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#### Interpretation: the affirmative must defend that the appropriation of outer space by private etities is unjust.

#### Outer space is outside earth

Dunnett 21 (Oliver Tristan, lecturer in geography at Queen’s University Belfast). Earth, Cosmos and Culture: Geographies of Outer Space in Britain, 1900–2020 (1st ed.). Routledge. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780815356301> EE

In such ways, this book argues that Britain became a home to rich discourses of outer space, both feeding from and contributing to iconic achievements in space exploration, while also embracing the cosmos in imaginative and philosophical ways.2

INSERT FOOTNOTE 2

2 This book primarily uses the term ‘outer space’ to describe the realm beyond the Earth’s atmosphere, conventionally accepted as beginning at the Kármán line of 100km above sea level. Other terms such as ‘interplanetary space’, ‘interstellar space’, ‘cosmos’, and ‘the heavens’ are used in specific contexts.

END FOOTNOTE 2

Cognisant of this spatial context, a central aim is to demonstrate how contemporary geographical enquiry can provide specific and valuable perspectives from which to understand outer space. This is an argument that was initiated by Denis Cosgrove, and his critique of Alexander von Humboldt’s seminal work Cosmos helped to demonstrate geography’s special relevance to thinking about outer space.3 The key thematic areas which provide the interface for this book’s research, therefore, are the cultural, political and scientific understandings of outer space; the context of the United Kingdom since the start of the last century; and the geographical underpinnings of their relationship.

#### “Appropriation” means exclusive ownership

Leon 18 (Amanda M., Associate, Caplin & Drysdale, JD UVA Law) "Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources." Virginia Law Review, vol. 104, no. 3, May 2018, p. 497-547. HeinOnline.

Appropriation. The term "appropriation" also remains ambiguous. Webster's defines the verb "appropriate" as "to take to oneself in exclusion of others; to claim or use as by an exclusive or pre-eminent right; as, let no man appropriate a common benefit."16 5 Similarly, Black's Law Dictionary describes "appropriate" as an act "[t]o make a thing one's own; to make a thing the subject of property; to exercise dominion over an object to the extent, and for the purpose, of making it subserve one's own proper use or pleasure."166 Oftentimes, appropriation refers to the setting aside of government funds, the taking of land for public purposes, or a tort of wrongfully taking another's property as one's own. The term appropriation is often used not only with respect to real property but also with water. According to U.S. case law, a person completes an appropriation of water by diversion of the water and an application of the water to beneficial use.167 This common use of the term "appropriation" with respect to water illustrates two key points: (1) the term applies to natural resources-e.g., water or minerals-not just real property, and (2) mining space resources and putting them to beneficial use-e.g., selling or manufacturing the mined resources could reasonably be interpreted as an "appropriation" of outer space. While the ordinary meaning of "appropriation" reasonably includes the taking of natural resources as well as land, whether the drafters and parties to the OST envisioned such a broad meaning of the term remains difficult to determine with any certainty. The prohibition against appropriation "by any other means" supports such a reading, though, by expanding the prohibition to other types not explicitly described.168

#### Private entity means non-state

Warners 20 (Bill, JD Candidate, May 2021, at UIC John Marshall Law School) "Patents 254 Miles up: Jurisdictional Issues Onboard the International Space Station." UIC Review of Intellectual Property Law, vol. 19, no. 4, 2020, p. 365-380. HeinOnline.

To satisfy these three necessary requirements for a new patent regime, the ISS IGA must add an additional clause ("Clause 7") in Article 21 specifically establishing a patent regime for private nonstate third parties onboard the ISS. First, Clause 7 would define the term "private entity" as an individual, organization, or business which is primarily privately owned and/or managed by nonstate affiliates. Specifically defining the term "private entity" prevents confusion as to what entities qualify under the agreement and the difference between "public" and "private."99 This definition would also support the connection of Clause 1 in Article 21 to "Article 2 of the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization." 100 A succinct definition also alleviates international concerns that the changes to the ISS IGA pushes out Partner State influence. 101 Some in the international community may still point out that Clause 7 still pushes towards a trend of outer space privatization. However, this argument fails to consider that private entities in outer space have operated in space almost as comprehensively as national organizations. 102

