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#### Their ascription of greater structural meaning to the insufferable pain of others are the attempts of bad conscience to internalize and disavow the tragic pain of existence-this ends in a self-hatred.

Deleuze ’83 (Gilles Deleuze, Nietzsche & Philosophy, 2nd ed., 1983, p. 129-130)

Such, at least, is the definition of the first aspect of bad conscience, of the topological aspect, its raw or material state. Interiority is a complex notion. What is interiorised is primarily active force; but interiorised force becomes manufacturer of pain; and as pain is produced more abundantly, interiority gains "in depth, width and height", an ever more voracious abyss. This means, secondly, that pain in its turn is interiorised, sensualised, spiritualised. What do these expressions mean? A new sense is invented for pain, an internal sense, an inward sense: pain is made the consequence of a sin, a fault. You have produced your pain because you have sinned, you will save yourself by manufacturing your pain. Pain conceived as the consequence of an inward fault and the interior mechanism of salvation, pain being interiorised as fast as it is produced, "pain transformed into feelings of guilt, fear and punishment": (GM III 20) this is the second aspect of bad conscience, its typological moment, bad conscience as feeling of guilt. In order to understand the nature of this invention we must assess the importance of a more general problem: what is the meaning of pain? The meaning of existence is completely dependent on it: existence is meaningful only to the extent that the pain of existence has a meaning (UM III, 5). Now, pain is a reaction. Thus it appears that its only meaning consists in the possibility of acting this reaction or at least of localising it, isolating its trace, in order to avoid all propagation until one can re-act once more. The active meaning of pain therefore appears as an external meaning. In order for pain to be judged from an active point of view it must be kept in the element of its exteriority. There is a whole art in this, an art which is that of the masters. The masters have a secret. They know that pain has only one meaning: giving pleasure to someone, giving pleasure to someone who inflicts or contemplates pain. If the active man is able not to take his own pain seriously it is because he always imagines someone to whom it gives pleasure. It is not for nothing that such an imagination is found in the belief in the active gods which peopled the Greek world: " 'Every evil the sight of which edifies a god is justified' ... what was at bottom the ultimate meaning of Trojan Wars and other such tragic terrors? There can be no doubt whatever: they were intended as festival plays for the gods" (GM II 7 p. 69). There is a tendency to invoke pain as an argument against existence; this way of arguing testifies to a way of thinking which is dear to us, a reactive way. We not only put ourselves in the position of the one who suffers, but in the position of the man of ressentiment who no longer acts his reactions. It must be understood that the active meaning of pain appears in other perspectives: pain is not an argument against life, but, on the contrary, a stimulant to life, "a bait for life", an argument in its favour. Seeing or even inflicting suffering is a structure of life as active life, an active manifestation of life. Pain has an immediate meaning in favour of life: its external meaning. "Our delicacy and even more our tartuffery . . . resist a really vivid comprehension of the degree to which cruelty constituted the great festival pleasure of more primitive men and was indeed an ingredient of almost every one of their pleasures . . . Without cruelty there is no festival: thus the longest and most ancient part of human history teaches — and in punishment there is so much that is festive!" (GM II 6 p. 66 and p. 67\*). This is Nietzsche's contribution to a peculiarly spiritual problem: what is the meaning of pain and suffering? We must admire the astonishing invention of the bad conscience all the more: a new meaning for suffering, an internal meaning. It is no longer a question of acting one's pain, nor of judging it from an active standpoint. On the contrary, one is numbed against pain by passion. "The passion of the most savage": pain is made the consequence of a fault and the means of a salvation; pain is healed by manufacturing yet more pain, by internalising it still further; one tries to forget, that is to say, one cures oneself of pain by infecting the wound (GM III 15). Nietzsche had already pointed out an essential thesis in the Birth of Tragedy: tragedy dies at the same time as drama becomes an inward conflict and suffering is internalised. But who invents and wills the internal meaning of pain?

