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#### Signifiers such as language remove us from the real --- that causes alienation when we attempt to fulfill our desires. Therefore, the role of the ballot is to endorse the best model for exposing drives.

Matheson 15 [Calum Matheson PhD, University of North Carolina, is the author of Desiring the Bomb: Communication, Psychoanalysis, and the Atomic Age. “Desired Ground Zeroes: Nuclear Imagination and the Death Drive.” 2015. Pp. 45-49.]

Jacques Lacan’s notion of the Real is notoriously difficult to define. In his book on the subject, Tom Eyers calls it the “most elusive” of Lacan’s concepts, but one that is also one that is “central” and “determining” for psychoanalysis (1). There are common elements of the various definitions. First, an agreement that both the economy of tropes that allows the conditions for meaning to emerge (the Symbolic) and the meanings and values invested in these tropes, including the subject itself (the Imaginary), do not and cannot perfectly capture all of existence or experience. Second, this unassimilable remainder structures the Symbolic and Imaginary, just as they structure each other, and thus all three registers are knitted together as demonstrated in Lacan’s famous “Borromean Knot.” The Real is what escapes mediation, what disrupts language itself. To explain its significance and relationship to desire requires examining its foundational role in the formation of the subject. The Real can be understood as the constitutive lack of the subject, its separation from the rest of existence by the self-definition necessary for it to come into being in the first place. This is made clear in the mirror stage, where the subject moves from a fragmented, disorganized concept of the body to the “finally donned armor of an alienating identity that will mark his [sic] entire mental development with its rigid structure” (Lacan, “Mirror Stage” 78). The formation of a discrete subject (a function in the Imaginary register) is a compromise. Its formation allows for participation in the Symbolic because to participate in that economy of exchange requires a “social I” (Lacan, “Mirror stage,” 79). This participation comes at the cost of alienation because the subject trades in a world of symbols which by their nature stand in for what is not present, and thus inescapably mediate the (Real) world outside of the subject, rather than making it present. This lack built in to the subject is the engine of desire: the subject’s divide from an object is a prerequisite for the desire of such an object, but the condition of mediation makes it impossible to ever incorporate it in a perfectly satisfying way. Thus desire remains unfulfilled and each chase for a symbol leads to another in loop which the very constitution of the subject dictates must be endless. This is the basic operation of the death drive which is not distinct from Eros. Were the impossible to occur and the drive of Eros to be fulfilled, it would be extinguished, as there would be nothing left to desire. Thus all drives aim, in a sense, at their own extinction, and therefore there is in a sense only one—the drive that aims towards the extinction of desire through its complete fulfillment in continuity with the world that was lost when the subject became distinct from it in the mirror stage. Although the death drive might stand in for the singular character of the drive, it should not be understood as a desire for the actual biological death of the subject’s body, or even the desire to inflict death on others. The self-destruction of the death drive is a desire to break the limits of the self as the alienating armor of the subject by experiencing unmediated contact with the Real. Death still defines its operation in other ways. The last portion of Lacan’s “The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis” explains the metaphorical centrality of death as the center of a torus formed by incessant symbolization. The fort-da game is most significant not because it shows that the child wishes to destroy its mother or even inoculate itself against that possibility, but because it assimilates the child into the Symbolic order through the repetition of the signifiers fort and da, which stand in for presence and absence. Death is central to language because the symbol itself invokes the absence and loss of non- existence since its function is to stand in for something that is gone. Language swirls around this absent center of death, a primordial absence encased in the inner ring of the torus, while the outer surfaces of language hold all else that cannot be symbolized at bay on the outside (Lacan, “Function and Field” 260-264). Paradoxically, death is necessarily evoked by the symbol as that which is absent and also made possible in the first place by that same symbol. The separation of the subject into its alienating identity as a social object makes a meaningful concept of death possible because without it there is no dasein, no individual, no singular human to die. George Bataille explains this with an entomological example. If a scientist picks one fly from a swarm, that fly is subject to death, because its end means the end of the discontinuous being selected by the entomologist. Without differentiation of its members, however, the swarm lives on; the selection of the fly is for the entomologist, not the animal (Bataille, “Hegel, Death and Sacrifice” 14-16). Thus it is with human beings. The subject is founded by a rejection of its sole animal nature by participating in a world of work and accumulation, mediated by language—essentially Lacan’s Symbolic. Thus individuals are made discontinuous with the general economy of matter and energy from which all things are formed by a conceptual separation inextricably bound up in death. Our existences are thus defined by discontinuity from a world of continuity, and for Bataille as for Lacan, our drives are singular in the sense that sex is a coupling that unifies with another and momentarily overcomes discontinuity just as death is the end of the subject’s brief separation from a universe differentiated only by the dismembering violence of our imposition of symbols upon it (Bataille, Erotism 13-17). The experience of death may still be unique because it suggests the absence implied by the sign and because it can be experienced only once by the subject—and for obvious reasons, cannot be symbolized by anyone with first-hand experience. As Freud argues in “Thoughts For The Times On War and Death,” we cannot even hope to imagine our own deaths because to do so demands that we imagine them from some perspective which would be destroyed in the experience itself. Death and the Real are therefore not identical, but are closely linked. The most important characteristic of the Real is not just that it suggests existence beyond language, but that this world-for-itself (to borrow from Eugene Thacker) intrudes on human reality and reveals it to be incomplete. Encompassing Max Picard’s concept of silence, the Real is not the absence of human reality so much as the traumatic revelation that that reality was always incomplete, always feigned in the face of existence so much more than human mediation has already covered. Chris Lundberg uses Lacan’s distinction between reality, being the social world of human construction, and the Real, being the occasional but inevitable failure of that reality, to develop his own distinction between failed unicity and feigned unicity. The Symbolic operates as an economy of interconnected and mutually-referential tropes weaving a kind of fabric that is the precondition for meaning, an environment in which social relationships can be understood in context. When the unified illusion of the social fails, we are compelled to stitch the tears in that fabric to maintain the world that gives us meaning (Lacan in Public 2-3). An account by Bill Laurence, the only journalist allowed to witness the Trinity test, provides evidence for this rupture and repair. While “not a sound could be heard” for the period after the flash and before the thunder, Laurence saw civilization itself collapse in an instant: The big boom came about one hundred seconds after the great flash—the first cry of a newborn world. It brought the silent, motionless silhouettes to life, gave them a voice. A loud cry filled the air. The little groups that had hitherto stood rooted to the earth like desert plants broke into a dance—the rhythm of primitive man dancing at one of his fire festivals at the coming of spring. They clapped their hands as they leaped from the ground...The dance of the primitive man lasted but a few seconds, during which an evolutionary period of about 10,000 years telescoped. Primitive man was metamorphosed into modern man—shaking hands, slapping his fellow on the back, all laughing like happy children. (12)

