### 1

#### The meta ethic is to avoid ontological gap between the real and symbolic

Answers prag since it doesn’t bridge the abstract with reality, asnwers meta ethic since just cuz people use it doenst mean it controls ethics

#### Ethics must begin absent signifiers

#### 1] Ideological Paradox – aesthetic abstraction subverts itself through signifiers.

Kim 1 (Chang-Hee Kim, The Fantasy of Asian America: Identity, Ideology, and Desire) 2009 //Nato

The performative transformation of the geisha into Madame Butterfly is made possible by concealing her traumatic ontological dimension as abandoned Oriental concubine. The iconic figure of Madame Butterfly is thus what represses the disturbing protuberance of the Real in the hegemonic order of Western modernity and successfully integrates the uncontrollable truth into the consistent universal of the Symbolic. Such an ideological effect of sublimation or aesthetic abstraction, however, cannot but expose its symptom which Žižek defines as “a particular element which subverts its own universal foundation, a species subverting its own genus” (TSOI 21). This subversive symptom is manifest in the problematic character of Rene Gallimard in Hwang’s M. Butterfly. Puccini’s opera bears witness to the ideological embodiment of Butterfly 76 the sublime as resurrected from the dead body of the Oriental geisha. It has showed us how the geisha transforms into the immortal signifier of Orientalism via her deathly sacrifice for her American lover. On the contrary, Hwang’s deconstructionist drama demonstrates how the universal signifier of colonial fantasy ends up as a pathological symptom of ideological paradox that subverts the very universal itself

#### 2] Desire Paradox – Fantasy to obtain the symbolic identity fails and leads to destruction. Subjects fundamentally resist and is not concerned what the impacts.

Kim 2 (Chang-Hee Kim, The Fantasy of Asian America: Identity, Ideology, and Desire) 2009 //Nato

Gallimard’s fear of seeing Song naked is attributed to his symptomatic anxiety that he is unable to live up to the hegemonic discourse that constitutes his symbolic identity as white heterosexual, and his queer identity as homosexual, transgender, and trans-racial lets him lose his ontological consistency in the Symbolic, which leads him to self-destruction. In 83 psychoanalytic terms, a symptom appears as a signifying formation that the power discourse confers on its meaning to interpret and cure. Given that, the subject is the locus of symptom insofar as its ontological substance is constituted and disciplined by the ideological discourse of the Symbolic and works as its agent. On the contrary, fantasy is an inert construction that cannot be analyzed and resists interpretation. It refers to a fundamental desire of the subject to resist the remedial interpretation of eruptive symptoms and to secure the distance from the Symbolic while making efforts to repress its own ontological gap (TSOI 74). In this sense, fantasy represents the subject’s ontological paradox that obscures the ontological binary of subjective and objective. Fantasy comes out as the projection of secret desire in the dominant discourse of the Symbolic onto the subject, through which the desire staged in fantasy becomes not only the subject’s own but also others’. Thus, the fundamental question of desire is concerned not so much with what I want as with what others want from me or what am I for those others (HRL 49)

#### 3] Power Paradox – trying to explain and solve for antagonisms fail since it leaves no room for the subject to be unidentifiable which makes it stuck in a cycle of violence.

Kim 3 (Chang-Hee Kim, The Fantasy of Asian America: Identity, Ideology, and Desire) 2009 //Nato

In light of racial identification, the apparitional power of fantasy operates paradoxically with a double function. First, it creates the gap of the subject between real and symbolic. Second, it disavows inherent antagonisms in the community by attempting to close the gap, turning its members into all identifiable subjects naturally belonging to it. In Orientalism, for instance, Edward Said criticizes a Western tradition of colonialism for producing knowledge about the East as an imagined construct that all “Eastern” societies are fundamentally similar insofar as they are conceptualized as antithetical to the Western counterparts. His point, though, is not that the a priori knowledge called Orientalism distorts some Oriental essence; rather, Orientalism, as he puts it, “operates as representations” (273). Granted, the reason that Western knowledge of the East becomes problematic is not so much that the West distorts some sort of the primordial essence of the East; rather, it is that its hegemonic system of representation is arbitrarily closing the gap between the real (unidentifiable) and the symbolic (representable) of the East, leaving no room for the East to be otherwise, 35 namely, to be further imaginable as something the West is not in the know about. Here, the notion of the real is an imaginary entity that always comes after the signification of the symbolic as a social construct, such that the real structurally originates in the unknowable gap with the symbolic. In other words, the Western fantasy of the East gives birth to the symbolic essence of the East via Orientalism by turning the East into an identifiable form of knowledge, getting rid of an imaginary essence believed to remain un-representable and unidentifiable. At the same time, such a hegemonic system of Western representation of the East also creates a fantasy about the indefinable entity of imaginary essence, the real, of the East leaving the gap open. Within this paradoxical framework, the East as an object of representation becomes stuck within the endless circle of Orientalism by being neither the fully Orientalism-free East nor the East as an authentic Western knowledge.

