the rights of the preceding step, and thus prepares to copy what he chided as abstract negation: an abstract—to wit, a subjectively and arbitrarily confirmed—positivity” (ND 162/159); “The thesis that the negation of the negation is something positive can only be upheld by one who presupposes positivity—as all-conceptuality—from the beginning” (ND 162/160). Hegel’s logic, according to Adorno, attempts to “dispute away the distinction between idea and reality” (ND 329/335) and this means that the concept of dialectic in Hegel cannot be rec- onciled with the account of experience Adorno wants to defend. One might argue that these are unfair criticisms given that they are based on a presupposition about Hegel’s philosophy which Hegel himself would hardly accept. Hegel is not trying to overcome ideal- ism; rather, he seems to assume programmatically the identity of the absolute from the beginning. Thus it is inaccurate to suggest—as Adorno sometimes does—that Hegel almost understands the impli- cations of his dialectical moment. But what Adorno is saying is that Hegel’s philosophy does, at least in places, lend itself to—if not amount to—a materialist theory of experience. Yet, for Adorno, Hegel dogmatically pursues a metaphysical agenda, one that is most strongly undermined by his own materialist theses. In the following passage, for example, Adorno cites Hegel and then provides a gloss outlining how Hegel has missed the point of his own philosophy: “Truth is also positive, as knowledge coinciding with the object, but it is this self-sameness only if knowledge has reacted negatively to the Other, if it has penetrated the object and has voided the negation which it is.” The qualification of truth as a negative reaction on the part of the knowledge that penetrates the object—in other words: extinguishes the appearance of the object being directly as it is—sounds like a program of negative dialectics as knowledge “coinciding with the object.” But the establishment of this knowledge as positivity abjures that program. (ND 162–163/160) Several clarifications need to be made of this passage. First, what have positivity or negativity got to do with anything? The context of Hegel’s idealism helps make sense of this. Adorno takes Hegel’s system to be aimed at completeness, and interprets the latter as positivity inasmuch as, as the passage goes, “it has penetrated the object and has voided the negation which it is.” If experience can be, as Adorno has stipulated, “full unreduced experience in the medium of conceptual reflection” then Hegel seems to have prejudiced the outcome of an examination of the nature of experience by pinning it to a presupposed order of conceptual positivity. Hence Hegel’s system has not fully absorbed the logic of experience. Adorno is claiming that Hegel is right in so far as he argues—to put it in Adorno’s epistemological terms—that knowledge is determined by the object: knowledge coincides with the object in that sense. But Hegel is more fundamentally committed to the idea of absolute identity, and that commitment “abjures” his implicit materialism. In essence, then, Hegel’s view of experience produces a distorted picture of subjectivity in that it deprives subjectivity of the ability to discriminate—to criticize—and replaces it with the ineluctable goal of identity. The effect of this, Adorno argues, is that the experience of particularity, which is achieved in the successful dialectical thesis of the introduction to the Phenomenology, is subordinated to the needs of the system: particularity itself is lost, and instead is transformed into a philosophical version of particularity. Adorno writes: “Hegel is constantly forced to shadow-box because he shrinks from his own conception: from the dialectics of the particular, which destroyed the primacy of identity and thus, consistently, idealism itself. For the particular he substitutes the general concept of particularization pure and simple—of ‘Existenz,’ for instance, in which the particular is not any more” (ND 175/173). Indeed there is a passage in Hegel that certainly seems to say exactly what Adorno is here attributing to him. In one part of the Encyclopaedia Hegel argues that particular sensible objects are unintelligible apart from their concept, which he sees as their essence. And that cognizance of essence appears to be an activity quite other than that of the experience of particulars described in the Phenomenology: With regard to the equally immediate consciousness of the existence of external things, this is nothing else than sensible consciousness; that we have a consciousness of this kind is the least of all cognitions. All that is of interest here is to know that this immediate knowing of the being of external things is deception and error, and that there is no truth in the sensible as such, but that the being of these external things is rather something-contingent, something that passes away, or a semblance; they are essentially this: to have only an existence that is separable from their concept, or their essence. (EL §76) A grand conclusion that Adorno attempts to draw from what he sees as the problem of Hegel’s treatment of particulars is that subjectivity, too, is thereby eroded in some way. A subject which achieves identity willy-nilly is, then, an inadequate subject. This conclusion is as ironic as it is radical. Far from empowering the subject, the achievement of identity reduces the subject by depriving it of the structures that could explain its critical, negative dimension. The Phenomenology had sketched out a compelling account of the way in which the subject’s engagement with objectivity is critical. And that critical dimension is, as we have seen Adorno argue, incompatible with a system that, in essence, has the metaphysical motivation of validating the nonexperiential notion of identity.

### 1NC – Fiat

You could just read the Bonefeld card if you wish. This is less topic-specific, and was intended as an answer to e.g. Coverstone. I never found an opportunity to read it, though, so I didn’t write out many frontlines.

#### “When all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail…” Justifying an affirmative ballot on the grounds that their policy would hypothetically best promote utility is an instance of Enlightenment thought that aims to administer, regulate, and master the external world—the judge should vote negative to refuse this regulation. They claim to understand the operation of political processes, the accuracy of scientific predictions, and facile rationalizations about “the greatest good,” but each of these claims is self-serving and violent—emphasis on the unity and coherence of these uses of conceptual schemas forecloses the possibility of disconfirming experience—you treat various aspects of the external world as wholly understandable objects subsumed under scientific probability models or idealistic theories of justice, which rubber-stamps an affirmative conclusion from the start. The 1AC’s use of policy simulation acts in service of bourgeois Enlightenment logics of mastery and control through conceptualizing the political as a completely-specifiable object, which terminates in serial policy failure and finds its apotheosis in the slave-master. Vote neg to analyze the aff’s contradictions.

Bonefeld 09 [Bonefeld, Werner. “Emancipatory Praxis and Conceptuality in Adorno.” *Negativity and Revolution: Adorno & Political Activism*. Eds. John Holloway, Fernando Matamoros & Sergio Tischler. London: Pluto Press, 2009. pp. 128–130. // WWXR]