#### The affirmative’s subversive project relies on a relationship of dialectical opposition between the settler and indigenous peoples, this works to sustain the settler subject as the very subject becomes an object of desire that necessitates destabilization. Their psychic investment into a reconceptualization of the settler curricular project only naturalizes new forms of settler desires, and therefore the violence of indigenization.

Veracini 8 (Lorenzo Veracini is an Associate Professor in History at Swinburne University of Technology in Melbourne, Australia, “Settler collective, founding violence and disavowal: The settler colonial situation”, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07256860802372246>, Journal of Intercultural Studies, 9/16/08) AqN

Settler Colonialism as a Project of Desire Desire (noun): a strong feeling of wanting to have something or wishing for something to happen; [mass noun] strong sexual feeling or appetite; something desired. Desire (verb) [with object]: to strongly wish for or want (something); to want (someone) sexually; (archaic) to express a wish to. Much of the scholarship on race, racialization, and settler colonialism has framed the relationship between racialized subjects and settler colonialism in legal or political terms.20 This move makes sense, considering that settler colonialism is, at base, a political project concerned with governance. For example, when Patrick Wolfe critically asserts that settler-colonial invasion is not an event, but a structure, he argues that the “event” of invasion is made permanent through technologies of governance, such as settler laws, policies, and institutions.21 Similarly, Lorenzo Veracini, when distinguishing settlerhood from migration, makes this distinction by suggesting that “settlers are founders of political orders, and carry their sovereignty with them.”22 Like Wolfe, Veracini identifies sovereignty and political governance as the feature that distinguishes settler invasion from migration. Still underexamined in the literature on settler colonialism are the kinds of emotive investments that settler subjects may have in settler coloniality. To be clear, I am not denying that settler colonialism is a political project. However, I do wish to emphasize the significance of desire, which I would argue enables settler-colonial governance and vice versa. This notion that settler colonialism is as much a project of desire as it is a purely political or legal project is certainly clear within the emergent literature on Queer Indigenous studies, which has shown how alternative models of kinship, through figures such as the berdache or two-spirit person, become objects of desire for Queer subjects searching for true or authentic selves and communities.23 For example, in his research on Queer settler subjectivities, Scott Morgensen discusses how Queer Indigenous identities are appropriated by White LGBTQ activists to serve their own goals of building Queer movements without simultaneously challenging the logics of settler colonialism.24 Similarly, in When Did Indians Become Straight? Mark Rifkin underlines how the fetishization of Native social structures by Queer settlers, or liberals more generally, is as complicit with the settler-colonial project as is the repudiation of these social structures by US imperialist politics.25 In each case, argues Rifkin, Native social practices are framed strictly through the lens of cultural difference rather than as integral to processes of governance, and Native sovereignty is undermined.26 The work of both Morgensen and Rifkin points to the ways that relations of desire sustain and reassert colonial power in settler states. For the Queer settlers discussed by Morgensen and Rifkin, it is indigeneity (or a commodified form of indigeneity) which is the object of desire.27 However, I would argue that settlerhood is also an object of desire, and settler-desires also do the work of sustaining colonial power. This is especially true in the case of the racialized subject seeking belonging in settler society or seeking access to the benefits and privileges of the settler society. Moreover, settlerhood is not only an object of desire in and of itself, but desires that are construed as natural or innate—such as “settling down” and starting a family—do the work of constituting settlerhood as natural and happenstance. It is this naturalization in particular which makes settler colonialism so tenacious. More specifically, the political relationship between “Natives” and “settlers” is sustained through the cultivation of settler subjectivities invested not only in asserting settler identity (for example, American, Canadian or Australian), but with seemingly abstract or “universal” aims, objectives, and ideals, such as settling down, heterosexual (heteronormative) love, property ownership, the nuclear family, the separation of public/private spheres, and so on. Incidentally, these are values that dovetail with other political projects. As indicated by Oxford English Dictionary definitions of the word, desire is generally associated with sexual desire, and it is almost always presumed to operate at the level of the individual rather than the collective. As suggested by the literature on critical psychoanalysis, however, the spaces of the psychic and social/cultural/structural are intimately intertwined. The desire I speak of in this paper is a settler/colonial desire, which manifests itself at the collective level even as it expresses itself at the individual level. When settler desire installs itself as individual desire, it makes invisible its structural dimensions. For example, the desire to “settle down” appears to be a neutral, arbitrary, personal desire, delinked from history or politics. In some ways, settler desire is analogous to the construction of race difference that Kalpana Seshadri-Crooks describes in Desiring Whiteness.28 Though she is engaged in a different conceptual task than I am in this paper, there are nonetheless some useful insights to be gleaned from Desiring Whiteness. In it, Seshadri-Crooks draws upon Lacan’s theory of subject constitution to develop a framework for understanding the logic through which race difference is organized. 