CAP

The root cause of the Korean slavery was forced labor and capitalism. Nothing less than rejecting cap will resolve this mentality

That was their Sevilla 2007 cards

Their second piece of ev says that the model minority were recognized as the best workers

“I am just a simple farm worker”

Asians are viewed as hard working and worth more, and privileged- these are contructions of society by the capitalist system

The affirmative’s claims of radical resistance are nothing more than interpassivity in the face of capitalism – their energetic promotion of an ideal critical theory serves as an ideological screen to allow the logic of capital to remain unchallenged.

Zizek 02—Professor of Philosophy @ Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana [Slavoj, “Revolution at the Gates”, pg 167-172]

The problem lies in the further implicit qualifications which can easily be discerned by a “concrete analysis of the concrete situation”, as Lenin himself would have put it. “Fidelity to the democratic consensus” means acceptance of the present liberal-parliamentary consensus, which precludes any serious questioning of the way this liberal-democratic order is complicit in the phenomena it officially condemns, and, of course, any serious attempt to imagine a different sociopolitical order. In short, it means: say and write whatever you like — on condition that you do not actually question or disturb the prevailing political consensus. Everything is allowed, solicited even, as a critical topic: the prospect of a global ecological catastrophe; violations of human rights; sexism, homophobia, anti-feminism; growing violence not only in faraway countries, but also in our own megalopolises; the gap between the First and the Third World, between rich and poor; the shattering impact of the digitalization of our daily lives ... today, there is nothing easier than to get international, state or corporate funds for a multidisciplinary research project on how to fight new forms of ethnic, religious or sexist violence. The problem is that all this occurs against the background of a fundamental Denkverbot: a prohibition on thinking. Today’s liberal-democratic hegemony is sustained by a kind of unwritten Denkverbot similar to the infamous Berufsverbot (prohibition on employing individuals with radical Left leanings in the state organs) in Germany in the late 1960s — the moment we show a minimal sign of engaging in political projects which aim seriously to challenge the existing order, the answer is immediately: “Benevolent as it is, this will inevitably end in a new Gulag!” The ideological function of constant references to the Holocaust, the Gulag, and more recent Third World catastrophes is thus to serve as the support of this Denkverbot by constantly reminding us how things could have been much worse: “Just look around and see for yourself what will happen if we follow your radical notions!” What we encounter here is the ultimate example of what Anna Dinerstein and Mike Neary have called the project of disutopia: “not just the temporary absence of Utopia, but the political celebration of the end of social dreams”.2 And the demand for “scientific objectivity” amounts to just another version of the same Denkverhot: the moment we seriously question the existing liberal consensus, we are accused of abandoning scientific objectivity for outdated ideological positions. This is the “Leninist” point on which one cannot and should not concede: today, actual freedom of thought means freedom to question the prevailing liberal-democratic “post-ideological” consensus — or it means nothing. The Right to Truth The perspective of the critique of ideology compels us to invert Wittgenstein’s “What one cannot speak about, thereof one should be silent” into “What one should not speak about, thereof one cannot remain silent”. If you want to speak about a social system, you cannot remain silent about its repressed excess. The point is not to tell the whole Truth but, precisely, to append to the (official) Whole the uneasy supplement which denounces its falsity. As Max Horkheimer put it back in the l930s: “If you don’t want to talk about capitalism, then you should keep silent about Fascism.” Fascism is the inherent “symptom” (the return of the repressed) of capitalism, the key to its “truth”, not just an external contingent deviation of its “normal” logic. And the same goes for today’s situation: those who do not want to subject liberal democracy and the flaws of its multiculturalist tolerance to critical analysis, should keep quiet about the new Rightist violence and intolerance. If we are to leave the opposition between liberal-democratic universalism and ethnic/religious fundamentalism behind, the first step is to acknowledge the existence of liberal fundamentalism: the perverse game of making a big fuss when the rights of a serial killer or a suspected war criminal are violated, while ignoring massive violations of “ordinary” people’s rights. More precisely, the politically correct stance betrays its perverse economy through its oscillation between the two extremes: either fascination with the victimized other (helpless