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#### The 1AC is an activist game – they trade violence for points and collect the ballot for passing “Go” – vote negative to induce a break in that operationality in favor of critical reflection.

Schleiner 19 Anne-Marie Schleiner, 2019, “The broken toy tactic: Clockwork worlds and activist games,” from “The Playful Citizen Civic Engagement in a Mediatized Culture,” edited by René Glas, Sybille Lammes, Michiel de Lange, Joost Raessens, and Imar de Vries, SJBE

Although my argument in this chapter will be informed by the substantial inroads that Bogost and others have wrought theorizing the dynamic procedural rhetoric of games, what has been somewhat overlooked, even by critics of ‘procedurality’ like Miguel Sicart (2011), is a closer consideration of procedurality itself. In particular, I am interested in the impact of these ‘gamic’ procedures on political or social critique in what are called ‘serious games.’ Serious games is a grab-bag appellation for diverse educational, training, and activist games, which I will for this chapter primarily limit to the analysis of ‘activist simulation games,’ games such as Climate Defense (Auroch Digital 2013) or Sweatshop (Littleloud 2011) with explicit political and/or persuasive ambitions on the part of their concerned citizen makers. A one- or two-person developer is often solely responsible for all aspects of the game-making in these independent small companies, including art direction, design, programming, and playtesting. The maker of an activist simulation game attempts to make use of mimetic algorithms in the game to present a persuasive argument in motion, to launch a social, environmental, or other activist critique, or to open a political question. As more ordinary citizens come of age among the ‘ludoliterate’ versed in the language and genres of gameplay, relatively easy to produce casual games are becoming an attractive vehicle for political action (Raessens 2010). Still, we are only beginning to forge an understanding of how such games both serve and fail as activist tools, as tactics, among others, available to the concerned citizen. Therefore, my definition in this chapter of an ‘activist simulation game’ is both: a. motivated by an activist or political intent on the part of the game-maker, and b. attempts to harness simulation and procedurality in the game to carry the maker’s political critique or message to the playing public.3 A definition relying partially on the game-maker’s intention does encounter inherent contradictions, as when, for example, games not explicitly intended to be politically persuasive, such as entertaining war games, can easily be read as propaganda. But the desire on the part of the game-maker to use a game as a form of political argumentation with a broader public, both when it succeeds and fails as it is countermanded by aspects of the game, is a primary tension that I will explore in this chapter. Referring to this difficulty in designing serious games Mary Flanagan writes: “These play spaces must retain all the elements that make a game enjoyable while effectively communicating their message” (2009, 249). In an activist simulation game, a play move is not only an inconsequential act of fun, but also carries symbolic weight by referencing real issues and world problems, for instance signifying whether a member of a threatened species like the polar bear in Polar Plunder (AIMS Games Center 2013) can find enough food under the ice for her cubs despite Arctic climate change. And yet, in spite of this added worldly weight and consequentiality, it is often difficult to take serious games seriously. Although game-makers set out to shock players with a moving diagram of harmful and tragic operations, players conversely succumb to the enchantment of lively, toy-like, mechanical processes within the miniature, abstracted clockwork game world, no matter how damaging the actual operations in the exterior world, regardless of how many dolphins are killed or how many tracts of rainforest are destroyed. The game asks to be played and mastered, inviting the player to enter into its cause and effect mechanical loops, regardless of the consequences—it is only a game, after all. The ‘toyness’ of the world of the game, the miniature abstraction of the model that announces itself as game, not life, contributes to this nullification of the game’s critical impact, as I will discuss further on. Moreover, I will argue that the operational movements running inside the game induce a complacency akin to what Martin Heidegger referred to as “everyday sight,” a way of “Being-in-the-World” already familiar to us from procedural interactions in the world outside the game (1927, 107). In order to better understand the effect of the procedurality of the game on the player, in this chapter I will draw on what may seem an unlikely and acontemporous source from outside the fields of game studies and computer science, where procedurality itself has often been accepted at face value as a positive rhetorical tool within games.4 In Being and time, his primary work devoted to forwarding a temporal, embodied phenomenological understanding of human existence, Heidegger theorized a common, everyday mode of being (ontology) and a mental framework that he understood as a submersion within the everyday circulations and procedures of the work-a-day, social world (Ibid., 78). This practical view of the workings of the world is what he refers to alternately as “everyday sight” and “circumspection” (2003, 107). A railway line transports workers from the suburbs to the city; the suburban train stops to let a passenger off at an inner-city station guarded by a vigilant conductor who steps back and forth on the station platform. Such an interlocking set of functional workings, which we also see running compellingly in the toy city of Madurodam, is supplementary to Heidegger’s “Dasein in the They,” an immersed everyday orientation within the common world (1927, 167). We seldom question or “disclose” our place or the place of others in such work-a-day utilitarian operations, for to do so continuously would impede our ability to plug into the “equipmental workshops” we use to take care of daily business (Ibid., 105). The dilemma that confronts the activist game-maker is that the very procedural logic of the simulation game that he or she hopes to harness for a provocative critique has a