## **1st Off**

#### **CP: The United States of America, Russian Federation, and People's Republic of China ought to allocate 20% of their vaccine allocation to the Global South. This solves the affirmative by allocating vaccines to less development countries and therefore increasing access.**

## **2nd Off**

**Worldwide, patents are disproportionately held by men.**

Clara **Guibourg**, 10-2-**2019**, "Why are so few women inventors named on patents?," BBC News,<https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-49843990>

Women inventors account for just under 13% of patent applications globally, according to the study, by the UK's Intellectual Property Office (IPO). That's one female inventor for every seven male ones. And although the proportion among patent applications is increasing, at the current rate it won't reach gender parity until 2070. So, why are there so few women in the world of inventing? Researchers attribute the gap to a lack of women working in science, technology, engineering and maths (Stem). According to Penny Gilbert, partner at intellectual property law firm Powell & Gilbert, it's simply a pipeline issue. "If we want to see more women filing patents, then we need to see more women taking up Stem subjects at university and going on to careers in research," she says. Currently only about a quarter of the UK workforce in Stem industries is female and fewer girls and women study these subjects at secondary school and university, despite efforts to diagnose and solve this imbalance. Patents are granted to the owner of an invention, allowing the creator and subsequent owners to prevent others from using their invention. In order to qualify as an "invention" patent, the filing must contain a new, useful idea - that would not be obvious to a skilled person in that field. They can be filed individually, or by teams of inventors. The gender disparity among inventors grows even starker when you take into account most female inventorship takes the form of a lone female on a male-dominated team. More than two-thirds of all patents come from all-male teams or individual male inventors - and just 6% from individual female inventors. All-female teams are nearly non-existent, making up just 0.3% of applications, according to the IPO. Even when they apply for patents, women may be less likely to receive them, according to a study of US patent applications, by Yale University researchers. They found applicants with an obviously female name were less likely to have their patent approved.

**When women are able to obtain patents, one of the main fields they concentrate in is pharmaceuticals.**

**Cutura, J. (2019**, July). *Challenges for Women Inventors and Innovators in Using the Intellectual Property System - A Literature Review*.<https://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/ip-development/en/agenda/pdf/literature_review.pdf>.

Looking at the participation of women in patents, it is clear that women cluster in particular fields. According to WIPO, the five fields with the highest shares of Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) applications with women inventors were biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, organic fine chemistry, food chemistry and analysis of biological materials. The five fields with the lowest shares of PCT applications with women inventors were civil engineering; engines, pumps and turbines; machine tools; mechanical elements; and transport.

**This lack of female inventors means women’s health is underrepresented in the biomedical field - innovation and capitalism is inevitable, because men will find a way to dominate**

Claudia LóPez **Lloreda** June 17, 2021, 6-17-**2021**, "Gender bias in patents may mean less biomedical innovation for women," STAT,<https://www.statnews.com/2021/06/17/gender-bias-toward-men-patents-less-biomedical-innovation-women-study>

The study, published Thursday in Science, found that female inventors are more likely to come up with biomedical ideas and products that focus on the needs of women whereas male inventors are more inclined to focus on products for men. That, the authors concluded, suggests society may be missing out on medications, devices, and technology that could benefit women’s health. The study found that, although the percentage of biomedical patents held by women had risen from 6.3% to 16.2% in the last three decades, men still significantly outnumber women as patent holders and, in turn, health- and medicine-related inventions more often address men’s health. If there was gender parity, there would have been 6,500 more female-focused inventions during the time the researchers studied, according to their findings. Rembrand Koning, assistant professor of business administration at Harvard University and lead author of the new paper, said the idea for the study first came to him when his wife was seeking tools to recover from some complications of her pregnancy — but had trouble finding some. Then, while reading a Bloomberg article on the apprehensiveness on a part of investors to discuss a smart breast pump, the light bulb went off. “If [women] are patenting less, what sort of inventions might we be missing?” he asked. Thinking more broadly this way about the implications of a lack of female patent holders may still be relatively new. Waverly Ding, associate professor at the University of Maryland who studies gender issues related to entrepreneurship and science and author of a 2006 Science study showing the gender gap in patenting, pointed out that people haven’t really thought about the consequences of her findings on society at large. “If we have a more diverse innovation workforce, then we’re going to have better results in terms of the quality and the type of patents we’re getting,” Ding said, adding, “But we have never really looked into this assumption and no one had tried to quantify what it means to have women’s representation.” To get at that, Koning, along with two researchers at the University of Navarra in Spain and McGill University in Canada, used machine learning to examine the text of all U.S. biomedical patents filed between 1976 and 2010 and estimate whether a patent was intended for female or male consumers. The researchers estimated inventors’ gender by matching their names with a dictionary of first names and, based on public birth records, assigned the gender most often associated with that name. They found that teams made up of women inventors were 35% more likely to have patents for female consumers than all-male teams. At the same time, women inventors patented male-focused ideas at similar rates as all-male teams.

**Innovation is key to improve women’s health.**

**CB Insights Research,** 11-13-**2018**, "How Innovative Women's Health Technology Changes Healthcare," https://www.cbinsights.com/research/report/womens-health-technology-transforming/

Innovations in women’s health are rapidly transforming the health space. Just this last August, the FDA cleared the first-ever digital contraceptive: Natural Cycle‘s fertility tracking app, which couples with a basal thermometer to allow women to better plan for or prevent pregnancy through temperature logging. This is just one of many examples of how reproductive health is emerging as a central focus for new startups looking to improve women’s healthcare. It’s a market that could appeal to women of all age demographics, especially as they navigate key transitions and health issues throughout their lives. And now, new technologies are making it possible for women to manage their health and well-being on a more precise and personalized level than ever before. Ranging from fertility tracking apps to post-menopausal medications, new platforms are giving the women’s health market a long-overdue makeover.

