#### Turn: Debate isn’t a home because of Eurocentric focus on what constitutes rationality. Only reorienting the memory of the Enlightenment through deconstruction problematizes whiteness. Borradori indicates that memory is always towards the future which means we can have a responsibility to the Other by recognizing Enlightment

Borradori ‘3 [Giovanna Borradori, professor of philosophy at Vassar college, Interview with Jacques Derrida “Philosophy in a Time of Terror” pg. 170-172]

Derrida’s reflection on the Europe-to-come began in 1990 when he was asked by the Italian philosopher Gianni Vattimo to respond to the question of European cultural identity. It was just a few months after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Surprisingly, given his usual tendency to refrain from axiomatic statements, on that occasion Derrida did offer one: “What is proper to a culture is not to be identical with itself.”43 This assertion confirms his belief in the ethical value of heterogeneity and difference, which I addressed by discussing the exclusive and in­clusive function of geographical boundaries, including the Berlin Wall, in the second section of this essay. For Derrida, identity entails internal differentiation or, in his formulation, “difference with itself.” Indeed, self-relation produces culture; but there is no culture without a relation to the other. No culture has a single origin: it is in the very nature of culture to explore difference and to develop a systematic openness to­ward others within one’s culture as well as in other cultures. On the one hand, European cultural identity cannot be dispersed ... It cannot and must not be dispersed into a myriad of provinces, into a mul­tiplicity of self-enclosed idioms or petty little nationalisms, each one jeal­ous and untranslatable. It cannot and must not renounce places of great circulation or heavy traffic, the great avenues or thoroughfares of transla­tion and communication, and thus, of mediatization. But, on the other hand, it cannot and must not accept the capital of a centralizing authority that, by means of its trans-European mechanisms ... would control and standardize.44 Beyond Eurocentrism and anti-Eurocentrism, two programs that Der­rida characterizes as “unforgettable” but “exhausted,” what is the cul­tural identity that we are responsible for? What memory and what promise does the name Europe evoke? For whom and before whom are we responsible? Derrida lists two kinds of responsibility. There is responsibility toward memory and responsibility toward oneself. While responsibility toward oneself underlines die need for a personal and unconditional commitment to the process of decision-making, re­sponsibility towards memory calls for a historical self-understanding based on difference and heterogeneity.44 To be responsible for this memory of Europe, we need to transform it to the point of reinventing it. In this way, we won’t simply either repeat or abhor its name. This transformation will occur only if we accept the possibility of an impos­sibility, the experience of aporia. It is necessary to make ourselves the guardians of an idea of Europe, of a difference of Europe, but of a Europe that consists precisely in not clos­ing itself off in its identity and in advancing itself in an exemplary way to­wards what it is not, toward the other heading or the heading of the other.46 The notion of capital features in the title that Derrida gave to his short book on Europe: The Other Heading. The book is meant to respond to the political promise of a unified Europe by taking responsibility for Europe’s past—a past that Derrida hopes will both protect and redirect Europe to another heading, another destination. Geographically, Eu­rope has understood itself as a promontory, a cape or a headland: the extreme portion of Eurasia and the point of departure for discoveries and colonization. Even though the need for a physical capital, a single metropolis that has the function of the heart of a nation, has consider­ably aged, the “discourse of the capital” is still intact. This discourse is intertwined with the question of European identity. European culture is responsible for the emergence of the ideal of the nation-state “headed” by a capital city. Paris, Berlin, Rome, Brussels, Amsterdam, Madrid, are all capitals in this very strong sense. The word capital comes from the Latin for head, caput, which also appears in a variety of other expressions, such as the headlines of a newspaper or the head­ing, the title, of a book. Europe, for Derrida, is the name for the head­ing of culture, the exemplary heading of all cultures. Taking responsibility for Europe means responding to the com­plexity constituting its past, present, and future, and reinventing their relations. Sovereignty, which Derrida renames “discourse of the capi­tal” is first on the list. In order to reinvent Europe and, at the same time, taking responsibility for its heritage, we need to believe in paradoxical contaminations, such as “the memory of a past that has never been present,” or “the memory of the future.” After all, Derrida points out, the movement of memory is not necessarily tied to the past. Memory is not only about preserving and conserving the past, it is always already turned toward the future, “toward the promise, toward what is coming, what is arriving, what is happening tomorrow.”47 This other heading is the direction in which Europe, the actual Europe, should be traveling. This is also the direction toward a new form of sovereignty, urgently demanded if cosmopolitanism is to be­come a political reality in the post-9/11 world. This destination is nei­ther new nor old but the memory of a past that has never been present. This is the memory of the promise of the Enlightenment: freedom and equality for all.