#### Thus the standard is embrace Charlie Chan’s subjectless and hauntological position

#### Prefer additionally

#### 1] Inclusion – Charlie Chan is key to inspiration to expand values and inclusion which o/w since debate needs to be accessible.

Kim 6 (Chang-Hee Kim, The Fantasy of Asian America: Identity, Ideology, and Desire) 2009 //Nato + lydia

Therefore, what is at stake in a critique of Asian American identity politics is not so much how identity politics excludes positive and legitimate subjects within itself as how the excluded in an ethnic identity come to haunt, frustrate, and inspire the subjects occupying hegemonic identitarian positions. In this sense, Charlie Chan is not only alive but also useful in the reformation of Asian America even in the twentiethfirst century. The permanent gap left excluded in Asian American identity comes to us as a promise for the possibility of expanding the democratic values in liberal society and, as Judith Butler puts it, “rendering [our polity] more inclusive, more dynamic and more concrete” (“RU” 13). What should be noted is that these possibilities do not always come from the outside in a way that alternative subjects, writings, and politics continue to flow in or develop by expanding the territorial space of Asian America in terms of race, gender, sex, and geography; rather, my point is that they are more often than not already immanent in the current identity-based politics of Asian America, waiting to 50 awake, rise, and get illuminated and thus adding to Asian American literary studies unknowingly ignored meanings and methodologies of Asian American critique. In a broad sense, this is what my dissertation contributes to the extant scholarship of Asian American literary studies.

#### 2] Lexicality – Charlie Chan is the center of Asian America which is the world we live in today, everything is defined in relation to it.

Kim 7 (Chang-Hee Kim, The Fantasy of Asian America: Identity, Ideology, and Desire) 2009 //Nato + Lydia

As a paradoxical figure of hauntology, Charlie Chan would never disappear, if not becoming a legend. No Asian American can possibly exist without his ghost lurking behind him insofar as his refashioning of self-identity as performing “resistance and rebellion,” on the one hand, becomes realized as antithetical to Chan, and on the other, becomes affiliated indispensably with him. I consider that Chan is what makes Asian Americans keep becoming themselves, incessantly haunting and inspiring them as the primordial figure of origin; at the same time, the configuration of Chan as imagined and primordial prevents them from fully being him in their effort to overcome him. 29 Moreover, the gap of their being and becoming Chan is in fact an ontological point of reference where the usefulness and effectiveness of the identity-bounded cultural nationalism of Asian America could originate, has become obsolete, and in turn, recently started yielding diverse attempts to replace itself with alternative politics. That is to say, Charlie Chan is not simply a fictional character in U.S. popular culture that reflects the racism and ignorance of white America about Asian America; the hauntological power of his pervasiveness and permanence in American society transforms him, paradoxically, into an archetype.

#### Negate – Subjectless position deconstructs identity in pursuit of justice which means there’s no distinction between states, private entities, earth, and space.