bracketed for gendered language

Conceptualisation does thus not mean “thinking” about things. Rather, it means thinking out of things (Adorno 1973: 33). If it were really about things, then conceptualisation would be external to its subject matter – thought would be applied to something presupposed as fact. Thought would thus relate to its world as a tool that can be applied to society like an instrument. The thing or reality is here presupposed as something external to thought, and vice versa, as if they really belonged to different worlds. Thought that does not go into its object does not recognise its object. Instead, it hypothesises its object and, by doing so, analyses it as an “as if.” That is, by hypothesising the objective world it hypothesises itself as a derivative of objects. Such thought is able to name and order things but cannot recognise them. In its vulgar version it operates an ethics akin to a cash register – indifferent to its own substance, eager to calculate. Thinking out of things aims at discovering their social constitution. For instance, does “price of labour amount to a yellow logarithm” (Marx 1966: 818) or is £5 an hour just and fair? Whatever the fairness or unfairness of a £5 an hour wage, analytical thinking does not bring the thing to its concept. It presupposes the thing and describes it in analytical terms, but does not recognise it. Why has human social existence acquired the form of a commodity? And what laws of necessity exist in a society whose labour power is saleable? Do the interests of the sellers and buyers of labour power coincide? These questions suggest that reification is really just an “epiphenomenon” (Adorno 1973: 190). What is reified and what is reification a reification of? Marx’s critique of religion argues that God requires no explanation. This is not because God cannot be explained but because the explanation of God rests on the comprehension of the social relations that bring God to the fore as an objective abstraction that controls and cows those same social relations from which it springs. Equally, reified things[’] do not require explanation by and of themselves. Their comprehension rests on the understanding of the social relations that exist in the mode of the object, and disappear in the appearance [Schein] of reality’s objective [gegen- ständlicher] character. What is it about the particular mode of human practice that requires it to exist against itself in the mode of the object? The reductio ad hominem that for Adorno (1993: 143) characterises the critical intent of Marx’s work does not entail the replacement of the object by the subject. It means the comprehension of the object as a mode of existence of the subject. Just as objectivity without the subject is nonsense, subjectivity without the object is nothing. Human practice is not only constitutive of the social world. Human practice also constitutes [the hu]Man as a social being. Man is a social concept – Man is neither a biological fact nor is society the result of instinct; Man is not made by God, nor is society regulated by a total social subject [gesamtgesellschaftliches Subjekt] that governs social reproduction through invisible means. In order to understand things, one has to be within them. Hegel’s notion of the work of the concept [die Arbeit des Begriffs] entails an internal connection between concept and thing, experience and substance. The concept, of course, does not work. We do. The work of the concept thus means to be led by thought without fear of where it might take us. The work of the concept means recognising the interior life of the thing-hood of society, to engage in its contradictions, and thus to understand not only the necessity of its movement, but also its capacity. What belongs to the constituted conceptuality of, say, the state? What is it capable of? What lies within its concept? Revealing the constituted conceptuality of things entails discovery of their internal life; it entails understanding the necessity of their mode of motion [Bewegungsweise], capacity and power [Macht], means and ends. Conceptualisation thus means articulating what is active in things, revealing their contradictory constitution and movement, and comprehending the violence that is hidden in and sustains the civilised appearance of equal and fair exchange relations. This, however, also means that conceptualisation – the work of the concept – works against its own tendency. Its critical intent is to demystify the fetish. However, to conceptualise means to identify. Identification does not crush the fetish; it affirms it. Conceptualisation is thus itself contradictory – it has to think against itself. In order to bring the thing to its concept [auf den Begriff bringen] the concept cannot encompass the thing [aufgehen in der Sache]. It has to be more than the thing, and this “more” has also to be within the thing. If thing and concept were to coincide, a critical theory of society would be superfluous. In short, the conceptualisation of things entails recognising their contradictory existence.

#### *The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who provides the best method for reconciling our conceptual models of the world with the objects they attempt to represent. Reworking our subjectivities and conceptual schemas to avoid appealing to a moral value or totalization of politics absent self-reflection is necessary to prevent the conditions of possibility of atrocities.*

*Adorno 98 [Adorno, Theodor W. (1998) ‘Education after Auschwitz’, in his Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords, Columbia University Press, New York. // WWXR 2016-8-4]*

*The premier demand upon all education is that Auschwitz not happen again. Its priority before any other requirement is such that I believe I need not and should not justify it. I cannot understand why it has been given so little concern until now. To justify it would be monstrous in the face of the monstrosity that took place. Yet the fact that one is so barely conscious of this demand and the questions it raises shows that the monstrosity has not penetrated people’s minds deeply, itself a symptom of the continuing potential for its recurrence as far as peoples’ conscious and unconscious is concerned. Every debate about the ideals of education is trivial and inconsequential compared to this single ideal: never again Auschwitz. It was the barbarism all education strives against. One speaks of the threat of a relapse into barbarism. But it is not a threat—Auschwitz was this relapse, and barbarism continues as long as the fundamental conditions that favored that relapse continue largely unchanged. That is the whole horror. The societal pressure still bears down, although the danger remains invisible nowadays. It drives people toward the unspeakable, which culminated on a world-historical scale in Auschwitz. Among the insights of Freud that truly extend even into culture and sociology, one of the most profound seems to me to be that civilization itself produces anti-civilization and increasingly reinforces it. His writings Civilization and its Discontents and Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego deserve the widest possible diffusion, especially in connection with Auschwitz.1 If barbarism itself is inscribed within the principle of civilization, then there is something desperate in the attempt to rise up against it. Any reflection on the means to prevent the recurrence of Auschwitz is darkened by the thought that this desperation must be made conscious to people, lest they give way to idealistic platitudes. Nevertheless the attempt must be made, even in the face of the fact that the fundamental structure of society, and thereby its members who have made it so, are the same today as twenty-five years ago. Millions of innocent people—to quote or haggle over the numbers is already inhumane—were systematically murdered. That cannot be dismissed by any living person as a superficial phenomenon, as an aberra- tion of the course of history to be disregarded when compared to the great dynamic of progress, of enlightenment, of the supposed growth of humanitarianism. The fact that it happened is itself the expression of an extremely powerful societal tendency. Here I would like to refer to a fact that, very characteristically, seems to be hardly known in Germany, although it furnished the material for a best-seller like The Forty Days of Musa Dagh by Werfel.2 Already in the First World War the Turks—the so-called “Young Turk Movement” under the leadership of Enver Pascha and Talaat Pascha—murdered well over a million Armenians. The highest German military and government authori- ties apparently were aware of this but kept it strictly secret. Genocide has its roots in this resurrection of aggressive nationalism that has developed in many countries since the end of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, one cannot dismiss the thought that the invention of the atomic bomb, which can obliterate hundreds of thousands of people literally in one blow, belongs in the same historical context as genocide. The rapid population growth of today is called a population explosion; it seems as though historical destiny responded by readying counter-explosions, the killing of whole populations. This only to intimate how much the forces against which one must act are those of the course of world history. Since the possibility of changing the objective—namely societal and political—conditions is extremely limited today, attempts to work against the repetition of Auschwitz are necessarily restricted to the subjective dimension. By this I also mean essentially the psychology of people who do such things. I do not believe it would help much to appeal to eternal values, at which the very people who are prone to commit such atrocities would merely shrug their shoulders. I also do not believe that enlightenment about the positive qualities possessed by persecuted minorities would be of much use. The roots must be sought in the persecutors, not in the victims who are murdered under the paltriest of pretenses. What is necessary is what I once in this respect called the turn to the subject. One must come to know the mechanisms that render people capable of such deeds, must reveal these mechanisms to them, and strive, by awakening a general awareness of those mechanisms, to prevent people from becoming so again. It is not the victims who are guilty, not even in the sophistic and caricatured sense in which still today many like to construe it. Only those who unreflectingly vented their hate and aggression upon them are guilty. One must labor against this lack of reflection, must dissuad[ing]e people from striking outward without reflecting upon themselves. The only education that has any sense at all is an education toward critical self-reflection. But since according to the findings of depth psychology, all personalities, even those who commit atrocities in later life, are formed in early childhood, education seeking to prevent the repetition must concentrate upon early childhood. I mentioned Freud’s thesis on discontent in culture. Yet the phenomenon extends even further than he understood it, above all, because the pressure of civilization he had observed has in the meantime multiplied to an unbearable degree. At the same time the explosive tendencies he first drew attention to have assumed a violence he could hardly have foreseen. The discontent in culture, however, also has its social dimension, which Freud did not overlook though he did not explore it concretely. One can speak of the claustrophobia of humanity in the administered world, of a feeling of being incarcerated in a thoroughly societalized, closely woven, netlike environment. The denser the weave, the more one wants to escape it, whereas it is precisely its close weave that prevents any escape. This intensifies the fury against civilization. The revolt against it is violent and irrational.*

## Extra

### Extensions

#### EXTEND Gurevitch 01—the aff “take[s] for granted” a coherent idea of free speech; they claim it’s essential to the construction and maintenance of a social system that yields [their fw]—…But the concepts of freedom and dialogue imperfectly subsume every instance of speech. A negative dialectical analysis of free speech uncovers the violence out of which speech originates and by which it is silenced. It uncovers how silence is the condition of speech, and freeing silence is a necessary prerequisite to freeing speech. It uncovers the limitations of these concepts of freedom and speech, reducing the concepts to avoid constraining the objects to which they apply.