bewitching effect on the player, comparable to Heidegger’s state of fascinated absorption in the practical workings of the world (1927, 107). Examples of equipment in Being and time, of clocks, hammers, planes, and needles, speak of a more rhythmic, mechanical, Industrial Age, but almost a century later, well into the Information Age, much of our world is still composed of functional, instrumental relations, on and off the screen (Ibid., 99). Circuitous operationality has found yet another abode in the weightless, abstract toy workings of computer games. And yet there are exceptions to this rule of the genre, ways for concerned citizens to design games that snap the player out of the hypnotic circle of toy operationality, via what I will refer to as the broken toy tactic. A rupture in the game catapults the player outside the comforting and rewarding operational sphere of the clockwork game world and induces him or her to critical reflection, contestation, or action. While analyzing two popular activist games closely, I will argue that the player’s shift from fascinated immersion in moving game world operations to a disturbed confrontation with a malfunction of play mirrors Heidegger’s anxious illuminations of the operational clockwork loops of the world that might arise when a tool, like his oft invoked hammer, is broken or missing (1927, 102). A break in the smooth functionality of the game discloses its operational logic in greater “totality” (Ibid., 105). For Heidegger, a “clearing” of everyday sight uncovers the disquieting temporality of “the who’s” existence, as well as illuminating his possibilities (Ibid., 167). Yet, in the hands of the concerned citizen game-maker, this unsettling existential pause or stop, this interruption of the game’s workings, is also a moment ripe for critical reflection and evaluation that precedes the formation of a political stance and possible action, the intended transformation of ‘games for change.’Overseers of toy world operations Let’s enter into a closer comparison of toy world operations at work in two widely played pioneering activist simulation games. The player of Uruguayan Gonzalo Frasca’s airstrike simulator game, September 12th (Frasca 2003a) assumes a ‘god’ or ‘bird’s-eye’ position overlooking a Middle Eastern city from above (see Figure 6.1). This is similar to the perspective on Will Wright’s classic SimCity (Maxis 1989) where the player as city planner constructs and manages a city from above. In fact, many simulation games, following the genre template set by SimCity and The Sims (Maxis 2000), position the player as a distant overseer of automated, minutely scaled, toy working worlds. The goal at the outset of September 12th, similar to many commercial war games released after the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001, appears to be to eliminate terrorists from the streets of a Middle Eastern city, identifiable by their gray robes and machine guns. But as the game proceeds, the player recognizes that the more frequently he launches missiles on the terrorists in the city, the more neighboring civilians, including women and children, are converted into terrorists. Forging a rational feedback loop between the player’s actions and visible outcomes in the game environment, September 12th simulates an escalating cycle of conflict exasperated by the War on Terror. This interactive, escalation between player and game becomes a dynamic, interactive argument for “violence begets violence.” Thus, the game procedurally makes a case for peace via the interactive simulation of strife between the terrorists and the player—who is cast in the role of an air force striker. But here we may be slightly misled in applying Frasca’s own belief in the rhetorical efficacy of simulation to the analysis of the game (2003b). The cycle of the escalation of violence largely becomes illuminated in a critical light because the game does not work properly as a game—the only way to ‘win’ the game would be to abstain from playing, from interacting with the game! On the flip side of the ‘positive’ simulation of a damaging cycle of the escalation of violence, lies a negative argument for non-intervention, for non-engagement, a ‘no play imperative’ in either war or games. Paradoxically, can the simulation of a harmful process only become visible (disclosed) to the player, and thereby leveraged as critique, if the game is made frustratingly unplayable, in effect rendered a broken toy? Before we continue with this question, let’s take a few moments to consider how procedurality and simulation have been understood in game scholarship thus far. Murray was one of the first to call attention to the procedurality of games and electronic media. According to Murray, [p]rocedural authorship means writing the rules by which the texts appear as well as writing the texts themselves. It means writing the rules for the interactor’s involvement, that is, the conditions under which things will happen in response to the participant’s actions. It means establishing the properties of the objects and potential objects in the virtual world and the formulas for how they will relate to one another. (1997, 152-153) Bogost refers to the rhetorical impact of such gamic procedural mechanisms on the player as ‘procedural rhetoric’: “I suggest the name procedural rhetoric for the practices of using processes persuasively, just as verbal rhetoric is the practice of using oratory persuasively and visual rhetoric is the practice of using images persuasively” (2008, 125). As a rhetorical form, game procedurality appears to be an important new form of communication available in the public political sphere. Similarly emphasizing the communicative power of gamic procedures, according to Frasca, a game designer or ‘Simauthor’ (simulation author) communicates via the rules, logical processes, and algorithms in the game that model the trajectory of outside the game workings and outcomes: Whoever designs a strike simulator that is extremely hard to play is describing his beliefs regarding social mechanics through the game’s rules rather than through events. […] They are not only able to state if social change is possible or not, but they have the chance of expressing how likely they think it may be. (2003b, 228) Activist game-makers such as Frasca therefore believe it is possible to harness the procedures of the game to mimic the probable outcome of a military assault, and to thereby