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#### The Affirmative Isn’t Topical:

#### Interpretation: The affirmative should defend the desirability of topical action. Nothing more or less than that desirability should decide if the affirmative wins. The negative should be able to win the round if proved undesirable.

#### Resolved” requires a policy resolution decided through a formal vote

Webster Dictionary 1913 (Definition of Resolved, Webster’s 1913 Dictionary, http://www.webster-dictionary.org/definition/resolve)

To express, as an opinion or determination, by resolution and vote; to declare or decide by a formal vote; - followed by a clause; as, the house resolved (or, it was resolved by the house) that no money should be apropriated (or, to appropriate no money).

#### Violation: they do not defned that **The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.**

.

#### Violation: The affirmative is not topical because they do not engage with the desirability of action by

#### Prefer our Interpretation:

#### First is Predictable Limits:

#### Giving the affirmative the ability to choose what the debate is about makes being negative pointless and impossible. Avoiding the predictable starting point not only makes clash impossible, but makes all of the preparation and research we do useless.

#### There are two impacts:

#### First is Fairness:

#### Affirmative topic selection allows the aff to structurally skew the debate in their favor at an extreme advantage. This nullifies our research, preparation, and practice which means the negative has an inherently lesser chance to win. Fairness is good and a prior issue---the judge’s decision reflects who displayed the best debate skills in the round, because debate is a game which requires competition---this means fairness is critical to maintain the game. It also means that fairness comes before the substance of their arguments---you cannot decide any other argument in this debate through the lens of our preparation for that argument---if they are winning a substantive argument, its probably because we weren’t effectively able to prepare for it

#### Second is Idea Testing:

#### A precise, stable, and clearly defined resolution allows the negative to test the affirmative in-depth. Any change, and this process become void and they will never learn to improve their argument because they will never be fully tested. We aren’t saying they arguments are false, we are saying that we should organize arguments around a common stasis point in order to improve them.

#### Turns their model of debate because in a world in which affirmatives do nothave to be topical – it cedes the space to Harvard weslake and debate drills --- these big schools w lots of money to hire coaches --- increases the exclusion of the black body In the debate space

#### – Iteration – targeted research enables third and fourth-line testing necessary to motivate advocacy and argumentative reflection.

#### Next is Clash: The affirmative has incentive to run the least contestable affirmative. This manipulates the game design of debate which makes it impossible to prepare on the negative. It structurally favors the aff because the aff speaks last, use perms, and the neg has the burden of rejoinder---this is key to engage a prepared adversary and a target of mutual contestation.

#### SWS D SOLVEs

TVA: The w

#### All are key to education: turns the aff

AT: Excluding People   
1 – T is disagreement, not exclusion – it’s a procedural DA to defending non-topical action instead of a witch hunt to eradicate the aff – it relies on the same logic of disagreement as any K, DA, or CP because it disagrees with how their aff was presented  
It’s impossible to exclude individuals using the ballot – just because you vote neg doesn’t mean they have to leave the activity – it just means an L on tabroom, nothing else2 – Viewing T as exclusion is bad:  
A) It makes negation impossible – every neg argument in existence relies on excluding the aff in some sense – if we read the cap or humanism K we’ll have to read root cause and do impact calculus which frames [THEIR THING] as comparatively less important than the K – framing disagreement is exclusion limits out all neg positions  
B) Viewing disagreement as exclusion makes every decision you render would be some exclusion of people which makes judging incredibly violent and makes debate antagonistic and turns their offense3 – T is identity agnostic – we read T against white pomo teams, policy teams, and anyone who isn’t topical, not to target a particular identity group4 – TVA’s and SSD solve enough of the 1AC’s form and content – it allows action to read the majority of the 1AC’s scholarship AND their form by adopting an unconventional antitrust policy5 – It links back to their CI – their interp also excludes affs that have no relation to the topic whatsoever  
AT: Excluding K Arguments  
We don’t exclude critical arguments:  
1 – On the aff – not all K’s reject the resolution – the TVAs prove you could include critical argumentation in conjunction with a topical advocacy – saying the USFG should NOT continue certain alliances does NOT require endorsing the state which most of their authors would agree with  
2 – SSD proves you could read K’s on the neg
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#### Vote negative to endorse the content of the 1AC but refuse them the ballot.

