## Shell

#### Interpretation: Elimination of patents cannot be contingent on another event

#### Violation: they read that they eliminate them in the case of a public health emergency which is not a permanent state of affairs according to parmet

#### Prefer my interpretation:

#### 1] Limits: they open the door to an infinite number of affs – from any condition to any time restriction. Each one becomes its own new aff.

#### 2] Ground: condition and delay counterplans are all ground we are entitled to because they disprove the idea of passing the plan right now.

#### 3] Semantics: There’s no temporal modifier on the resolution. That means you can’t defend the aff as true only during the pandemic. Not defending the text of the resolution justifies the affirmative doing away with random words in the resolution which destroys predictability because they are no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 4] Mixes Burdens – it requires an evaluation of post fiat arguments about the state of the world in state of PHE to determine tropicality. But t is a pre fiat burden so it has to be evaluated absent any content level arguments about the rez.

#### 5] There are contested definitions of what constitutes a public health emergency – means even if they have a definition – different ethical actors have different interpretations so the res becomes indeterminate.

#### F

#### E

#### No RVIS

#### DTD CI

## K

**The ROTB/ standard is to endorse the debater who best performatively and methodologically rejects the lack.**

**Ruti 10** Mari Ruti. (2010). *Winnicott with Lacan: Living Creatively in a Postmodern World. American Imago, 67(3), 353–374.[*doi:10.1353/aim.20 [sci-hub.tw/10.1353/aim.2010.0016](https://sci-hub.tw/10.1353/aim.2010.0016)] [https://muse.jhu.edu/article/414021/pdf] // ahs emi

Let us consider Lacan first.1 As we know, Lacan’s theory of subject formation is premised on the notion of foundational lack or alienation. The transition from the Imaginary to the Symbolic—from preoedipal drives to the collective social space of signification and meaning production—is, for Lacan, a process of primordial wounding in the sense that the subject is gradually brought face to face with its own lack. While the internalization of the signifier brings the subject into existence as a creature of desire (thereby giving it access to a fully “human” existence), it simultaneously reveals that the surrounding world is much larger and more powerful than any individual subject could ever be—that the self is always merely a minor participant in a system of signification that operates quite independently of its “private” passions and preoccupations. In this manner, the signifier shatters the fantasies of omnipotence and wholeness that characterize the emerging ego of the mirror stage. One could, then, say that, in the Lacanian scenario, we purchase our social subjectivity at the price of narcissistic injury in the sense that we become culturally intelligible beings only insofar as we learn to love ourselves a bit less.It is worth noting right away that one of the things that drives a wedge between Lacan and Winnicott is that while Winnicott regards the ego as what allows the subject to enter into an increasingly complex relationship to the world, Lacan associates it primarily with narcissistic and overconfident fantasies that lend an illusory consistency to the subject’s psychic life. Lacan explains that the subject’s realization that it is not synonymous with the world, but rather a frail and faltering creature that needs continuously to negotiate its position in the world, introduces an apprehensive state of want and restlessness that it finds difficult to tolerate and that it consequently endeavors to cover over by fantasy formations. In other words, because lack is devastating to admit to—because the subject experiences [lack] it as a debilitating wound—it is disposed to seek solace in fantasies that allow it to mask and ignore the reality of this lack. Such fantasies alleviate anxiety and fend off the threat of fragmentation because they enable the subject to consider itself as more unified and complete than it actually is; by concealing the traumatic split, tear, or rift within the subject’s psychic life, they render its identity (seemingly) reliable and immediately readable. As a result, they all too easily lead the subject to believe that it can come to know itself in a definitive fashion, thereby preventing it from recognizing that “knowing” one version of itself may well function as a defense against other, perhaps less reassuring, versions. One consequence of the subject’s dependence on such egogratifying fantasies is that they mislead it to seek self-fulfillment through the famous objet petit a—the object cause of desire that the subject believes will return to it the precious sense of wholeness that it imagines having lost.2 In this scenario, the subject searches for meaning outside of itself, in an object of desire that seems to contain the enigmatic objet a. Lacan’s goal, in this context, is to enable the subject to perceive that this fantasmatic quest for secure foundations is a waste of its psychic energies. His aim is to convince the subject that the objet a will never give it the meaning of its existence, but will, instead, lead it down an ever-**widening spiral of existential deadends.** How, then, does the Lacanian subject find meaning in its life? Lacan’s answer is that it is only by accepting lack as a precondition of its existence—by welcoming and embracing the primordial wound inflicted by the signifier—that the subject can begin to weave the threads of its life into an existentially evocative tapestry. It is, in other words, only by exchanging its ego for language, its narcissistic fantasies for the meaning making capacities of the signifier, that the subject can begin to ask constructive questions about its life.3 For Lacan, there are of course no definitive answers to these questions. But this does not lessen the value of being able to ask them. The fact that there is no stable truth of being does not prevent the subject from actively and imaginatively participating in the production of meaning.