[omitted].

### Gurevitch Alt

#### The aff’s concept of unfettered dialogue assumes that pure speech is in principle equally accessible and open to all… Yet their concept of free speech papers over primary non-identities: speech is interrupted and silenced along relations of domination; speech interrupts antecedent silences and silences difference. The 1NC’s negative dialectical analysis of free speech rejects the aff’s call for deliberative commonality, recognizing the limitations of conceptual knowledge and the critical promise of silence.

Gurevitch 01 [Zali Gurevitch (Faculty of Social Sciences Hebrew University of Jerusalem). “Dialectical dialogue: the struggle for speech, repressive silence, and the shift to multiplicity.” *British Journal of Sociology* Vol. No. 52 Issue No. 1 (March 2001) pp. 87–104. // WWXR]

Dialogue is an unstable state. In Adorno’s (1973) terms of negative dialectics [dialogue] it may be described as non-identity, the impossibility of the ultimate quiethood of harmony. The truth of harmony, for him, is in dissonance. This dialogic sensibility applies to all aspects of dialogue – it is forever either too much or too little, wavering and shifting sides which tilt not only toward understanding and open play but also away, and against, ‘agonisti- cally guided by contrary solicitations . . . the tension-laden constellation of forces pulling us at once in the direction of consensuality and in the direc- tion of dissent’ (Coles 1995: 31). The dialectical aspect of dialogue illuminates those tensions of non-identity, which both take place within a dialogical framework as well as threaten it. It reopens dialogue and troubles its assumed unity, taken for granted, common world, and even troubles its assumed or wished for plurality. In sociological theory dialogue was treated as a basic unit and dynamism of the social, which plays between that which is non-identity, open and con- tingent, and that which encapsulates and structures the social. George Herbert Mead (1934) was one of the rst to make the dialogic element of human sociality his leading concept. For Mead dialogue is basically gestural – a gesture with pragmatic charge that enables, through addressing itself to the other’s corresponding response, a common play, and eventually a rule governed game of self and society. His dialogic sociality indeed offers a certain openness of the social, which was developed by the Symbolic Inter- actionist project to the interpretability and negotiability of social facts. Generally, however, the tendency is toward an orchestrated dialogical whole, founded on the assumption of sameness as the condition for con- versation of gestures. This is also Schutz’s (1970) basic idealization (as he calls it), that dialogue works toward commonality and unification of the world as taken for granted. Ethnomethodology (e.g. Watson and Robert 1992) developed this idea in connection with language games and practical talk where dialogue or conversation1 expose the openness and fragility of ‘structure’, ‘rules’ and ‘facts’. The emphasis in these theories is mainly descriptive – dialogue is considered as a phenomenon to be discovered, which usually reveals the (supposed or constructed) unity or commonness of the social. Dialogue is referred to as a practice and site for constituting a unified world, where strangeness, difference and opposition are overcome by dialogical sociality, and assume away the critical importance of the split in dialogue (see Gurevitch 1988). In recent critical sociological theory the term ‘dialogue’ changes from a descriptive to a critical, corrective tool, pertaining not only to how social order is developed and maintained, but how a distorted sociality should be redeemed. Dialogue, in this way, is tantamount to an interrogation of authoritarian or distortive speech and with the project of restoring freedom, multiplicity, democracy, expression (see Gardiner, 1996). Bakhtin (1981) figures dialogue as the main corrective instrument and the goal in his attack against abstract and detached linguistic structures as well as monologic, authoritarian and totalistic forms. For Habermas (1984), in a different way, dialogue is a tool for the execution of rationality, ethics, and enlightenment, a corrective of distorted speech, and the restoration of reasoned understanding, the telos of communicative action. In this critical and corrective mode, dialogue tends to be idealized as the primordial element in human life, which is already an open and egalitarian enterprise. Since ‘life is by its very nature dialogical’ (Bakhtin 1984: 293), it is only in dialogue, whether the intimate unmediated encounter of Buber,2 the living plurality of language of Bakhtin, or the ideal speech community of Habermas, that humanity can fully come to the fore as an existential stance, a literary trope, or an ethical accomplishment. What is avoided, however, is the elemental problematic of dialogue itself. Rather than leave dialogue as a pure structure distorted by ‘external’ arrangements or ideologies and constrained by social and institutional factors (Voloshinov 1973), it is argued in the following that dialogue must itself be critically interrogated.3 This is also relevant in anthropology, where dialogue is the method of inquiry, stretching between the anthropologists and the social ‘other’ with whom, of whom, or for whom they speak. Recently, critical studies in anthropology (cf. Clifford and Marcus 1986; Rapport 1997) foregrounded the dialogic nature of anthropological knowledge, advocating it as critique against monologistic tendencies on the part of the ‘knowing’ anthropolo- gist and ‘objective’ knowledge. Yet even in this eld, as Crapanzano (1992: 188,197) comments, the problematic of dialogue itself has hardly been considered In the last few years there has been much talk about dialogue in anthropological circles. Some of it has a distinctly messianic tone. It heralds in a new paradigm . . . [but] dialogue not only reveals but often enough conceals the power relations and the desires that lie behind the spoken word . . . dialogue has a transformational as well as an opposi- tional dimension – an agonistic one. In the present essay I intend to explore such elements of opposition, coercion, fear and struggle as inherent in dialogic encounter, and to con- sider the possibility of egalitarian plurality and multiplicity as possible dia- logic shifts rather than imposed ideology. At first, the aspect of opposition and struggle in dialogue will be explored as a condition for recognition. In this struggle, speech fights against another speech, voice against voice, to the point of I or Thou, enslaving the Other speech in order to attain a master’s voice. This dialectical aspect is mitigated both in social life and in theory with counter forces, either those who (e.g. Taylor 1992) lay more stress on the Other’s right for recognition, or those who accentuate dia- logue’s primordial plurality. The first type is more clearly an ethical approach, advocating justice and freedom, while the second (like Bakhtin’s approach) is more concerned with plurality as dialogic play. The struggle for recognition, and the two responses to it, namely, the ethical and the plural will be considered in the following as three dialogic ‘moments’. I will begin with a dialogical reading of Hegel’s figures of Master and Slave. These gures succinctly portray the problematic of the struggle for recognition and the dialectics of the ‘middle term’ between Self and Other. They imply issues such as power relations, authoritarian- ism, centrism, and enforced silence within dialogue. Following that, I will relate specifically to repressive silence and its vicissitudes, and then discuss ethical dialogue that balances mastery and repressive silence by shifting from Self to the giving of recognition, respect, and listening to the Other. Finally, I will turn to the third moment of multiplicity – where dialogue questions the oppository mode, highlighting sociable play rather than a drama of recognition. Each of these moments will be particularly explored by a different theoretical approach pertaining to specific types of social situations and the way they connect to each. I shall follow each moment separately, and as they develop, respond to, and shift from one to the other, portraying together an idea of the ‘social’ as a critical dialogic stance with its inherent dialectical betweenness and potential opening and expanding multiplicity. THE MIDDLE TERM BETWEEN MASTER AND SLAVE Translated into dialogical terms, Hegel’s (1977 [1807]) figures of Master and Slave relate the tension between speakers who strive for recognition, independence and mastery. The struggle of the Master and the Slave may be understood as a struggle within consciousness, or, in a more anthropologized and social way, as Kojève (1969) presented it, and as I tend to use it here, between two consciousnesses. In this process of attainment of self-consciousness, one must go through negation. Self-consciousness has to win recognition and recognition by an other. To be in dialogue in a dialectical way would mean the individual consciousness getting out of itself, negating itself, and meeting another consciousness, which threatens (in its very strange and external existence) to tear and disavow the Self. The Other must, therefore, be eventually negated again, and superseded, won over, to return to the unified Self. This is how consciousness splits. For Hegel this split is the ‘middle term’ where the encounter is brought to its fundamental split as a setup for duel. It is winning or dying. The middle term becomes a point of inner distance, where one must ‘stretch’ one’s consciousness to the limit of Otherness in order to meet the external, ‘alien’ Other who does the same and is met at the moment of his/her own extreme self-distance The middle term is self-consciousness which splits into the extremes; and each extreme is this exchanging of its own determinateness and an absolute transition into the opposite. Although, as consciousness, it does indeed come out of itself, yet, though out of itself, it is at the same time kept back within itself. . . Each is for the other the middle term, through which each mediates itself with itself and unites with itself. . . They recog- nize themselves as mutually recognizing one another. (Hegel 1977: 112) The encounter is, then, a moment of two ‘Selves’ who have become ‘Other’ but must hold on to their unity and supersede that moment, that is, super- sede the other and their own threatening Otherness. The question becomes that of risking one’s life, like in playing ‘chicken’ – how far can one go out of oneself to win the other, taking the risk of not coming back. The one who yields out of fear, and turns back rst, loses. The winner becomes the speaker, the Master’s voice, and the loser loses the right of speech. The silenced looser in fact there and then endows recognition in silence, admitting the other’s