A Subpoint is the Links: The affirmative assumes a stable value system that is objective and can’t be questioned. This is reflected in their will to truth that dichotomizes existence into interpretation and actual truth. This attempt is a farce and even if it was possible to know objective truth we ought to reject it. They force us to accept the acetic ideals of reactive forces instead of making existence active. The affirmative’s attempt at absolute truth is a dangerous farce that appeals to ascetic values and virtues external to the subject. This value of truth reflects their will to truth and an absolute discovering of ethics and epistemology. Nietzsche:

Friedrich Nietzsche, On the Genealogy of Morals from Basic Writings of Nietzsche. Trans. by Walter Kauffman. Modern Library Publisher.

Has a European or a Christian free-thinker [Freigeist] ever strayed into this proposition and the labyrinth of its consequences? Does he know the Minotaur of this cave from experience? I doubt it, indeed, I know otherwise: – **nothing is stranger to these people who are absolute in one thing**, these so-called ‘free spirits’, than freedom and release in that sense, in no respect are they more firmly bound; precisely **in their faith in truth they are more rigid and more absolute than anyone else.** Perhaps I am too familiar with all this: that venerable philosopher’s abstinence prescribed by such a faith like that commits one, **that stoicism of the intellect which**, in the last resort, **denies itself the ‘no’ just as strictly as the ‘yes’, that will to stand still before the factual,** the factum brutum, that fatalism of ‘petits faits’116 (ce petit faitalisme,117 as I call it) in which French scholarship now **seeks a kind of moral superiority** over the German, **that renunciation of any interpretation (of forcing, adjusting, shortening,** omitting, filling-out, inventing, falsifying and everything else essential to interpretation) – **on the whole, this expresses the asceticism of virtue** just as well as any denial of sensuality (it is basically just a modus of this denial). However, the compulsion towards it, **that unconditional will to truth, is faith in the ascetic ideal itself, even if, as an unconscious imperative,** make no mistake about it, – **it is the faith in a metaphysical value, a value as such of absolute truth, sanctioned and guaranteed by this ideal alone.**

First: Their Kantian framing of reason links because they turn ethics into an internal quest for truth and objective understanding of morals absent any interpretation or situation. Deleuze 1:

Gilles Deleuze [Professor of Philosophy Emeritus at the University of Paris VIII]. “Nietzsche and Philosophy”. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson. 1962.

But in what way did Kant understand his idea of philosophylegislation? Why does Nietzsche, at the very moment when he seems to revive and develop the Kantian idea, rank Kant among the "philosophical labourers", those who are content to make inventories of current values, the opposite of the philosophers of the future? (BGE 211 p. 123). For Kant, **what legislates** (in a domain) **is always one of our faculties: understanding, reason. We are legislators ourselves only insofar as we make proper use of this faculty and allot our other faculties tasks which conform to it**. We are legislators only insofar as we submit to one of our faculties, as it were the whole of ourselves. But to what do we submit in such a faculty, to what forces? **Understanding and reason** have a long history: they **are instances which still make us obey when we no longer want to obey anyone.** When we stop obeying God, the State, our parents, reason appears and persuades us to continue being docile because it says to us: it is you who are giving the orders. **Reason represents our slavery and our subjection as some thing superior which make us reasonable beings. Under the name of practical reason**, "Kant invented a reason expressly for those cases in which one has no need to bother about reason: namely, when the needs of the heart, when morality, when 'duty' speaks". 2' And, finally, what is concealed in the famous Kantian unity of legislator and subject? Nothing but a renovated theology, theology with a protestant flavour: **we are burdened with the double task of** priest and believer, **legislator and subject**. Kant's dream was not to abolish the distinction between two worlds (sensible and super-sensible) but to secure the unity of the personal in the two worlds. The same person as legislator and subject, as subject and object, as noumenon and phenomenon, as priest and believer. This arrangement succeeds as theology: "Kant's success is only a theologian's success" (AC 10). Can we really believe that by installing the priest and the legislator in us we stop being primarily believers and subjects? The legislators and the priest practise the ministry, the legislation and the representation of established values; all they do is internalise current values. **Kant's** "proper **usage of the faculties" mysteriously coincides with these established values: true knowledge, true morality, true religion**