#### Resolved means a legislative policy.

**Words and Phrases 64,** Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964. Definition of the word “**resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote**; as ‘**it was resolved by the legislature**;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “**to establish by law**”

**Violation – You don’t**

**Vote neg -**

#### [1] Ground – not defending implementation means affs gut neg prep since they can spike out of util DA’s, CP’s, strategic solvency deficits, and circumvention in the 1AR by saying that implementation is irrelevant, which equally applies to the few generics we could read to ensure the aff takes a concrete action. A couple impacts: (a) link turns critical ed – we can’t test the aff from a policy standpoint since util offense doesn’t link, which kills critical contestation (b) policy education – in your world we kill any discussion of real world factors that would constrain the passage of the aff – hijacks their solvency – otherwise there’s no way to ensure the aff gets passed (c) neg ground outweighs aff ground

**[2] Limits – Ex post-facto topic adjustment structurally favors the aff by manipulating the balance of prep which is anchored around the resolution as a stasis point. Not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months, which means their arguments are presumptively false because they haven’t been subject to well-researched scrutiny. Their interp creates a race to the margins incentivizing affs to defend uncontestable statements like “2+2=4” or “racism is bad” and the lack of a stable mechanism means they can always revise their aff to de-link from the few generics that are responsive.**

**[3] Truth Testing – they don’t get to weigh the aff - lack of preparation entails the impossibility of testing the 1AC’s scholarship. Fairness is an independently higher layer than their arguments – if we win it then we don’t have to weigh it against other impacts in the round.**

#### [4] SSD – can read transhumanism as a neg position

#### [1] Fairness first – (a) Debate is fundamentally a game which requires both sides to have a relatively equal shot at winning and is necessary to produce any benefit from the activity (b) Ballot proximity - individual ballots can’t solve their impacts, but they can solve mine --- they can’t alter wholesale subjectivity or inspire broad political change, but are most proximate towards resolving in-round skews (c) Fairness independently outweighs on decision-making: every argument concedes to the validity of fairness i.e. that the judge will make a fair decision based on the arguments presented. This means if they win fairness bad vote neg on presumption because you have no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments.

#### [5] No impact turns: (a) We should experiment with ideological opposition – reading T is a good thing even if its false because it makes us test a multiplicity of strategies from many directions and refines good methods (b) They can’t win on an impact turn absent justifying an RVI because they’re still operating under the model of

#### T outweighs the aff: (a) Testing – if we can’t substantively engage with the 1AC that means they’ll win every time – means cross apps of case or framework are incoherent since we indict the entirety of you reading them in the first place (b) T is a procedural question – all of the claims of the 1AC are substantive but not theoretical – they can’t weigh those. The terms of debate necessarily precede substance – e.g. following speech times, answering in c-x, etc – otherwise debate would become incoherent babbling without constraint.

### 3

#### To be a subject requires conformity with the meanings, norms, and traditions of the Symbolic. The illusive nature of the signifier induces Lack, a sense of loss which cannot be overcome by the subject. This dooms political projects, as the failure to overcome lack becomes our object of desire.

McGowan ’16 Todd McGowan (Associate Professor of Film and Television Studies at the University of Vermont). “Capitalism and Desire: The Psychic Cost of Free Markets, Columbia University Press, 2016, pgs. 28-32.

