# 1nc Round 3 Wake

## Off

### 1nc – k

**We have reached the end of art and history – the patriarchal capitalist regime no longer relies on capital as production of material or extraction of labor but rather affective fuel – the 1ac is not in *opposition* to colonial control but is the *new normal***

James 14 (Robin James, Associate Professor of Philosophy at UNC Charlotte, Incandescence, Melancholy, and Feminist Bad Vibes: A Response to Ziarek’s Feminist Aesthetics and the Politics of Modernism, differences:A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, Vol. 25, No.. 2, p. 120-123, Duke University Press)

To use Jack Halberstam’s term, we like our women to “go gaga” because this incandescence, this “unpredictable feminine” (114) methodology allows us to eke even more light out of otherwise exhausted enlightenment modernity. If we’ve reached, as Ziarek discusses, the so-called end of art and the end of history (and the end of tonality and the end of representation and, well, the end of modernity), then the only way to find more resources is, like Pixar’s wall-e, by sifting through our vast piles of waste. And in that waste heap is abject femininity (what musicologist Susan Cook calls the feminized “abject popular”). Femininity is abject because its exclusion from patriarchy is what constitutes patriarchy as a coherent system. In both Ziarek’s aesthetics of potentiality and in resilience discourse, women artists do the cultural work of remaking abjection or constitutive exclusion into ecstatic radiance.13 In the former case, that work is revolutionary; in the latter case, that work normalizes. Resilience discourse transposes feminist revolution into a nationalist, patriarchal, white supremacist practice. Take, for example, Katy Perry’s “Firework,” in which the lyrics trace the affective journey from dejection to radiant exceptionality. The song begins by asking listeners to identify with feelings of irrelevance, weakness, loneliness, and hopelessness; it posits and affirms damage, suffering, and pain. But then Perry’s narrator argues that in spite and perhaps because of this damage, the listener has precisely the means to connect to others, to make a difference, to have hope: “[T]here’s a spark in you / You just gotta ignite the light and let it shine.” She uses the metaphor of fireworks (and their association with u.s. Independence Day celebrations) to describe the listener’s self-transformation from black dust to shining light: you may feel like trash, but if you can just light yourself on fire, that trash will burn with a dazzling radiance that lights up the sky, just as it lights up audiences’ faces. Here, Perry transforms abjection—feeling like trash, unmoored, socially dead—into incandescent triumph. In the song, the addressee’s personal triumph evokes u.s. nationalist narratives of overcoming colonization (i.e., the Declaration of Independence, celebrated on the Fourth of July). Feminine incandescence—the transformation of waste and melancholy into glowing potential—is no longer revolutionary. Not only parallel to u.s. nationalism, it is the very means for reproducing normativity. In resilience discourse, wild and crazy femmes—like, say, Ke$ha— reproduce normativity in the same way that deregulatory economic practices do (see Cardenas). Unlike Kant’s genius, who gives laws and generates order (i.e., regulation, giving a law) out of unruly materiality, the incandescent, “gaga” femme amplifies what feels like disorder by “resignif[ying] damaged bodies and objects previously expelled from the realm of meaning” (6). And to do this, incandescent femme geniuses use a specific type of experimentation, what Ziarek calls “a dynamic model of interrelation between literary form and material elements of the work of art” (6). This “dynamic interaction” between large-scale form and material details produces “effects” that are “unpredictable and unforeseeable” (Adorno qtd. in Ziarek 114). Experimental methods produce aleatory results.14 Neoliberalism, however, has systematized the aleatory; deregulatory practices are designed to control background conditions so that “dynamic interactions” between form and material produce a range of superficially random outcomes.15 Deregulation turns experimentation into the means of capitalist/hegemonic production. Brilliant gaga ecstasy is what fuels economic and social reproduction.16 So even though incandescent potentiality might be “the very opposite of the traffic in women” (Ziarek 119) figured as the exchange of commodities (e.g., in Irigaray and Rubin), it is quite consistent with neoliberal political and aesthetic economies. Who radiates with potentiality more than the resilient, entrepreneurial postfeminist woman? In the same way that feminized, blackened receptivity was the solution to modernist anxieties about alienation (e.g., the aforementioned Gooding-Williams), feminized, racially nonwhite resilience is taken as a solution to the problem of the “end of art.” Having transgressed all limits and prohibitions—for example, emancipating dissonance, making music out of noise—modernist art had no means of establishing its opposition to society/social normativity. Similarly, capitalism had colonized the globe, exhausting its ability to profit through simple expansion; with no new markets, with nothing else new to conquer, it needed a new method for generating surplus value. As Jeffery Nealon and others argue, capitalism has become a logic of investment and intensity. Instead of expanding and assimilating, it recycles waste and increases efficiencies. Thus, traditionally non- or devalued “women’s work” becomes the fastest growing sector of the service-and-care-work economy. And women’s art-making practices become the hottest new thing in the artworld: think of all the “feminist art” retrospectives and exhibits that have taken place in the past five or so years. Modernism’s constitutive outside becomes neoliberalism’s bread and butter; or, the abject is now central to the means of capital, political, and aesthetic production.17

#### The aff’s demands buy into the logic of the speed-elite – the push to make debate a site of activism and circulate knowledge about black livingness mystifies their reliance on unethical modes of technology and communication that results in a cooption of their advocacy, redirecting it towards ends that are fundamentally military. Instead you should vote negative in favor of the 1nc’s poetic, speculative research method that takes problem in visibility through rendering it visible – this is an ethics of intellectual inquiry that resists the imperative of speeding up the flow of information and instead performs the trick of fatal theory, engendering an accident in the infrastructure that brings about the possibility of the event. Our refusal of the affirmative’s will to knowledge beyond the point of speculation clones the form of debate, causing the university to implode from within.