#### Prefer: A) recognition and embrace of our shared lack is the basis point of collective identity to form political change in the first place. B) Everything is constrained by the lack, even the flow because communication will always be coopted. C) most reciprocal because u cant embrace the lack more or less- it’s a binary so its more reciprocal and resolvable because one of us cant embrace more. D) your framework makes no sense – evaluating the debate through a lens of probability doesn’t make sense in the context of a] the k because there aren’t long internal link chains b] its not a fwk it’s a weighing arg under a fwk which means u prefer embracing the lack – no 1ar fwk – moots 7 mins of nc offense and allows them to be infinitely shifty

**The affirmatives utopian reimagining of America without explicit praxis to overcome the structural realities of oppression is not a benign political demand – it is empty rhetoric and symbology that reduces the subject to an object of our own sadistic enjoyment.**

Lundberg 12 Christian O. Lundberg, Director of Cultural Studies and Associate Professor of Rhetoric at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2012, Lacan in Public: Psychoanalysis and the Science of Rhetoric, pub. University Alabama Press, p. 165-175 // recut ahs ss

The first reading, which focuses on Mel Gibson’s *The Passion of the Christ,* takes up the economic exchange between identitarian practices and the ontological register of public making by tracing the metaleptic exchanges that constitute an evangelical Christian public around the metaphor of constitutive violence. i engage in a close reading of *The Passion* and the tropological exchanges it performs in constituting an evangelical public through, around, and beyond the film. The sec ond reading focuses less on a close reading than on characterizing the logic of investment and formal rhetorical processes that animate a specific kind of demand: in this case, the demands of radical antiglobalization protestors to be recognized as dangerous. Thus, my reading of radical anti-globalization protest takes up the political possibilities of the democratic demand, arguing that a purely formal account of the demand eschews attention to the rhetorical production of enjoyment and therefore overstates the political potential both of the democratic demand and a politics of resistance. Here i would like to show how a rhetorically inflected reading of Lacan’s work provides an analytic prescription for public politics that moves beyond enjoyment and aims at the articulation of collective political desire. if the first reading is focused on the relationship between the specific imaginary contents that underwrite a public bond, the sec ond is engaged in understanding the ways that symbolically constituted practices of address and investment imply determinate political consequences. Both of these readings imply critiques of conventional rhetorical practices of interpretation, suggesting an alternative analytic practice of engaging the nexus between trope and affective investment. Thus, these readings form a criti cal-inter pretive couplet: in reading *The Passion,* i would like to demonstrate the shortcomings of fetishizing the imaginary in isolation from the broader symbolic economy that underwrites it; conversely, in reading the demands of radical antiglobalization protest, i would like to show the shortcomings of a purely formal account of the demand that operates in isolation from the practices of enjoyment and the imaginary relations of address under writing radical demands

**Pandemic threat construction justifies the ever-expansion of the bio-political regime through the normalization of biopolitical technologies and attitudes that are masked as requirements for the health of citizens.**

Couch et al 20:Couch, Danielle et al. "COVID 19 - Extending Surveillance And The Panopticon". Journal Of Bioethical Inquiry, 2020. Accessed 10 Nov 2020. //Scopa