communicate a particular belief about the workings of the world to the player-citizen, a citizen who may have voting rights and live in a nation with influence over the course of the war. Simulation games deliberately encourage the forging of correspondences from inside-the-game actions, procedures running within Johan Huizinga’s “magic circle” of play (1950), to external spheres of action, so as to provoke a confusion that Bogost dubs as ‘simulation fever’: “But for the magic circle to couple with the world, it must not be hermetic; it must have a breach through which the game world and real-world spill over into one another” (2006, 136). Therefore, for the purposes of this discussion, what is important from Huizinga’s much-cited and challenged magic circle is the relation between procedures running inside the game and those outside the game. Worldly goings-on, when transposed via simulation to the game sphere or magic circle, become magically enchanting because they are miniature toy-like abstractions. My application of the magic circle to contemporary simulation games is not intended to imply that such digital games are magical, sorcerous rituals, as in Daniel Pargman and Peter Jakobsson’s (2008) critique of the contemporary usage of Huizinga’s term. The movement of causal loops within the game exerts the more mundane, everyday magic of the toy miniature, what Chaim Gingold (2003) refers to as a “miniature garden,” a spatially reduced, abstracted world like a Japanese garden, model train set, or a doll house. Over the course of his Master’s thesis, also conducted at Georgia Tech, Gingold expands on the term he encountered in an interview with Shigero Miyamoto, the influential Japanese game designer of Nintendo computer games. Gingold writes: [A] garden has an inner life of its own; it is a world in flux which grows and changes. A garden’s internal behaviors, and how we understand those rules, help us to wrap our heads and hands around the garden. […] Gardens, like games, are compact, self-sustained worlds we can immerse ourselves in. (2003, 7) The reduction in scale and in complexity in a Japanese garden, the scaling down from forest to tree, from lake to pond, serve in a game as a cognitive aid for the player’s apprehension of the systematic clockwork world, a miniature sphere of operations. The simulation game’s ‘procedural argument’ intentionally blurs the line between the miniature game world and the outside world, but there are important differences between the operations running on either side of this fence or ludic border. Although all games have dynamic, timebased procedures, not all of these play moves make much sense outside the game—in other words, to state the rather obvious, not all games are simulation games. For example, when a player makes a move in checkers, this does not correlate to a specific action undertaken in the world outside the game. In this way, the falling, colorful squares of Tetris (Pajitnov 1984) are just that, falling colorful squares. These primarily signify play moves. In such abstract games, actions procedurally advance the game forward toward a goal (or multiple goals) triggering wins and losses. By contrast, in the simulation game, actions and processes have a double signification as both gamic procedures and as metaphoric actions. And yet this added layer of metaphoric significance does not mean that the player will reflect critically on the simulated operation in activist games, as will become apparent in the following example. By way of comparison to September 12th, let’s now consider another widely played, free for download, activist simulation game that affords the player an overview of a miniature toy world. Similar to September 12th, Paulo Pedercini’s farcical McDonald’s Video Game (Molleindustria 2006), simulates a harmful operation, in this case, an environmentally destructive fast food corporate industry. McDonald’s Video Game is structured as a managerial simulation game, and although designed and programmed entirely by Pedercini, the prolific creator behind Molleindustria, the game implements a slick graphical user interface button panel (see Figure 6.2) reminiscent of commercially produced The Sims. The McDonald’s Video Game player alternates between managing four distinct production cycles: a. overseeing farm production; b. administering a cattle feedlot; c. managing a chain of hamburger-grill workers; and d. negotiating policies and marketing campaigns in ‘corporate headquarters.’ The challenge of the game is to effectively multitask, manage, and maintain the production routines in all four areas without letting one slip. As the player’s skill improves, outcomes of actions in one sphere of operations have ramifications elsewhere in the game. For instance, if not enough cattle are raised, negative consequences arise further up the supply chain, ultimately effecting the McDonald’s corporation bottom-line. Although McDonald’s Video Game periodically discloses snippets of textual information about fast food industry practices, it is this simulation of lively processes that imparts a convincing overview of interlocking cycles of fast food bio-production, from deforestation to raising enough cattle for meat to fastfood public relations campaigns. Despite recurrent dips into bankruptcy, McDonald’s Video Game operates so well as managerial training software with the management of a miniature, toy-like, cheerful cow and hamburger world that the ironic subtext of this being an unethical business practice is often missed by players. For instance, when my game design students in Singapore played McDonald’s Video Game, they seemed largely unconcerned about the detrimental side effects of this type of production on workers, animals, consumers, or the environment. They were willing to undertake whatever was necessary to keep the game system alive and the McDonald’s corporation above the bottom line, even adding diseased cows to the food chain. The enchanting ordinariness of toy world equipment Unlike the vehicles circulating in the toy model city of Madurodam, games like September 12th and McDonald’s Video Game require interaction from the player via buttons or a graphical user interface (GUI), conventionally organized into an instrumental dashboard at the edge of the screen. September 12th presents the player with a weapon for targeting and shooting the terrorists; McDonald’s Video Game offers the player a colorful toy-like button interface of slaughterhouse machinery to first convert the livestock into hamburgers, and then a different range of equipment for converting hamburgers into dollars. This observation on the equipment of the game interface may seem obvious, but it is this very ordinariness in game interaction that poses another challenge to critical and activist game design because ‘equipmental’ interactions with game procedures contribute to the player’s ‘everyday sight.’ In a chapter of Being and time entitled ‘The worldhood of the world,’ Heidegger describes the equipment required for his everyday operational view of ‘Being-in-the-World’: “In our dealings we come across equipment for writing, sewing, working, transportation, measurement. […] A totality of equipment is constituted by various ways of the ‘in-order-to,’ such as serviceability, conduciveness, usability, manipulability” (1927, 97). When observable in the clockwork toy world, these equipmental operations impart everyday common sense. Referring to the simulation of a natural cycle in a clock, Heidegger writes: “In a clock, account is taken of some definite constellation in the world system” (2003, 72), and further on he writes: “When we make use of the clock-equipment, which is proximally and inconspicuously ready-to-hand, the environing Nature is ready-to-hand along with it” (Ibid., 101). In other words, those earthly relations that are simulated or incorporated in the equipment, such as the movement of the sun from day to night being replicated in the clock, are easily ‘discovered’ and naturalized in the ‘clock-equipment’. Equipment, or the “ready-to-hand” is easy to see, contrasting to Heidegger’s “presence-at-hand,” the term he uses to refer to the sounds and colors of perceived but not yet differentiated “reality,” such as a rumble of noise that upon reaching the ear does not quite resolve into the screech of a passing motorbike (1927, 228). Unlike the confusion that an intrusion of “presence-at-hand” reality might occasion, the equipmental operations of the ready-to-hand world are easily apprehended, made sense of, or ‘discovered.’ The equipment’s functionality seems obvious, running smoothly in plain sight, in the common-sense realm of ‘the They.’ Naturally, the player would want to use the available buttons to operate the farm machinery and produce hamburgers. Thus, simulation games simulate alleged processes from outside the game sphere in plain view, invoking the everyday perspective of how things work, the operations of fast food production, or of an efficient airstrike. If we apply an extended Heideggerian interpretation, ‘equipment’ refers not only to interface buttons, but also to the larger operations (in his terms ‘workshops’) that these buttons trigger or manipulate. For instance, September 12th presents the player with a weapon for targeting and shooting the terrorists; while McDonald’s Video Game offers the player a colorful toy-like button-interface of slaughterhouse machinery to turn livestock into hamburgers, and then a different range of equipment for turning hamburgers into dollars. Although ready-to-hand equipment is easily discoverable, it is also hidden, in another sense. The familiarity of everyday sight or circumspection, conceals “the totality” of a clockwork operation, the in-order-to relations that it is connected to, including objects and persons at a distance (Heidegger 1927, 105). Immersion in the clockwork world’s operations is a state of “concernful” absorption that is to a certain extent blind and alienated, not only to its own existence, but to the larger repercussions of the operation (Ibid., 101). The game’s movement compels the player to accept its operations as ordinary, as unquestionable cycles of everyday life, unfolding within plain view or, to be more precise, in relation to simulation genre games, within the elevated plain view of the great overseer of the toy world operations. The challenge that then confronts the concerned citizen game-maker is that no matter what these simulated operations are, as they run with the evocative mimicry within miniature toy worlds, they acquire everyday currency and uncritical acceptance among players via the motion of their interlocking, toy-like workings. Player vs. game But do the toy world’s procedures really subsume the player to such an extent? Is the operational functionality of the game truly so bewitching? Furthermore, an allegation could be made that Bogost’s rhetorical transmission of procedural game logic from the sender (the game-maker or ‘Simauthor’) to receiver (the player) is limited by a communications model of sending and receiving. The player in this analysis, even while interacting with the game, becomes a passive recipient of rhetoric in motion. In a similar vein, Sicart critiques the limited role that players are afforded in designer-weighted, instrumental ‘proceduralist’ game studies, writing that players “are important, but only as activators of the process that sets the meanings contained in the game in motion” (2011). Are game designers, then, the only ones afforded the role of agents of engaged ludic citizenship? In support of player agency, Frasca proposes that players, not only game designers, potentially impact the ultimate rhetorical “outcome” of a game by channeling the course of play into directions unimagined by the game-maker (2003b, 228). Frasca calls upon Brazilian theater director Augusto Boal’s “Theater of the Oppressed” as a model for how a game can depart from Aristotlean narrative closure. Frasca writes “one of [Boal’s] most popular techniques, re-enacts the same play several times by allowing different audience members to get into the stage and take the protagonist’s role,” resulting in unforeseen outcomes (Ibid.). For instance, such player-directed outcomes are evident in the spectacular demise of artificial game life, of entire families and their pets, in a dark genre of the Sims known as ‘Disaster Sims.’ The player’s influence on the game’s rhetorical outcome in such cases amounts to a breaking of the original game designer’s ‘script’ to breed a suburban American family. With these morbid, broken games, often ending in fire, we return via a different path, following the player’s initiative rather than the game-maker’s, to derailed and broken game equipment. On the other hand, when the toy is not broken, when the system is running without interruption, as when the player engages with the productive fast food mechanizations of McDonald’s Video Game, the player remains blind to its workings even as she plugs into its persuasive everyday perspective. Losing track of time, the player immerses herself in a sequence of game challenges that, if designed well, alternates rewards (points, bonuses, and additional tools) with escalating peaks of difficulty, oscillating within what psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi refers to as a pleasurable “flow state” between challenge and skill (1990, 74). Thus, the player’s fascinated state of absorption during gameplay suggests a loss of agency to the game’s mechanics, except for when the player willfully alters the course of the game’s ‘oppressive script’. Similarly, again from the realm of phenomenological philosophy, Heidegger’s student Hans-Georg Gadamer makes the inverse proposal that the game plays the player rather than the player the game (1975). Gadamer conducted an inquiry into aesthetics and art that brought him to the phenomenology of play. Gadamer’s player gives up his will to the game while performing the reflexive moves demanded by a game: “The structure of play absorbs the player into itself, and thus frees him from the burden of taking the initiative, which constitutes the actual strain of existence” (1975, 105). The player merges with the game, entering into an ongoing interactive, reflexive feedback loop: “What happens to us in the experience of art, Gadamer suggests, is very much like what happens to us in play: we lose ourselves” (Weinsheimer 1985, 102). Unless the player is forced to reflect upon correspondences reaching beyond the game, the player’s critical and reflective capacity, political or otherwise, is easily bewitched amid the movement of game actions. Reacting with neither doubt, nor, on the contrary, belief, the player flows with the game’s operational allegations about how the world works. Only when the model is broken or interrupted by a renegade player, such as the maker of a Disaster Sim, or a game cheater or breaker, or through some form of sabotage installed by the game-maker, does the toy world’s algorithms and workings become visible. Frasca’s September 12th catapults the player outside the cozy assumptions of the clockwork game world and the comfortable correlations between rewarding player proficiency with toy weapons and ‘how things work.’ The brokenness of September 12th manifests in that playing well delivers loss, subverting the expectation of the player to master a rewarding challenge of eliminating terrorists. In McDonald’s Video Game, on the other hand, the very operationality of the model of fast food production cycles transmitted to the player overcomes the game’s critical impact. Beautiful toys that run too well are always enchanting, no matter how ugly the outcome of their workings. The player is lost in the game. Broken toys and the no play imperative The operational logic of the game takes hold. A player’s action inspires a resulting reaction on the part of the game. The game, in turn, compels the player to further reflexive play moves and if the game is designed well, the player loses herself, losing even a sense of the passage of hours and days, within the game, absorbed into the game’s workings, immersed in a feedback loop, Gadamer’s aesthetic union of player and game. The player performs a role among other processes running within the clockwork world through interaction with the game machine and the management of its simulated processes. Like the imprint of a popular tune that demands to be liked through its repeated exposure to the ears, players unreflectively absorb the logic of military operations, internalize the production cycle of hamburgers, and flow with the hum of tractors. How satisfying when at least the toy world is operating as it should. In the rational, operational spheres of games, as in the instrumental spheres of life, one’s everyday perspective turns away from suffering and the consequences of damaging human operations. Most feel powerless to disengage from, halt, or redirect harmful goings-on that are naturalized. Players flee their own mortality to the artificial circulations of ageless clockwork, toy worlds. In this sense, Madurodam’s endless ship and train circulations are a soothing and forgetful memorial to the untimely demise of young George Maduro. A tactical recipe for the activist simulation game consists then of two steps, f irst a positive, then a negative; f irst to constructively program a simulation of a harmful operation from the world into the game, followed up by either a game-maker, or player instigated interruption, or sabotage that breaks the spell of the game’s movement and procedurality, thereby illuminating its operationality in a critical light. Absorption in the everyday world of ‘equipmental’ dealings and transactions are broken at this rift of ‘in-order-to’ relations among entities, things, and persons. Induced to a discomforting re-evaluation and analysis of the games’ operational logic, the player performs a critical diagnosis of the wrongness or rightness of the broken play equipment. After being subjected to the broken toy tactic, a worldly operation’s common sense, the everyday claim on existence comes into dispute, becoming a matter of critical concern for the citizen-player. What is paradoxical with the broken toy tactic is that the game and activist critique remain in the last instance incompatible—only by interrupting or ejecting the player from the game, the no play imperative, is a critique illuminated and a political questioning made possible. Moreover, the intended effect of such games is not just a break in the game, but also the possibility of putting a stop to the destructive worldly procedure that is being simulated. The no play imperative extends beyond the game to the refusal to be a ‘player’ in the harmful processes of the world, a refusal to play at war, a refusal to play at the exploitation of the environment in the production and consumption of fast food. Thus, the most earnest mixture of politics and games seems to be delivered in games that do not believe in playing per se, but in the impossibility of separating the world and game, of separating procedurality in one realm or the other on either side of the ludic border. The activist game attempts to catapult the player from absorption in the clockwork toy world, to a realm of politics that he or she is otherwise quite busy avoiding.