#### The ballot is a codified desire for productivity that denies agency and subjectivity

**Moffatt 6** (Ken, Associate director, School of Social Work, Ryerson University, “Grading as the Coding of Student Desire in the Context of Lacking” BSH)

In this article I argue that students are in the double bind of expressing desire in a classroom context that produces lacking. The coding of desire through the act of grading is part of the play of capitalist relations within the classroom setting. Capitalist relations are about the harnessing of productive social change through constructing persons as ‘productive’ as well as ‘wanting’ or ‘lacking’. I make thae case that the professor need explore means of eliciting desire outside the play of capitalist forces through being conscious of the pervasive capitalist influence in our classrooms. I begin by discussing student desire in a social work classroom and the professor’s role in coding the desire through grading students worth. The professor (agent of capital) manipulates this measure (grading) for the purposes of capitalist enterprise. I discuss how lacking is actively constructed in the classroom setting with particular concern for the uneven distribution of lacking among students who have been marginalized through race, class sexuality and gender. The expression of desire, the manipulation of desire by grades and finally the creation of lacking in the classroom create an untenable situation for social work students. Students are caught in the contradiction of being encouraged to express desire while the signifiers (grades) of student worth manipulate desire at best or make it invisible at worst. The encouragement of productive subjectivity becomes a central task of the professor in hopes of creating territories of desire that exist outside of capitalist coding. Throughout the article I use the example of a student who wishes to challenge her grade as a means to imagine the abstract concepts that influence everyday academic practice. The seemingly innocuous, routine exchange between student and professor is reconsidered as an expression of desire. Student Desire and Coding Desire In the book Anti Oedipus (1983), Deleuze and Guattari argue that one of Freud’s most profound discoveries was his treatment of desire. According to the authors, Freud defined desire as abstract and subjective psychic energy. This concept of desire allows one to imagine it as “a flow of forces that produces relations” (Colebrook 2002:xvii). Desire produces connections with elements of reality, be they natural, social, linguistic, technological, or mechanical (Schroeder 2005). Desire, expressed as a variety of energetic conversions, can flow in many directions and create surprising connections (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 1987). According to Schroeder, Deleuze defines desire as a productive outpouring of energy, infusing and intensifying desire’s object. He (Deleuze) rejects that desire expresses lack or emptiness, which must then be compensated by consumption or action. (Schroeder 2005:289). At the same time that Deleuze and Guattari (1983) draw upon Freud’s concept of desire as an abstract and subjective energy, they critique Freud for tying desire solely to sexuality. They argue that Freud shackles the understanding of desire to mythologies about the family, such as the Oedipal complex, and therefore does not allow for the multiple expression of desire, but rather codes and signifies the nature of desire. This type of recoding results in neutralisation and mortification (Deleuze and Guattari 1983). When desire is freed from Freud’s concepts of the Oedipal complex and the familial triangle of mother, father and child, it has multiple means of escape. Desire can be understood both as more specific and broader than our taken-for-granted codes that associate desire to the body and sexuality. Although desire may be understood sexually, it need not be tied to the body or to sexuality, nor defined by gender attractions. Desire operates at a specific or “molecular” level with a very particular intensity; it also operates at a broader or “molar” level tied to the networks of human, social and technical relationships (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 1987). The molecular and molar expressions of desire are interconnected. Desire is inseparable from complex assemblages that necessarily tie into molecular levels, from microinformations already shaping postures, attitudes, perceptions, expectations, semiotic systems etc. Desire is never an undifferentiated instinctual energy, but itself results from a highly developed, engineered set up rich in interactions: a whole supple segmentarity that processes molecular energies (Deleuze and Guattari 1987:215). Rather than existing as a separate essence or principle, desire is experienced through personal interactions, collective social relations and a whole series of assemblages (Deleuze and Guattari 1987). When freed from our commonly accepted beliefs and codes, desire operates as a force for social and political possibilities, and even revolutionary change. Conversely, when desire is unexamined or ignored, it can contribute to troubling or dangerous personal and collective political forces (Deleuze and Guattari 1987). Judith Butler (2004) also ties desire to a network of relations while acknowledging its abstract quality. Based on the thought of Spinoza, Butler defines desire as the endeavour to persist in one’s own being. While endeavouring to persist, the desirous person also seeks recognition of his or her existence. Recognition is necessary for a person to maintain existence and ensure a viable life: the being desires not only to persist in its own being but to live in a world of representations that reflect the possibility of that persistence, and finally to live in a world in which it both reflects the value of other’s lives as well as its own (Butler 2004:235). One of the most intense expressions of desire I experience as a professor is when a student is challenging me over her grade. Her