#### Surveillance is a core function of all public health systems. Responses to the COVID-19 pandemic have deployed traditional public health surveillance responses, such as contact tracing and quarantine, and extended these responses with the use of varied technologies, such as the use of smartphone location data, data networks, ankle bracelets, drones, and big data analysis. Applying Foucault’s (1979) notion of the panopticon, with its twin focus on surveillance and self-regulation, as the preeminent form of social control in modern societies, we examine the increasing levels of surveillance enacted during this pandemic and how people have participated in, and extended, this surveillance, self-regulation, and social control through the use of digital media. Consideration is given to how such surveillance may serve public health needs and/or political interests and whether the rapid deployment of these extensive surveillance mechanisms risks normalizing these measures so that they become more acceptable and then entrenched post-COVID-19. Much media coverage and wider social discourse have presented the COVID-19 pandemic as “unprecedented,” but in some ways this is not the case. Throughout history, outbreaks of disease have ravaged humanity, producing profound, enduring effects, even occasionally leading to the collapse of civilizations. What is unprecedented about the COVID-19 pandemic is the different type and extent of surveillance that has been deployed in response to it. In this paper we examine various examples of this surveillance in relation to Foucault’s (1979) notion of the panopticon and consider current and future implications. Surveillance and Foucault’s Panopticon Eighteenth-century English social reformer and utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham designed the panopticon, a circular or rotunda shaped prison with an inspection room in the centre so that “a functionary standing or sitting on the central point, had it in his power to commence and conclude a survey of the whole establishment in the twinkling of an eye” (Bentham, quoted in Steadman 2012, 4). Foucault used the underlying concept as a metaphor for the disciplinary regime that prevails in modern society, in which the key form of social control has moved from spectacle, which prevailed in pre-modern societies, to surveillance (Foucault 1979). The panopticon allows disciplinary power to be enacted through hierarchical observation, examination, and normalizing judgement (Foucault 1979). In many settings, including in medicine and public health, the regime of power is all-pervasive: the few watch the many, undertaking surveillance using “methods of fixing, dividing, recording” throughout society (Foucault 1979, 305). As a form of social control, this ubiquitous panoptic surveillance contributes to the feeling of being under continual surveillance, and so in response to this individuals become their own agents of surveillance by complying with normative expectations and conventions without having to be actually under surveillance. People willingly participate in this surveillance. In this manner panoptic surveillance is an apparatus of discipline which makes the exercise of power more efficient and effective—it is a subtle form of coercion (Foucault 1979), and thus the power is enacted invisibly and inapparently, permeating all aspects of social life. Self-surveillance and discipline in these ways have become the primary source of social control in modern society. In relation to health we see this self-surveillance reflected and embedded in common expressions such as “taking care of yourself,” “keeping an eye on your weight,” “watching what you eat,” “watching the speed limit,” and “watching your fluid (or alcohol) intake” (Couch et al. 2016, 62). Foucault used an earlier pandemic, the outbreak of plague, to demonstrate how modern forms of governance and surveillance arose: … the plague gave rise to disciplinary projects … an organization in depth of surveillance and control, an intensification and a ramification of power…. those sick of the plague were caught up in a meticulous tactical partitioning in which individual differentiations were the constricting effects of a power that multiplied, articulated and subdivided itself… (Foucault 1979, 198) Foucault’s notion of panoptic surveillance has been practically applied to various public health issues and provides a useful framework for considering surveillance responses during the COVID-19 pandemic. Surveillance and COVID-19 Surveillance is a core function of all public health systems. In the course of the COVID-19 pandemic many standard surveillance techniques have been applied, including contact tracing (World Health Organization 2017), global seroprevalence studies (Vogel 2020), selective nasopharyngeal swabbing of cases, contacts, and the general population, and testing of blackwater for viral fragments (Mallapaty 2020). In addition to these traditional methods, COVID-19 has seen the development of a range of novel surveillance techniques. A multitude of smart phone apps have been devised to improve symptom tracking and contact tracing. Emergency powers have been widely enacted, and police, military, and government surveillance activities to ensure people are complying with COVID-19 restrictions have been greatly extended. The following is a partial list of additional forms of surveillance recently introduced: & United Kingdom and United States: COVID Symptom Study (this was initially called COVID Symptom Tracker), a symptom tracking app developed by King’s College London, Massachusetts General Hospital, and Zoe Global Ltd which collected data from 2,450,569 U.K. and 168,293 U.S. individuals between March 24 and April 21, 2020 (Menni et al. 2020). & Australia: BeatCOVID19Now, a symptom tracking app which collects anonymized data that can be shared with health authorities and researchers and can identify geographical clusters of COVID-19 spread (Slezak and Timms 2020; Swinburne University of Technology 2020). & Australasia: FluTracking, an existing website focused on tracking flu symptoms in Australia and New Zealand, incorporating