#### The striving for unity and coherence is the hallmark of whiteness. Deconstruction is a logic of disintegration that would generate radical and open subjectivities.

Wadham ‘3 [Ben Wadham, TASA Conference University of New England, “The Turn to Whiteness: Race, Nationand Cultural Sociology” December 2003]

There are two points of note here: firstly, that identity is considered relational and hierarchical. There are multiple forms of cultural relations, for example gender is differentiated (Connell 1995), as is race or class (Frankenberg 1993, 1997). Secondly, it is also useful to consider the 'logics of identity', that is, the ways that particular identities position themselves within cultural relations (Hall 1992). Adorn° and Horkheimer (1973) describe the hegemonic logic of identity within Western philosophy, and Western cultures more generally, as a dialectic of Enlightenment. This dialectic refers to the way that the Self valorises identity and the Other is marginalised as an assertion of difference. This reification of Self and Other occludes incommensurability, that is, this subject tan only conceive others on his terms. In some way everything must be commensurable, able to be rationalised on the terms of the hegemonic subject. In the context of Australian racialisation whiteness has become that cocoon where an exclusive national identity has developed. This dialectic of Enlightenment, alternatively described as identitarian thinking, is where the Self articulates the Other as a threat to cultural and individual security, where the destabilisation of the hegemonic order is experienced as disorder, and where multiplicity is dangerous and commensurability paramount (O'Neill 1999: 9). This striving for unity and coherence marks the hegemonic subject and is, I argue, the hallmark of the white, masculinist, bourgeois Self (Adorno 1996, 1973; Becker-Schmidt 1999). It can be described as manifesting a closed subjectivity (Jameson 1990: 9). We can think about the logic of identity as relational, that is, identitarian thinking presents the hegemonic logic of identification while others' logics of identity sit in relations of subordination, complicity or radical alterity to this logic and its associated identities, discursive regimes and cultural practices. In other words, there are different ways of thinking and identifying and different logics of identity. Bhabha's (1990a) work on the third space, Adorno's logic of disintegration (1973), or Derrida's (1982) deconstruction are different ways of talking about the potential for critical and reflexive thought. It is argued that a logic of disintegration would generate open, radical and inclusive subjectivities.

#### Archive DA: The 1AC attempt to archive the black woman and Chicana queer narrative of Kianna Middleton within the debate space is reflective of a much larger political play. That which is archived has always been interpreted, represented, and displayed by those in a position of privilege.

Derrida ‘95 [Jacques Derrida, “Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression” Diacritics, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Summer, 1995), pp. 9-63, http://www.jstor.org/stable/465144]

The concept of the archive shelters in itself, of course, this memory of the name arkhe. But it also shelters itself from this memory which it shelters: which comes down to saying also that it forgets it. There is nothing accidental or surprising about this. Contrary to the impression one often has, such a concept is not easy to archive. One has trouble, and for essential reasons, establishing it and interpreting it in the document it delivers to us, here in the word which names it, that is the "archive." In a way, the term indeed refers, as one would correctly believe, to the arkhe in the physical, historical, or ontological sense, which is to say to the originary, the first, the principial, the primitive, in short to the commencement. But even more, and even earlier, "archive" refers to the arkhe in the nomological sense, to the arkhe of the commandment. As is the case for the Latin archivum or archium (a word that is used in the singular, as was the French "archive," formerly employed as a masculine singular: "un archive"), the meaning of "archive," its only meaning, comes to it from the Greek arkheion: initially a house, a domicile, an address, the residence of the superior magistrates, the archons, those who commanded. The citizens who thus held and signified political power were considered to possess the right to make or to represent the law. On account of their publicly recognized authority, it is at their home, in that place which is their house (private house, family house, or employee's house), that official documents are filed. The archons are first of all the documents' guardians. They do not only ensure the physical security of what is deposited and of the substrate. They are also accorded the hermeneutic right and competence. They have the power to interpret the archives. Entrusted to such archons, these documents in effect state the law: they recall the law and call on or impose the law. To be guarded thus, in the jurisdiction of this stating the law, they needed at once a guardian and a localization. Even in their guardianship or their hermeneutic tradition, the archives could neither do without substrate nor without residence It is thus, in this domiciliation, in this house arrest, that archives take place. The dwelling, this place where they dwell permanently, marks this institutional passage from the private to the public, which does not always mean from the secret to the nonsecret. (It is what is happening, right here, when a house, the Freuds' last house, becomes a museum: the passage from one institution to another.) With such a status, the documents, which are not always discursive writings, are only kept and classified under the title of the archive by virtue of a privileged topology. They inhabit this unusual place, this place of election where law and singularity intersect inprivilege. At the intersection of the topological and the nomological, of the place and the law, of the substrate and the authority, a scene of domiciliation becomes at once visible and invisible. I stress this point for reasons which will, I hope, appear more clearly later. They all have to do with this topo-nomology, with this archontic dimension of domiciliation, with this archic, in truth patriarchic, function, without which no archive would ever come into play or appear as such. To shelter itself and sheltered, to conceal itself. This archontic function is not solely topo-nomological. It does not only require that the archive be deposited somewhere, on a stable substrate, and at the disposition of a legitimate hermeneutic authority. The archontic power, which also gathers the functions of unification, of identification, of classification, must be paired with what we will call the power of consignation. By consignation, we do not only mean, in the ordinary sense of the word, the act of assigning residence or of entrusting so as to put into reserve (to consign, to deposit), in a place and on a substrate, but here the act of consigning through gathering together signs. It is not only the traditional consignatio, that is, the written proof, but what all consignatio begins by presupposing. Consignation aims to coordinate a single corpus, in a system or a synchrony in which all the elements articulate the unity of an ideal configuration. In an archive, there should not be any absolute dissociation, any heterogeneity or secret which could separate (secernere), or partition, in an absolute manner. The archontic principle of the archive is also a principle of consignation, that is, of gathering together.