#### Vote negative to embrace eternal recurrence of the same

#### Eternal recurrence is an acceptance that we cannot stop suffering and our attempts to order to cosmos inevitably fail; instead, it affirms that we should not try to change any part of our life, and should embrace the entirety of it, even those parts that lead to pain and suffering. An acceptance that no change can happen allows us to master our pain. Trying to change some parts of life or only embracing happy moments of life inevitably recreate hatred of life, meaning the permutation short circuits alt solvency

Kain 7 (Philip J., Professor at Penn State, Nietzsche, Eternal Recurrence, and the Horror of Existence, The Journal of Nietzsche Studies, Issue 33, Spring 2007, pp. 49-63, pmuse aks)

Eternal recurrence, I think we can say, shows us the horror of existence. No matter what you say about your life, no matter how happy you claim to have been, no matter how bright a face you put on it, the threat of eternal recurrence brings out the basic horror in every life. Live it over again with nothing new? It is the “nothing new” that does it. That is how we make it through our existing life. We hope for, we expect, something new, something different, some improvement, some progress, or at least some distraction, some hope. If that is ruled out, if everything will be exactly the same in our next life, well that is a different story. If you think you are supremely happy with your life, just see what happens if you start to think that you will have to live it again. Suppose that you can, as Aristotle suggested, look back over your life as a whole and feel that it was a good one—a happy one. Would that make you want to live it again? Would you at the moment in which you feel that your life was a happy one also crave nothing more fervently than to live it again? What if your life was a joyous life or a proud life? It is quite clear that you could have a very positive attitude toward your life and not at all want to live it again. In fact, wouldn’t the prospect of eternal repetition, if the idea grew on you and gained possession of you, begin to sap even the best life of its attractiveness? Wouldn’t the expectation of eternal repetition make anything less appealing? Wouldn’t it empty your life of its significance and meaning? Most commentators seem to assume that the only life we could expect anyone to want to live again would be a good life. That makes no sense to me. On the other hand, most people would assume that a life of intense pain and suffering is not at all the sort of life it makes any sense to want to live again. I think Nietzsche was able to see that a life of intense pain and suffering is perhaps the only life it really makes sense to want to live again. Let me try to explain. For years Nietzsche was ill, suffering intense migraines, nausea, and vomiting. Often he was unable to work and confined to bed. He fought this. He tried everything. He sought a better climate. He watched his diet fanatically. He experimented with medicines. Nothing worked. He could not improve his condition. His suffering was out of his control. It dominated his life and determined his every activity. He was overpowered by it. There was no freedom or dignity here. He became a slave to his illness. He was subjugated by it. What was he to do? At the beginning of the essay “On the Sublime,” Schiller writes: [N]othing is so unworthy of man than to suffer violence. . . . [W]hoever suffers this cravenly throws his humanity away. . . . This is the position in which man finds himself. Surrounded by countless forces, all of which are superior to his own and wield mastery over him. . . . If he is no longer able to oppose physical force by his relatively weaker physical force, then the only thing that remains to him, if he is not to suffer violence, is to eliminate utterly and completely a relationship that is so disadvantageous to him, and to destroy the very concept of a force to which he must in fact succumb. To destroy the very concept of a force means simply to submit to it voluntarily. Although Nietzsche did not go about it in the way Schiller had in mind, nevertheless, this is exactly what Nietzsche did. What was he to do about his suffering? What was he to do about the fact that it came to dominate every moment of his life? What was he to do about the fact that it was robbing him of all freedom and dignity? What was he to do about this subjugation and slavery? He decided to submit to it voluntarily. He decided to accept it fully. He decided that he would not change one single detail of his life, not one moment of pain. He decided to love his fate. At the prospect of living his life over again, over again an infinite number of times, without the slightest