**Intellectual property rights are key to innovation.**

**Bacchus 2020** [James, CATO.org "An Unnecessary Proposal: A WTO Waiver of Intellectual Property Rights for COVID-19 Vaccines" Free Trade Bulletin No. 78, Dec. 16, https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines

The primary justification for granting and protecting IP rights is that they are incentives for innovation, which is the main source for long‐​term economic growth and enhancements in the quality of human life. IP rights spark innovation by “enabling innovators to capture enough of the benefits of their own innovative activity to justify taking considerable risks.”18 The knowledge from innovations inspired by IP rights spills over to inspire other innovations. The protection of IP rights promotes the diffusion, domestically and internationally, of innovative technologies and new know‐​how. Historically, the principal factors of production have been land, labor, and capital. In the new pandemic world, perhaps an even more vital factor is the creation of knowledge, which adds enormously to “the wealth of nations.” Digital and other economic growth in the 21st century is increasingly ideas‐​based and knowledge intensive. Without IP rights as incentives, there would be less new knowledge and thus less innovation.

**The impact to this is gender inequality in the healthcare system, resulting in lower standards of care for everyone.**

Katherine **Hay,, 2019**, "Disrupting gender norms in health systems: making the case for change," PubMed Central (PMC),<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7233290>

Health services prioritise care in ways consistent with traditional norms, which results in poor care for women, men, and gender minorities.31 Examples include valuing women on the basis of their reproductive capacity and provision of care for children, viewing men as strong and not in need of care, and defining both as heterosexual and cisgender (ie, where biological sex at birth matches gender).31 For example, women are at greater risk than men for depression or anxiety,32-34 cancer,35 and health burdens due to ageing,36,37 but health systems show little response to these differences and in some contexts show worse care than for men.38 In India, which has a glaring sex ratio imbalance attributed in part to lower health-care seeking for female relative to male children,40,41 there is little indication that health services are addressing these biases.41 Men’s health receives even less focus, even though men have higher health risks and lower life expectancy relative to women,32,33,42-48 and restrictive gender norms related to masculinity have been linked to behavioural risks (eg, substance use, suicide, and injury) and delayed health seeking.42,49,50 Furthermore, there is evidence that providers differentially respond to men seeking care, assuming lower compliance for male relative to female patients.51,52 Men are often excluded from maternal and child health care, despite evidence of the importance of their inclusion; research documents clinical resistance to men’s engagement in maternal and paediatric care, reinforcing restrictive norms that men are not needed for maternal and child health.53-55 Health disparities for sexual and gender minorities are also well documented, and include lower health-care coverage, higher physical and mental health concerns and unmet medical needs, and increased behavioural risks (eg, substance use, violence, and sex trade involvement) and prevalence of sexually transmitted infections and HIV.56-62 For both sexual and gender minorities, stigmatisation and discrimination from health providers is common,63-65 reinforcing barriers to health care for these groups. Such issues are even more prominent in countries where sexual and gender minorities are criminalised, a health and human rights violation rooted in restrictive gender norms.56,58,59,66 Health systems must recognise and respond to the negative effects of restrictive gender norms to address the inequalities they reinforce.67 Responses range from gender unequal (reinforcing male advantage) to, far less commonly, gender transformative (altering gender norms and power; appendix).68 We systematically reviewed health system models (n=17) and found few that guide gender responsiveness (appendix). The more widely known and used models, including the Control Knobs,69 Building Blocks,70 and the Universal Coverage Cube,71 are mechanistic in nature, mapping components but not how they interact with the social environment. Other models recognise that health systems are dynamic and complex12,72-74 but do not provide an intersectional gender analysis to understand how gender bias and restrictive gender norms affect health systems. A parallel systematic review of gender transformative clinical interventions yielded few studies, despite research documenting their capacity to affect wellbeing (appendix).75 Only four identified studies76-79 used a clinic-based gender transformative approach and showed significant health impact. These studies focused on family planning counselling or intimate partner violence and on counselling to improve restrictive gender norms and inequalities to promote health. Although few studies were identified, they resulted in multiplicative behavioural health effects (eg, reduction in intimate partner violence and increased contraceptive use), suggesting that gender transformative approaches can produce multifold benefits. Gender inequalities in health persist with little response from health systems, which is not surprising because our models of health systems do not guide us to consider or address gender inequalities. These findings highlight a missed opportunity to engage health systems in gender transformative strategies to improve health at a population level.

## **3rd Off**

#### **Voting aff is an investment in cruel optimism – the 1acs use of the debate space as the stepping stone for their advocacy is a form of false hope which simulates agency causing resentiment through psychological disappointment – the alternative is a redaction of the 1AC**

**Berlant 11** [Lauren, George M. Pullman Professor, Department of English, University of Chicago, *Cruel Optimism*, Routledge: Duke University Press, 2011, p. 33-6]