29 She argues that while the origins of race difference can be historically situated, its effects exceed language.30 However, racial difference assumes the appearance of naturalness and ahistoricity. To do this, racial difference relies upon the order of sexual difference, where sexual difference (via Lacan) is that which cannot be fully articulated by language.31 Racial difference acquires its tenacity and pervasiveness by assuming naturalness and ahistoricity. One could ask a similar question about settler/colonial desire: How do settler desires become naturalized to the point that their violence is erased, their history disappeared? Even as there is recognition that settler colonialism (or its euphemism, “discovery”) has a clear history, and even as there is recognition of First Peoples, the process of settlement itself continues to be construed as benign. Like race, settler coloniality becomes naturalized or made “normal” by relying upon the order of sexual difference, such that the calls to own property or start a (nuclear) family become delinked from their historical contexts and reconfigured as natural, innate, ahistorical desires. At the same time, it should be noted that while settler desires are constructed as innate, settlerhood itself is not marked on the body in the same way as race or sex difference. Rather, the settler/Native distinction is imprinted on the body through race. That is, there is no inherent recognition of settler-ness except through some sense of racial difference, which is often ambiguous. Outside of this, claims to settler status are recognized only through political and legal technologies, such as birth certificates, passports, status cards, and so on. It is perhaps due to this lack of embodied recognition that settler desire is so significant to sustaining colonial power. Indeed, settler/colonial desire is integral to the construction of settler subjectivities, to settler narratives, and to the project of erasure underlying the indigenizing efforts of settler projects. Settler colonialism is able to sustain itself because settler subjects are invested in its project. Because they are framed as belonging to the space of the psychic settler, desires are able to do the work of naturalizing settler imperatives. In other words, they are able to do this work because they are framed as universal human desires. As Scott Morgensen notes in relation to gender difference, “Any naturalisation of Western heteropatriarchy or binary sex/gender also naturalises settler colonialism. . . . Settler colonisation performs the West’s potential universality, by transporting and indigenising Western governance upon territories far from Europe: in settler states that then may appear not to be perpetual colonisers, but rather to be natural sites of Western law.”32 As a key aspect of this naturalization process, desire links settlerhood to the category of the human—with the implication that the binary counterpart to the settler, the “Native,” belongs to the category of the nonhuman. Such was the dilemma that Frantz Fanon described in Black Skin, White Masks. 33 The process of colonization, argued Fanon, institutes the binary of the colonizer/colonized, which seizes the subjectivity of the colonized, denying the ability of the colonized ever to be recognized except through the logic of racial difference.34 For Fanon, only anticolonial struggle held the promise of recapturing the humanity stolen by colonization. Yet, as Denise Ferreira da Silva has argued, the category of the human is always already embedded in the politics of racialization, emerging from historical-material contexts, even as it has the appearance of being natural.35 Claims to humanity rely on the figure of the “Other,” without which humanness cannot be recognized. Da Silva’s analysis thus problematizes the modernist quest for humanity itself. The evocation of humanity, signaled through naturalized desire, is also what facilitates a project of indigenization—wherein it appears natural and inconsequential that settlers belong to, and are legitimate occupants of, land that was acquired through deceptive treaty processes and through policies of genocide and assimilation.36 For example, in Indian Cowboy, love, marriage, and “settling down” are central themes. The film evokes the “American Dream”—the fantasy of marriage, nuclear family, property ownership, and success within a capitalist economy—while simultaneously making invisible the Indigenous histories and claims to land which make the American Dream possible. Because these erasures are enacted through desire—desire constructed as that which is natural, benign, and essentially human—the erasures are neutralized; the effects of their violence are rendered void.

