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## 1

#### Interpretation – Affs must demonstrate how they engage efforts to advocate the plan beyond the 1AC outside of debate.

**Reid-Brinkley 20** – Shanara Reid-Brinkley 2020, “The Future is Black: Afropessimism, Fugitivity, and Radical Hope in Education”, Edited by Carl Grant, Ashley Woodson, Michael Dumas, https://books.google.com/books?id=SMHyDwAAQBAJ&pg=PR5&source=gbs\_selected\_pages&cad=2#v=onepage&q&f=false//WY

What lies in the wake" of competitive policy debate? How are Black debaters doing wake work? In the following section I take two examples from the National Debate Tournament Final Round to demonstrate wake work in competitive debate. Next, I ana-lyze the central argument in the final round characterizing the current clash of civilizations in debate and the ramifications of building community in debate. The final round of the 2017 National Debate Tournament was not just a com- petition, it was a referendum on the notion of a universal community and the structural exclusions and fairness issues that characterize the traditions and norms of competitive practice. Georgetown is affirmative in the debate and of fer a federal policy toward Alaska as an example of a specific proposal to combat catastrophic climate change. Based on the norms of competition, Georgetown presents a coherent affirmative argument providing an effective stasis point for fair deliberation of the climate change resolution. After the affirmative's speech Rutgers is allowed to cross-examine the speaker. Devane Murphy asks, “When is the first life saved as a result of the afffirmative]?” (2017). While Georgetown admits that a debate round cannot save lives directly, they argue that discuss- ing climate change policy is a valuable academic conversation. Rutgers then asks a series of questions about Georgetown's relationship as individuals to the people and places targeted by the federal policy they suggest: “Do you know any people in the arctic? Do you know any communities in the arctic? Can you name a family in the arctic?” (Murphy, 2017). While Georgetown answers no to these questions, they argue that a focus on debaters as individuals rather than the policy option they have presented is a distraction from the stasis point they have set for the debate. Using Afropessimism as a heuristic for engaging the resolution, debaters like Rutgers, reject any affirmation of the United States Federal Government. For these students, the federal government is always an unethical actor. In as much as the resolutional statement requires the affirmative to posit federal government action as an ethical response to public need, the vast majority of Black debaters refuse to take such a position. To combat this refusal to follow com- petitive norms, the Framework argument developed to confront the disruption of the normative form and content of policy debate competition. Framework debaters (mostly White and non-Black POCs) argue that if a team violates the norms of common practice they reject the normative stasis points for delibera-tion destroying the educational benefits of policy debate. Framework has operated as a strategic tool of capture and exclusion of Black thought in competitive debate. However, as "the holds multiply" so too does Black innovation. Rutgers' strategy in the final round took the form of the traditional Framework argument, but using Black thought to revise the content and turn it against the norms of traditional debate. Black Framework, Rutgers' strategy, argued that the affirmative must embody their politics and demonstrate how they directly engage in efforts to reduce climate change. Rutgers' argues that Georgetown is disconnected from their politics which is why they can advocate a policy that may affect the people of the Arctic while having little knowledge of those people or their lives. This kind of orientation toward policy action is dangerous, encouraging what Rutgers refers to as “ascetic tourism" by which debaters role-playing policy advocates “tour [the] trauma of various populations without ever acting to alleviate the harm” (Murphy, 2017). When Georgetown seeks further clarification of Black Framework, Rutgers' responds: "We provided an interpretation of what we think debate should look like, the same way in which when you're negative and you read my affirmative and you say we should not be able to do what we do. Very simple” (Murphy, 2017). Georgetown often runs the traditional Framework argument against Black Debate teams who fall outside their interpretation of a fair stasis point for debate about the resolution. Rutgers' turns the tables on Georgetown argu- ing that the traditional form of policy debate produces poor policy advocates and that Black Debate practice which centers embodied political practice is a superior method of training political advocates. Black Framework is an exam- ple of political theorizing from the hold. It operates from the perspective that anti-blackness is the stage upon which all political deliberation is played and then strategically identifies a tactic and an exigency for disruption.Rutgers capitalizes on the growing middle majority of judges who agree that Black Debate practice is an effective training tool for political advocacy. The use of Black Framework flips the script; it is a jarring (re)performance of the acts of exclusion that Black debaters have faced for decades. It took the form of Framework, paired with Black content, to argue that the neo-liberal norms of civil society would no longer get a free pass as the base frame for political negotiation. Rutgers turned a mirror on debate and offered a reflection of itself haunted by the specter of Black death. Arguing Black Framework was an act of bringing out the dead.

#### 1 – Access – Not only are privileged debaters forced to mobilize as accomplices to minority debaters, but students confront how abstract vernacular within debate shapes knowledge outside of the round.

#### 2 – Presumption – Absent an affective connection towards space exploration that moves past imaginary fiated action, voting aff cannot actualize their advantages and entrench cruel optimism.

#### 3 – Pornotroping – The 1AC utilizes suffering as a currency to trade in exchange for ballots which commodifies experience – our interp forces them to go further to realize the lived consequences of in-round practices.

#### 4 – TVA – Introduce a petition to halt space exploration.

#### Drop the debater – we indict their model of debate.

#### Competing Interpretations – you cannot be reasonably oppressive, and reasonability bright-lines are arbitrary which requires judge intervention.

**No RVIs: (A) Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe (B) Discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting (C) Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly (D) Its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments (E) Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory (F) They are the logic of criminalization that over-punish people-of-color for trying to create productive discourse.**

**1NC theory first – (A) If I was abusive, it was because the 1AC was (B) You have persuasive advantages in the 2AR on top of infinite prep time.**

## 2

### K

#### The 1ACs Lacanian triad causes desire to become co-opted into a constant self-destructive drive.

Caldwell 9 – Luke Caldwell, 2009 “Schizophrenizing Lacan: Deleuze, [Guattari], and Anti-Oedipus,” intersections 10, no. 3 (2009): 18-27.

