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### 1NC – T

#### Interpretation: the affirmative must defend that only just governments ought to recognize the right to strike

#### Just governments respect liberties

Dorn 12 James A. Dorn, Cato Journal, "The Scope of Government in a Free Society", Fall 2012, https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/12/v32n3-10.pdf

If laws are just, liberty and property are secure. The most certain test of justice is negative—that is, justice occurs when injustice (the violation of natural rights to life, liberty, and property) is prevented. The emphasis here is on what Hayek (1967) called “just rules of conduct,” not on the fairness of outcomes. No one has stated the negative concept of justice better than the 19th century French classical liberal Frederic Bastiat ([1850] 1964: 65): When law and force confine a man within the bounds of justice, they do not impose anything on him but a mere negation. They impose on him only the obligation to refrain from injuring others. They do not infringe on his personality, or his liberty or his property. They merely safeguard the personality, the liberty, and the property of others. They stand on the defensive; they defend the equal rights of all. They fulfill a mission whose harmlessness is evident, whose utility is palpable, and whose legitimacy is uncontested. In short, the purpose of a just government is not to do good with other people’s money, but to prevent injustice by protecting property and securing liberty.

#### Violation – the US isn’t a just government – they violate liberties

Amnesty International, 4-14-2021, "Everything you need to know about human rights in United States of America," No Publication, https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/americas/united-states-of-america/report-united-states-of-america/

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 2020 The Trump administration’s broadly dismal human rights record, both at home and abroad, deteriorated further during 2020. The USA experienced massive demonstrations across the country with the backdrop of the COVID-19 pandemic, contested 2020 general elections and a widespread racist backlash against the Black Lives Matter movement. In response to thousands of public demonstrations against institutional racism and police violence, law enforcement authorities routinely used excessive force against protesters and human rights defenders and failed to constrain violent counter-protests against primarily peaceful assemblies. The administration also sought to undermine international human rights protections for women; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people; and victims of war crimes, among others. It also exploited the COVID-19 pandemic to target migrants and asylum-seekers for further abuses. Joe Biden was declared the winner of the November presidential election. Background Despite confirmation by the Electoral College that Joe Biden had won the November presidential election, President Trump continued to challenge the result, making repeated unsubstantiated claims of electoral irregularities. These continued allegations sparked a number of pro-Trump protests and raised concerns about the peaceful transfer of power in January. Discrimination The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated long-standing inequalities in the USA. Inadequate and uneven government responses to the pandemic had a disproportionate and discriminatory impact on many people based on their race, socioeconomic situations and other characteristics. Systemic disparities dictated who served as frontline workers and who had employment and economic security and access to housing and health care.1 Incarcerated people were particularly at risk due to insanitary conditions in prisons and detention where they were unable to adequately physically distance and had inadequate access to hygienic supplies as facilities became hotspots for infection. Additionally, racially discriminatory political speech and violence risked increasing the number of hate crimes. Right to health Workers in health care, law enforcement, transportation and other “essential” sectors faced enormous challenges as the US government failed to adequately protect them during the pandemic. Shortages in personal protective equipment (PPE) meant that health and other essential workers often had to perform their jobs without adequate protection and in unsafe environments. In April, the National Nurses Union held a physically distanced protest in front of the White House against the lack of PPE for health workers. From March to December 2020, more than 2,900 health care workers died amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. The US Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) acknowledged that available figures were likely underestimates. Some health and other essential workers in the public and private sectors also faced reprisals, including harassment, disciplinary procedures and unfair dismissal, if they spoke out about the inadequate protective measures. Excessive use of force At least 1,000 people were reportedly killed by police using firearms. The limited public data available suggests that Black people are disproportionately impacted by police use of lethal force. The US government’s programme to track how many such deaths occur annually was not fully implemented. No state laws governing the use of lethal force by police – where such laws exist – comply with international law and standards regarding the use of lethal force by law enforcement officials.2 Freedom of assembly Law enforcement across the USA committed widespread and egregious human rights violations against people protesting about the unlawful killings of Black people and calling for police reform. Amnesty International documented 125 separate incidents of unlawful police violence against protesters in 40 states and Washington, D.C., between 26 May and 5 June alone.3 Thousands more protests took place in the remainder of the year. Violations were committed by law enforcement personnel at the municipal, county, state and federal levels, including by National Guard troops who were deployed by the federal government in some cities. The violence included beatings with batons or other devices, the misuse of tear gas and pepper spray, and the inappropriate and indiscriminate firing of “less lethal” projectiles. In numerous incidents, human rights defenders – including protest organizers, media representatives, legal observers and street medics – were specifically targeted with chemical irritants and kinetic impact projectiles, arrested and detained, seemingly on account of their work documenting and remedying law enforcement agencies’ human rights abuses. Right to life and security of the person The government’s ongoing failure to protect individuals from persistent gun violence continued to violate their human rights, including the right to life, security of the person and freedom from discrimination, among others. Unfettered access to firearms, a lack of comprehensive gun safety laws (including effective regulation of firearm acquisition, possession and use) and a failure to invest in adequate gun violence prevention and intervention programmes continued to perpetuate this violence. In 2018, the most recent year for which data was available, some 39,740 individuals died from gunshot injuries while tens of thousands more are estimated to have sustained gunshot injuries and survived. In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, with increased gun sales and shootings, the USA failed in its obligation to prevent deaths from gun violence, which could have been done through a range of urgent measures, including de-listing gun stores as essential businesses. As of 2020, expansive “Stand Your Ground” and “Castle Doctrine” laws, both of which provide for private individuals to use lethal force in self-defence against others when in their homes or feeling threatened, existed in 34 US states. These laws appeared to escalate gun violence and the risk of avoidable deaths or serious injuries, resulting in violations of the right to life. As protesters against the killing of Black people took to the streets in cities across the USA, there were instances where armed civilians in states where the open carrying of firearms is permitted engaged protesters, causing at least four deaths.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Precision — anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits – there are 200 governments in the world – letting them pick an unjust ones explodes limits via infinite permutations of governments

#### Education is a voter since it is the only portable and durable skill that influences our subject formation. Fairness is a voter since a] debate is a game, competition equity matters proven by desire for wins, b] is worthless without rules and equal access.

#### [Competing Interps] – Reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### [No RVI’s] – 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

#### DTD – DTA is incoherent since its an indict to the plan as a whole and its key to deterring future abuse. Independently drop the arugment would reject the whole plan text so still vote neg

### 1NC – K

#### The affirmative’s call for the unconditional right to strike is cotemporaneous with what we will call: the “politics of decency.” Decency is fundamentally a colonial enterprise that establishes a schema of intelligibility vis a vis the division between “good” and “bad” citizen subjects. The illusion of a “more just society” not only serves to calibrate the state’s ability to kill, but also leads to an internalized desire to aspire towards decency, thus eradicating the very potential for meaningful anti-institutional organizing. You should understand the politics of decency as fundamentally conducive of the current racial order – making possible globalized forms of authoritarian, racialized violence under the façade of democratic transparency.