#### They’ll say voting negative does nothing, but I’ll say they should be more creative – what does voting aff accomplish?

OUCB 09 Occupied UC Berkeley, 10-18-2009, “The Necrosocial: Civic Life, Social Death, and the UC.” Anti-Capital Projects, <https://anticapitalprojects.wordpress.com/2009/11/19/the-necrosocial/>, SJBE

Yes, very much a cemetery. Only here there are no dirges, no prayers, only the repeated testing of our threshold for anxiety, humiliation, and debt. The classroom just like the workplace just like the university just like the state just like the economy manages our social death, translating what we once knew from high school, from work, from our family life into academic parlance, into acceptable forms of social conflict. Who knew that behind so much civic life (electoral campaigns, student body representatives, bureaucratic administrators, public relations officials, Peace and Conflict Studies, ad nauseam) was so much social death? What postures we maintain to claim representation, what limits we assume, what desires we dismiss? And in this moment of crisis they ask us to twist ourselves in a way that they can hear. Petitions to Sacramento, phone calls to Congressmen—even the chancellor patronizingly congratulates our September 24th student strike, shaping the meaning and the force of the movement as a movement against the policies of Sacramento. He expands his institutional authority to encompass the movement. When students begin to hold libraries over night, beginning to take our first baby step as an autonomous movement he reins us in by serendipitously announcing library money. He manages movement, he kills movement by funneling it into the electoral process. He manages our social death. He looks forward to these battles on his terrain, to eulogize a proposition, to win this or that—he and his look forward to exhausting us. He and his look forward to a reproduction of the logic of representative governance, the release valve of the university plunges us into an abyss where ideas are wisps of ether—that is, meaning is ripped from action. Let’s talk about the fight endlessly, but always only in their managed form: to perpetually deliberate, the endless fleshing-out-of—when we push the boundaries of this form they are quick to reconfigure themselves to contain us: the chancellor’s congratulations, the reopening of the libraries, the managed general assembly—there is no fight against the administration here, only its own extension. Each day passes in this way, the administration on the look out to shape student discourse—it happens without pause, we don’t notice nor do we care to. It becomes banal, thoughtless. So much so that we see we are accumulating days: one semester, two, how close to being this or that, how far? This accumulation is our shared history. This accumulation—every once in a while interrupted, violated by a riot, a wild protest, unforgettable fucking, the overwhelming joy of love, life shattering heartbreak—is a muted, but desirous life. A dead but restless and desirous life. The university steals and homogenizes our time yes, our bank accounts also, but it also steals and homogenizes meaning. As much as capital is invested in building a killing apparatus abroad, an incarceration apparatus in California, it is equally invested here in an apparatus for managing social death. Social death is, of course, simply the power source, the generator, of civic life with its talk of reform, responsibility, unity. A ‘life,’ then, which serves merely as the public relations mechanism for death: its garrulous slogans of freedom and democracy designed to obscure the \*\*\* and decay in which our feet are planted. Yes, the university is a graveyard, but it is also a factory: a factory of meaning which produces civic life and at the same time produces social death. A factory which produces the illusion that meaning and reality can be separated; which everywhere reproduces the empty reactionary behavior of students based on the values of life (identity), liberty (electoral politics), and happiness (private property). Everywhere the same whimsical ideas of the future. Everywhere democracy. Everywhere discourse to shape our desires and distress in a way acceptable to the electoral state, discourse designed to make our very moments here together into a set of legible and fruitless demands. Totally managed death. A machine for administering death, for the proliferation of technologies of death. As elsewhere, things rule. Dead objects rule. In this sense, it matters little what face one puts on the university—whether Yudof or some other lackey. These are merely the personifications of the rule of the dead, the pools of investments, the buildings, the flows of materials into and out of the physical space of the university—each one the product of some exploitation—which seek to absorb more of our work, more tuition, more energy. The university is a machine which wants to grow, to accumulate, to expand, to absorb more and more of the living into its peculiar and perverse machinery: high-tech research centers, new stadiums and office complexes. And at this critical juncture the only way it can continue to grow is by more intense exploitation, higher tuition, austerity measures for the departments that fail to pass the test of ‘relevancy.’ But the ‘irrelevant’ departments also have their place. With their ‘pure’ motives of knowledge for its own sake, they perpetuate the blind inertia of meaning ostensibly detached from its social context. As the university cultivates its cozy relationship with capital, war and power, these discourses and research programs play their own role, co-opting and containing radical potential. And so we attend lecture after lecture about how ‘discourse’ produces ‘subjects,’ ignoring the most obvious fact that we ourselves are produced by this discourse about discourse which leaves us believing that it is only words which matter, words about words which matter. The university gladly permits the precautionary lectures on biopower; on the production of race and gender; on the reification and the fetishization of commodities. A taste of the poison serves well to inoculate us against any confrontational radicalism. And all the while power weaves the invisible nets which contain and neutralize all thought and action, that bind revolution inside books, lecture halls. There is no need to speak truth to power when power already speaks the truth. The university is a graveyard– así es. The graveyard of liberal good intentions, of meritocracy, opportunity, equality, democracy. Here the tradition of all dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living. We graft our flesh, our labor, our debt to the skeletons of this or that social cliché. In seminars and lectures and essays, we pay tribute to the university’s ghosts, the ghosts of all those it has excluded—the immiserated, the incarcerated, the just-plain-fucked. They are summoned forth and banished by a few well-meaning phrases and research programs, given their book titles, their citations. This is our gothic—we are so morbidly aware, we are so practiced at stomaching horror that the horror is thoughtless.