last word.4 In this way, the human moment of encounter turns into a fight unto death. It is one or the other, and thus the only path possible is either kill the other or be killed. The middle term, that delicate moment of imbal- ance at the heart of human encounter, where one is dangerously out of one’s shell, becomes a decisive moment of masterly freedom or else of defeat and loss of Self – that is, if we understand ‘Self’ as desire for pres- ence and voice and as fear of humiliation and death. The fight may take the form of controversy, dispute or contest, with poss- ible knockouts, sometimes below the belt, aiming to silence the other, knock him/her down to the floor of silence. In more moderate terms, this is applicable to any conversation where an arena is set for the appearance of individual voices claiming recognition, the right of speech, speaking time, attention, even when ritualized and mannered. In this drama, speeches fight for the recognition of the Other, both the Other against whom the fight is on, and also for the recognition of a third party – siblings rivaling over parents, an audience, a friend, a lover, or (as in the story of Cain and Abel) God. In the same vein, Harold Bloom’s (1973) ‘anxiety of in uence’ is depicted as a dialectic of struggle for the word against the already given word When a potential poet rst discovers (or is discovered by) the dialectic of in uence, rst discovers poetry as being both external and internal to himself, he begins a process that will end only when he has no more poetry within him . . . for the poet is condemned to learn his profound- est yearning through an awareness of other selves. (op. cit.: 25–26) The struggle of speech for individuality and poetic strength is a struggle against in uence, against the threat of being faded by a stronger word that shadows one’s self existence. The poetic ‘strong’ voice is caught in a com- bative dialogue, where the bond is not weaker than the ght. The desire to free oneself of the forced hearing of the Other’s voice, only repeats that voice, albeit in ‘misreading’ and variation. Thus the struggle to get away from conversation is in conversation. This is true in the history of creation and writing, as in ordinary, actual conversation. Killer speech cannot avoid the middle term throughout. Killing the other ‘all together’ would have disastrous consequences even for the potential winner. The death of the other would destroy the prospect of victory, because who will survive to recognize the Master? The dependence of the Master, then, turns death into submission – and forms the gures of Master and Slave. Superiority and submission substitute for freedom and death. These are more acceptable socially as legitimate practices within orderly social encounter, especially in their contained forms of insti- tutionalized competition, authority and control. In the ordinary and hard- ened forms the struggle is embalmed in repression with its two prototypical sides – the repressor and the repressed. Consequently, the middle term is silenced and erased, and conversation becomes merely a conversation through things, which for the Master are a nuisance and for the Slave are blood, sweat and tears. The middle term of conversation and its vibrant silence becomes repressive and repressed silence. REPRESSIVE SILENCE Repressive silence implies that a struggle for speech had been decided, either by terror, through ‘fair’ ght, through internalized discipline or at the point of a gun, any gun, as the gun of humiliation, silencing doubt, fear, opposition. Out loud it comes as an order, such as a soft ‘hush!’ a more out front ‘Shut up!’ or simply ‘Silence!’ which aims to restrain, suf- focate, deaden, block presence, stop the voice from crying, cover up pain, and thus obsess inner talk. There are both ordinary and extreme, violent forms of such arrest of speech. It may begin with a very ordinary small event – like silencing someone because he or she is ‘making noise’, or ‘speaks out of line’ in phrases such as ‘Be quiet’, ‘Don’t say that’, or just ‘No!’ These repressive gestures are the hallmark of education’s whips operative in ever y classroom and home. But they are also part of everyday conversation, strewn among ordinary sentences and gestures. They may come in slight hints, a twitch of an eye, or a changing expression of a face, signs (so evident in intimate relations) that we tend to respond to almost with a re ex; and they may be overt, like not listening, turning to someone else, diverting a subject, not asking an expected question, or hurting with words against words, saying ‘it’ is worthless, and thus signaling speech to stop.5 The development of a speaker involves both speech and silence. Learn- ing to speak is also learning not to speak, partly as a way of restraint, and partly in terror, sometimes bleeding silently from a hurting remark, only not to risk our necks in the struggle. A rebellious thought might have already crept into our minds and subverted the talk that keeps on while we split off and are distracted. The unsaid and the turmoil around it may nd its way to a backstage conversation such as: Q: ‘Why don’t you tell her that?’ A: ‘I can’t.’ Q: ‘What are you afraid of? . . . just tell her . . . she will understand . . . and even if she . . .’ A: ‘I can’t tell her that!’ We close ourselves off or run away to the other side of the street from words we shirk from – afraid to utter or to hear.6 This may be the case face to face, or more easily when in a group of conversants, the dispersed atten- tion allows more shade for distraction. We become in part silenced speech, unheard, euphemized, or obsessive, carrying in our speeches a chain of repressions, fear, unstruggled for words, orders, chickenings, victories, from both sides of the Master–Slave equation. From the general phenomenon described above, the potentiality of abusive repression is the more troubling issue, and that which speci cally concerns critical theory. We shift from ubiquitous phrases of shutting up in social interaction to horrendous states where discipline as repressive silence becomes outright terror – a manifestation of evil. What distin- guishes evil repression from ordinary discipline of conversation is its uni- directionality – repression directed solely onto the other and never upon oneself in respect for the other. Political ‘critical’ writing focuses on exemplifying this in cases from con- temporary politics and their anti-conversational approach, erasing or repressing desire. These critics emphasize particularly the desire of ‘the Other’ that is forced into silence, threatened and banished from the kingdom of the spoken. Silence is used as a weapon of subjugation, an act of force against speech, the suffocation of the ‘Other’s’ voice and its poten- tial danger. ‘Above all the Dirty war is a war of silencing’, writes Taussig (1992: 26) about state terror. Masters, individual or systemic, silence their inferiors, the state its citizens, the anthropologists their ‘natives’, men women, adults children, doctors patients, knowledge alternative know- ledge. Sampson (1993) describes the importance of this issue in contemporary thinking in a summary form The postmodern era has witnessed the vigorous emergence of numerous social movements on behalf of the silenced seeking to gain a voice in the affairs of the day, and to name the terms of that voice . . . the women’s movement is one of the major forces leading this transformation joined as well by movements on behalf of people of color, people with different sexual orientations, people with different lifestyles and experiences, people concerned about ecology and environmental issues, and a whole range of emerging nationalistic movements. (op. cit.: 14) Silence here ‘shrouds’ itself (Felman 1992: 183) by asserting avoidance and a voiding of hearing and of acknowledging. Silenced speech is coupled with a silenced ear, which undercuts the possibility of testimony as a way to conversation. It is essentially the refusal to lend an ear to the other’s night- mare (Beckett’s Godot) Gogo: I had a dream. Didi: Don’t tell me! Gogo: I dreamt that – Didi: DON’T TELL ME! This is not to say that the broken voice, even in a secluded and petri ed way, is totally deteriorated. Remnants of an inner ear are never paralyzed. Speech lurks below the silenced and silence lurks below speech. Repressive silence is never fully ‘successful’. The silenced remain in the zone of whisper, spell, dream or haunted thoughts. The ear lets it be heard, the inscribed body memorizes, becomes voice, becomes speech, not always welcome (when the repressed returns in a demonic form). The result thus is more subtle than just a clear cut division between the said and the unsaid, the spoken and the restricted from speech or from hearing (Foucault 1984: 309): Silence itself – the things one declines to say, or is forbidden to name . . . is less the absolute limit of discourse, the other side from which it is sep- arated by a strict boundar y, than an element that functions alongside the things said. Repressive silence is thus not exactly what we would tend to call ‘silence’. It is not silent at all. It is rather tantamount with speech – a shout or an order not to speak, the speech under silence, and the convoluted and sub- versive speech that results. The dictating mouth is not silent and the silenced even less. Thus on both sides – of the silencer and the silenced – repressive silence or repressive speech are states of a distorted, broken, or violently cut conversation.7 As already mentioned, speech (every one’s speech, I presume) bears a history of silencing and being silenced, scarred with moments of aggression and insult and their accompanying feelings of shame, guilt, fear and rage. Yet speech is also born in moments of breaking the silence, which implies here unsilencing silence not only speech. Therefore, the speech that breaks the hardened shell of repressive silence is not a pure expression of an authentic voice, but an after-silence-speech – a critique of repressive speech. To resume conversation means, then, more than just claiming or giving the right of speech; it is the exposure of silence itself. Consequently, conversation requires not only the ability to speak, but the ability to be silent. Rather than repression – the inability to speak – it is free speech, which goes through silence – the ability not to speak. The resolution of repressive silence would be, then, not only the resurgence of speech but the return of silence – silence that makes space and proliferates speech. Hence, instead of the intuitive concept of ‘talk-talk’ as definitive of conversation, a more complex one is suggested, namely, ‘talk-silence-talk’, where talk is critical of its own inherent repression. Conversation is rendered as a form of critique, then, not in its knowledgeable statements, but in its ability to be silent that predicates the communicative act as an essential aspect of social knowledge.