children, raped women . . .), or a focus on the problematic other who, although criminal, and so on, also deserves protection of his human rights, because “today it’s him, tomorrow it’ll be us” (an excellent example is Noam Chomsky’s defence of a French book advocating the revisionist stance on the Holocaust). On a different level, a similar instance of the perversity of Political Correctness occurs in Denmark, where people speak ironically of the “white woman’s burden”, her ethico-political duty to have sex with immigrant workers from Third World countries — this being the final necessary step in ending their exclusion. Today, in the era of what Habermas designated as die neue Unubersichtlichkeit (the new opacity),~ our everyday experience is more mystifying than ever: modernization generates new obscurantisms; the reduction of freedom is presented to us as the dawn of new freedoms. The perception that we live in a society of free choices, in which we have to choose even our most “natural” features (ethnic or sexual identity), is the form of appearance of its very opposite: of the absence of true choices. The recent trend for “alternate reality” films, which present existing reality as one of a multitude of possible outcomes, is symptomatic of a society in which choices no longer really matter, are trivialized. The lesson of the time-warp narratives is even bleaker, since it points towards a total closure: the very attempt to avoid the predestined course of things not only leads us back to it, but actually constitutes it — from Oedipus onwards, we want to avoid A, and it is through our very detour that A realizes itself. In these circumstances, we should be especially careful not to confuse the ruling ideology with ideology which seems to dominate. More than ever, we should bear in mind Walter Benjamin’s reminder that it is not enough to ask how a certain theory (or art) positions itself with regard to social struggles — we ask how it actually functions in these very struggles. In sex, the true hegemonic attitude is not patriarchal repression, but free promiscuity; in art, provocations in the style of the notorious “Sensation” exhibitions are the norm, the example of art fully integrated into the establishment. Ayn Rand brought this logic to its conclusion, supplementing it with a kind of Hegelian twist, that is, reasserting the official ideology itself as its own greatest transgression, as in the title of one of her late non-fiction books: “Capitalism, This Unknown Ideal”, or in “top managers, America’s last endangered species”. Indeed, since the “normal” functioning of capitalism involves some kind of disavowal of the basic principle of its functioning (today’s model capitalist is someone who, after ruthlessly generating profit, then generously shares parts of it, giving large donations to churches, victims of ethnic or sexual abuse, etc., posing as a humanitarian), the ultimate act of transgression is to assert this principle directly, depriving it of its humanitarian mask. I am therefore tempted to reverse Marx’s Thesis 11: the first task today is precisely not to succumb to the temptation to act, to intervene directly and change things (which then inevitably ends in a cul-de-sac of debilitating impossibility: “What can we do against global capital?”), but to question the hegemonic ideological co-ordinates. In short, our historical moment is still that of Adorno: To the question “What should we do?” I can most often truly answer only with “I don’t know.” I can only try to analyse rigorously what there is. Here people reproach me: When you practise criticism, you are also obliged to say how one should make it better. To my mind, this is incontrovertibly a bourgeois preiudice. Many times in history it so happened that the very works which pursued purely theoretical goals transformed consciousness, and thereby also social reality. If, today, we follow a direct call to act, this act will not be performed in an empty space — it will be an act within the hegemonic ideological coordinates: those who “really want to do something to help people” get involved in (undoubtedly honourable) exploits like Mediecins sans frontieres, Greenpeace, feminist and anti-racist campaigns, which are all not only tolerated but even supported by the media, even if they seemingly encroach on economic territory (for example, denouncing and boycotting companies which do not respect ecological conditions, or use child labour) — they are tolerated and supported as long as they do not get too close to a certain limit.6 This kind of activity provides the perfect example of interpassivity: of doing things not in order to achieve something, but to prevent something from really happening, really changing. All this frenetic humanitarian, Politically Correct, etc., activity fits the formula of “Let’s go on changing something all the time so that, globally, things will remain the same!”