**Hoofd 10** (Ingrid M. Hoofd, Assistant Professor in the Communications and New Media Programme at the National University of Singapore, Feb 2010, “The accelerated university: Activist-academic alliances and simulation of thought,” ephemera, http://www.ephemerajournal.org/contribution/accelerated-university-activist-academic-alliances-and-simulation-thought)

Although Facoltà di Fuga and Ricercatori Precari do not ally themselves explicitly with the alter-globalist movement, their call against neo-liberalism and for online thinking and research in service of the struggles of ‘the oppressed and marginalised’ makes them quite suitable for creating such alliances. This call for ‘knowledge in service of the oppressed’ is more explicitly present in Investigacció (Research), which was set up in order to combine the agendas of social movement activists with those of university researchers. In their flyer for their first international meeting on ‘Social Movements and Activist Research’ in 2004 in Spain, Investigacció likewise aptly accuses the neo-liberal privatisation of knowledge as the main cause for current social exclusion. Knowledge, in their view, instead should be produced from the ‘focal point of activist research’ which should entail the ‘actual subjectivities of research from and for social movements’, instead of from those who reside within the privileged space of academia (Investigacció, 2005: 1). The meeting is hopefully envisioned to be a ‘space of encounter and self-formation’ which ‘self-constitute[s] as a-disciplinary so that we can overcome the fictitious distinctions common to academicism’ (2005: 2). Knowledge will thus, according to Investigacció, be generated ‘from our own subjectivities (in contrast to aiming for scientific ‘objectivity’) without limitations or hierarchies’ (2005: 3). But far from an ‘a-disciplinary self-constitution’ that supposedly overcomes any fictitious distinction, Investigacció for one relies heavily on the common fictitious distinction between activism and academia to validate their praxis. By contrasting their initiative to the false objectivity of academicism, they **validate their own knowledge production** by **claiming to be in the margins** as opposed to **the ‘ivory tower’**, as if the latter is a stable area from which one can detach oneself from the outside world and hence **objectively analyse**. Also, **one could wonder to what extent one is actually speaking from the margins when one has the time, technologies, spaces and connections to organise an event** like Investigacció. The desire to generate knowledge from **‘one’s own subjectivity, without limitations’** (2005: 3**) is analogous to the mythical humanist narrative of breaking with and improving upon previous knowledge – a form of knowledge-innovation that the academic institution is also infused with.** The university of excellence as well as its doublings into projects like Investigacció are therefore an effect of its repetitions (with a difference) into the neo-liberal mythical space of progress and acceleration. The creation of more and more ‘spaces and mechanisms of production, exchange and collective reflection’ (2005: 3) is indeed precisely what late-capitalism seeks to forge, as long as such reflection generates an intensification of production. **The idea that subjectivities from social movements are in any way less produced by neo-liberal globalisation is highly problematic**. In fact, such an idea suggests a **rather positivist notion of the subject** – similar to that supposedly objective academic individual Investigacció seeks to dethrone. Investigacció then somewhat nostalgically narrates a subject untainted by power structures and technologies. In fact, the Investigaccióinitiative displays how the subject of activist research empowers her- or himself throughrecreating the fictitious distinction between activism and academia. S/he does so by reproducing this opposition, which in turn co-creates and accelerates these ‘new spaces’ – spaces that were created with the goal of facilitating global capitalism and its speed-elite, and that allow for the perfection of military power through technologies of surveillance. The call for participants to become active and productive in co-organising the international event – of course, without any monetary remuneration – is also much present in Investigacció’s rhetoric. They suggest that participants should engage with one another not only at the meeting, but especially through the online spaces Investigacció has created for the purpose of generating **activist research**. ‘**Take action!’ says their flyer**, ‘[...] **make it so the conference is yours**!’ This seductive appeal to the subject-individual as the centre of creative production is very common to neo-liberal consumerism and its emphasis on cybernetic interactivity. But it is also false in that it gives the participants a sense of control over Investigacció that they actually do not have – eventually, the main organisers (have already) set the agenda and handed out the stakes. In short, the organisers fail to situate themselves by pretending everyone is on the same level of privilege – for example, not requiring monetary compensation – in this project, and this failure is strangely an effect of their attempt at reviving a more democratic academic structure. Information Initially, one could think that Baudrillard’s assessment **confirms my analytical suspicion regarding activist-research projects**. In ‘The Implosion’, Baudrillard starts from the premise that the **increase of information** in our media-saturated society **results in a loss of meaning** because it ‘**exhausts itself** in the act of **staging communication’**. New media technologies **exacerbate the subject’s fantasy of transparent communication**, while increasingly what are communicated are mere copies of the same, a ‘recycling in the negative of the traditional institution’ (Baudrillard, 1994: 80). New technologies are simply the **materialisation of that fantasy of communication**, and the ‘**lure’** (1994: 81) of such a **technocratic system** resides in the requirement of **active political engagement to uphold that fantasy**. **This translates in a call to subjectivise oneself** – **to be vocal, participate, and to ‘play the [...] liberating claim of subjecthood’** (1994: 85). The result of the intensifying circular logic of this system, he says, is that meaning not only implodes in the media, but also that **the social implodes in the masses** – the construction of a ‘hyperreal’ (1994: 81). Contra the claim of Glocal Research Space that such praxes of alliance are ‘without an object’ (Glocal Research Space, 2003: 19), this does not mean that objectification does not take place at all. Instead, and in line with Baudrillard’s argument, the urge to subjectivise oneself and the objectification of the individual go hand in hand under speed-elitism – a double bind that locks the individual firmly into her or his technocratic conditions. Indeed, the argument in ‘Activist Research’ that ‘research [should be] like an effective procedure [which is] in itself already a result’ (2003: 19) describes the conditions of Readings’ ‘university of excellence’ where any research activity, thanks to technological instantaneity, translates immediately into the capitalist result of increased information flow (Readings, 1996: 22). **Active subjects and their others become the cybernetic objects of such a system of information flow**. The insistence in ‘Activist Research’ on free, travelling and nomadic research simply makes sure that this logic of increased flow is repeated. Because of this desire for increased flow and connection, **activist-research projects are paradoxically highly exclusivist in advocating the discourses and tools of the speed-elite**. The problem with projects like Edu-Factory or the **productive cross-over of activism and academia** is therefore not only that **their political counter-information means just more information** (**and loss of meaning**) **as well as more capitalist production**, but that **it puts its faith in precisely those technologies and fantasies of control, communication and of ‘being political’ that underlie the current logic of overproduction.