### *Minima Moralia*

#### Utopian thought link – tag omitted.

Adorno 51 [Adorno, Theodor (grumpy old glasses-man). “*I.Q*.” *Minima Moralia: Reflections On A Damaged Life.* Trans. E.F.N. Jephcott. London: Verso, 2005. p. 196–197. First published Frankfurt-am-Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1951. // WWXR]

The modes of behaviour appropriate to the most advanced state of technical development are not confined to the sectors in which they are actually required. So thinking submits to the social checks on its performance not merely where they are professionally imposed, but adapts to them its whole complexion. Because thought has by now been perverted into the solving of assigned problems, even what is not assigned is processed like a problem. Thought, having lost autonomy, no longer trusts itself to comprehend reality, in freedom, for its own sake. This it leaves, respectfully deluded, to the highest-paid, thereby making itself measurable. It behaves, even in its own eyes, as if it had constantly to demonstrate its fitness. Even where there is no nut to crack, thinking becomes training for no matter what exercise. It sees its objects as mere hurdles, a permanent test of its own form. Considerations that wish to take responsibility for their subject-matter and therefore for themselves, arouse suspicion of being vain, windy, asocial self-gratification. Just as for neo-positivists knowledge is split into accumulated sense-experience and logical formalism, the mental activity of the type for whom unitary knowledge is made to measure, is polarized into the inventory of what he knows and the spot-check on his thinking-power: every thought becomes for him a quiz either of his knowledgeability or his aptitude. Somewhere the right answers must be already recorded. Instrumentalism, the latest version of pragmatism, has long been concerned not merely with the application of thought but the (a priori condition of its form. When oppositional intellectuals endeavour, within the confines of these influences, to imagine a new content for society, they are paralysed by the form of their own consciousness, which is modelled in advance to suit the needs of this society. While thought has for- gotten how to think itself, it has at the same time become its own watchdog. Thinking no longer means anything more than checking at each moment whether one can indeed think. Hence the impression of suffocation conveyed even by all apparently independent intellectual productions, theoretical no less than artistic. The socialization of mind keeps it boxed in, isolated in a glass case, as long as society is itself imprisoned. As thought earlier internalized the duties exacted from without, today it has assimilated to itself its integration into the surrounding apparatus, and is thus condemned even before the economic and political verdicts on it come fully into force.

#### AT alt solvency indict – tag omitted.

Adorno 51 [Adorno, Theodor (grumpy old glasses-man). “Finale.” *Minima Moralia: Reflections On A Damaged Life.* Trans. E.F.N. Jephcott. London: Verso, 2005. p. 247 First published Frankfurt-am-Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1951. // WWXR]

The only philosophy which can be responsibly practised in face of despair is the attempt to contemplate all things as they would present themselves from the standpoint of redemption. Knowledge has no light but that shed on the world by redemption: all else is reconstruction, mere technique. Perspectives must be fashioned that displace and estrange the world, reveal it to be, with its rifts and crevices, as indigent and distorted as it will appear one day in the messianic light. To gain such perspectives without velleity or violence, entirely from felt contact with its objects - this alone is the task of thought. It is the simplest of all things, because the situation calls imperatively for such knowledge, indeed because consummate negativity, once squarely faced, delineates the mirror- image of its opposite. But it is also the utterly impossible thing, because it presupposes a standpoint removed, even though by a hair’s breadth, from the scope of existence, whereas we well know that any possible knowledge must not only be first wrested from what is, if it shall hold good, but is also marked, for this very reason, by the same distortion and indigence which it seeks to escape. The more passionately thought denies its conditionality for the sake of the unconditional, the more unconsciously, and so calamitously, it is delivered up to the world. Even its own impossibility it must at last comprehend for the sake of the possible. But beside the demand thus placed on thought, the question of the reality or unreality of redemption itself hardly matters.

