## 1

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives must specify and separately delineate a standard or Role of the Ballot text in the 1AC.

#### Violation: they didn’t

#### Standards

#### 1] Shiftiness- They can shift out of my turns based on whatever theory of the good they operate under due to the nature of a vague standard/framing mechanism. Especially true because the warrants for their theory could justify different versions of reforming education and structural violence coming first and I wouldn’t know until the 1AR which gives them access to multiple contingent standards. Turns the aff [a] discussion [b] harms edu standards

#### 2] Real World – Critical theorists need to be as specific as possible when delineating their theory since there are so many nuances and contextual applications of philosophy especially in the context of education as we need a concrete model/curriculum to resolve the impacts of the aff which makes a general critique of Common Core. Especially crucial to resolving structural violence as you need concrete policy based options to rectify material structures and violence.

#### This spec shell isn’t regressive- it literally determines what framework the affirmative defends and how to link offense back to it

No cross apps -

Voters-

DTD/CI/NORVIS

## 2

#### Survival rhetoric organizes around those who can claim they’ve overcame in a consumable form to be marketed and sold as a good in the symbolic economy. The aff steps into the role of the archiver that translates resilience into empty communicative signs that ultimately get coopted.

James 15 [Robin James is an Associate Professor of Philosophy @ UNC Charlotte. “Resilience & Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism, Publisher: Zero Books p. 88-92]

Resilience must be performed explicitly, legibly, and spectacularly. Overcoming is necessary but insufficient; to count and function as resilience, this overcoming must be accomplished in a visible or otherwise legible and consumable manner. Overcoming is a type of “affective labor” which, as Steven Shaviro puts it, “is productive only to the extent that it is a public performance. It cannot unfold in the hidden depths; it must be visible and audible” (PCA 49n33) In order to tune into feminine resilience and feed it back into its power supply, MRWaSP has to perceive it as such. “Look,! Overcame!” is the resilient subject’s maxim or mantra. Gender and race have always been “visible identities,” to use philosopher Linda Martin Alcoff’s term, identities strongly tied to one’s outward physical appearance. However, gendered/racialized resilience isn’t visible in the same way that conventional gender and racial identities are visible. To clarify these differences, it’s helpful to think of resilience in terms of a “Look, I overcame!” imperative. “Look, I Overcame!” Is easy to juxtapose to Frantz Fanon’s “Look a Negro!”, which is the touch stone for his analysis of gendered racialization in “The Fact of Blackness.” In both cases, looking is a means of crafting race/gender identities and distributing white patriarchal privilege. But, in the same way that resilience discourse “upgrades” traditional methods for crafting identities and distributing privilege, the “looking” in “Look, I Overcame’” is an upgrade on the “looking” in “Look, a Negro” According to Fanon, the exclamation “Look, a Negro!” racializes him as a black man. To be “a Negro” is to be objectified by the white supremacist gaze. This gaze fixes him as an object, rather than an ambiguous transcendence (which is a more nuanced way of describing the existentialist concept of subjectivity). “The black man,” as Fanon argues, “has no ontological resistance for the white man” (BSWM 110) because, as an object and not a mutually-recognized subject, he cannot return the white man’s gaze (“The Look” that is so important to Sartre’s theory of subjectivity in Being & Nothingness). The LIO narrative differs from Fanon’s account in the same way it differs from Iris Young’s account of feminine body comportment: in resilience discourse, objectification isn’t an end but a means, any impediment posed by the damage wrought by the white/male gaze Is a necessary prerequisite for subjectivity, agency, and mutual recognition. In other words, being looked at isn’t an impediment, but a resource. Resilience discourse turns objectification (being looked at) into a means of subjectificatlon (overcoming). It also makes looking even more efficient and profitable than simple objectification could ever be. Recognizing and affirming the affective labor of the resilient performer, the spectator feeds the performer’s individual overcoming Into a second-order therapeutic narrative: our approbation of her overcoming is evidence of our own overcoming of our past prejudices. This spectator wants to be seen by a wider audience as someone who answers the resilient feminine subject’s hail, “Look, I Overcame’. Just as individual feminine subjects use their resilience as proof of their own goodness, MRWaSP uses the resilience of its “good girls” as proof that they’re the “good guys” — that its social and ethical practices are truly just, and that we really mean it this time when we say everyone is equal. For example, the “resilience” of “our” women is often contrasted with the supposed “fragility” of Third-World women of color. Or, in domestic US race-gender politics, the resilience of some African-American women (their bootstraps-style class ascendance) is contrasted to the continued fragility of other African-American women, and thus used to reinforce class distinctions among blacks. There are a million different versions of this general story: “our” women are already liberated — they saved themselves —but, to riff on Gayatri Spivak, “brown women need saving from brown men.” Most mainstream conversations about Third-World women are versions of this story: discussions of “Muslim” veiling, female circumcision, sweatshops, poverty ‘development.” they’re all white-saviorist narratives meant to display MRWaSP’s own resilience. Look, I Overcame!” upgrades ‘Look, a Negro’ by (a) recycling objectification into overcoming and (b) compounding looking, so that one can profit from others’ resilience, treating their overcoming as one’s own overcoming. This upgrade in white supremacist patriarchy requires a concomitant upgrade in looking.” This shift in looking practices parallels developments in film and media aesthetics. As Steven Shaviro has argued, the values, techniques, and compositional strategies most common in contemporary mainstream Western cinema — like Michael Bay’s Transformers—are significantly different than the ones used in modernist and post-modernist cinema, and that these differences in media production correlate to broader shifts in the means of capitalist and ideological production. Neoliberalism’s aesthetic is, he argues, “post-cinematic.” This post-cinematic aesthetic applies not just to film and media, but to resilience discourse. Its performance practices and looking relations configured by the “Look. I Overcame!” imperative, resilience is, in a way, another type of post-cinematic medium. In the next section I use Shaviro’s theory of post-cinematic media to identify some specific ways in which traditional patriarchal tools are updated to work compatibly with MRWaSP resilience discourse. The looking in the “Look, I Overcame!” narrative is not the same kind of looking described by concepts like “the male gaze” or “controlling images” This looking is a type of deregulated MRWaSP visualization.