## 2

### Innovation DA

#### Climate Patents and Innovation high now and solving Warming but patent waivers set a dangerous precedent for appropriations – the mere threat is sufficient is enough to kill investment.

Brand 5-26, Melissa. “Trips Ip Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents & Patent Law, 26 May 2021, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/. //sid

The biotech industry is making remarkable advances towards climate change solutions, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course [we dispute this notion](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/)), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) [Katherine Tai](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/05/tai-says-united-states-will-back-india-southafrica-proposal-waive-ip-rights-trips/id=133224/) was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our normative position. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no due process, no particularized findings, no compensationand no recourse. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new seed technologies and sustainable biomass, reducing greenhouse gases in manufacturing and transportation, capturing and sequestering carbon in soil and products, and more, would be required to turn over their proprietary know-how to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating to voluntary international collaborations. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation [raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report_FINAL.pdf). If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in place to protect important climate change technologies after their long road from bench to market, it is unlikely they will continue to investat the current and required levels**.**

#### Climate change destroys the world.

Specktor 19 [Brandon writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html> Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many** interlinked geological processes; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of **the global** population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of [lethal heat conditions](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly one-third **of the world's land surface** turns to desert. Entire ecosystems collapse, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to stress the fabric of the world's largest nations, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in nuclear war, are likely. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

#### Turns the aff – the delta Variant proves current vaccines aren’t enough – we need new innovations.

Guarino 8-18 Ben Guarino 8-18-2021 “Vaccines show declining effectiveness against infection overall but strong protection against hospitalization amid delta variant” <https://archive.is/pvuzL#selection-747.0-750.0> (Education: University of Pennsylvania, BSE in bioengineering; New York University, MA in journalism)//Elmer

Results from a trio of studies, published in the CDC’s weekly report, motivated the Biden administration to consider booster shots. Three studies published Wednesday by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention show that protection against the coronavirus from vaccines declined in the midsummer months when the more contagious delta variant rose to dominance in the United States. At the same time, protection against hospitalization was strong for weeks after vaccination, indicating the shots will generate immune fighters that stave off the worst effects of the virus and its current variations. Data from these studies persuaded the Biden administration to develop a plan for additional doses to bolster the immune systems of people vaccinated months earlier. The trio of reports, published Wednesday in the Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, the CDC’s scientific digest, also **reinforce** the **idea** that vaccines alone will be unable to lift the nation out of the pandemic. Masks and other precautions should be part of “a layered approach centered on vaccination,” wrote researchers from the New York State Department of Health and the University at Albany School of Public Health in their study of vaccine effectiveness across New York state. All three reports measure vaccine effectiveness, which compares the rates of infection or hospitalization among vaccinated people with the rates among people who had not been vaccinated. Until now, evaluations of vaccine effectiveness amid delta largely relied on observations from outside the United States. A recent New England Journal of Medicine study concluded the Pfizer vaccine was 88 percent effective against infections that caused symptoms in England. Others, such as a study in Israel, found larger declines in protection against infection. One U.S. report that has not yet gone through peer review, collecting data from Mayo Clinic Health System facilities in five states, found a drop in the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine’s effectiveness against delta infections to 42 percent. The other mRNA vaccine, made by Moderna, was 76 percent effective. The new study from New York is the first to assess vaccine protection against coronavirus infection across the entirety of a U.S. state amid delta. The study authors found a modest drop in effectiveness: It descended from 92 percent in May to 80 percent in late July. Twenty percent of new infections and 15 percent of hospitalizations from covid-19, the disease caused by the coronavirus, were among vaccinated people. The second of the three studies published Wednesday by the CDC found effectiveness against infection declined for nursing home residents after delta emerged. It dropped from 75 percent in March through May to 53 percent in June and July. Vaccination for visitors and staff is crucial, the study authors wrote, and “additional doses of COVID-19 vaccine might be considered for nursing home and long-term care facility residents.” The third report, an analysis of patients at 21 hospitals in 18 states, found sustained protection against hospitalization. Effectiveness was steady at 86 percent, even in the midsummer months when delta outcompeted other variants of concern. For adults who do not have compromised immune systems, that effectiveness stood at 90 percent.