. If standard Cultural Studies criticize capitalism, they do so in the coded way that exemplifies Hollywood liberal paranoia: the enemy is “the system”, the hidden “organization”, the anti-democratic “conspiracy”, not simply capitalism and state apparatuses. The problem with this critical stance is not only that it replaces concrete social analysis with a struggle against abstract paranoiac fantasies, but that — in a typical paranoiac gesture — it unnecessarily redoubles social reality, as if there were a secret Organization behind the “visible” capitalist and state organs. What we should accept is that there is no need for a secret “organization-within-an-organization”. the “conspiracy” is already in the “visible” organization as such, in the capitalist system, in the way the political space and state apparatuses work.8 Let us take one of the hottest topics in today’s “radical” American academia: postcolonial studies. The problem of postcolonialism is undoubtedly crucial; however, postcolonial studies tend to translate it into the multiculturalist problematic of the colonized minorities’ “right to narrate” their victimizing experience, of the power mechanisms which repress “otherness,” so that, at the end of the day, we learn that the root of postcolonial exploitation is our intolerance towards the Other, and, furthermore, that this intolerance itself is rooted in our intolerance towards the “Stranger in Ourselves”, in our inability to confront what we have repressed in and of ourselves — the politico-economic struggle is thus imperceptibly transformed into a pseudopsychoanalytic drama of the subject unable to confront its inner traumas. . . . (Why pseudo-psychoanalytic? Because the true lesson of psychoanalysis is not that the external events which fascinate and/or disturb us are just projections of our inner repressed impulses. The unbearable fact of life is that there really are disturbing events out there: there are other human beings who experience intense sexual enjoyment while we are half-impotent; there are people submitted to terrifying torture.. . . Again, the ultimate truth of psychoanalysis is not that of discovering our true Self, but that of the traumatic encounter with an unbearable Real.) The true corruption of American academia is not primarily financial, it is not only that universities are able to buy many European critical intellectuals (myself included — up to a point), but conceptual: notions of “European” critical theory are imperceptibly translated into the benign universe of Cultural Studies chic. At a certain point, this chic becomes indistinguishable from the famous Citibank commercial in which scenes of East Asian, European, Black and American children playing is accompanied by the voice-over: “People who were once divided by a continent ... are now united by an economy” — at this concluding highpoint, of course, the children are replaced by the Citibank logo. The great majority of today’s “radical” academics silently count on the long-term stability of the American capitalist model, with a secure tenured position as their ultimate professional goal (a surprising number of them even play the stock market). If there is one thing they are genuinely afraid of, it is a radical shattering of the (relatively) safe life-environment of the “symbolic classes” in developed Western societies. Their excessive Politically Correct zeal when they are dealing with sexism, racism, Third World sweatshops, and so on, is thus ultimately a defence against their own innermost identification, a kind of compulsive ritual whose hidden logic is: “Let’s talk as much as possible about the necessity of a radical change, to make sure that nothing will really change!” The journal October is typical of this: when you ask one of the editors what the title refers to, they half-confidentially indicate that it is, of course, that October — in this way, you can indulge in jargonistic analyses of modern art, with the secret assurance that you are somehow retaining a link with the radical revolutionary past.. . . With regard to this radical chic, our first gesture towards Third Way ideologists and practitioners should be one of praise: at least they play their game straight, and are honest in their acceptance of the global capitalist co-ordinates — unlike pseudo-radical academic Leftists who adopt an attitude of utter disdain towards the Third Way, while their own radicalism ultimately amounts to an empty gesture which obliges no one to do anything definite. There is, of course, a strict distinction to be made here between authentic social engagement on behalf of exploited minorities (for example, organizing illegally employed chicano field workers in California) and the multiculturalist/postcolonial “plantations of no-risk, no-fault, knock-off rebellion” which prosper in “radical” American academia. If, however, in contrast to corporate multiculturalism”, we define “critical multiculturalism” as a strategy of pointing out that “there are common forces of oppression, common strategies of exclusion, stereotyping, and stigmatizing of oppressed groups, and thus common enemies and targets of attack,” I do not see the appropriateness of the continuing use of the term “multiculturalism”, since the accent shifts here to the common struggle. In its normal accepted meaning, multiculturalism perfectly fits the logic of the global market.