#### The system requires its participants to be both subjects, to strive for false liberation, and objects, to ultimately submit to the will of the hyperreal. Engaging in “liberatory practices” fuel the system.

Baudrillard 81 [Jean; Simulacra and Simulation; French Sociologist/Philosopher; 1981; University of Michigan Press; LCA-BP][[1]](#footnote-1) \*edited for lang

With one caution. We are face to face with this system in a double situation and insoluble double bind - exactly like children faced with the demands of the adult world. Children are simultaneously required to constitute themselves as autonomous subjects, responsible, free and conscious, and to constitute themselves as submissive, inert, obedient, conforming objects. The child resists on all levels, and to a contradictory demand he responds with a double strategy. To the demand of being an object, [t]he[y] opposes all the practices of disobedience, of revolt, of emancipation; in short, a total claim to subjecthood. To the demand of being a subject [t]he[y] opposes, just as obstinately and efficaciously, an object's resistance, that is to say, exactly the opposite: childishness, hyperconformism, total dependence, passivity, ~~idiocy~~. Neither strategy has more objective value than the other. The subject-resistance is today unilaterally valorized and viewed as positive - just as in the political sphere only the practices of freedom, emancipation, expression, and the constitution of a political subject are seen as valuable and subversive. But this is to ignore the equal, and without a doubt superior, impact of all the object practices, of the renunciation of the subject position and of meaning - precisely the practices of the masses - that we bury under the derisory terms of alienation and passivity. The liberating practices respond to one of the aspects of the system, to the constant ultimatum we are given to constitute ourselves as pure objects, but they do not respond at all to the other demand, that of constituting ourselves as subjects, of liberating ourselves, expressing ourselves at whatever cost, of voting, producing, deciding, speaking, participating, playing the game - a form of blackmail and ultimatum just as serious as the other, even more serious today. To a system whose argument is oppression and repression, the strategic resistance is the liberating claim of subjecthood. But this strategy is more reflective of the earlier phase of the system, and even if we are still confronted with it, it is no longer the strategic terrain: the current argument of the system is to maximize speech, the maximum production of meaning. Thus the strategic resistance is that of the refusal of meaning and of the spoken word - or of the hyperconformist simulation of the very mechanisms of the system, which is a form of refusal and of non-reception. It is the strategy of the masses: it is equivalent to returning to the system its own logic by doubling it, to reflecting meaning, like a mirror, without absorbing it. This strategy (if one can still speak of strategy) prevails today, because it was ushered in by that phase of the system which prevails. To choose the wrong strategy is a serious matter. All the movements that only play on liberation, emancipation, on the resurrection of a subject of history, of the group, of the word based on "consciousness raising," indeed a "raising of the unconscious" of subjects and of the masses, do not see that they are going in the direction of the system, whose imperative today is precisely the overproduction and regeneration of meaning and of speech.

#### Thus, all hope of information implodes and the personal self is killed – meaning ceases to exist and interrelationships can no longer develop fruitfully.

Leon 9 [Carol Leon; prof at the University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur; Movement and Belonging: Lines, Places, and Spaces of Travel; 2009; LCA-BP]

