# Virilio/”Speed K” – Affirmative Core – Hoya-Spartan Scholars 2012

## Section for students attending the Virilio Lecture

### An Opening Thought

A year ago, I wrote a file that had some topic-specific Aff answers to various Space K’s. In that file, I pushed-back at the stereotype that “Hoya-Spartan may not be a great place to learn about the K”.

A year later, I simply ask that you talk to Hoya-Spartan student. Between after-labs and file discussion like this evening’s chat about Virilio, I don’t even think that narrative is out there.

Instead, I would like to advance a new narrative – if the high school debate community is going to learn about critical theory, learning about specific ties to the transportation (or future) topic(s) should be at a premium. The focus of the Hoya-Spartan K chats were about how these critical theories did and did not contextualize to the topic and Affs at hand.

Looking forward, I believe that is where conversation rests.

To that end, we did as much work as we could to investigate the intersection between Virilio and the transportation topic.

* Will

### Take Notes Here & share them with the students at your school

## Candidates for your Frontline

### Grove Arg – 2AC

#### ( ) Virilio’s basic assumption is flawed. Speed of tech doesn’t ruin the political—Opposite is true

Grove ‘8

Jairus Victor Grove is a Ph.D. candidate at Johns Hopkins University in International Relations and Political Theory. His research focuses on the new materialities of politics and warfare. He studies the effects of new forms of warfare on soldiers and civilian populations in urban settings.

Chapter 1: A Schmittian Century?: From Nuclear Leviathan to Nuclear-Sovereign-Assemblage – March 17, 2008 – http://becomingwar.blogspot.com/2008/03/chapter-1-schmittian-century-from.html

Initially nuclear weapons seemed to solidify even complete the decisionistic model of sovereignty once and for all. In Virilio’s reading of Schmitt’s the state of emergency became permanent and democracy ended once it became possible for a single individual to decide to got to war and to finish that war in 30 minutes. At first glance Virilio’s apocalyptic diagnosis seems accurate. Nuclear weapons at their current numbers could destroy the entire planet and given the structure of the United States nuclear command any Congressional or popular attempt to stop the war would be in vain. This is the backbone of Virilio’s argument. Politics and a democratic balance of power require time. Time to react, time to respond, time to debate, time to strategize, time to implement and ICBMS nullify time. But Virilio is wrong. The threat of the extreme case has obscured the actual or present case that presents new opportunities for intervention. Politics, whether micro or macro, does not begin and end with the sovereign decision; the sovereign decision (both expressively and in its enactment) emerges from a relay of forces, connections, and other previous decisions, resonances, forces, and actants that are presupposed in each subsequent iteration of the sovereign decision, and layered in multiple streams of time. Even an increasingly automated nuclear arsenal requires the participation of literally millions of people and countless networks, objects, tectonic stability, stable solar flare activity and on and on. The decision only *appears* singular when Virilio truncates time to the moment the president ‘pushes the button.’ We are not as of yet in that moment so other temporal rhythms abound and each part of the nuclear assemblage follows a different temporal course. Certainly the sovereign decision is a powerful, expressive, performative act of individuation for the sovereign and highly affective in mobilizing populations, but it is not self-constituted or self-causal. The process of individuation and mobilization necessitates a field of relations and resonances from which the sovereign decision emerges. The decision is also not decisive. Instead it territorializes the relations *from which it emerges* through its resonant modulation. The enunciation of a sovereign decision (a distinct inquiry from the ‘making of a decision. Certainly no less emeshed but nonetheless ought to remain analytically different) is something like a refrain, the sovereign—in so far as it is constituted by the enunciation of decisions—is a condensation point for national ethos, affect, and institutional identity making. Each decision is constitutive not of the ‘sovereign’ as is the case in Schmitt’s analysis but of a sovereign point of identification or reified, dogmatic consistency which can be recognized but need not remain static or immobile. Again however such a node is only possible because of its attachments whether physical or resonant (both material) to the complex system of tradition, culture, wires, telephones, satellites, nuclear silos, television cameras, previous sovereign decisions, personal affective characteristics, character, etc. This list is not exhaustive by any measure however it gestures in the direction of what I am trying to get at. The sovereign is not an individual, at best it is an iterative series of moments of performative or expressive individuation resulting from a complex interface with machines, networks, affective fields. The assemblage has a life of its own that cannot and should not be reduced to a single point simply because that is most consistent with our common sensibilities. In some sense the sovereign is a prosthesis or interface to be worn by whoever is elected to office. (President as first-person-shooter?) This does in part explain why there is so little transition time between each sovereign and so little variation in war powers. It is reference point or index for a history of actions and events made more complex by the function it is meant or believed to serve. It is the titular focal point of an assemblage that if recognized as such would undermine its own function. An assemblage that function because it can inspire belief in it is unity not its dispersed and multivalent organization. The irony is that the development of miles of fiberoptic networks, new technological interfaces and mobility was supposed to save the centralized and hierarchical sovereign form from its obvious strategic liability—that of being an easy target. However in increasing its ‘survivability’ it has also opened innumerable points of access to the supposed center. Each access point whether it be technological, affective, or economic that can recenter, or reterritorialize the sovereign assemblage. I do not want to make this sound ‘easy’ or ‘painless’ however as this ‘dispersed’ or redundant network system has become ‘everyday’ increasingly the President has been unaware of exactly who is in control or even at how many levels the Nuclear-sovereign-assemblage can be engaged or reterritorialized.

### Doesn’t contextualize to transportation – 2AC

#### ( ) Speed K doesn’t apply to *transportation* – overstretches a ***military*** thesis.

Kellner ‘99

(Douglas, George F. Kneller Chair in the Philosophy of Education, UCLA – “Virilio, War, and Technology: Some Critical Reflections," Theory, Culture and Society, Vol. 16(5-6), 1999: 103-125, http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/Illumina%20Folder/kell29.htm)

In \_Speed and Politics\_ (1986 [1977]), Virilio undertakes his first sustained attempt to delineate the importance of accelerated speed, of the impact of technologies of motion, of types of mobility and their effects in the contemporary era. Subtitled "Essay on Dromology," Virilio proposes what he calls a "dromomatics" which interrogates the role of speed in history and its important functions in urban and social life, warfare, the economy, transportation and communication, and other aspects of everyday life. "Dromology" comes from the Latin term, dromos, signifying race, and dromology studies how innovations in speed influence social and political life. The "dromocratic revolution" for Virilio involves means of fabricating speed with the steam engine, then the combustion engine, and in our day nuclear energy and instantaneous forms of warfare and communication. Virilio was initially an urbanist who suggests that the city is a dwelling place organized by channels of communication and transportation, penetrated by roadways, canals, coastlines, railroads, and now airports. Each crossing has its speed limits, its regulations, and its systematic enclosure and spaces with in a system of societal organization. The city itself is a conglomeration of these roads, a stopover for travel, and a system of "habitable circulation" (Virilio 1986: 6). City life unfolds in the spectacle of the street with its progressions and movements, its institutions and events, mobilizing and moving flows of traffic and people. Likewise, politics unfolds in the streets and urban sites of demonstration, debate, revolt, and revolutionary insurrection. Cyberspace, Virilio claims, supplies another space without the usual coordinates of space and time that also produces a disorienting and disembodying form of experience in which communication and interaction takes place instantaneously in a new global time, overcoming boundaries of time and space. It is a disembodied space with no fixed coordinates in which one loses anchorage in one's body, nature, and social community. It is thus for Virilio a dematerialized and abstract realm in which cybernauts can become lost in space and divorced from their bodies and social world. In addition, Virilio analyzes and denounces what he calls "a pernicious industrialization of vision" (1997b: 89) and what he fears is a displacement of vision by machines. Virilio is afraid that increasingly visions machines are seeing for us, ranging from cameras to video to satellite surveillance to nanotechnology which probes the body (and next the mind?). For Virilio, we are increasingly subjected to bombardment by images and information and thus by "a discreet pollution of our vision of the world through the sundry tools of communication" (1997b: 96). Moreover, he fears, media like cinema and television train and constrain vision, leading to degradation of vision and experience: "If, according to Kafka, cinema means pulling a uniform over your eyes, television means pulling on a straitjacket, stepping up an eye training regime that leads to eye disease, just as the acoustic intensity of the walkman ends in irreversible lesions in the inner ear" (1997b: 97). Shrilly technophobic and consistently hysterical, Virilio demonizes modern information and communication technologies, suggesting that they are do irreparable damage to the human being. Sometimes over-the-top rhetorical, as in the passage just cited, Virilio's 1990's comments on new information technology suggest that he is deploying the same model and methods to analyze the new technologies that he used for war technology. He speaks regularly of an "information bomb" that is set to explode (1995a, 1995b, 1995c, 1997a, and 1997b), evoking the specter of "a choking of the senses, a loss of control of reason of sorts" in a flood of information and attendant disinformation. Deploying his earlier argument concerning technology and the accident, Virilio argues that the information superhighway is just waiting for a major accident to happen (1995a and 1995b; 1997a and 1997b), which will be a new kind of global accident, effecting the whole globe, "the accidents of accidents" (Epicurus): "The stock market collapse is merely a slight prefiguration of it. Nobody has seen this generalized accident yet. But then watch out as you hear talk about the 'financial bubble' in the economy: a very significant metaphor is used here, and it conjures up visions of some kind of cloud, reminding us of other clouds just as frightening as those of Chernobyl..." (1995b). In a 1995 interview with German media theorist Friedrich Kittler (1995c), titled "The information Bomb," Virilio draws an analogy between the nuclear bomb and the "information bomb," talking about the dangers of "fallout" and "radiation" from both. In contrast to the more dialectical Kittler, Virilio comes off as exceedingly technophobic in this exchange and illicitly, in my view, deploys an amalgam of military and religious metaphors to characterize the world of the new technologies. In one exchange, Virilio claims that "a caste of technology-monks is coming up in our times," and "there exist monasteries (of sorts whose goal it is to pave the way for a (kind of) 'civilization' that has nothing to do with civilization as we remember it." These monks are avatars of a "technological fundamentalism" and "information monotheism," a world-view that replaces previous humanist and religious worldviews, displacing man and god in favor of technology. [This world-view] comes into being in a totally independent manner from any controversy. It is the outcome of an intelligence without reflection or past. And with it goes what I think as the greatest danger (of all), the derailment, the sliding down into the utopian, into a future without humanity. And that is what worries me. I believe that violence, nay hyperviolence, springs out of this fundamentalism. Virilio goes on to claim that fallout from the "information bomb" will be as lethal for the socius as nuclear bombs, destroying social memory, relations, traditions, and community with an instantaneous overload of information. Thus, the technological "monks" who promote the information revolution are guilty of "sins in technical fundamentalism, of which we witness the consequences, the evil effects, today." One wonders, however, if the discourse of "sin," "evil," and "fundamentalism" is appropriate to characterize the effects and uses of new technologies which are, contrary to Virilio, hotly and widely debated, hardly monolithic, and, in my view, highly ambiguous, mixing what might be appraised as positive and negative features and effects. Yet Virilio is probably correct that the dominant discourse is largely positive and uncritical and that we should be aware of negative aspects and costs of the new technologies and debate their construction, structure, uses, and effects. Virilio is also right that they constitute at least a threat to community and social relations, as previously established, though one could argue that the new communities and social relations generated by use of the new technologies have positive dimensions as well as potentially negative ones. Virilio notes as well the ways that new technologies are penetrating the human body and psyche, taking over previous biological, perceptual, and creative functions of human beings, making humans appendages of a technological apparatus. He writes: "I am a materialist of the body which means that the body is the basis of all my work" (Virilio 1997a: 47). In his early work, Virilio spoke of the body as "a vector of speed" and "metabolic vehicle" in which increased speed and velocity overwhelmed the human sensorium and empowered controllers of technologies of speed over other humans (1986). In more recent work, he has described the body as a planet, as a unique center around which objects gravitate, and criticizes increasing derealization of the body in cyberspace and virtual technologies (1997a and 1997b). Virilio is thus in part a materialist humanist and phenomenologist who is disturbed by the invasion of the human body by technology and the substitution of the technological for the human and lived experience. We noted above Virilio's disagreement with Baudrillard over the issue of simulation which Virilio prefers to interpret in terms of substitution of one mode of experience or representation for another. Virilio's project is to describe the losses, the disappearances, of the substitution, describing now technology displaces human faculties and experience, subjecting individuals to ever more powerful modes of technological domination and control. Thus, Virilio describes the effects of new technologies in terms of an explosion of information as lethal as nuclear explosion and warns of the ubiquity of new types of accident that will require new modes of deterrence and dissuasion. He also envisages progressive derealization and dematerialization of human beings in the realm of virtual reality which may come to rule every realm of life from war to sex. From this perspective, technology emerges as the major problem and threat of the contemporary era, as a demonic force that threatens to erase the human. Much as his predecessors, Heidegger and Ellul, Virilio warns of the totalitarian threat in technology and calls for a critical discourse on technology, recognition of its possible negative effects, and regulation of technological development, subjecting technology to human and political control. Yet Virilio has never really theorized technology per se, and uses the same model and categories to analyze war technology to characterize new information technology. Thus, he has not really unravelled the riddle of technology which would have to interrogate its fascination, power, and complexity, and not just its negativity. Virilio criticizes the discourses of technophilia, that would celebrate technology as salvation, that are totally positive without critical reservations, but he himself is equally one-sided, developing a highly technophobic and negative discourse that fails to articulate any positive aspects or uses for new technologies, claiming that negative and critical discourses like his own are necessary to counter the overly optimistic and positive discourses. In a sense, this is true and justifies Virilio's predominantly technophobic discourse, but raises questions concerning the adequacy of Virilio's perspectives on technology as a whole and the extent to which his work is of use in theorizing the new technologies with their momentous and dramatic transformation of every aspect of our social and everyday life.