** It is at this point that John Armitage and Joanne Roberts in ‘Chronotopia’ contend that such a **‘cyclical repetition’** (Armitage and Roberts, 2002: 52) is **particularly dangerous** because the fantasy of control remains exactly that, a **fantasy**. At the same time, this increasingly forceful repetition **can only eventually give way to ‘the accident’ because chronotopian speed-spaces are fundamentally and exponentially unstable**. Armitage and Roberts’ idea of ‘cyclical repetition’ through chronotopianism does thus not mean an exact repetition of the speed-elite’s quest for mastery – instead, I would argue that it is this **immanent quality of difference in repetition**, of the ‘**essential drifting due to [a technology’s] iterative structure** cut off from […] consciousness as the authority of the last analysis’ as Derrida calls it in ‘Signature Event Context’ (Derrida, 1982: 316) **that allows for the accident or true event to appear**. The difference through technologically sped-up repetition appears then perhaps as a potential, but only precisely as a growing potential that cannot be willed – in this sense, it will be an unanticipated event indeed. One could then speak of an intensification of politics in what is perhaps too hastily called the neo-liberal university, opening up unexpected spaces for critique in the face of its neo-liberalisation, which in turn points to **the fundamental instability of its enterprise**. Activist-research projects add to this intensification by virtue of their **techno-acceleration**. This intensification of politics is **no ground for univocal celebration**, since it remains also the hallmark of the neo-liberal mode of production of knowledge through the new tele-technologies as excellent, regardless of its critical content. The current university’s instability mirrors and aggravates the volatility of a capitalism marked by non-sustainability, a growing feminisation of poverty, the rise of a new global upper class, and **highly mediated illusions of cybernetic mastery**. **This nonetheless also opens up new forms of thought, if only appearing as ‘accidents’**. Derrida hints at this, but also at the university’s elusiveness, in ‘Mochlos, or: the Conflict of the Faculties’, when he claims that he ‘would almost call [the university] the child of an inseparable couple, metaphysics and technology’ (Derrida, 1993: 5, emphasis mine). Almost, but never quite – **here then emerges the possibility of truly subversive change**. But **this change will not be brought about by the mere content of the critique, but by the way it pushes acceleration to the point of systemic disintegration or implosion**. In Fatal Strategies, **Baudrillard calls this the ‘fatal strategy’ that contemporary theory must adopt: a sort of conceptual suicide attack which aims at pulling the rug out from under the speed-elitist mobilisation of semiotic oppositions, and which shows the paradox behind any attempt at structural predictions.** In ‘The Final Solution’, Baudrillard relates this intensification of the humanist obsession with dialectics, mastery, and transparency – the quest for immortality that is at the basis of techno-scientific research – to **destruction and the death drive** through the metaphor of and actual research around cloning, which strangely resonates well with Derrida’s investigation of the tele-technological archive in Archive Fever. **I read Baudrillard’s ‘Final Solution’ here as a metaphor for the duplication (cloning) of thought into virtual spaces outside the university walls proper**. If contemporary research seeks to make human cloning possible, argues Baudrillard, then **this endeavour is equivalent to cancer**: after all, cancer is simply automatic cloning, a deadly form of multiplication. It is of interest here to note that the possibility of creating an army of clones has likewise **garnered much military interest**, just **as academia today more and more serves military ends**. As the logic of cloning as automatic multiplication is typical of all current technological and humanist advancements, **the exacerbation of this logic can only mean more promise and death**. At this point my argument mirrors **the apocalyptic tone of the activist-research projects**. In the final analysis, the problem with Edu-Factory, Facoltà di Fuga, Investigacció, Universidad Nómada, Ricercatori Precari, and Glocal Research Space is that these projects entail a very specific form of subjugation with dire consequences for the slower and less techno-genic classes. Techno-scientific progress entails a regress into immortality, epitomised by a nostalgia typical of the current socio-technical situation, for when we were ‘undivided’ (Baudrillard, 2000: 6). I contend that Baudrillard refers not only to the lifeless stage before humans became sexed life forms, but also makes an allusion to psycho-analytic readings of the ‘subject divided in language’ and its nostalgia for wholeness and transparent communication. **The desire for immortality, like archive fever, is therefore the same as the Freudian death drive, and we ourselves ultimately become the object of our technologies of scrutiny and nostalgia**. **The humanist quest of totally transparency of oneself and of the world to oneself that grounds the idea of the modern techno-scientific university, is ultimately an attempt at (self-)destruction, or in any case an attempted destruction of (one’s) radical difference [alterity]. The urgent political question**, which Stiegler problematically avoided in Disorientation, then becomes: which selves are and will become caught up in the delusion of total self-transparency and self-justification, and which selves will be destroyed? And how may we conceive of **an ‘ethic of intellectual inquiry or aesthetic contemplation’** that **‘resists the imperatives of speed’**, as Jon Cook likewise wonders in ‘The Techno-University and the Future of Knowledge’ (Cook, 1999: 323)? It is of particular importance to note here that **the very inception of this question and its possible analysis, like the conception of the speed-elite, is itself again a performative repetition of the grounding myth of the university of independent truth, justice and reason**. Therefore, in carrying forward the humanist promise, this analysis is itself bound up in the intensification of the logic of acceleration and destruction, and that is then also equally tenuous. This complicity of thought in the violence of acceleration itself in turn quickens the machine of the humanist promise, and can only manifest itself in the prediction of a coming apocalypse – whether it concerns a narrative of the death of thought and the university, or of a technological acceleration engendering the Freudian death drive. **We are then simply the next target in the technological realisation of complete** γνωθι σαυτον (**know thyself) – or so it seems. Because after all, a clone is never an exact copy, as Baudrillard very well knows; and therefore, the extent to which activist-research projects hopefully invite alterity can thankfully not yet be thought.**