While Deleuze and Guattari support Lacan’s decentering of the Cartesian subject, they find certain elements of this formulation of desire reactive from a Nietzschean perspective. 21 By defining desire in terms of lost objects, Lacan— and psychoanalysis generally—forces desire into “an idealistic (dialectical, nihilistic) conception”. 22 Rather than remaining stuck within this pessimistic formulation, however, Deleuze and Guattari see Lacan’s idea of the “object a” as a means through which to bring about a reversal of this situation, making desire an instrument of liberation rather than ressentiment. 23 Lacan's admirable theory of desire appears to us to have two poles: one related to "the object small a” as a desiring machine, which defines desire in terms of a real production, thus going beyond both any idea of need and any idea of fantasy; and the other related to the "great Other" as a signifier, which reintroduces a certain notion of lack. In a note in Anti-Oedipus, they claim, 24 Doing away with the Lacan’s language of the “subject” and collapsing his ontology of the Imaginary, Symbolic, and the Real, Deleuze and Guattari argue that everything is Real and that everything is a machine. In the opening chapters of Anti-Oedipus, Deleuze and Guattari radicalize the former and raise it to an ontological principle and, in so doing, overturn the latter. 25 Liberating the “objet petit a” from its subordination to lack, they transform Lacan’s concept into a primordial source of energy that transforms and is transformed through the ways it is organized. Deleuze and Guattari refer to this energy as a hylè—a pure continuous flux or material flow—and define a machine as a “system of interruptions or breaks” in this flow. 26 Everywhere it is machines—real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary couplings and connections. An organ machine is plugged into an energy source machine: the one produces a flow that the other interrupts. In the opening lines of Anti-Oedipus, they claim, 27 Through the connection of one machine to another, desire produces reality. This should not, however, lead one to believe that they fall into a naïve realism of concrete identities. Rather, because all machines consist of other machines, which consist of other machines…ad infinitum, there is never any whole that actually unifies an object in a complete way. Identities are only “produced as a residuum alongside the machine, as an appendix, or as a spare part adjacent to the machine” and subjects are, following Lacan, “not at the center…but on the periphery, with no fixed identity, forever decentered, defined by the states” that they pass through. 28 This internal reversal and radicalization of Lacan’s theory of desire forms one of the core critiques that much of the rest of Anti-Oedipus follows from. If reality emerges from historically contingent formations of desire, the Imaginary and Symbolic are therefore not dimensions that obscure desire but are rather secondary manifestations if it. 29 This allows Deleuze and Guattari to collapse the difference between the libidinal economy and the political economy—the latter being merely a more complex machine that emerges from the former and feeds back to shape flows of desire in specific ways. 30 While organization is imperative for the productive capacity of desire to function—unbound energy falls back on “the body without organs” and becomes unproductive and “sterile”—codification that is too rigid likewise prevents desire from proliferating: “the body suffers…from not having some other sort of organization…Desiring-machines work only when they break down, and by continually breaking down”. 31 This movement between disorganization and organization—or, as Deleuze and Guattari call it deterritorialization and reterrirtorialization—is what is referred to as desiring-production. 32

#### The affs invocation of desire as conditioned by ‘the unconscious’ is a dangerous view of the psyche and the social world.

**Greedharry 8** – Mrinalini Greedharry 8, Professor of English at Laurentian University, 2008, Postcolonial Theory and Psychoanalysis: From Uneasy Engagements to Effective Critique, p. 121-124

The first problem Deleuze and Guattari identify, a problem that arches over the following four objections, is that psychoanalysis fundamentally misrecognizes and subsequently misrepresents desire. While this is true in the general sense that psychoanalysis poses its theories as a mediating structure between our desires and us, it is also true in the particular sense that Deleuze and Guattari describe below:

we have a triangulation that implies in its essence a constituent prohibition, and that conditions the differentiation between persons: prohibition of incest with the mother, prohibition against taking the father’s place. But a strange sort of reasoning leads one to conclude since it is forbidden, that very thing was desired. (70)

In other words, according to the psychoanalytic scheme, we only realize Oedipus is our desire at the same moment when we realize we can never fulfil that desire. Desire is the thing that escapes us. Naturally, given their commitment to non-representational thought, Deleuze and Guattari object to this conceptualization of desire as something that only becomes visible, or articulated, at the moment when it is displaced because it is located in the theoretical framework as the ‘invisible’ or lacking thing. They object to psychoanalysis’ failure to understand that the prohibition of a desire is not desire itself— that lack or incompletion is not the defining feature of desire. For them, as evidenced by the concept of desiring-machines, desire is something that is produced by and between bodies not repressed or permitted according to Oedipal laws.

Though this first objection is posed at the meta-philosophical level it has consequences for postcolonial studies. If psychoanalysis misrepresents desire, or rather conflates its own theorization of what desire is with desire itself, then its value as an actual theory of desire is significantly diminished. Psychoanalysis, Deleuze and Guattari seem to suggest, is nothing more than a discourse about its own conceptualization of desire. If this is true, then studying psychoanalysis as one Western theory of desire among others may well be an important task for postcolonial studies, but using psychoanalysis as a theory of desire to explain and account for the colony seems to be an exercise in proving that the theory works in other contexts. Bhabha’s work, as we saw in the previous chapter, was criticized on precisely these grounds. It would seem clear, however, that colonial societies were social and political formations that incited, produced and managed different economies of desire than those produced in the metropolitan centres. If psychoanalysis can only refer all formations of desire back to its Oedipal conceptualizations, then postcolonial studies needs to develop its own conceptual tools for explaining the singularly colonial productions of desire.

Though Deleuze and Guattari discard the notion that desire can be repressed, they do not discard the possibility that the Oedipal prohibition works as a form of social repression. In fact, they argue that Oedipus, though it is not a genuine prohibition, functions as a social repression because the Oedipus is a way of thinking about desire that has captured us. We believe that Oedipus is the only way to think about our desires, and so we allow ourselves to be caught in the Oedipus trap. In their own words, Deleuze and Guattari argue that the Oedipus is:

the bait, the disfigured image, by means of which repression catches desire in the trap. If desire is repressed, this is not because it is desire for the mother and for the death of the father ... The danger is elsewhere. If desire is repressed, it is because every position of desire, no matter how small, is capable of calling into question the established order of a society. (116)

They argue that psychoanalysis has an interest in presenting Oedipus itself as the repressed desire, since in this way, psychic repression appears primary and social repression must appear to follow later, as a secondary problem. We might think, for example, of the alternative to Lacan’s mirror stage proposed by Fanon. He claims that the black child in the closed world of his or her family is psychologically healthy, but that the child’s contact with the social forces of the racist world triggers problems.