### Stevenson Arg – 2AC

#### ( ) Virilio Speed K wrong – *won’t improve research*, *excess technophobia*, and *no political alt*.

Stevenson ‘2

Nick Stevenson is a Lecturer in the Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, Understanding Media Cultures: Social Theory and Mass Communication – page 206

Virilio’s main contribution to contemporary debates in respect of the media of mass communication has been to add a sceptical voice in respect of technological innova-tion, and to focus our attention on the temporal dimensions of communications systems. However, as we shall see, while a critical engagement with Virilio is undoubtedly worthwhile, his contributions have a number of limitations. Virilio’s writing is perhaps best read as a warning as to where technological change might lead rather than as offering a balanced account of the effects of technological development. Here I want to concentrate upon the suggestive comments he makes linking technology, speed and cultural impoverishment. Finally, I will end the discussion of Virilio by making some further critical comments concerning what I take to be the main limitations of his analysis. Technology, as Virilio points out, is intimately concerned with speed and efﬁciency. The quickening of the time allowed for opinion formation can often lead to the production of superﬁcial perspectives in place of those which could have taken a deeper and more substantial view. We might then be in a position to receive more information more quickly than ever before, but denied the interpretative opportunities to make the world more meaningful. For example, the increased speeding up of events interferes with our capacity to feel empathy and disappoint-ment. The media it seems are always moving on, restlessly searching for fresh news and different viewpoints. This makes the achievement of responsible and meaningful forms of reﬂection increasingly difﬁcult in the modern age. Yet it is a mistake to proceed as if the media only colonise society’s shared capacity to construct meaningful relations with others. For instance, the culture of immediacy and speed can also feed the idea that we the nation, or international alliance, in a time of crisis, ought to do something. This can be invaluable if we are considering offering immediate humanitarian aid to the victims of a disaster, but can also have other perhaps more negative consequences, given that speed can be used to displace the necessary labour of democratic deliberation. The rapidity with which these decisions are made might mean that a wide-ranging public discussion has not yet taken place and that not enough ‘quality’ information has been made available to make a judgement. I am struck by a basic ambivalence between the need to receive information quickly and the consequences this might have for human reasoning. The wider point is that the temporal bias introduced by media cultures disrupts our capacity for critical reflection as well as providing a necessary service and inﬂuence on contemporary political culture. The issue here is to hold an intellectual concern regarding the lack of slowness in our culture against an appreciation of the ‘political’ necessity of speeding up information exchange. So far I have treated Virilio’s writing to only the most sympathetic forms of engagement. I have sought to argue that Virilio’s work does indeed offer the supportive critic with the possibility of raising some key questions in respect of the temporal dimensions of contemporary media cultures. However we also need to recognise that Virilio’s current projections are severely limited. Here I will mention four reasons as to why Virilio’s work is unlikely to develop a productive cannon of research in respect of the media of mass communication. Virilio’s limitations are: (1) his technophobia; (2) his neglect of the political possibilities offered by media cultures new and old; (3) his lack of analysis of the inter-connections between new media and identity; and (4) his failure to appreciate the ways in which new media is structured in a contested cultural ﬁeld. I shall however keep these arguments brief as they have been approached in more detail elsewhere in the volume.

### Left Melancholy arg – 2AC

#### ( ) Left melancholy turn – their value-to-life and epistemology claims are wrong and trapped in mourning. They’re also turned by anti-politics.

McAllister ‘8

Kirsten Emiko McAllister teaches in the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University, Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol 33 (2008) p. 567-589

But I am less concerned with what is obviously Virilio’s ideal human subject than with the way his work appears to be trapped in mourning, in melancholy. He seems unable to let go of something he assumes has been lost. Grieving this loss, he refuses to reach beyond the terms of the model for the world. The inability to engage with the contemporary changing world is evident in his inability to contemplate anything other than the degeneration of human life. Even if his aim is to blow apart the fantasies of academics who blindly embrace technoscience, his focus on the techniques to effectively blow apart their fantasies point to the way he is enthralled by the destructive forces of modernity.10 And while Virilio asserts “Resistance is always possible!” (quoted in Armitage, 2000, p. 194, emphasis in original), resistance seems impossible in the worlds he paints in his texts. Wendy Brown writes about the melancholy of left intellectuals, what Walter Benjamin referred to as “left melancholia,” pointing out that “we come to love our Left passions and reasons, our Left analyses and convictions, more than we love the existing world that we presumably seek to alter with these terms” (Brown, 2003, pp. 460). Benjamin defines left melancholia as “a mournful, conservative, backward-looking attachment to a feeling, analysis, or relationship that has been rendered thing-like and frozen in the heart of the putative Leftist” (quoted in Brown, 2003, p. 460). It issues from an “unaccountable loss, some unadvowedly crushed ideal” (p. 460). Brown identifies many losses for the Left over the last century, including labour and class, socialist regimes, the legitimacy of Marxism, a unified movement, and alternatives to capitalism (p. 460). Although many on the Left can acknowledge these losses, Brown contends there is an unavowed loss, the loss of the promise that “Left analysis and . . . commitment would supply its adherents with a clear and certain path towards the good the right and the true” (p. 460). She claims that this was the basis for the pleasure of being on the Left and the basis of our “self-love as Leftists.” To give up this love up would require a radical transformation of the self. Brown turns to Freud to explain that if the love for the dead object or destroyed ideal cannot be given up, it takes its refuge in narcissistic identification, and hate comes into operation on this substitutive object, abusing it, debasing it, making it suffer and deriving sadistic satisfaction from its suffering. (quoted in Brown, 2003, p. 460) Brown claims that identity movements as well as post-structuralism and post-modernism have become the substitutive objects blamed for the Left’s weakness and its inability to generate coherent authoritative accounts of the world. This scorn safeguards the critics from recognizing the inadequacy of their own analyses. With regard to Virilio, as mentioned above, his energies are focused on mimetically capturing the destructive drive of modern technology rather than considering what is necessary for a new basis for life, for example, non-humanist modes of eco-centred living (for example, see Heyd, 2005; Katz, Light, & Rothenberg, 2000; Plumwood, 1993; Shiva, 1999; Wong, 2008). Caught in mourning for the loss of pre-modern techn¯e, which, for Virilio, is tied to the sacred, he seems to refuse to let go of that to which he is profoundly attached, to accept its death. As a result, he views the world around him in terms of painful absence and is unable to realize that life continues to undergo transformation rather than just destruction (Freud, 1984).11 His zeal in describing the collapse of the human world, atrophied human bodies, the mad worship of speed, and the penetrating reach of the antithesis of life at its most infinitesimal level suggests that humans have become his substitute object**.** His imagery debases the human body as he sadistically describes our reduction to neurologically simple organisms capable only of a few feeble winks and squirms. The danger of melancholy is that it makes it impossible to accept the loss. The subject thus becomes locked in stasis, unable to realize the adaptive and transformative potential of life forms and cultural practices: what might be the basis for new forms of techn¯e that instantiate sustainable relations between life forms and socio-political technologies. For example, as I have suggested, he refuses to engage with the work by feminist scholars and artists who have critically theorized techno-body interfaces. What is “other” and “not yet” is all of what escapes and transmutes the relentless colonization of life that he so vividly paints.

### Agency turn – 2AC

#### ( ) Our human agency disad and contextualization challenge.

#### Speed K’s too sweeping and ignores that people can check the impact.

Adria ‘8

(Marco Adria – Director of the Graduate Program in Communications and Technology University of Alberta – The Journal of Community Informatics – Vol 4, No 1 (2008) – http://www.ci-journal.net/index.php/ciej/article/view/426/392)

A totalizing view of technology is evident in the work of Virilio, as it is in the work of Martin Heidegger, Jacques Ellul, and Marshall McLuhan. From this perspective, technology is seen as a demiurge, that is, as ultimately influencing and shaping all human experience. Such a view underestimates the diversity of technological forms, the varying intentions of users, and the resiliency of human agency. The method employed by these theorists, however, is to uncover the unrecognized structuring influences of technology as a means of understanding its full scope in human life. Achieving such an understanding need not be grounded in an anti-technological stance, but may be rooted in the conviction that without understanding of what is at stake in technological change, meaningful social action in response is impossible. If the gestalt of medium theory could be stated in a word, it might well be to understand. Medium theory provides a route to insight and rich description, from which strategies for action may be devised.

#### Human agency is important – they can’t “trade” their K impact for it.

Malik ‘2

Kenan Malik is a writer and senior visiting fellow at the Department of Political, International, and Policy Studies at the University of Surrey. This paper was presented to the Engelsberg seminar on 'Consciousness, Genetics and Society', Avesta, Sweden, 14 - 16 June 2002 – http://www.kenanmalik.com/papers/engelsberg\_nature.html

For this and many other reasons, many find implausible the idea that human agency is just an illusion. They therefore adopt a different approach - accepting, in principle, the existence of consciousness and agency, but ignoring them in practice when formulating scientific concepts of human nature. The psychologist Steven Pinker, for instance, points out that moral reasoning, depends upon our acknowledgement of ourselves as sentient beings. The concept of sentience 'underlies our certainty that torture is wrong and that disabling a robot is the destruction of property but disabling a person is murder'. Pinker acknowledges that, as yet, we have no idea how to explain sentience scientifically. But, he argues, 'Our incomprehension of sentience does not impede our understanding of how our mind works.'10 It seems odd to hold that sentience is both central to human thinking and also irrelevant to our understanding of how the mind works. As the neurologist Raymond Tallis points out, to construct a theory of the human mind while ignoring sentience is a bit like 'trying to build a house by starting at the second floor'. Sentience, Tallis observes, 'is the first, not the last, problem of psychology. It is not merely the most difficult of the problems of consciousness or mind; it is also the pivotal one and addressing it cannot be postponed until one has solved the "easier" problems such as those pertaining to... intelligence, memory, thinking etc.'11 Consciousness and agency, in other words, are not phenomena tacked on to human nature; they are at the heart of what it is to be human. The relationship between humans as physically determined beings, and humans as conscious agents - between humans as objects and humans as subjects - is one of the most difficult problems for scientists and philosophers. While analytically we can talk of humans either as subjects or as objects, in reality humans are simultaneously both subject and object. We have at present no real conceptual framework within which to consider such an ontological peculiarity. Denying one or other aspects of our humanness, however, is not a way of solving the conundrum. By insisting that humans can be understood in purely naturalistic terms, mechanistic thinkers are in practice forced to give up on the attempt to understand humans as subjective beings, and compelled to view us simply as objects.