KatherineKellyAbraham’18 |Three anonymous members of the Abolition Collective, April 22, 2018, “Burn it Down: Abolition, Insurgent Political Praxis, and the Destruction of Decency,” *Abolition: A Journal of Insurgent Politics* Volume 1 Issue 2. Footnotes i, iii, and iv included in curly braces|KZaidi

This journal calls for abolition, a call implicitly asserting that contemporary sociopolitical and economic institutions are inherently unfixable and beyond resuscitation, reform, or rescue. The fantasy of radically changing political structures from within is simply not a viable political option for those concerned with the ultimate destruction of the mechanisms of carnage that shape modern life and its attendant regimes of governance, such as: the global war machine, the prison industrial complex, transnational resource extraction, and the national sacrifice areas (Ortiz 1992) generated in the wake of these lethal socioeconomic configurations and expressions of empire.[i] {As we further elaborate in the next section, we use the term “national sacrifice area,” coined by Simon Ortiz (Ortiz 1992, 337), to describe the intentional delineation of specific geopolitical areas that can be destroyed, with impunity, in order to consolidate Euro-American power—via resource extraction, for example.} Rather than drawing from these regimes of death for social and legal recognition, power, and welfare—what we broadly refer to as the “state”—consider what it would mean to the modern ordering of life to utterly destroy the state, to refuse its seductions and ruses of power, to incinerate it until nothing remains but ash?

Our imperative to “burn it down” draws from a rich tradition of scholarship that positions the state as a technique, practice, and effect of modern governance and its optimization, rationalization, and normalization. Following Timothy Mitchell, we define the state as a “network of institutional mechanisms through which a certain social and political order is maintained” (Mitchell 2006, 175). In the words of Michel Foucault, the state functions as “a schema of intelligibility for a whole set of already established institutions, a whole set of given realities” (Foucault 2004, 286). As a schematic and reality, we perceive the state as providing a legible matrix for the parameters of self-management and self-conduct: for social and political order. As Achille Mbembe insists, the adoption of state or sovereign power is “a twofold process of self-institution and self-limitation” (Mbembe 2003, 13). Attendant to the important critiques made by Fanon, we argue that this twofold process remains shaped by Euro-American colonial mores at the “objective as well as subjective level” of experience and perception (Fanon 2008, xv). That is to say, we understand state power as generative of inherently colonial relations of rule: relations that produce contemporary sociopolitical, juridical, and affective orientations, sensibilities, and subjectivities.[ii] As Glen Sean Coulthard argues, “colonial relations of power are no longer reproduced primarily through overtly coercive means, but rather through the asymmetrical exchange of mediated forms of state recognition and accommodation” (Coulthard 2014, 15). We add that the state accomplishes this mediation vis-à-vis the internalized politics of decency: an argument to which we shortly return.

The project of this piece is not to think about how to make life more livable under current regimes of power or to ponder building something new or altered in the state’s place. Rather, we imagine alternative worlds based in the total abolition of these regimes because of their astonishingly responsive capabilities, which render profound social transformation impossible. The state successfully incorporates its margins and continually extends its representation in order to further its grasp on the body politic (for instance, the inclusion of women in combat roles or the Supreme Court ruling on same sex marriage). Simultaneously, and without coincidence, the state manipulates its boundaries through violent forms of capital accumulation and proxy wars, marks borders with fences and deportations, and uses its streets as a costly theater for subjects that deviate from its aims. However, the fundamentally lethal interests of state power have not changed since the European invasion of the Americas. Instead, global technologies of communication and visibility have forced the state to pivot, creating the illusion of a more transparent, democratic, and equal society. Nonetheless, the state relies on fantasies of “individual” participation (civil rights, voting, recognition, and protest) as much as it relies on its authoritarian power to revoke those fantasies without notice or recourse.

As the violences executed by the state continue to shape everyday life in this country, we believe that it is by no means extreme to posit that one solution to these ills is to destroy—to burn down—contemporary institutions of governance, policing, and comfort, to cooperatively dismantle the workings of the state. For us, a radical project of abolition and insurgent political praxis refuses to negotiate with the state, or seek recognition from any of its bureaucratic apparatuses, in order to secure the small-scale concessions that only colonize and quell resistance. Political projects of compromise with the state have proven insufficient—especially in addressing everyday violence, such as police brutality, that continues to erupt unchecked in the face of mainstream “social justice” organizing. Ultimately, this organizing and activism treats the state as a central means of stopping the very political violence that insures its core function, operation, and maintenance.

State tactics shift, but are nonetheless continually productive of social protocols for acceptable, legible citizens and aberrant, disposable subjects: a division and “existential deviation” (Fanon 2008, xvii) that we argue is rooted in Euro-American colonial power, such as white supremacy and heteropatriarchy. This power, which continues to inform the tangible parameters of the modern state, must remain the strategic target of abolition as a practice and vision if new worlds or alternative spaces of sociopolitical organization are to exist and thrive. As we show, one of the central challenges that insurgents face is the fact that colonial state power remains occluded by the representational moorings of the Euro-American civilizing mission, such as the political conceptions of civility and decency that remain the ideological cornerstones of democratic participation.[iii] {We loosely define “insurgents” as those political subjects who adamantly and violently refuse the seductions of the state, including its comforts and promises of safety. Consequently, these subjects are rendered disposable by the state, or are the focus of violent forms of state control, such as imprisonment, torture, and/or execution. Thus, we are not making an understatement to say that insurgents put their lives on the line for their politics. However, we do not make distinctions in this article between “good” insurgents vs. “bad” insurgents precisely because of the way Euro-American conceptual power is recuperated vis-à-vis these categorizations. Of course, we wrestle with the ethics of our position and consider this struggle to be the necessary and ongoing work of insurgent political organizing and strategizing.} These notions legitimize certain forms of organizing and comportment over others, ensuring that state power is distributed, unchanged, into the hands of those that best serve its interests. We dedicate the remainder of this article to examining how these concepts further colonial state power in order to ground our call for the incineration of decency as a starting point for insurgent political praxis.

The terms “decency” and “civility” are used interchangeably in this article to describe a particular form of exclusionary, homicidal, and suicidal politics. This politics demands inclusion within the colonial state, as it currently exists—at the expense of dismantling white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, transphobia, and capitalism on a global level, in the name of respectability, conviviality, progress and democracy. Following Aimé Césaire, we argue that the politics of decency represents the true “barbarism” of the colonizer (Césaire 2000, 47). Césaire stated that:

I make no secret of my opinion that at the present time the barbarism of Western Europe has reached an incredibly high level, being surpassed—far surpassed, it is true—by the barbarism of the United States. And I am not talking about Hitler, or the prison guard, or the adventurer, but about the “decent fellow” across the way…the respectable bourgeois [emphasis added] (Césaire 2000, 47).

For Césaire, the problem of colonial domination did not lie solely within its more overt acts of death dealing, expressed “openly…in broad daylight” (Césaire 2000, 49). Rather, Césaire held that the problem of this domination also resided in its ideological shadows: its “decent” homes, families, schools and churches, its “respectable” citizen-subjects who turned a blind eye to the genocide shaping everyday life in colonized locations (e.g., the U.S.) and long before World War II.