Kim 8 (Chang-Hee Kim, The Fantasy of Asian America: Identity, Ideology, and Desire) 2009 //Nato + lydia

Evidently, Asian American women scholars have attempted to unravel the dilemma via a paradigm shift of rethinking Asian American identity as an abstract mode of theoretical analysis. Among the leading scholars is Kandice Chuh, author of Imagine Otherwise: On Asian Americanist Critique published in 2003. In her book, Chuh advocates the necessity for deconstructing the identity-based category of Asian America in terms of what she calls a “subjectless analysis.” As an idea to dispel a uniform subjectivity, this notion challenges Asian American representation as stable, monolithic, and essentialist. Her call for the new paradigm to reconsider Asian America aims at breaking from the existing identity-based configuration of the ethnic nation; it is focused on “advancing and engaging in practices of liberation and freedom” (115) to promote the critical investigation of naturalized categories. She writes, “[W]hat is needed is not identity but a commitment to combating states of domination, to unifying for the sake not of the self but in the endless pursuit of justice” (148). Chuh’s ambitious articulation of “subjectlessness” becomes an effective tool for dismantling the extant politics of Asian American identity, achieving its persuasive power to move Asian American critique beyond the framework of the nation. Theoretically, Chuh’s notion of “subjectless discourse” is considered an effective way that helps reconfigure Asian America in a more flexible3 way and thus make its members break from the established category of race and thus dispel the cultural nationalism of identity politics. Besides, the notion of “subjectless” subjectivity enables Asian Americans to set their political position against white racist America to combat social injustice in the rather humanitarian sense that they are defined in terms of not racial but un-decidable identity in pursuit of endless social justice. In this framework, Asian American studies turns into the forms of critique (Chuh 61) that help its members develop into an un-decidable subject that refuses to get confined within the ethnic framework of identity-based Asian America. In other words, Chuh’s theoretical concept of “subjectless-ness” can operate as unraveling the limits of an identity-based politics of resistance while doing justice to subaltern subjects, in light of the recognition of difference, which includes victims of intra-racial racism within Asian America. Given them all, I agree with Nhi Lieu on Chuh: “Contending that Asian Americanist discourse must move beyond celebratory representations, Chuh convincingly argues that the field must confront and grapple with the contradictory politics at play in complex depictions of race” (495). Chuh’s idea of “subjectless analysis” is convincing to an extent that that Asian American subjects cannot be categorized in a uniform way for their heterogeneous historiographies, variant political interests, and uneven relations with one another. In reality, the oppositional political embodiment of Asian America is in nature so multifarious, contradictory, and even antagonistic as to cause even intraethnic conflicts as witnessed in the case of the controversy over Lois-Ann Yamanaka’s novel Blu’s Hanging at the 1998 Association for Asian American Studies Conference in Hawai‘i.4 This dissertation reconsiders how rethinking Asian Americans as subjectless might be realized not only theoretically but also practically. At stake is how we would possibly conceptualize the way in which Asian Americans remain so subjectless literally as to become non-Asian Americans within the national framework of becoming American. Chuh’s argument for conceiving of Asian American studies as subjectless discourse drives from her rejection of the current uniform formation of Asian America, which results from her insistent rejection of any forms of nationalism (127). Yet it should be also noted that this makes its ethnic members un-decidable subjects without sets of stable differences to identify them in repudiation of ethnic essentialism. My point is to what extent we could imagine political, if neither national nor racial, incentives to motivate the un-decidable subjects to collectively combine together, via not so much identity as un-decidability (83), against the already nationalized and racialized establishment of American nationalism. Chuh’s investment of subjectless discourse, in shifting Asian American studies away from the identity-based nation of Asian America, consequently, ends up in self-contradiction. More specifically, it comes to a stalemate that both the demand for social justice of equating subjectless difference with equality and its impossibility considering that the U.S. body politic takes on and exploits racial difference contradict each other. It is not to mention that in such a colonial context, Asian America is subject to having limited access to full citizenship by remaining racialized, marginalized, and ghettoized from the mainstream.

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted – there’s always an institutional DA to going through Congress c) ought means “moral obligation” so the lack of that obligation means the aff hasn’t fulfilled their burden d) resolved indicates “firmly determined” which means they proactively did something, to negate that means that they aren’t resolved e) permissibility can’t affirm since then anything would be ok which would justify racism – we should be safe and do nothing. f) to negate means to deny the truth of which means if the aff is false you vote neg

### 2

#### 1] Their strategy of quick, blippy, hidden arguments exclude people with learning disabilities

Thompson 15 Terrence Lonam April 21, 2015 “Miscellaneous Thoughts from the Disorganized Mind of Marshall Thompson” http://nsdupdate.com/2015/04/21/miscellaneous-thoughts-from-the-disorganized-mind-of-marshall-thompson/