### Competing Modes – 2AC

#### ( ) Virilio’s premise is wrong. “Speed” is the wrong question. This issue is competing modes of speed. Aff turns-off some competing streams for others.

Roberts ‘10

Ivy Roberts is a multimedia producer, educator, media theorist and cultural critic. Her research interests include postmodernism, hyperreality, mixed reality, identity, and cyber studies. She is a PhD student at the European Graduate School. She holds an MA from Antioch University and a BA from Marlboro College. Postmodern Palimpsest –Nov 14, 2010 – https://sites.google.com/site/postmodernpalimpsest/writings-1/72910

What if Virillio is wrong? Speed is not the defining factor of postmodern life. Distraction on the one hand and ignoring on the other replace the problem of speed. We know that the streams of information exist, vying for our attention, always-on. If this is the case, that one stream competes for your attention against another information stream, then you have the power to turn it off. Unfocus your eyes, zone out, wait, choose. When the information is always on and always streaming, it becomes a constant. You are the variable.

## Backlines for the previous section

### Extending Grove – 1AR

#### Extend our Grove ev – two implications:

#### First – their K’s epistemology is unsound – over-assumes military tech.

#### Here’s more ev that you should reject their premise:

Kellner ‘99

(Douglas, George F. Kneller Chair in the Philosophy of Education, UCLA – “Virilio, War, and Technology: Some Critical Reflections," Theory, Culture and Society, Vol. 16(5-6), 1999: 103-125, http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/Illumina%20Folder/kell29.htm)

Yet I want to argue in this study that Virilio has a flawed conception of technology that is excessively one-sided and that misses the emancipatory and democratizing aspects of new computer and media technologies. My argument is that his vision of technology is overdetermined by his intense focus on war and military technology and that this optic drives him to predominantly negative and technophobic perspectives on technology per se. However, precisely the one-sidedness and extremely critical discourse on war and military technology, as well as his reflections on war, cinema, technologies of representation and vision machines, constitute some of the most valuable aspects of his work. Consequently, in the following pages I will follow Virilio in pursuing what he calls the "riddle of technology" and interrogate his attempts to elucidate this conundrum. Nowhere, however, does Virilio directly theorize technology in any systematic or sustained way, although reflections on it permeate his analyses. Thus, I want to probe Virilio's perspectives on technology to determine the extent of his insight and use-value, and to indicate what I see as the limitations of his perspectives. In this reading, Virilio emerges as one of the major critics of war, technology, and vision machines in our time, albeit with excessively negative and even technophobic proclivities.

#### Second – they have the politics K backward. Speed doesn’t ruin politics, it saves us from fascism. Here’s more ev:

Stevenson ‘2

Nick Stevenson is a Lecturer in the Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, Understanding Media Cultures: Social Theory and Mass Communication – page 207-8

The development of the media of mass communications has gradually seen the decline of print as the dominant form of communication and the rise of an audio-visual domain. Virilio links the visualisation of the media into narratives of decline where our perceptions of reality are progressively undermined by a speed culture. As I have indicated, Virilio tends to see progressive political possibilities in reversing this process, with human populations better able to make contact with others through face-to-face communication and print cultures. While there is much that could be said on the superficiality of much visual culture and its progressive underming of literate cultures, such an analysis is too sweeping. The popularisation of the media, which has accompanied the rise of television and its increasingly visual nature of media cultures, has also made public cultures and associated debates open to a greater number of people. While the visualisation of media cultures can indeed be linked into narratives of control and surveillance in the way that Virilio suggests, it can equally be connected into a progressive democra-tisation of everyday life. The visual bias of much media and communication provides social movements with considerable opportunities to interrupt the ﬂow of dominant media messages, by staging dramatic media events and engaging in image manipu-lation. We can make a similar argument in respect of the development of the Net. As Dahlgren (2001) has argued the partial displacement of hierarchical forms of information that the Net makes available confuses the boundaries between who is and who is not a journalist. While these arguments have been carried too far by some Net enthusiasts the possibilities that ‘ordinary’ people have for constructing their own sites of images, information and discourse is greatly enhanced by the arrival of new media. Seemingly these and other democratic possibilities are missed by a critique which offers an overly one-sided view of new media technologies.

#### ( ) Speed K hurts progressive politics – makes fascism more likely, turning all their args.

Stevenson ‘2

Nick Stevenson is a Lecturer in the Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, Understanding Media Cultures: Social Theory and Mass Communication – page 214-15

The arrival of new technologies of communication has offered new possibilities for the social theory of mass communication. We have witnessed the development of a number of provocative perspectives in this regard seeking to articulate the links between technological change, globalisation and the new social movements such as cyberfeminism. In this respect, Castells and Harraway have sought to outline the ambivalent possibilities and limitations of the new media age most coherently. Despite their limitations, Castells’s and Haraway’s analyses of the network society neither lapse into technological optimism nor pessimism. Yet, not surprisingly, other theorists *such as* Schiller and Virilio have chosen to concentrate upon some of the less progressive features of the new communications revolution. That is they continue to offer powerful correctives to much ‘cyberdrool’ which has accompanied the development of the Net within the academy. Such perspectives will continue to find a home in a world where the main driving force behind communications’ development remains the requirements of the military and the market. However, while commentators concentrate on either positive or negative poles of analysis, critical debate is likely to be deﬁned through the discourse of the other. Perhaps the main limitation here is the inability to link the arrival of new media into many of the possibilities (and of course limitations) suggested by social movements who seek to develop a political response to our rapidly changing world. The development of a new politics for a new age, which resists the temptation of fundamentalism and is adequate to the challenges of the modern world, is more likely to develop through an engagement with technological change, globalisation and gender politics than their mutual negation. For progressive and generative political forces this chapter has argued that there is no return to the certitudes of either an exclusively class politics or a less technologically complex society.

### Extending “K doesn’t apply to transportation” (Kellner) – 1AR

#### Extend that the K doesn’t apply to transportation.

#### Kellner gives two impacts:

#### First – K is not epistemologically sound. Their underlying thesis never studied transportation or anything but military tech.

#### Second – zero link and we win on perm. We’ve de-contextualized the link.

#### And, arg doesn’t apply to us. Saying it does is too sweeping and ignores historical counter-examples

Beckman ‘11

Karen Beckman is a Professor of Cinema and Modern Media in the department of the History of Art at the Univ of Pennsylvania. She completed her BA in English at Cambridge University and her Ph.D in English at Princeton University.

“Karen Beckman On her book Crash: Cinema and the Politics of Speed and Stasis” – the cover interview for Rorotoko – February 28, 2011 – http://rorotoko.com/interview/20110228\_beckman\_karen\_on\_crash\_cinema\_politics\_speed\_stasis/?page=1

Chapter Three would also be a good place to start. It looks at how film and photography were used in car safety research as well as how industrial films made by American car companies visually engaged the contradictory fantasies that the automobile seems to provoke. On the one hand, the automobile offers a private interior and safe space akin to a home, except that it allows the driver to be alone in a way that the family home does not. On the other hand, the automobile represents an anonymous, high-speed, and transparent new technology aligned with the psyche’s desire for risk, exhibitionism, transgressive sociality, and speed. Commercially driven, the industrial films of the mid-century emerge at the nexus of this double desire for risky speed and guaranteed safety. Although Paul Virilio has made important critiques of the way ordinary technologies of transportation and vision participate in the militarization of everyday life, my book argues that his work tends to oversimplify the nature of risk and the capacity of cinema. For me, Virilio’s view of both cinema and the automobile is too singular, too totalizing, and also too ahistorical. My approach involves selecting specific examples that offer alternatives to Virilio’s understanding of the interactions among the car, the accident, and cinema. Although examples of the collusion between visual technology and the military proliferate daily, making Virilio’s critique necessary, I wanted to produce a work that would add another voice to this conversation, one that wasn’t ready to just give up on cinema. Another distinction between my approach to the accident and Virilio’s is that we have different relationships with the concept of “responsibility.” My own is informed by the work of Leo Bersani, Douglas Crimp, and Tim Dean on sexuality and desire; by Jean Laplanche’s theory of the drives; and by Judith Butler’s Giving An Account of Oneself, in which, influenced by Levinas, she asks what it means to behave ethically when we know that we can never fully know the self, and therefore can never fully control what it does. I am interested in exploring what comes out of this movement between psychoanalysis’s focus on the subject and the unconscious, and a focus on social and political structures. Virilio is constantly frustrated with the blindness, violence, and stupidity of human behavior; I am interested in where we go after that.

#### Speed K’s epistemologically flawed – exaggerates danger and lacks empirics.

Thommesen ‘3

(Jacob Thommesen is a doctoral student at the Center for Tele-Information at the Technical University of Denmark. He has a Master’s degree in Computer Science from the University of Copenhagen. He is now preparing his thesis on intranet-based knowledge sharing in virtual organizations. His work is inspired by German philosophy and critical theory. Since Spring 2000, he has been associated with the ikon (Innovation, Knowledge and Organisation Network) group based in Warwick Business School. “Virilio: From Space to Time, From Reality to Image” – A review of three of Virilio’s books – Paul Virilio (2001a) A Landscape of Events. Cambridge, MA: MIT. (PB: pp. 120. £10.50. ISBN: 0-2627-2034-5) Paul Virilio (2001b) Virilio Live: Selected Interviews, ed. John Armitage. (PB: pp. 299. £20.99. ISBN: 0-7619-6860-1) Paul Virilio (2002) Desert Screen: War at the Speed of Light. Loudon: Continuum. (PB: pp. 192. £12.99. ISBN: 0-8264-5822-X – Ephemera – volume 3(2): 147-155 – http://www.ephemeraweb.org/journal/3-2/3-2thommesen.pdf)

It seems appropriate to close this review by returning once more to the issue of technology and warfare, which has resumed actuality with two recent hi-tech wars. It will also provide an opportunity to explain his method. Leaving aside the idea of society being shaped by military logic, one might question whether Virilio exaggerates the significance of technology in warfare, that is, whether he accepts at face value the picture presented by the proponents of televised high-precision missile systems. Without being an expert in military history, I seem to remember that those bombs were never quite as smart and precise as announced by military spokesmen. And it has also been argued that at least the more recent war in Afghanistan was not won from the air but depended quite largely on ground personnel (at a mere 'relative speed'4). Furthermore, the example of automatic defence systems also seems to show that he echoes the optimistic arguments about the potential for Artificial Intelligence. He accepts that this degree of automatization - not only in warfare, but also as a general tendency - is a realistic vision, while the fact is that research in AI has failed to deliver for decades. (On other hand it is a relief that he does not simply argue that AI is impossible due to phenomenological insights). Thus, while Virilio offers a critical antidote to the choir of IT evangelists, i.e. the idea of us all getting together in the global village (which he explicitly criticizes), he may be criticized for a similar tendency to attribute too much importance to the isolated factor of Technology. And perhaps this critique could be extended to his method in general, that is, dying to read signs of the future in various contemporary events without resorting to any elaborate empirical study, picking out convenient examples without over-zealous attention to then actual representativity - a method Brugger and Petersen (1994) label 'archaeology of the future\*. On the other hand, those may be exactly the conditions and risks involved in trying to grasp the future: the intention is to identify future tendencies rather than merely describe contemporary reality. Although the critique of his empirical 'method' should not be completely silenced, neither should critique silence the observations of an analytical and somewhat cynical 'visionary'. I certainly find many of his ideas and arguments inspiring for further study, without having to subscribe to all of his theses.