In fact, Césaire insisted that the politics of decency was central to legitimizing the genocide of the original civilizing mission: the violent implementation of Euro-American systems of thought, embodied taxonomies, historicity, and political governance to consolidate socioeconomic and biological power. As Césaire poignantly argued: “I hear the storm. They talk to me about progress, about achievements, diseases cured, improved standards of living. I am talking about societies drained of their essence, cultures trampled underfoot…extraordinary possibilities wiped out” (Césaire 2000, 42). Thus, at the heart of the civilizing mission, the conceptual fuel that drove its murderous engine was the framing of its white supremacist, capitalist, and heteropatriarchal violences as the epitome of Euro-American decency and civility.

We argue that the continued advancement and adoption of decency as a cultural commandment of behavior for participation in the civic sphere enacts the civilizing mission in its recalibrated form and lethally fortifies colonial statecraft and power. For example, these politics legitimize (what appears to be) the passive participation of the “decent fellow” and the “respectable bourgeois” in this mission vis-à-vis so-called “peaceful” desires for inclusion within the state. The danger of this passivity and desire is that both are absolutely violent and perpetuate an outside, “indecent” constituency. This “indecent” constituency is figured as the biopolitical break in the population that threatens to overrun state interests; wherein Muslims are imagined as terrorist, blackness is always already criminal, and whiteness remains the standard by which diversity is measured and extracted.[iv] {Foucault elaborates the term “biopolitics” to describe the contemporary techniques and technologies of governance that seek to maximize the productive and classificatory ordering of known political and biologic “life” and as an expression of sovereign or state power. Rather than the state wielding power through its ability to end life (through the “sword”), power expresses itself through the right to know, maximize, and shape the conditions of life. Examples of this include public health, institutions such as prisons or schools, conditions of labor, the bureaucracy of state management expressed in statistics, etc.} When everyday violence is deployed in the name of these ideologies, the state arbitrates between those who are innocent and guilty, offering a judgement that continues to be divided by race, class, gender, and sexuality. This violence is perceived as the “natural” expression of “civilization,” key to its maintenance and safety. When those who decry these judgements deploy violence, they do so outside of the Euro-American parameters of the “decent,” and are thus marked for rationalized, legitimized, “civilized” annihilation.

#### This spectacle of “radical liberalism,” this wielding of sovereignty against itself, can only end in the abduction of global revolutionary movements by the corporate state in a grand theatre of reactionary protest masquerading as radical politics.

Interior Ministry'18 |The Interior Ministry comprises of an anonymous group of guerilla militants and semioticians. “Guerilla Semiotix,” from *ALIENIST Magazine #4* (December 2018): RAGE AGAINST THE ALGORITHM. Page 38-42. <https://alienistmanifesto.files.wordpress.com/2018/12/Alienist_Magazine-4_December_2018-1.pdf>|KZaidi

EXPERIMENTAL KNOWLEDGE AS SUBVERSIVE FORCE It was never a question of WHEN WILL THE REVOLUTION BEGIN? A revolution has been in progress for over two hundred years. The question is HOW HAS THIS REVOLUTION CONTINUED TO BE ABDUCTED, BEHIND THE SPECTACLE OF A FEW MOMENTARY “ERUPTIONS” – events left to yellow on the pages of history books? Decade after decade of pornographic commodification has transformed the “historical aura” of transgression & emancipation into a new form of impoverished labour. This production of self-alienation has entered a vicious circle which masquerades as the predominant “revolutionary thought” of today: dissociated to such a degree that it is capable not only of experiencing its own destruction as an aesthetic pleasure of the first order (Benjamin), but that it is capable of doing so repeatedly, ad infinitum. THE PERMANENT OBSOLESCENCE OF “REVOLUTION”? It has been said that today the study of political economy is more closely related to paleoanthropology than to the “emancipation” of everyday life. One of these disciplines takes the Stone Age as its object of inquiry, the other inhabits it. Too often “revolutionary thought” likewise suffers from terminal anachronism. In the 50 years since 1968, the cybernetic Corporate-State Apparatus has taken Marx’s invocation to change the world & Rimbaud’s to change life far more literally & far more seriously than those romantic custodians of the holy relics who in half a century have barely produced one revolutionary carrot. Like true reactionaries they cling to the cycle of manufactured controversy, projecting a vague & opportune hopefulness against a meridian of despair. But revolution isn’t this travesty of alienation dressed-up as “protest movements,” distracted by the spectacle of endless “reform.” It’s as if the first thing that had to be forgotten is that reform, like election cycles & market adjustment, is code for SYSTEMIC ERROR. THE IMPOVERISHED LABOUR OF ALIENATED INDIVIDUALISM In any society in which Power projects itself through a system of conspicuous consumption, complicity is the norm. But the system isn’t separate from the “individual” that complies. Compliance is already a matrix of false choices. To comply or not to comply: the illusion of autonomous action, an alibi against inaction, a death sentence. Yet complicity is the system. It’s an existential “reply” to a totalising demand: that the system be acknowledged as the sole determinant of everything that is the case. The possible world, no less. This isn’t a philosophical problem. Even its apparent forms of contradiction have been internalised to it: it produces simulacra of its own “negation” as a matter of course. Like neurotic symptoms they displace onto a mechanism of escalating catastrophe what can only be perceived in the form of the impossible. THE END OF HISTORY. THE END OF REASON. THE END OF CIVILISATION. THE END OF MAN. THE END OF THE WORLD. Yet corresponding to each of these ENDs – these zero-sum demands for all-or-nothing – is a secret pathology. For the Corporate-State Apparatus was born from the abduction & repression of a “revolutionary” impulse. The existence of this sublimated “revolution” is, however, still perceptible through an incidence of menace, at the moment when imminent danger concentrates our vision on the foundational logic of every system of Power that promotes the idea that all revolutions must fail. A logic that encapsulates both the possibility & fragility of Power’s concrete existence. Thus brought to view, its structures can then be critically threatened. Not to perform in the theatre of permitted pseudo-critique, but to directly intervene in the immune system of its counterrevolutionary “social body.” To turn upon itself its totalising feedback mechanism of global “mind-control.” To jam not only the signal but the entire transmissional apparatus. THE CAPACITY TO TRANSFORM KNOWLEDGE INTO POWER RESTS UPON THE CAPACITY TO TRANSFORM THEORY INTO PRAXIS? The world doesn’t come with readymade political content. Other than in response to the terms of Power being more & more dictated in unison – in a simulation of World Order – there are no truly universal tactics. All guerrilla tactics are situational. A tactic cannot be indefinitely held in reserve: it is always defined by a window of opportunity, an emergent possibility, an event. While the ability to choose the occasion of engagement is essential above all, interminable deferment isn’t a strategic option (the “No Action Alternative”). Nor does inaction confer any advantage in the realm of tactical engagement as such, if the objective is merely to preserve the advantage of inaction. Nor does a failed action automatically confer an advantage upon the enemy, by exposing a tactic to discovery & co-option. Co-opted into the arsenal of the Corporate-State, a “surrendered” tactic does not necessarily cede anything, since neither the tactic itself nor the circumstances of its employment are transferable. Indeed, by virtue of the Corporate-State Apparatus’ compulsion to repeat, co-option introduces an element of useless non-knowledge into the enemy system, thereby contributing to the rate of increase in its overall entropy. AVANT-GARDE-LUMPEN-PROLETARIAT The tactics adopted by Alienist counter-semiotic practices (SEMIOTIX) are therefore neither abstractions nor simply actions but an entire complex of spatio-temporalities. Guerrilla SEMIOTIX are closely calculated yet never programmatic. A merely repeated action isn’t a repeated tactic: but the repetition of an action may in & of itself be a tactic (whether a noncompulsive, unpredictable repetition, producing surprise; or a predictable action, designed to trap the enemy in a predictable response). A tactic can’t be reduced to the sum of its individual actions, its repertoire. It must be understood, then, that the true objective of any tactical response by the Corporate-State Apparatus is thus not the neutralisation or capture of critical weaponry, but the capture of their logic (for example, the capitulation to a “theatre of engagement”: ballotbox, TV news, protest march, opinion poll, social media) thus allowing the exploitation of an entire tactical line of thought before it has even been articulated. Such logiccapture has provided the cybernetic Corporate-State Apparatus with the appearance of unworldly Power, like an alien entity against which there’s no defence & upon which every attack conveys ever-greater resilience.