new questions to track COVID-19 (University of Newcastle, Hunter New England Population Health, and Hunter Medical Research Institute 2020). & Singapore: TraceTogether, a contact tracing tool promoted as a means to “protect ourselves … our loved ones and … our community” (Government of Singapore 2020). & Australia: COVIDSafe, a contact tracing app promoted as providing government with the confidence to “find and contain outbreaks quickly” to allow Bioethical Inquiry easing of restrictions “while still keeping Australians safe” (Australian Government 2020). & Israel: measures approved to allow the Shin Bet internal security service to access mobile phone data to retrace movements of infected individuals (ABC News 2020b). & Taiwan: use of mobile phone location-tracking data to geofence people, erecting an “electronic fence” to notify police if people breach quarantine requirements (Lee 2020). & Hong Kong: wrist bands linked with a smart phone app to ensure compliance with self-quarantine measures, notifying authorities if an individual leaves their dwelling without authorization (Saiidi 2020). & Australia and the United States: ankle bracelets to be used when people fail to comply with quarantine or self-isolation requirements (Kallingal 2020; Hendry 2020). & China: co-opted and repurposed industrial mapping and surveying by drones to undertake crowd management and disease detection, incorporating loudspeakers, high-definition zoom lenses, flood lights, thermal sensors, and chemical spray jets for largearea disinfectant dispersal (Liu 2020). The drones have reportedly been used to break up mah-jong games and accost people in the street, with one elderly woman advised: “Yes auntie, this drone is speaking to you. You shouldn’t walk about without wearing a mask. You’d better go home, and don’t forget to wash your hands” (D’Amore 2020). & Western Australia: drones deployed by police in public places to ensure people practise distancing in adherence with government rules (Rimrod and McNeill 2020). & Italy: drones reportedly used by police to take people’s temperature without their consent (The Star 2020). & Globally: in response to privacy concerns, Google and Apple released an app which decentralizes the data collected by locating contact-matching on devices themselves rather than via a centrally controlled computer server (Kelion 2020). In addition to these responses, researchers and private sector companies have used COVID-19 to promote both existing surveillance technologies and new ones under development, such as an automated fever scanning system that operates via CCTV cameras to assess the temperatures of individuals in crowds (Daly 2020). New pandemic drones are being developed which go even further, employing a “specialised sensor and computer vision system that can monitor temperature, heart and respiratory rates, as well as detect people sneezing and coughing in crowds, offices, airports, cruise ships … and other places where groups of people may … congregate” (Gibson 2020, ¶1). Global technology companies have presented their aggregated location data as a service to help address COVID-19 issues—Google has its Community Mobility Reports (Google 2020) and Facebook has its Data for Good which publishes daily maps about population movements (Jin and McGorman 2020). Extending the Panopticon? The COVID-19 health emergency has produced unprecedented levels of surveillance. Acceptance of this new, enhanced disciplinary regime has been gained on the basis of appeals about the importance of health and healthcare and fears of infection and death affecting individuals and their families. The preponderance of these appeals and fears may have reduced scrutiny and questioning about both the need for an advanced, allpervasive panopticon and its long-term implications. The construction of the system has been stimulated by governments and supported by public health experts, and it has complemented other methods of data collection and surveillance developed in the private sector, in some cases originally for other purposes. Collectively, vast troves of data can now be accessed. While the specific details may vary across countries and cultures, we have seen extensive and remarkably uniform changes. Consistent with Foucault’s (1979) description of how the plague allowed increased social control, during COVID-19 we have been witnessing a similar systematic, underlying process. The novel regimes of surveillance can be considered to exemplify a form of “biosurveillance” that integrates aspects of public health surveillance with techniques employing the use of big data formerly reserved for the maintenance of state and national security (Lee 2019). Prior to the advent of COVID-19, concerns had been raised around the lack of transparency regarding how big data algorithms were developed and applied and how biases built into these algorithms can exacerbate racial and socioeconomic inequalities and vulnerabilities (Hacker and Petkova 2017; Gianfrancesco et al. Bioethical Inquiry 2018). The nature and extent of the power exercised through big data analytics, the identity of those on whose behalf such power was exercised, and to whom—if anyone—they were accountable has been the subject of scrutiny (Couldry and Powell 2014); these concerns are even more relevant now with the introduction of multiple new forms of surveillance. One of the key issues raised about surveillance using smart phone apps has been potential breaches of “privacy,” in response to which assurances about data protection and anonymity have been provided. Previous scholars have noted that the very rich data derived from location-focused surveillance can be employed to draw inferences of a deeply intrusive nature (Clarke and Wigan 2011; Michael and Clarke 2013). The potential use of such data against already vulnerable people, such as domestic violence survivors, whose abusers may access and use contact tracing app location data via physical or spyware access to their phone (WESNET 2020) may also be of great consequence, as is the danger of misuse by others, such as cybercriminals who commonly target health-related data for