change, with every detail of suffering and pain the same, he was ready to say, “Well then! Once more!” (Z IV: “The Drunken Song” 1). He could not change his life anyway. But this way he broke the psychological stranglehold it had over him. He ended his subjugation. He put himself in charge. He turned all “it was” into a “thus I willed it.” Everything that was going to happen in his life, he accepted, he chose, he willed. He became sovereign over his life. There was no way to overcome his illness except by embracing it. I think we are now in a position to see that for eternal recurrence to work, for it to have the effect that it must have for Nietzsche, we must accept without qualification, we must love, every single moment of our lives, every single moment of suffering. We cannot allow ourselves to be tempted by what might at first sight seem to be a much more appealing version of eternal recurrence, that is, a recurring life that would include the desirable aspects of our present life while leaving out the undesirable ones. To give in to such temptation would be to risk losing everything that has been gained. To give in to such temptation, I suggest, would allow the suffering in our present life to begin to reassert its psychological stranglehold. We would start to slip back into subjugation. We would again come to be dominated by our suffering. We would spend our time trying to minimize it, or avoid it, or ameliorate it, or cure it. We would again become slaves to it. For the same reason, I do not think it will work for us to accept eternal recurrence merely because of one or a few grand moments—for the sake of which we are willing to tolerate the rest of our lives. Magnus holds that all we need desire is the return of one peak experience. This suggests that our attitude toward much of our life, even most of it, could be one of toleration, acceptance, or indifference—it could even be negative. All we need do is love one great moment and, because all moments are interconnected (Z IV: “The Drunken Song” 10; WP1032), that then will require us to accept all moments. This would be much easier than actually loving all moments of one’s life—every single detail. The latter is what is demanded in Ecce Homo, which says that amor fati means that one “wants nothing to be different” and that we “[n]ot merely bear what is necessary . . . but love it” (EH “Clever” 10, emphasis added [except to love]). We want “a Yes-saying without reservation, even to suffering. . . . Nothing in existence may be subtracted, nothing is dispensable . . .” (EH “BT” 2). If we do not love every moment of our present life for its own sake, those moments we do not love, those moments we accept for the sake of one grand moment, I suggest, will begin to wear on us. We will begin to wish we did not have to suffer through so many of them, we will try to develop strategies for coping with them, we will worry about them, they will start to reassert themselves, they will slowly begin to dominate us, and pretty soon we will again be enslaved by them. Our attitude toward any moment cannot be a desire to avoid it, change it, or reduce it—or it will again begin to dominate us. Indeed, in Ecce Homo, Nietzsche says that he had to display a “Russian fatalism.” He did so by tenaciously clinging for years to all but intolerable situations, places, apartments, and society, merely because they happened to be given by accident: it was better than changing them, than feeling that they could be changed—than rebelling against them. Any attempt to disturb me in this fatalism, to awaken me by force, used to annoy me mortally—and it actually was mortally dangerous every time. Accepting oneself as if fated, not wishing oneself “different”—that is in such cases great reason itself. (EH “Wise” 6) Eternal recurrence is an attempt to deal with meaningless suffering. It is an attempt to do so that completely rejects an approach to suffering that says, Let’s improve the world, let’s change things, let’s work step by step to remove suffering— the view of liberals and socialists whom Nietzsche so often rails against. If it is impossible to significantly reduce suffering in the world, as Nietzsche thinks it is, then to make it your goal to try to do so is to enslave yourself to that suffering.
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#### Framings of racial and gendered violence are rooted in a presupposition of human superiority—extermination of the other becomes possible only in a society which deems the ‘nonhuman’ exterminable with impunity

Deckha ’10 Maneesha Deckha, “It’s time to abandon the idea of ‘human’ rights,” The Scavenger, 12/13/2010, http://www.thescavenger.net/animals/its-time-to-abandon-the-idea-of-human-rights-77234-536.html