#### The archive requires the inscription of an event into an external environment similar to how the 1AC inscribes Middleton’s narrative to give it credence within debate. The archive can only assume an originary breakdown of her memory, and by doing so imposes hermeneutic violence upon the text.

Derrida ‘95 [Jacques Derrida, “Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression” Diacritics, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Summer, 1995), pp. 9-63, http://www.jstor.org/stable/465144]

But, the point must be stressed, this archiviolithic force leaves nothing of its own behind. As the death drive is also, according to the most striking words of Freud himself, an aggression and a destruction (Destruktion) drive, it not only incites forgetfulness, amnesia, the annihilation of memory, as mneme or anamnesis, but also commands the radical effacement, in truth the eradication, of that which can never be reduced to mneme or to anamnesis, that is, the archive, consignation, the documentary or monumental apparatus as hypomnema, mnemotechnical supplement or representative, auxiliary or memorandum. Because the archive, if this word or this figure can be stabilized so as to take on a signification, will never be either memory or anamnesis as spontaneous, alive and internal experience. On the contrary: the archive takes place at the place of originary and structural breakdown of the said memory. There is no archive without aplace of consignation, without a technique of repetition, and without a certain exteriority. No archive without outside. Let us never forget this Greek distinction between mneme or anamnesis on the one hand, and hypomnema on the other. The archive is hypomnesic. And let us note in passing a decisive paradox to which we will not have the time to return, but which undoubtedly conditions the whole of these remarks: if there is no archive without consignation in an externalplace which assures the possibility of memorization, of repetition, of reproduc- tion, or of reimpression, then we must also remember that repetition itself, the logic of repetition, indeed the repetition compulsion, remains, according to Freud, indissociable from the death drive. And thus from destruction. Consequence: right on what permits and conditions archivization, we will never find anything other than what exposes to destruction, in truth what menaces with destruction introducing, a priori, forgetfulness and the archiviolithic into the heart of the monument. Into the "by heart" itself. The archive always works, and a priori, against itself. The death drive tends thus to destroy the hypomnesic archive, except if it can be disguised, made up, painted, printed, represented as the idol of its truth in painting. Another economy is thus at work, the transaction between this death drive and the pleasure principle, between Thanatos and Eros, but also between the death drive and this seeming dual opposition of principles, of arkhai, for example the reality principle and the pleasure principle. The death drive is not a principle. It even threatens every principality, every archontic primacy, every archival desire. It is what we will call, later on, le mal d'archive, archive fever.

#### Nothing is more problematic than the notion of the archive – the 1AC documentation of Middleton’s narrative is not reflective of her own thoughts, but rather the aff’s re-presentation of her text.

Derrida ‘95 [Jacques Derrida, “Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression” Diacritics, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Summer, 1995), pp. 9-63, http://www.jstor.org/stable/465144]