**When we talk about an object of desire, we are really talking about a cluster of promises we want someone or something to make to us and make possible for us. This** cluster of promises **could be embedded in a person, a thing, an institution, a text**, a norm, a bunch of cells, smells, **a good idea - whatever**. To phrase 'the object of desire' as a cluster of promises is to allow us to encounter what's incoherent or enigmatic in our attachments, not as confirmation of our irrationality but as an explanation for our sense of our endurance in the object, insofar as proximity to the object means proximity to the cluster of things that the object promises, some of which may be clear to us while others not so much. **In other words, all attachments are optimistic. That does not mean that they** all **feel optimistic**: one might dread, for example, returning to a scene of hunger or longing or the slapstick reiteration of a lover or parent's typical misrecognition. **But the surrender to the return to the scene where the object hovers in its potentialities is the operation of optimism as an affective form**. In optimism, **the subject leans toward promises contained within the** present moment of the **encounter with their object.' 'Cruel optimism' names a relation of attachment to compromised conditions of possibility whose realisation is discovered either to be impossible**, sheer fantasy, **or** too possible, and **toxic**. What's cruel about these attachments, and not merely inconvenient or tragic, **is that the subjects who have x in their lives might not well endure the loss of their object or scene of desire, even though its presence threatens their well-being, because whatever the content of the attachment is, the continuity of the form of it provides something of the continuity of the subject's sense of** what it means to keep on living on and to look forward to being in the world. This phrase points to a condition different than that of melancholia, which is enacted in the subject's desire to temporise an experience of the loss of an object/scene with which she has identified her ego continuity. **Cruel optimism is the condition of maintaining an attachment to a problematic object**. One more thing: **the cruelty of an optimistic attachment is**, I think, usually **something an analyst observes about someone's** or some group's **attachment** to x, **since usually that attachment** exists without being an event, or even better**, seems to lighten the load for someone**/some group.^ But **if the cruelty of an attachment is experienced by someone**/some group, even in disavowed fashion, **the fear is that the loss of the object**/scene of promising itself **will defeat the capacity to have any hope about anything**. Often this fear of loss of a scene of optimism as such is unstated and only experienced in a sudden incapacity to manage startling situations, as we will see below. One might point out that all objects/scenes of desire are problematic, in that investments in them and projections onto them are less about them than about what cluster of desires and affects we can manage to keep magnetised to them. I have indeed wondered whether all optimism is cruel, because the experience of loss of the conditions of its reproduction can be so breathtakingly bad, just as the threat of the loss of x in the scope of one's attachment drives can feel like a threat to living on itself. But some scenes of optimism are clearly crueller than others: where cruel optimism operates, the very vitalising or animating potency of an object/ scene of desire contributes to the attrition of the very thriving that is supposed to be made possible in the work of attachment in the first place. This might point to something as banal as a scouring love, but it also opens out to obsessive appetites, working for a living, patriotism, all kinds of things. One makes affective bargains about the costliness of one's attachments, usually unconscious ones, most of which keep one in proximity to the scene of desire/attrition. This means that a poetics of attachment always involves some splitting off of the story I can tell about wanting to be near x (as though x has autonomous qualities) from the activity of the emotional habitus I have constructed by having x in my life in order to be able to project out my endurance as proximity to the complex of what x seems to offer and proffer. To understand cruel optimism, therefore, one must embark on an analysis of rhetorical indirection, as a way of thinking about the strange temporalities of projection into an enabling object that is also disabling. I learned how to do this from reading Barbara Johnson's work on apostrophe and free indirect discourse. In her poetics of indirection, each of these rhetorical modes is shaped by the ways a writing subjectivity conjures other ones so that, in a performance of fantasmatic intersubjectivity, the writer gains superhuman observational authority, enabling a performance of being made possible by the proximity of the object. Because this object is something like what I am describing in the optimism of attachment, I'll describe a bit the shape of my transference with her thought. In 'Apostrophe, Animation, and Abortion,' which will be my key referent bere, Johnson tracks the political consequences of apostrophe for what has become foetal personhood: a silent, affectively present but physically displaced interlocutor (a lover, a foetus) is animated in speech as distant enough for a conversation but close enough to be imaginable by the speaker in whose head the entire scene is happening.' But **the condition of projected possibility**, of a hearing that cannot take place in the terms of its enunciation ('you' are not here, 'you' are eternally belated to the conversation with you that I am imagining) **creates a fake present moment of intersubjectivity in which, nonetheless, a performance of address can take place. The present moment is made possible by the fantasy** of you, **laden with the** x **qualities I can project** onto you, given your convenient absence. Apostrophe therefore appears to be a reaching out to a you, a direct movement from place x to y, but **it is actually a turning back, an animating of a receiver on behalf of the desire to make something happen now that realises something in the speaker**, makes the speaker more or differently possible, because she has admitted, in a sense, the importance of speaking for, as, and to, two: but only under **the** condition, and **illusion**, that the two is really (in) one. Apostrophe **is thus an indirect, unstable, physically impossible but phenomenologically vitalising movement of rhetorical animation that permits subjects to suspend themselves in the optimism of a potential occupation of the same psychic space of others, the objects of desire who make you possible** (by having some promising qualities, but also by not being there).'' Later work, such as on 'Muteness Envy,' elaborates Johnson's description of the gendered rhetorical politics of this projection of voluble intersubjectivity.'^ The paradox remains that **the conditions of the lush** submerging of one consciousness into another require a double negation: of the speaker's boundaries, so s/he can grow bigger in rhetorical proximity to the object of desire; and of the spoken of, who is more or less a powerful mute placeholder providing an opportunity for the speaker's imagination of her/his/their flourishing. Of course psychoanalytically speaking all intersubjectivity is impossible. It is a wish, a desire, and a demand for an enduring sense of being with and in x, and is related to that big knot that marks the indeterminate relation between a feeling of recognition and misrecognition - recognition is the misrecognition you can bear, a transaction that affirms you without, again, necessarily feeling good or accurate (it might idealise, it might affirm your monstrosity, it might mirror your desire to be nothing enough to live under the radar, it might feel just right, and so on).'' Johnson's work on projection shows that scenes of impossible identity, rhetorically rendered, open up meaning and knowledge by mining the negative - projective, boundary dissolving - spaces of attachment to the object of address who must be absent in order for the desiring subject of intersubjectivity to get some traction, to stabilise her proximity to the object/scene of promise. In free indirect discourse, a cognate kind of suspension, the circulation of this kind of merged and submerged observational subjectivity, has less pernicious outcomes, at least when Johnson reads Zora Neale Hurston's practice of it.' In a narrator's part-merging with a character's consciousness, say, free indirect discourse performs the impossibility of locating an observational intelligence in one or any body, and therefore forces the reader to transact a different, more open relation of unfolding to what she is reading, judging, being, and thinking she understands. In Jobnson's work such a transformative transaction through reading/speaking 'unfolds' the subject in a good way, despite whatever desires they may have not to become significantly different." In short, Johnson's work on projection is about the optimism of attachment, and is often itself optimistic about the negations and extensions of personhood that forms of suspended intersubjectivity demand from the reader. What follows is not so buoyant: this is an essay politicising Freud's observation that 'people never willingly abandon a libidinal position, not even, indeed, when a substitute is already beckoning to them'.^ It comes from a longer project about the politics, aesthetics, and projections of political depression. Political depression persists in affective judgments of the world's intractability - evidenced in affectlessness, apathy, coolness, cynicism, and so on - modes of what might be called detachment that are really not detached at all but constitute ongoing relations of sociality.'" The politically depressed position is manifested in the problem of the difficulty of detaching from life-building modalities that can no longer be said to be doing their work, and which indeed make obstacles to the desires that animate them; my archive tracks practices of self-interruption, self-suspension, and self-abeyance that indicate people's struggles to change, but not traumatically, the terms of value in which their life-making activity has been cast." **Cruel optimism is**, then, like all phases, a deictic, a phrase that points to a proximate location: as **an analytic lever** it is an incitement to inhabit and **to track the** affective **attachment to what we call 'the good life,' which is for so many a bad life that wears out the subjects who nonetheless**, and at the same time**, find their conditions of possibility within it.** My assumption is that **the conditions of ordinary life** in the contemporary world even of relative wealth, as in the US, **are conditions of the** attrition or the **wearing out of the subject**, and that the irony - that the labour of reproducing life in the contemporary world is also the activity of being worn out by it - has specific implications for thinking about the ordinariness of suffering, the violence of normativity, and the 'technologies of patience' or lag that enable a concept of the later to suspend questions of the cruelty of the now.'^ Cruel optimism is in this sense a concept pointing toward a mode of lived imminence, one that grows from a perception about the reasons people are not Bartlehy, do not prefer to interfere with varieties of immiseration, but choose to ride the wave of the system of attachment that they are used to, to syncopate with it, or to be held in a relation of reciprocity, reconciliation, or resignation that does not mean defeat by it. Or perhaps they move to normative form to get numb with the consensual promise, and to misrecognise that promise as an achievement. This essay traverses three episodes of suspension - from John Ashhery, Charles Johnson, and Ceoff Ryman - of the reproduction of habituated or normative life. These suspensions open up revelations about the promises that had clustered as people's objects of desire, stage moments of exuberance in the impasse near the normal, and provide tools for suggesting why these exuberant attachments keep ticking not like the time bomb they might be but like a white noise machine that provides assurance that what seems like static really is, after all, a rhythm people can enter into while they're dithering, tottering, bargaining, testing, or otherwise being worn out by the promises that they have attached to in this world