When he writes Beyond the Pleasure Principle in 1920, Freud begins to define the subject through its constitutive loss. From this point on in his thinking, he conceives of the subject as completely determined by loss, as driven toward its own destruction—a process that he misleadingly labels "death drive.” Though there are hints of this breakthrough in earlier works, the radicality of the 1920 revolution should not be understated. In fact, even Freud himself did not fully grasp its radicality, as evidenced by his failed attempt to reduce the subject's repetition of failure and loss to a tendency to return to an inorganic state. Death drive connotes a desire to die, which is why it leads readers of Freud (and even Freud himself) astray. What he is really onto with this concept is that the subject finds satisfaction in repeating loss, that the subject's satisfaction is inextricable from failure. No one sets out consciously to fail, and, even if one did, the act of making failure a goal would immediately transform it into a different form of success. Within consciousness the subject cannot give failure primacy. Consciousness is oriented around projects in which the subject aims at succeeding, and the failures of these projects, from the perspective of consciousness, are only contingent failures the subject can attempt to remedy by trying again or trying harder. Unconsciously, however, the subject depends on failure to satisfy itself. Failure and loss produce the object as absent, and it is only the absence of the object that renders it satisfying. Absence animates the subject, driving it to act, in a way that presence cannot. If we think about who marches in the street, it is those who lack, not those who have, and when those who have do march, it is because the threat of loss manifests itself. Even though they march for the elimination of this lack, it is absence that motivates them to march in the first place. It is also absence or the threat of it that enables us to get out of bed in the morning and go to work. The subject that had no absence in its existence would be unable to act and would lack the impetus even to kill itself. After seeing numerous patients display their attachment to absence and loss, Freud concludes that it holds the key to the subject's form of satisfaction. We can see this play out in sports fandom. Though we consciously root for our favorite team to win, we find more unconscious satisfaction in the persistent struggles of the sports team that we root for than in its unqualified successes. The close game is infinitely more interesting than the blowout because it enables the fan to experience loss while not having loss enter into consciousness. No one wants to root for a team that wins all its games, and if fans flock to the games of teams that win all the time, they go to see the loss (or potential loss) that will disrupt the winning, just like auto racing fans go to see cars crashing (or potentially crashing), though this desire remains unconscious. Even when our favorite team wins a championship, we begin almost immediately to consider how they might fare the next year. This is a way of leaving the terrain of success for that of potential failure. When we achieve the pinnacle of success, we seek out a way to return loss into our existence by imagining a new challenge or embarking on a new project. Loss injects value into the subject's existence and gives it an object that provides satisfaction. Freud's conception of the priority of loss and its repetition troubles other psychoanalysts (like Fairbairn, for instance) because it highlights the impossibility of any satisfaction associated with obtaining the object. After this point, for Freud, one simply cannot have the satisfying object. Any notion of success becomes unthinkable, and one must reconceive satisfaction in terms of how one fails. Failure becomes the only option. On the basis of privileging failure, Freud reimagines the object in a way that challenges both much of the history of philosophy and the psychic demands of capitalism. The object is not an object that the subject hopes to obtain but a limit that the subject encounters. The subject cannot overcome the limit but constitutes itself and its satisfaction through the limit. That is to say, the object that thwarts the subject's efforts at obtaining it retroactively creates the subject around the recalcitrance. The subject seeks out what it cannot obtain and latches itself onto these objects. Its failure with regard to them provides a satisfaction that completely defies the capitalist image of reality. Freud's conception of the object enables us to rethink the famous slogan from May 1968 in France. The mantra of this movement—jouir sans entraves (enjoy without hindrances)—expresses the critique of capitalism’s repressiveness, the critique that dominated much of the twentieth century. The problem with this slogan is that eliminating the barriers to enjoyment would eliminate the source of enjoyment. By slightly changing it to jouir les entraves (enjoy the hindrances), we capture the constitutive importance of the obstacle. Satisfaction exists in the obstacle that the