Yet such an appearance is precisely that: an intricately constructed mirroreffect, in which every action has its algorithmic double which, like the image in a mirror, seems to pre-empt it. This is no mere illusion, but the very foundation of real Power: the accumulated mass of surplus-value that – like the authoritarian spectacle in Lear – turns nothing into the reifi ed force of no-thing. THE IMPOSSIBLE IS RAISED TO THE LEVEL OF A REVOLUTIONARY CRITERION In principle, tactical advantage is always limited against a brute force analytic response. A tactic by definition requires some element that is unknown or unpredictable to the adversary – yet the Corporate-State Apparatus has the capacity in principle to calculate & analyse to a depth that negates any but the most trivial element of surprise or socalled “psychological element.” In truth, the variables affecting the character & extent of the CorporateState Apparatus’ response to a tactical action cannot be described as psychological, except where political (& not cybernetic) control is a determining factor. Even where a tactic may be designed simply to produce confusion by its apparent randomness, the Corporate-State Apparatus will defi ne that randomness & compute its probabilities. Anticipating counter-tactical actions in advance is thus the most common “tactical value” in ideological guerrilla warfare. The Corporate-State Apparatus knows its vulnerabilities & exploits them as a weapon. But this knowledge, too, is situational & these exploits can themselves become unforeseen vulnerabilities. Such an “epiphany” – the way in which the Corporate-State Apparatus’ system of totalising control can be made to decentre itself into an entirely different, self-subversive configuration – is a fundamental tactical objective of Alienist SEMIOTIX. A CORNUCOPIA OF UNBOUNDED FUTURES How can it be possible any longer to be committed to “non-violent protest” in a world systematically dominated by a regime of TOTAL VIOLENCE? Engineers of mass slavery, genocide, chemical & nuclear war, industrialscale disinformation, & a global political, economic & ecological subjection to the vicious circle of carbon-fuelled commodity irrationalism. The criminal insanity of the Corporate-State Apparatus is only too-well attested: what to do with this knowledge? In the face of unrestrained Corporate-State criminality, the belief in non-violent protest & ballot-box reformism is not only a pipedream but an attitude of collusion in a psychiatric Ponzi Scheme masquerading as a Social Contract. Political alarmism demands evermore extravagant returns: greater austerity, greater concessions on civil rights, greater indemnities for corporate malfeasance, greater collateral for wars of thinly-veiled aggression. The ballotbox has always been used as a weapon of reactionary ideology by the Corporate-State Apparatus. “Fascism isn’t the contrary of democracy but its evolution in times of crisis” (Brecht). Nixon. Reagan. Bush. Trump. At the height of the Paris Uprising in ’68, De Gaulle, too, staged “elections”: the student & worker protests were immediately reduced to the lowest common denominator of organised parliamentary cretinism. At the height of the anti-war movement n the USA, Martin Luther King & Robert Kennedy were shot, the Chicago Democratic Convention was turned into a police riot, & the subsequent presidential “election” – the proverbial CALL-TO-ORDER – served no other purpose than to affi rm the “silent majority.” Democracy’s DEAD HAND. THE SEMIOTIX OF VANISHING Ideological warfare is essentially language war. For this reason its area of operations goes beyond the territorial limits of conventional warfare, penetrating the very ontological conditions of “political being.” Ideological warfare emerges & grows in a signifying environment. It is pursued in the constant struggle to dominate that arena of political Power which overshadows all social relations & which situates the “social reality” in which meaning moves. It is precisely this arena in which guerrilla actions are judged to succeed or fail. Guerrilla warfare is “underground’ warfare. Going underground is about information control, it isn’t a place. A plunge into the unknown, an exploration of the inside of voice, the unmapped tunnels & grottoes of the glottis, oesophagus, stomach & lungs (Henri Chopin). If language is saturated by Power, it is a question of entering into zones of radical ambivalence & ambiguity. Zones of word-virus mutation. Amphibious zones that can’t be located on any map, that belong to no territory. Merely in order to exist, such zones represent the subversion of every form of permissibility, of its entire system of social signifi cations. They are the very contrary of a “counterculture.” If they form a network of secret consensus, this is not in order to clandestinely advertise an intention, to call for adherents, to invite prestige. But how – it is asked – does an insurrection hide within a conspiranoiac system of mass industrialised surveillance? Within a language traversed by countless algorithms, dragnets & logorrhoeas? How does it evade the psychosis of Power, whose madness is that it is “everywhere”?

#### Rather than choosing to become assassins, as the 1AC has done, vote negative to side with the tactic of cyberguerilla warfare. Do NOT fall into the trap of commodification and stratified politics and instead, opt for evasion, outflanking, scrambling and stealth to find system vulnerabilities to target and exploit. Only this contains the means of leveraging not only alternative mediums of communication but also guerilla tactics that spell the death of western power structures.

Interior Ministry'18 |The Interior Ministry comprises of an anonymous group of guerilla militants and semioticians. “Guerilla Semiotix,” from *ALIENIST Magazine #4* (December 2018): RAGE AGAINST THE ALGORITHM. Page 84-88. <https://alienistmanifesto.files.wordpress.com/2018/12/Alienist_Magazine-4_December_2018-1.pdf>|KZaidi