Deleuze and Guattari insist that it is social repression that depends on psychic repression, or, in other words that ‘psychic repression, is a means in the service of social repression’ (119). They do not attempt to do away with the separate concept of psychic repression, but they recognize that social repression sometimes delegates its work to agents of psychic repression, such as, most obviously, the family. They argue that it is vital not simply that desire be repressed but that it takes repressive forms that the subjects themselves desire, hence their affirmation of Wilhem Reich’s proposition that the masses are never simply fooled but have their desires educated, coded and recoded back to them so that desire can go on being repressed. Desire is not something to be released from repression, it is something to be captured and recaptured by an ethics, such as Anti-Oedipus, that enable us to look clearly at those forces that have desire in their hold.

Repression of desire is, in fact, a ready and familiar trope for explaining the psychic and social features of colonial society. We saw a perfect example of this in Nandy’s work. Nandy proposed that the discourse of hyper-masculinity the British introduced to India was a result of their repressed homosexuality, a repression that could be resolved in the colonies where British men were more free to express their homophilia, if not their homosexuality. The notion that the colonies were a place where the colonizer could resolve his psychic repressions, either by expressing them or sublimating them, is not unique to Nandy; it is almost a cliché in the histories and literatures of colonialism. But if psychic repression is a theoretical object produced by psychoanalysis, and it is also an object that distracts our clear view of the social conditions of repression, then it is not the most useful concept for postcolonial studies. In fact, it may also be preventing us from reading colonial formations of desire in their immediacy. Nandy’s example is instructive. Though he is able to focus our attention on a historical moment where British and Indian desires produced a uniquely colonial formation of masculinity he is not able to describe this formation as anything more than a psychic repression with social consequences. Like Bhabha, Nandy is able to show us that repression is a mechanism that works in the colonies too but he is not able to show us how the social, political, cultural and economic conditions brought psychic desires into play in order to achieve colonization.

#### The theorization of the unconscious as the foundation of desire short-circuits revolutionary politics and locks in neoliberalism and antiblackness.

**Coles 18** – Chris Coles 18, Western Washington University, 2018, “Against the Psychoanalytic Unconscious: Deleuze, Guattari, and Desire as a Heuristic for Self-Regulating Biopolitics,” Occam’s Razor, Vol. 8, <https://cedar.wwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1050&context=orwwu>

While Foucault’s analysis is thorough in the material examination of the existence and function of biopolitics, it lacks a desire-focused explanation for the reason in which biopolitics is so effective at not only sustaining power, but also in the regulation of populations4. This lack of desire- centered analysis has led some to interpret and mobilize Foucauldian biopolitics in such a way that reinforces the Lacanian psychoanalytic tradition; the process has forwarded an understanding of biopolitics that actually reinforces biopolitical control. As both a resistance to this fundamentally violent trend and application of Foucault’s analysis to the violence of the neoliberal world, I propose that the work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (specifically their elaboration on desire and ‘desiring-machines,’) as the best heuristic for understanding the way in which biopower functions.

Deleuze and Guattari’s first written-assemblage ""Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia Volume 1” addresses the way in which Lacanian psychoanalysis - and psychoanalysis writ large - engenders the conditions for the capitalist control and manipulation of bodies and subjectivities5. Thus, before diving into Deleuze and Guattari’s (DnG) concept of desire and how it implicates biopolitics, it’s critical to understand the Lacanian psychoanalysis that provided the structure for which they were writing against. While both Lacan and DnG’s critical projects center the importance of desire, they go about constructing desire - and its interaction with subjects and society - radically differently. Forwarding and reframing (to his credit) Freud, Lacan centers desire around an individual’s unconscious and specifically the unconscious containment of unknowable ‘signifiers’6. Indeed, to Lacan, the unconscious governs the expression of a subjects desire and actions; dually, the unconscious is unable to be fully understood7.

To clarify, what Lacan articulates is that there are latent, naturalistic ‘signifiers.’ When interfaced with social realities (which correspond to said ‘signifiers’), it produces a specific kind of desiring-response. Lacan then uses Freud’s Oedipus Complex to re-conceptualize the want to kill the father as the fundamental ‘castration’ or ‘loss’ that is at the heart of every subject’s psychological development8. This loss provides the framework for which unconscious signifiers interface with the world. Due to the strictly partial knowability of the unconscious, there will always be a 'lack' in what is expressed and what is understood. This ‘lack’ comes to express the fundamental lynch pin of Lacanian desire: due to the inability of subjects to fully understand the other, desire can only be represented and understood through the individual’s unconscious.

Despite the fact that Foucault would likely object to his work being explained through a frame of Lacanian psychoanalysis, he lacks an articulation of how biopolitics intersects with a conception of desire and subjectivity. Due to this, and the near omnipresence of Lacan in the western academy, Foucault’s conception of biopolitics leaves itself very open to the possibility of being explained through Lacan. A conception of biopolitics understood through Lacanian psychoanalysis would ground the functioning of biopower in its appeal to individual unconscious signifiers; also, communicating that sovereign control stems from its ability to generate the possibility for individuals to shift their psychological anxiety (or lack thereof) onto the other.

The possibility for the aforementioned Lacanian interpretation of biopolitics seems to be most applicable in Foucault’s usage of Bentham’s ‘Panopticon’ as a heuristic for understanding one structuralized instance of biopolitics. One of Foucault’s arguments as to why the panoptic society is so powerful in its regulation of populations is due to the fact that the panoptic is able to “spread throughout the social body” through its ability to get subjects to self-regulate themselves9. The question of self-regulation opens the door for Lacanian psychoanalysis to describe the conditions for which that self-regulation occurs; generally, this is through some appeal to the voyeuristic unconscious. Since self-regulation centers on Foucault’s discussion of power, this interpretation is able to circuit the entirety of biopolitics through Lacanian psychoanalysis.