object erects in the face of the subject's efforts to obtain it rather than in the eradication of all obstacles. But this is what the capitalist imperative to accumulate enables us to avoid confronting. The speaking subject satisfies itself through its process of failing to obtain its object, even if this goes unrecognized by the subject itself. The relationship between subjectivity and loss leads the subject to flee this recognition and find asylum in the framework of capitalist accumulation. The subject repeats a constitutive loss because loss is the only way that the speaking subject has to relate to objects, even though capitalism provides the image of an alternative. The signifier confronts the subject with an absence that forms subjectivity and that the subject can never overcome. But the loss that haunts the subject also constitutes the subject, which is why it seeks to repeat this loss. The signifier creates the subject through the act of removing what is most essential for the subject, even though this essential object doesn't exist prior to its removal. From this point on, the subject will remain unable to divorce satisfaction from loss. One might say that through the signifier the subject loses the object into existence. Loss generates the object at the same time that it marks its disappearance, which has a determinative effect on how the subject satisfies itself. The subject may find fleeting pleasure in success and achievement, but its only satisfaction will take the form of the repetition of loss. Subjects undermine themselves and self-sabotage not because they are stubborn or stupid but because this is their path to satisfaction. For the speaking subject, winning is only a detour on the way to losing. Even the winners in the world of the signifier are ultimately on the side of defeat, but just take a longer time to get there than others. When we understand the difference between instinctual beings and speaking subjects, the appeal of thinking about ourselves in terms of instinct rather than subjectivity becomes self-evident. Instinctual beings have the capacity to overcome loss and obtain satisfaction through the object they seek. Instinctual beings can become winners that suffer only contingent failures rather than remaining ensconced in perpetual failure. Instinct holds within it the promise of a satisfaction untainted by loss, a full satiation that, even if it soon disappears, can often be replicated. The being envisions a goal that would provide satisfaction and then either attains the goal or not. Success may be difficult and may not endure, but it's not impossible. But the subject attains satisfaction through the repetition of its inability to obtain its object. Failure is the subject's mode of success. Lacan describes this in one of his most lucid explanations of the structure of subjectivity. In Seminar XI, he separates the subject's goal from its aim and uses a metaphor to explain the aim. He claims, "When you entrust someone with a mission, the aim is not what he brings back, but the itinerary he must take. The aim is the way taken.” The satisfaction of the subject derives from the path that it takes. But what Lacan fails to add here is that this path necessarily involves an encounter with loss: rather than seeking out its object, the subject finds ways to miss it and to ensure that it remains lost. The lost object is constitutively lost, and the satisfaction that it offers depends on it remaining so. The subject has no hope that it might attain its lost object, which is why psychoanalysis must refrain from describing the infant's satisfying relationship with the mother's breast prohibited by the father. It is only in retrospect (or from the perspective of an observer) that this relationship appears perfectly satisfying. Freud first conceives of the appeal of loss in response to his observation of self-destructive actions that appear to violate the pleasure principle. It is the penchant for self-sabotage and self-destruction that leads Freud to speculate about the existence of a death drive that aims at a return to an inorganic state. But we don't have to indulge in this type of hypothesis if we recognize the constitutive role that loss plays in the subject's satisfaction. Without the lost object, the subject would lose what animates it and the source of its enjoyment. The act of self-sabotage, even though it detracts from the subject's pleasure, enables the subject to continue to satisfy itself. In Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Freud theorizes that the negative therapeutic reaction that subverts the psychoanalytic cure is not just the product of resistances. The subject does not want to be cured because it associates healing with the loss of its foundational loss, a prospect much more horrifying that the pain of the neurosis. With the recognition of the constitutive role of loss in the psychic economy, psychoanalysis must alter its conception of the cure. Rather than simply ending repression or even overcoming loss, the cure has to involve changing the subject's relation to its lost object, experiencing the intimate connection between loss and satisfaction.