CYBERGUERRILLA WARFARE KNOWS NO BOUNDARIES Cyberspace favours the attacker. The cyberguerrilla is able to mask their electronic identity in a cyberspace that changes constantly. New systems mean new vulnerabilities. Firewalls & intrusion prevention systems will thwart only so many attacks. Defenders must be right all the time; the attacker, only once. Negligence with portable drives, outdated virus protection, compromised passwords, wireless code insertion, physical breach, social engineering, & dozens of other exploits are commonplace & regularly open the door to an attack. Socalled realworld barriers have no counterparts in cyberspace. Neither electronic nor air-gapped barriers offer sanctuary. As long as a device contains a processor & some memory, it can be accessed, affected & controlled. Thus, it is important to understand that the defender’s main strategy often lies in their response after an attack has already occurred; or “active defence” (offensive action) in anticipation of attacks that have not yet occurred. Despite appearances, as in the “realworld” no cyberattack is immune to countermeasures, given adequate resources. (It must be assumed that such countermeasures won’t be restricted by jurisdiction: in any kind of guerrilla action no tactical value can be placed upon the supposed asymmetry of “legal process,” unless as a last resort.) Thus, as in “realworld” guerrilla warfare, every cyberattack must be prepared within a larger strategy of CONTINUOUS EVASION. CYBERGUERRILLA ACTIONS FORM A DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM What can be done once can usually be done again. By stealth & “elegance” of design & execution, cyberguerrilla actions can accumulate in such a way that their true character will remain unrecognised & uncommunicated, & may thus be perpetuated in a broad configuration. While every impression should be given that attacks are isolated & opportunistic incidents, ideally they should be coordinated in such a way as to be amplified in larger logistical & control systems: electrical grids, financial systems, air & rail transport, shipping, distribution centres, water & sewage systems, even GPS. The motivation for cyberguerrilla actions cannot be “spectacular.” Excepting material verification (blackouts, downed networks, etc.), it must be assumed that state & corporate defenders will veil even the fact of attack in secrecy, unless it is advantageous or unavoidable for them to do otherwise. “Outing” the enemy’s vulnerabilities is nevertheless of dubious tactical value & of short-lived effect: indeed, the actual frequency of such occurrences has had no other consequence than to routinise both the systems of defence & the public’s (i.e. market’s) response. The pursuit of spectacular actions has, in general, the consequence of negating an integrated strategy & diminishing the likelihood of success in executing actions of a more substantial, further-reaching nature. Spectacularism has been the most frequent downfall of guerrilla operations. For this reason, but not only for this reason, NO CYBERGUERRILLA ACTION SHOULD EVER BE PUBLICLY “CLAIMED.” THE CYBERGUERRILLA IS AN ATTACK ALGORITHM It is an often-repeated truism that cyberattacks are self-defeating, since they call into being the very means of overcoming them. Yet institutional & organisational inertia often mitigates against the effectiveness of such means. And just as with purely technical responses, the inter-governmental & corporate intelligence-sharing that frequently proceeds in a knee-jerk fashion following such attacks often PRODUCES NEW VULNERABILITIES. For this reason, the most effective responses to cyberguerrilla actions are often restricted to classic indications techniques rather than to Big Brother panopticism. While the tendency of the Corporate-State Apparatus is nevertheless to aggregate its responses into a “dynamic defence,” this can have the eff ect of amplifying the institutional inertia it is designed to overcome into broader systemic perturbations of which it is unaware. It remains an important tactical consideration of the cyberguerrilla, then, to determine how a limited action might be used to cause a system to more profoundly COMPROMISE ITSELF. THE CYBERGUERRILLA IS A CONTESTANT IN AN UNDISCLOSED STRUGGLE The consensus view is that the “threat of & opportunity for real damage from cyberspace is increasing,” yet this is only a measure of the ambitions of the Corporate-State Apparatus to fully integrate all aspects of everyday life into its control structures. This “threat,” therefore, represents the degree of in-built crisis on which the increasing degrees of that control are justified. “Cyberspace is a domain & a global commons whose reach is being constantly expanded by wired, wireless, & sneaker-netted connectors. Everything from home thermostats to the critical infrastructure that is vital to daily life (water, power, manufacturing) is within its reach. It is ‘shared by all’ & dominated by none” (RAND). But there is nothing at all neutral about the terrain of cyberspace. Nor are these “threats” in any way the existential risk a supposedly benevolent Corporate-State Apparatus pretends them to be, but rather a low-level attrition in what is otherwise an active battlespace. The task of the cyberguerrilla is to determine what is NOT being represented in this threat-assessment – which, far from describing a forced move, is in fact a calculation-in-advance in the larger struggle for CYBERSPACE DOMINATION. Thus the cyberguerrilla is not only tasked with exploiting the vulnerabilities of the cybernetic supply chain, but of the GENERAL SITUATION arising from the expanded hegemonic struggle that drives it. By such means does the true nature of the Corporate-State Apparatus come more clearly into view as the very architecture of that struggle itself. CYBERGUERRILLA ACTIONS HOLD A MIRROR UP TO POWER Invisibility is the prime consideration. Techniques of coordination & communication are key to the success of any cyberguerrilla action, & must be given equal consideration as to the action itself. Rapid communications evolutions favour small, agile groups able to quickly leverage technological advancements against the Corporate-State Apparatus’ advantage in material, financial & technological resources. Increasingly this advantage is restored through the analysis of newly conventionalised modes of communication, designated broadly as social media. “The growth of social media as an effective data source for understanding the information environment has made it more important than ever for the U.S. military to develop a robust capacity for social media analytics in support of information operations” (RAND). It must be appreciated that all public communication concerning cyberguerrilla actions – wherever there is a transmissible record or log of any kind – ultimately occurs in the domain of social media, thus providing intelligence about time-frames, demographics, organisational structure, areas of activity, network reach & psychological profi le. “Geotagged posts can supplement social media analysis, helping identify the geographic spread of ideas or areas of particularly strong or weak support for a cause, group, or idea. Network analysis provides additional potential benefits in planning efforts to promote or counter the spread of specific ideas or information. Analysing the data generated by social media posts against metadata & the demographics of users associated with the accounts can help identify influencers in a social network. Image classification algorithms can aggregate & describe the kinds of images shared on social media, which, when analysed alongside other data with geoinferencing & mapping software, can visualise changes in local populations preferences & attitudes” (RAND). Yet these means can also be used in the planning & execution of cyberguerrilla actions against elements of the Corporate-State Apparatus. THE CYBERGUERRILLA PRODUCES FALSE INDICATORS The semantics of cyberguerrilla action must remain indecipherable. Both the true nature of the action & its intent must remain opaque before, during & after. Wherever possible, all visible patterns of activity should be randomly distributed or concealed within a general background noise. Increasingly, social media data is representative of entire populations (cognitive, informational, physical) – with the consequence that conspicuous absence from media platforms can be as indicative as conspicuous presence. Where social media presence is employed e.g. for disinformation, it must therefore be conscientiously desynchronised from all cyberguerrilla activity while simultaneously presenting a false picture. In their most basic form, maps of individual user-relationships & interactions on social media platforms can be used to identify members of a cyberguerrilla cell. Researchers have been able to detect nuances in the dynamics of interpersonal networks by analysing the information posted by users on these platforms. Similar means, however, can be used to target security operations themselves by discovering human & infrastructural vulnerabilities via the unsecured circulation of sensitive online data & metadata (e.g. geotags automatically embedded in photos taken with mobile devices are visible in social media uploads, etc.). In this way the enemy’s “active defence” may be turned to advantage by combining counter-analysis & the construction of persuasive decoys. The use of such decoys need not be restricted to the task of evasion in the planning, execution or aftermath of cyberguerrilla actions, but can also be means of attack in & of themselves. THE CYBERGUERRILLA IS AUTOPOIETIC It is necessary to understand the security culture & logic of the enemy. Above all, it is necessary to understand how mitigation strategies & defence systems are segmented, & where automated & manual systems meet or overlap in the “cyber kill chain” (early warning, inbound-protect, activity detection, outbound-protect, etc.). It is also necessary to understand the history & logic of cyberwarfare itself. Nothing must be left to assumption. This means pursuing a close analysis of the prevailing financial, heuristic & effects-based models of cybersecurity in relation to critical infrastructure (RAND, Lockheed Martin, Goldman Sachs, GCHQ, NSA, the Australian Signals Directorate…) as well as identifying those technical limitations to be exploited. Such analysis is the task of every cyberguerrilla. Ultimately, this should be undertaken with a view to planning cyberguerrilla actions that, wherever possible, can be automated & made fully autonomous, on the model e.g. of a GAN (Generative Adversarial Network). The CYBERGUERRILLA CONCEPT aims to expand the asymmetrical domain of cyberguerrilla action by decoupling its operations from identifiable “realworld” actors – employing weapons capable of analysis & organisation, & of exercising initiative in offence, & which ideally leave no trace.