#### Absent a questioning of the fantasies behind the settler colonial project, the affirmative’s form of resistance justifies more righteous violence as they bolster the psychic drives of the colonizer through opposition.

Hixson 13 (Walter Hixson is a professor of history at the University of Akron, “American Settler Colonialism: A History”, 12/5/13) AqN \*modified for gendered language\*

Fantasy played an important role in the evolution of settler societies and the genocidal violence that accompanied them. For the Americans, the fantasies of "American exceptionalism" and "Manifest Destiny" were driving forces replete with psychic contradictions and traumatic repercussions. In Australia the "national fantasy" of "mateship" obscured the destruction of Aboriginal societies, with attendant psychic consequences. The same phenomenon played out in South Africa, where the trekboers viewed themselves as destined, and in modern Israel under the settlement compulsions of Zionism. In attempting to carry out their fantasies, to realize their dreams, settler colonials perceived their actions as the performance of good works. Settlement required the courage to cross the sea, enter into the unknown, build cabins, hew out farms, overcome obstacles, raise families, forge communities, worship God, and build the imagined community of the nation. Settlers could take pride in their good works and identify with those perceived as being of the same race and religion who shared their pride and experiences. Those of different (inferior) races and cultures who posed an obstacle to the settlement project manifestly were engaged in wrongdoing. By intruding into settler fantasies and disrupting their good works, the indigenous people were responsible for the consequences that followed—removal, destruction of their societies, death. In these ways fantasy, rationalization, narcissism, projection, and guilt permeated the conscious and unconscious mind of the colonizer, enabling genocidal violence as well as historical. The psychoanalytic theories of Jacques Lacan illuminate these points. "The domain of the good is the birth of power," Lacan explained. "To exercise control over one's goods is to have the right to deprive others of them." Jennifer Rutherford elaborates, "This paradox, identified by Freud and articulated by Lacan, is the manifestation of aggression at the very moment we set out to do good." As the Americans set out to build their farms and communities or the Australians to tame the outback, "an aggressive jouissance—a will to destruction"—set in at the expense of those who impeded these projects, namely the indigenous and borderland peoples.92 The persistent violence of the colonial encounter, as narrated throughout this volume, stemmed from the repeated disruption of the settler colonial fantasies and projects on the part of the indigenous populations. Not merely the ambivalence and resistance of the indigenous people but ultimately their very presence ruptured the settler colonial fantasy. As indigenous peoples appeared to impede the path of the new chosen peoples they menaced the good that inhered in the rational, civilized, progressive, and providentially destined settler project. "Within the frameworks of psychoanalytic discourse, anti-colonial resistance is coded as mad- ness, dependency or infantile regression," Ania Loomba points out. "The inferior being always serves as a scapegoat," the French psychoanalytic theorist Octave Mannoni pointed out, "our own evil intentions can be projected onto him [them]." 93 As the indigene becomes the force of evil pitted against the good of the colonizing project, the psychic drives within the colonizer rationalize violent repression. Despite all ambivalent efforts to work with ~~him~~ [them], to share culture, religion, and the benefits of civilization, by putting up resistance the indigene shows that in the end ~~he is~~ [they are] a savage who understands only the exercise of power. Righteous violence, however lamentable, is therefore justified. "A true Stalinist politician loves mankind, yet carries out horrible purges and executions—his heart is breaking while he does it, but he cannot help it, it is his Duty towards the Progress of Humanity," the Lacanian philosopher Slavoj Zizek explains. "It is not my responsibility, it is not me who is really doing it. I am merely an instrument of the higher Historical Necessity. The obscene enjoyment of this situation is generated by the fact that I conceive of myself as exculpated for what I am doing: I am able to inflict pain on others with the full awareness that I am not responsible for it." 94 Settler communities are both "civilized" and "savage" and therefore must walk a fine psychic line in forging a collective identity and institutions. In the case of the United States, "There was, quite simply, no way to make a complete identity without Indians," Phlip Deloria explains. "At the same time, there was no way to make a complete identity while they remained."95 Considerable psychic gymnastics arise from the contradictions involved in cleansing the land of the indigenes while appropriating their desirable characteristics within the maw of the dominant culture, all the while eliding the genocidal past. The colonizer's claims of indigeneity and authenticity require long-term effort but also entail "a cognitive dissonance, a gap between knowledge and belief," a repression of knowledge. Thus the unresolved "historical legacy of violence and appropriation is carried into the present as traumatic memory, inherited institutional structures, and often unexamined assumptions."