### Link—Moral FW

#### K turns case + framework is bad—it presupposes a world as it is + structuralism is bad – tag omitted.

Bonefeld 09 [Bonefeld, Werner. “Emancipatory Praxis and Conceptuality in Adorno.” *Negativity and Revolution: Adorno & Political Activism*. Eds. John Holloway, Fernando Matamoros & Sergio Tischler. London: Pluto Press, 2009. p. 132. // WWXR]

The derivation of human social practice from presupposed, that is, from hypothesised social structures, accepts what the critical tradition sets out to subvert qua demystification: it accepts commodity fetishism as something that is both immediately valid and beyond comprehension; and seeks demystification not by comprehending human practice in its form of appearance but by deriving human practice from presupposed social structures (see Bonefeld 2004). By hypothesising the constituted world of things as an already existing and given “anatomy” or objective framework of action, the understanding that society has to do with human beings in their social relations is cut short to the notion that the human being is a mere derivative of things (see Adorno 1975: 32). What, then, is the social practice that Marx has in mind when he argues that its comprehension demystifies the social world? Surely, it cannot be the action of economic categories and attendant human agents – it cannot be the action of a human subject that operates, as it has to, as a personification or character- mask of those same categories. The much praised dialectics between structure and agency is not helpful. It presupposes what it sets out to explain. It presupposes human practice in the form of an object and supposes the object as an active extramundane thing. The dialectics of structure and agency gives dialectics a bad name. It depends on dogmatic immediacies and moves in vicious circles as it hops from structure to agency, and back again, from agency to structure; and instead of comprehending what they are, each is presupposed in a tautological movement of thought; none is explained.

### Alt/Dialectics Bad

#### AT dialectics perm (understand the alt as a step in a dialectical process, e.g. of the scarsdale hegel ac) … also an alt – tag omitted.

Tischler 09 [Tischler, Sergio (Instituto de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla). “Adorno: The Conceptual Prison of the Subject, Political Fetishism and Class Struggle.” *Negativity and Revolution: Adorno & Political Activism*. Eds. John Holloway, Fernando Matamoros & Sergio Tischler. Essay Trans. Anna-Maeve Holloway. London: Pluto Press, 2009. pp. 107–109 // WWXR]

In the Preface to Negative Dialectics, Adorno formulates his theoretical programme as an effort to liberate dialectics from the primacy of the identity principle. “As early as Plato, dialectics meant to achieve something positive by means of negation; the thought figure of a ‘negation of negation’ later became the succinct term.” This text seeks to “free dialectics from such affirmative traits without reducing its determinacy” (Adorno 1990: xix). Negative dialectics presupposes totality; however, far from placing it at the centre of knowledge and of the elaboration of a revolutionary theory of the subject, as in Lukács, it turns what is negated in totality into an epistemological starting point. Departing from this principle, it will no longer be possible to think of radical social change in terms of an alternative totality which is fully identified with the subject.4 As we said, one of the points of focus of negative dialectics is the critique of the Lukácsian theory of the subject, based in the final analysis on Hegelian totality. This critique aims, among other things, at dismantling the forms of power and domination which enclose and conceal the concept as an expression of the identity principle. That is why Adorno renders contradiction the fundamental principle of dialectics, in clear opposition to the centrality of the category of totality in positive dialectics. However, the Adornian critique of the epistemic centrality of totality does not amount to the conceptual annihilation of the latter. It means thinking of totality in negative terms; that is, starting from its crisis. In other words, the negation of the negation does not move towards synthesis, towards a new totality represented by an abstract and homogeneous subject. What is new emerges from the crisis of totality and its main figures are particularity and constellation. The categories of a critique of systems are at the same time the categories in which the particular is understood. What has once legitimately transcended particularity in the system has its place outside the system. The interpretive eye which sees more in a phenomenon than it is – and solely because of what it is – secularizes metaphysics. Only a philosophy in fragment form would give their proper place to the monads, those illusory idealistic drafts. They would be conceptions, in the particular, of the totality that is inconceivable as such. (Adorno 1990: 28) For Adorno, particularity is the quintessential critical category. It is the system’s excess, and that excess can be understood as the crisis of totality organised as a system.5 Thus, the centre of the question of the subject in Adorno is radically shifted towards particularity, leaving positive totality as that which must be overcome.6 That is, the overcoming of totality does not imply another totality, which is not the same but symmetrical in its logical structure, but the unfolding of the excess negated in totality.7 According to Lukács, capitalist totality is overcome by another totality, the proletariat. There is a shift from a bad or perverse totality to another one, where the unity of subject/object is achieved; thus, the social world is liberated from exploitation, domination and estranged forms of existence. Following this line of thought, the logical structure remains unaltered: totality is conceived in terms of identity. The subject/object identity cannot be produced in capitalism because of class antagonism, but Communism is its realisation. The goal is full totality, full identity. The subject is conceived as totality and through figures of totality: class, party, state. Thus, the liberation from class antagonism would, at the same time, be the production of an identitarian synthesis formed in the new figures of totality. On the contrary, Adorno claims that to think of radical social change in terms of figures of totality is part of a process of perversion and fetishisation of the idea of revolutionary change. To imagine it in that way leads to identifying totality with the system; that is, renouncing totality as a category destined to dissolve with emancipation. Thus the category of totality is critical only if thought of as contradictory, that is, starting from its overflowing or excess. So one could claim that particularity, conceived as the crisis of totality, is the theoretical effort to think of the overflowing in non-identitarian, anti-system terms. Its utopia is the abolition of society as a reification that subsumes the individual. That is why, for Adorno, a philosophy of the future would not be tied to totality and dialectics (Jay 1984a: 267).

### OLD Roleplaying Bad (Mitchell 98)

#### Role-playing reduces debaters to spectators, eviscerating their agency as the competitive nature of debate creates a sense of detachment. The debate public takes on characteristics of a lab, barred from the external world.

Mitchell 98 (Gordon R., Associate Professor of Communication and Director of the William Pitt Debating Union at the University of Pittsburgh. “Pedagogical possibilities for argumentative agency in academic debate”. Argumentation and Advocacy, Volume 35, Issue 2. Fall 1998. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_hb6699/is\_2\_35/ai\_n28720712/) LHS\

As two prominent teachers of argumentation point out, "Many scholars and educators term academic debate a laboratory for testing and developing approaches to argumentation" (Hill and Leeman 1997, p. 6). This explanation of academic debate squares with descriptions of the study of argumentation that highlight debate training as preparation for citizenship. As a safe space that permits the controlled "testing" of approaches to argumentation, the academic laboratory, on this account, constitutes a training ground for "future" citizens and leaders to hone their critical thinking and advocacy skills. While an isolated academic space that affords students an opportunity to learn in a protected environment has significant pedagogical value (see e.g. Coverstone 1995, p. 8-9), the notion of the academic debate tournament as a sterile laboratory carries with it some disturbing implications, when the metaphor is extended to its limit. To the extent that the academic space begins to take on characteristics of a laboratory, the barriers demarcating such a space from other spheres of deliberation beyond the school grow taller and less permeable. When such barriers reach insurmountable dimensions, argumentation in the academic setting unfolds on a purely simulated plane, with students practicing critical thinking and advocacy skills in strictly hypothetical thought-spaces. Although they may research and track public argument as it unfolds outside the confines of the laboratory for research purposes, in this approach, students witness argumentation beyond the walls of the academy as spectators, with little or no apparent recourse to directly participate or alter the course of events (see Mitchell 1995; 1998). The sense of detachment associated with the spectator posture **is highlighted** during episodes of alienation in which [when] debaters cheer news of human suffering or misfortune. Instead of focusing on the visceral negative responses to news accounts of human death and misery, debaters overcome with the competitive zeal of contest round competition show a tendency to concentrate on the meanings that such evidence might hold for the strength of their academic debate arguments. For example, news reports of mass starvation might tidy up the "uniqueness of a disadvantage" or bolster the "inherency of an affirmative case" (in the technical parlance of debate-speak). Murchland categorizes cultivation of this "spectator" mentality as one of the most politically [grievous] ~~debilitating~~ failures of contemporary education: "Educational institutions have failed even more grievously to provide the kind of civic forums we need. In fact, one could easily conclude that the principle purposes of our schools is to deprive successor generations of their civic voice, to turn them into mute and uncomprehending spectators in the drama of political life" (1991, p. 8)