**At the level of form, radical demands are an affective investment which robs agency, cede the political, and reaffirms state authority.**

Lundberg ’12 (Chris, comm studies prof at UNC, Lacan in Public)

The demands of student revolutionaries and antiglobalization protestors provide a set of opportunities for interrogating hysteria as a po liti cal practice. For the antiglobalization protestors cited earlier, demands to be added to a list of dangerous globophobes uncannily condense a dynamic inherent to all demands for recognition. But the demands of the Mexico Solidarity Network and the Seattle Independent Media project demand more than recognition: they also demand danger as a specific mode of representation. “Danger” functions as a sign of something more than inclusion, a way of reaffirming the protestors’ imaginary agency over processes of globalization. If danger represents an assertion of agency, and the assertion of agency is proportional to the deferral of desire to the master upon whom the demand is placed, then demands to be recognized as dangerous are doubly hysterical. Such demands are also demands for a certain kind of love, namely, the state might extend its love by recognizing the dangerousness of the one who makes the demand. At the level of the demand’s rhetorical function, dangerousness is metonymically connected with the idea that average citizens can effect change in the prevailing order, or that they might be recognized as agents who, in the instance of the list of globalophobic leaders, can command the Mexican state to reaffirm their agency by recognizing their dangerousness. The rhetorical structure of danger implies the continuing existence of the state or governing apparatus’s interests, and these interests become a nodal point at which the hysterical demand is discharged. This structure generates enjoyment of the existence of oppressive state policies as a point for the articulation of identity. The addiction to the state and the demands for the state’s love is also bound up with a fundamental dependency on the oppression of the state: otherwise the identity would collapse. Such demands constitute a reaffirmation of a hysterical subject position: they reaffirm not only the subject’s marginality in the global system but the danger that protestors present to the global system. There are three practical implications for this formation. First, for the hysteric the simple discharge of the demand is both the beginning and satisfaction of the political project. Although there is always a nascent political potential in performance, in this case the performance of demand comes to fully eclipse the desires that animate content of the demand. Second, demand allows institutions that stand in for the global order to dictate the direction of politics. This is not to say that engaging such institutions is a bad thing; rather, it is to say that when antagonistic engagement with certain institutions is read as the end point of politics, the field of political options is relatively constrained. Demands to be recognized as dangerous by the Mexican government or as a powerful antiglobalization force by the WTO often function at the cost of addressing how practices of globalization are reaffirmed at the level of consumption, of identity, and so on or in thinking through alternative political strategies for engaging globalization that do not hinge on the state and the state’s actions. Paradoxically, the third danger is that an addiction to the refusal of demands creates a paralyzing disposition toward institutional politics. Grossberg has identified a tendency in left politics **to retreat from the “politics of policy** and public **debate**.”45 Although Grossberg identifies the problem as a specific coordination of “theory” and its relation to left politics, perhaps a hysterical commitment to marginality informs the impulse in some sectors to eschew engagements with institutions and institutional debate. An addiction to the state’s refusal of ten makes the perfect the enemy of the good, implying a stifling commitment to po liti cal purity as a pretext for sustaining a structure of enjoyment dependent on refusal, dependent on a kind of paternal “no.” Instead of seeing institutions and policy making as one part of the political field that might be pressured for contingent or relative goods, a hysterical politics is in the incredibly difficult position of taking an addressee (such as the state) that it assumes represents the totality of the political field; simultaneously it understands its addressee as constitutively and necessarily only a locus of prohibition. These paradoxes become nearly insufferable when one makes an analytical cut between the content of a demand and its rhetorical functionality. At the level of the **content** of the demand, the state or institutions that represent globalization are figured as illegitimate, as morally and politically compromised because of their misdeeds. Here there is an assertion of agency, but because the assertion of agency is simultaneously a deferral of desire, the identity produced in the hysterical demand is not only intimately tied to but is ultimately dependent on the continuing existence of the state, hegemonic order, or institution. At the level of affective investment, the state or institution is automatically figured as the legitimate authority over its domain. As Lacan puts it: “demand in itself . . . is demand of a presence or of an absence . . . pregnant with that Other to be situated within the needs that it can satisfy. Demand constitutes the Other as already possessing the ‘privilege’ of satisfying needs, that it is to say, the power of depriving them of that alone by which they are satisfied.”46

#### Apocalyptic rhetoric attempts to mediate the infinitude of the Real, but backfires through neocon cooption and indeterminate prescriptions. Scenario planning is an investment in apocalypse that justifies genocidal logic and desires the end of the world.

Matheson 15 Calum Lister Matheson (Professor of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh; PhD, Communication Studies, University of North Carolina). “Desired Ground Zeroes: Nuclear Imagination and the Death Drive.” UNC Chapel Hill Dissertation, 2015, <https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/downloads/sn009z17m?locale=en>. MBPZ