Second: Their arguments for the objectivity of due process link. They use due process to categorize situations based on formal notions of truth. Milovanovic:  
DRAGAN MILOVANOVIC [Ph.D. Professor Justice Studies Program Northeastern Illinois University] 2006 International Journal for the Semiotics of Law DIVERSITY, LAW AND JUSTICE: A DELEUZIAN SEMIOTIC VIEW OF ‘CRIMINAL JUSTICE’

Packer28 has provided a convenient comparison of the due process model and the crime control model underlying existing criminal justice systems in the U.S. **The due process model follows the logic of** Max Weber’s **formal rationality ideal type in law. Here, formality is of highest value: formal fact finding; opportunity to be heard, to confront witnesses, to cross examine, to a neutral fact-finding body,** to access to a lawyer, to appeal. Adversarial fact-finding, with opposing lawyers clashing for the truth would assure that the ‘‘what happened?’’ will be established beyond a reasonable doubt. **The crime control model,** however, has different values. It **values informalism in identifying as much crime in society as possible and in its prosecution.** Efficiency is its call. Efficiency depends on speed. Informality and stereotyped procedures in assembly line forms of justice rendering best assure that a high conviction rate is obtained. The working presumption is not innocence until proven guilty but its reverse: guilty until proven innocent. Its informality can be likened to Max Weber’s29 substantive rational or substantive irrational ideal types of law. Plea bargaining is but one of its essential instruments. In both these models, according to Griffith,30 a battle metaphor is being employed. There are contestants, there are winners and losers, **there is one truth, there is a clean separation of law breaker and victim, there is no inherent mechanism for individual or social repair. These battle metaphors are supportive of master signifiers that are in line with it.** Thus we can see how Deleuze’s notion of regimes of signs may reflect each approach, crime control and due process model, but ultimately, the battle metaphor is productive of master signifiers which captures various sentiments by its participants. Said in another way, master signifiers populate the arena of crime fighting in particular ways. Drawing from Lacan’s discourse of the master and discourse of the university**, we could argue that participants, whichever ‘‘side’’ they are on, are offered discursive subject positions within particular regimes of sign whereby some realities are constructed, others are not.**

B Subpoint is the Impacts: In succumbing to the ascetic ideal they negate the ability to have value in life and foster resentment towards life. Deleuze 2 writes:

Gilles Deleuze [Professor of Philosophy Emeritus at the University of Paris VIII]. “Nietzsche and Philosophy”. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson. 1962.

From the speculative position to the moral opposition, from the moral opposition to the ascetic contradiction . . But the ascetic contradiction is, in turn, a symptom which must be interpreted.What does **the man of the ascetic ideal** want? The one who repudiates life **is** also **the one who wants a diminished life, the conservation of his type and moreover its power and triumph, the triumph and contagion of reactive forces.** At this point reactive forces discover the disturbing ally that leads them to victory: nihilism, the will to nothingness (GM III 13). The will to nothingness which can only bear life in its reactive form. **The will to nothingness is the one that used reactive forces as a way of ensuring that life must contradict, deny and annihilate itself.** The will to nothingness from the beginning, inspires all the values that are called "superior" to life. This is Schopenhauer's greatest error: he believed that the will is denied in all values superior to life. In fact, it is not the will which is denied in superior values, **it is the superior values that are related to a will to deny, to annihilate life. This will to deny defines "the value" of superior values. Its weapon is to hand life over to the domination of reactive forces in such a way that the whole of life slips further and further away, separated from what it can do, getting smaller and smaller, towards nothingness,** towards the poignant feeling of his nothingness" (GM III 25). **The will to nothingness and reactive forces, these are the two constituent elements of the ascetic ideal.**

This turns and outweighs the AC because 1) it’s an internal link turn to their framework. They say they value according with moral values but negate the reason why we care about or cherish those values because we are always reacting rather than acting. 2) It link turns the AC because in claiming rationality they force us to negate and destroy what is deemed irrational, which negates the reason we care about ethics since we become our own priests trying to eradicate evil; thus, their morality doesn’t serve to guide action.

C Subpoint is the Alternative: Abandon all notions of truth in favor of affirming thought as invention and creation rather than static and absolute. I affirm life and all that is active in it as opposed to the reactive forces of the AC. Deleuze 3:

Gilles Deleuze [Professor of Philosophy Emeritus at the University of Paris VIII]. “Nietzsche and Philosophy”. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson. 1962.