While the intersection of race and gender is often acknowledged in understanding the etiology of justificatory narratives for war, the presence of species distinctions and the importance of the subhuman are less appreciated. Yet, the race (and gender) thinking that animates Razack’s argument in normalizing violence for detainees (and others) is also centrally sustained by the subhuman figure. As Charles Patterson notes with respect to multiple forms of exploitation: Throughout the history of our ascent to dominance as the master species, our victimization of animals has served as the model and foundation for our victimization of each other. The study of human history reveals the pattern: first, humans exploit and slaughter animals; then, they treat other people like animas and do the same to them. Patterson emphasizes how the human/animal hierarchy and our ideas about animals and animality are foundational for intra-human hierarchies and the violence they promote. The routine violence against beings designated subhuman serves as both a justification and blueprint for violence against humans. For example, in discussing the specific dynamics of the Nazi camps, Patterson further notes how techniques to make the killing of detainees resemble the slaughter of animals were deliberately implemented in order to make the killing seem more palatable and benign. That the detainees were made naked and kept crowded in the gas chambers facilitated their animalization and, in turn, their death at the hands of other humans who were already culturally familiar and comfortable with killing animals in this way. Returning to Razack’s exposition of race thinking in contemporary camps, one can see how subhuman thinking is foundational to race thinking. One of her primary arguments is that race thinking, which she defines as “the denial of a common bond of humanity between people of European descent and those who are not”, is “a defining feature of the world order” today as in the past. In other words, it is the “species thinking” that helps to create the racial demarcation. As Razack notes with respect to the specific logic infusing the camps, they “are not simply contemporary excesses born of the west’s current quest for security, but instead represent a more ominous, permanent arrangement of who is and is not a part of the human community”. Once placed outside the “human” zone by race thinking, the detainees may be handled lawlessly and thus with violence that is legitimated at all times. Racialization is not enough and does not complete their Othering experience. Rather, they must be dehumanized for the larger public to accept the violence against them and the increasing “culture of exception” which sustains these human bodily exclusions. Although nonhumans are not the focus of Razack’s work, the centrality of the subhuman to the logic of the camps and racial and sexual violence contained therein is also clearly illustrated in her specific examples. In the course of her analysis, to determine the import of race thinking in enabling violence, Razack quotes a newspaper story that describes the background mentality of Private Lynndie England, the white female soldier made notorious by images of her holding onto imprisoned and naked Iraqi men with a leash around their necks. The story itself quotes a resident from England’s hometown who says the following about the sensibilities of individuals from their town: To the country boys here, if you’re a different nationality, a different race, you’re sub-human. That’s the way that girls like Lynndie England are raised. Tormenting Iraqis, in her mind, would be no different from shooting a turkey. Every season here you’re hunting something. Over there they’re hunting Iraqis. Razack extracts this quote to illustrate how “race overdetermined what went on”, but it may also be observed that species “overdetermined what went on”. Race has a formative function, to be sure, but it works in conjunction with species difference to enable the violence at Abu Ghraib and other camps. Dehumanization promotes racialization, which further entrenches both identities. It is an intertwined logic of race, sex, culture and species that lays the foundation for the violence.

#### The ethical irresponsibility of speciesism produces constant, unspeakable violence

Kochi and Ordan ‘8 Tarik Kochi & Noam Ordan, “An Argument for the Global Suicide of Humanity,” borderlands, vol. 7 no. 3, 2008, http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol7no3\_2008/kochiordan\_argument.pdf