#### Their politics can only lead to an endless quest for jouissance that causes ressentiment and psychic violene.

Hook 17 [Derek Hook; Duquesne University and University of Pretoria; “What Is ‘Enjoyment as a Political Factor’?” *Political Psychology;* 2017; Date Accessed: 27 July 2019.] DG

Jouissance of the Drive We can now add a further qualification, namely that jouissance and affect should not be equated. It is more accurate to understand jouissance as a mode of intensity, a type of arousal—a thrilling twist—that occurs when affect moves beyond the bounds of what is comfortable, reasonable, or satisfying. Bearing this in mind prevents us from making the error of thinking jouissance as itself a variety of affect that permits for easy categorization (as in types such as anger, frustration, joy, etc.). Enjoyment should not be delimited in thus way; it is neither a subcategory of affect nor the preserve of a limited range of affects. We can further refine our understanding of the concept by stressing, as Lacan (1992), that **“jouissance appears not purely and simply as the satisfaction of a need, but as the satisfaction of a drive”** (p. 209). Furthermore, any drive impulse—be it “blind” physiological sensation or a more overly “goal-directed” activity—can serve as the basis of jouissance. It helps here to signal the omnipresence of enjoyment in everyday life, to indicate that any drive activity—”drive” understood here as the psychical elaboration of pressing bodily impulses—is linked to the pursuit of jouissance. **We should evoke here the notion of the death drive**; doing so allows us to offer a succinct formulation: [J]ouissance is a form of enjoyment willing to exceed the parameters of life. Miller (1992) is once again instructive: To understand the concept of jouissance in Lacan as unique is to understand “that it concerns at the same time libido and death drive, libido and aggression, not as two antagonistic forces external to one another, but as a knot” (pp. 25–26). Lacan (2007) goes so far as to declare that **jouissance is “the path towards death”** (p. 17), a comment which calls to mind Freud’s earlier (1924) observation that “even the subject’s destruction of himself cannot take place without libidinal satisfaction” (p. 170). This opens a further dimension of the concept, which, as we will go on to see, must be related both to the notions of the law and the superego. Hence, Eagleton’s (2003) description of jouissance as “the lethal pleasure of Freud[’s] primary masochism, in which we reap delight from the way that the law or superego unleashes its demented sadism upon us” (p. 198). Jouissance, then, to review the key points made above is: (1) diametrically opposed to pleasure and desire; (2) bodily and subliminal rather than unconscious in nature; (3) less an affect than an excess of affect, a mode of intensity produced by pursuing drive impulses; (4) necessarily “negative” (excessive, traumatic) in the sense that it is inflected with the death drive; (5) takes the form of contravention (is transgressive) inasmuch as it pushes the subject painfully (enjoyably) beyond the law or socially prescribed limits. “Negative Dialectics” Our own enjoyment—let alone that of others—is, for the most part, repulsive to us, and needs to be kept at arm’s length. The subject’s stance regards their own enjoyment is thus necessarily conflicted. Jouissance exacerbates the split in the subject who at once reviles their enjoyment and yet, periodically, succumbs to it. So, ordinary (neurotic) subjects want more jouissance, feels they deserve more enjoyment than they are receiving, and yet they are also appalled and repulsed by it, more readily identifying it in the deplorable enjoyments of others. Contrary then to the tendency to view enjoyment within the frame of isolated individuality, we need rather approach it in terms of prospective relations to others. Jouissance, insists Macey (1988), “is not...a category of pure subjectivity” (p. 203). Rather, it implies “a dialectic of possession and enjoyment of and by the other” (p. 203). The revulsion we feel toward our own jouissance is, as already noted, all too readily displaced onto others (as Lacan [1992] laments in Seminar VII: “[W]hat is more of a neighbor to me than this...my jouissance...which I don’t dare go near” [p. 186]). These **others**, moreover, **are always ready to blame for having too much jouissance**, for having procured improper or malignant enjoyments that appear to compromise given social or cultural norms or laws. Given neurotic subjects’ presumption that they have surrendered a crucial quantity of enjoyment—an effect of socialization, of the symbolic overwriting the bodily experience of drives—they maintain a preexisting condition of resentment toward such enjoying others. Differently put: **This resentment comes before, and thus in a sense determines, what the subject perceives to be the illegitimate or disproportionate enjoyments of others.