Deleuze and Guattari focus on Lacanian psychoanalysis and its explanation of power as the oppositional form which they develop their concept of desire. Antithetical to Lacan’s individualist concept of desire, Deleuze and Guattari articulate that desire is inherently a collective and horizontal function; hence, the connection of one subject to another creates a 'desiring-machine’. Additionally, the function produces desire both from that connection and the connections broader position in the structures of society10.

To Deleuze and Guattari, desire is necessarily a collective production, in which the unconscious is a theater that produces and internalizes the desire that is produced by the relationships in which subjects engage - also, the structures of power that those subjects encounter11,12. Desire implicates subjectivity; however, subjects are not static, contained, individuals. Instead, subjects are constantly open and changing to the desire that is constantly produced in civil society; Deleuze and Guattari term this ‘becoming’13. Therefore, desire is not a lack that can never be understood (terminalizing in only the individual); instead, desire is a flow that is constantly moving, connecting, and growing in intensity in such a way that produces subjects as 'becoming instead of individual14. ‘'Becoming’ consequently produces subject-subject relationships and structural arrangements that are horizontal. These arrangements are based on affective connections and open to the flowing of desire in a necessarily anti-hierarchal way; these arrangements being called ‘assemblages’15.

Deleuze and Guattari articulate that while the function of desire (aforementioned) being such, desire is not produced in a neutral way. Rather, the very nature (horizontal and collective) of desire means that desire is able to be controlled, or 'circuited by structures of power. This operates through structures of power utilizing their material power to forward a dominant conception of desire; this elevates the only flow of desire that is considered legitimate to express. Structures of power thus utilize their hegemonic power to force ‘becoming’ into statized individuals17. Inverting assemblages into hierarchical relations produce desire in such a way that only makes sense in so far as its relation to that structure of power. For example, white construction of people of color is characterized as inherently undesirable and fundamentally anti-human; this reveals the way in which structures of oppression hijack subjects desire to reinforce the conditions of their power. Also, how they frame desire which is recognized by said system as ‘deviant’. Thus, Deleuzoguattarian desire would conceptualize the self-regulation endemic to biopolitics as not a question of the voyeuristic unconscious; instead, it is the sovereign’s ability to circuit desire as only intelligible if it is fundamentally biopolitical. Subjects’ expression of self-regulating biopolitics is not a question of their unconscious signifiers. Hegemonic power’s ability to control the production of desire in such a way that subjects are forced to be biopolitical and desirous of biopolitics. This is compounded with the way in which neoliberalism allows for the production of limited 'becoming’, particularly white ‘becoming’. This extends to capital investment and categorization of bodies, revealing how Deleuzoguattarian theory is important in understanding the meta level power of biopolitics. Also, the ways in which other structures of power, like neoliberalism, utilize biopolitics to cement and exercise their power.18

Indeed, Deleuze, Guattari’s, and Lacan’s concepts of desire are radically different. Lacanian psychoanalysis is individualist, naturalistic, and hierarchical, while Deleuzoguattarian desire is the exact opposite of that; Deleuze and Guattari also problematize Lacanian psychoanalysis as an explicit function of oppression19. Deleuze and Guattari problematize the individualistic naturalism inherent in the Lacanian unconscious as a refusal to engage with the ways that structures of power infiltrate the subject’s unconscious. To demonstrate this fact, Deleuze excavates the traditional Freudian case of Schreber, in which during a session of psychoanalysis Schreber expresses explicitly racist discourse. However, the psychoanalyst ignores this and latches onto Schreber’s utterance of a specific name as an indication of their Oedipus20. This, to Deleuze, highlights the individualist focus of Lacanian psychoanalysis, forcing the only concern onto ‘signifiers’. This leads to ignoring structures of power like anti-blackness and settler colonialism. In short, the process allows them to re-naturalize themselves.21

Not only does the Lacanian unconscious tacitly reinforce structures of power through obscuration, but also directly in its construction of subjectivity as a strictly static and enclosed individual22. Specifically, by framing desire and consequent subject as starting and ending with the biologic body, it characterizes the subject as hierarchical - collapsing the possibility for the flow of desire. This causes bodies to be defined strictly on the basis of their worth in relation to structures of power (for example, their productivity to the capitalist project; hence, specific bodies to be based on their defined worth to neoliberal markets)23-25. In summary, Lacanian psychoanalysis is not only oppressive in and of itself, but also makes theorizing biopolitics under a Lacanian framework a near impossibility. This is because the systems (capitalism, neoliberalism, settler colonialism, anti-blackness, et cetera) that the Lacanian unconscious reinforces all utilize biopolitics as an exercise of their oppression and legitimacy.

Foucault theorized biopolitics as a tool to shed light on the material way in which the sovereign is able to utilize and manipulate its power to justify itself and create the conditions for oppression. It was done in the service of creating more effective, nuanced, and liberating resistance movements. This provides invaluable tools to the dismantling of the intertwined nature of contemporary surveillance. We lose that revolutionary power when we utilize a framework that replicates biopolitics and subsequently turns our coalitions of resistance into matrices of oppression.

Deleuzoguattarian desire is relevant through its ability to provide the most material explanation of biopolitics. Also, it has an ability to fundamentally resist one of the foundational ways that biopolitics expresses itself. In contrast, Lacanian psychoanalysis should be rejected on the grounds that its foundational replication of some of the central tenants of neoliberalism. Additionally, it becomes impossible to utilize the analysis of biopolitics to dismantle biopower when the very framework you are utilizing replicates the conditions of biopower.

#### Vote negative to embrace schizoanalysis – we disengage from institutions of production by embracing becoming opposed to 1ACs static configuration.