**The alternative is to embrace the death drive. Utopian ideals seek to achieve that which is impossible—our striving to reach enjoyment replicates the very thing we are trying to eliminate. Only by founding our politics upon recognition that our limitations provide the perfect source for endless enjoyment can we prevent the endless repetition of suffering.**

**McGowan ‘13** “Enjoying What We Don’t Have: The Political Project of Psychoanalysis” (Todd, Assoc. Prof. of Film and Television Studies @ U. of Vermont) Accessed on 7/25/19 AHS// emi

In light of this barrier, the formulation of a psychoanalytically informed political project demands that we dissociate politics from progress as it is usually conceived. We cannot escape progress, and yet the traditional conception of progress always runs aground. Th is paradox must become the foundation of any authentic psychoanalytic politics. It demands that rather than trying to progress toward overcoming the barrier that separates us from the good society, we begin to view identification with the barrier as the paradoxical aim of progress. The barrier to the good society — the social symptom — is at once the obstacle over which we continually stumble and the source of our enjoyment.32 Th e typical politics of the good aims at a future not inhibited by a limit that constrains the present. Th is future can take the form of a truly representative democracy, a socialist utopia, a society with a fair distribution of power and wealth, or even a fascist order that would expel those who embody the limit. But the good remains out of reach despite the various eff orts to reach it. The limit separating us from the good society is the very thing that constitutes the good society as such. **Overcoming the limit shatters the idea of the good in the act of achieving it.** In place of this pursuit, a **psychoanalytic politics insists on identification with the limit rather than attempting to move beyond or eliminate it. If there is a conception of progress in this type of politics, it is progress toward the obstacle that bars us from the good rather than toward the good itself. Identification with the limit involves an embrace of the repetition of the drive because it is the obstacle or limit that is the point to which the drive returns. No one can be the perfect subject of the drive because the drive is what undermines all perfection.** But it is nonetheless possible to change one’s experience within it. The fundamental wager of psychoanalysis — a wager that renders the idea of a psychoanalytic political project thinkable — is that repetition undergoes a radical transformation when one adopts a different attitude toward it. We may be condemned to repeat, but we aren’t condemned to repeat the same position relative to our repetition. **By embracing repetition through identification with the obstacle to progress rather than trying to achieve the good by overcoming this obstacle, the subject or the social order changes its very nature.** Instead of being the burden that one seeks to escape, **repetition becomes the essence of one’s being and the mode through which one att ains satisfaction. Conceiving politics in terms of the embrace of repetition rather than the construction of a good society takes the movement that derails traditional political projects and reverses its valence.** Th is idea of politics lacks the hopefulness that Marxism, for instance, can provide for overcoming antagonism and loss. With it, we lose not just a utopian ideal but the idea of an alternative future altogether — the idea of a future no longer beset by intransigent limits — and this idea undoubtedly mobilizes much political energy.33 **What we gain, however, is a political form that addresses the way** 21 **that subjects structure their enjoyment. It is by abandoning the terrain of the good and adopting the death drive as its guiding principle that emancipatory politics can pose a genuine alternative to the dominance of** global capitalism rather than incidentally creating new avenues for its expansion and development. **The death drive is the revolutionary contribution that psychoanalysis makes to political thought.** But since it is a concept relatively foreign to political thought, I will turn to various examples from history, literature, and fi lm in order to concretize what Freud means by the death drive and illustrate just what a politics of the death drive might look like. Th e chapters that follow trace the implications of the death drive for thinking about the subject as a political entity and for conceiving the political structure of society. Part 1 focuses on the individual subject, beginning with an explanation of how the death drive shapes this subjectivity. Th e various chapters in part 1 trace the implications of the death drive for understanding how the subject enjoys, how the drive relates to social class, how the drive impacts the subject as an ethical being, and how the subject becomes politicized. Th e discussion of the impact of the death drive on the individual subject serves as a foundation for articulating its impact on society, which part 2 of the book addresses, beginning with the impact of the death drive on the constitution of society. Part 2 then examines how the conception of the death drive helps in navigating a path through today’s major political problems: the ineffi cacity of consciousness raising, the seductive power of fantasy, the growing danger of biological reductionism and fundamentalism, the lure of religious belief, and the failure of att empts to lift repression. The two parts of the book do not att empt to sketch a political goal to be att ained for the subject or for society but instead to recognize the structures that already exist and silently inform both. Th e wager of what follows is that the revelation of the death drive and its reach into the subject and the social order can be the foundation for reconceiving freedom. The recognition of the death drive as foundational for subjectivity is what occurs with the psychoanalytic cure. Th rough this cure, the subject abandons the belief in the possibility of fi nding a solution to the problem of subjectivity. **The loss for which one seeks restitution becomes a constitutive loss — and becomes visible as the key to one’s enjoyment rather than a barrier to it.** A political project derived from psychoanalytic thought would work to broaden this cure by bringing it outside the clinic and enacting 22 on society itself. **Th e point is not, of course, that everyone would undergo psychoanalysis but that psychoanalytic theory would function as a political theory. Politically, the importance of psychoanalysis is theoretical rather than practical. Politically, it doesn’t matt er whether people undergo psychoanalytic therapy or not.** **This theory would inaugurate political change by insisting not on the possibility of healing and thereby att aining the ultimate pleasure but on the indissoluble link between our enjoyment and loss. We become free to enjoy only when we have recognized the intractable nature of loss.** Though psychoanalytic thought insists on our freedom to enjoy, it understands freedom in a counterintuitive way. **It is through the death drive that the subject attains its freedom. The loss that founds this drive frees the subject from its dependence on its social environment, and the repetition of the initial loss sustains this freedom.** By embracing the inescapability of traumatic loss, one embraces one’s freedom, and any political project genuinely concerned with freedom must orient itself around loss. **Rather than looking to the possibility of overcoming loss, our political projects must work to remain faithful to it and enhance our contact with it. Only in this way does politics have the opportunity to carve out a space for the freedom to enjoy rather than restricting it under the banner of the good.**

