## 1 – T FWK

#### Interpretation – the affirmative should defend a hypothetical enactment of a topical post-fiat policy action. To clarify, the affirmative must defend resolved: “A just government ought to recognize the right of workers to strike”

#### [1] Resolved requires a policy

**Louisiana House 05** [3-8-2005, http://house.louisiana.gov/house-glossary.htm]

**Resolution A legislative instrument** that generally is **used for** making declarations, **stating policies,** and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; **a resolution uses the term "resolved".** Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4)

#### [2] Ought refers to a legal relationship between an empirical condition and some legally mandated consequence. KELSEN:

Pure Theory of Law, Hans Kelsen, 1934

Both cases involve simply the expression of a functional connection of elements, the connection specific to the respective system—here nature, there the law. In particular, even causality represents only a functional connection when one frees it of the metaphysico-magical sense originally attached to it by man, still entirely animistic and imagining in the cause some secret force creating, out of itself, the effect. A causal principle thus purified can never be dispensed with in the natural sciences, for what is manifest in the principle is simply the postulate of the intelligibility of nature, a postulate that can be approximated only by linking the material facts given to our cognition. Laws of nature say: ‘if A is, then £ must be.’ Positive laws say: ‘if A is, then B ought to be.’ And neither the laws of nature nor positive laws have said anything thereby about the moral or political value of the connection between A and B. The ‘ought’ designates a relative a priori category for comprehending empirical legal (p.25) data. In this respect, the ‘ought’ is indispensable, lest the specific way in which the positive law connects material facts with one another not be comprehended or expressed at all. For it is obvious that this connection is not the connection of cause and effect. It is not as the effect of a cause that punishment is set for a delict; rather, the legislator establishes between these two material facts, delict and punishment, a linkage that is completely different from causality. Completely different, but just as inviolable. For in the system of the law, that is, owing to the law, punishment follows always and without exception from the delict, even if, in the system of nature, punishment may fail to materialize for one reason or another. Where punishment does materialize, it need not occur as an effect of the delict, functioning as cause; it can have entirely different causes, even if, indeed, the delict has not taken place at all.

#### Violation: They don’t (elaborate)

#### Vote neg:

#### [x] Clash – I don’t have prep specific to their non-T aff to generate in depth clash – they can leverage their specific knowledge of their aff to always frame out generics and use their extensive frontlines to crush any pre round prep I generated, magnified by the fact that I can only prep the rez o/w [a] Education since arg interaction is the only specific way we learn in debate, B] Advocacy Skills - turns their aff scholarship – the only way to create change in the real world is by being able to make advocacies and engage in them– allowing clash forces people to actually consider your claims and forces good engagement

#### Reject clash bad – they purposely read their aff in a competitive activity that assumes clash

#### [x] State Education – debate is a unique forum in which we can learn the most out of all spaces about the state, even if the state is bad, using the state and talking about it allows us to understand how levels of power and how the state functions – that turns the aff – in order to engage in your method and challenge the state we need to understand how it operates – also takes out any T violent arguments

#### [x] Limits – absent the rez the aff could be anything which makes infinite affs. That destroys fairness – their abuse is supercharged by two things. A] they literally have infinite prep since the 2-month topic reset doesn’t apply and B] they can cherry pick their aff to be something trivially true like racism bad which I can’t substantively deny.

#### Framing issues:

#### [x] Fairness o/w - a] testing – you can’t evaluate their args because the round was skewed – if they have 10 minutes to win their aff or fairness bad and I have 1 for the opposite they will win – proves fairness is good even under their method of (insert their ROB thing) b] they concede its authority via speech times and tournament procedure c] Ballot Proximity – voting aff wont solve all of (insert what they want to solve), but its unique to being able to solve fairness [d] all your arguments assume they will evaluated by the judge fairly, saying unfairness good is just saying to not evaluate your args

#### [x] Vote on education – [a] it’s the only terminal impact to debate that matters after the round o/w on portability [b] its uniquely key to being able to challenge (insert what they want to solve) it’s the only way to know how and what we should be doing

#### [x] Prefer competing interpretations, reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention which can moot the entirety of 1ac or 1nc speeches.

#### [x] Drop the debater – a] to deter future abuse and b] drop the arg on T is functionally the same

#### [x] No RVI – a] logic – I’m fair vote for me makes no sense and outweighs because all args must be logical, b] baiting – rvis incentivize abuse to win on theory

#### [x] TVA - 1] Fiat is fake, but you can defend the topic without being the state – that produces the best education and solves their offense

Newman 10 [Newman, Saul. [Reader in Political Theory at Goldsmiths, University of London] Theory & Event, Volume 13, Issue 2, 2010.]