Later, diagnosed with terminal cancer, von Neumann supposedly converted to Catholicism on his deathbed, convinced by another, long dead, mathematician: Blaise Pascal (Jordan 1). Pascal’s wager, that one should believe in God even if He is very unlikely to exist because the consequences of eternal damnation are infinite (Pascal 67- 9), is the basic structure of the sign of survival that was inverted in the twentieth century to be an argument mandating care for the material world instead. Incubated in the warmth of the Bomb, this sign has metastasized to other areas of apocalyptic fantasy predictions. As its transmogrification from Jonathan Schell’s pacifist anti-nuclear stance to Dick Cheney’s defense of preemption will show, arguments based on the attempt to calculate the incalculable are indeterminate. The excess of tuché frustrates automaton, and this secular version of Pascal’s wager is the broken machinery it leaves behind. Jonathan Schell wrote perhaps the most famous book about nuclear war to be marketed as non-fiction. Fate of the Earth is an attempt to make nuclear war seem real through the unabashed use of sublime language. The first of its three parts is full of beautiful passages about the destruction that a nuclear war might produce before ending in a “republic of insects and grass.” Relying heavily on the assumption that a nuclear winter would follow a war between the USA and USSR and that such an event would cause humanity to go extinct,14 Schell contemplates what the end of the human species might mean and what its possibility suggests for defense policy. Schell, like Kristiakoswky at the Trinity test, thought of nuclear war as the end of humanity. Seeing the world apparently as one for us, he wrote that all value was human value, so a nuclear war would destroy everything meaningful in the known universe (95). Nuclear war must, therefore, be avoided at all costs. Schell wrote: [T]he mere risk of extinction has a significance that is categorically different from, and immeasurably greater than, that of any other risk, and as we make our decisions we have to take that significance into account…It represents not the defeat of some purpose, but an abyss in which all human purposes would be drowned for all time. We have no right to place the possibility of this limitless, eternal defeat on the same footing as risks that we run in the ordinary conduct of our affairs in our particular transient moment of human history…although the risk of extinction may be fractional, the stake is…infinite, and a fraction of infinity is still infinity…morally they are the same, and we have no choice but to address the issue of nuclear weapons as though we knew for a certainty that their use would put an end to our species. (Schell 95) This passage serves as the end of the first part of Fate of the Earth and a transition to the middle section of the book, “The Second Death,” which is about future generations. Schell’s argument is a version of Pascal’s wager where “infinity” takes the place of a Christian God. “Infinity” as a concept is always an attempt to mediate the Real because it replaces something that by definition cannot be resolved in language or understood by human beings in its entirety into a single word, a placeholder to represent with finite bounds something that can never be represented. It is the ultimate license in metonymy since all associations are included within it; no proliferation of meaning is prohibited. Its symbolic function can be compared to the various names of God in negative theology, all of which stand in for something that is acknowledged to be inexpressible (Pseudo-Dionysius 52-53). Some version of Schell’s infinite risk argument was used by anti-nuclear activists in public rallies (Sorensen 141), and also used by others to think about a range of other “existential threats” (e.g., Matheny). A report by the Global Challenges Foundation explicitly focuses on “infinite risks” including nuclear war, describing itself as “the first science-based list of global risks with a potentially infinite impact” (Pamlin and Armstrong 31). Representatives of the Vatican recently used the argument too, signing on to a statement including this line: “as long as nuclear weapons exist, there remains the possibility of a nuclear explosion. Even if the probability is small, given the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear weapon detonating, the risk is unacceptable” (Gagliarducci). Even when the hazard is expressed as “catastrophic,” or quantified with some suitably huge number, it is effectively infinite: as Yudkowsky argues, human beings calculate scale poorly, and a sufficiently large number is not rationally understood. “Human emotions take place within an analog brain,” writes Yudkowsky. “The human brain cannot release enough neurotransmitters to feel emotion a thousand times as strong as the grief of one funeral. A prospective risk going from 10,000,000 deaths to 100,000,000 deaths does not multiply by ten the strength of our determination to stop it. It adds one more zero on paper for our eyes to glaze over, an effect so small that one must usually jump several orders of magnitude to detect the difference experimentally” (16). In the more elegant formulation attributed to Josef Stalin, one death is a tragedy. One million deaths is just a statistic. Our failure to grasp these magnitudes could be called the problem of hrair after the Lapine language of Watership Down. Rabbits in the novel can only count to four. Any larger number, be it five or one thousand, is simply hrair. The word means “a great many; an uncountable number; any number over four” (Adams 475). The language we employ attempts to master and reduce the 103 incomprehensible vastness of time and space to mark difference where comprehension is impossible. Infinity is perhaps the best example, but any very large number serves the same structural function of expressing loss beyond practical measure. Thus, although the Global Challenges Foundation argues that “infinite risk” is not meant in a mathematical sense and that calculations are possible, they are in effect meaningless: the investments of “infinity” exceed our ability to calculate, as indeed the report acknowledges when it argues for a categorically different treatment of these risks (Pamlin and Armstrong 33). This quandary frustrates the attempt to make calculable values that seem to exceed calculation itself. A shadow always remains in the quantification of infinity and the attempt to master it technologically, a remainder that haunts the edges of supposedly perfect reason. This is Martin Heidegger’s concept of the gigantic, something much like the sense of the Real that shines through in the sublime: The gigantic is rather that through which the quantitative becomes a special quality and thus a remarkable kind of greatness... as soon as the gigantic in planning and calculating and adjusting and making secure shifts over out of the quantitative and becomes a special quality, then what is gigantic, and what can seemingly always be calculated completely, becomes, precisely through this, incalculable. This incalculable remains the invisible shadow that is cast around all things everywhere when man [sic] has been transformed into subiectum and the world into picture. (Heidegger 135) Through this shadow the modern world extends itself into “a space withdrawn from representation” and gestures towards something which we are denied to know (Heidegger 136). For Schell, the losses possible in a nuclear war are infinite because they threaten future generations beyond count. Preventing the birth of future individuals is immoral, by this logic, which has some bizarre (and apparently unintended) echoes in the Catholic view on abortion (Schell 116). As no future individuals are cotemporal with those assigning them worth, the value of future generations is symbolic, not unique to the individuals actually “prevented” (Kleinig 196-197). The reason we must not immolate ourselves in nuclear fire, then, is that we must continue to reproduce—the value of each individual lies in that person’s ability to create more individuals. There is no discussion of anything else that we are obligated to do for the future. For Schell, responsibility seems to be a finite obligation to an infinite number of people. This infinite future is frequently represented by the metaphor of the child.