** The perceived existence of jouissance thus implies a social relationship, one that exists before the other upon whom this jouissance will be projected. So, what even the most elementary experience of jouissance necessitates is a type of hating object-relation, a conflicted mode of intersubjectivity, which is always already there, prior to the racial/cultural/social other who will be assigned a position in this negative interpersonal dialectic. The construction of otherness is thus not merely an effect of social construction. It involves also a libidinal component, a prior attribution of stolen enjoyment, a readymade form of resentment awaiting a blameworthy subject upon whom this crime can be pinned. Enjoyment in the Form of Lack Jouissance, certainly once approached as a type of possession, exhibits an odd characteristic: It is never more real than when we have been dispossessed of it. Enjoyment, that is to say, comes most forcefully into being, is most intensely experienced, when: (1) It is seen to be in the possession of others, or (2) when it is perceived as endangered, about to be snatched away. Put differently**, jouissance seems most typically to exist in an “already stolen” or precarious state; it only takes form in the shadow of a potential castration.** This helps us understand Vighi’s (2010) initially puzzling description. Jouissance, he says, is a type of libidinal excess, most typically experienced as a lack. This experience of surplus, he insists, corresponds to a void: “[E]very enjoyment is structured around a lack...a paradoxical lack of enjoyment” (p. 25). Furthermore: We perceive enjoyment not as lack but as fullness, a ubiquitous substance that fills our lives and gives it meaning. Here we are faced by what we might call the “enjoyment parallax,” with parallax naming the different aspects of the same object viewed from...different lines of sight. **Although enjoyment in its deepest connotation is always a lack, we...perceiv[e] it as fullness.** (p. 25) This facet of enjoyment—that it oscillates between surplus and absence, a “too much” and a “not enough”—once again highlights the intersubjective aspect of the concept. Moreover, if it is the case, as Vighi (2010) argues, that attributions of enjoyment invariably spring from the experience of lack, then it is unsurprising that this lack should be allocated a cause, and, more importantly yet, a suspect who is responsible for this lack. Jouissance, that is to say, entails an elementary narrative component. The most rudimentary experience of **jouissance implies** already therole—the **fantasy**—**of a culprit, someone who enjoys more than I,** or who is poised to steal the little enjoyment that I do possess. One of the most articulate expressions of this idea is offered by Stavrakakis (1999) who insists that the festivals of jouissance by means of which we constitute our “national ways of enjoyment” are always in some way lacking: No matter how much we love our national ways of enjoyment, our national real, this real is never enough, it is already castrated... this loss can be attributed to the existence of an alien culture or people: the enjoyment lacking from our national community is being denied to us because “they” stole it.... What is not realised within such a schema is the fact...**that we never had at our disposal the surplus enjoyment that we accuse the Other of stealing.** (p. 156) The modes of jouissance that we have been discussing cannot be dismissed merely as individual or idiosyncratic quirks (which, of course, is not to say there will not be considerable latitude in terms of how these forms of enjoyment are experienced by individuals). How though is this “structured” quality of enjoyment to be explained? This is a particularly important question given that the notion of jouissance as developed in the clinic is always attuned to the singularity of a subject’s enjoyment.

#### Thus, the alternative is to embrace the death drive --- that breaks down drives and accepts our limitations, solving our enjoyment of violence.

McGowan 13 [Todd McGowan, author of Enjoying What We Don’t Have: The Political Project of Psychoanalysis. “Enjoying What We Don’t Have: The Political Project of Psychoanalysis.” 2013. Pp. 283-286.]