#### Even if the aff’s *demands* are radical, their presentation is not --- forwarding livingness is a constraining affective investment that reduces aff solvency and legitimizes violence

Lundberg 12 (Christian Lundberg, Co-Director of the University Program in Cultural Studies and Professor of Rhetoric at the University of North Carolina, PhD in Communication Studies from Northwestern University, Lacan in Public: Psychoanalysis and the Science of Rhetoric, p. 174-177)

Thus, "as hysterics you demand a new master: you will get it!" At the register of manifest content, demands are claims for action and seemingly powerful, but at the level of the rhetorical form of the demand or in the register of enjoyment, demand is a kind of surrender. As a relation of address the hysterical demand is more a demand for recognition and love from an ostensibly repressive order than a claim for change. The limitation of the students' call on Lacan does not lie in the end they sought but in the fact that the hysterical address never quite breaks free from its framing of the master. The fundamental problem of democracy is not articulating resistance over and against hegemony but rather the practices of enjoyment that sustain an addiction to mastery and a deferral of desire. Hysteria is a politically effective subject position in some ways, but it is politically constraining from the perspective of organized political dissent. If not a unidirectional practice of resistance, hysteria is at best a politics of interruption. Imagine a world where the state was the perfect and complete embodiment of a hegemonic order, without interruption or remainder, and the discursive system was hermetically closed. Politics would be an impossibility: with no site for contest or reappropriation, politics would simply be the automatic extension of structure. Hysteria is a site of interruption, in that hysteria represents a challenge to our hypothetical system, refusing straightforward incorporation by its symbolic logic. But, stepping outside this hypothetical non-polity, on balance, hysteria is politically constraining because the form of the demand, as a way of organizing the field of political enjoyment, requires that the system continue to act in certain ways to sustain its logic. Though on the surface it is an act of symbolic dissent, hysteria represents an affirmation of a hegemonic order and is therefore a particularly fraught form of political subjectivization. The case of the hysteric produces an additional problem in defining jouissance as equivalent with hegemony. One way of defining hysteria is to say that it is a form of enjoyment that is defined by its very disorganization. As Gerard Wajcman frames it, the fundamental analytical problem in defining hysteria is precisely that it is a paradoxical refusal of organized enjoyment by a constant act of deferral. This deferral functions by asserting a form of agency over the Other while simultaneously demanding that the Other provide an organizing principle for hysterical enjoyment, something the Other cannot provide. Hysteria never moves beyond the question or the riddle, as Wajcman argues: the "hysteric ... cannot be mastered by knowledge and therefore remains outside of history, even outside its own .... [I]f hysteria is a set of statements about the hysteric, then the hysteric is what eludes those statements, escapes this knowledge .... [T]he history of hysteria bears witness to something fundamental in the human condition-being put under pressure to answer a question.T'" Thus, a difficulty for a relatively formal/ structural account of hegemony as a substitute for jouissance without reduction: where is the place for a practice of enjoyment that by its nature eludes nanling in the order of knowledge? This account of hysteria provides a significant test case for the equation betweenjouissance and hegemony, for the political promise and peril of demands and ultimately for the efficacy of a hysterical politics. But the results of such a test can only be born out in the realm of everyday politics. On Resistance: The Dangers of Enjoying One's Demands The demands of student revolutionaries and antiglobalization protestors provide a set of opportunities for interrogating hysteria as a political practice. For the antiglobalization protestors cited earlier, demands to be added to a list of dangerous globophobes uncannily condense a dynamic inherent to all demands for recognition. But the demands of the Mexico Solidarity Network and the Seattle Independent Media project demand more than recognition: they also demand danger as a specific mode of representation. "Danger" functions as a sign of something more than inclusion, a way of reaffirming the protestors' imaginary agency over processes of globalization. If danger represents an assertion of agency, and the assertion of agency is proportional to the deferral of desire to the master upon whom the demand is placed, then demands to be recognized as dangerous are doubly hysterical. Such demands are also demands for a certain kind of love, namely, the state might extend its love by recognizing the dangerousness of the one who makes the demand. At the level the demand's rhetorical function, dangerousness is metonymically connected with the idea that average citizens can effect change in the prevailing order, or that they might be recognized as agents who, in the instance of the list of globalophobic leaders, can command the Mexican state to reaffirm their agency by recognizing their dangerousness. The rhetorical structure of danger implies the continuing existence of the state or governing apparatus's interests, and these interests become a nodal point at which the hysterical demand is discharged. This structure generates enjoyment of the existence of oppressive state policies as a point for the articulation of identity. The addiction to the state and the demands for the state's love is also bound up with a fundamental dependency on the oppression of the state: otherwise the identity would collapse. Such demands constitute a reaffirmation of a hysterical subject position: they reaffirm not only the subject's marginality in the global system but the danger that protestors present to the global system. There are three practical implications for this formation. First, for the hysteric the simple discharge of the demand is both the beginning and satisfaction of the political project. Although there is always a nascent political potential in performance, in this case the performance of demand comes to fully eclipse the desires that animate content of the demand. Second, demand allows institutions that stand in for the global order to dictate the direction of politics. This is not to say that engaging such institutions is a bad thing; rather, it is to say that when antagonistic engagement with certain institutions is read as the end point of politics, the field of political options is relatively constrained. Demands to be recognized as dangerous by the Mexican government or as a powerful antiglobalization force by the WTO often function at the cost of addressing how practices of globalization are reaffirmed at the level of consumption, of identity, and so on or in thinking through alternative political strategies for engaging globalization that do not hinge on the state and the state's actions. Paradoxically, the third danger is that an addiction to the refusal of demands creates a paralyzing disposition toward institutional politics. Grossberg has identified a tendency in left politics to retreat from the "politics of policy and public debate.":" Although Grossberg identifies the problem as a specific coordination of "theory" and its relation to left politics, perhaps a hysterical commitment to marginality informs the impulse in some sectors to eschew engagements with institutions and institutional debate. An addiction to the state's refusal often makes the perfect the enemy of the good, implying a stifling commitment to political purity as a pretext for sustaining a structure of enjoyment dependent on refusal, dependent on a kind of paternal "no." Instead of seeing institutions and policy making as one part of the political field that might be pressured for contingent or relative goods, a hysterical politics is in the incredibly difficult position of taking an addressee (such as the state) that it assumes represents the totality of the political field; simultaneously it understands its addressee as constitutively and necessarily only a locus of prohibition. These paradoxes become nearly insufferable when one makes an analytical cut between the content of a demand and its rhetorical functionality. At the level of the content of the demand, the state or institutions that represent globalization are figured as illegitimate, as morally and politically compromised because of their misdeeds, Here there is an assertion of agency, but because the assertion of agency is simultaneously a deferral of desire, the identity produced in the hysterical demand is not only intimately tied to but is ultimately dependent on the continuing existence of the state, hegemonic order, or institution. At the level of affective investment, the state or institution is automatically figured as the legitimate authority over its domain. As Lacan puts it: "demand in itself ... is demand of a presence or of an absence ... pregnant with that Other to be situated within the needs that it can satisfy. Demand constitutes the Other as already possessing the 'privilege' of satisfying needs, that it is to say, the power of depriving them of that alone by which they are satisfied."46