In trying to understand the impact of postmodernity on the self and the self’s relationship with place, I found Fredric Jameson’s and Jean Baudrillard’s reflections on postmodernism especially illuminating. Postmodernism, Jameson observes, replicates “the logic of consumer capitalism.” Two important features of postmodernism—“the transformation of reality into images [and] the fragmentation of time into a series of perpetual presents”—are consonant with an increasingly media-ridden society governed by consumerism and rapid change. One of the anomalies of this contemporary condition is “the death of the subject.” Jameson calls this a form of pastiche because it involves no norm or original. By extension, there is no distinct or personal identity. What exists is merely reproductions of imitations. Technology has created what Jameson refers to as a “schizophrenic experience” which is “an experience of isolated, disconnected, discontinuous material signifies which fail to link up into a coherent sequence.” What one encounters here is an instantaneous overload of information and the breakdown of temporal continuities. Not only is too much information revealed but the past becomes Other, lost in the deluge of information. Since there are no links between signifiers, the self loses grasp of its individuality because identity depends on a sense of the persistence of the “I.” Even familiar surroundings become unreal, lost to the self because the inner relationships between things cease to exist. This “new sonorous present” breaks down the sense of our past and exacerbates the loss of self- and place-identity. Baudrillard’s “The Ecstasy of Communication” also discusses the ways in which postmodernism overwrites foundations, originals and origins. Time has turned into pastiche and this means the loss of history. Communication networks have destroyed the meaningful opposition between subject and object in which people once projected themselves into their surroundings, creating a reflexive relationship with the external world. Electronic and computer technologies have replaced this relationship with a nonreflecting, “smooth operational surface of communication” so that everything becomes visible, transparent and void of personal meaning. Thus the intimate connections between self and universe are destroyed. Postmodernity, Baudrillard declares, is the epoch of hyperreality in which “what was projected psychologically and mentally, what used to be lived out on earth as metaphor…is henceforth projected into reality, without any metaphor at all, into an absolute space which is also that of simulation.” In this, as Baudrillard calls it, ecstasy of communication, the world is wrapped in a network of signs and culture becomes “the collective sharing of simulacra.” Indeed, Baudrillard’s theorising takes postmodernism a step further with this radical non-realist definition which images the human being as a “terminal of multiple networks.” With the “death” of the human body, geographical significance becomes obscure: “The countryside, the immense geographic countryside, seems to be a deserted body whose expanse and dimensions appear arbitrary (and which is boring to cross even if one leaves the main highways), as soon as all events are epitomized in the towns, themselves undergoing reduction to a few miniaturized highlights. Places are configured not only by “distance” but also “a well-defined geographical lack.” “Travels in hyperreality,” to borrow Umberto Eco’s expression, blur the boundaries between reality and illusion. The self loses its interior relationship with a place where the latter becomes unreal and is emptied of personal projection. Hyperreality has threatened the self’s relationship to the outer world and this considerably unsettles the self’s sense of belonging. Baudrillard’s arguments are particularly relevant because, as also suggested by Chris Rojek and Bryan Turner, they collude with most of the conventions used to manage normality in everyday life. Within the postmodern condition lies a very real danger of people losing their way in the labyrinth because while it is liberating to play numerous, diverse roles, there is also “something stressful and deeply unsettling about it.” “Speech is free perhaps,” Baudrillard declares, “but I am less free than before: I no longer succeed in knowing what I want.” The voyeurism, the emptying of interiority and the loss of both private and public spaces—implode self and society. In this space of simulation, historical continuity and memory and replaced by an obsession with instantaneity. When simulacrum becomes reality, the self loses its sense of identity and its intimate relationship with its world. Displacement and homelessness become part of the rhetoric of contemporary discourse. /.

**Thus, the alternative is to embrace radical nihilism. Capitalism engages in unending reproduction; only a drainage of excess solves: drain propped up ideals, drain the death grip of semiocapitalism. A society that maintains capitalist production is contingent upon subjects that are forced to labor under semiocapitalism – so we let the system collapse in on itself.**

**Baudrillard 81** [Jean Baudrillard, sociologist, cultural theorist, and philosopher], Simulacra and Simulation, 1981//pesh-anika