## Case

### FW

#### Their conception of death as a biological end to life denies way in which death is co-constitutive of life. The result is the securitization against death from which social control is made possible and life is reduced to a capitalist prolongation.

**Robinson 12.** Andrew Robinson, political theorist and activist based in the UK, “An A to Z of Theory | Jean Baudrillard: The Rise of Capitalism & the Exclusion of Death” Ceasefire Magazine, March 30, 2012, <https://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-baudrillard-2/>

The passage to capitalism: Symbolic exchange – or rather, its suppression – plays a central role in the emergence of capitalism. Baudrillard sees a change happening over time. Regimes based on symbolic exchange (differences are exchangeable and related) are replaced by regimes based on equivalence (everything is, or means, the same). Ceremony gives way to spectacle, immanence to transcendence. Baudrillard’s view of capitalism is derived from Marx’s analysis of value. Baudrillard accepts Marx’s view that capitalism is based on a general equivalent. Money is the general equivalent because it can be exchanged for any commodity. In turn, it expresses the value of abstract labour-time. Abstract labour-time is itself an effect of the regimenting of processes of life, so that different kinds of labour can be compared. Capitalism is derived from the autonomisation or separation of economics from the rest of life. It turns economics into the ‘reality-principle’. It is a kind of sorcery, connected in some way to the disavowed symbolic level. It subtly shifts the social world from an exchange of death with the Other to an eternal return of the Same. Capitalism functions by reducing everything to a regime based on value and the production of value. To be accepted by capital, something must contribute value. This creates an immense regime of social exchange. However, this social exchange has little in common with symbolic exchange. It ultimately depends on the mark of value itself being unexchangeable. Capital must be endlessly accumulated. States must not collapse. Capitalism thus introduces the irreversible into social life, by means of accumulation. According to Baudrillard, capitalism rests on an obsession with the abolition of death. Capitalism tries to abolish death through accumulation. It tries to ward off ambivalence (associated with death) through value (associated with life. But this is bound to fail. General equivalence – the basis of capitalism – is itself the ever-presence of death. The more the system runs from death, the more it places everyone in solitude, facing their own death. Life itself is fundamentally ambivalent. **The attempt to abolish death through fixed value is itself deathly.** Accumulation also spreads to other fields. The idea of progress, and linear time, comes from the accumulation of time, and of stockpiles of the past. The idea of truth comes from the accumulation of scientific knowledge. Biology rests on the separation of living and non-living. According to Baudrillard, such accumulations are now in crisis. For instance, the accumulation of the past is undermined, because historical objects now have to be concealed to be preserved – otherwise they will be destroyed by excessive consumption. Value is produced from the residue or remainder of an incomplete symbolic exchange. The repressed, market value, and sign-value all come from this remainder. To destroy the remainder would be to destroy value. Capitalist exchange is always based on negotiation, even when it is violent. The symbolic order does not know this kind of equivalential exchange or calculation. And capitalist extraction is always one-way. It amounts to a non-reversible aggression in which one act (of dominating or killing) cannot be returned by the other. It is also this regime which produces scarcity – Baudrillard here endorses Sahlins’ argument. Capitalism produces the Freudian “death drive”, which is actually an effect of the capitalist culture of death. For Baudrillard, the limit to both Marx and Freud is that they fail to theorise the separation of the domains they study – the economy and the unconscious. It is the separation which grounds their functioning, which therefore only occurs under the regime of the code. Baudrillard also criticises theories of desire, including those of Deleuze, Foucault, Freud and Lacan. He believes desire comes into existence based on repression. It is an effect of the denial of the symbolic. Liberated energies always leave a new remainder; they do not escape the basis of the unconscious in the remainder. Baudrillard argues that indigenous groups do not claim to live naturally or by their desires – they simply claim to live in societies. This social life is an effect of the symbolic. Baudrillard therefore criticises the view that human liberation can come about through the liberation of desire. He thinks that such a liberation will keep certain elements of the repression of desire active. Baudrillard argues that the processes which operate collectively in indigenous groups are repressed into the unconscious in metropolitan societies. This leads to the autonomy of the psyche as a separate sphere. It is only after this repression has occurred that a politics of desire becomes conceivable. He professes broad agreement with the Deleuzian project of unbinding energies from fixed categories and encouraging flows and intensities. However, he is concerned that capitalism can recuperate such releases of energy, disconnecting them so they can eventually reconnect to it. Unbinding and drifting are not fatal to capitalism, because capitalism itself unbinds things, and re-binds things which are unbound. What is fatal to it is, rather, reversibility. Capitalism continues to be haunted by the forces it has repressed. Separation does not destroy the remainder. Quite the opposite. The remainder continues to exist, and gains power from its repression. This turns the double or shadow into something unquiet, vampiric, and threatening. It becomes an image of the forgotten dead. Anything which reminds us of the repressed aspects excluded from the subject is experienced as uncanny and threatening. It becomes the ‘obscene’, which is present in excess over the ‘scene’ of what is imagined. This is different from theories of lack, such as the Lacanian Real. Baudrillard’s remainder is an excess rather than a lack. It is the carrier of the force of symbolic exchange. Modern culture dreams of radical difference. The reason for this is that it exterminated radical difference by simulating it. The energy of production, the unconscious, and signification all in fact come from the repressed remainder. Our culture is dead from having broken the pact with monstrosity, with radical difference. The West continues to perpetrate genocide on indigenous groups. But for Baudrillard, it did the same thing to itself first – destroying its own indigenous logics of symbolic exchange. Indigenous groups have also increasingly lost the symbolic dimension, as modern forms of life have been imported or imposed. This according to Baudrillard produces chronic confusion and instability. Gift-exchange is radically subversive of the system. This is not because it is rebellious. Baudrillard thinks the system can survive defections or exodus. It is because it counterposes a different ‘principle of sociality’ to that of the dominant system. According to Baudrillard, the mediations of capitalism exist so that nobody has the opportunity to offer a symbolic challenge or an irreversible gift. They exist to keep the symbolic at bay. The affective charge of death remains present among the oppressed, but not with the ‘properly symbolic rhythm’ of immediate retaliation. The Church and State also exist based on the elimination of symbolic exchange. Baudrillard is highly critical of Christianity for what he takes to be a cult of suffering, solitude and death. He sees the Church as central to the destruction of earlier forms of community based on symbolic exchange. Baudrillard seems to think that earlier forms of the state and capitalism retained some degree of symbolic exchange, but in an alienated, partially repressed form. For instance, the imaginary of the ‘social contract’ was based on the idea of a sacrifice – this time of liberty for the common good. In psychoanalysis, symbolic exchange is displaced onto the relationship to the master-signifier. I haven’t seen Baudrillard say it directly, but the impression he gives is that this is a distorted, authoritarian imitation of the original symbolic exchange. Nonetheless, it retains some of its intensity and energy. Art, theatre and language have worked to maintain a minimum of ceremonial power. It is the reason older orders did not suffer the particular malaise of the present. It is easy to read certain passages in Baudrillard as if he is bemoaning the loss of these kinds of strong significations. This is initially how I read Baudrillard’s work. But on closer inspection, this seems to be a misreading. Baudrillard is nostalgic for repression only to the extent that the repressed continued to carry symbolic force as a referential. He is nostalgic for the return of symbolic exchange, as an aspect of diffuse, autonomous, dis-alienated social groups. Death: Death plays a central role in