## Case

### 1nc – presumption

#### Presumption

#### 1--Psychological violence- the only ground they leave is against their thesis level making say black life is bad or re-energization through performance is bad- this proves how their aff structurally recreates psychological violence in the pursuit of wins for the ballot as the competitive site of debate makes negation inevitable

#### 2--Bad debates/education- this is proven by the inevitable jurisdiction arguments they’ll make in the 2ac- if you don’t think non-Black folks should have a say in the benefits and drawbacks of survival strategies then why did you insert it into a public policy debate against non-black people- you have sufficiently left us with nothing to say which kills engagement and clash and reproduces culpability

#### 3--Aff condo - allows the affirmative to re-interpret their aff to be something new in every speech - especially with their ability to leverage perms and absent a plan text as a stable locus for advocacy you must default negative on the question of competitive equity- all critical and policy negative ground is predicated off of proving why the aff’s change from the status quo is bad- if you vote affirmative, you make it impossible to be negative by allowing affs that don’t propose a meaningful change from the status quo to win debates

#### 4--Teleos- there’s literally no point in which the affirmative’s method is complete- this proves that the affirmative doesn’t outline a goal oriented advocacy but instead forwards a sociological analysis of the status quo- this form of debate is bad for radical education because we won’t be prepared to use different tactics provisionally, instead opting for overarching theories about how the world operates- this means that material instances of violences are ignored

#### 5--Academia DA- carving out open performative space in debate all while criticizing debate’s exclusionary practices represents a cruelly optimistic attachment to the debate space as a site for liberatory performance- this purifies the debate space and the academy making it seem like a great place which allows it to reproduce its genocidal logics

#### 6--Affective investment in the maintenance of sentimental public spheres lubricates the wheels of liberalism, mobilizing fantasies of collective desires that undergird neoliberal regimes of governance

Berlant 8

(Lauren Berlant, Professor of English at the University of Chicago, Introduction of *THE FEMALE COMPLAINT: The Unfinished Business of Sentimentality in American Culture*, Duke University Press: Durham and London, 2008)