Nihilism no longer wears the dark, Wagnerian, Spenglerian, fuliginous colors of the end of the century. It no longer comes from a Weltanschauung of decadence nor from a metaphysical radicality born of the death of God and of all the consequences that must be taken from this death. Today's nihilism is one of transparency, and it is in some sense more radical, more crucial than in its prior and historical forms, because this transparency, this irresolution is indissolubly that of the system, and that of all the theory that still pretends to analyze it. When God died, there was still Nietzsche to say so - the great nihilist before the Eternal and the cadaver of the Eternal. But before the simulated transparency of all things, before the simulacrum of the materialist or idealist realization of the world in hyperreality (God is not dead, he has become hyper-real), there is no longer a theoretical or critical God to recognize his own. The universe, and all of us, have entered live into simulation, into the malefic, not even malefic, indifferent, sphere of deterrence: in a bizarre fashion, nihilism has been entirely realized no longer through destruction, but through simulation and deterrence. From the active, violent phantasm, from the phantasm of the myth and the stage that it also was, historically, it has passed into the transparent, falsely transparent, operation of things. What then remains of a possible nihilism in theory? What new scene can unfold, where nothing and death could be replayed as a challenge, as a stake? We are in a new, and without a doubt insoluble, position in relation to prior forms of nihilism: Romanticism is its first great manifestation: it, along with the Enlightenment's Revolution, corresponds to the destruction of the order of appearances. Surrealism, dada, the absurd, and political nihilism are the second great manifestation, which corresponds to the destruction of the order of meaning. The first is still an aesthetic form of nihilism (dandyism), the second, a political, historical, and metaphysical form (terrorism). These two forms no longer concern us except in part, or not at all. The nihilism of transparency is no longer either aesthetic or political, no longer borrows from either the extermination of appearances, nor from extinguishing the embers of meaning, nor from the last nuances of an apocalypse. There is no longer an apocalypse (only aleatory terrorism still tries to reflect it, but it is certainly no longer political, and it only has one mode of manifestation left that is at the same time a mode of disappearance: the media - now the media are not a stage where something is played, they are a strip, a track, a perforated map of which we are no longer even spectators: receivers). The apocalypse is finished, today it is the precession of the neutral, of forms of the neutral and of indifference. I will leave it to be considered whether there can be a romanticism, an aesthetic of the neutral therein. I don't think so - all that remains, is the fascination for desertlike and indifferent forms, for the very operation of the system that annihilates us. Now, fascination (in contrast to seduction, which was attached to appearances, and to dialectical reason, which was attached to meaning) is a nihilistic passion par excellence, it is the passion proper to the mode of disappearance. We are fascinated by all forms of disappearance, of our disappearance. Melancholic and fascinated, such is our general situation in an era of involuntary transparency. I am a nihilist. I observe, I accept, I assume the immense process of the destruction of appearances (and of the seduction of appearances) in the service of meaning (representation, history, criticism, etc.) that is the fundamental fact of the nineteenth century. The true revolution of the nineteenth century, of modernity, is the radical destruction of appearances, the disenchantment of the world and its abandonment to the violence of interpretation and of history. I observe, I accept, I assume, I analyze the second revolution, that of the twentieth century, that of postmodernity, which is the immense process of the destruction of meaning, equal to the earlier destruction of appearances. He who strikes with meaning is killed by meaning. The dialectic stage, the critical stage is empty. There is no more stage. There is no therapy of meaning or therapy through meaning: therapy itself is part of the generalized process of indifferentiation. The stage of analysis itself has become uncertain, aleatory: theories float (in fact, nihilism is impossible, because it is still a desperate but determined theory, an imaginary of the end, a weltanschauung of catastrophe).