**Caldwell 09** (; Luke is senior at the University of Washington, studying the Comparative History of Ideas, History, and Human Rights. Caldwell was named as a 2009 Beinecke Scholar, Autumn 2009, Schizophrenizing Lacan: Deleuze, [Guattari], and Anti-Oedipus)// sosa

As a **model** for this connective/disjunctive process of continual transformation, Deleuze and Guattari **turn the schizophrenic against the stability** of the psyche and develop a form of schizoanalysis to **revolutionize psychoanalysis.** While Freudian analysis **aims to treat the psychotic** by helping them acknowledge and control their unconscious desires in the name of securing stable subjectivity, schizoanalysis **aims to free the process of desiring-production** from social constraints. To this end, Deleuze and Guattari celebrate the process of schizophrenia as a force that **breaks through the rigid codification**s of the social field and resists being trapped in any singular identity. Rather than helping people, they see psychoanalysis an extension of the repressive society that **introduces lack into desire, thereby restraining it** in subordination to an abstracted complete **object: Lack is created, planned**, and organized in and through social production….**Desire does not lack** anything; it does not lack its **object.** It is, rather, the subject that is missing in desire, or **desire that lacks a fixed subject**; there is no fixed subject unless there is repression…. There are those who will maintain that **the schizo is incapable of uttering the word I**, and that we must restore his ability to pronounce this hallowed word. All of which the schizo sums up by saying: **they’re ~~fucking~~ me over again**. One of the strongest ways that psychoanalysis fulfills this function is by **forcing the schizo into the Oedipus complex.** In order to escape the trap of Oedipus, Deleuze and Guattari historicize psychoanalysis to expose it as an ideology that is **anachronistic and repressive.** Looking historically at how different modes of social organization (“social machines”) codify desire in specific ways, Deleuze and Guattari examine what they call the “savage territorial machine”, the “barbarian despotic machine” and the “civilized capitalist machine”. The territorial machine, they claim, rigidly codifies desire, but distributes power equally throughout the population. The despotic machine, on the other hand, is a regime of overcoding, where society is hierarchically constructed in subordination to a transcendental signifier. Under the “name-of-the-despot”, patriarchal. Domination is replicated at every level of social organization, especially in the family. The capitalist machine, in opposition to the others, is built upon a regime of decoding, where material flows of production and consumption are constantly transforming.35 While Deleuze and Guattari see the decoding power of capital as a force capable of liberating the creativity of the schizophrenic process, it is also coupled with a force of recoding that aims to maintain the stratification of society and consolidation of power. The liberatory **power of decoding** therefore functions as a mode of **repression,** allowing people in power to convert labor into surplus value more effectively.36 One of the ways that capitalism desperately **avoids dissolving** the power differential that maintains social hierarchies is by fortifying **the patriarchal family**. While the deterritorializing power of capitalism is so strong that **even the organization of the family is not safe** from its grips, psychoanalysis, wielding the Oedipus complex, serves as an important vector through which desire that escapes the family is suppressed.37 Rather than describing a certain repressed state of affairs, the Oedipus complex really functions as a deterritorializing force that frees desire only to reinscribe it again as lack within the strict limits of the family. As a throwback to the despotic machine, the psychoanalyst pushes the **analysand to renounce their schizophrenic desire and internalize** the totalitarian signifier of **the father and his law**.38 Instead of placing blame on the vested powers that maintain the conditions that repress desire, psychoanalysis secures these **repressive conditions** by “socializing” **those that harbor the capacity to break free from their chains**. The ideological misconception of psychoanalysis resides in its failure to recognize that Oedipus—not the father—is the agent of castration and that **the cure is really the disease**; as Deleuze and Guattari write, “castration as an analyzable state…is the effect of castration as a psychoanalytic act”.39 While this critique directly implicates Freudian analysis as a form of ideology, Deleuze and Guattari believed that Lacan was actually heading in this direction and, in fact, paved the way for the destruction of Oedipus. By making the Oedipal structure symbolic, yet organizing this structure around the absent signifier of the phallus, Lacan showed that “Oedipus is imaginary, nothing but an image, a myth” and that “these images are produced by an oedipalizing structure” (capitalism) that “reproduces the element of castration”.40 Lacan’s work therefore illuminated how the whole Oedipal house of cards was founded upon a “despotic Great Signifier acting as an archaism” and led psychoanalysis “to the point of its self-critique”.41 This allowed Anti-Oedipus to tip the scales and reveal the “reverse side” of representation and structure “as a positive principle of nonconsistency that dissolves it”.42 With the house blown down and a new world constructed, **we find not Oedipus** but the schizophrenic at the root of our desire, and **see the unconscious** not as a theater but **as a factory** mobilized toward continual transformation and social revolution. Rather than rejecting the insights of Lacan, as Žižek claims, Deleuze and Guattari radicalize him in an effort to overturn the ideological apparatus of capitalism and liberate desire from reactivity. Whether their project is successful remains dependent not upon abstract principles of ontology but rather in the ways that people can use it. As Guattari says, “We’re strict functionalists: what we’re interested in is how something works”. What we find in Anti-Oedipus is an example and an inspiration for how revolution could work if we move outside ourselves and embrace the creative and subversive potential of the desire coursing in and through the world of which we are a part. **Let’s give it a try, incipit schizophrenia!**

## 3

### NC

#### 1 – Extinction outweighs: (A) Reversibility – It forecloses the alternative because we can’t improve society if we are all dead (B) Structural violence – Death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities (C) Objectivity – Body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical (D) Uncertainty – If we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true, we should preserve the world to keep debating about it.

#### 2 – Prioritize a focus on existential risk in the context of debates about outer space.

Baum 16 [Seth, @ Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, In “The Ethics of Space Exploration”, ed. James S.J. Schwartz & Tony Milligan, Springer, 2016, pages 109-123. This version 29 July 2016. <https://sethbaum.com/ac/2016_SpaceEthics.pdf>] brett

A basic conclusion of this paper is that consequentialists should pay attention to outer space. This is because outer space can be the location of immense consequences (via space colonization) and because outer space scenarios can force us to rethink our consequentialist ethics (via ETI encounter).

Attention to outer space prompts us to recognize the big picture. This holds for consequentialist ethics as much as it does for anything else. Only by thinking through the possibilities of outer space can we understand how our lives could matter in the grand scheme of things. And the fact of the matter is that our lives can matter immensely. We can set the pieces in motion for an immense cosmic civilization. We can help prevent civilization-ending global catastrophe so as to enable future space colonization. And we can determine whether or not to try messaging to ETI.