### Strategic Gaze Link

#### [tag omitted].

Crogan 11 [Crogan, Patrick. *Gameplay Mode: War, Simulation, and Technoculture.* Electronic Mediations 36. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Print, 2011. // WWXR]

With simulation, experience is not recorded in the same manner as in a narrative. A simulation is produced through a process of modeling. To rephrase Gonzalo Frasca, the selective reiteration of the factical record of experience produces a model that is the reduction of a more complex system into a less complex system designed to operate for a particular purpose.9 The purpose dictates the process of evaluating the simulation in its design phase, wherein the selective reproduction of experience in and as the model is accomplished. In his influential work (in simulation industry circles) on designing computer simulations, Robert G. Sargent describes this evaluation process as having three stages: validation, verification, and accreditation of the model.10 Elaborating on Sargent’s description and commenting on his diagrammatic representation of this process, Roger Smith states, For the purposes of VV&A the simulation development process is divided into the problem space, conceptual model, and software model with definite transitions and quality evaluations between these stages as shown in Figure 2 [reproduced below as Figure 9, with Smith’s minor terminological changes from Sargent’s original diagram]. Validation is the process of determining that the conceptual model reflects the aspects of the problem space that need to be addressed and does so such that the requirements of the study can be met. Validation is also used to determine whether the operations of the final software model are consistent with the real world, usually through experimentation and comparison with a known data set. Verification is the process of deter- mining that the software model accurately reflects the conceptual model. Accreditation is the official acceptance of the software model for a specified purpose. A software model accredited for one purpose may not be acceptable for another, though it is no less valid based on its original design.11 Questions of truthfulness, legitimacy, and significance posed by an accredited simulation can only concern the fitness of the simulation “for a specified purpose.” This purpose will revolve around study of a defined “problem space” within “the real world,” study that would take the form of Espen Aarseth’s ergodic engagement with the simulation intended to result in the discovery of possible solutions (epiphanies) that would eliminate the problem (aporia) in the problem space.12 At the serious (as opposed to entertainment) end of the simulation business of military-industrial, economicologistic, and related applications, these hypothetical solutions would be tested in the real world with a view to obviating the need for any future reformulation of the problem space—such, at least, is the dominant, instrumental view of the goal of simulation. A less positivist, more cynical view of the simulation industry’s operation may be closer to the mark. This would see a typical late capitalist enterprise seeking the perpetual growth of consumption of its product via the marketing of an endless stream of new and improved versions arising from a perpetually iterative design process.13 In any event, the design of a simulation effectively preempts the questioning of the significance and legitimacy of its record of experience other than from an instrumental perspective. That which narrative works generate as an integral part of the dynamics of their reception is not a designed out- come of simulation in the commercial mainstream. These questions have been posed and answered in advance in the design phase of the simulation. The answers inhere in the model as schematic representation of the problem space, itself a schema of the real world that poses the problem in response to which the simulation has been produced. A simulation is therefore a system that must foreclose the question of the nature and legitimacy of its reproduction of experience before it can function effectively as a problem-solving technics. The validation of the conceptual model must be concluded before the verification or accreditation stages of design can be finished. An accredited simulation will elicit, as the core of its reception by the user, an implicit affirmation of its conceptual model signaled by his or her cybernetic engagement in the simulation’s software model of the problem space. Ian Bogost puts it succinctly in characterizing video games as exemplars of “procedural representation” produced in the simulational modeling of processes. Game design is all about choices and selections afforded by the model: “choices are selectively included and excluded in a procedural representation to produce a desired expressive end.”14

[omitted].

### Militarism Impact

#### [tag omitted].

Crogan 11 [Crogan, Patrick. *Gameplay Mode: War, Simulation, and Technoculture.* Electronic Mediations 36. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Print, 2011. // WWXR]

Logistics as the management of a system of vectors requires a translation of economic activity, transportation systems, and armed conflict into a flow-chart, a diagrammatic representation of an incredibly complex and dynamic reality. This process of translation produces an informational space where logistical problems are anticipated, mapped, and resolved. Virilio describes the advent of logistics as revolutionary because of its potential to refigure economics, politics, and military strategy by subordinating them to the ever- increasing requirements of the logistical process. He sees in General Eisenhower’s management of the D-day invasion the launching of an “a-national logistical revolution,” subsequently formulated for general applicability in an early post–World War II definition of logistics that issued from the Pentagon: “Logistics is the procedure following which a nation’s potential is transferred to its armed forces, in times of peace as in times of war.”28 This definition raises a crucial point in Virilio’s account of the postwar era. If the logistical tendency were to run its course to its “logistical” conclusion, the transfer of a nation’s potential to its armed forces would be, before anything else, the transformation of a nation into logistical potential. This is why Virilio will recognize in this definition a key to understanding the “a-national logistical revolution.” The nation as origin of identity and as the locus of political and sociocultural propriety disappears with the pre- dominance of the logistical flowchart. The decisive increase in importance and consequent proliferation of the logistical flowchart in the postwar period is the central element in the over- flowing of the military sphere into all other spheres of human activity. The transformation of a nation into logistical potential leads to the transformation of the reality of the world of nations into a virtual reality. That is to say, the traditional elements and relationships of sociopolitical and cultural logistical space 49 reality become increasingly virtualized. All walks of life and all institutions, while maintaining their conventional appearance, tend to be determined more and more by the dictates of the logistics of perception, communication, politics, strategy, economics, and so on. Accepted modes of reasoning, interpretation, and decision making in these fields are subordinated to logistical considerations—the anticipation of threat, coordination of resources toward the minimization of contingency, security (rather than defense)— and survive only to legitimate processes that they no longer govern.29The space animated by the flight simulator is both a significant material instance of and contributor to this transformation of a politicostrategic real into a logistical diagram. As such, the virtual space of flight simulation is a descendant of two related representational traditions: the diagram and the map, which is itself a form of diagram. According to Michael Benedikt, both the diagram and the map exploit the power of René Descartes’s in- sight into the translatability of algebra and geometry into each other. The Cartesian coordinate system for plotting mathematical equations in two- dimensional space has led to the notion that “space itself is not necessarily physical: rather it is a ‘field of play’ for all information.”30 Diagrams and charts are thus “hybrids, mixing physical, energic or spatiotemporal coordinates with abstract, mathematical ones, mixing histories with geographies, simple intervallic scales with exponential ones, and so on.”31 For Benedikt, the proliferation of diagramming in the twentieth century— from “simple bar charts and organizational ‘trees’ through matrices, networks and ‘spreadsheets’ to elaborate, multidimensional, computer-generated visu- alizations of invisible physical processes”—raises questions about the “onto- logical status” of diagrammatic representation. The diagrammatic spatiality of these “entities,” he argues, exceeds the geography of the two-dimensional “piece of paper or computer screen on which we see them. All have a reality that is no mere picture of the natural, phenomenal world, and all display a physics, as it were, from elsewhere.”32 This “reality” is, for Benedikt, writing in the early 1990s, the “first evidence” of the “materializing” of cyberspace and the precursor to cyberspace’s “parallel universe created and sustained by the world’s computers and communication lines.”33 This derealizing of physical space in favor of the materialization of a “physics from elsewhere,” so fundamental to the advent of cyberspace, is a 50 logistical space necessary part of the virtualizing, logistical process.34 The virtual space of flight simulation enacts this diagrammatical reanimation of the world as an informational field of play. The simulator does not simply represent a real space, even if it does so with ever-increasing verisimilitude. This is a re- animation because it brings to life the world in a new way, one in which logistical considerations dominate over all others. The virtual space of the simulation is designed with the parameters of its interactive affordances in mind. That is, it is a modeling of both the world and what can and needs to be done within it. This new life of the world would be, in a sense, a living death because the possibility of nonlogistical modes of interpreting and acting (political, ethical, strategic) wither in this world. The dying away of these traditional modes of interpreting (and) existing in the new logistical world could even be considered to be an inevitable consequence of the process of reanimation at work in this transformation of the real. As Cholodenko has pointed out in a discussion of the “uncanny” nature of animation’s “illusion of life,” the gen- eration of this illusion always has a relation to death. He argues that animation cannot be thought without thinking loss, disappearance and death, that one cannot think the endowing with life without thinking the other side of the life cycle—the transformation from the animate to the inanimate—at the same time, cannot think endowing with motion without thinking the other side of the cycle of movement—of metastasis, deceleration, inertia, suspended animation, etc.—at the same time, and cannot think the life cycle without thinking the movement cycle at the same time.35