\*1 Analysis is itself perhaps the decisive element of the immense process of the freezing over of meaning. The surplus of meaning that theories bring, their competition at the level of meaning is completely secondary in relation to their coalition in the glacial and four-tiered operation of dissection and transparency. One must be conscious that, no matter how the analysis proceeds, it proceeds toward the freezing over of meaning, it assists in the precession of simulacra and of indifferent forms. The desert grows. Implosion of meaning in the media. Implosion of the social in the masses. Infinite growth of the masses as a function of the acceleration of the system. Energetic impasse. Point of inertia. A destiny of inertia for a saturated world. The phenomena of inertia are accelerating (if one can say that). The arrested forms proliferate, and growth is immobilized in excrescence. Such is also the secret of the hypertelie, of what goes further than its own end. It would be our own mode of destroying finalities: going further, too far in the same direction - destruction of meaning through simulation, hypersimulation, hypertelie. Denying its own end through hyperfinality (the crustacean, the statues of Easter Island) - is this not also the obscene secret of cancer? Revenge of excrescence on growth, revenge of speed on inertia. The masses themselves are caught up in a gigantic process of inertia through acceleration. They are this excrescent, devouring, process that annihilates all growth and all surplus meaning. They are this circuit short-circuited by a monstrous finality. It is this point of inertia and what happens outside this point of inertia that today is fascinating, enthralling (gone, therefore, the discreet charm of the dialectic). If it is nihilistic to privilege this point of inertia and the analysis of this irreversibility of systems up to the point of no return, then I am a nihilist. If it is nihilistic to be obsessed by the mode of disappearance, and no longer by the mode of production, then I am a nihilist. Disappearance, aphanisis, implosion, Fury of Verschwindens. Transpolitics is the elective sphere of the mode of disappearance (of the real, of meaning, of the stage, of history, of the social, of the individual). To tell the truth, it is no longer so much a question of nihilism: in disappearance, in the desertlike, aleatory, and indifferent form, there is no longer even pathos, the pathetic of nihilism - that mythical energy that is still the force of nihilism, of radicality, mythic denial, dramatic anticipation. It is no longer even disenchantment, with the seductive and nostalgic, itself enchanted, tonality of disenchantment. It is simply disappearance. The trace of this radicality of the mode of disappearance is already found in Adorno and Benjamin, parallel to a nostalgic exercise of the dialectic. Because there is a nostalgia of the dialectic, and without a doubt the most subtle dialectic is nostalgic to begin with. But more deeply, there is in Benjamin and Adorno another tonality, that of a melancholy attached to the system itself, one that is incurable and beyond any dialectic. It is this melancholia of systems that today takes the upper hand through the ironically transparent forms that surround us. It is this melancholia that is becoming our fundamental passion. It is no longer the spleen or the vague yearnings of the fin-de-siecle soul. It is no longer nihilism either, which in some sense aims at normalizing everything through destruction, the passion of resentment (ressentiment).\*2 No, melancholia is the fundamental tonality of functional systems, of current systems of simulation, of programming and information. Melancholia is the inherent quality of the mode of the disappearance of meaning, of the mode of the volatilization of meaning in operational systems. And we are all melancholic. Melancholia is the brutal disaffection that characterizes our saturated systems. Once the hope of balancing good and evil, true and false, indeed of confronting some values of the same order, once the more general hope of a relation of forces and a stake has vanished. Everywhere, always, the system is too strong: hegemonic. Against this hegemony of the system, one can exalt the ruses of desire, practice revolutionary micrology of the quotidian, exalt the molecular drift or even defend cooking. This does not resolve the imperious necessity of checking the system in broad daylight. This, only terrorism can do. It is the trait of reversion that effaces the remainder, just as a single ironic smile effaces a whole discourse, just as a single flash of denial in a slave effaces all the power and pleasure of the master. The more hegemonic the system, the more the imagination is struck by the smallest of its reversals. The challenge, even infinitesimal, is the image of a chain failure. Only this reversibility without a counterpart is an event today, on the nihilistic and disaffected stage of the political. Only it mobilizes the imaginary. If being a nihilist, is carrying, to the unbearable limit of hegemonic systems, this radical trait of derision and of violence, this challenge that the system is summoned to answer through its own death, then I am a terrorist and nihilist in theory as the others are with their weapons. Theoretical violence, not truth, is the only resource left us. But such a sentiment is Utopian. Because it would be beautiful to be a nihilist, if there were still a radicality - as it would be nice to be a terrorist, if death, including that of the terrorist, still had meaning. But it is at this point that things become insoluble. Because to this active nihilism of radicality, the system opposes its own, the nihilism of neutralization. The system is itself also nihilistic, in the sense that it has the power to pour everything, including what denies it, into indifference. In this system, death itself shines by virtue of its absence. (The Bologna train station, the Oktoberfest in Munich: the dead are annulled by indifference, that is where terrorism is the involuntary accomplice of the whole system, not politically, but in the accelerated form of indifference that it contributes to imposing.)