#### Capitalism causes extinction and destroys value to life

Simonovic 7 [Ljubodrag, Ph.D. in Philosophy; M.A. in Law; author of seven books, 2007, A New World is Possible, “Basis of contemporary critical theory of capitalism.”] Gender edited

The final stage of a mortal combat between [hu]mankind and capitalism is in progress. A specificity of capitalism is that, in contrast to "classical" barbarism (which is of destructive, murderous and plundering nature), it annihilates life by creating a "new world" – a "technical civilization" and an adequate, dehumanized and denaturalized man. Capitalism has eradicated man from his (natural) environment and has cut off the roots through which he had drawn life-creating force. Cities are "gardens" of capitalism where degenerated creatures "grow". Dog excrement, gasoline and sewerage stench, glaring advertisements and police car rotating lights that howl through the night - this is the environment of the "free world" man. By destroying the natural environment capitalism creates increasingly extreme climatic conditions in which ~~man is~~ [people are] struggling harder and harder to survive – and creates artificial living conditions accessible solely to the richest layer of population, which cause definitive degeneration of ~~man~~ [people] as a natural being[s]. "Humanization of life" is being limited to creation of micro-climatic conditions, of special capitalistic incubators - completely commercialized artificial living conditions to which degenerated people are appropriate. The most dramatic truth is: capitalism can survive the death of man as a human and biological being. For capitalism a "traditional ~~man~~ [person]" is merely a temporary means of its own reproduction. "Consumer~~-man~~ [person]" represents a transitional phase in the capitalism-caused process of mutation of man towards the "highest" form of capitalistic ~~man:~~ a robot~~-man.~~ "Terminators" and other robotized freaks which are products of the Hollywood entertainment industry which creates a "vision of the future" degenerated in a capitalist manner, incarnate creative powers, alienated from man, which become vehicles for destruction of man and life. A new "super race" of robotized humanoids is being created, which should clash with "traditional mankind", meaning with people capable of loving, thinking, daydreaming, fighting for freedom and survival - and impose their rule over the Earth. Instead of the new world, the "new man" is being created - who has been reduced to a level of humanity which cannot jeopardize the ruling order. Science and technique have become the basic lever of capital for the destruction of the world and the creation of "technical civilization". It is not only about destruction achieved by the use of technical means. It is about technicization of social institutions, of interpersonal relations, of the human body. Increasing transformation of nature into a surrogate of "nature", increasing dehumanization of the society and increasing denaturalization of man are direct consequences of capital's effort, within an increasingly merciless global economic war, to achieve complete commercialization of both natural and the social environment. The optimism of the Enlightenment could hardly be unreservedly supported nowadays, the notion of Marx that man imposes on himself only such tasks as he can solve, particularly the optimism based on the myth of the "omnipotence" of science and technique. The race for profits has already caused irreparable and still unpredictable damage to both man and his environment. By the creation of "consumer society", which means through the transition of capitalism into a phase of pure destruction, such a qualitative rise in destruction of nature and [hu]mankind has been performed that life on the planet is literally facing a "countdown". Instead of the "withering away" (Engels) of institutions of the capitalist society, the withering away of life is taking place.

Our alternative is to vote negative to reject the affirmative as a refusal to participate in activities which support capitalism. We must hollow out capitalist structures by refusing to invest our energy in reforms and rescue operations—avoids transition wars

Herod 4-Social Activist since 1968, owns an awesome website, Attended Columbia University and spent a year abroad at the University of Beirut (Lebanon) [James, Getting Free, 2004, http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm]

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells. This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and *start participating* in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing everything we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There *is* no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must *want something else* and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.

Kritik

# 1NC Subversive Ideology K

**Ideological transgression is a continuation of the existing order—the power of the protest structurally depends upon the continued authority of the system. The critique functions as a carnivalesque reversal of authority—we make a gesture of non-compliance that posits us as the “real” masters of fate.**

**Zizek 95** (Slavoj, PhD in Philosophy @ the University of Ljubljana, Senior Research in Sociology @ the University of Ljubljana, Professor of Philosophy and Psychoanalysis @ the European Graduate School, has been a visiting professor @ University of Chicago, Columbia University, Princeton, University of London, and NYU, International Director of the Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities, president of the Society for Theoretical Psychoanalysis, LAW AND THE POSTMODERN MIND: SUPEREGO BY DEFAULT, Cardozo Law Review, 1995, 16 Cardozo L. Rev. 925)