#### ( ) Virilio clarifies that his K is *no longer* about transportation.

Virilio Interview ‘99

(Paul – their author, as interviewed by John Armitage is Principal Lecturer in Politics and Media Studies at the University of Northumbria, UK Theory, Culture and Society, Vol. 16(5-6), 1999 – via Sage database

J A: In Speed & Politics you also suggest that successive waves of acceleration imply both the 'disappearance' of physical geographical space and a new politics of real time. What, for you, is the most important aspect of the relationship between the physical dimension and the political space of real time? PV: Well, the *old* politics of acceleration were mainly about transport. That is, the possibilities inherent in moving goods from one place to another, or, perhaps equally importantly, moving troops from one point to another. This means that acceleration bore next to no relationship to information. You had pigeons, and other methods of despatching, but through the ages there was hardly any acceleration of information transmission. But today, that is, since the beginning of the 20th century, acceleration is mainly about the increasing speed of information transmission. Sure, transportation has been constantly speeded up too, but, today, the major development is the increasing speed of information transmission, and the quest for the attainment of real time. Information transmission is thus no longer concerned with the bringing about of a relative gain in velocity, as was the case with railway transport compared to horse power, or jet aircraft compared to trains, but about the absolute velocity of electromagnetic waves.

#### ( ) Speed K wrong in transportation – doesn’t cause detachment and alt is too utopian.

Leach ‘97

Neil Leach is director of the MA in Architecture and Critical Theory at the University of Nottingham.

Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory – page 358

Virilio is now known above all as a theorist of speed and time. Technical developments in the field of telecommunications and transportation have led to an erosion of the physical, to the point where ‘the loss of material space leads to the government of nothing but time’. This has an obvious consequence for a discipline such as architecture which has exerted its influence through materiality. In ‘The Overexposed City’ Virilio explores a number of themes that arise from this condition. Symbolically— but also practically—the city is no longer governed by physical boundaries but by systems of electronic surveillance. Thus the city gate gives way to the security gateway at the airport. Within the home too the traditional physical window gives way to the interface of the screen. Everywhere architecture is going through a crisis as the hegemony of physical presence is being eroded, and notions such as ‘near’ and ‘far’ have lost their traditional authority—‘ speed distance obliterates the notion of physical dimension’.Virilio could be criticized for the utopianism of his futuristic vision, and for failing to take sufficient account of the corporeality of the body in his thinking. Likewise it could be argued that the homogenization of global communications, far from promoting a simple placelessness, may have a counter-effect of a renewed celebration of the specificity of material place. Yet there is an undeniable prescience in Virilio’s vision. With the advent of the Internet, Virilio’s observation that the screen has become the city square, ‘the cross roads of all mass media’, reveals the far-sightedness of much of Virilio’s thought. In the age of cyberspace, Virilio has emerged as a leading theorist.

### Extending Stevenson – 1AR

#### ( ) Extend our Stevenson card – three warrants were given:

#### First – *Their K won’t boost research quality* – turns their epistemology args.

#### Second – *Excess technophobia*. Thus, their offense is wrong.

#### And, that technophobic fear is so extreme that it *boosts fascism – turning their own goals.*

Stevenson ‘2

Nick Stevenson is a Lecturer in the Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, Understanding Media Cultures: Social Theory and Mass Communication – page 207

1. The most obvious limitation of Virilio's approach is his pronounced techno-phobia. To give one example amongst the many available in his work. The development of what Virilio calls a political economy of speed is such that at times he sounds as though the only way of resisting the totalitarian ambitions of technology is through technological abstinence. The political trajectory of such a position is both conservative and reactionary. Unlike say Castclls, Virilio's politics and social theory fail to appreciate the ways in which contemporary society and culture has been unalterably transformed by the impact of new technology. There is then a lingering sense within Virilio's writing of a possible return to a society with low levels of technological development. While such views may indeed form part of a resistance to certain features of contemporary media and social development, they can hardly be expected to generate a sustainable political perspective working within the contradictions and ambivalences of the present. Indeed Virilio's position on the information society often comes close to the neo-Luddism described by Castells (1998b). Within this Virilio misses the opportunity to think more constructively as to how new technologies might become utilised by inclusive forms of social development. That is, if a globally sustainable planetary economy is to become possible it will be built through the new information technologies, not their abolition. The main problem here being that Virilio offers an excessively onesided view of technology which 'substitutes moralising critique for social analysis and political action' (Kellner, 2000).

### Extending Left Melancholy Turn (McAllister)

#### Extend our Left Melancholy turn – two implications

#### First – it epistemologically indicts the whole Speed K – Virilio is trapped in a psycho-analytic nostalgia that makes him overly pessimistic. Takes-out out their impact and alts

#### Second – it super-charges our disads to their alt. Their worldview keeps progressives trapped in that pessimism, allowing the Far-Right to take-over.

### Extending Agency Arg – 1AR

#### Extend our Agency arg – two impacts:

#### First – humans can fight-off the negative imapcts of technology and speed, taking out their impact

#### Second – they assume humans are helpless and ignorant – denying our agency. That turns the K impact – because it embraces a violent conception of humanity that can’t be “traded” for the sake our their offense.

#### And, Speed K denies agency and links to anti-politics

Kellner ‘99

(Douglas, George F. Kneller Chair in the Philosophy of Education, UCLA – “Virilio, War, and Technology: Some Critical Reflections," Theory, Culture and Society, Vol. 16(5-6), 1999: 103-125, http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/Illumina%20Folder/kell29.htm)

Virilio misses a key component of the drama of technology in the present age and that is the titanic struggle between national and international governments and corporations to control the structure, flows, and content of the new technologies in contrast to the struggle of individuals and social groups to use the new technologies for their own purposes and projects. This optic posits technology as a contested terrain, as a field of struggle between competing social groups and individuals trying to use the new technologies for their own projects. Despite his humanism, there is little agency or politics in Virilio's conceptual universe and he does not delineate the struggles between various social groups for the control of the new technologies and the new politics that they will produce. Simply by damning, demonizing and condemning new technologies, Virilio substitutes moralistic critique for social analysis and political action, reducing his analysis to a lament and jeremiad rather than an ethical and political critique � la Ellul and his tradition of Catholic critique of contemporary civilization, or critical social theory. Virilio has no theory of justice, no politics to counter, reconstruct, reappropriate, or transform technology, no counterforces that can oppose technology. Thus, the increasing shrillness of his lament, the rising hysteria, and sense of futile impotence.

## Answering their Internal Links and Impact Claims

### Speed/Tech not deterministic – it won’t spiral

#### ( ) Tech’s not deterministic – “speed” wont’ cause war or oppression.

Thommesen ‘3

(Jacob Thommesen is a doctoral student at the Center for Tele-Information at the Technical University of Denmark. He has a Master’s degree in Computer Science from the University of Copenhagen. He is now preparing his thesis on intranet-based knowledge sharing in virtual organizations. His work is inspired by German philosophy and critical theory. Since Spring 2000, he has been associated with the ikon (Innovation, Knowledge and Organisation Network) group based in Warwick Business School. “Virilio: From Space to Time, From Reality to Image” – A review of three of Virilio’s books – Paul Virilio (2001a) A Landscape of Events. Cambridge, MA: MIT. (PB: pp. 120. £10.50. ISBN: 0-2627-2034-5) Paul Virilio (2001b) Virilio Live: Selected Interviews, ed. John Armitage. (PB: pp. 299. £20.99. ISBN: 0-7619-6860-1) Paul Virilio (2002) Desert Screen: War at the Speed of Light. Loudon: Continuum. (PB: pp. 192. £12.99. ISBN: 0-8264-5822-X – Ephemera – volume 3(2): 147-155 – http://www.ephemeraweb.org/journal/3-2/3-2thommesen.pdf)

A key concept in his work is dromology, which is derived from Greek - dromas: running, fast - and may be translated as the science of speed. For Virilio, the one and simple rule of technology development has been that of an ever-increasing speed; and this rule seems to define fundamental aspects of warfare and society. In short, the logic of speed has driven the development of warfare, which on its part has defined the architecture of cities, finally setting the conditions for political regimes. To spell this thesis out. let us focus on the evolution of warfare, which can be characterized by three phases. The first and longest was based on defence and weapons of obstruction, designed to block attackers. In this phase, fortified cities could survive sieges for months (even years), and this created a space for political life, thus centred on a local, geographically defined unit. The phase of defence ended with the invention of artillery, weapons of destruction, against which walls could no longer offer protection. In the second phase, the war of siege was replaced by the offensive war of movement -and the medieval city lost its role as political centre, to be replaced by the nation state. Since then, however, technological development has brought warfare into the third phase: the combination of high-precision bombs and communication satellites (representing a fourth front) to guide them to their target has annihilated the advantage of movement. Arms of interdiction and absolute speed have rendered vulnerable the mechanised forces based on relative speed. And this development has brought new conditions for political regimes, reducing the role of the nation state, and of any form of political debate. Allowing for some degree of simplicity, the causal relations implied by this line of argument may be depicted somewhat like this: Speed/technology —> military and warfare —> architecture of cities —> political regimes/structures This argument - which is neatly summarised by Briigger and Petersen (1994) in their introduction to Virilio. The War, the City, the Political - clearly illustrates the more controversial aspects of Virilio's thinking. For one, the basic technological determinism may raise some critique, i.e. from those arguing the social construction of technology. Furthermore, the idea that society is fundamentally shaped by military considerations is also somewhat unique and incompatible with more common explanations. Finally, some might argue that only an architect would regard the architecture of cities as decisive for political life.

#### ( ) Virilio exaggerates the negative consequence of speed and technologies

McAllister ‘8

Kirsten Emiko McAllister teaches in the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University, Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol 33 (2008) p. 567-589

The conclusions Virilio reaches are alarming. Like Heidegger’s modern episteme, the logistics of perception is driven by a reductive law, but unlike the modern episteme, it specifically targets life forms, stripping them of complexity. The reduction to passive flesh suggests a regression in evolution back to simpler forms of life lacking in neurological complexity and moral-political development. I do not dispute the fact that biological and human life forms as well as planetary existence are under threat (Gilroy, 2004). But I question embracing the conclusion that the inherent power of things (humans, bodies of water, microprocessors, plants, turbine engines, microbes, buildings, photocopies) has been completely denuded and all things have been reduced to “primary material.” This grants far too much effective power to the reductive drives characterizing what Virilio calls the “antithesis to life.”

#### ( ) Tech doesn’t spiral – Virilio’s specifically wrong in transportation contexts

Fuller ‘5

Glen Fuller works at the University of Canberra. He is an Assistant Professor of Journalism and Communications. Event Mechanics – February 18, 2005 – http://eventmechanics.net.au/2005/02/watchew-talkin-bout-negri/

Let me open with a quote from Virilio: “The first important revolution on the technical plane is that of transportation, which favors an equipping of the territory with railroads, airports, highways, electric lines, cables, etc. It has a geopolitical element. The second revolution which is almost concomitant, is the transmissions revolution, including Marconi, Edison, radio, television. From this point on, technology is set loose. It becomes immaterial and electromagnetic.” He then goes on to say there is another revolution, of miniaturisation. This third revolution produces a ‘hyper-active man.’ My interest, for this post, are the first two revolutions. Virilio is wrong to suggest that technology becomes immaterial and electromagnetic without qualifying the fact that such transmission technologies were added to the technologies of transportation, but did not completely replace them. We still have technologies of transportation, and I will take this as being obvious. What we are left with is a hybrid form. ‘Mobility’ now, in the most general sense, is both material and immaterial.

### A-to Virilio’s Power/Violence/Fascism Arg

#### ( ) Virilio wrong – speed doesn’t boost power

Stevenson ‘2

Nick Stevenson is a Lecturer in the Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, Understanding Media Cultures: Social Theory and Mass Communication – page 210

Here we might follow Stuart Hall (1996) in arguing that contemporary cultural identities are increasingly multiple and diverse. Identities are constituted by different discourses, languages and histories and are not the ‘effect’ of tech-nologies. In other words, Virilio’s ‘reading’ of the effect of the penetration of information technology cannot adequately take account of a diversity of contested cultures and subject positions. Within this we might emphasise, along with Castells(see above) and Melucci (1996), that power within modern society is exercised through the production and exchange of symbols and not the erosion of human reality by technology. The establishment of master codes and symbols within global ﬂows of information are increasingly likely to be contested in a diversity of spaces and places. Inevitably this means that the introduction of information technology opens the possibility for new forms of information that challenge, reinforce and contest the organisation of our understanding of the main features of human life, from questions of sexuality to global poverty. These perspectives invariably intro-duce both an awareness that modernity remains constituted through powerful centres of information and symbolic provision, and that such codes are increasingly drawn upon in a diversity of social and cultural contexts. The problem here is that Virilio fails to investigate the contestation of identities and codes, preferring to emphasise the ‘brute’ effects of technology.