## **AT: Framework**

#### **They say the ROTJ is the Giroux evidence - you can’t break down neoliberal systems of power and education without taking into account the role of women in those systems**

#### **​​Feminist approaches to labor only contest the inequalities of economic relations without theorizing their fundamental cause. This makes both sexual and class inequality inevitable—only universal resistance to capital creates space for total emancipation.**

**Cotter ‘1** Jennifer Cotter, Assistant Professor of English at William Jewell College, “Eclipsing Exploitation: Transnational Feminism, Sex Work, and the State,” Red Critique, Spring 2001, http://redcritique.org/spring2001/eclipsingexploitation.htm

This "transnationalism," therefore, is itself a form of crisis management for capitalism that does not go beyond the localism that it claims to contest. Nowhere is this more clear than in transnational feminism's re-theorization and normalization of the concept of class. Under the banner of "transnationalism" the dominant feminism now claims to "return" to issues of class, labor, and "economic production" in the theorization of the material conditions of women's lives, after decades of denying their relationship. For instance, like many feminists, Angela McRobbie wants to distance herself from the failures of post-modern feminism by showing that its culturalist focus on "desire" and "pleasure" in consumption and its subsequent inattention to "the highly exploitative conditions under which [consumer] goods . . . have been produced," have engendered a mode of feminism that has "resulted in the [economic] bottom end . . . of the social hierarchy being dropped from the political and intellectual agenda" (32-33; emphasis added). As a consequence she argues that feminism, if it is to be effective toward social change, must not abandon "class as a primary concept for understanding social structure" (38). Likewise, in their articulation of "transnational feminist cultural studies" Kaplan and Grewal argue for the necessity of "such terms as division of labor, class, capital, commodification, and production" in feminism if it is going to address the material conditions of all women's lives, not just some ("Beyond" 351). However, in transnational feminism and cultural feminist theory generally, "class" is theorized not as the place of the subject in the social relations of production but as his/her location in the social relations of reproduction, exchange, and consumption, or what McRobbie calls the "social relations of shopping." While transnational feminists are now rushing to address "class," the theory of class that they propose is one that displaces economic contradictions in the social relations of production, with moral and ethical contradictions in the "workplace." For McRobbie "class" and "production" are understood in occupationalist terms—in terms of the type of work performed and the social status it has in the workplace—not in terms of one's relationship to the means of production. In her analysis of women in the fashion industry, for instance, she argues that what is necessary in order to change their exploitative conditions of "production" is a "(New) Labor policy" that "think[s] across the currently unbridgeable gap" between various sectors of the international fashion industry by emphasizing collaboration and ethical understanding between designers and pieceworkers and public pressure from fashion magazines, celebrities, and other consumers to move women into "better paid and more highly skilled work" (42). In short, transforming "production relations," according to McRobbie, means embracing solutions that propose to change the position of women within the existing division of labor from one sector to another, or changing the way in which particular sectors are ethically valued by others. In actuality, what she and other feminist theorists today are calling the sphere of "production" is in fact the sphere of the circulation of labor-power as a commodity. That is, they focus on changing the terms under which labor-power is circulated as a commodity: the terms within which it is bought and sold. What is excluded by the theorization of "class" and "production" as modes of "circulation" is the possibility and necessity of transforming the relations under which labor-power is produced as a commodity: the conditions of exploitation that enable it to be bought and sold in the first place. The position of labor-power as a commodity is taken for granted as "given" in transnational feminist discourse and, as a consequence, "class" is normalized. This leads to practices that restrict feminism to cooperation with the existing social relations of production without transforming them.