There is no path leading from the death drive to utopia. The death drive undermines every attempt to construct a utopia; it is the enemy of the good society. It is thus not surprising that political thought from Plato onward has largely ignored this psychic force of repetition and negation. But this does not mean that psychoanalytic thought concerning the death drive has only a negative value for political theorizing. It is possible to conceive of a positive politics of the death drive. The previous chapters have attempted to lay out the political implications of the death drive, and, on this basis, we can sketch what a society founded on a recognition of the death drive might look like. Such a recognition would not involve a radical transformation of society: in one sense, it would leave everything as it is. In contemporary social arrangements, the death drive subverts progress with repetition and leads to the widespread sacrifice of self-interest for the enjoyment of the sacrifice itself. This structure is impervious to change and to all attempts at amelioration. But in another sense, the recognition of the death drive would change everything. Recognizing the centrality of the death drive would not eliminate the proclivity to sacrifice for the sake of enjoyment, but it would change our relationship to this sacrifice. Rather than being done for the sake of an ultimate enjoyment to be achieved in the future, it would be done for its own sake. The fundamental problem with the effort to escape the death drive and pursue the good is that it leaves us unable to locate where our enjoyment lies. By positing a future where we will attain the ultimate enjoyment (either through the purchase of the perfect commodity or through a transcendent romantic union or through the attainment of some heavenly paradise), we replace the partial enjoyment of the death drive with the image of a complete enjoyment to come. There is no question of fully enjoying our submission to the death drive. We will always remain alienated from our mode of enjoying. As Adrian Johnston rightly points out, “Transgressively ‘overcoming’ the impediments of the drives doesn’t enable one to simply enjoy enjoyment.”1 But we can transform our relationship to the impediments that block the full realization of our drive. We can see the impediments as the internal product of the death drive rather than as an external limit. The enjoyment that the death drive provides, in contrast to the form of enjoyment proffered by capitalism, religion, and utopian politics, is at once infinite and limited. This oxymoronic form of enjoyment operates in the way that the concept does in Hegel’s Logic. The concept attains its infinitude not through endless progress toward a point that always remains beyond and out of reach but through including the beyond as a beyond within itself. As Hegel puts it, “The universality of the concept is the achieved beyond, whereas that bad infinity remains afflicted with a beyond which is unattainable but remains a mere progression to infinity.”2 That is to say, the concept transforms an external limit into an internal one and thereby becomes both infinite and limited. The infinitude of the concept is nothing but the concept’s own self-limitation. The enjoyment that the death drive produces also achieves its infinitude through self-limitation. It revolves around a lost object that exists only insofar as it is lost, and it relates to this object as the vehicle for the infinite unfurling of its movement. The lost object operates as the self-limitation of the death drive through which the drive produces an infinite enjoyment. Rather than acting as a mark of the drive’s finitude, the limitation that the lost object introduces provides access to infinity. A society founded on a recognition of the death drive would be one that viewed its limitations as the source of its infinite enjoyment rather than an obstacle to that enjoyment. To take the clearest and most traumatic example in recent history, the recognition of the death drive in 1930s Ger- many would have conceived the figure of the Jew not as the barrier to the ultimate enjoyment that must therefore be eliminated but as the internal limit through which German society attained its enjoyment. As numerous theorists have said, the appeal of Nazism lay in its ability to mobilize the enjoyment of the average German through pointing out a threat to that enjoyment. The average German under Nazism could enjoy the figure of the Jew as it appeared in the form of an obstacle, but it is possible to recognize the obstacle not as an external limit but as an internal one. In this way, the figure of the Jew would become merely a figure for the average German rather than a position embodied by actual Jews. Closer to home, one would recognize the terrorist as a figure representing the internal limit of global capitalist society. Far from serving as an obstacle to the ultimate enjoyment in that society, the terrorist provides a barrier where none otherwise exists and thereby serves as the vehicle through which capitalist society attains its enjoyment. The absence of explicit limita- tions within contemporary global capitalism necessitates such a figure: if terrorists did not exist, global capitalist society would have to invent them. But recognizing the terrorist as the internal limit of global capitalist society would mean the end of terrorism. This recognition would transform the global landscape and deprive would-be terrorists of the libidinal space within which to act. Though some people may continue to blow up buildings, they would cease to be terrorists in the way that we now understand the term. A self-limiting society would still have real battles to fight. There would remain a need for this society to defend itself against external threats and against the cruelty of the natural universe. Perhaps it would require nuclear weapons in space to defend against comets or meteors that would threaten to wipe out human life on the planet. But it would cease positing the ulti- mate enjoyment in vanquishing an external threat or surpassing a natural limit. The external limit would no longer stand in for a repressed internal one. Such a society would instead enjoy its own internal limitations and merely address external limits as they came up. Psychoanalytic theory never preaches, and it cannot help us to construct a better society. But it can help us to subtract the illusion of the good from our own society. By depriving us of this illusion, it has the ability to trans- form our thinking about politics. With the assistance of psychoanalytic thought, we might reconceive politics in a direction completely opposed to that articulated by Aristotle, to which I alluded in the introduction. In the Politics, Aristotle asserts: “Every state is a community of some kind, and every community is established with a view to some good; for everyone always acts in order to obtain that which they think good. But, if all communities aim at some good, the state or political community, which is the highest of all, and which embraces all the rest, aims at good in a greater degree than any other, and at the highest good.”3 Though later political thinkers have obviously departed from Aristotle concerning the question of the content of the good society, few have thought of politics in terms opposed to the good. This is what psychoanalytic thought introduces. If we act on the basis of enjoyment rather than the good, this does not mean that we can simply construct a society that privileges enjoyment in an overt way. An open society with no restrictions on sexual activity, drug use, food consumption, or play in general would not be a more enjoyable one than our own. That is the sure path to impoverishing our ability to enjoy, as the aftermath of the 1960s has made painfully clear. One must arrive at enjoyment indirectly. A society centered around the death drive would not be a better society, nor would it entail less suffering. Rather than continually sacrificing for the sake of the good, we would sacrifice the good for the sake of enjoyment. A society centered around the death drive would allow us to recognize that we enjoy the lost object only insofar as it remains lost.
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#### Counterplan Text:

#### 1. The World Trade Organization ought to be abolished.

#### 2. The member nations of the WTO ought to independently and without influence from international government eliminate patents on medicines based on Indigenous knowledge from patentability.

Hawley, senator, JD Yale, 20

(Josh, 5-5, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/05/opinion/hawley-abolish-wto-china.html)

The coronavirus emergency is not only a public health crisis. With [30 million Americans unemployed](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/30/us-weekly-jobless-claims.html), it is also an economic crisis. And it has exposed a hard truth about the modern global economy: it weakens American workers and has empowered China’s rise. That must change. The global economic system as we know it is a relic; it requires reform, top to bottom. We should begin with one of its leading institutions, the World Trade Organization. We should abolish it.

#### The WTO as an institution is unethical and perpetuates colonialism – solves case

Godrej 20

(Dinyar, Co-editor @ New Internationalist, 4-20, https://newint.org/features/2020/02/10/brief-history-impoverishment)

For countries that were undergoing economic ravishment by structural adjustment, the 1990s brought new torments in the form of the World Trade Organization (WTO), a club dominated by rich nations. In the name of creating a ‘level playing field’, the WTO required poorer countries to sign up to an all-or-nothing, binding set of rules, which removed protections for domestic industries and allowed foreign capital unhindered access. This was strongly prejudicial to the interests of local industries, which were not in a position to withstand foreign competition. Influence within the WTO is weighted by the size of a nation’s economy – thus even if all poorer nations joined forces to demand policy changes they would still not have a chance against wealthy nations. This trade injustice has drawn widespread protests and pressure for the WTO to reform. Meanwhile, wealthy nations are increasingly going down the route of bilateral Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Usually negotiated in secret, the interests of their corporations are paramount in FTAs and include the ability to sue states for eye-watering sums (should they, for example, want to terminate a contract or nationalize an industry) with no provision for states to do the same. Such instruments are working to create a utopia for transnational corporations, creating a business-friendly climate, which translates as the demolition of labour protection, tax cuts for the wealthiest and a supine regulatory environment. Tax havens operated by the richest countries are home to huge sums of illicit wealth draining out of some of the poorest. Today, due to how the global economy has been engineered, for every dollar of aid sent to poorer countries, they lose 10 times as much in outflows – and that’s before one counts their losses through unfair trade rules and underpaid labour. Foreign investors take nearly $500 billion a year in profits from the Global South, and trade-power imbalances cost poorer nations $700 billion a year in lost export revenue. 7 CONCENTRATION In the 21st century wealth increasingly flows through corporate hands towards a small super-elite. In a trend that began in the 1990s, the lion’s share of equity value is being realized through squeezing workers: the classification ‘working poor’ so familiar in the Global South is now increasingly also being used in the wealthy North, where neoliberal capitalism is leading inevitably to wage erosion and work precarity, coupled with the withdrawal of state support. Inequality is rising dramatically. In 2018 the richest 26 people owned wealth equivalent to the poorest half of the world’s population. And their wealth was increasing at the rate of $2.5 billion a day. Meanwhile 3.4 billion people – nearly half the world – were living on less than $5.50 a day.