Sentimentality: Love, Then Repeat As the preface suggested, the intimate public of femininity has always conjoined the very act of consumption to a powerful hunger to know and adapt the ways other people survive being oppressed by life. The therapeutic intensity of this drive is so conventional to sentimentality it comprises a story that barely needs to be told, a promise of aesthetic recognition and redemption whose consumption is its own reward. Such an economy is an important part of the sense of belonging an intimate public provides: the cliché and the convention represent “insider knowledge.” It would be easy to dismiss the social productivity of this kind of reward, as it associates subjective confirmation with fundamental changes of the sort the privileged rarely want to risk. But the mechanism of sentimental saturation of the intimate sphere with materials and signs of consumer citizenship has been crucial to what Mark Seltzer has called the “pathological public sphere” of the contemporary United States, which Karen Halttunen locates in the sensationalism of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century.43 The Uncle Tom genealogy is notable precisely because its sensationalism was a politically powerful suturing device of a bourgeois revolutionary aesthetic. The contradictions evoked by that phrase will be played out variously throughout each chapter: what links them is the centrality of affective intensity and emotional bargaining amid structural inequity, and the elaboration and management of ambivalent attachments to the world as such, the as-suchness of the world.44 I have been speaking of conventions, of stereotypes, and forms, the diacritics of congealed feeling that characterize the cultural scene of sentimentality: behind this is a desire to see the sentimental itself as a form—a dynamic pattern—not just a content with scenic themes, like that of weeping, sacrifice, and sanctified death. As when a refrigerator is opened by a person hungry for something other than food, the turn to sentimental rhetoric at moments of social anxiety constitutes a generic wish for an unconflicted world, one wherein structural inequities, not emotions and intimacies, are epiphenomenal.45 In this imaginary world the sentimental subject is connected to others who share the same sense that the world is out of joint, without necessarily having the same view of the reasons or solutions: historically, the sentimental intervention has tended to involve mobilizing a fantasy scene of collective desire, instruction, and identification that endures within the contingencies of the everyday. The politico-sentimental therefore exists paradoxically: it seeks out the monumental time of emotional recognition, a sphere of dreaming and memory, and translates that sense into an imaginary realm of possible acting, where agency is somehow unconstrained by the normative conventions of the real as it presents itself; and it holds the real accountable to what affective justice fantasy has constructed. This is to say that where sentimental ideology is, so will there be a will to separate and compartmentalize fundamental psychically felt social ambivalences, so that a sense of potentiality can be experienced enduringly, motivatingly, and even utopianly. The downside is that, often, all of the forces in play can seem formally equivalent. For example, the critique of patriarchal familialism that sentimental texts constantly put forth can be used to argue against the normativity of the family; at the same time, the sacred discourse of family values also sustained within this domain works to preserve the fantasy of the family as a space of sociability in which flow, intimacy, and identification across difference can bridge life across generations and model intimate sociability for the social generally. Likewise, at the same time that bourgeois nationalism promotes a sentimental attachment among strangers that is routed through the form of the nation, it also abjures the sentimental when the idiom of certain claims is inconvenient. (Sentimentalists talk about the emotional costs of injustice, not the material ones; the personal impacts of not changing, not the structural benefits of continuity.) Arguments for rationality and individual affective and appetitive self-management in the everyday have also been used to build and to critique identity discourses associated with historically subordinated U.S. populations;46 at the same time sentimental rhetoric is mobilized to describe everything from the timeless psychic unity of citizens possessing a national identity to the fragility of normal culture itself when faced with challenges to it.47 Meanwhile, social progressives have for over a century represented the ordinary effects of structural suffering in tactically sentimental ways—modes of testimony, witnessing, visual documentation about the personal impact of structural subordination—to critique the racist/patriarchal/capitalist world; now that same world has assimilated those genres to describe the psychic effects of feminism/multiculturalism on those who once felt truly free, nationally speaking. What conclusions can we reach from this jumble of ambitions to use and refuse sentimentality in the political sphere? That politics, mediated by publics, demands expressive assurance, while political subjectivity is, nonetheless, incoherent; that ideological incoherence or attachment to contradictory ethics and ways of life is not a failure but a condition of mass belonging; that ambivalent critique produces domains (such as intimate publics) to one side of politics that flourish insofar as they can allow the circulation of the open secrets of insecurity and instability without those revelations and spectacles engendering transformative or strongly resistant action in the idiom of political agency as it is usually regarded. Tracking mass-mediated norms of belonging in the affective register and conventions of engendering emotional solidarities helps us to understand the reproduction of normative life amid serious doubts about the probability that anyone, except the lucky, will be able to forge durable relations of reciprocity among intimates or strangers; such fractures produce the complaint as a register not merely of a stuckness but of the conditions of bargaining that allow people to maintain both their critical knowledge and their attachments to what disappoints.

### 1nc – semiotic mediation

**7-- narratives of oppressed overcoming function as semiotic capital to grease the wheels of racial neoliberalism**

**James 15** Robin James, professor of philosophy at UNC Charlotte, Resilience & Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism, Zero Books, 2015: 88 |||clarity edits marked by|||