There are two aspects that I would like to address here. Firstly, the notion of demand:makingcertaindemands onthe state– say for higher wages, equal rights for excluded groups, to not go to war, or an end to draconian policing – is one of the basic strategies of social movements and radical groups. Making such demands does not necessarily mean working within the state or reaffirming its legitimacy. On the contrary, demands are made from a position outside the political order, and they often exceed the question of the implementation of this or that specific measure. Theyimplicitlycall into questionthe legitimacy and even the sovereignty of the stateby highlightingfundamentalinconsistenciesbetween, for instance, a formal constitutional order which guarantees certain rights and equalities, and state practices which in reality violate and deny them

#### 2] Solvency deficits to the TVA are neg ground – they aren’t entitled to a perfect aff

## 2 – Method DA

#### The aff views politics as working at the margins and works on policies that escapes those margins. Leftist politics are attached to mourning, but aren’t willing to overcome it. It has already ceded any claim to politics as staking a universal claim, or anything that is envisioned as liberatory relevant to the system we are in. The aff cedes the political to capitalism and instead gains a form of narcissistic and melancholic pleasure.

[Dean 3\*, Jodi. "Communist desire." *The Ends of History*. Routledge, 2013. 14-31.] LHP BT & JW

An emphasis on the drive dimension of melancholia, on Freud’s attention to the way sadism in melancholia is “turned round upon the subject’s own self,” leads to an interpretation of the general contours shaping the left that differs from Brown’s. Instead of **a left** attached to an unacknowledged orthodoxy, we have one that **has given way on the desire for communism**, **betrayed its historical commitment to the proletariat, and sublimated revolutionary energies into restorationist practices that strengthen the hold of the capitalism**. **This left has replaced commitments to the emancipatory, egalitarian struggles of working people against capitalism,** commitments that were never fully orthodox, but always ruptured, conflicted, and contested, **with incessant activity** (not unlike the mania Freud also associates with melancholia) **and so now satisfies itself with criticism and interpretation, small projects and local actions,** particular issues and legislative victories, **art**, technology, procedures**, and process.** **It** **sublimates revolutionary desire** **to** democratic drive, to **the repetitious practices** **offered up as** democracy (whether representative, deliberative, or **radical), having already conceded to the inevitably of capitalism**, “noticeably abandoning any striking power against the big bourgeoisie,” to return to Benjamin’s language**. For such a left enjoyment comes from its withdrawal from power and responsibility, its sublimation of goals and responsibilities into the branching, fragmented practices of micro-politics, self-care, and issue awareness.** Perpetually slighted, harmed, and undone, **this left remains stuck in repetition, unable to break out of the circuits of drive in which it is caught, unable because it enjoys.** Might this not explain why **the left confuses discipline with domination**, **why it forfeits collectivity in the name of an illusory, individualist freedom that continuously seeks to fragment and disrupt any assertion of a common**? **The watchwords of critique within this structure of left desire are moralism, dogmatism, authoritarianism, and utopianism, watchwords enacting a perpetual self-surveillance: has an argument, position, or view inadvertently *risked* one of these errors**? **Even some of its militants reject party and state, division and decision, securing in advance an inefficacy sure to guarantee it the nuggets of satisfaction drive provides.** If **this left is rightly described as melancholic**, and I agree with Brown that it is, then **its melancholia derives from the real existing compromises and betrayals** inextricable from its history, its accommodations with reality, whether of nationalist war, capitalist encirclement , or so-called market demands. Lacan teaches that, like Kant’s categorical imperative**, super-ego refuses to accept reality as an explanation for failure. Impossible is no excuse—desire is always impossible to satisfy.** So it’s not surprising that **a wide spectrum of the contemporary left have either accommodated themselves, in one way or another, to an inevitable capitalism or taken the practical failures of Marxism-Leninism to require a certain abandonment of antagonism, class, and revolutionary commitment to overturning capitalist arrangements of property and production**. **Melancholic fantasy**—the communist Master, authoritarian and obscene—as well as sublimated, melancholic practices—there was no alternative—**shield them**, *us*, **from confrontation with guilt over this betrayal as they capture us in activities that feel productive, important, radical**. Perhaps I should use the past tense here and say “shielded” because it is starting to seem, more and more, that the left has worked or is working through its melancholia. While acknowledging the incompleteness of psychoanalysis’s understanding of melancholia, Freud notes nonetheless that the unconscious work of melancholia comes to an end: “Just as mourning impels the ego to give up the object by declaring the object to be dead and offering the ego the inducement of continuing to live, so does each single struggle of ambivalence loosen the fixation of the libido to the object by disparaging, denigrating it, and even as it were killing it. It is possible for the process in the Ucs. [unconscious] to come to an end, either after the fury has spent itself or after the object has been abandoned as useless” (255). Freud’s reference to “each single struggle of ambivalence” suggests that the repetitive activities I’ve associated with drive and sublimation might be understood more dialectically, that is, not merely as the form of accommodation but also as substantive practices of dis- and reattachment, unmaking and making. Zizek in particular emphasizes this destructive dimension of the drive, the way its repetitions result in a clearing away of the old so as to make a space for the new. Accordingly, in a setting marked by a general acceptance of the end of communism and of particular political-theoretical pursuits in ethics, affect, culture, and ontology, it seems less accurate to describe the left in terms of a structure of desire than to point to the fragmentation or even non-existence of a left as such. Brown’s essay might be thought of as a moment in and contribution to the working through and dismantling of left melancholia. In its place, there are a multiple practices and patterns which circulate within the larger academic-theoretical enterprise (theorized by Lacan in terms of the discourse of the university) which has itself already been subsumed within communicative capitalism. Some of the watchwords of anti-dogmatism remain, but their charge is diminished, replaced by more energetic attachment to new objects of inquiry and interest. **The drive shaping melancholia, in other words, is a force of loss as it turns round, fragments, and branches.** Over time, as its process, its failure to hit its goal, is repeated, satisfaction attains to this repetition and the prior object, the lost object of desire, is abandoned, useless. So, for example, some theorists today find the analytic category of subject theoretically uninteresting, essentially useless; thus, they’ve turned instead to objects, finding in them new kinds of agency, creativity, vitality, and even politics. **The recent reactivation of communism bears witness to some of the most direct statements of the end of melancholia as a structure of left desire**. Describing the massive outpouring of enthusiasm for the 2009 London conference on the idea of communism, Costas Douzinas and Slavoj Zizek, note that even the question and answer sessions were “good-humored and non-sectarian,” a clear indication “that the period of guilt is over.”[[1]](#endnote-1) Similarly, in his own contribution to the communist turn, Bruno Bosteels glosses the idea of the communist horizon as invoked by Alvaro Garcia Linera. **The communist horizon effects “a complete shift in perspective, or a radical ideological turnabout, as a result of which capitalism no longer appears as the only game in town and we no longer have to be ashamed to set our expecting and desiring eyes on a different organization of social relationships.”**