In the traditional patriarchal society, the inherent transgression of the law assumes the form of a carnivalesque reversal of authority: the king becomes a beggar, madness poses as wisdom, etc. A custom practiced in the villages of northern Greece until the middle of our century exemplifies this reversal. n5 One day a year was set aside for women to take over. Men had to stay at home and look after children while women gathered in the local inn, drank to excess, and organized mock trials of men. What breaks out in this carnevalesque suspension of the ruling patriarchal law is the fantasy of feminine power. Lacan draws attention to the fact that, in everyday French, one of the designations for the wife is la bourgeoise n6 - the one who, beneath the semblance of male domination, actually pulls the strings. This, however, can in no way be reduced to a version of the standard male chauvinist wisecrack that patriarchal domination is not so bad for women after all since, at least in the close circle of the family, they run the show. The problem runs deeper; **one of the consequences of the fact that the master is always an impostor is the duplication of the master** - the agency of the master is always perceived as a semblance concealing another, "true" master. Suffice it to recall the well-known anecdote quoted by Theodore Adorno in Minima Moralia, about a wife who apparently subordinates to her husband and, when they are about to leave the party, obediently holds his coat, all the while exchanging behind his back ironic patronizing glances with the fellow guests to communicate the message, "poor weakling, let him think he is the master!" In this opposition of semblance and actual power men are impostors, condemned to performing empty symbolic gestures while the actual responsibility falls to women. However, the point not to be missed here is that this specter of woman's power structurally depends on the male domination: it remains its shadowy double, its retroactive effect, and as such its inherent moment. For that reason, bringing the woman's shadowy power to light and acknowledging it publicly enables law to cast off its direct patriarchal dress and present itself as neutral egalitarian. The character of its obscene double also undergoes a radical shift: **what now erupts in the carnivalesque suspension of the "egalitarian" public law is precisely the authoritarian-patriarchal logic that continues to determine our attitudes,** although its direct public expression is no longer permitted. "**Carnival" thus becomes the outlet for the repressed dark side of social jouissance: Jew-baiting riots, gang rapes, lynchings, etc.** Insofar as the superego designates the intrusion of enjoyment into the field of ideology, we can also say that the opposition of symbolic law and superego points towards the tension between ideological meaning and enjoyment:symbolic law guarantees meaning, whereas superego provides enjoyment which serves as the unacknowledged *support* of meaning. Today, in the so-called postideological era, it is crucial to avoid confounding fantasy that supports an ideological edifice with ideological meaning - how can we otherwise account for the paradoxical alliance of post-Communism and Fascist nationalism such as that between Russia and Serbia? At the level of meaning, their relationship is that of mutual exclusion; yet they share a common phantasmatic support (when Communism was the discourse of power, it played deftly with nationalist fantasies - from Stalin to Ceausescu). Consequently, there is also no incompatibility between the postmodern cynical attitude of nonidentification - of distance towards every ideology - and the nationalist obsession with the ethnic thing. The thing is the substance of enjoyment: the cynic is a person who believes only in enjoyment - and is not the cynic the clearest example of one obsessed precisely with the national thing?

**Critiques uphold the existing system because they are a safe outlet for transgression, which is a necessary supplement to any system of power.**

**Zizek 95** (Slavoj, International Director of the Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities, president of the Society for Theoretical Psychoanalysis, LAW AND THE POSTMODERN MIND: SUPEREGO BY DEFAULT, Cardozo Law Review, 1995, 16 Cardozo L. Rev. 925)

The proper way to approach "psychoanalysis and law" is to ask the question: what kind of law is the object of psychoanalysis? The answer is, of course: superego emerges where the law - the public law, the law articulated in the public discourse - fails. At this point of failure, the public law is compelled to search for support in an illegal enjoyment. Superego is the obscene "nightly" law that necessarily accompanies, as its shadow, the "public" law. This inherent and constitutive splitting in the law is the subject of Rob Reiner's film, A Few Good Men, the court-martial drama about two marines accused of murdering one of their fellow soldiers. In the film, the military prosecutor accuses two marines of premeditated murder. The defense, however, wins an acquittal, demonstrating that the defendants were just following "Code Red" orders, which authorize a clandestine nighttime beating of any fellow soldier who, in the opinion of his peers or of the superior officer, breaks the United States Marines' ethical code. The dual function of Code Red is extremely interesting; it condones an act of transgression - illegal punishment of a fellow soldier - yet, at the same time, it reaffirms the cohesion of the group, calling for an act of supreme group identification. Such a code must remain under cover of night, unacknowledged, unutterable; in public, everybody feigns ignorance, or even actively denies its existence. Code Red represents the community spirit in its purest form, exerting the strongest pressure on the individual to comply with its mandate of group identification; yet simultaneously, it violates the explicit rules of community life. The plight of the two accused soldiers is that they are unable to grasp this exclusion of Code Red from the "big Other" - the public law; they desperately ask themselves what they did wrong, since they simply followed a superior officer's order.  From whence does this splitting of the law into the written public law and its underside, the "unwritten," obscene secret code, come? From the incomplete character of the public law. Explicit, public rules do not suffice; they must be supplemented by a clandestine "unwritten" code aimed at those who, although they violate no public rules, maintain a kind of inner distance and do not truly identify with the "spirit of community." n2 Sadism thus relies on the splitting of the field of the law into law qua "ego-ideal": a symbolic order which regulates social life and maintains social peace, and into its obscene, superegotistical inverse. As has been shown by numerous analyses from Mikhail Bakhtin onwards, **periodic transgressions of the public law are inherent to the social order inasmuch as they function as a condition of the latter's stability**. n3 **What most deeply holds together a community is not so much identification with the law that regulates the community's "normal" everyday circuit, but rather identification with a specific form of transgression of the law** - of the law's suspension (in psychoanalytic terms, with a specific form of enjoyment).