Should we do these things? Answering this all-important question requires ethics. Therefore, just as consequentialists should pay attention to outer space, so too should outer space analysts pay attention to consequentialism, and indeed to ethics in general. Defensible forms of consequentialism will generally conclude that (1) humanity today should focus on avoiding global catastrophe, (2) space colonization should proceed with caution, but ultimately should proceed at immense scale, and (3) high-power/long-duration METI should not be conducted until more effort is put to assessing whether the consequences are likely to be good.

The ethical arguments and empirical analyses in this paper are quite brief and are not the final word on the subject. I have said little in defense of consequentialism and my preferred form of it. The analyses of space colonization and ETI encounter are likewise at best only approximate and leaving much for future work. Some of it is due to space constraints in this paper, but much of it is due to the fact that the research simply has not yet been performed. Outer space consequentialism could make for a fruitful line of inquiry.

The merits of this line of inquiry are diminished by the conclusion to focus on avoiding global catastrophe. Any global catastrophe would preclude the possibility of future research on all topics, including outer space consequentialism. Likewise, any hopes of resolving the ethical dilemmas and empirical uncertainties depend on us surviving long enough to do the research. An argument can thus be made against any work on outer space in favor of work on the global catastrophic risks. My own view is that work on outer space should be pursued mainly to the extent that it is instrumentally valuable towards reducing the global catastrophic risks. To that end it can be quite instrumentally valuable. Outer space can offer great motivation due to its immense opportunities, and it can be deeply inspirational due to its beauty and wonder and the big-picture perspective it offers. While attention to outer space should not distract humanity from the urgent threats that it faces, some attention is very much worthwhile.

#### Outweighs: (A) Most articles about private appropriation are written through util – means other frameworks can never engage with core questions of the lit and decks predictability – equal topic lit means fair ground. (B) Substance begs the question of a framework being good for debate – fairness is a gateway issue to deciding the winner and education is the reason schools fund debate.

**3 – Reject Calc Indicts/Util Triggers Permissibility/Util Fails arguments: (A) They’re all NIBs that skew the neg and move the debate away from the topic (B) Morally abhorrent – it would say we have no obligation to prevent genocide and that slavery was permissible.**

4 – Imagining utopias good – allows us to strive for a better world and actualize things in debate outside. Turns their impacts since u can confront the lack through policy outside of debate.

## 4

### CP

#### We endorse the entirety of the 1AC with the exception of mining in space.

#### Private companies are key to a growing space mining sector – investors, profitability, and market demand.

Krishnan 20 [C A Krishnan, 8-6-2020, "Space mining: Just around the corner?," Week, <https://www.theweek.in/news/sci-tech/2020/08/06/Space-mining-Just-around-the-corner.html> [accessed 12-6-21] lydia

A Mars mission carrying 100 metric tons cargo in 2022 followed by a manned mission by 2024 are the immediate milestones of Elon Musk’s SpaceX plan which aims to create a self sustaining Mars city by 2050. Just a few decades back this would have sounded as fantasy, but today it looks as if this time frame may actually be bettered. Space missions are set to undergo revolutionary changes and Elon Musk’s vision and timelines are indicators of this. Space is increasingly being seen as a treasure trove of precious minerals and also a place for future human habitation beyond the earth. Global private space industry investors believe that space mining has the potential to shape and define the 21st Century. NASA estimates that the 'Asteroid belt’ holds minerals worth quintillion of dollars. American astrophysicist Neil Degrasse Tyson believes, “The first trillioners will be those who mine asteroids”. The “Main Asteroid Belt” is located between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter, about 450 to 650 million Kilometers from earth, with million asteroids in it. Over the decades, apart from Moon and Mars, governments and private agencies have been carrying out extensive research and studying asteroids for their composition, possibility of mining them and their mining value —Asteriod ‘Bennu’ has been assessed at $670 million and asteroid ‘2011 UW158’ at $ 5.7 trillion. Transportation of the mined resources for utilisation, however, poses major hurdles. A ‘BBC Future’ report by Sarah Cruddas puts the cost of shipping a ton of water into space at about $ 50 million. As per Chris Lewicki, president of Planetary Resources, an asteroid mining company, it takes more energy to escape the first 300 kilometers from the Earth than the next 300 million kilometers. Similarly, bringing back anything more than a few kilograms of samples from space to the Earth would be even more complex in terms of logistics. To start with, therefore, global space industry investors are focusing on keeping mined space resources in space itself for ‘in situ resource utilisation’. Availability of water on the Moon, Mars and asteroids offer very attractive prospects; apart from being crucial for supporting life and growing food, it also opens the possibility of using its constituents, hydrogen and oxygen, for making rocket fuel. Today, the possibility of manufacturing tools and even building habitats on Moon or Mars with the help of 3D printers using iron, nickel, cobalt, gold, platinum, and iridium etc which are available on the Moon, Mars and asteroids seem within reach. Researchers are working on using regolith, the weathered rock particles found on lunar surface for making moon bricks using 3D printers. These bricks will form the basic construction material for the first moon station and even the first moon hotel. Space industry players believe that an investment of $ 4 billion in water mining in space can generate annual revenue worth about $2.4 billion. Similarly, there is a new community of customers who are already looking for buying propellant in space. American space launch provider, United Launch Alliance (ULA), a Lockheed Martin and Boeing joint venture that provides launch rockets, has made it known that, ULA is willing to pay about $ 3000 a Kg for propellant in low earth orbit. Fast paced developments are taking place in the field of space mining technology with private players in the lead. Optical mining using concentrated sunlight, robotics, automated mining applications, advanced drilling machines etc are just a few examples. Participation of private players has reduced the investment burden and greatly enhanced the width and pace of innovation. It is believed that launch of the first asteroid mining vehicle as well as setting up of the first fuelling stations on the Moon and in low earth orbit could become a reality within a decade. Japanese mission ‘Hayabusa’ was the first to bring samples from an asteroid to earth in 2010. ‘Hayabusa - 2’ made its rendezvous with the near earth asteroid ‘162173 RYUGU’ in June 2018, left the asteroid after collecting samples in November 2019 and will be back on earth on December 6, 2020. Similarly the NASA mission OSIRIS-REx, costing about $ 1 billion, launched in 2016 is due to return to earth with samples of asteroid ‘101955 Bennu’ on September 24, 2023. The latest US space mission, ‘Perseverance’ launched on July 30, 2020 will land on Mars on February 18, 2021. It will be using a helicopter on Mars, set to be the first use of a helicopter outside the earth. Apart from collecting samples from Mars and search for signs of habitable conditions on Mars, it will also test the possibility of manufacturing molecular oxygen from the carbon dioxide-rich Mars atmosphere. Beyond the technological capability, there are, however, complex legal issues. While making fuel and water in space and its ‘in situ resource utilisation’ may pass the scrutiny, commercial exploitation of space through minerals mining, tourism, real estate etc may prove hugely contentious in terms of international legal framework for space. The current legal frameworks were adopted when space activities were entirely within the domain of national governments and were confined to research alone. But with the nature of space activities moving from purely research activities to military applications to commercial activities and with the entry of private players and a new community of consumers in space, the vintage outer space treaty has been rendered grossly inadequate; vagueness of the treaty does not cater for the ‘new types of uses’ or the ‘new users’ of space. Louis de Gouyon Matignon, in a thesis on the subject observed that “some states have already taken the absence of express prohibition as a sign that the utilisation of space resources is permissible, and both the USA and Luxembourg recently adopted national legislations expressly allowing it”. This has, however, triggered a response from the international community denouncing such unilateral initiatives and recommending a collective approach on the lines of the laws for high seas and deep sea bed. Whether a widely acceptable new space treaty comes through or not, Space mining is a reality and the early entrants are likely to retain monopoly and huge economic advantages for a very long time.