#### The world fundamentally rests on the logic of (in)difference, in which origins are simultaneously unlocatable and everywhere all at once. The proliferation of communication under late stage capitalism washes up and crashes on the rocks of truth and falsity, eroding meaning at its shores. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best ruptures hyperreality.

* We defend consequences
* The debate is based off of the flow
* Theory comes before the K

**Baudrillard 1** [Jean Baudrillard, sociologist, philosopher and cultural theorist, true sweetheart, “Fatal Strategies”; LCA-BP] \*edited for lang

More generally, visible things do not terminate in obscurity and in silence; they vanish into what is more visible than the visible: obscenity. An example of this ex-centricity of things, of this drift into excrescence, is the irruption of randomness, indeterminacy, and relativity within our system. The reaction to this new state of things has not been a resigned abandonment of traditional values, but rather a ~~crazy~~ overdetermination, an exacerbation, of these values of reference, function, finality, and causality. Perhaps nature is, in fact, horrified by the void, for it is in the void, and in order to avoid it, that plethoric, hypertrophic, and saturated systems emerge. Some-thing redundant always settles in the place where there is no longer any-thing. Determinacy does not withdraw to the benefit of indeterminacy, but to the benefit of a hyperdeterminacy: the redundancy of determinacy in a void. Finality does not disappear in favor of the aleatory, but rather in favor of hyperfinality, of a hyperfunctionality: more functional than the functional, more final than the final - the hypertelic (hypertélie). Having been plunged into an in-ordinate uncertainty by randomness, we have responded by an excess of causality and teleology. Hypertelic growth is not an accident in the evolution of certain species, it is the challenge of telos as a response to increasing indeterminacy. In a system where things are increasingly left to chance, telos turns into delirium, and develops entities that know all too well how to exceed their own ends, to the point of invading the entire system. This is true of the behavior of the cancerous cell (hypervitality in a single direction), of the hyperspecialization of objects and people, of the operationalism of the smallest detail, and of the hypersignification of the slightest sign: the leitmotiv of our daily lives. But this is also the chancroid secret of every obese and cancerous system: **those of communication, of information**, of production, of destruction - **each having long since exceeded the limits of functionality,** and use value, in order to enter the phantasmic escalation of finalities. The ~~hysteria~~ of causality, the inverse of the ~~hysteria~~ of finalities, which corresponds to the simultaneous effacement of origins and causes, is **the obsessive search for origins, for responsibility, for reference**; an attempt to extinguish phenomena in infinitesimal causes. But it is also the genesis and genetics complex, which on various accounts are represented by psychoanalytic palingenesis (the whole psyche hypostatized in prime infancy, every sign a symptom); and biogenetics (all probabilities saturated by the fatal ordering of molecules); and the hypertrophying of historical research, the delirium of explaining everything, of ascribing everything, of referencing everything ... All this becomes a fantastic burden - references living one off the other and at the other's expense. Here again we have an excrescent interpretive system developing without any relation to its objective. All of this is a consequence of a forward flight in the face of the haemorrhaging of objective causes. Inertial phenomena are accelerating. Arrested forms proliferate, and growth is immobilized in excrescence. This is the form of the hypertelic, that which goes beyond its own ends: the crustacean that strays far from the ocean unable to return (to what secret end?); or the increasing gigantism of Easter Island statues. Tentacular, protuberant, excrescent, hypertelic: this is the inertial destiny of a saturated world. The denial of its own end in hyperfinality; is this not also the mechanism of cancer? The revenge of growth in excrescence. The revenge and summons of speed in inertia. The masses are also caught in this gigantic process of inertia by acceleration. The masses are this excrescent process, which precipitates all growth towards ruin. **It is the circuit that is shortcircuited by a monstrous finality**. Exxon: the American government requests a complete report on the multinational's activities throughout the world. The result is twelve 1,000 page volumes, whose reading alone, not to mention the analysis, would exceed a few years work. Where is the information? Should we initiate an information dietetics? Should we thin out the obese, the obese systems, and create institutions to uninform? The incredible destructive stockpiling of strategic weapons is only equaled by the worldwide demographic overgrowth. As paradoxical as it may seem, both are of the same nature and correspond to the same logic of excrescence and inertia. A triumphant anomaly: no principle of justice or of proportion can temper either one; they incite one another. And worse, there isn't even so much as Promethean defiance here, no excessive passion or pride. It appears simply that the species has crossed a particular mysterious point, where it has become impossible to turn back, to decelerate, or to slow down.