First, I think that evaluating who is the better debater via who dropped spikes excludes lots of specific individuals, especially those with learning disabilities. I have both moderate dyslexia and extreme dysgraphia. Despite debating for four years with a lot of success I was never able to deal with spikes. I could not ‘mind-sweep’ because my flow was not clear enough to find the arguments I needed, and I was simply too slow a reader to be able to reread through the relevant parts of a case during prep-time. I was very lucky, my junior year (which was the first year I really competed on the national circuit) spikes were remarkably uncommon. Looking back it was in many ways the low-point for spike. They started to be used some my senior year but not anything like the extent they are used today. I am entirely confident, however, in saying that if spikes had had anywhere near the same prevalence when I started doing ‘circuit’ debate as they do now, I—with the specific ways that dyslexia/dysgraphia has affected me—would never have bothered to try to debate national circuit LD (I don’t intend to imply this is the same for anyone who has dyslexia or dysgraphia, the particular ways that learning disabilities manifest is often difficult to track). Now, the mere fact that I would have been prevented from succeeding in the activity and possibly from being able to enjoyably compete is not an argument. I never would have been able to succeed at calligraphy, but I would hardly claim we should therefore not make the calligraphy club about handwriting. Instead, what I am suggesting is that the values that debate cares about and should be assessing are not questions of handwriting or notation. We expect notation instrumentally to avoid intervention, but it is not one of the ends of debate in itself. Thus, if there is a viable principle upon which we can decrease this strategic dimension of spikes but maintain non-intervention I think we should do so. I was ‘good’ at philosophy, ‘good’ at argument generation, ‘good’ at research, ‘good’ at casing, ‘great’ at framework comparison etc. It seems to me that as long as I can flow well enough to easily follow a non-tricky aff it was proper that my learning disabilities not be an obstacle to my success. (One other thing to note, while I was a ‘framework debater’ who could never have been good at spikes because of my learning disability I have never met a ‘tricky debater’ who could not have succeeded in debate without tricks simply in virtue of their intelligence and technical proficiency; that is perhaps another reason to favor my account.)

#### Vote them down – inclusion is a tangible out-of-round impact distinct from the procedural aspects of debate – it’s key to minority participation.

#### 2] Theoretical – turns fairness and education because tricks avoid education that happens in the debate and makes it to where if we drop one we lose which decks fairness

#### 3] Spikes that aren’t on top are a voting issue- it means I have to wait for the 1ac to finish to formulate a strategy since I don’t know what your going to read which moots 6 min of prep

#### 4] Spikes that weren’t disclosed are a voting issue- prevents us from rigorously testing your norm and incentivizes surprise tactics

#### 5] Under views are a voting issue—one small theory analytic can take out huge chunks of the 1nc which kills substantive clash

#### 6] New 2NR Responses- A] none of the spikes have a clear implication in the 1ac B] It’s key to robustly contest their norm. C] Stops them from hiding tricks in random parts of the aff

#### 7] Negating is harder so auto reject aff fairness claims- they have a 2ar judge psychology advantage and have infinite prep before round

#### 8] RVI’s on each spike- otherwise they can read the most absurd paradigm issues for 6 min and are never held accountable

#### 9] The role of the negative is to contradict the aff – weighing means that u don’t prefer one side

#### 10] No invincible 2NR – the 2ar has judge persuasion and the last word

#### 11] DTA – a] most logical since it’s the violation b] reciprocity – takes the same amount of time to read c] arbitrary since no brightline to how much unfairness is needed to trigger the ballot

#### 12] Form over content – a] their speech-act controls the way that we understand and interpret their content, b] it shouldn’t matter how correct you are if you engaged in unethical practices along the way, both of these mean that you should evaluate the K as a side-constraint on how we view things like the aff.

#### 13] Yes 1ar theory but new 2n paradigm issues

#### A] 3 minute 2ar can sit on whatever i undercover

#### B] not infinitely abusive cuz only have 7 minutes

#### C] 13 to 13 time solves

#### D] first and last speech outweighs since judge is inclined to believe you and give

#### E] 1ar leeway which solves for time skew

#### AND TIME SKEW NOT A STANDARD – its used to justify literally every argument which outweighs on norming and means they can never rectify the skew