# Aff

### Aff Answers

#### TURN—the K is resignation in the face of injustice, lacks the theoretical tools to differentiate between more and less unjust societies, and underestimates the potential for change. Their advocacy is wrong and also abhorrent—vote aff on this card.

Jones ‘99

Richard Wyn Jones is at Cardiff University, where he is currently a Professor of Politics. Professor Wyn Jones is the former Director of the Institute of Welsh Politics and professor in critical security studies at Aberystwyth University. *Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory* – 1999. ISBN 1-55587-335-9 (hc. :alk. paper) ON-LINE ED.: Columbia International Affairs Online, Transcribed, proofread, and marked-up in HTML, September 1999. \*\* we don’t endorse the ableist language in the lined-down text // WWXR

An even more troubling feature of Adorno and Horkheimer’s analysis is the downplaying of individual responsibility that is implicit in their argument. If Auschwitz is the inevitable outcome of enlightenment, and if instrumental rationality is too powerful to resist, then can we expect an individual Nazi to act in a different fashion? In the hermetic society the individual is a mere cipher, and if this is the case, can any individual really be blamed for his or her behavior? These questions highlight an ethical lacuna at the heart of Dialectic of Enlightenment. Despite the obvious intentions of the authors, their analysis generates a logic that renders them unable to differentiate meaningfully between different actions in the political realm. If “nothing complicitous with this world can have any truth,” then surely everything that exists in the real world must be judged equally untrue or false. But if this is so, how are we to evaluate efforts at securing change in contemporary society? Let us consider the ending of apartheid in South Africa. Although the citizens of that country cannot be adjudged to be free after the overthrow of the apartheid system, surely they are fre*er*. Although the establishment of liberal democracy there offers no panacea, it is a better system than the totalitarian one that it has replaced. But although Adorno and Horkheimer as individuals would almost certainly have rejoiced in the downfall of the apartheid system, as theoreticians they seem to be unable to provide us with any grounds for favoring one particular set of social institutions over another. Here we have a bizarre inversion of the relativism to which contemporary poststructuralist approaches are prone. By arguing that there are no grounds to choose between different accounts of reality, poststructuralists are inevitably forced to accept that all accounts of a given reality are true. They can make no judgment on these claims that is not arbitrary (Norris 1992; Hunter and Wyn Jones 1995). Similarly, by arguing that everything in the world is equally false, Adorno and Horkheimer can make no judgment as to why we might prefer some forms of behavior and some set of practices over others. Here the impasse into which the analysis of Dialectic of Enlightenment leads its authors stands in bold relief. The determinism and reductionism of their argument is ultimately paralyzing. It was, of course, Antonio Gramsci who popularized the injunction that all those intent on changing society should attempt to face the world with a combination of “pessimism of the intellect” and “optimism of the will.” This position has much to commend it given the propensity of radicals to view society with rose–tinted glasses. However, the limitations of this position are nowhere better illustrated than in Dialectic of Enlightenment, in which the pessimism is so thoroughgoing that it becomes absolutely debilitating. Any attempt to challenge the status quo already stands condemned as futile. The logical outcome of this attitude is resignation and passivity. Adorno attempted to make a virtue of the detached attitude that he and Horkheimer adopted toward the political struggles of their own age by claiming: “If one is concerned to achieve what might be possible with human beings, it is extremely difficult to remain friendly towards real people.” However, considering that it is only “real people” who can bring about a better society, Adorno’s “complex form of misanthropy” ultimately leads only to quiescence (Wiggershaus 1994: 268). Thus, despite the clear similarities in the influences and interests of the founding fathers of critical theory and Gramsci, the resignatory passivity of the authors of Dialectic of Enlightenment led them to a position on political practice far more akin to that of Oswald Spengler or Arthur Schopenhauer than to that adopted by the Sardinian Marxist Gramsci, even as he languished in a fascist prison. In view of the traditional Marxist emphasis on the unity of theory and practice, it is hardly surprising that Adorno and Horkheimer’s rejection of any attempt to orient their work toward political activity led to bitter criticism from other radical intellectuals. Perhaps the most famous such condemnation was that of Lukács, who acidly commented that the members of the Frankfurt School had taken up residence in the “Grand Hotel Abyss.” The inhabitants of this institution enjoyed all the comforts of the bourgeois lifestyle while fatalistically surveying the wreckage of life beyond its doors. Whereas Lukács’s own apologias for Stalinism point to the dangers of subordinating theoretical activity to the exigencies of day–to–day practical politics, Adorno and Horkheimer sunder theory and political practice completely, impoverishing the theoretical activity itself. Their stance leads to an aridity and scholasticism ill suited to any social theory that aspires to real–world relevance. Furthermore, the critical theorist’s position on political practice is based on an underestimation of the potential for progressive change that exists even in the most administered societies. It is instructive to contrast the attitude of Adorno and Horkheimer with that of Raymond Williams, who delivers the following broadside against “high culture Marxists” such as the members of the Frankfurt School: When the Marxists say that we live in a dying culture, and that the masses are ignorant, I have to ask them... where on earth they have lived. A dying culture, and ignorant masses, are not what I have known and see. (R. Williams 1989: 8) As I will discuss in Chapter 6, the evidence suggests that Williams is closer to the truth. People acting both individually and collectively, through social movements and state institutions, *can* actually influence the world around them in a progressive direction. Adorno and Horkheimer’s pessimism is unwarranted.

#### Outweighs:

#### A. Metaethics—justice is scalar, not binary—only the aff method recognizes this. Means we can never formulate a correct morality using the K, so no way to understand an obligation to vote on it.

#### B. Probability—it’s more likely we can cause positive change—apartheid movements, civil rights, gay marriage, Dodd-Frank and Glass-Steagall prove.

#### C. Scope—the K is too totalizing—it prevents political action even when we do have an accurate description of the site of politics and have already conducted an investigation into the conditions of possibility of the social structures we’re reforming. Means we never solve anything, which is net worse.