#### Thus, the alternative is to traverse the fantasy – this spills up to tangible political change, shifting politics away from one focused on escaping loss to one embracing it.

McGowan ‘13 (Todd, Assoc. Prof. of Film and Television Studies @ U. of Vermont, Enjoying What We Don’t Have: The Political Project of Psychoanalysis, pp. 208-210)

Like philosophy and Marxism, psychoanalysis also has a history of opposing itself to fantasy. Its basic trajectory appears to involve curing the patient of an excessive investment in fantasy life. It seems as if neurotics come to psychoanalysts suffering from their fantasies and that the sessions allow the neurotics to gain some distance from these fantasies and thereby see them for what they are. Gaining purchase on one’s fantasy life — or simply **becoming aware that one is fantasizing** — **is one** predominant **image of the psychoanalytic process**. My own therapy, for instance, consisted in gaining awareness of the nonexistence of normal people. The analyst’s unremitting silence in response to my questions about how everyone else would react in similar situations ultimately allowed me to recognize the obvious fact that there was no such thing as a normal reaction or normal person**. I was invested in the fantasy of normality without realizing that it was a fantasy**, and **analysis laid this fantasy bare and** thus **facilitated a disinvestment in it.** In this way, like so many patients I felt as if I was able to move beyond a barrier that I did not even know existed. Many theorists who recognize the political importance of psychoanalysis do so because of its ability to combat fantasy. For example, **this dimension** of psychoanalysis **leads** Yannis Stavrakakis, in *Lacan and the Political*, to see **the contemporary** **political task of psychoanalysis as one of “traversing the fantasy of utopian thought**.”25 In the vein of the philosopher or the Marxist, Stavrakakis sees a danger in the way that **fantasy hides the gap that haunts the symbolic order**. As he notes, “**Fantasy negates the real by promising to ‘realise’ it,** by promising **to close the gap between the real and reality**, by repressing the discursive nature of reality’s production.”26 Here, Stavrakakis sees the ideological dimension of fantasy, and **psychoanalysis** for him **facilitates** this **recognition and** provides **a way to dissolve fantasy’s power**

# Case