Baudrillard’s theory, and is closely related to symbolic exchange. According to Baudrillard, what we have lost above all in the transition to alienated society is the ability to engage in exchanges with death. Death should not be seen here in purely literal terms. Baudrillard specifies early on that he does not mean an event affecting a body, but rather, **a form which destroys the determinacy of the subject** **and of value** – which returns things to a state of indeterminacy. Baudrillard certainly discusses actual deaths, risk-taking, suicide and so on. But he also sees death figuratively, in relation to the decomposition of existing relations, the “death” of the self-image or ego, the interchangeability of processes of life across different categories. For instance, eroticism or sexuality is related to death, because it leads to fusion and communication between bodies. Sexual reproduction carries shades of death because one generation replaces another. Baudrillard’s concept of death is thus quite similar to Bakhtin’s concept of the grotesque. Death refers to metamorphosis, reversibility, unexpected mutations, social change, subjective transformation, as well as physical death. According to Baudrillard, indigenous groups see death as social, not natural or biological. They see it as an effect of an adversarial will, which they must absorb. And they mark it with feasting and rituals. **This is a way of preventing death from becoming an event which does not signify**. Such a non-signifying event is absolute disorder from the standpoint of symbolic exchange. For Baudrillard, the west’s idea of a biological, material death is actually an idealist illusion, ignoring the sociality of death. Poststructuralists generally maintain that the problems of the present are rooted in the splitting of life into binary oppositions. For Baudrillard, the division between life and death is the original, founding opposition on which the others are founded. After this first split, a whole series of others have been created, confining particular groups – the “mad”, prisoners, children, the old, sexual minorities, women and so on – to particular segregated situations. The definition of the ‘normal human’ has been narrowed over time. Today, nearly everyone belongs to one or another marked or deviant category. The original exclusion was of the dead – it is defined as abnormal to be dead. “You livies hate us deadies”. This first split and exclusion forms the basis, or archetype, for all the other splits and exclusions – along lines of gender, disability, species, class, and so on. This discrimination against the dead brings into being the modern experience of death. Baudrillard suggests that death as we know it does not exist outside of this separation between living and dead. The modern view of death is constructed on the model of the machine and the function. A machine either functions or it does not. The human body is treated as a machine which similarly, either functions or does not. For Baudrillard, this misunderstands the nature of life and death. The modern view of death is also necessitated by the rise of subjectivity. The subject needs a beginning and an end, so as to be reducible to the story it tells. This requires an idea of death as an end. It is counterposed to the immortality of social institutions. In relation to individuals, ideas of religious immortality is simply an ideological cover for the real exclusion of the dead. But institutions try to remain truly immortal. Modern systems, especially bureaucracies, no longer know how to die – or how to do anything but keep reproducing themselves. The internalisation of the idea of the subject or the soul alienates us from our bodies, voices and so on. It creates a split, as Stirner would say, between the category of ‘man’ and the ‘un-man’, the real self irreducible to such categories. It also individualises people, by destroying their actual connections to others. The symbolic haunts the code as the threat of its own death. The society of the code works constantly to ward off the danger of irruptions of the symbolic. The mortal body is actually an effect of the split introduced by the foreclosure of death. The split never actually stops exchanges across the categories. In the case of death, we still ‘exchange’ with the dead through our own deaths and our anxiety about death. We no longer have living, mortal relationships with objects either. They are reduced to the instrumental. It is as if we have a transparent veil between us. Symbolic exchange is based on a game, with game-like rules. When this disappears, **laws and the state are invented to take their place**. It is the process of excluding, marking, or barring which allows concentrated or transcendental power to come into existence. Through splits, people turn the other into their ‘imaginary’. For instance, westerners invest the “Third World” with racist fantasies and revolutionary aspirations; the “Third World” invests the west with aspirational fantasies of development. In separation, the other exists only as an imaginary object. Yet the resultant purity is illusory. For Baudrillard, any such marking or barring of the other brings the other to the core of society. “We all” become dead, or mad, or prisoners, and so on, through their exclusion. **The goal of ‘survival’ is fundamental to the birth of power. Social control emerges when the union of the living and the dead is shattered, and the dead become prohibited.** The social repression of death grounds the repressive socialisation of life. People are compelled to survive so as to become useful. For Baudrillard, capitalism’s original relationship to death has historically been concealed by the system of production, and its ends. It only becomes fully visible now this system is collapsing, and production is reduced to operation. In modern societies, death is made invisible, denied, and placed outside society. For example, elderly people are excluded from society. People no longer expect their own death. As a result, it becomes unintelligible. It keeps returning as ‘nature which will not abide by objective laws’. It can no longer be absorbed through ritual. Western society is arranged so death is never done by someone else, but always **attributable to ‘nature’**. This creates a bureaucratic, judicial regime of death, of which the concentration camp is the ultimate symbol. **The system now commands that we must not die** – at least not in any old way. **We may only die if law and medicine allow it.** Hence for instance the spread of health and safety regulations. On the other hand, **murder and violence are legalised, provided they can be re-converted into economic value. Baudrillard sees this as a regressive redistribution of death.** It is wrested from the circuit of social exchanges and **vested in centralised agencies.** For Baudrillard, there is not a social improvement here. People are effectively being killed, or left to die, by a process which never treats them as having value. On the other hand, even when capitalism becomes permissive, inclusive and tolerant, it still creates an underlying anxiety about being reduced to the status of an object or a marionette. This appears as a constant fear of being manipulated. The slave remains within the master’s dialectic for as long as ‘his’ life or death serves the reproduction of domination. A fatal ontology?: In Fatal Strategies, Baudrillard suggests an ontology which backs up his analysis of death. The world itself is committed to extremes and to radical antagonism. It is bored of meaning. There is an ‘evil genie’, a principle of Evil which constantly returns in the form of seduction. Historical processes are really pushed forward by this principle. All energy comes from fission and rupture. These cannot be replaced by production or mechanical processes. There is no possibility of a collective project or a coherent society, only the operation of such forces. Every order exists only to be transgressed and dismantled. The world is fundamentally unreal. This leads to a necessity of irony, which is to say, the slippage of meaning. Historically, the symbolic was confined to the metaphysical. It did not affect the physical world. But with the rise of models, with the physical world derived increasingly from the code, the physical world is brought within the symbolic. It becomes reversible. The rational principle of linear causality collapses. The world is, and always remains, enigmatic. People will give for seduction or for simulation what they would never give for quality of life. Advertising, fashion, gambling and so on liberate ‘immoral energies’ which hark back to the magical or archaic gamble on the power of thought against the power of reality. Neoliberalism is in some ways an ultimate release of such diabolical forces. People will look for an ecstatic excess of anything – even boredom or oppression. In this account, the principle of evil becomes the only fixed point. Desire is not inescapable. What is inescapable is the object and its seduction, its ‘principle of evil’. The object at once submits to law and breaks it in practice, mocking it. Its own “game” cannot be discerned. It is a poor conductor of the symbolic order but a good conductor of signs. The drive towards spectacles, illusions and scenes is stronger than the desire for survival.