#### ( ) Speed and Tech can liberate – this outweighs their domination args

Stevenson ‘2

Nick Stevenson is a Lecturer in the Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, Understanding Media Cultures: Social Theory and Mass Communication – page 208

Virilio, as I have indicated, seeks to make a positive virtue out of his pessimistic reﬂections on new media. His argument positions him ﬁrmly against those who would argue in favour of the potentially liberating promise of the web. However Mark Poster (1995, 1996, 1997) argues that such reﬂections actually spell the inability of critical theory to understand the signiﬁcance of new media. That is, critical theory is overwhelmingly concerned with whether or not the media limit or foster autonomous social relations, rather than investigating the ways in which media might constitute new subject positions. For Poster (1995:24) what is at stake is not the way new media help foster domination or resistance, but ‘a broad and extensive change in the culture, in the way identities are structured’. That is virtual reality helps evoke new possibilities for the imagination given its emphasis upon play, simulation and discovery. The enthusiasm for the Net, then, is not an escape from reality, but from the dominant codes of modernity which sought to articulate a view of the subject as autonomous and rational. Within virtual com-munities subjects are able to explore the boundaries of different identity formations while pleasurably entering into previously unexplored imaginary worlds. It is new media’s relatively decentralised structure that potentially turns everyone into a producer and a consumer of information that constitutes subjects as multiple and unstable. These possibilities dispense with the opposition between a ‘real’ and ‘ﬁctitious’ community and enable participants to express themselves without the usual visual clues and markers. Such a situation encourages the proliferation of local narratives, the experience of different realities and a diversity of knowledges. Again if it is the unﬁxing of subject positions that excites Poster it is the escape from reality that seems to bother Virilio. The problem being that such is the strength of Virilio’s repudiation of new media he leaves unexplored the positions of thosewho have become its most enthusiastic advocates. Notable here is Virilio’s dismissal of cyberfeminism. The limitations of this particular mixture of theoretical and political concerns aside, Virilio argues that cyberfeminism is a dead-end, given that it seems to celebrate ‘the replacement of emotions by electrical impulses’(Armitage, 2000b: 51). What is notable here is Virilio’s resistance to the idea that cybercultures could impact upon modern identity formations in ways which are not always reducible to humans being invaded by the destructive logics of technology. Such a position, then, fails to engage with the more ambivalent and more culturally complex features of identity politics in respect of the Net.

#### ( ) Speed and Tech won’t categorically result in violence – new online communities disprove Virilio’s premise.

Adria ‘8

(Marco Adria – Director of the Graduate Program in Communications and Technology University of Alberta – The Journal of Community Informatics – Vol 4, No 1 (2008) – http://www.ci-journal.net/index.php/ciej/article/view/426/392)

By contrast, the community model represents ‘relatively stable, long-term online group associations mediated by the Internet’ (2). These associations are largely uneconomic, providing returns that are connected to the community’s values, norms, and meanings (Etzioni & Etzioni 1999). The community informatics ideal is based on the community model of Internet use described by Feenberg and Bakardjieva. It seeks what Kellner calls more ludic uses of technology, that is, the more playful kinds of uses representing a ‘more ecological mode of social organization’ (Kellner 1998, 14). Such an ecology is decentralized, immersed in humanistic concerns, and responsive to direct human observation and concrete social action. Yet the consumption and community models of the Internet described by Feenberg and Bakardjieva are themselves a set of recently developed conceptual alternatives to the more historically stable model of military logistics described by Virilio (2006). This is the model that gave life to the Internet and which is still used to inform certain aspects of the consumption model. Two fundamental aspects of the Internet as a social environment will be discussed: changing conceptions of time and of social space, including altered patterns in the movement of people in urban areas. Some implications of these changes are then suggested for communities seeking to use wireless zones within the praxis of community informatics.

#### ( ) Virilio’s claims about technology and fascism are wrong and lack a workable alt to fix them

Herrero ‘11

Fernando Gómez Herrero is a Visiting Assistant Professor at Oberlin College,; Ph.D. Romance Studies (Hispanic & Latin American Studies), Duke University (1999); M.A. English, Wake Forest University (1994). Review of “University of Disaster According to Paul Virilio” – Culture Bites – August 3, 2011 – http://www.fernandogomezherrero.com/blog/?p=322

How to inhabit permanently the Virilian house of being, accordingly? How to get out? With or without intellectualist, discursive prejudices: how do we seek refuge in the homelessness of this lucidity? Do we see any limits to this account that presents a limitless world of technicity endlessly modernizing itself in virtual / digital cultural modalities? Will mash-up interdisciplinarity do in furthering alternative visions? An affirmative answer is nowhere to be seen in University of Disaster that holds the primary focus on the natural sciences. Virilio’s modulated emotionality conveys no fear about the crumbling of the houses of knowledge already under occupation by commercialization and bureaucratization (slow-motion statism of national universities on the European side of the Atlantic, and more nimble, unstable, always short-term and corporate privatization on the US side). Coming from no precise location, his occasional prophetic voice calls for the radical reform of the (Western-model) University in toto with no ethnographies or blueprints on either side of the Atlantic. His writing is not academic in the conventional sense of sticking quietly to one predictable, disciplinary mode while keeping the circle of social survivability intact with no noise and bad smell. Recreating a Cornel Wester’s George-Clintonesque line: our author does not want to “de-odorize the funk.” Let it all hang out! No fig leaves covering the magnificence of old knowledge that leads to “disaster”! Leave the celebrations to the administrators and managers in their controlled environments. There is a bit of a “retro” look in Virilio –a bit of a Godardesque 1960s feeling if you wish, at least in the main text that concerns me here– in the critical return to the moment of the creation of the nuclear bomb (the Manhattan project) within the context of WWII, fifty years ago. This dramatic success in the natural sciences, so the argument goes, produces a lack in the phenomenological conscience. There is an “incredible ethical and philosophical deficit” (118). For whom do the bells toll? Virilio repeats a previous sense of alarm in relation to the “dangerous (false) securities of the European culture in a historical moment [this is in 1933] of the irruption of barbarism in the world.” Why is Virilio insisting in 2007 on his negative valorization of the disastrous science around the middle of the 20th century? Is this a historical analogy of the future ahead of us? Virilio’s epigrammatic writing does not answer in straightforward fashion, as though denunciation could only advance obliquely in the double lack of conscience and faithful narratives.

### A-to Speed K/Tech 🡪 Extinction

#### ( ) Speed won’t cause extinction – that claim is wrong and props-up the Right

Stevenson ‘2

Nick Stevenson is a Lecturer in the Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, Understanding Media Cultures: Social Theory and Mass Communication – page 209

Finally, missing from Virilio’s argument is an account of the way in which new media may become linked into the contestation of cultural identity. Virilio’s analysis offers a picture of human subjectivity increasingly limited and crippled by the impact of technology. Here there is a strong family resemblance between Virilio and a host of cultural critics who argue that humanistic sensibilities are currently under attack by a technologically determined present (Roszak, 1986).Such perspectives offer speciﬁc narratives of decline, where more ‘authentic’ cultures are gradually replaced by technologically induced sensibilities. The development of what Postman (1993) calls a technopoly is ushered into place when common cultures are progressively shaped by the requirements of technology. A technopoly displaces questions of cultural value and quality by championing efficiency, objective measurement and quantity. Virilio’s radicalness comes in taking these arguments further by suggesting such is technology’s dominance over culture that it is actually pushing global societies ever closer to their own destruction. Without wishing to dismiss these perspectives out of hand, such viewpoints have a con-servative bent and often underestimate the extent to which popular cultures are capable of sustaining a diverse range of tastes and sensibilities. Indeed, if we follow these critical points we might ask what is the social basis for technophobia? Andrew Ross (1994) argues that technophobia amongst intellectuals and experts can be connected to a fear that the development of technology will erode their traditional status and store of cultural capital. This fear (which is not without basis) is that the knowledge economy requires the creation of an obedient, instrumental and efﬁcient knowledge class. While these are important considerations, Virilio does not demonstrate sufﬁcient reﬂexivity in attempting to position his analysis within a wider social ﬁeld. Put differently, we might argue that because Virilio fails to consider how his concerns can be linked to a traditional knowledge class, he thereby neglects to analyse different identity formations to his own.

### A-to “Speed 🡪 Colonialism”

#### ( ) Virilio wrong – tech doesn’t successfully bleed into colonization or violent power

McAllister ‘8

Kirsten Emiko McAllister teaches in the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University, Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol 33 (2008) p. 567-589

Here Virilio describes the invasive reach of technology into the microprocesses of the body, fuelled by the drive to expand and colonize. In Virilio’s visions there appears to be no escape, or what Raymond Williams described in his foreboding book Towards 2000 (1983) no “resources of hope,” in Virilio’s visions. Does Virilio grant too much effective power to the processes of reduction in a future that has already arrived? I would argue he does not take into account the massive resources needed to orchestrate control over vast heterogeneous networks and populations.

### A-to Speed K and Ontology Args

#### ( ) Speed K bad – *too sweeping*, *no alt*, and *creates unsound ontology*.

Cooper ‘2

(Simon, Senior Lecturer at the University of Sunderland – Technoculture and Critical Theory: In the Service of the Machine ? – page 115)

This book has argued tor a need to conceive of the social as an intersection of levels, each more or less abstract. It is the existence and often contradictory relationship between these levels that is downplayed in Virilio, remaining only implicitly available through his category of 'disappearance'. Hence, he develops only a one-dimensional critique, one that cannot determine how technology might be deployed critically, or show how effective forms of resistance might be allowed to unfold beyond a mere strategy of invocation. I hope to show this through an extended analysis of Virilio's work, arguing that his pessimism and lack of alternative is a structural problem rather than a question of individual inflection. This structural difficulty can be further highlighted through an analysis of the writing of McKcnzie Wark, who attempts to use Virilio's work to gesture towards an alternative conception of technology lacking in Virilio himself. Ultimately, I want to say that both Virilio's overwhelmingly negative analysis and Wark's optimism are insufficient because they fail to go beyond the construction of a one-dimensional ontology that overstates the extent of technological reconstruction. Such an ontology can only move between a technologically determined nihilism (Virilio) and the celebration of heterogeneous fragmentation (Wark).

### A-to “Speed 🡪 leaves humanity detached”

#### ( ) Speed and technology don’t leave humanity detached.

Guerin ‘9

Frances Guerin is an academic and writer. She completed her PhD in Cinema Studies at NYU in 2000, following an MA in Art History at University of Melbourne, in Australia. She is the author of A Culture of Light: Cinema and Technology in 1920s Germany (University of Minnesota Press, 2005). She is co-editor of The Image and the Witness: Trauma, Memory and Visual Culture (Wallflower Press, 2007). Her latest book, Through Amateur Eyes: Film and Photography in Nazi Germany is in press at University of Minnesota Press. She has also written a book on grey painting, The Truth is Always Grey: from Grisaille to Gerhard Richter which is forthcoming. Native Land / Terre Natale Raymond Depardon, Paul Virilio Fondation Cartier – Roaming Images November 21, 2008 - March 15, 2009 – http://www.artslant.com/par/articles/show/4351?print=1

True to the problematic and superficial (in the philosophical sense) equation of war and representation in War and Cinema, for his contribution to Terre natale, Paul Virilio walks down an urban mews-like street euphorically pronouncing that we now live in a world in which migration, nomadism (both literal and virtual) will, if they have not already, become the norm. Hand in hand with all this movement, the notion of "native land" becomes contested. In typical Virilio style, the euphoria around these global movements and renegotiations of geographical space spares no thought for the privilege of being able to move in this way. As I watched the video I felt the irritation rise and I wondered about all the people who are forced to move, or who are unable to wander at will around and across the globe? But more importantly, what Virilio fails to take into account is that surely the need for home and identity becomes stronger as traditional geographical borders become eroded in the hi-tech world we now inhabit - or traverse. In response to Virilio's shortsightedness, I am cued by the exhibition to remember Depardon's installation on the ground floor in which people in South America, Africa, and rural France are filmed in conventional talking heads style, speaking in their own on-the-path-to-extinction language. These natives talk about how their identity is linked to the land and to their language. However, these are not narratives about migration and geographical shifts that have taken place due to technological developments - they are plain old-fashioned colonialist discourses, that tell the stories of people who can't stay where they are, and whose language is rapidly disappearing because the oppressors want to take their land, culture and identity. I wonder how their stories differ from those of the victims of the conquistadors in the same regions 350 years ago?