## Case

#### Overview:

#### [1] Ruse of solvency – aff resolve the socioeconomic underpinnings that give rich kids advantages – grades, parent involvement, courses, legacies and more disprove

Meltzer 18 [Erica; “Eliminating standardized testing won’t make college admissions fair”; <https://thecriticalreader.com/eliminating-testing-admissions-fair/>; 2018; tutor in Manhattan; BP]

The University of Chicago’s recent decision to go test-optional got me thinking: what if Bob Shaeffer over at [FairTest](https://www.fairtest.org/) got his wish, and the SAT and ACT were not merely made optional but flat out abolished? Let’s assume – as seems reasonable – that the rest of the system would remain unchanged. So picture it: a world in which every one of an elite college’s 50,000+ applicants (or more) would be judged entirely on his or her specific merits, as a totally unique and authentic individual, and given full and complete consideration unmarred by input from the ACT or the College Board. Wouldn’t that the result be a better system, a *fairer* system, a system that no longer punished disadvantaged students who couldn’t afford expensive test prep classes? Probably not. Whatever merit anti-testing arguments may have, I confess that I don’t understand how an even more subjective admissions process could possibly produce greater equity on a systemic level. Socioeconomic factors underlie so many aspects of the admissions process that eliminating standardized testing would do little to eliminate wealthy students’ overall advantage. So when people call for the broad implementation of test-optional policies, if not the outright abolition of standardized tests, I wonder whether they’ve actually thought through what the consequences would look like, on a practical level. It’s fair to assume, for example, that an admissions process devoid of SAT/ACT scores would be much more heavily reliant on transcripts. But here, too, well-off students are better off. Not only do they have access to more advanced classes, but they also have higher grades. According to a 2017 College Board report: The g*rade-*p*oint* a*verage* of students at private *high* schools *who took the SAT* climbed *between 1998 and 2016 from 3.25* to 3.51*, or almost 8 percent…* *In suburban public high schools it went from 3.25 to 3.36.* In city public schools*,* ithardly budged*, moving from 3.26* to 3.28*.* Now obviously, the College Board has a more than a small stake in ensuring colleges’ continued acceptance of the SAT, but that bias alone should not by itself invalidate the findings. So if anti-testing logic is applied here, since grades correlate with income, does it then follow that grades should be abolished as well? If private school students have higher GPAs than public school students, should private schools be abolished? And if AP scores happen to correlate with income, does that mean AP tests should be eliminated as well? Interestingly, I looked around, and I’ve actually been unable to find a general breakdown of scores by income level; the stats floating around focus on either access levels or passing levels; students with 3s, 4s, and 5s all get lumped together, perhaps so that the College Board can duck the sort of allegations that dog the SAT. Frankly, though, it would be astounding if there *weren’t* a direct correlation between income and actual scores. Now that’s a study I’d really like to see! There’s also the fact that private schools are notorious for devising their own grading systems, in no small part to impede comparisons between their students to public school riffraff. Andover (which sent 16 students from the class of 2017 to Harvard) grades on a 1-6 scale, for example; St. Paul’s grades on a scale of 1-7; Kinkaid (Houston) grades on 1-11. And let’s not even get into the proposed Mastery Transcript, which replaces letter/number grades with “competency-based” levels of proficiency, e.g., Analytical and Creative Thinking” and “Leadership and Teamwork.” This is the ultimate in replacing knowledge with “skills.” It was proposed by a group of…you guessed it, elite private schools. One point that often gets overlooked is that high-priced tutoring is not limited to prep for *required*standardized tests. Private school students are also more likely to have access to high-priced *general* academic tutoring, as well as tutoring for AP exams. Even if the SAT and ACT were abolished, does anyone seriously think that students’ transcripts wouldn’t still benefit from $250/hr. help in calculus? And what about parents who are able to tutor their children for physics class, or ones who can edit their papers to the point of perfection? Grades, unlike test-scores, can also be affected by purely subjective measures such as extra credit and parental willingness to lobby for things like test retakes and greater weight for class participation. When I tutored, I actually encountered wealthy students who had been tutored in almost every subject for pretty much their entire school careers. In one truly over-the-top case, the parents hired tutors to simply sit and do the student’s homework for him. To be sure, these are isolated anecdotes, as well as very extreme examples (even by Manhattan standards), but students in that income bracket are also disproportionately represented in the applicant pools at top schools. Then, of course, there’s the essay, perhaps the area most ripe for “help” that crosses a line. In the absence of test scores, it would undoubtedly take on additional weight. And no, regardless of what admissions officers claim, they [cannot always tell](https://thecriticalreader.com/biggest-lie-college-admissions/) when applicants’ work is not truly their own. The same goes for video-based projects a student might submit. (A friend mentioned to me that while out walking in her upper-middle-class neighborhood recently, she saw a company advertising video help for college applicants. As if no one saw that coming.) Colleges also have their financial bottom line to consider: the reality is that all but the very wealthiest institutions are “need-aware,” giving an outright advantage to full-pay students as the number of places in the freshman class decreases. In addition, the corollary to application inflation (which would undoubtedly increase yet further if scores were no longer requirement) is enrollment instability, and schools need to take steps to protect their yield.One way that colleges accomplish this is to accept large percentages of their applicants Early Decision, a practice that by and large benefits advantaged applicants. Even if a college can commit to meeting full financial need, the reality is that to be competitive, ED applicants must essentially be “set” academically, extracurricularly, etc. by the beginning of senior year, which in turns tends to require strong advising – something that less privileged applicants are, on the whole, less likely to have access to. In terms of yield, privileged applicants are also advantaged by attending schools that have a history sending students to a particular college, and where guidance counselors – who may even have worked as admissions officers at elite colleges – can ensure admissions offices that they will actively lobby for admits to attend. To me, the open circulation between college admissions offices and prep school counseling offices is one of the most scandalous aspects of the admissions process, but it is almost never mentioned. On the flipside, a student with a similar profile – but no scores – from a school that rarely or never sends graduates to that college will be viewed as something of a wild card and may be less likely to gain admission. Colleges barely have the capacity to manage the tens of thousands of applications they are already receiving – what would they do with twenty or thirty thousand more? admissions officers are only human: they would take shortcuts and make snap judgments, and their biases would inevitably creep into the process even more so than they already do. (As a side note, I think there’s a common assumption that top private schools give the biggest boost to kids applying to the most selective colleges, but I’m not entirely sure that’s accurate – some of those kids are such clear admits that they would get in to Harvard, Stanford, etc. regardless of where they went to high school. The real benefit is often for the kids below the very top, the ones who might get lost in a big public high school but whom a savvy counselor can help finagle into Hamilton or Lehigh or USC.) Then there’s the demonstrated-interest factor, which also gives a lift to applicants who can do things like visit campus and sit in on classes. (More time on campus = more specific “why this school?” essays, which in turn signals likelihood of attendance, which becomes an advantage in terms of yield protection.) Plus recommendations, which are generally far more in-depth and personal for private-school applicants, who have smaller classes and more opportunities to develop strong relationships with teachers. There are also sports such as fencing, squash, and crew, in which achievement – indeed, participation – is highly correlated with income. (A cursory glance at the varsity crew rosters at any Ivy reveals a disproportionate concentration of students from a small set of New England prep schools, along with select institutions in Canada and Australia.) Yet it’s pretty safe to assume that admissions committees aren’t sitting around worrying about the fact that some students’ athletic achievements might be in part due to the type of private coaching other students can’t afford. And no one would seriously propose that colleges halt athletic recruitment in high-income sports because the process penalizes disadvantaged applicants. While the anti-testing crowd may like to cite a single infamous (and incredibly outdated) analogy question about regattas and oarsmen as proof of the SAT’s bias, the supreme irony is that every year, colleges continue to give a massive admissions tip to *actual prep school rowers*. Oh, and what about legacy admissions? Presumably those will stick around too. I could keep going on like this, but I think I’ve made my point. These are all systemic disadvantages that permeate every aspect of the holistic admissions process. In this context, standardized test scores are only one piece of a much larger picture. In contrast, required standardized testing is an easy scapegoat: it’s *boring* (arguably the most egregious sin in American culture); it is based on the assumption that applicants can be directly compared academically according to a single common metric, a notion that flies directly in the face of Romantic/progressive dogma; and it has an unfortunate tendency to expose the extent to which students’ grades have been inflated (although this is less true since the SAT redesign).