#### Anti-Cap and Anti-CC struggle needs the state; the perm is true.

https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/5168-we-must-nationalise-total

Clearly, the situation is not the same. Our political world is completely different. That said, the First World War can be seen as the catastrophe that really began the twentieth century. Governments throughout the world, particularly in Europe, were prepared to send millions of soldiers to die on the battlefield without a valid reason. Individuals such as Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, known as Lenin, and Rosa Luxemburg, then asserted that if we wanted to stop this catastrophe, we had to depose its artisans and transform the war into a political crisis. That is how the situation today is analogous. **We are faced with a chronic emergency which will continue for the long term and worsen on many fronts because we have ruling classes that maintain the driving forces of this ecological crisis. Our political task is** precisely that which Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg had to confront: **how to transform these moments of crisis, such as the pandemic, into political crises that shatter the driving forces behind these problems.** *You quote Lenin when he said that ‘to temporise in insurrection is death…It is impossible to save anything now by half-measures.’ There is no place here for reformism. Where do you situate yourself between the three classic branches of political transformation, i.e. reformism, revolutionary reformism and revolution?* If I understand you correctly, I would say **that I situate myself rather on the side of revolutionary reformism, because I do not think that the left or the climate movement should demand today the complete abolition of capitalism, should seek to make a clean slate. To start with, no revolution of that kind ever succeeded. Lenin himself did not demand such a thing, the Bolshevik slogan was peace, bread and land**. Those were the key demands that fuelled their revolutionary project. **The left has spent around two centuries trying to abolish capitalism, so far without success, and it finds itself today, throughout the world, in a state of unprecedented weakness. To imagine that we could pass from our dreadful present weakness to the total abolition of capitalism tomorrow is for me completely unrealistic. Besides, we have to act extremely rapidly given the timescale of the climate crisis, and we cannot give ourselves tasks that are impossible to accomplish in this short space of time. But it is precisely because the timescale is so short and the change needed so colossal that we have to attack the very powerful interests at the heart of the capitalist economy**. **Take Total for example – the largest French private company – which continues to grow in the Arctic or in East Africa by constructing what will soon be the longest oil pipeline in the world.****[[1]](https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/5168-we-must-nationalise-total" \l "_edn1" \o ") That must stop. We cannot have companies of this type, which profit from the expansion of fossil fuel production. These companies must be closed and transformed into something completely different. Those are the kinds of ‘reform’ I would like to see: nationalise Total, immediately end completely its production of oil and gas, and transform it into a company devoted to the capture and sequestration of atmospheric CO2, for example**. **To achieve this, we need a different kind of French state, acting in response to massive popular pressures. And if this reform were brought about, would it also open up a process of reorganisation of French society? I don’t know. But these are fundamental demands, concrete ones, that we have to formulate. At the stage of the conflict where we are at present, therefore, it is not a matter of saying that we have to get rid of the capitalist system from one day to the next, but certainly to formulate extremely basic and necessary demands** – in this case to take control of oil and gas companies, and then see where we go from there. *Perhaps the most difficult change concerns our way of life, the goods we produce, the way in which we consume… Fossil energies are one thing, but there is also the extraction of metal to make cars or buses, natural resources to build homes, etc. The idea of sobriety and sharing goes against the desire produced by society to live like the upper classes. How do we convince the population?