## DA

#### Images of suffering increase desire for images of suffering.

Alford 20 - Aaron J. Alford, Medium, January 13th, 2020 “Disaster Pornography and the American Media”[<https://medium.com/@aaronjalford1/disaster-pornography-and-the-american-media-f01ee1cb4512>] Accessed 1/30/20 SAO

Most of us are familiar with the concept of pornography, at least sexual pornography: Images or media meant to titillate your arousal. Similarly, the images of catastrophe and destruction presented by the news media are like a drug, used by first world nations to feed off the suffering of the rest of the world. Images of death and violence from non-western countries are extracted and reprocessed for consumption by you, the consumer. The production of disaster porn is, as Baudrillard proclaimed, charity cannibalism and incentives the perpetuation of oppressive conditions in order to sustain and prolong our enjoyment. “We are the consumers of the ever delightful spectacle of poverty and catastrophe, and the moving spectacle of our own efforts to alleviate it. We see to it that extreme poverty is reproduced as a symbolic deposit, as a fuel essential to the moral and sentimental equilibrium of the West.” — Baudrillard In short, disaster pornography shows us images of suffering and our efforts to stop suffering, which gives us a little dopamine hit. **Our news media is trying to get you addicted to violence, so they can sell you more ads**. Disaster pornography is the new drug. Or should I say, old drug. Producing and reproducing suffering Somehow, what Baudrillard warned of the year I was born is still going full force, unchecked, unchallenged, and no one is calling it out. Baudrillard said “Our whole culture lives off this catastrophic cannibalism, relayed in cynical mode by the news media.” Now I can already hear you scoffing at my ridiculous claims, but consider these examples. The New York Times Sells the Iran missiles as “an Action Movie” The Iran war effort is being pushed, as I write, by American media. Take for example the New York Times coverage of a missile strike compared to Al Jazeera’s coverage of the same missile strike. One is factual, the other wants you to imagine your favorite Iron Man movie. The **New York Times wants to feed your wildest fantasies** about the glory of war, and how beautiful it is. Al Jazeera, the non-western source, simply reported the facts. The big difference is the framing. NBC Worships Trump’s Missile Attacks on Syria Consider another example, NBC’s Brian Williams coverage of a missile attacks on Syrian air bases in which he described the wanton destruction as “beautiful missiles.” He said he was “tempted to quote the great Leonard Cohen” in that he is “guided by the beauty of our weapons.” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lJz9q7pfXkY The U.S’s Cycle of support and betrayal of the Kurds To better understand this cycle, look no further than the U.S’s support and then sudden betrayal of the Kurds. During the gulf war, there was a huge push for “humanitarian protections” for the Kurds, even after Saddam Hussein had already crushed them while the west stood by drinking our tea. In 2003, we start a war against Saddam Hussein, which perpetuates the instability that feeds our love for disaster even more. Then ISIS comes out of that chaos, and we are even more fed. Then the Kurds defeat ISIS, popular opinion of the Kurds goes up in the wake of the Syrian civil war and destruction of ISIS, only to have our president abandon them to be genocided on the Syrian border by fucking Turkey. You see, we never cared about the Kurds, only the images they gave us. Only their suffering, only their death, was enough to sate the American appetite for war, violence, and suffering. The election of Donald Trump Baudrillard argued that when the disaster market from around the world slows down, the west will turn inward and **produce its own spectacles of disaster**. Brexit and the election of white nationalists in America are great examples of what Baudrillard warned of. Another example of this cycle of catastrophe is president Donald Trump’s election. Donald Trump received 2 billion dollars of free television coverage in 2016 leading up to his election. The media could not get enough of this crazy television host billionaire who thought