When knowledge becomes a legislator, the most important thing to be subjected is thought. Knowledge is thought itself, but thought subject to reason and to all that is expressed in reason. The instinct for knowledge is therefore thought, but thought in its relation to the reactive forces which seize and conquer it. For rational knowledge sets the same limits to life as reasonable life sets to thought; life is subject to knowledge and at the same time thought is subject to life. **Reason sometimes dissuades and sometimes forbids us to cross certain limits: because it is useless** (knowledge is there to predict) because it would be evil (life is there to be virtuous), **because it is impossible** (there is nothing to see or think behind the truth). 2' — But does not critique, understood as **critique of knowledge** itself, **express new forces capable of giving thought another sense**? **A thought that would go to the limit of what life can do, a thought that would lead life to the limit of what it can do? A thought that would affirm life instead of a knowledge that is opposed to life. Life would be the active force of thought, but thought would be the affirmative power of life.** Both would go in the same direction, carrying each other along, smashing restrictions, matching each other step for step, in a burst of unparalleled creativity. **Thinking would then mean discovering ,inventing , new possibilities of life. "There are lives with prodigious difficulties; these are the lives of the thinkers.** And we must lend an ear to what we are told about them, for here we discover possibilities of life the mere story of which gives us joy and strength and sheds light on the lives of their successors. There is as much invention, reflection, boldness, despair and hope here as in the voyages of the great navigators; and to tell the truth, these are also voyages of exploration in the most distant and perilous domains of life. What is surprising in these lives is that two opposed instincts, which pull in opposite directions, seem to be forced to walk under the same yoke: the instinct that leads to knowledge is constantly constrained to abandon the ground where man habitually lives and to throw itself into the uncertain, and the instinct that wills life is forced to grope ceaselessly in the dark for a new place to establish itself' (PTG). In other words**, life goes beyond the limits that knowledge fixes for it, but thought goes beyond the limits that life fixes for it. Thought ceases to be a ratio** **y**26\* life ceases to be a reaction. **The thinker thus expresses the noble affinity of thought and life: life making thought active, thought making life affirmative.**

Extend Nietzsche 1: In appealing to absolute ideas of truth in AC adopts a will to truth where we always attempt to find some absolute truth and meaning that we can never question and always remains. In the Will to truth they adopt ascetic ideals by excluding the possibility of interpretation and by forcing us to react to the world rather than interpret it.

Extend Deleuze 1: The practical reason/rationality framework of the AC links to the Ascetic ideal by forcing us to be legislators ourselves only insofar as we make proper use of this faculty and we are forced to deny ourselves certain values.

Extend Deleuze 2: The AC’s ascetic virtue negates value in life because we are always simply reacting to absolute values rather than creating value which forces a will to nothingness because we don’t care about the value of values simply the value themselves which means there’s no longer a purpose or value in morality.

Extend Deleuze 3: In affirming life we free ourselves of the ascetic ideal by pushing knowledge to its limit and freeing it from a will to truth that prohibits certain faculties of our thinking. This solves the harm by not making life static and reactive but rather affirms our ability to choose.

Extend the alternative: to forgo all notions of truth in favor of affirming life and a new conception of knowledge.

Util Link

Their focus on predictive and calculative thought is an impossible guise that attempts to order the world according to fascist demands. The world is actually random and unpredictable. Util is another link. Massumi writes:

Brian Massumi [[Canadian](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canada) [political philosopher](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_philosophy) and [social theorist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_theory). Currently teaching at [Université de Montréal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universit%C3%A9_de_Montr%C3%A9al), in the Communication Sciences Department. PHD in French literature]. A User’s Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia. MIT Press.

We skipped multiplicity. In one sense, it is the reproducibility of the fractal, the potential for generating from the same equation a variety of diagrams, each of which would be different depending on when the process was stopped. But as we have seen, there is a multiplicity inherent to every meaning encounter taken separately, in that each diagram envelops a number of heterogeneous levels. This aspect is missing in this example because the fractal proliferates according to a principle of self-similarity. The transformations are identical, so any two segments on any level are symmetrical**. What is missing is chance. If chance variations are thrown in** (the "throw of the dice" in The Logic of Sense and Nietzsche), **the endless snow flaking will deviate into a truly random figure in which no two segments are the same, but which is still mathematically describable.** As it proliferates, it will snake in and out on itself, creating a formation resembling a shoreline with islands. If randomization is taken one step farther and the chance variations of line-draw and cut are freed from the constraint of a triangular starting point, the fracturing will fill more and more space, eventually producing a unified plane-effect. This is called a "random walk." **The "plane" of Life itself** (the "cosmos''; nature-culture; the abstract machine in its widest connotation; monism in its other aspect, as generative matter-31energy, an abstract dynamism at a level at which it is a sufficient cause) **is a "space-filling fractal" of infinite dimension.** Computer graphics employs fractals generated by controlled stochastic procedures (programmed deviations) to simulate natural formations**. 30 But nature is never effectively controlled** (causing but uncaused; founding but unfounded). **Every moment in life is a step in a random walk. Uncannily familiar as the shore may seem, looking back reveals no Eden of interiority and self-similarity, no snowflake state to regain.** Ahead lies nothing with the plane reliability of solid ground**. You can never predict where the subatomic particle will appear, or what will flash across the synapse** (pure instantaneous event). **Once thrown, however, the dice are destiny.**