Within the picture many paint of humanity, events such as the Holocaust are considered as an exception, an aberration. The Holocaust is often portrayed as an example of ‘evil’, a moment of hatred, madness and cruelty (cf. the differing accounts of ‘evil’ given in Neiman, 2004). The event is also treated as one through which humanity might comprehend its own weakness and draw strength, via the resolve that such actions will never happen again. However, if we take seriously the differing ways in which the Holocaust was ‘evil’, then one must surely include along side it the almost uncountable numbers of genocides that have occurred throughout human history. Hence, if we are to think of the content of the ‘human heritage’, then this must include the annihilation of indigenous peoples and their cultures across the globe and the manner in which their beliefs, behaviours and social practices have been erased from what the people of the ‘West’ generally consider to be the content of a human heritage. Again the history of colonialism is telling here. It reminds us exactly how normal, regular and mundane acts of annihilation of different forms of human life and culture have been throughout human history. Indeed the history of colonialism, in its various guises, points to the fact that so many of our legal institutions and forms of ethical life (i.e. nation-states which pride themselves on protecting human rights through the rule of law) have been founded upon colonial violence, war and the appropriation of other peoples’ land (Schmitt, 2003; Benjamin, 1986). Further, the history of colonialism highlights the central function of ‘race war’ that often underlies human social organisation and many of its legal and ethical systems of thought (Foucault, 2003). This history of modern colonialism thus presents a key to understanding that events such as the Holocaust are not an aberration and exception but are closer to the norm, and sadly, lie at the heart of any heritage of humanity. After all, all too often the European colonisation of the globe was justified by arguments that indigenous inhabitants were racially ‘inferior’ and in some instances that they were closer to ‘apes’ than to humans (Diamond, 2006). Such violence justified by an erroneous view of ‘race’ is in many ways merely an extension of an underlying attitude of speciesism involving a long history of killing and enslavement of non-human species by humans. Such a connection between the two histories of inter-human violence (via the mythical notion of differing human ‘races’) and interspecies violence, is well expressed in Isaac Bashevis Singer’s comment that whereas humans consider themselves “the crown of creation”, for animals “all people are Nazis” and animal life is “an eternal Treblinka” (Singer, 1968, p.750). Certainly many organisms use ‘force’ to survive and thrive at the expense of their others. Humans are not special in this regard. However humans, due a particular form of self-awareness and ability to plan for the future, have the capacity to carry out highly organised forms of violence and destruction (i.e. the Holocaust; the massacre and enslavement of indigenous peoples by Europeans) and the capacity to develop forms of social organisation and communal life in which harm and violence are organised and regulated. It is perhaps this capacity for reflection upon the merits of harm and violence (the moral reflection upon the good and bad of violence) which gives humans a ‘special’ place within the food chain. Nonetheless, with these capacities come responsibility and our proposal of global suicide is directed at bringing into full view the issue of human moral responsibility. When taking a wider view of history, one which focuses on the relationship of humans towards other species, it becomes clear that the human heritage – and the propagation of itself as a thing of value – has occurred on the back of seemingly endless acts of violence, destruction, killing and genocide. While this cannot be verified, perhaps ‘human’ history and progress begins with the genocide of the Neanderthals and never loses a step thereafter. It only takes a short glimpse at the list of all the sufferings caused by humanity for one to begin to question whether this species deserves to continue into the future. The list of human-made disasters is ever-growing after all: suffering caused to animals in the name of science or human health, not to mention the cosmetic, food and textile industries; damage to the environment by polluting the earth and its stratosphere; deforesting and overuse of natural resources; and of course, inflicting suffering on fellow human beings all over the globe, from killing to economic exploitation to abusing minorities, individually and collectively. In light of such a list it becomes difficult to hold onto any assumption that the human species possesses any special or higher value over other species. Indeed, if humans at any point did possess such a value, because of higher cognitive powers, or even because of a special status granted by God, then humanity has surely devalued itself through its actions and has forfeited its claim to any special place within the cosmos. In our development from higher predator to semi-conscious destroyer we have perhaps undermined all that is good in ourselves and have left behind a heritage best exemplified by the images of the gas chamber and the incinerator. We draw attention to this darker and pessimistic view of the human heritage not for dramatic reasons but to throw into question the stability of a modern humanism which sees itself as inherently ‘good’ and which presents the action of cosmic colonisation as a solution to environmental catastrophe. Rather than presenting a solution it would seem that an ideology of modern humanism is itself a greater part of the problem, and as part of the problem it cannot overcome itself purely with itself. If this is so, what perhaps needs to occur is the attempt to let go of any one-sided and privileged value of the ‘human’ as it relates to moral activity. That is, perhaps it is modern humanism itself that must be negated and supplemented by a utopian anti-humanism and moral action re-conceived through this relational or dialectical standpoint in thought.