#### Space mining is key to sustain global resources -- otherwise, resource wars.

MacWhorter 16 [Kevin; J.D. Candidate, William & Mary Law School, "Sustainable Mining: Incentivizing Asteroid Mining in the Name of Environmentalism", William & Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review, Vol 40, Issue 2, Article 11, <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1653&context=wmelpr>] brett

A. Rare Element Mining on Earth

In the next sixty years, scientists predict that certain elements crucial to modern industry such as platinum, zinc, copper, phosphorous, lead, gold, and indium could be exhausted on Earth. 12 Many of these have no synthetic alternative, unlike chemical elements such as oil or diamonds.13 Liquid-crystal display (LCD) televisions, cellphones, and laptops are among the various consumer technologies that use precious metals.14Further, green technologies including wind turbines, solar panels, and catalytic converters require these rare elements. 15 As demand rises for both types of technologies, and as reserves of rare metals fall, prices skyrocket.16 Demand for nonrenewable resources creates conflict, and consumerism in rich countries results in harsh labor treatment for poorer countries.17

In general, the mining industry is extremely destructive to Earth’s environment.18 In fact, depending on the method employed, mining can destroy entire ecosystems by polluting water sources and contributing to deforestation.19 It is by its nature an unsustainable practice, because it involves the extraction of a finite and non-renewable resource.20 Moreover, by extracting tiny amounts of metals from relatively large quantities of ore, the mining industry contributes the largest portion of solid wastes in the world.21 The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) describes the industry as the source of more toxic and hazardous waste than any other industrial sector [in the United States], costing billions of dollars to address the public health and environmental threats to communities. 22 Poor regulations and oxymoronic corporate definitions of sustainability, however, make it unclear as to just how much waste the industry actually produces.23

Platinum provides an excellent case study of the issue, because it is an extremely rare and expensive metal—an ore expected to exist in vast quantities in asteroids.24 Further, production of platinum has increased sharply in the past sixty years in order to keep up with growing demand for use in new technologies.25 In fact, despite their high costs, platinum group metals are so useful that [one] of [four] industrial goods on Earth require them in production. 26 Scholars do not expect demand to slow any time soon.27 Among other technologies, industries use platinum in products such as catalytic converters, jewelry production, various catalysts for chemical processing, and hydrogen fuel cells.28 While there is no consensus on how far the Earth’s reserves of platinum will take humanity, many scientists agree that platinum ore reserves will deplete in a relatively short amount of time.29

With the rate of mining at an all-time high,30 it is increasingly clear that historical patterns of mineral resources and development cannot simply be assumed to continue unaltered into the future. 31 The platinum mining industry, however, has a strong incentive to increase its rate of extraction as profits grow with the rate of demand. Without any alternative, this destructive practice will continue into the future.32

So-called platinum-group metal (PGM) ores are mined through underground or open cut techniques.33 Due to these practices, all but a very small fraction of the mined platinum ore is disposed of as solid waste.34 The environmental consequences of platinum production are thus quite significant, but like the mining industry in general, the amount of waste is typically under-reported.35

While this is due to high production levels at the moment, those levels will only increase given the estimated future demand of platinum.36 In spite of the negative consequences, mining continues unabated because it is economically important to many areas.37 The future environmental costs provide a major challenge in creating a sustainable system. Relegating at least some mining companies to near-Earth asteroids would reduce the negative effects of future mining levels on Earth. The economic benefits of mining need not be sacrificed for the sake of the environment.38

#### Terrestrial resource scarcity goes nuclear---we outweigh on timeframe, just the prospect of shortages triggers escalation.

Klare 13 [Michael T., The Nation’s defense correspondent, is professor emeritus of peace and world-security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association in Washington, D.C. His newest book, All Hell Breaking Loose: The Pentagon’s Perspective on Climate Change, will be published this fall. 2013. “How Resource Scarcity and Climate Change Could Produce a Global Explosion,” <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/how-resource-scarcity-and-climate-change-could-produce-global-explosion/>] brett

Brace yourself. You may not be able to tell yet, but according to global experts and the US intelligence community, the earth is already shifting under you. Whether you know it or not, you’re on a new planet, a resource-shock world of a sort humanity has never before experienced.

Two nightmare scenarios—a global scarcity of vital resources and the onset of extreme climate change—are already beginning to converge and in the coming decades are likely to produce a tidal wave of unrest, rebellion, competition and conflict. Just what this tsunami of disaster will look like may, as yet, be hard to discern, but experts warn of “water wars” over contested river systems, global food riots sparked by soaring prices for life’s basics, mass migrations of climate refugees (with resulting anti-migrant violence) and the breakdown of social order or the collapse of states. At first, such mayhem is likely to arise largely in Africa, Central Asia and other areas of the underdeveloped South, but in time, all regions of the planet will be affected.