### Advantage

#### Collapse is inevitable

Nouriel Roubini 18, Ph.D. in economics from Harvard, professor at NYU’s Stern School of Business and CEO of Roubini Macro Associates, former Senior Economist for International Affairs in the White House’s Council of Economic Advisers during the Clinton Administration, Brunello Rosa, co-founder and CEO at Rosa & Roubini Associates, research associate at the Systemic Risk Centre at the London School of Economics, Laurea Cum Laude in Economics from the University of Siena in Italy, 9/13/18, “We are due a recession in 2020 – and we will lack the tools to fight it,” https://www.theguardian.com/business/2018/sep/13/recession-2020-financial-crisis-nouriel-roubini

As we mark the 10th anniversary of the collapse of Lehman Brothers, there are still ongoing debates about the causes and consequences of the financial crisis, and whether the lessons needed to prepare for the next one have been absorbed. But looking ahead, the more relevant question is what actually will trigger the next global recession and crisis, and when.¶ The current global expansion will likely continue into next year, given that the US is running large fiscal deficits, China is pursuing loose fiscal and credit policies, and Europe remains on a recovery path. But by 2020, the conditions will be ripe for a financial crisis, followed by a global recession.¶ There are 10 reasons for this. First, the fiscal-stimulus policies that are currently pushing the annual US growth rate above its 2% potential are unsustainable. By 2020, the stimulus will run out, and a modest fiscal drag will pull growth from 3% to slightly below 2%.¶ Second, because the stimulus was poorly timed, the US economy is now overheating, and inflation is rising above target. The US Federal Reserve will thus continue to raise the federal funds rate from its current 2% to at least 3.5% by 2020, and that will likely push up short- and long-term interest rates as well as the US dollar.¶ Meanwhile, inflation is also increasing in other key economies, and rising oil prices are contributing additional inflationary pressures. That means the other major central banks will follow the Fed toward monetary-policy normalisation, which will reduce global liquidity and put upward pressure on interest rates.¶ Third, the Trump administration’s trade disputes with China, Europe, Mexico, Canada and others will almost certainly escalate, leading to slower growth and higher inflation.¶ Fourth, other US policies will continue to add stagflationary pressure, prompting the Fed to raise interest rates higher still. The administration is restricting inward/outward investment and technology transfers, which will disrupt supply chains. It is restricting the immigrants who are needed to maintain growth as the US population ages. It is discouraging investments in the green economy. And it has no infrastructure policy to address supply-side bottlenecks.¶ Fifth, growth in the rest of the world will likely slow down – more so as other countries will see fit to retaliate against US protectionism. China must slow its growth to deal with overcapacity and excessive leverage; otherwise a hard landing will be triggered. And already-fragile emerging markets will continue to feel the pinch from protectionism and tightening monetary conditions in the US.¶ Sixth, Europe, too, will experience slower growth, owing to monetary-policy tightening and trade frictions. Moreover, populist policies in countries such as Italy may lead to an unsustainable debt dynamic within the eurozone. The still-unresolved “doom loop” between governments and banks holding public debt will amplify the existential problems of an incomplete monetary union with inadequate risk-sharing. Under these conditions, another global downturn could prompt Italy and other countries to exit the eurozone altogether.¶ Seventh, US and global equity markets are frothy. Price-to-earnings ratios in the US are 50% above the historic average, private-equity valuations have become excessive, and government bonds are too expensive, given their low yields and negative term premia. And high-yield credit is also becoming increasingly expensive now that the US corporate-leverage rate has reached historic highs.¶ Moreover, the leverage in many emerging markets and some advanced economies is clearly excessive. Commercial and residential real estate is far too expensive in many parts of the world. The emerging-market correction in equities, commodities, and fixed-income holdings will continue as global storm clouds gather. And as forward-looking investors start anticipating a growth slowdown in 2020, markets will reprice risky assets by 2019.¶ Eighth, once a correction occurs, the risk of illiquidity and fire sales/undershooting will become more severe. There are reduced market-making and warehousing activities by broker-dealers. Excessive high-frequency/algorithmic trading will raise the likelihood of “flash crashes.” And fixed-income instruments have become more concentrated in open-ended exchange-traded and dedicated credit funds.¶ In the case of a risk-off, emerging markets and advanced-economy financial sectors with massive dollar-denominated liabilities will no longer have access to the Fed as a lender of last resort. With inflation rising and policy normalisation underway, the backstop that central banks provided during the post-crisis years can no longer be counted on.¶ Ninth, Trump was already attacking the Fed when the growth rate was recently 4%. Just think about how he will behave in the 2020 election year, when growth likely will have fallen below 1% and job losses emerge. The temptation for Trump to “wag the dog” by manufacturing a foreign-policy crisis will be high, especially if the Democrats retake the House of Representatives this year.¶ Since Trump has already started a trade war with China and wouldn’t dare attack nuclear-armed North Korea, his last best target would be Iran. By provoking a military confrontation with that country, he would trigger a stagflationary geopolitical shock not unlike the oil-price spikes of 1973, 1979 and 1990. Needless to say, that would make the oncoming global recession even more severe.¶ Finally, once the perfect storm outlined above occurs, the policy tools for addressing it will be sorely lacking. The space for fiscal stimulus is already limited by massive public debt. The possibility for more unconventional monetary policies will be limited by bloated balance sheets and the lack of headroom to cut policy rates. And financial-sector bailouts will be intolerable in countries with resurgent populist movements and near-insolvent governments.¶ In the US specifically, lawmakers have constrained the ability of the Fed to provide liquidity to non -bank and foreign financial institutions with dollar-denominated liabilities. And in Europe, the rise of populist parties is making it harder to pursue EU-level reforms and create the institutions necessary to combat the next financial crisis and downturn.¶ Unlike in 2008, when governments had the policy tools needed to prevent a free fall, the policymakers who must confront the next downturn will have their hands tied while overall debt levels are higher than during the previous crisis. When it comes, the next crisis and recession could be even more severe and prolonged than the last.

#### Government recognition doesn’t involve policy action or any change – this is terminal defense to the aff’s solvency and outweighs on legal precision.

Law Dictionary ‘ND [The Law Dictionary; Featuring Black's Law Dictionary Free Online Legal Dictionary 2nd Ed.; No Date; “What is RECOGNIZE?”; https://thelawdictionary.org/recognize/; Accessed 10-28-2021] AK

To try; to examine in order to determine the truth of a matter. Also to enter into a recognizance.