## Answering the Alt

### Virilio Alt – possible 2AC

#### ( ) Virilio has zero workable alt and links to anti-politics

Rosha ‘3

Rekha Rosha is a doctoral candidate and teaching fellow at Brandeis University. Department of English and American Literature – Brandeis University – Review of: Paul Virilio, A Landscape of Events. “Accelerating Beyond the Horizon” – 2003 – http://pmc.iath.virginia.edu/text-only/issue.103/13.2rosha.txt

Certainly Virilio's harrowing visions of humans in suspended animation waiting out the end times, of mountains crumbling into data, of buildings without substance, and of wars without trace have apocalyptic overtones that urge the reader to question the influences on his argument. While technology requires sustained, careful critiques, if for no other reason than its mammoth presence in contemporary life, it is unclear what Virilio intends to gain by attaching this sort of millenarianism to his critique. Which is also to say: things end badly in this book. Virilio offers no suggestions as to how we might intervene in the processes he describes, or how we might stave off the horrific end he sees for us. In the final sentences of A Landscape, he explains that in fact no intervention is possible: "The countdown has in fact begun. In a few months, a few years at most, there will no longer be time to intervene; real time will have imploded" (96). While the dire tone of this prediction might be meant to galvanize the reader into action, it unnecessarily closes down the efficacy of that action--for what kind of intervention can be accomplished in a few months, a few years? This prompts a second, more cynical question: If the world has become so hostile to humans to the extent that we are barely animate with only months to live, why bother sounding the alarm at all? Indeed, there seem to be few, if any, means to re-appropriate, re-direct, sabotage, or poach the mechanisms of disappearance that Virilio critiques. Apparently, no subject, neither man nor woman, Westerner nor Easterner, rich nor poor, black nor white can find new ways to connect with one another under the given conditions. While other theorists--Deleuze and Guattari, Baudrillard, and Haraway come most immediately to mind--have suggested that possibilities for resistance remain even amidst the most limiting of circumstances, Virilio seems unconvinced. At times he seems so committed to his own apocalyptic vision that he does not pursue the possibilities his own arguments make available--that is, if information can dismantle matter, it might also be able reconstitute matter in perhaps radical and useful ways. With the increased, though exaggerated, emphasis on information, bodies disconnected from space might be free to renegotiate certain limitations. Yet in Virilio's critique, there is apparently no exit.

#### Avoiding anti-politics vital to check atrocity

Small ‘6

(Jonathan, former Americorps VISTA for the Human Services Coalition,“Moving Forward,” *The Journal for Civic Commitment*, Spring, http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue7/Small.jsp)

What will be the challenges of the new millennium? And how should we equip young people to face these challenges? While we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the challenges, we can say unequivocally that humankind will face them together. If the end of the twentieth century marked the triumph of the capitalists, individualism, and personal responsibility, **the new century will present challenges that require collective action**, unity, and enlightened self-interest. **Confronting global warming, depleted natural resources, global super viruses, global crime syndicates**, and multinational corporations with no conscience and no accountability **will require** cooperation, openness, honesty, compromise, and most of all **solidarity** – ideals not exactly cultivated in the twentieth century. We can no longer suffer to see life through the tiny lens of our own existence. Never in the history of the world has our collective fate been so intricately interwoven. **Our very existence depends upon our ability to adapt to this new paradigm, to envision a more cohesive society.** With humankind’s next great challenge comes also great opportunity. Ironically, modern individualism backed us into a corner. **We have two choices, work together in solidarity or perish together in alienation.** Unlike any other crisis before**, the** noose is truly around the neck of the whole world at once. Global super viruses will ravage rich and poor alike, developed and developing nations, white and black, woman, man, and child. Global warming and damage to the environment will affect climate change and destroy ecosystems across the globe. Air pollution will force gas masks on our faces, our depleted atmosphere will make a predator of the sun, and chemicals will invade and corrupt our water supplies. Every single day we are presented the opportunity to change our current course, to survive modernity in a manner befitting our better nature. **Through zealous cooperation and radical solidarity we can alter the course of human events.** Regarding the practical matter of equipping young people to face the challenges of a global, interconnected world, **we need to teach cooperation**, community, solidarity, balance and tolerance in schools. We need to take a holistic approach to education. Standardized test scores alone will not begin to prepare young people for the world they will inherit. The three staples of traditional education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) need to be supplemented by three cornerstones of a modern education, exposure, exposure, and more exposure. How can we teach solidarity? How can we teach community in the age of rugged individualism? How can we counterbalance crass commercialism and materialism? How can we impart the true meaning of power? These are the educational challenges we face in the new century. **It will require a** radical **transformation of our conception of education**. We’ll need to trust a bit more, control a bit less, and put our faith in the potential of youth to make sense of their world. In addition to a declaration of the gauntlet set before educators in the twenty-first century, this paper is a proposal and a case study of sorts toward a new paradigm of social justice and civic engagement education. Unfortunately, the current pedagogical climate of public K-12 education does not lend itself well to an exploratory study and trial of holistic education. Consequently, this proposal and case study targets a higher education model. Specifically, we will look at some possibilities for a large community college in an urban setting with a diverse student body. Our guides through this process are specifically identified by the journal Equity and Excellence in Education. The dynamic interplay between ideas of social justice, **civic engagement**, and service learning in education **will be the lantern in the dark cave of uncertainty**. As such, a simple and straightforward explanation of the three terms is helpful to direct this inquiry. Before we look at a proposal and case study and the possible consequences contained therein, this paper will draw out a clear understanding of how we should characterize these ubiquitous terms and how their relationship to each other affects our study. Social Justice, Civic Engagement, Service Learning and Other Commie Crap Social justice is often ascribed long, complicated, and convoluted definitions. In fact, one could fill a good-sized library with treatises on this subject alone. Here we do not wish to belabor the issue or argue over fine points. For our purposes, it will suffice to have a general characterization of the term, focusing instead on the dynamics of its interaction with civic engagement and service learning. Social justice refers quite simply to a community vision and a community conscience that values inclusion, fairness, tolerance, and equality. The idea of social justice in America has been around since the Revolution and is intimately linked to the idea of a social contract. The Declaration of Independence is the best example of the prominence of social contract theory in the US. It states quite emphatically that the government has a contract with its citizens, from which we get the famous lines about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Social contract theory and specifically the Declaration of Independence are concrete expressions of the spirit of social justice. Similar clamor has been made over the appropriate definitions of civic engagement and service learning, respectively. Once again, let’s not get bogged down on subtleties. Civic engagement is a measure or degree of the interest and/or involvement an individual and a community demonstrate around community issues. There is a longstanding dispute over how to properly quantify civic engagement. Some will say that today’s youth are less involved politically and hence demonstrate a lower degree of civic engagement. Others cite high volunteer rates among the youth and claim it demonstrates a high exhibition of civic engagement. And there are about a hundred other theories put forward on the subject of civic engagement and today’s youth. But one thing is for sure; **today’s youth no longer see government and politics as an effective or valuable tool for affecting positive change in the world.** Instead of criticizing this judgment, perhaps we should come to sympathize and even admire it. Author Kurt Vonnegut said, “There is a tragic flaw in our precious Constitution, and I don’t know what can be done to fix it. This is it: only nut cases want to be president.” Maybe the youth’s rejection of American politics isn’t a shortcoming but rather a rational and appropriate response to their experience. Consequently, the term civic engagement takes on new meaning for us today. In order to foster fundamental change on the systemic level, which we have already said is necessary for our survival in the twenty-first century, we need to fundamentally change our systems. Therefore, **part of our challenge becomes convincing the youth that these systems, and by systems we mean government** and commerce, **have the potential for positive change.** Civic engagement consequently takes on a more specific and political meaning in this context. Service learning is a methodology and a tool for teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and deepening practical understanding of a subject. Since it is a relatively new field, at least in the structured sense, service learning is only beginning to define itself. Through service learning students learn by experiencing things firsthand and by exposing themselves to new points of view. Instead of merely reading about government, for instance, a student might experience it by working in a legislative office. Rather than just studying global warming out of a textbook, a student might volunteer time at an environmental group. If service learning develops and evolves into a discipline with the honest goal of making better citizens, teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and most importantly, exposing students to different and alternative experiences, it could be a major feature of a modern education. Service learning is the natural counterbalance to our current overemphasis on standardized testing. Social justice, civic engagement, and service learning are caught in a symbiotic cycle. The more we have of one of them; the more we have of all of them. However, until we get momentum behind them, we are stalled. Service learning may be our best chance to jumpstart our democracy. In the rest of this paper, we will look at the beginning stages of a project that seeks to do just that.

### Virilio Alt – possible 1AR extensions

#### ( ) Virilio is too pessimistic and the alt slips into violent prejudice.

Brigham ‘95

Linda Brigham is Assistant Professor of English at Kansas State University, Manhattan – “Transpolitical Technocracy and the Hope of Language: Virilio and Habermas” – 13 Sep 1995 -- http://nideffer.net/proj/\_SPEED\_/1.4/articles/brigham.html

Nonetheless, my purpose here is not techno-utopian. I think Virilio's warning concerning the undoing of physical geography has cogency, despite its inclination towards hysteria. Even more so, I find Habermas' sober analysis of the unwanted multiple consequences of steering media to hold great critical value. But both Virilio's condemnation of the manipulated precept and Habermas' methodological distinction between lifeworld and system fail to do justice to the media density of human cognition. The task of making sense in any culture is already heavily laden with technology. It is true that the accelerations of exchange facilitated by media have changed the world, in some ways disastrously. There is little doubt that transnational capital is responsible for much global violence, for a dreadful standard of living in many parts of the world, and for a backlash against the civil rights of all kinds of people. But nature was never very kind either, if it existed at all, and the limits on who is permitted free speech were always imposed by non-linguistic means. Reductive schemes to right these immense wrongs perhaps participate in the same austere prejudice that elevated the mind above the body and made it a God, starving its subjects into a so-called humanist metaphysics -- a metaphysics of scarcity.

#### ( ) Virilio’s tech and speed K is too extreme. The K *doesn’t help our insight* and offers no *realistic* alt

Couples ‘97

Christopher E. Couples, Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Political Science – reviewed by prominent members of the VPI staff – including Timothy W. Luke, chair of the Political Science Dept and Dr. Gearóid Ó Tuathail – an assistant professor in the Department of Geography at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The National Information Infrastructure Initiative: Space, Discipline, War Machine

http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-92997-84457/unrestricted/couples.pdf

Virilio’s position is, at times, an extreme one. His critique of the informationalization of society provides a useful corrective to the cyber-boosterism to which we are exposed daily. Virilio’s take on the existence of the Subject in digital spaces is an apocalyptic one in its emphasis on the domination which he sees as “latent in technology”. Yet, he does not offer, other than the ethic of ‘opposition’, any greater understanding of what it means to be a Subject and Object in digital space. Virilio offers no hope for a digitized future — the effacement of distance, it seems, can only lead to an effacement of meaning, as cause becomes effect, and image becomes meaning. Except for the most reactionary Luddites, living without technology (or more accurately, digital technology) is probably not an option. Even the most radical academics do their work (or have it done) on computerized word processors, so as Lenin put it (in another context) “What is to be done?”

## Federici Section

### Some background Information about this interview

### Specific Fascism Turn – 2AC

#### ( ) Virilio cedes to the Far-Right and immorally over-values the impact to speed. He’d let everyone die for his ivory tower K of speed.