Resilience must be performed explicitly, legibly, and spectacularly. Overcoming is necessary, but insufficient; to count and function as resilience, this overcoming must be accomplished in a visible or otherwise legible and consumable manner. Overcoming is a type of "affective labor" which, as Steven Shaviro puts it, "is productive only to the extent that it is a public performance, it cannot unfold in the hidden depths; it must be visible and audible" (PCA 49n33). In order to tune into feminine resilience and feed it back into its power supply, MRWaSP has to perceive it as such. "Look, I Overcame!" is the resilient subject's maxim or mantra. Gender and race have always been "visible identities," to use philosopher Linda Martin Alcoff's term, identities strongly tied to one's outward physical appearance. However, gendered/ racialized resilience isn't visible in the same way that conventional gender and racial identities are visible. To clarify these differences, it's helpful to think of resilience in terms of a "Look, I Overcame!" imperative. "Look, I Overcame!" is easy to juxtapose to Frantz Fanon's "Look, a Negro!", which is the touchstone for his analysis of gendered racialization in "The Fact of Blackness." In both cases, looking is a means of crafting race/gender identities and distributing white patriarchal privilege. But, in the same way that resilience discourse "upgrades" traditional methods for crafting identities and distributing privilege, the "looking" in "Look, I Overcame!" is an upgrade on the "looking" in "Look, a Negro!" According to Fanon, the exclamation "Look, a Negro!" racializes him as a black man. To be "a Negro" is to be objectified by the white supremacist gaze. This gaze fixes him as an object, rather than an ambiguous transcendence (which is a more nuanced way of describing the existentialist concept of subjectivity). "The black man," as Fanon argues, "has no ontological resistance for the white man" (BSWM 110) because, as an object and not a mutually-recognized subject, he cannot return the white man's gaze ("The Look" that is so important to Sartre's theory of subjectivity in Being & Nothingness). The LIO narrative differs from Fanon's account in the same way it differs from Iris Young's account of feminine body comportment: in resilience discourse, objectification isn't an end but a means. Any impediment posed by the damage wrought by the white/male gaze is a necessary prerequisite for subjectivity, agency, and mutual recognition. In other words, being looked at isn't an impediment, but a resource. Resilience discourse turns objectification (being looked at) into a means of subjectification (overcoming). It also makes looking even more efficient and profitable than simple objectification could ever be. Recognizing and affirming the affective labor of the resilient performer, the spectator feeds the performer's individual overcoming into a second-order therapeutic narrative: our approbation of her overcoming is evidence of our own overcoming of our past prejudices. This spectator wants to be seen by a wider audience as someone who answers the resilient feminine subject's hail, "Look, I Overcame!". Just as individual feminine subjects use their resilience as proof of their own goodness, MRWaSP uses the resilience of its "good girls" as proof that they're the "good guys"—that its social and ethical practices are truly just, and that we really mean it this time when we say everyone is equal. For example, the "resilience" of "our" women is often contrasted with the supposed "fragility" of Third-World women of color. Or, in domestic US race-gender politics, the resilience of some African-American women (their bootstraps-style class ascendance) is contrasted to the continued fragility of other African-American women, and thus used to reinforce class distinctions among blacks. There are a million different versions of this general story: "our" women are already liberated—they saved themselves—but, to riff on Gayatri Spivak, "brown women need saving from brown men." Most mainstream conversations about Third-World women are versions of this story: discussions of "Muslim" veiling, female circumcision, sweatshops, poverty, "development," they're all white-saviorist narratives meant to display MRWaSP's own resilience. Look, I Overcame!" upgrades "Look, a Negro! |||Black|||" by (a) recycling objectification into overcoming .and (b) compounding looking, so that one can profit from others' resilience, treating their overcoming as one's own overcoming. This upgrade in white supremacist patriarchy requires a concomitant upgrade in "looking." This shift in looking practices parallels developments in film and media aesthetics. As Steven Shaviro has argued, the values, techniques, and compositional strategies most common in contemporary mainstream Western cinema—like Michael Bay's Transformers—are significantly different than the ones used in modernist and post-modernist cinema, and that these differences in media production correlate to broader shifts in the means of capitalist and ideological production. Neoliberalism's aesthetic is, he argues, "post-cinematic." This post-cinematic aesthetic applies not just to film and media, but to resilience discourse. Its performance practices and looking relations configured by the "Look, I Overcame!" imperative, resilience is, in a way, another type of post-cinematic medium. In the next section I use Shaviro's theory of post-cinematic media to identify some specific ways in which traditional patriarchal tools are updated to work compatibly with MRWaSP resilience discourse. The looking in the "Look, I Overcame!" narrative is not the same kind of looking described by concepts like "the male gaze" or "controlling images." This looking is a type of deregulated MRWaSP visualization.

### 1nc – cruel optimism

#### 8-- the whiteness of debate utilizes the aff’s scenes of violence for anxiety assuasion, translating scenic suffering into material violence

Hook 13 (Derek, prof @ birkbeck college, university of London, The racist bodily imaginary: The image of the body-in-pieces in (post)apartheid culture, Subjectivity Vol. 6, No. 3, 254–271)