he would be a good president. The truth is that the media always wanted him to be the president, the source of constant disasters both here and abroad. Donald Trump is a president who: Impulse killed an Iranian General without a declaration of war Cut taxes for the rich and raised taxes on the poor Put children, including babies, in cages at the border Bullied a 15 year old climate activist on Twitter Has been accused of sexual misconduct by at least 17 women Betrayed our ally the Kurds and genocidal Turkey Has actively supported a Saudi Arabian genocide in Yemen Started a trade war with China for no apparent reason Attempted to bribe Ukrainian officials into meddling with our election, and got impeached for it Nominated a rapist to the Supreme Court Supported known child molester Roy Moore for congress Paid of a porn star to stay quiet about how he cheated on his wife with her Is best friends with Steve Bannon, a outspoken fascist and white nationalist Said that there were good people on both sides of a dispute between white supremacists and people protesting white supremacy Pardoned a sheriff in Arizona who advocates for concentration camps Consistently uses anti-Semitic tropes and promotes division I mean, the list goes on from here, but you get my point. Donald Trump is **a walking disaster maker, and the media worships him for it**. Hell, Republicans worship him for it. Even when the media and right wing establishment claim to disagree with him, they put him and his hateful rhetoric on the pedestal. The truth is, no matter what they tell you, the owners of American media want his reelection. It is just too good for their bottom line. A president who creates disaster’s like these is exactly what the American media needs to keep American addicted and the profits rolling in. How then shall we live? Disaster pornography relies on a cycle of production and consumption. The West is complicit in the creation of numerous disasters all around the world. When Donald Trump fucked with Iran, it provoked a response from Iran which is now played back by our media as a justification for further western intervention. This cycle didn’t just start, it’s been going on since before I was born. The west does not respond to disasters, we fucking create them. It’s a process, by which we sell our souls to the devil. Although I fear this description is unfair — to the devil. So how do we stop it? How we prevent the cycle of disaster, images, disaster? It’s simple; **stop watching** disaster porn. I don’t mean stop watching the news, but I do mean to stop listening to the neo-liberal pundits, the discourse of fear, and the spectacles of violence displayed for your pleasure. Listen to news sources who have some god damned respect for humanity. (This means not Fox News OR CNN, if that wasn’t clear). “We have long denounced the capitalistic, economic exploitation of poverty of the ‘other half of the world’. We must today denounce the moral and sentimental exploitation of that poverty — charity cannibalism being worse than oppressive violence.” — Baudrillard So I ask you today, to denounce with me the exploitation of disaster for our own selfish needs. **Say no to the staged spectacle and eventually the market for these simulated disasters will dry up**. When the market of staged disasters is no longer where we look, we will again be able to recognize real human suffering when we encounter it, and act to resolve it. Rather than ignoring the suffering of the underpaid, overworked, and exploited around us, we will finally be able to recognize their suffering as legitimate, rather than looking to the news for our moral compass.

#### Vote neg to reject the affs carnival of suffering. This operates on higher level than the affs hypothetical troop withdrawal because we are refusing the form of debate as a communicative institution. The aff can only operate on the level of content.

## Case

### Comparative worlds

#### [1] the k takes it out – The 1AC is an endorsement of a never-ending quest for knowledge, a striving toward the material and calculable, inseparable from an unconscious paranoia that eats at the subject as its lifelong quest for meaning is for not. We sacrifice the very nature of knowledge while disintegrating our psychic integrity and crushing any value to life.