#### **The ROTJ is to vote for the team that best tackles capitalistic structures by examining the epistemology of their methodology and its impact on women. The only side that does this is the negative. Capitalism uniquely impacts women - the disad proves this on the link level by saying the affirmative increases capitalism and makes things net worse for women. Any risk of a link on the disad magnifies the reasons we win the ROTJ**

## **AT: Offence**

#### **Reject the vague affirmative action - their plan text and the alternative they propose - the vagueness is bad and means they can change their advocacy - that makes them a moving target which moods out ground and hurts education and fairness**

#### **Capitalism isn’t the root cause, rather it’s personal relationships of power between the state and individual such as the dynamic between men and women**

**Aberdeen 3** – activist and founder, Aberdeen Foundation (Richard, The Way, http://richardaberdeen.com/uncommonsense/theway.html)

A view shared by many modern activists is that capitalism, free enterprise, multi-national corporations and globalization are the primary cause of the current global Human Rights problem and that by striving to change or eliminate these, the root problem of what ills the modern world is being addressed. This is a rather **unfortunate and historically myopic view**, reminiscent of early “class struggle” Marxists who soon resorted to violence as a means to achieve rather questionable ends. And like these often brutal early Marxists, modern anarchists who resort to violence to solve the problem are walking upside down and backwards, adding to rather than correcting, both the immediate and long-term Human Rights problem. Violent revolution, including our own American revolution, becomes a breeding ground for poverty, disease, starvation and often mass oppression leading to future violence. Large, publicly traded corporations are created by individuals or groups of individuals, operated by individuals and made up of individual and/or group investors. These business enterprises are deliberately structured to be empowered by individual (or group) investor greed. For example, a theorized ‘need’ for offering salaries much higher than is necessary to secure competent leadership (often resulting in corrupt and entirely incompetent leadership), lowering wages more than is fair and equitable and scaling back of often hard fought for benefits, is sold to stockholders as being in the best interest of the bottom-line market value and thus, in the best economic interests of individual investors. Likewise, major political and corporate exploitation of third-world nations is rooted in the individual and joint greed of corporate investors and others who stand to profit from such exploitation. More than just investor greed, corporations are driven by the greed of all those involved, including individuals outside the enterprise itself who profit indirectly from it. If one examines “the course of human events” closely, it can correctly be surmised that the “root” cause of humanity’s problems comes from individual human greed and similar negative individual motivation. The Marx/Engles view of history being a “class” struggle ¹ does not address the root problem and is thus fundamentally flawed from a true historical perspective (see Gallo Brothers for more details). So-called “classes” of people, unions, corporations and political groups are made up of individuals who support the particular group or organizational position based on their own individual needs, greed and desires and thus, an apparent “class struggle” in reality, is an extension of individual motivation. Likewise, nations engage in wars of aggression, not because capitalism or classes of society are at root cause, but because individual members of a society are individually convinced that it is in their own economic survival best interest. War, poverty, starvation and lack of Human and Civil Rights have existed on our planet since long before the rise of modern capitalism, free enterprise and multi-national corporation avarice, thus the root problem obviously goes deeper than this.

#### **Turn - The WTO is inevitably a tool of accumulation for capitalist imperialism – international institutional monopoly capitalism overdetermines the plan’s move to peace – causes war, environmental degradation, and extinction.**

**Cuong, 18**

[Vu Manh, Researcher @ VietEra Foundation: “International institutional monopoly capitalism and its manifestations,” published by Monthly Review on December 19, 2018. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Cuong-Vu-10/publication/331162082\_International\_institutional\_monopoly\_capitalism\_and\_its\_manifestations/links/5c6c2588299bf1e3a5b62764/International-institutional-monopoly-capitalism-and-its-manifestations.pdf]//AD