To appreciate the power of this encroaching catastrophe, it’s necessary to examine each of the forces that are combining to produce this future cataclysm.

Resource Shortages and Resource Wars

Start with one simple given: the prospect of future scarcities of vital natural resources, including energy, water, land, food and critical minerals. This in itself would guarantee social unrest, geopolitical friction and war.

It is important to note that absolute scarcity doesn’t have to be on the horizon in any given resource category for this scenario to kick in. A lack of adequate supplies to meet the needs of a growing, ever more urbanized and industrialized global population is enough. Given the wave of extinctions that scientists are recording, some resources—particular species of fish, animals and trees, for example—will become less abundant in the decades to come, and may even disappear altogether. But key materials for modern civilization like oil, uranium and copper will simply prove harder and more costly to acquire, leading to supply bottlenecks and periodic shortages.

Oil—the single most important commodity in the international economy—provides an apt example. Although global oil supplies may actually grow in the coming decades, many experts doubt that they can be expanded sufficiently to meet the needs of a rising global middle class that is, for instance, expected to buy millions of new cars in the near future. In its 2011 World Energy Outlook, the International Energy Agency claimed that an anticipated global oil demand of 104 million barrels per day in 2035 will be satisfied. This, the report suggested, would be thanks in large part to additional supplies of “unconventional oil” (Canadian tar sands, shale oil and so on), as well as 55 million barrels of new oil from fields “yet to be found” and “yet to be developed.”

However, many analysts scoff at this optimistic assessment, arguing that rising production costs (for energy that will be ever more difficult and costly to extract), environmental opposition, warfare, corruption and other impediments will make it extremely difficult to achieve increases of this magnitude. In other words, even if production manages for a time to top the 2010 level of 87 million barrels per day, the goal of 104 million barrels will never be reached and the world’s major consumers will face virtual, if not absolute, scarcity.

Water provides another potent example. On an annual basis, the supply of drinking water provided by natural precipitation remains more or less constant: about 40,000 cubic kilometers. But much of this precipitation lands on Greenland, Antarctica, Siberia and inner Amazonia where there are very few people, so the supply available to major concentrations of humanity is often surprisingly limited. In many regions with high population levels, water supplies are already relatively sparse. This is especially true of North Africa, Central Asia and the Middle East, where the demand for water continues to grow as a result of rising populations, urbanization and the emergence of new water-intensive industries. The result, even when the supply remains constant, is an environment of increasing scarcity.

Wherever you look, the picture is roughly the same: supplies of critical resources may be rising or falling, but rarely do they appear to be outpacing demand, producing a sense of widespread and systemic scarcity. However generated, a perception of scarcity—or imminent scarcity—regularly leads to anxiety, resentment, hostility and contentiousness. This pattern is very well understood, and has been evident throughout human history.

In his book Constant Battles, for example, Steven LeBlanc, director of collections for Harvard’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, notes that many ancient civilizations experienced higher levels of warfare when faced with resource shortages brought about by population growth, crop failures or persistent drought. Jared Diamond, author of the bestseller Collapse, has detected a similar pattern in Mayan civilization and the Anasazi culture of New Mexico’s Chaco Canyon. More recently, concern over adequate food for the home population was a significant factor in Japan’s invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and Germany’s invasions of Poland in 1939 and the Soviet Union in 1941, according to Lizzie Collingham, author of The Taste of War.

Although the global supply of most basic commodities has grown enormously since the end of World War II, analysts see the persistence of resource-related conflict in areas where materials remain scarce or there is anxiety about the future reliability of supplies. Many experts believe, for example, that the fighting in Darfur and other war-ravaged areas of North Africa has been driven, at least in part, by competition among desert tribes for access to scarce water supplies, exacerbated in some cases by rising population levels.

“In Darfur,” says a 2009 report from the UN Environment Programme on the role of natural resources in the conflict, “recurrent drought, increasing demographic pressures, and political marginalization are among the forces that have pushed the region into a spiral of lawlessness and violence that has led to 300,000 deaths and the displacement of more than two million people since 2003.”

Anxiety over future supplies is often also a factor in conflicts that break out over access to oil or control of contested undersea reserves of oil and natural gas. In 1979, for instance, when the Islamic revolution in Iran overthrew the Shah and the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, Washington began to fear that someday it might be denied access to Persian Gulf oil. At that point, President Jimmy Carter promptly announced what came to be called the Carter Doctrine. In his 1980 State of the Union Address, Carter affirmed that any move to impede the flow of oil from the Gulf would be viewed as a threat to America’s “vital interests” and would be repelled by “any means necessary, including military force.”

In 1990, this principle was invoked by President George H.W. Bush to justify intervention in the first Persian Gulf War, just as his son would use it, in part, to justify the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Today, it remains the basis for US plans to employ force to stop the Iranians from closing the Strait of Hormuz, the strategic waterway connecting the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean through which about 35 percent of the world’s seaborne oil commerce passes.

Recently, a set of resource conflicts have been rising toward the boiling point between China and its neighbors in Southeast Asia when it comes to control of offshore oil and gas reserves in the South China Sea. Although the resulting naval clashes have yet to result in a loss of life, a strong possibility of military escalation exists. A similar situation has also arisen in the East China Sea, where China and Japan are jousting for control over similarly valuable undersea reserves. Meanwhile, in the South Atlantic Ocean, Argentina and Britain are once again squabbling over the Falkland Islands (called Las Malvinas by the Argentinians) because oil has been discovered in surrounding waters.

By all accounts, resource-driven potential conflicts like these will only multiply in the years ahead as demand rises, supplies dwindle and more of what remains will be found in disputed areas. In a 2012 study titled Resources Futures, the respected British think-tank Chatham House expressed particular concern about possible resource wars over water, especially in areas like the Nile and Jordan River basins where several groups or countries must share the same river for the majority of their water supplies and few possess the wherewithal to develop alternatives. “Against this backdrop of tight supplies and competition, issues related to water rights, prices, and pollution are becoming contentious,” the report noted. “In areas with limited capacity to govern shared resources, balance competing demands, and mobilize new investments, tensions over water may erupt into more open confrontations.”