Federici ‘87

This card is quoting Virilio – Silvia Federici is a Teaching Fellow at Hofstra – Here, she has obtained a transcript of Virilio’s final editorial meeting prior to releasing his book called Pure War A Review Play on Paul Virilio/Sylvere Lotringer, Pure War Author(s): Silvia Federici and George Caffentzis Reviewed work(s):Source: Social Text, No. 17 (Autumn, 1987), pp. 97-105Published by: Duke University PressStable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/466480 .

The following is the transcript of a tape we received from Paris apparently recording the final editorial meeting between Sylvere Lotringer and Paul Virilio, concerning the publication of Pure War (Semiotext(e): New York, 1983). We have decided to publish it as part of our investigation in contemporary political anthropology. Our concern is one of classification, especially relating to new political hybrids. This taxonomic problem appears crucial to us, since our informants in Europe report of a new vogue: one-time leftist circles have become hosts to what in the past would have been tagged as right-wing discourse. This phenomenon poses the old relativistic paradox: has fascism changed, has the left changed, or both? We chose as our case study Virilio, out of many possible candidates, due to a statement he makes in Pure War: "When they did away with the death penalty in France six months ago I felt terrorized." Virilio's terror cast a dark spot on our political x-ray screen. This tape explains some of the background to such a statement. It also has raised many productive questions and we hope to give a deeper analysis of its syntax in a future Vulgar Marxist Notes. If the tape is bogus in letter or spirit, please inform Social Text. If not, inform Semiotext(e). NB: We have capitalized the sections of this tape that do appear in the book, Pure War, to allow the reader to better evaluate the significance of the absences. Transcript Sylvere: I've reread the manuscript and I would like to ask you some questions to see if your thoughts could be ... not explained ... I know you loathe explanations, but ex/plicated. Paul: My thoughts are stones thrown in the water, whose echoes multiply in expanding circles; they're steps in a staircase, I touch them and I have already abandoned them. Tendencies is what I'm after. Completing your thoughts is modern man's fall, his original sin. S: Yet I'm afraid our American friends, in their dromological passion for quick answers, may miss the steps and stumble. I've heard some pretty funny misunderstandings. Some people think you're a fascist, a sexist and a smoke seller. One thing people cannot stomach is your statement that the ANTI-MILITARIST IS A RACIST, SOMEONE WHO ATTACKS MAN and that you EASILY MIX WITH GENERALS AND ADMIRALS. They also don't want to hear that THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CASPAR WEINBERGER AND A UNION MEMBER IN A BRAWL. Can't we change something? P: These Americans are so literal! No wonder Michel has become a best seller there. S: But let me see if I get you right. You freely mix with generals because you distinguish between military men and military intelligence and technology; and also because YOU HAVE TO PUT YOURSELF IN THE POSITION OF MILITARY OFFICERS THE BETTER TO QUESTION THEM, in the same way as Heidegger put himself in the position of the Nazis to better question Nazism. P: Exactly. MY ENEMY IS NOT THE MAN OF WAR BUT THE MILITARY MACHINE. THE MILITARY ARE DOMINATED BY IT AND THEY ARE NOT MORE RESPONSIBLE FOR NUCLEAR WAR THAN THE CIVILIANS. THE PROOF IS THAT THEY ARE DISAPPEARING. And that's tragic! S: That's what my American friends don't understand, why you're so sentimental about these generals ... P: Of course they don't understand. America is the place where the triumph of utilitarian thinking is nearly complete. Your friends don't see that those military men they despise so much were in all ages the truest shepherds of being. War was the ground where man could bring forth his historical destiny. But with the automation of military decision NOTHING REMAINS OF MAN'S POWER, and those unique human qualities war heightened to ecstasy-responsibility in the face of death, political sensibility, reflection-are lost. WAR ITSELF DECLINES. S: Perhaps, but they are suspicious because there are rumours that the FRENCH MILITARY READS YOUR WORK SERIOUSLY. P: I'm pleased they do. France may be the only country in Europe capable of raising the question of the century: the question of the possibilities nuclear weapons disclose. Every other country has capitulated either to American techno/logic or to a chimera: the idea that you can abolish the unabolishable. BUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS CANNOT BE ABOLISHED. THAT IS WHAT THE PACIFISTS NEVER UNDERSTAND. ONCE NUCLEAR WEAPONS EXIST THEY CAN ALWAYS BE REPRODUCED. S: How do we destroy them, then? P: We have to question the essence of nuclear technology. COMPREHEND IT IN THE SENSE OF INCLUSION. KNOWLEDGE HAS ALWAYS COME FROM CONQUEST, FROM TER-RITORIAL PENETRATION. We won't destroy the ultimate weapon until we find the courage to penetrate the nuclear territory. S: Are you saying we should have a nuclear war? **P**: I'm saying that we cannot act as if nuclear weapons did not exist, and that the enemy is not nuclear weapons, but our enslavement to technology. THE WORST DANGER TODAY IS 'NUCLEAR FAITH,' I.E., THE BELIEF THAT IT IS A GOOD THING IF NUCLEAR WEAPONS DO NOT EXPLODE. THIS IS SUICIDE, CULTURAL SUICIDE. THE PROBLEM WITH WHAT I CALL THE ULTIMATE WEAPON IS NOT ITS DESTRUCTIVE POWER I.E., THE FACT THAT FIVE MILLION OR MORE COULD DIE. THE PROBLEM IS ITS SPEED-ITS QUASI INSTANTANEOUS AUTOMATED DECISION MAKING WHICH LEAVES NO TIME FOR REFLECTION-A FEW SECONDS: THAT'S ALL THAT REMAINS OF MAN. S: But Paul, what's the difference between what you say and Weinberger's nuclear doctrine? P: Well, the US nuclear doctrine initially raised some hopes; but with Reagan's "Starwars" scenario they've retreated to the most technocratic position. One hoped at first that finally a leader or a people was called to reveal the deep religious significance of nuclear war and admit that humanity won't be saved until we confront the nuclear ordeal on the basis of our own reflected choice. For WAR TODAY IS EITHER NUCLEAR WAR OR NOTHING. S: This won't sell... P: But it follows from what I said in my KEY BOOK on speed. The problem is that DEMOCRACY IS NO LONGER IN THE HANDS OF MAN . . . ANDROPOV AND REAGAN HAVE ONLY A FEW MINUTES LEFT, a few minutes between warning and launch measuring the extinction of human freedom. But if nuclear war is planned over months and years, then when the missiles are launched we can be sure they're launched by men and not by automatons blindly pushing forward the nuclear machine ... True, A BILLION CASUALTIES ON THE FACE OF THE EARTH WOULD NOT BE NEGLIGIBLE. BUT WHAT MATTERS IS THAT THEY WON'T HAVE DIED IN VAIN, as we will have learnt to CONTROL what we PRODUCE. S: No, you cannot say this in the book... P: Nonsense! When will modern man listen to the claims history makes upon him and put aside his fear of nuclear weapons? After all, YOU DON'T ABOLISH MONARCHY BY SIMPLY KILLINGT HE KING. Unfortunately, NONE OF THE SO-CALLED GREAT POLITICIANS TODAY IS ABLE TO APPROACH THE KIND OF MODERNITY THAT I HAVE TRIED TO TALK ABOUT IN THIS BOOK ... ALL OF THEM HAVE ARGUMENTS, A SALES PITCH THAT DATES FROM THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. None can face the consequences of the existence of nuclear weapons. This is why when the left calls Reagan a fascist I smile. Reagan is a typical American. He wants results without risks; he wants nuclear war without spilling too much American blood-the whole job done by satellites and computers. That is not fascism, that's technocracy...

(Note: the “P” that is talking in this evidence is Paul Virilio)

### Specific Fascism Turn – 1AR

#### ( ) Virilio’s politics goes too far – ignores the worst fascism for the sake of over-dwelling on speed.

Federici ‘87

This card is quoting Virilio – Silvia Federici is a Teaching Fellow at Hofstra – Here, she has obtained a transcript of Virilio’s final editorial meeting prior to releasing his book called Pure War A Review Play on Paul Virilio/Sylvere Lotringer, Pure War Author(s): Silvia Federici and George Caffentzis Reviewed work(s):Source: Social Text, No. 17 (Autumn, 1987), pp. 97-105Published by: Duke University PressStable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/466480 .

S: But what is the relation between fascism and technology? P: Heidegger said it: "Fascism is the encounter of modern man and technology"; and with this statement he revealed his permanent importance to this epoch. For by placing himself into fascism he was able to understand the question of technology. S: But didn't he dissociate himself from the Nazi party? P: Yes. Heidegger had joined the Nazis because fascism appeared to him so epistemologically suggestive. But Hitler dashed his hopes... S: Why, was it the death camps, the war, the SS? P: Come, come. Heidegger rejected the Nazis because Hitler, Speer and the rest were taken in by technocracy. Take the death camps. The problem for Heidegger was not that millions of Jews were killed, but *how* it was done ... S: You're going too far. P: On the contrary, your steps are too small. The death camps were run mechanistically, bureaucratically, "banally," as Hannah Arendt put it. And they were kept as a dirty little secret, a grimy sweatshop of death, rather than being acknowledged as the product of a terrible destiny. They were assembly lines, operated by bureaucratic robots destroying will-less automatons. This was hardly the fascism Heidegger had longed for. Let the Jews be exterminated but as the expression of an historically conscious political decision. Their deaths would have acquired a meaning...

(Note: the “P” that is talking in this evidence is Paul Virilio)

#### ( ) Virilio justifies undifferentiated atrocity in a meaningless quest to de-bunk speed.

Federici ‘87

This card is quoting Virilio – Silvia Federici is a Teaching Fellow at Hofstra – Here, she has obtained a transcript of Virilio’s final editorial meeting prior to releasing his book called Pure War A Review Play on Paul Virilio/Sylvere Lotringer, Pure War Author(s): Silvia Federici and George Caffentzis Reviewed work(s):Source: Social Text, No. 17 (Autumn, 1987), pp. 97-105Published by: Duke University PressStable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/466480 .

S: Because he made a point that struck me. "It's not speed that is important, but control. If you can do something quickly, then you can decide to do it slowly, if it's in your interest." He gave me the example of electronic banking: it now takes longer to clear checks than before computerization, not because it cannot be done more quickly, but because the higher interest rates make the time the banks hold on to the money more profitable to them. I thought it was clever. ... Moreover, something happened since our last conversation that made me rethink your theories about speed. After we finished taping I returned to Nepal for a few weeks. I was in a remote village when I fell and I hurt my leg. I wanted to go to the nearest hospital, but the bus there passes only every two days; so for hours I sat on a mule, while sentences from our conversation swirled in my head mocking me. For I saw my need for speed and the need of millions of others desiring a vehicle. P: So you were afraid of dying, and you were willing to exchange the intensive life of pain on the mule for the extensive life bowing to speed would give you... S: I thought you were a christian, you've no compassion? Anyway there is a great difference between an intensive life I choose and one forced on me. Further, Paul, all your talk of death ... that seems to excite you ... now I see it's fuzzy. There are many ways of dying and their differences are important. To be murdered, to be executed, to commit suicide, to die in an auto accident, to be bombed to death are quite different experiences. You roll them up into one universal thing, so undifferentiated it appears like Being itself. P: You see! A little brush with death can make for much thought.

(Note: the “P” that is talking in this evidence is Paul Virilio)

#### ( ) Virilio radically over-values speed – permits atrocity and nuclear war

Federici ‘87

This card is quoting Virilio – Silvia Federici is a Teaching Fellow at Hofstra – Here, she has obtained a transcript of Virilio’s final editorial meeting prior to releasing his book called Pure War A Review Play on Paul Virilio/Sylvere Lotringer, Pure War Author(s): Silvia Federici and George Caffentzis Reviewed work(s):Source: Social Text, No. 17 (Autumn, 1987), pp. 97-105Published by: Duke University PressStable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/466480 .