\*IIMC=International Institutional Monopoly Capitalism

The Evolution of Monopoly Capitalism Monopoly capitalism emerged from “laissez-faire” capitalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as described clearly by V.I. Lenin in Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, allowing giant corporations to dominate the accumulation process. Since the late 1970s, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union, this system has reached a new level in its development, forging imperial centralism or “International Institutional Monopoly Capitalism” (IIMC), whereby a handful of powerful nation-states explicitly use international organizations to impose their interests and further expand accumulation. Figure 1 presents a brief overview of the conceptualization of capitalism throughout its history, focusing on the development of monopoly capitalism from the 1870s to the present, including both economic and politic facets. It includes IIMC as the newest term in the evolution of monopoly capitalism. (2) (3) (4) (5) As Karl Marx noted, capitalism has an inherent drive toward endless accumulation through the production of “surplus value.” In relation to this defining characteristic of the system, there have been distinct historical configurations of its operation. IIMC represents the highest form of the imperialism stage of capitalism, given the increasingly coordination between the monopoly capital and the state within core nations. **As a state-formed monopoly capitalism, IIMC has been forcing most economies to participate in its system, regardless of whether those economies are capitalist or socialist** (except North Korea). This is what Nikolai Bukharin pointed to a century ago. According to Samir Amin, in the globalization era, the efficiency of economic management by nation-states has changed. Under IIMC, advanced capitalist states are even stronger, as far as their economic-political reach, and are **able to control international institutions and organizations**. Within these core nations, the state uses its strength to support the formation of “supercompanies” (the multinational corporations that monopolize one or a number of products/services worldwide), serving the interests of the richest class, while bringing some additional benefits to its broader population. **These countries are monopoly nations.** Through international institutional settings (e.g., World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization), monopoly capital and monopoly nations **extend their influence and power into every corner of the world, even the few remaining socialist strongholds, causing complex conflicts** within globalization and regionalization processes. Capital Concentration and the Establishment of Monopoly Nations Capital accumulation and the centralization and concentration of capital led to the formation of monopolies (cartels, syndicates, trusts, consortiums, and conglomerates). This **fundamental law of capitalism** continues to take effect in the IIMC period, albeit at a very high level. However, the following organic processes contributed to the formation of monopoly nations: 1. The concentration and centralization of capital in super-companies: The increasing strength and expansion of super-companies, especially over the last five decades, have advanced economic internationalization and globalization. Globally, the 500 largest companies generated $31.1 trillion in 2014. They accounted for nearly 40 percent of world income –up 20 percent from less than 20 percent in 1960. Super-companies not only have a monopoly within one country’s borders but also are dominant in other countries worldwide. The overseas assets of the world’s 100 largest non-financial super-companies in 2011 accounted for 63 percent of their total assets, whereas foreign sales reached 65 percent of their total. This is reflected in the intensification of foreign direct investment (FDI); the significant transfer of employment, technology and international financial operations; and the strong rise of financial systems, bank credit, and insurance. Many super-companies with powerful finances (assets, revenues) can far exceed the gross domestic product (GDP) of many economies. For example, Procter & Gamble (ranked 100 in the list of the largest companies), as noted in Table 1,has revenues that are higher than the GDP of Oman,which is the largest economy in a group of 124 smalland medium-sized economies, with $81.8billion in 2014. Supercompanies can dramatically influence small and/or poor countries as they **pressure governments** to condone **environmental degradation**, **violation of national labor laws**, and **abuse of labor rights**. They can force these governments to tender incentives, which maximize their profits by allowing extremely poor working conditions and low wages. Some super-companies actively **destroy local agriculture** and **kill marine life**, which has sparked mass protests. They often **hire military personnel to open fire on peaceful protestors and make assassinations**. 2. The mass exploitation of workers: The division of labor extends throughout the world. In 2011, the employment of foreign affiliates worldwide reached sixty-nine million jobs, up by 8 percent from 2010. Specifically, the total number of employees of the ten largest companies worldwide in 2014 exceeded 9.8 million, which is more than the population of many independent nations. This international division of labor is a product of monopoly capitalism, seeking to avoid the “law of declining rate of profit” and striving to increase the rate of profit. John Bellamy Foster and John Smith have clearly presented this trend, using archetypical examples of the labor and production associated with iPhones, T-shirts, and coffee, which involve super-exploitation overseas by super-companies. As a result, over the last three decades, an enormous amount of surplus value has been produced in the periphery, but **captured by super-companies within monopoly nations**. Through the international division of labor and expansion of branches worldwide, super-companies promote alliances in the form of complex cooperation among themselves and between themselves and small- and medium-sized companies. They adopt a “divide and rule” approach to control labor worldwide. These super-companiestake advantage of the economies of scale to increase their market shares and influence. Once they are in place in peripheral countries, they influence habits and traditional customs. Workers re-align themselves to earn a living wage. 3. The symbiotic growth of monopoly nations and super-companies: Both the state and capital rely on each other to exploit existing internal natural resources (e.g., OECD with its oil); control major production resources throughout the world (e.g., the United States in regard to Iraq’s oil, China influence on its neighbors’ sea routes and exclusive economic zone in the East and South China Seas); and possess key technologies, such as weapons, cell cloning, artificial intelligence robots, **patent medicine** develop, or media and communication. In other words, monopoly nations are the products of “five monopolies.” Super-companies and monopoly nations exert their technological and economic powers to dominant the world market, leading to both positive and negative impacts. Super-companies like capitalists to **have control over mass destructive weapons**, in order to defeat competitors and to destroy commoners’ benefits. The first and most outstanding monopoly nation is the United States, which has only two companies that reached a turnover in excess of $5 billion in 1955: General Motors ($9.82 billion) and Exxon Mobil ($5.66 billion). However, by 1990, the number of large companies (over $5 billion of turnover) had reached more than 100. In 2013, the smallest company (Exelon: energy sector) of the 132 largest companies had a turnover of $23.5 billion. On a global scale, the company that has the lowest ranking in the top 500 list of largest companies (ranked by Fortune in 2013) is Ricoh (office-equipment sector), reaching sales of over $23.2 billion. Also included in this list are eighty-nine companies from China, which is a rapid increase, compared to its thirty-four companies in 2008. As of 2015, the Global 500 are represented by 36 countries, but nearly 472 of the Global 500 are from only 16 countries: Canada, the United States, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Australia, Brazil, India, and Russia. Of these 16 countries, 13 are the world’s largest economies. Table 2 lists the typical monopoly nations in the world in 2015. The combining of super-companies and states that Lenin analyzed nearly 100 years ago, in which capitalists pivot around political agencies and monopolies, led to the integration of monopoly nations and international institutions/organizations. Thus, under the conditions of IIMC, this integration has crucially influenced the globalization process of the world economy, specifically for the peripheral countries. Although these monopoly nations dominate at different levels and their income is not equivalent, they do not conquer other nations; nonetheless, they help transfer a vast surplus of value from peripheral countries into the core countries. **Monopoly Nations Monopolize International Institutions** The rise of super-companies has not meant the end of competition, which is globally more intense today than ever before. Simultaneously, monopoly nations do not displace super-companies or prevent their monopolistic power; on the contrary, these states directly and indirectly provide super-companies with advantages and benefits. As Harry Braverman explained, “the state is guarantor of the conditions, the social relations, of capitalism, and the protector of the ever more unequal distribution of property.” The role of the state has changed in monopoly nations: it not only regulates the domestic economy, exploits the state capital, and protects monopolies on the international market, but it also represents and supports the allies of domestic monopolies **to affect the activities of international institutions/organizations in its favor and increase its competitiveness.