**Mills,** Mills, Jon. “Lacan on Paranoiac Knowledge.” *Dr. Jon Mills Psychoanalyst Philosopher Psychotherapy Psychologist*, Process Psychology, www.processpsychology.com/new-articles/Lacan-PP-revised.htm.When these aspects of human life are broadly considered, it becomes easier to see how our linguistic-epistemological dependency has paranoiac *a priori* conditions. From Freud to Klein and Lacan, **knowledge is a dialectical enterprise** that stands **in relation to fear--to the horror of possibility**--the possibility of the *not*: **negation**, conflict, **and suffering saturate our very beings, beings whose self-identities are linguistically constructed. The relation between knowledge and paranoia is** a **fundamental** one, and perhaps no where do we see this dynamic so poignantly realized than in childhood. From the 'psychotic-like' universe of the newborn infant (e.g. see Klein, 1946), to the relational deficiencies and selfobject failures that impede the process of human attachment, to the primal scene and/or subsequent anxieties that characterize the Oedipal period, leading to the inherent rivalry, competition, and overt aggression of even our most sublimated object relations, -- fear, trepidation, and dread hover over the very process of knowing itself. **What is paranoid is that which stands in relation to opposition**, hence that which is **alien to the self. Paranoia is** not simply that which is beyond the rational mind, but it is **a generic process of *nosis***--**'I take thought, I perceive,** I intellectually **grasp,** I **apprehend'**--hence have ***apprehension* for what I encounter in consciousness**. With qualitative degrees of difference, we are all paranoid simply because others hurt us, a lesson we learn in early childhood. **Others hurt us with their knowledge**, with what they say, as do we. **And we hurt knowing. 'What will the Other do next?' We are both pacified yet cower in extreme trembling over what we may and may not know**--what we may and may not find out; and this is why **our relation to knowledge is fundamentally paranoiac**. For Aristotle (1958), "all men by nature desire to know" (p. 108). **This philosophic attitude is kindled by our educational systems** perhaps informing the popular adage, **'knowledge is power.' But whose?** There is no doubt that the acquisition of knowledge involves a power differential, but what if **knowledge itself is seen as too powerful because it threatens our psychic integrity**? In the gathering of **knowledge** there **is** simultaneously **a covering-over**, a blinding **to what one is exposed to**; moreover, **an erasure**. I ~~know~~ (No)! Unequivocally, **there are things we desire to know nothing about at all; hence the psychoanalytic attitude places unconscious defense--negation**/denial and repression--**in the foreground of human knowledge, the desire not to know. When we engage epistemology**--the question and meaning of knowledge--**we are intimately confronted with paranoia**. For example, there is nothing more disturbing when after a lifetime of successful inquiry into a particular field of study it may be entirely debunked by the simple, arrogant question: 'How do you know?' **Uncertainty, doubt, ambiguity, hesitation, insecurity--anxiety!: the process of knowing exposes us** all **to immense discomfort. And any epistemological claim is equally a metaphysical one**. Metaphysics deals with first principles, the fundamental, ultimate questions that preoccupy our collective humanity: 'What is real? Why do I exist? Will I *really* die?' Metaphysics is paranoia--and we are all terrified by its questions: 'Is there God, freedom, agency, immortality?' *Is? Why? Why not? Yes but why?!* **When the potential meaning and quality of one's personal existence hinge on the response to** these **questions, it is no wonder** why most **theists say only God is omniscient**. And although Freud (1927) tells us that the very concept of **God is an illusory derivative** of the Oedipal situation--a wish to be rescued and comforted from the anxieties of childhood helplessness, He--our exalted Father in the sky--is ***always* watching**, judging. Knowing this, the true believer has every reason to be petrified. For those in prayer or in the madhouse, **I can think of no greater paranoia**.

### Fwk

#### [1] Pleasure and pain aren’t additive or aggregatable just like two headaches don’t equal a migraine.

#### [2] Self Defeating: Always trying to maximize as much X as possible prevents us from actually using X, which means we never experience pleasures goodness.

### 1AR theory

#### 1. Reject 1AR Theory – a) double bind – either you can put minor ink next to answer of my responses and extend your arguments to auto-win or the judge has to intervene to see if the 2ar answers to the 2n are good enough. Intervention o/w since it takes the round out of debater’s hands b) they have 2 speeches on theory while I have 1 which means they can structurally preempt my answers and respond to them and I can’t do either c) infinite abuse in the context of aff abuse doesn’t make sense since you can read 1ac theory and uplayer with other 1ar offs like Ks d) they have 1 more minute on the theory debate due to a 7-6 skew which o/w since theory is mainly about substance e) evaluate 2n paradigm issues and framing since they have 2 speeches to answer and weigh against 1 argument and I need another speech to compensate