P: I'll trust your judgment. After all capital punishment is not the only way to take responsibility for death. I'M THINKING OF PRIMITIVE SOCIETIES WHICH PLACED DEATH AT THEIR CENTER. Take human sacrifices; anthropologists always interpreted them in a utilitarian way, but to me they express the recognition of DEATH AS THE GREAT ORGANIZER OF SOCIETY. Death is not something to fear, it is something to be questioned, so that WE KNOW HOW TO ORGANIZE IT. FROM THIS POINT OF VIEW I FEEL CLOSER TO RURAL SOCIETIES THAN TO MY CONTEMPORARIES. S: Sometimes, Paul, you frighten me. But I suppose your boldness is what is so fascinating about you. P: I'm only stating the obvious. IT WAS NOT UNTIL INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY THAT WE LOST OUR POLITICAL AWARENESS OF DEATH. IN THE PAST YOU WERE A CHIEF, OR A KING, OR A STRATEGIST BECAUSE YOU HAD A RELATION WITH DEATH INSCRIBED WITHIN THE LAW. YOU WERE A LEADER BECAUSE YOU WERE OPENLY WILLING TO KILL. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT WAS THE LAST POINT ON WHICH DEATH STILL HAD A RELATION TO POLITICS. THE STATE, THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE DECIDED ON DEATH-THE MOST SERIOUS BUSINESS ON EARTH-INCLUDING ITS PRACTICAL EXECUTION, THE GUILLOTINE, HANGING, THE ELECTRICAL CHAIR. I CANNOT HELP FEELING ITS ABOLITION IN FRANCE HAS BEEN A TRAGIC MISTAKE, FOR NOW DEATH WILL HAVE NO INTELLIGIBILITY AND POLITICS ITSELF WILL DISAPPEAR. IT IS THE ESSENCE OF POLITICS THAT IT CONFERS DEATH BY LAW. S: You sound like John Locke. But let me ask you: you approve, then, of the reintroduction of executions in the US? P: Yes, this is what raised my hopes for a breakthrough with respect to Pure War coming from the Reagan quarter. S: What do you mean? P: I said it! I am not against nuclear war, I'm against the way it is organized, where the decision for war or peace belongs to an answering machine. If this were not the case, nuclear weapons should be welcome. Even now we can see that nuclear war can have positive effects. For THE POSSIBILITY OF THE DEATH OF THE ENTIRES PECIES REINTRODUCES THE QUESTION OF GOD, THE QUESTION OF ETHICS ... THROUGH THE DOOR OF TERROR GOD HAS COME BACK INTO HISTORY.

(Note: the “P” that is talking in this evidence is Paul Virilio)

### Epistemology K of Virilio

#### ( ) Epistemology K of Virilio:

#### editor writes his args, hides his fascism, and writes passages to sell books.

Federici ‘87

This card is quoting Virilio – Silvia Federici is a Teaching Fellow at Hofstra – Here, she has obtained a transcript of Virilio’s final editorial meeting prior to releasing his book called Pure War A Review Play on Paul Virilio/Sylvere Lotringer, Pure War Author(s): Silvia Federici and George Caffentzis Reviewed work(s):Source: Social Text, No. 17 (Autumn, 1987), pp. 97-105Published by: Duke University PressStable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/466480 .

S: I don't care if you are right. Personally, I don't want to be called a fascist. Remember also that our market is the left. Add a disclaimer. State that you're not in favour of capital punishment. Then you can say what you want. P: But I'll make a fool of myself. Americans may be naive, but this is too silly... S: Leave it to me. You can't imagine how much people swallow if it is well packaged. Plus, Americans are always afraid of not being sophisticated enough and when they're puzzled they think there is some subtlety they're missing. Put it this way: "I'M NOT IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY, I AM FOR DEATH.( PW, p. 130). Let them figure this one out! P: I'll trust your judgment. After all capital punishment is not the only way to take responsibility for death. I'M THINKING OFPRIMITIVESOCIETIES WHICH PLACED DEATH AT THEIR CENTER. Take human sacrifices; anthropologists always interpreted them in a utilitarian way, but to me they express the recognition of DEATH AS THE GREAT ORGANIZER OF SOCIETY. Death is not something to fear, it is something to be questioned, so that WE KNOW HOW TO ORGANIZE IT. FROM THIS POINT OF VIEW I FEEL CLOSER TO RURAL SOCIETIES THAN TO MY CONTEMPORARIES.

(Note: the “P” that is talking in this evidence is Paul Virilio)

(Note: the “S” that’s talking in this evidence is Virilio’s then-editor Sylvere Lotringer)

#### This speaks for itself:

Federici ‘87

This card is quoting Virilio – Silvia Federici is a Teaching Fellow at Hofstra – Here, she has obtained a transcript of Virilio’s final editorial meeting prior to releasing his book called Pure War A Review Play on Paul Virilio/Sylvere Lotringer, Pure War Author(s): Silvia Federici and George Caffentzis Reviewed work(s):Source: Social Text, No. 17 (Autumn, 1987), pp. 97-105Published by: Duke University PressStable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/466480 .

P: But I'll make a fool of myself. Americans may be naive, but this is too silly... S: Leave it to me. You can't imagine how much people swallow if it is well packaged. Plus, Americans are always afraid of not being sophisticated enough and when they're puzzled they think there is some subtlety they're missing. Put it this way: "I'M NOT IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY, I AM FOR DEATH.( PW, p. 130). Let them figure this one out! P: I'll trust your judgment. After all capital punishment is not the only way to take responsibility for death. I'M THINKING OF PRIMITIVE SOCIETIES WHICH PLACED DEATH AT THEIR CENTER. Take human sacrifices; anthropologists always interpreted them in a utilitarian way, but to me they express the recognition of DEATH AS THE GREAT ORGANIZER OF SOCIETY. Death is not something to fear, it is something to be questioned, so that WE KNOW HOW TO ORGANIZE IT. FROM THIS POINT OF VIEW I FEEL CLOSER TO RURAL SOCIETIES THAN TO MY CONTEMPORARIES. S: Sometimes, Paul, you frighten me. But I suppose your boldness is what is so fascinating about you. P: I'm only stating the obvious. IT WAS NOT UNTIL INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY THAT WE LOST OUR POLITICAL AWARENESS OF DEATH. IN THE PAST YOU WERE A CHIEF, OR A KING, OR A STRATEGIST BECAUSE YOU HAD A RELATION WITH DEATH INSCRIBED WITHIN THE LAW. YOU WERE A LEADER BECAUSE YOU WERE OPENLY WILLING TO KILL. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT WAS THE LAST POINT ON WHICH DEATH STILL HAD A RELATION TO POLITICS. THE STATE, THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE DECIDED ON DEATH-THE MOST SERIOUS BUSINESS ON EARTH-INCLUDING ITS PRACTICAL EXECUTION, THE GUILLOTINE, HANGING, THE ELECTRICAL CHAIR. I CANNOT HELP FEELING ITS ABOLITION IN FRANCE HAS BEEN A TRAGIC MISTAKE, FOR NOW DEATH WILL HAVE NO INTELLIGIBILITY AND POLITICS ITSELF WILL DISAPPEAR. IT IS THE ESSENCE OF POLITICS THAT IT CONFERS DEATH BY LAW. S: You sound like John Locke. But let me ask you: you approve, then, of the reintroduction of executions in the US? P: Yes, this is what raised my hopes for a breakthrough with respect to Pure War coming from the Reagan quarter. S: What do you mean? P: I said it! I am not against nuclear war, I'm against the way it is organized, where the decision for war or peace belongs to an answering machine. If this were not the case, nuclear weapons should be welcome. Even now we can see that nuclear war can have positive effects. For THE POSSIBILITY OF THE DEATH OF THE ENTIRES PECIES REINTRODUCES THE QUESTION OF GOD, THE QUESTION OF ETHICS ... THROUGH THE DOOR OF TERROR GOD HAS COME BACK INTO HISTORY. S: Now I begin to understand... P: So perhaps you'll have some sympathy for me. To be involved with the war machine is not easy. But HOLDERLIN'SP HRASE" WHERET HE DANGER GROWS, GROWS ALSO THAT WHICH SAVES" IS VERY IMPORTANT TO ME. I BELIEVE THAT WITHIN THIS PERVERSION OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE BY THE WAR MACHINE HIDES ITS OPPOSITE. For only when we dwell in the ultimate danger does our true essence shine forth, our freedom as watch-keepers of nuclear being. THUST HEREIS W ORKT O BED ONEW ITH THE MACHINEI TSELF.I t's my political work. POLITICSI N THE ANCIENTS ENSEH AS NEVER DONE ANYTHING OTHER THAN PUT ITS HANDS IN THE BLOODY GUTS OF THE CADAVRE OF WAR AND PULL OUT SOMETHING THAT COULD BE USED. IT IS THE QUESTION OF DEATH, WE CANNOT ESCAPE IT ... WE MUST GET INSIDE PURE WAR, WE MUST COVER OURSELVES WITH BLOOD AND TEARS, WE MUSTN'T TURN AWAY. S: Who's being melodramatic now? Dining and wining with generals can't be all that bad . . . But there's another problem. I've counted fifteen plain contradictions in your answers. You say e.g. that "WOMEN'SL IBERATIOLNE DT O THED EFEATO F THEL OGISTIC COUPLE" and that "THE COUPLE WAS THE ORIGINAL WAR MACHINE." But then you complain that the feminists are responsible for the growth of terrorism. P: Don't get me wrong. I'm not against feminism. LUCEI RIGARAYIS AN OLD FRIEND OF MINE and I'M INTERESTED IN THE INVENTION OF A NEW FEMALE IDENTITY. IT'S LIKE INVENTING A NEW DIET. But THE POLITICAL DIMENSION OF WOMEN'S LIBERATION IS SHOT! I'm horrified by the disintegration of the family it has produced ... it makes popular defense impossible. S: This is the part of your argument I like best. P: Of course! The diaspora of the sexes has broken down the social milieu of the domestic economy, which is the basis of popular defense. But without the family there is nothing to defend. So, you end up with THE TERRORIST, who's as enamoured of technology and WHO SAYS: "MY WOMEN TOOK OFF, MY KIDS ARE ILLEGITIMATE (NOT ONE OF THEM WOULD RECOGNISE ME), MY PARENTS CAN'T STAND ME (THEY'RE TOO BOURGEOIS), SO I'LL GET A BIG PISTOL, GET ON A BOEING, AND GET DOWN TO IT." THAT TERRORIST BECOMES A MILITARY MAN. IT'S THE END OF POPULAR DEFENSE. S: Is your notion of popular defense a sort of vigilantism, with women and men joining together to do the job? P: That's right. The problem with the old division of labor is the man saying, "I'll be the warrior, I'll face death for you, you do the cooking." S: Then your model is the white South African family, where the woman keeps a gun in her handbag and sharpens her skills at the firing range; and the culprit is the ANC guerilla, crossing the border and leaving wives and children behind. P: I suppose, but, as I said, I'M NOT INTERESTEDIN AFRICA, although I must admit, DECOLONIZATION WAS A REAL TRAGEDY, FOR IT ONLY LED TO ENDO-COLONIZATION. S: South Africa aside, with this anti-Women's Lib stuff I'm all with you. But can I throw out that talk about Aristotle and accidents? I don't know much about generals, but I've studied philosophy and you commit so many fallacies of ambiguity that I'm embarrassed. P: Leave it, there's no time for changes. Speed is the essence for publications. S: Well, Paul, I'm on my way. P: Wait, you have not told me when I'll be paid. S: I'm afraid there won't be any money. P: Are you kidding? I banked on this money for my trip to Japan. I would have to change my plans! S: I thought you loved interruptions . they're so productive. And why do you need to travel? Didn't you say we're all co-present now in the world? And aren't you always complaining about the dictatorship of movement? P: This is not just! You promised there would be some money. S: Paul, you said it: social justice is for the birds; nobody believes in it any longer. Moreover, you should know I can't be the one who made that promise. .. the identity of the ego is a myth . . . P: That's Gilles' line, not mine. S: I must go. P: NOOOOO!!!! Let's settle the money question!!!! (At this point the tape is interrupted. But in the interest of precision we can report that some epithets were heard in French, English, Italian and German, followed by the slamming of a door.)

(Note: the “P” that is talking in this evidence is Paul Virilio)

(Note: the “S” that’s talking in this evidence is Virilio’s then-editor Sylvere Lotringer)