Nothing is less reliable, nothing is less clear today than the word "archive." And not only because of the two orders of the arkhe we distinguished at the beginning. Nothing is more troubled and more troubling. The trouble with what is troubling here is undoubtedly what troubles and muddles our vision (as they say in French), what inhibits sight and knowledge, but also the trouble of troubled and troubling affairs (as they also say in French), the trouble of secrets, of plots, of clandestineness, of half-private, half- public conjurations, always at the unstable limit between public and private, between the family, the society, and the State, between the family and an intimacy even more private than the family, between oneself and oneself. I thus name the trouble, or what is called in English the "trouble," of these visions and of these affairs in a French idiom which is again untranslatable, to recall at least that the archive always holds a problem for translation. With the irreplaceable singularity of a document to interpret, to repeat, to reproduce, but each time in its original uniqueness, an archive ought to be idiomatic, and thus at once offered and unavailable for translation, open to and shielded from technical iteration and reproduction. Nothing is thus more troubled and more troubling today than the concept archived in this word "archive." What is more probable, on the other hand, and more clear, is that psychoanalysis is not without responsibility in this trouble. It wants to analyze it, but it also heightens it. In naming psychoanalysis here, one refers already, in any case, to the archive which is classified, at least provisionally, under the name of "psychoanalysis," of "Freud," and of a few others. In other words, if we no longer know very well what we are saying when we say "archive," "Freud" is undoubtedly not without responsibility. But the name of Freud, the name of the Freuds, as we have seen, itself becomes plural, thus problematic. The trouble de l'archive stems from a mal d'archive. We are en mal d'archive: in need of archives. Listening to the French idiom, and in it the attribute "en mal de," to be en mal d'archive can mean something else than to suffer from a sickness, from a trouble or from what the noun "mal" might name. It is to burn with a passion. It is never to rest, interminably, from searching for the archive right where it slips away. It is to run after the archive, even if there's too much of it, right where something in it anarchives itself. It is to have a compulsive, repetitive, and nostalgic desire for the archive, an irrepressible desire to return to the origin, a homesickness, a nostalgia for the return to the most archaic place of absolute commencement. No desire, no passion, no drive, no compulsion, indeed no repetition compulsion, no "mal-de" can arise for a person who is not already, in one way or another, en mal d'archive. Now the principle of the internal division of the Freudian gesture, and thus of the Freudian concept of the archive, is that at the moment when psychoanalysis formalizes the conditions of archive fever and of the archive itself, it repeats the very thing it resists or which it makes its object. It raises the stakes. Such is the case with the three plus one theses (or prostheses). Three of them have to do with the concept of the archive, one other with the concept of the concept.

#### The aff solves the disad because we recognize that we can never have a pure identification with the oppressed. This is the only way to prevent the violence of the static archive – we must always yearn to know what was lost.

Derrida ‘95 [Jacques Derrida, “Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression” Diacritics, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Summer, 1995), pp. 9-63, http://www.jstor.org/stable/465144]

And as wager [gageure]. The archive has always been a pledge, and like every pledge [gage], a token of the future. To put it more trivially: what is no longer archived in the same way is no longer lived in the same way. Archivable meaning is also and in advance codetermined by the structure that archives. It begins with the printer. We shall leave these questions suspended for the moment. Let us simply remark, and this is the same archival concern, a dating: this "mystic pad," this exterior, thus archival, model of the psychic recording and memorization apparatus, does not only integrate the inaugural concepts of psychoanalysis, from the Sketches up to the articles of the Metapsychology, by way of the Traumdeutung, in particular all those which concern for example repression, censorship, recording (Niederschrift) in the two systems (UCS and PCS), the three points of view (topic, dynamic, and economic). Taking into account the multiplicity of regions in the psychic apparatus, it also integrates the necessity, inside the psyche itself, of a certain outside, of certain borders between insides and outsides. And with this domestic outside, that is to say also with the hypothesis of an internal substrate, surface, or space without which there is neither consignation, registration, or impression nor suppression, censorship, or repression, it prepares the idea of a psychic archive distinct from spontaneous memory, of a hypomnesis distinct from mneme and from anamnesis: the institution, in sum, of aprosthesis of the inside. We have said "institution" (one could say "erection") so as to mark, right from the originary threshold of this prosthesis, a rupture which is just as originary with nature. The theory of psychoanalysis, then, becomes a theory of the archive and not only a theory of memory. This does not prevent the Freudian discourse from remaining heterogeneous, as I tried to show in "Freud and the Scene of Writing": an antagonistic and traditional motif continues in this discourse to oppose a metaphysics to the rigorous consequence of this prosthetics, that is, of a logic of hypomnesis. The model of this singular "mysticpad" also incorporates what may seem, in the form of a destruction drive, to contradict even the conservation drive, what we could call here the archive drive. It is what I called earlier, and in view of this internal contradiction, archive fever. There would indeed be no archive desire without the radical finitude, without the possibility of a forgetfulness which does not limit itself to repression. Above all, and this is the most serious, beyond or within this simple limit called finiteness or finitude, there is no archive fever without the threat of this death drive, this aggression and destruction drive. This threat is in-finite, it sweeps away the logic of finitude and the simple factual limits, the transcendental aesthetics, one might say, the spatio-temporal conditions of conservation. Let us rather say that it abuses them. Such an abuse opens the ethico-political dimension of the problem. There is not one mal d'archive, one limit or one suffering of memory among others: enlisting the in-finite, archive fever verges on radical evil.