One of the great strengths of Fanon’s (1952/1986) Black Skin White Masks lies precisely in its apparent exaggerations, which show how adept the young Fanon was, amidst his early enthusiasm for psychoanalysis, in reading white fantasy. Fanon uses the imagery of the black body being broken apart, burnt, cut, exploded, eviscerated, describing such scenes with the notion of ‘corporeal malediction’.3 He was obviously deeply affected by accounts of lynching and related forms of physical racist violence, but his disturbingly eloquent descriptions, articulated in the vocabulary of phenomenology and psychoanalysis, go further than this. He taps into the just ‘beneath the surface’ imaginary quality of racist fantasy. Fantasy of this sort is not readily assumed or ‘owned’ by the subject. It is not openly spoken of, or effectively ‘subjectivized’; quite the contrary, the experiencing subject might be surprised, even repelled by the fantasy if it is rendered too clearly, in overly explicit forms. Nor for that matter is the fantasy wholly unconscious; it is more like a latent schema of understanding, a subliminal frame of apprehension through which black otherness comes to be understood. Fanon (1952/1986) is also profoundly aware of the idealizing aspect of such fantasies. These idealizations are entwined with stereotyping caricatures, so that apparently admirable qualities become reduced to racial vices: the perception of economic industriousness is thus transformed into ‘the Jew’s love of money’ (for detailed elaboration of Fanon’s argument, see Hook, 2011). What this postulate brings to light is the possibility that the (post)apartheid preoccupation with the black body-in-pieces maintains a ‘co-representative’, an additional fantasmatic component. I have in mind here the notion of the black body as strong, impervious, possessed of a formidable and superior physicality. This stereotypical trait, which might be recognized variously in irrational attributions of athleticism, bodily strength, vitality and natural physical endowment, is of course a well-known trope of racism also in British and US contexts (St Louis, 2005; Stuart, 2005). The black body here becomes – perhaps unexpectedly – ‘phallic’: an emblem of strength, of power, of what the white subject has lost, or stands to lose. Our tentative analysis thus points to a twofold schema, an antinomy of fantasy. On the one hand: the phallic corporeality of black corporeality, the black body as epitome of physicality, as icon of vitality, as body in apotheosis. Yet, in contrast to such (distorted) idealizations, these bodies remain in perpetual proximity to death, to suffering; they are pictured in terrible states of duress, of dismemberment and violence that the white subject can never quite imagine for themselves. The fantasmatic black body exists thus in two irreconcilable scenes: as site of destruction (the body-in-pieces), and as image of physical perfection, bodily exultation, site of exaggerated vitality. Body in extremis coincides thus with the body in excelsis. Such a complex of coinciding images makes for fertile terrain within the racist (or racialized) imaginary, and affords a variety of dynamic explanations. One may understand the alternating components of this complex, this racist ‘archetype’, along the lines suggested by Mbembe’s (2001) discussion of the body of the colonized, in which an exaggerated physicality eradicates properties of agency, spiritual elevation and humanity: [I]n the colony the body of the colonized individual is considered, in its profanity, one object among others. Indeed, being no more than a ‘body- thing’, it is neither the substrate nor the affirmation of any mind or spirit ... His cadaver remains lying on the earth in a sort of unshakable rigidity, a material mass and a simple, inert object, condemned in the position of that which plays no role at all. (Mbembe, 2001, pp. 26–27) What is particularly useful about Mbembe’s contribution is that it links many of the above psychoanalytic theorizations of the body to a more overtly political dimension, that of key notions within the philosophy of colonial subjugation.4 These ideas link back to a longstanding Fanonian theme: the delegation of the bodily. This is the idea that the crass corporeality of the body that a particular (racial/class) group disavows is projected upon another group, who is thus consigned to the position of abject racial other. Fanon’s concern is primarily with white attributions of the hyper-sexuality of blacks, but we may extrapolate his idea to include the facet of excess corporeality, the dimension of the abject body. The factor of racialization here is impossible to ignore: the broken body, the suffering body, the repulsive body-in- pieces is always, certainly within apartheid culture, the black body. We can go one step further and link this conceptualization to Lacan’s (2006) formulations regarding the corps morcelé. In his seminal essay on the mirror-stage, Lacan notes that the ‘fragmented body ... is regularly manifested in dreams’, particularly so under experiences of ‘the aggressive disintegration of the individual’ (p. 78). Of course, given the predominance of the social fantasy with which we are concerned here, it is apparent that such schemas of fragmentation are not equally distributed throughout all social groups. One would expect, in situations of radical social asymmetry, that such imagery would be delegated to racial/cultural/ class others who are then given the burden of acting as depository for all such values and all related anxieties of fragmentation. This would be to say that the white body-in-pieces in racist or (post)colonial culture is elided; it never comes into view; it is never present except in the displaced form of the abjected black body-in-pieces. On the basis of the above theorizations we can offer at least two accounts of the dynamic relationship between the facets of the fantasy we are examining. Doing so enables us to speculate on the libidinal economy, that is, the distribution of affects, in these related scenes. We might begin by emphasizing the priority placed on the imagining of the black body-in-pieces in racist contexts, and stress the need for white subjects to revisit or visualize this image precisely as the displacement of the fragmentary experiences of the white body-in-pieces. Odd as it may sound, such images here would have a placatory function, soothing anxieties of dissolution by locating them in a site of pronounced dis-identifica- tion. A societal fixation with such images, their incessant repetition within various forms of popular culture, can thus be understood along affective lines: such images glow with the gratification of respite, with the alleviation of anxiety, they make a tacit pronouncement: ‘White bodies are not destined for this fate’. There is also an argument that such scenes visit upon their victims exactly the violence they are thought to deserve. One relies here on the notion of projection, the idea that the other comes to be the carrier of the repellant values that the racist subject has themselves discarded. One thus attacks the other, blames them, with vigour proportionate to the need to expel these attributes from the self. To this we may add the Lacanian thesis that such depictions play the part of a scene of (dis) identification. Lacan’s (2006) notion of the mirror stage specified that a double relation obtained between the subject and potential image of identification: the image is both jubilantly loved as a narcissistically gratifying object, and yet also hated inasmuch as it proves a destabilizing or rivalrous influence. Such images of black body-in-pieces are, as such, a pure imagining of hate. There is a wishfulness about them, as if they visualize a desire, perhaps like the picturing of a wish in a dream, albeit in a literal and unusually undisguised manner.