** The role of the state and its various imperial alliances with local politicians is facilitated through the discourse of national and international competitiveness. Thus, the rise of monopoly nations has not killed competition in all of its forms. In fact, rivalry is more frequent and fierce between monopoly nations and other economies. The formation of monopoly nations and the emergence of a number of new industrialized countries have caused problems for individual economies to address and settle the issues related to international economic activities. For example, the legal systems and the legal provisions of nations have become a barrier to the circular flow of resources and limited the mobilities of the supercompanies. These can range from the agricultural protection policies that were severely opposed by the Cairns Group at the Uruguay Round in 1986 (the first time developing countries had played an active role) to the restriction regulations in immigration. They are also associated with cultural or political issues such as Internet censorship in China, Euroscepticism trend in European Union and Brexit in the United Kingdom, the opposition of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), and new protectionism in the United States. Meanwhile, the international institutions had just proved their consistency in their role of coordination and international arbitration among new member economies in the beginning phase. Subsequently, the competitiveness among countries has moved to a higher level and continued to increase, which manifested itself in many forms such as disputes of commerce, technology, and finance, etc. The recent disputes include: batteries (solar) between the United States and India; beef among the United States, Indo, and Japan; steel pipes between Japan and China; auto parts between the United States and China; catfish, frozen shrimp, and garments between Viet Nam and the United States; and rare earths among the United States, the European Union, Japan, and China. There is a severe conflict among the United States, the European Union, Ukraine, and Russia on the recent issue of annexing Crimea. Since its establishment, the World Trade Organization has witnessed many disputes over dumping, anti-subsidy, and safeguarded trade among member economies. Most of these arguments are related to monopoly nations. The number of quarrels is growing rapidly: over the last twenty years in particular, the World Trade Organization has had to resolve hundreds of cases. Specifically, the United States is a typical monopoly nation that is associated with the majority of the commercial disputes in the world (344 cases), followed by the European Union (316 cases), Japan (180 cases), and China (155 cases). In the context of the multitude of interlocking and complicated disagreements, the dispute settlement mechanism of World Trade Organization constitutes the basic cornerstone maintaining the multilateral trading order. **However, monopoly nations have been controlling this mechanism.** If there are disputes among the strongest monopoly nations, this makes them direct competitors (these include the United States, Japan, Western Europe, Russia, and China). Thus, monopoly nations tend to compromise and align with others to monopolize the World Trade Organization. Otherwise, super-companies always plan well to avoid a devalued competition. In the case of Ford, Toyota, and the other leading auto firms, the companies did not try to undersell each other in their prices. Instead, they competed for the low-cost position by making reductions in prime production (labor and raw material) costs that could be implemented in peripheral regions. Monopoly nations monopolize not only the World Trade Organization but also other international institutions/organizations or forums, such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and regional banks. Furthermore, monopoly nations monopolize political forums like G-7, the European Union, and even the most powerful United Nations. Monopoly nations also monopolize most other regional organizations, from Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and most recent the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. Below is a list of typical international institutions/organizations and mechanisms that the monopoly nations are monopolizing: • United Nations: Founded in 1945, it was monopolized at its founding by the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. These five members not only have the responsibility to maintain international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations but also have the power to veto, thus enabling them to oppose or prevent any proposed resolution of the other members. As a rule, as these five members become stronger, the United Nations is weaker. The weakness of the United Nations is expressed not only in the handling of the South China Sea dispute, but also in events such as Ukraine’s political crisis, the East China Sea quarrels, and its ability to eliminate wars and serious conflicts since the fall of Soviet (31) (32) (33) MR Online | International institutional monopoly capitalism and its manifestations Page 8 of 26 https://mronline.org/2018/12/19/international-institutional-monopoly-capitalism-and-… 07/01/2019 Union, specifically wars for economic purpose. For instance, the U.S. war machine engaged in Afghanistan (2001-14) and Iraq (2003-11); the Russia annexation of Crimea (2014); and the threat of a Chinese war in the South China Sea. The key motivation of the current aggressive and strongest monopoly nations is to gain control over vital strategic resources. • World Bank: Founded in 1944, an international institution was originally dominated by the United States and the United Kingdom. The domination of monopoly nations is evident in the voting rights of the member economies in the World Bank. Of the members, in 2013 the United States had highest voting rights at 17.69 percent, followed by Japan (6.84 percent), China (4.42 percent), Germany (4.00 percent), the United Kingdom (3.75 percent), and France (3.75 percent). • International Monetary Fund: Established in 1944, the International Monetary Fund’s funding is contributed by the member economies. Since its inception, the United States has always been the largest contributor (17.69 percent) and has been dominant through the majority of the voting rights, followed by other members with large holdings in 2010, such as Japan (6.56 percent), Germany (6.12 percent), the United Kingdom (4.51 percent), France (4.51 percent), and China (4.00 percent). • World Trade Organization: The World Trade Organization was established in 1995 to replace the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that had been in effect since 1948. Its mission is to eliminate or minimize trade barriers to free trade. The majority of its decisions are based on negotiation and consensus. However, **the negotiation process does not always reach consensus among all of its members**. This process is often criticized by many developing economies because they are not welcome in the negotiations and because, according to Richard Steinberg, the trade negotiations are actually promoted and end at a negotiating position that provides special benefit for the European Union and the United States. The formation of the regional institutions/organizations, the multilateral economic cooperation forums, and bilateral negotiations are an expression of the ever-increasing conflict between the regionalization and globalization processes. Such examples include the conflicts between the European Union and World Trade Organization on agricultural policy; between North American Free Trade Agreement and World Trade Organization on juridical and political issues; and between Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and World Trade Organization on oil price/supply management. These processes lead to very complicated overlapping and interlocking regional and international organizations because a monopoly nation can be a member of several organizations simultaneously. Thus, **these organizations become the direct or indirect means to facilitate the monopoly nations in exploiting other countries.** It is **inevitable** that the activities of powerful international institutions (such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and World Trade Organization) have not really brought equal benefits to all. The IIMC built a complex called the “IMNs-United Nation: Specialized Agencies, International Institutions/Organizations, and Region Organizations” (IMNsInIs). This organization is beyond the scope of previous international institutions. In other words, the IIMC is a combination of the power of super-companies, monopoly nations, and the juridical capacity of the international institutions. Under IIMC, capital globalization has not only strengthened the power of monopoly nations but has simultaneously created the dependence of other states/nations on the world market and finance system, which are dominated by monopoly nations. This relationship among states/ nations reflects the development of monopoly nations at the expense of the peripheral regions. In addition, “IMNs-InIs” is different from “transnational capitalism class – transnational state” structure in quality, in which the former has instrumentalized the latter. In IMNs-InIs, the international organizations have progressively been the “instrumental institutions” in the hands of monopoly nations to favor them and hinder other economies. This is typically the case when the United Nations Security Council members impose sanctions against other nations, trumping any efforts that could weaken their veto power. It is true in how monopoly nations dominate the WTO through the Doha Development Agenda to hinder agricultural economies of peripheral countries. It is evident in how the International Monetary Fund serves wealthy countries but increases poverty and environmental degradation in poor countries. The establishment of the Beijing-based Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank has raised concerns for both the United States and Japan regarding whether the bank will have high standards of governance and safeguards, which will prevent damage to other creditors. The IIMC is the final stage of “state-formed monopoly capitalism,” the new form of capitalist production that maintains the existence of capitalism and adapts it to new historical conditions.