challenge, tied to a desire for success and recognition, is experienced through a series of minute expressions. The student who speaks about her desire for success expresses desire with a particular intensity. This intensity or energetic conversion, based in desire, is not necessarily tied to the body as a whole, since it is experienced through the many molecular expressions of intensity. The intensity may be expressed through tears in her eyes, low voice, clenched fists, or a rigid body. It is a partial object, not yet fully understood by me or completely comprehensible in terms of our interpersonal relationship. Desire for success is not necessarily good or bad when experienced in this manner. This particular desire, expressed through the seeking of a grade change, is not necessarily about the student’s personality traits such as ambition, greed or narcissism, nor can it be fully understood as the student’s complicity in capitalist notions of success based on competition. Through a differing lens provided by Deleuze, Guattari and Butler, the desire for a grade change can be viewed as an immediate intensity at the molar level. It can perhaps be best understood as desire expressed within the confines of technical assemblages, namely, measures of worth such as grading, financial merit systems and computer coding. These assemblages are inherent in the classroom and the capitalist context within which it exists. From this point of view, the desire is probably not understood completely by either of us. Since the desire is not fully understood, but is defined by the student seeking recognizable representations that allow her to maintain existence, the issue is whether the student and I can work together to explore the desire as expressed through intensity. This manner of framing the task stands in contrast to a professor seeking to understand the student’s actions through essentialist concepts that tie desire to personality traits. It also requires getting beyond the association of capitalism only with broad structures, since doing so could only narrow the means of understanding her actions. These could only be understood as being derived from her conscious choice to be complicit in those broad structures of capitalism. Desire as the seeking of recognition and/or desire as an expression of connective forces make a much more ambivalent affair out of the seemingly straightforward action of considering a grade change. Unfortunately, the struggle between student and professor usually focuses primarily on the grade, and is often resolved by a grade change that frees both the student and the professor from engaging in further interpretive work. The technical grade change makes the local struggle less meaningful, since it acts as a code for the expression of desire. Coding and Deterritoralization of Desire While the network of expressions and relations is being created, a capitalist process coexists that deterritorializes desire. Deterritorialization of desire involves freeing the expression of desire from a particular territory (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 1987). Although deterritorialization in all its expressions is not necessarily bad, when it involves the misrepresentation of desire and disciplining of local connections, it becomes problematic (Haver 1997). Capitalism, based on the deterritorialization of desire, breaks through the local references of connective forces. Having contributed to releasing the flow of desire from local networks, the capitalist process recodes desire with signifiers and images. At times, coded images have no reference to the reality of expressed intensity, desire, or productivity. Desires, and the intensities associated with those desires, are recoded in a manner congruent with the governing principles of capitalism, such as the individual defined according to private property and the surplus value of labour, which are made operational through codes (Deleuze and Guattari 1983). The persons’ desires are coded as objects ready for manipulation within a chain of signifiers of value. Just as Freud recoded desire to contain it, so too the capitalist enterprise recodes desire to represent it in a contained manner. There are many forms of coding that serve a regulatory purpose (Pinar 1997). Within Western capitalism, codes are reconstructed through imagery, tying desire to consumerism. This type of coding reconstructs desire in a banal form so that it is linked to the consumption and acquisition of private property and goods. These codes are not restricted to, but can be seen in, the images present on video billboards, in television advertisements, and in movies(Giroux 2000; Kristeva 1995; Deleuze and Guattari 1983). Another form of coding is tied to financial and monetary systems. Capitalist enterprise re-inscribes local connections and local production to serve its own logic of the meaning of value: Currently we are experiencing a form of filiative capital. Capital becomes filiative when money begets money, or value a surplus value- value in process, money in process and as such, capital… Value… suddenly presents itself as an independent substance, endowed with a motion of its own... instead of simply representing the relations of commodities, it enters now… into relations with itself. It differentiates itself as original value from itself as surplus value (Deleuze and Guattari 1983:227: Italics mine for emphasis). Through the technical redefinition of the local forces, surplus labour and human productivity are redefined so that they can be measured and manipulated through abstract, reductive measures of human worth and well-being or rabattu (Deleuze and Guattari 1983). These measures reduce the complexity of interpretation, attempting to control for externalities (Moffatt 2001). At the same time, reductive measures function as an indicator of worth within an abstract field (Franklin 1992). Under these conditions, capital becomes the immanent field defined by the various forms of rabattu in differential relation to one another (Deleuze and Guattari 1983).