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### K

#### We are dynamic – overtime, affective encounters shape subjectivity. The 1ACs transcendental invocation of identity imposes sameness onto a chaotic world which fails and concedes to fascism.

**Jun** – Jun, Nathan. “Deleuze, Values, and Normativity.”, Agastya

The primary focus of Deleuze’s early works is metaphysics and the history of philosophy. Nevertheless, a few ideas from these works are worth noting in brief detail in order to understand Deleuze’s later, more explicitly moral-theoretical endeavors. **The** rest is Deleuze’s critique of the subject. **Liberal political philosophy** – not to speak of modern philosophy more generally – **begins with the concept of the individual, self-identical subject** (as opposed to non-subjective concepts such as essences, substances, or, in the political realm, sovereigns). Within this framework, **the subject is not only conceptually distinct from the world but substantially distinct; it is**, in a word, **beyond** or transcendent of **it**. This is because the subject (which is immaterial and active) constitutes the world (which is physical and passive). To this extent, moreover, **the subject is superior to the world because it gives form and content to an otherwise empty and inert “prime matter.”** Deleuze denies this dualistic picture of reality. Following Spinoza, he instead claims that there is only one Being or substance which expresses itself differentially through an infinite number of attributes (chief among them thought and exten- sion) which are in turn expressed through an infinite number of modes. **Because Being is univocal, the world and everything it contains** – from physical objects to mental constructions – **cannot be articulated in terms of relations of self-contained identity** (Deleuze 1994: 36–40). It does not follow from anything, it is not subordinated to anything, and it does not resemble anything; it expresses and is expressed in turn: ¶ Expression is on the one hand an explication, an unfolding of what expresses itself, the One manifesting itself in the Many . . . Its multiple expression, on the other hand, involves Unity. The One remains involved in whatever expresses it, imprinted in what unfolds it, immanent in whatever manifests it. (Deleuze 1990b: 16) ¶ **All being is immanent; there is no transcendence, thus there are no self-contained identities outside the world** (gods, values, subjectivities, etc.) **that determine or constitute it** (Deleuze 1983: 147). Furthermore, substance is at root a difference that exists virtually in the past and is actualized in various modes in the present.7 These modes are not stable identities but multiplicities, differences, complicated intersections of forces. As Daniel Smith notes: **“There is no universal or transcendental subject, which could function as the bearer of universal human rights, but only variable and historically diverse ‘processes of subjectivation’”** (Smith 2003: 307). ¶ 94 Deleuze and Ethics ¶ **The** Cartesio-**Kantian subject which underlies modern politico-philosophical thought** is therefore a fiction. It **neither transcends the world nor is transcended by anything else in turn**. But there is another key concept that underlies much modern thought – **the concept of rationality**. Simply put, rationality **involves an alleged direction** of t **between our thoughts and the world** (theoretical rationality) **or between our** desires/**moral beliefs and our actions** (practical rationality). Both con- ceptions involve the idea of representation – our thoughts are rational to the extent that they accurately represent the world (i.e., are true); our actions, in turn, are rational to the extent that they accurately rep- resent our desires/moral beliefs.8 Ever since Kant, moral **philosophers** have **tended to regard rationality as the foundation of normativity**. As Christine Korsgaard puts it: ¶ Strictly speaking, **we do not disapprove the action because it is vicious; instead, it is vicious because we disapprove it.** Since morality is grounded in human sentiments, **the normative question cannot be whether its dictates are true. Instead, it is whether we have reason to be glad that we have such sentiments, and to allow ourselves to be governed by them.