#### [2] The dialectical paradigm under which the aff operates codes bodies into griddable categories in opposition with each other – this forces deviant bodies into straited lines, such that revolutionary movement is halted by the question of who is oppressed *enough* to be part of the revolution

Gaztambide 14 [Daniel, doctoral candidate at the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology, Rutgers University. He currently serves as an adjunct lecturer at Hunter College Silberman School of Social Work, where he teaches courses on race, gender, class, and sexuality and psychoanalytic developmental theory. He is an APA Division 39 (Psychoanalysis) liaison to the APA Committee on Ethnic Minority Affairs and a fellow in APA's Minority Fellowship Program. “I’m not black, I’m not white, what am I? The illusion of the color line.” Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 1088-0763 Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society Vol. 19, 1, 89–97 97]

Part of what I am talking about here is what the Lacanian Latino Studies scholar Antonio Viego (2007) refers to as “coercive mimeticism,” an institutional and social practice whereby there are certain ways in which ethnic minorities must act, believe, dress, and be in order to present themselves as “recognizably ethnic,” as Latino-enough, as Black-enough, as Asian-enough, and so forth. It is mimetic insofar as one has to look into the mirror of ethnic identity and adapt oneself to that image, reproducing a very particular ego-identity, one that is often a poor fit to one’s more immediate subjective experience. It is also coercive in that there are institutional, cultural, and societal pressures to conform to that notion of identity in order to find one’s place in the coordinates of race and ethnicity – essentially, to be allotted a place on the color line. We are to take up our respective place on the chessboard as Black or White, pawns in a much bigger and deadlier game. Here we can glean both the imaginary and symbolic functions of racial object maps. These object maps provide coherence and integration in the imaginary to an otherwise chaotic collection of signifiers – the racialized bodies in which we exist. At the same time, racial object maps yield symbolic categories of me and not-me, Black and White, and a language with which to organize and regulate closeness, distance, and racial desire. Conversely, what is contained, or to be more precise, excluded, through the symbolic and imaginary operations of the object map is the Real dimension of race – the ever shifting, anxiety-producing, formless nature of the color line. When ambiguously ethnic subjects fail to see their image in the mirror, when they are unable to play the language games of race and racial signification, there is a noticeable discomfort and anxiety that sets in among those who partake in the production of coercive mimeticism. The illusion of the color line comes into focus, disrupting how we see and define racialized bodies, evoking the fragmented and uncoordinated nature of the child’s body prior to Lacan’s (2005a, b) mirror stage. The illusion of wholeness, of being a whole body-ego – whether White, Black, or Brown – falters, revealing the destitute, undifferentiated, and broken nature of race and racial identity. To survive the encounter with the Real of race, I argue, paves the way for a unique kind of freedom. To give one example, a Puerto Rican-ness is more malleable, flexible, and non-linear than one bound into one static form and yields a fluidity that fosters experimental and novel ways of responding to oppression. This fluidity at the same time can validate the ghosts of one’s ancestors while integrating their wisdom into new, emancipatory potentialities. To be clear, I am not denying the importance of addressing colorism, racism, and the privileging of white skin that exists in the Latino community and other ethnic minorities (not to mention society as a whole). It is important for us to have that conversation, and point out how notions of mestizaje, of hybridity in the Latino experience, may mask underlying tensions around race and skin color, and render the relative privilege of light-skinned Latinos such as myself invisible. At the same time, I am proposing that we also have a conversation that is perpendicular to a critique of racism and colorism, intersecting with it but going towards a different vector. How we exclude one another based on not meeting certain expectations about what it means to be Latino, Asian, Black, etc., threatens to disempower us further, limiting our political power by carving out a “minority of a minority” as opposed to sustaining often difficult conversations about our sameness and difference. Similarly, as Baratunde Thurston (2011) points out in his recent book, How to be Black, often this kind of black-checking or color-checking narrows our vision of what it means to be Black (or Latino, or Asian, etc.). Reflecting on his own sense of his Blackness, he writes, “One of the most consistent themes in my own experience… is this notion of discovering your own Blackness by embracing the new, the different, the uncommon, and, simply, yourself” (p. 218). Color-checking prevents us from experimenting with different forms of dis-identification which enrich, challenge, and nourish us, and which hold the promise of new forms of resistance, emancipation, and psychosocial revolt. As I argue, these perpendicular conversations push and pull toward different trajectories, but have as their intersection the most crucial nexus of political, cultural, and social justice. So what am I, in the end? I am whatever you want me to be: oppressor, oppressed, cracker, spic, enemy, friend, White, Black, lover, fighter, masculine, effeminate, strong, weak, dead or alive. Just know that with each turn, each attempt to define me, to mark me, to confine and bind me, you free me. Like the hysteric who produces ever shifting configurations of symptoms in order to throw the obsessive physician off guard (see Gherovici, 2003), I will keep producing knowledge of something else, something other, something that is incalculable and undefinable. Something Real. For you I’ll become a Hispanic hysteric, screeching Foucault (1972) with each symptom, with each episode of acting out, “Do not ask me who I am and do not ask me to remain the same” (p. 17). Because in the end this is not really about me, or where I stand on the color line. It is about your illusion about where you stand and where you place yourself in the coordinates of race and ethnicity, of self and other, of Black and White. In that sense I function as your blank screen, receiving your projections and identifications, hopefully returning them to you as knowledge productions that question, destabilize, and decenter your ego, paving the way for the subject that slides in the link between signifier and signified, that does not know if it is caused by the signifier or the signified of race, but is instead, its own cause.

#### A2 Dover 15//

#### [1] no such thing as a “benevolent teacher” [a] under hyperreality – all of them are participating in making students into palatable signifiers for consumption – that’s messed up because it homogenizes the experiences of students [b] the very assumption that a teacher engaged in common core could be benevolent is mistaken

#### A2 Burris and Aja 14//

#### [1] necessity of benchmark – pre-common core all we had was NCLB which was worse because it didn’t allow for the flexibility of SPED programs, gifted edu classrooms, etc

#### [2] reform based approaches are a link –

#### A2 Reese 14//

#### [1] charity cannibalism – the aff uses the images of strugglig Blacka nd Brown children to win ballots – that [a] desensitizes us to material violence and recreates cyclical racist approaches and assumptions about the success of POC students, which is an independent voter for accessibility [b] decks aff solvecny bc it all gets subsumed by the simulacra --

#### A2 Dover 2//

#### [1] Their incorporation politics creates a conception of human which necessitates a deviant subject - the 1ac will always ask who is human *enough* to necessitate recognition

Weheliye 14[Alexander Weheliye, Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University, 2014, “Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human,”]

**We** are in dire **need** of **alternatives to** the **legal** conception of **personhood** that dominates our world, **and**, in addition, **to not lose sight of what** re­mains outside the law, what the law cannot capture, what it cannot magi­cally transform into the fantastic form of property ownership. Writing about the connections between transgender politics and other forms of identity- based activism that respond to structural inequalities, legal scholar Dean Spade shows how the focus on inclusion, recognition, and equality based on a narrow legal framework (especially as it pertains to antidiscrimination and hate crime laws) not onlyhinders the eradication of violence against trans people and other vulnerable populations but actually creates the condition of possibility for the continued unequal “distribution of life chances.”22 If demanding recognition and inclusion remains at the center of minority politics, it willlead only to a delimited notion of personhood as property that zeroes in comparatively on only one form of subjugation at the expense of others, thus allowing for the continued existence of hierarchical differ­ences

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)