* Two things. **On a strategic level, it is logical to be a bit down to earth in the sense that, to start a process of radical transformation of society, you have to begin somewhere and identify an enemy – or a force – that is actually at the centre of the disorder and must be defeated. And once you have achieved this, you move on to the following steps. So, to concentrate on the oil and gas companies doesn’t mean that everything is perfect with solar or wind energy, electric cars, etc., but that this is what is imperative strategically**. Now, I also think that we can envisage a transition towards a society without fossil fuels, which will improve people’s quality of life and is not just a question of sacrifice. Certain sacrifices will have to be accepted, of course, such as aviation as we know it, and by the richest people first of all. But ordinary workers will also have to accept certain sacrifices – the overconsumption of meat, for example. It is possible to explain to people in a sufficiently convincing way that they have much to gain from such a transition: working less, not seeing their job suddenly offshored to China, etc. *Many currents in the ecological movement are inspired by anarchism, and have a pretty hostile attitude towards the state, seeing it as centralising, concerned to develop its power and its economy, fundamentally anti-democratic… What is your position towards the state?* **In my ideal world, power would be decentralised. But we are at the opposite extreme from an ideal situation, and we are heading closer towards nightmare and dystopia. To wait for another form of state would therefore be both crazy and criminal. The only way to escape from the impasse, I believe, is a centralised power capable of braking the forces of destruction.** Take the recent legal case where The Hague tribunal decided that Shell has to reduce its CO2 emissions by 45 per cent by 2030. Of course, we don’t know if this will be carried out. **But, in principle, what this suggests is that you can have a state apparatus ordering an oil and gas company to change its practices, and perhaps, in the end, to cease its activities completely. I can see no other institution than the state, in our societies, able to take and apply such a decision. That is not something that can be carried out by neighbourhood committees or a federation of councils – unless this establishes itself as a new state.** Concerning this case at The Hague, it is interesting to the extent that it reveals that there is a branch of our state apparatus, the judicial branch, which is sensitive to the pressure of the climate movement. **We must not stop exerting pressure on the various branches of the state apparatus, even if we do not like the state. We are in a crisis, and we must use all the forces available to us.** *You are one of the few intellectuals to think on both a strategic and a tactical level, with the ideas you develop in* How to Blow Up a Pipeline*. How do you combine the two things?* Certain methods would do us a lot of harm at this stage – for example, if some climate activists started to adopt armed struggle. But that apart, **we need the greatest possible diversity of tactics, including legal cases, various kinds of lobbying, parliamentary efforts, electoral campaigns, street occupations, and mass blockades of lignite mines, as Ende Gelände have been doing in Germany.****[[2]](https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/5168-we-must-nationalise-total" \l "_edn2" \o ") Mass civil disobedience, of course, but also the destruction of property and sabotage.** The projects to expand the extraction of fossil fuel that are currently under way throughout the world really deserve to be destroyed. If people in Uganda or Tanganyika destroyed the pipelines there tomorrow, I don’t see how you could condemn this. Throughout human history, what destruction of property would be more legitimate than that? The great paradox is that this has not yet happened on a large scale. *That’s what you call the ‘Lanchester enigma’, after the essayist John Lanchester who in 2007 expressed his surprise that climate activists had not yet committed acts of terrorism, given the scale of the catastrophe, and the ease with which one could sabotage a gas station or vandalise an SUV…* It’s just crazy that ‘business as usual’ continues with everything we know today, given that 30 million people have had to flee their homes just in the last year because of natural catastrophes bound up with extreme meteorological phenomena – consequences of global heating. That reminds me of the recent novel by Kim Stanley Robinson, *The Ministry for the Future*. He imagines a very convincing transition in the form of a kind of best-case scenario for the coming decades, involving a plethora of movements and tactics. **Sabotage and destruction of property play a key role. But there are also existing state institutions operating under the aegis of the United Nations, and a multitude of local initiatives… I believe that this is the best way of thinking the transition: a turbulent and disorderly process, acting on different levels, with recourse to various tactics. If French people launched a campaign against Total, that could very easily include forms of destruction of property, and that could increase the pressure.**

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)