#### Text: Vote negative to refuse the speciesist ethic of the 1AC.

#### The aff’s ethical insufficiency is prior to its consequential benefits. Rejecting speciesism is essential to opening better ways of relating to other beings

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 44-45

Leaving aside for the moment the question of how far Murdoch’s and Levinas’s understandings might be compatible, or at odds, with claims about the ethicopolitical stewardship of nature (questions that, as the next section illustrates, are closely connected with the manner in which their metaphysics is thought of as providing a "guide for mor- als”), it is still necessary to ask what it means to “join the world as it really is" and how this might relate to a potential ecological ethics. In other words, how far might such approaches be capable of recognizing the ethical import of nonhuman others given that both Murdoch and Levinas speak of the other as a human being? In Levinas’s terms, the Other (Autrui often, but not always consistently, capitalized) is exclu- sively and explicitly so, as, for example, with regard to the face-to-face encounter. Certainly, if such an ethics can be understood as being relevant to the more—than-human world, it offers the possibility of paying concerned attention to patterns of difference in nature without reducing these differences to representational codes (taxonomies) and systems (axiologies) that might claim to, but cannot, capture essential moral distinctions between categories of beings (Smith 2001a). Such an ethics would be a much more suitable response to a natural world that is alien, purposeless, and independent of human interests. Animals, birds, stones, trees really are alien in the sense that they are other than human, that they exhibit radically different and sometimes extraor- dinarily strange ways of being-in-the-world. Humanistic approaches, indebted to the anthropological machine, tend to emphasize and use these differences as reasons for excluding such things from moral consideration. They are not like our-human-selves, and so, they argue, in their anthropocentric self-obsessed ways, can consequently be of no ethical (as opposed to instrumental) interest to us. The unfortunate response of environmental ethics to such claims has often been to try to minimize differences and find essential similarities or common purpose or to establish mutual dependencies by extending these same self-centered patterns (Taylor 1986; Attfield 1991). Certain aspects of the environment are deemed morally considerable because they share some supposedly key aspect of human selfhood that makes them as "intrinsically" valuable as ourselves, for example, as subjects- of-a-life. Our self-concern becomes the basis for a (supposedly) ethical concern for those others deemed sufficiently like us. An alternative, more expansive strategy, which still retains this same self-centered form, is to suggest that the whole of nature might be deemed valuable insofar as it is reconceptualized (via, for example, ecology, quantum physics, or non-Western metaphysics) as part of our extended selves (see, for example, Callicott’s [1985] early work). Some even combine both strategies, for example, by espousing a form of “contemporary panpsychism” whereby the universe is reenvisaged as a "self-realizing system," which “possesses reflexivity and to this extent . . . is imbued with a subjectival dimension" (Mathews 2003, 74).14 However, in adopting these strategies, these purportedly biocentric approaches change the content but retain the form, the same anthro- pocentrically self-obsessed locus, of the dominant ethical held (Smith 2001a). These forms of axiological extensionism, while often well in- tentioned, are not only philosophically artificial (constructed largely in order to justify certain already predetermined ends) and ecologically impractical but also tend to replicate, rather than fundamentally challenge, the presuppositions of the anthropological machine. For all their egalitarian rhetoric, they tend to ethically favor those things most like, or closest to, that defined as properly human. The real differences that an alien nature presents are overlooked and human alienation fantasized away.15 By contrast, Murdoch and Levinas can be understood as arguing that ethics exists as a non-self-centered response to the recog- nition of such alienation from the world and from others. Indeed, there is no real ethics without recognizing such differences, An ecological difference ethics thus potentially offers a radical alternative to all attempts to enclose the nonhuman in an economy of the Same.