** (Korsgaard 1996: 50) ¶ The point here is that an immoral action – one which we ought not to perform – is one which we have a rational reason not to perform. What distinguishes normativity from conventional modes of practical reasoning is the universalizable or categorical nature of the rational reason in question – i.e., the fact that in all relevantly similar circum- stances it applies equally to all moral agents at all times. Typically **this rational reason has taken the form of a universal moral principle**, such as Kant’s categorical imperative (“so act on that maxim which you can at the same time will to be a universal law”) or Bentham’s principle of utility (“act so as to bring about the greatest happiness for the greatest number”). It is precisely **this universal and abstract character** which **makes normativity “transcendent”** in the sense outlined earlier. ¶ Deleuze regards this concept of rationality, no less than the concept of the subject, as a fiction: “Representation fails to capture the affirmed world of difference. Representation has only a single center, a unique and receding perspective, and in consequence a false depth. It mediates everything, but mobilizes and moves nothing” (Deleuze 1994: 55–6). The problem with **this “dogmatic image of thought”** is that it **relies on representation, and difference** (read: substance) cannot be represented through linguistic categories. **This** is because linguistic **categorization assumes that the things it aims to represent are fixed,** stable, and ¶ Deleuze, Values, and Normativity 95 ¶ self-identical, which, as we noted above, they are not. The difference at the heart of being is uid, constantly over owing the boundaries of representation.9 In the place of representational language, Deleuze offers what he calls a “logic of sense” (which, for the sake of brevity, we shall not explore here.)10 Deleuze’s political philosophy, as outlined in the two volumes of Capitalism and Schizophrenia co-authored with Guattari,11 may be seen as an extension of his earlier ontology. Like all of Deleuze’s works, the Capitalism and Schizophrenia volumes are so formidably dense and complicated that we cannot begin to do justice to them in an essay of this size. Instead we will limit ourselves to a brief “thematic overview” of those ideas and concepts which are relevant to understanding the role of normativity in Deleuzian philosophy. ¶ Just as **Deleuze** **replaces the** foundational modern concept of identity with the concept of difference, so does he replace the **concept of the individual subject with other concepts such as the machine**. In Deleuze’s ontology, **individuals, communities, states, and the various relations that obtain among them are all understood as machines or machinic processes. Unlike an organism, which is “a bounded whole with an identity and an end**,” and unlike a mechanism, which is “a closed machine with a speci c function,” a machine is “nothing more than its connec- tions; it is not made by anything, and has no closed identity” (Colebrook 2002: 56; cf. Deleuze and Guattari 1977: 1). Whereas **liberalism regards the relation between individuals and society mechanistically** (i.e., as a “speci c set of connections”) **or organically** (i.e., “as a self-organizing whole”), **Deleuze regards this relation machinically** (i.e., “as only one level of connections that can be discussed”) (May 2005: 123). **Unlike the static, self-contained, and transcendental subject of liberal theory, machines are fluid, mobile, and dynamic; they** are **capable** of **changing, of connecting and reconnecting with other machines, they are immanent to the connections they make, and vice versa.** In creating these connec- tions, moreover, machines produce and are produced by desires (hence “desiring-machines”). **The liberal subject consents to be governed because it lacks the ability to realize its own interests independently** of the state. **Machines, in contrast, “do not operate out of lack. They do not seek to ful ll needs. Instead they produce connections.** Moreover, the connections they produce are not pre-given ... Machines are productive **in unpredictable and often novel ways**” (May 2005: 125). ¶