### WTO DA

#### We’re turning WTO collapse – it’s key to food security – the WTO destroys small farms – that hurts food security.

Keyman 14 Ariana Keyman 7-17-2014 “Drawing links between food security and land rights in an era of globalization” [www.e-ir.info/2014/07/17/drawing-links-between-food-security-and-land-rights-in-an-era-of-globalization/](http://www.e-ir.info/2014/07/17/drawing-links-between-food-security-and-land-rights-in-an-era-of-globalization/) //Elmer

Exacerbating the existent injustice was the imposition of neoliberal economic development policies imposed by institutions such as the World Bank, IMF, and WTO following independence. These policies have included trade liberalization and the subsequent flooding of local markets with cheap food imports, against which local famers can hardly compete; cutting price supports and subsidies for food producers; and excessive export promotion. This culminated in credit being inadequate or too expensive, and prices too low for smaller and poorer farmers to cover rising production costs. The result has been that the access of the poor to land has continued to deteriorate significantly, as they are forced to sell the land they own, cannot afford land rentals, or lose by defaulting on credit.[26] The export-led, free **trade-based, industrial ag**riculture model of large farms and land concentration has attempted to address the problem of food insecurity and hunger by boosting exports from the giant plantations owned by the wealthy as the way to generate income to import cheap food. However, not only does this increase food insecurity as the local population is then subjected to the volatility of the international market, but they also often cannot afford to buy what is grown as export-oriented crops in their own countries.[27] Grassroots movements led by family farmers, peasants, rural workers, and indigenous people have taken root against insecure and unjust land tenure systems in many parts of the world. Perhaps the most prominent and concentrated of these is the global alliance, La Via Campesina, founded in 1993 by farmers’ organizations from Europe, Latin America, Asia, and Africa. More recently, however, international institutions, led by the World Bank, have started to take note of the significance of land in broad-based sustainable development objectives and food security.[28] The report titled, “Rising Global Interest in Farmland: Can it Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits?,” published by the Bank in 2011, was perhaps the first major initiative indicative of this growing concern.

#### Food insecurity goes Nuclear

FDI 12 (Future Directions International, a Research institute providing strategic analysis of Australia’s global interests; citing Lindsay Falvery, PhD in Agricultural Science and former  Professor at the University of Melbourne’s Institute of Land and Environment, “Food and Water Insecurity: International Conflict Triggers and Potential Conflict Points,” <http://www.futuredirections.org.au/workshop-papers/537-international-conflict-triggers-and-potential-conflict-points-resulting-from-food-and-water-insecurity.html)//Elmer>

There is a growing appreciation that the conflicts in the next century will **most likely** be fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be significantly greater as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. . He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.” “Hunger feeds anarchy.” This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.” As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves. Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry. A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon. The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war.

# Accessibility

## 1

#### The 1AC is an activist game – they trade violence for points and collect the ballot for passing “Go” – vote negative to induce a break in that operationality in favor of critical reflection.

Schleiner 19

activist games present a persuasive argument to open a political question a play move is an inconsequential act of fun but carries symbolic weight players succumb to the enchantment no matter how damaging in the exterior world, The game asks to be played and mastered, inviting the player to enter its cause and effect loops, the operational movements induce complacency outside the game We seldom question our place in such utilitarian operations, And yet A rupture in the game catapults the player outside A break in the smooth functionality of the game discloses its operational logic is a moment ripe for critical reflection that precedes the formation of a political stance only by interrupting is political questioning made possible

#### They’ll say voting negative does nothing, but I’ll say they should be more creative – what does voting aff accomplish?

OUCB 09

The classroom manages our social death, even the chancellor congratulates our strike shaping the meaning and force of the movement Let’s talk about the fight endlessly, but always only perpetually deliberate, the boundaries reconfigure themselves to contain us the university is a graveyard, but also a factory of meaning which produces civic life and social death knowledge for its own sake perpetuate the inertia of meaning containing radical potential

## 2

### Innovation DA

#### Climate Patents and Innovation high now and solving Warming but patent waivers set a dangerous precedent for appropriations – the mere threat is sufficient is enough to kill investment.

Brand 5-26

biotech advances climate solutions .” If an IP waiver is necessary Administration will apply same logic to climate crisis In the context of climate change companies develop technologies reducing gases capturing carbon required to turn over proprietary know-how the suggestion alone devastating collaborations investors cannot be confident IP in place it is unlikely they will invest

#### Climate change destroys the world.

Specktor 19

models fail to account for interlinked processes governments ignor scientists ice sheets vanish feedback loop Thirty-five percent of land and 55 percent of population subject to lethal heat droughts, floods and wildfires ravage the land one-third turns to desert ecosystems collapse destroying agriculture turning 1 billion people into refugees [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and drops in food and water stress nations nuclear war likely end of civilization

#### Turns the aff – the delta Variant proves current vaccines aren’t enough – we need new innovations.

Guarino 8-18

Results motivated Biden to consider booster shots Three studies published show protection against the coronavirus from vaccines declined when delta variant rose vaccines alone will be unable to lift the nation out of the pandemic a study in Israel found larger declines in protection against infection facilities found drop in Pfizer vaccine’s effectiveness against delta infections to 42 percent

### WTO DA

#### We’re turning WTO collapse – it’s key to food security – the WTO destroys small farms – that hurts food security.

Keyman 14

development policies imposed by WTO flood local markets with cheap imports, which local famers can hardly compete; cutting price supports and subsidies for food producers and excessive export promotion. culminated in credit being inadequate for farmers to cover production costs increase food insecurity as local population subjected to volatility of the international market,

#### Food insecurity goes Nuclear

FDI 12

conflicts in the next century will be fought over lack of resources if people are hungry the state is not stable bloody wars are liable to follow credible scenario for World War 3 is festering chain of resource conflicts famine as a potential trigger for nuclear war