**Lacanian politics are a genuine political alternative. If it is impossible to fully represent the real, then we have no choice but to institutionalize the Lack or design politics around doubt and uncertainity. This will result in more radically democratic politics**.

Counter advocacy

The way we relate to debates matter and the structure and constraints of debate prevent accessibility and our infatuation with competition and winning a ballot prevents us from discussion that can lead to change in debate or in the real world. We know we don’t have our hands on the levers of power, but we can change the way we debate with the incorporation of identity. Our hail is to change the way we debate to an open forum discussion where anyone can participate—the closed doors prevent us from true engagement and desensitize us to the oppression of the 1AC.

Andy Ellis felt similarly in a 2004 (andy, debate critic, message posted to edebate, archived at http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200404/0463.html)

3)Lets make this argument perfectly clear too, its not just ok to be like i wanna work on the hill or i wanna work in the washington think tank establishment any more than its ok to be all like well i dont like the third reich but that internship a the chancelors asitant is a good carreer move, people wont say this because we are all supposed to be civil in this activity but what many of the community members use debate as preparation for is preparation for a kind of thinking that has left millions of dead bodies scattered here and around the world. When people say well I do this because I wanna be a congressman so I have to have traditional debate so I can prepare I say see you don’t know how right you are, my experience with much actual policy making is that it is a lot like traditional debate, decisions made in a hermetically sealed insular context free from public participation and input in which the bodies of those most effected by the decision are wielded entirely out of their control, decisions are always played out on a game board and made in a calculative way, much like debates most of the real policymaking is made by privileged white males in closed door settings, much like traditional debate a discourse of expertise is utilized to exclude anybody who doesn’t know the language, so yes debate is preparation for the policy making process, but instead of a reason why to keep going its a reason to take action to intervene against the genocidal condensation that exists within the preparatory pedagogythat jake and a bunch of other people simply find fun...lots of people like bull fighting too, doesnt mean that your fun is free of complicty in bad shit 4)before you tell me about all the good policy makers who have come out of debate that would have otherwise been eviler genocidal fucks, consider the massive amounts of lawyers and policymakers who we have taught to be better genocideres, those folks who will now be better prosecutors better imperial planners, better able to add liberal legitimacy to the pnac empire machine, simply put I don’t doubt that many of you are preparing for a future in politics, my problem is with the way you prepare and what you are preparing for.

Therefore the counterplan is to do the plan and discuss it in an open forum. This is key for several reasons. First it is more infinite than the aff because we are able striate from the norms of debate which are oppressive. Second it leads to disconnection from the ballot. The reason why they can never solve for their aff is because they have a want for the ballot which is why they have this strategy.

Bringing the round to the public is key to solve a broader issue

Competitiveness also means that people never recognize this struggle, rather view it as competition and write strats not engage

The competitiveness and speed also prevents a level of learning because the debates happen to quickly and all of the discussions end right after the ballots are casted thi is a way of starting the discussion but not letting it end

Also the thesis of the 1ac is to create a new understanding and knowledge of oppression that we didn’t know before. Introducing other people to participate means that there is a better chance of deliberation and understanding and incorporating more people into this discussion of oppression.

Thus we end the speech by presenting the question to the affirmative team. Would you like to open this debate and have a discussion of the affirmative that creates an inclusiver discussion so everyone in this round can understand, learn and participate in the discussion?