#### Thus, the role of the ballot is to reject the liberal subject. Our theory of the subject constrains normative judgements – moral theories must account for the nature of the self which takes action first.

#### Vote negative to embrace actuality ecology – this disrupts their majoritarian conception of subjecthood by recognizing our micropolitical affective investments and becoming molecules in political pack assemblages.

MacCormack – Patricia MacCormack, 2009 MacCormack is a professor of Continental Philosophy at Anglia Ruskin University, she researches continental philosophy, feminism, queer theory, posthumanism, body modification, among other subjects. She is a visiting Leverhulme Fellow at the University of California, Santa Barbara. “Vitalistic Feminethics: Materiality, Mediation and the End of Necrophilosophy” in “Deleuze and Law – Forensic Futures” edited by Rosi Bradotti, Claire Colebrook, and Patrick Hanafin, Agastya

Benhabib’s formulation of a context-specific ethics – interactive not legislative (Benhabib, 1992, p. 6) – encourages an application of Deleuze and Guattari’s theory of becoming and its focus on specificity, intensity and unique intersections, within an ethical and ‘real-life’, social context or ecology. Mediation is a constant consideration of concrete specificities as they intersect, not economically but in terms of quality and movement. Deleuze recognises meditative ecology: ‘Not becoming unearthly. But becoming all the more earthly by inventing laws of liquids and gases on which the earth depends.’3 **Deleuze points to the application of theories of becoming and mediation as** directly affective of real bodies and real situations **in movement – finite existential territories and machinic phyla – not philosophical** or reflective conceptual versions of becoming. This actuality ecology encompasses what Braidotti emphasises: ‘Here **the focus is more on the experience and the potential becoming of real women in all of their diverse ways of understanding and inhabiting the position “woman”’** (Braidotti, 1994, p. 115). **Actuality ecology involves the slowing of time, of tactics which are modest and thus possible to concretise**, and of the mobilisation of pack assemblages, devolved animal-humans, rather than the ‘so individual it is no longer completely there as human’ post-human. **Feminism, queer, animal rights and other mobilisations of reified maps are pack deterritorialisations of existential territories – inextricably actual and theoretical, politically, aesthetically, activist, creatively** (and actually risky for being so). While one may argue that the philosopher activates change because thought is material and thinking is inextricable from action, **the body able to be hurt, deprived or die is the point at which the real of hermeneutic subjectivity both haunts and is irrefutably maintained in all philosophies**. To activate material vitalistic philosophy the vitalism of the assemblage must colonise that irresistible point of self-maintenance located primarily in the flesh – all we are and all we need to live. Corporeal philosophy introduces the hitherto ignored, repressed and overcome. Autonomy defined through legally owning our own bodies is precisely what we must refuse in order to negotiate ethically being a self as not others. We must become molecular and one molecule **in a political assemblage, a molecule in a pack such as the pack of feminism, of anti-racism, of animal rights, of queer-rights**. Real flesh has been the site of prejudice, isomorphic annexation and suffering. It is purely **because of the flesh – its use and its minoritarian status visually and conceptually – that suffering and death has been experienced.** The animal slaughtered or experimented on, the woman impregnated, raped or beaten, **the racial other starved or murdered, the queer denied human rights** have all been made to suffer corporeally and cease to exist through the maintenance of majoritarian ideology. This ideology is a material philosophy. We should not focus on the victim, **becomings are not victimhoods but tactical entry points** (although the prevention of the making dead of the victims is nonetheless an inherent quality of becomings). Majoritarian systems need to be the focus of change, not just the immediate rights for preserving potential victims within those systems. **We must take care not to martyr ourselves. Claiming we shall sacrifice our ‘oneness’ simply makes the value of that oneness consistent. If it is not sustained it cannot be part of the assemblage and while not wanting to overvalue the one that is us, we should not underestimate the more-than-one-less-than-one, which is our ability to act as part of assemblages. We are sustained in our becomings not in our beings.** Activism changes paradigms but also attempts to preserve the life of other individuals at local and micro levels. Ethics demands that we seek to decentre molar systems of majoritarianism which oppress ‘women’, ‘animals’ and so forth as groups but also actively affect single instances of suffering and life. The sustaining self encourages these new assemblages which in turn sustain themselves and that with which they subsequently make connections. Sustainability forms both local and overarching assemblages. Sustainability raises ‘the challenge here of how to think in terms of processes, not of entities or single substances, at both the social and symbolic levels’ (Braidotti, 2006, p. 206, cites Becker and Jahn).

## 2

### T

#### Interpretation – Affirmatives must demonstrate how they engage efforts to advocate the plan beyond hypothetical imagination in the 1AC.

**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.

#### Vote Neg:

#### 1 – Access – privileged debaters are forced to mobilize as accomplices to minority debaters, and students confront how abstract vernacular 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.

#### Reject the team – (1) No argument to drop and (2) Strongest internal link to better norms through deterrence.

**No RVIs – (1) Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe (2) Discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting (3) Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly (4) Its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments (5) Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory – stop theory after 2n to check for 3 minute 2ar (6) They are the logic of criminalization that over-punish people-of-color for trying to create productive discourse.**

#### Competing interpretations – (1) Reasonability is arbitrary – impossible to know what is reasonable until you establish a brightline (2) Bites judge intervention – they have to gut check what they think is good (3) Collapses – you use offense/defense to evaluate offense under the brightline (4) Norms – you can sidestep norms by selectively choosing a different brightline you meet every round.