Democracy Link

Their focus on a democratic state order is the basis of an objective normative structure we are forced to measure up against. Massumi:

Brian Massumi [[Canadian](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canada) [political philosopher](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_philosophy) and [social theorist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_theory). Currently teaching at [Université de Montréal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universit%C3%A9_de_Montr%C3%A9al), in the Communication Sciences Department. PHD in French literature]. A User’s Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia. MIT Press.

**This expands** **the definition of "democracy": every body's "free choice" to delegate its becoming in return for living out its "productive life" in the despotism it most desires.** Choose your quasicause. "Democracy" is the quasicause representing the choice of quasicauses: equal opportunity despotism. Most of **the mini-despotisms that proliferate under "democracy" are** more **normalizing** than outright disciplinary. They often allow several quasicauses to function simultaneously, and apply them almost haphazardly. Bodies are not required to conform in their life's path to a rigidly defined code of actions and expressions enveloped in a particular quasicause. Neither total conformity nor sincere belief is necessarily called for. **All that is** **required is that** their form be respected. Once again, that **the body be molar; that it be generalizable; that its trajectory through the world be** more or less **predictable**; **that it work and ideally reproduce itself, and in the process reproduce the social order** (with slight generational variations). In other words, the only minidespotism to which every body is required to submit without exception is its Self. The only universally applied quasicause is the soul, or a suitable substitute (a conscience will do, or simply a phallus). Molarity is reduced to the most miniaturized and generalizable form humanly possible: supposedly selfdirecting subjectivity operating within the limits of good/common sense as socially defined (individual life confined to an artificially closed system ruled by the whole attractor of stable equilibrium, also known as the "American Dream"). Molarity molds itself to the human shape, in a personalization of the plane of transcendence. **Everybody becomes a "legislating subject," at least in the privacy of its own home. In a "democracy,"** the kingdom of Oedipus, **a man's home is his castle. Thus even in a liberal nation-state where neonormality reigns supreme, the form that everybody must respect is still fundamentally a State-form. The State itself can afford to depart from that form, because it has seen to it that its citizens will take up where it leaves off.**

**The Socratic Will to Truth is characterised by the attempt to understand and order life rationally by renouncing the** Dionysian **elements of existence and privileging an idealised** Apollonian **order**. **As life is inescapably comprised of both order and disorder, however, the promise of control through Socratic reason is only possible by creating a 'Real World' of eternal and meaningful forms, in opposition to an 'Apparent World' of transitory physical existence. Suffering and contingency is contained within the Apparent World, disparaged, devalued, and ignored in relation to the ideal order of the Real World.** Essential to the Socratic Will to Truth, then, is the fundamental contradiction between the experience of Dionysian suffering in the Apparent World and the idealised order of the Real World. According to Nietzsche, **this dichotomised model led to the emergence of a uniquely 'modern'**10 **understanding of life which could only view suffering as the result of the imperfection of the Apparent World.** This outlook created a modern notion of responsibility in which the Dionysian elements of life could be understood only as a phenomenon for which someone, or something, is to blame. Nietzsche terms this philosophically-induced condition ressentiment, and argues that it signalled a potential crisis of the Will to Truth by exposing the central contradiction of the Socratic resolution. This contradiction, however, was resolved historically through the aggressive universalisation of the Socratic ideal by Christianity. According to Nietzsche, ascetic Christianity exacerbated the Socratic dichotomisation by employing the Apparent World as the responsible agent against which the ressentiment of life could be turned. **Blame for suffering fell on individuals within the Apparent World, precisely because they did not live up to** God, **the Truth, and the Real World.**