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

## 3

### Theory

#### Interpretation – Affirmatives must define *private entities* in a delineated card in the 1AC.

UpCounsel ND – “Private Entity: Everything You Need to Know”. UpCounsel (interactive online service that makes it faster and easier for businesses to find and hire legal help). No Date. Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.upcounsel.com/private-entity> //Xu

A private entity can be a partnership, corporation, individual, nonprofit organization, company, or any other organized group that is not government-affiliated. Indian tribes and foreign public entities are not considered private entities.

Unlike publicly traded companies, private companies do not have public stock offerings on Nasdaq, American Stock Exchange, or the New York Stock Exchange. Instead, they offer shares privately to interested investors, who may trade among themselves.

Private Company vs. Private Entity

The Companies Act of 2013 governs the registration of private companies.

This type of company is formed by following the steps laid out by this law.

Private entities are determined not by this law but by ownership and holding. For example, sole proprietorships and partnerships are designed as private entities.

A private entity is not necessarily a private company, but all private companies are private entities.

How Private Entities Work

Although private companies can be of any size, they often include a small group of chosen investors who may include employees, colleagues, friends and family, and other interested parties. If this type of company needs funding to grow, it may seek it from venture capital firms or from large institutional investors. Some private companies eventually decide to go public with an initial public offering (IPO) of stock shares on a public exchange. Sometimes, public companies go private when a large investor buys a bulk of the outstanding stock shares and plans to remove them from public exchanges.

How FOIA Affects Private Entities

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is a federal law that requires certain agencies to provide certain types of records to any person who asks. Major government bodies such as federal courts and Congress are exempt from FOIA. Some state agencies are also exempt depending on state laws governing public records. In general, FOIA applies to:

Federal, state, and local government agencies, such as the Federal Communications Commission.

Certain state legislatures depending on the laws in those states.

Most private entities are not bound by federal FOIA laws. However, these laws may apply to private entities involved in government business. This situation occurred in Colorado in 2000, when a nonprofit corporation was required by the state's Court of Appeals to share documents related to a project it was working on with the city of Denver.

**Prefer:**

#### 1 – Stable Advocacy – they can redefine in the 1AR to wriggle out of DAs which kills high-quality engagement. We lose access to Tech Race DAs, Asteroid DAs, case turns, and core Process CPs that have varying definitions – outweighs on reversibility since the 2NR can’t compensate after absurd 1AR shifts.

#### CX can’t resolve this because (A) Not flowed so it’s non-verifiable (B) Skews 6 min of prep during the AC which is irreciprocal (C) They can lie and no way to check (D) Debaters are trained by coaches to be shifty.

#### 2 – Real World – Policy makers must specify the entity that they are recognizing. It also means zero solvency – absent spec, private entities can circumvent since there is no delineated way to enforce the aff and means their solvency can’t actualize.

#### 3 – Resolvability – Constantly morphing advocacies makes debate impossible because the judge doesn’t know what you defend or if a DA even links – comes first because the judge has to pick a winner and loser.

#### Independently, P-Spec isn’t regressive since (1) Determines the scope of the AFF which is core topic lit (2) Novices specify details about the plan which proves it’s grounded in LD norms. Also, infinite regress tailors optimal norms which outweighs on duration.

## 4

#### Interp – debaters must delineate theory interps in cite boxes

#### Violation they don’t - screenshots

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

#### Prefer

#### 1] Norming – a) predictability – knowing what shells you read allows me to know about what theory norms that you want to set instead of going into round without any idea of how to test your norm and ensures setting the best norms b) spillover – disclosing shells allow for your norms to proliferate by letting debaters see what norms are good and OW since it’s a sequencing question to other voters

#### 2] substance crowdout – knowing what interps to meet by disclosing them allows me to meet them instead of forcing you to read a shell which decks topic ed and ow on time frame since we only have 2 months to talk about the topic