#### **Turn - The plan’s focus on medicine trades off with a more holistic approach to healthcare – that ensures health inequities while not solving the root of the problem.**

**Sell and Williams, 20**

[Susan K., School of Regulation and Global Governance @ The Australian National University, Political Science @ George Washington University; and Owain D., University of Queensland, Public Health: “Health under capitalism: a global political economy of structural pathogenesis,” Review of International Political Economy, 27:1 (2020), 1-25, DOI: 10.1080/09692290.2019.1659842]//AD

Capitalism and private economic activity have produced new health technologies and medicines over time, while at the same time binding these welcome developments in health to supply via the global market. **This has skewed the provision of health care toward an increasingly biomedical and reductive model at the expense of more holistic approaches including social determinants of health** (Tseris, 2017). Privileged approaches that **focus on biomedicine** and silver bullets **crowd out population-level health policies that address more comprehensive components of health**. Governance constructs these outcomes and is co-produced by the interests in regulation and its capture (Glasgow & Schrecker, 2016).

### **2NR**

### **O/V**

#### **Capitalism and innovation are inevitable - that means that in the world of the affirmative women are pushed aside time and time again -**

#### **Case outweighs and turns the disad -**

#### **Cross apply the analysis we did on the framing debate -**

#### **Also the Aberdeen evidence is really important that capitalism isn’t the root cause, but actually the relationships between men and women matter most**

1. **SPL No Date** - [Sexuality, Poverty, and Law Programme, This programme provides new evidence-based knowledge and new policy options that support efforts to: (1) strengthen, through legal reform, the rights of LGBTI (lesbian, gay, transgender, bisexual and intersex) people and others marginalised because of their sexuality; and (2) support LGBTI people and others marginalised because of their sexuality to establish sustainable livelihoods.The theme produces risk-sensitive, practical approaches that can be implemented to achieve legal reform and tackle poverty among people marginalised due to their sexuality, What are the consequences of gender inequality?, http://spl.ids.ac.uk/sexuality-gender-faith/women-gender-power/what-are-consequences-gender-inequality, Accessed 3/31/18]//ZA
2. To understand gender we have to look beyond gender norms and examine roles and stereotypes as a wide set of practices that reflect the **gendered nature of power**. This includes looking at the **economic** and political **spheres** of our social life. Unchallenged **cultures of male dominance** lead to the subordination and even **exclusion of many women, and** also **many men** who do not conform to ‘hegemonic’ forms of masculinity. This effectively **sidelines more than half** of the world’s talent, experience and knowledge, leaving our societies **operating at under 50 per cent capacity**. Looking specifically at women: there is a growing and **compelling body of evidence** which shows that women not only bear the **brunt of poverty** but, that women’s empowerment is a **central precondition for its elimination**. **Poverty elimination can only be achieved by addressing the disproportionate burden of poverty, lack of access to education and health services, and lack of productive opportunities borne by women**. Gender inequality represents a **huge loss of human potential**, with costs for men as well as for women. Gender equality is therefore **integral to democracy, development and** a **h**uman **ri**ghts **system** to which all people are entitled. Rigid norms related to gender and power differentials between groups of men, mean that many men are **vulnerable to violence** (the leading cause of death for young men worldwide) and are less likely to seek health services when needed as compared to women. Programme interventions at the local level have shown tremendous success in engaging men and boys in promoting their own health and well-being and that of women and girls. Violence Violence, privilege, injustice and impunity are **intimately linked**. Violent behaviour is generally perceived to be an **integral part of male behaviour** and as a normal feature of being a man. **Violence is**, in fact, **culturally ‘masculinised.’** Gender-based violence is related to systems and feelings of power – the oppression of women and certain groups of men. **Gender inequality perpetuates a culture of violence**. When women are viewed as something less, as persons subjected to male authority, men feel less hesitation in using and degrading women for their own satisfaction as their satisfaction is deemed to be of greater importance. Unfortunately, culturally dominant norms of masculinity that encourage men to use violence limit not only men’s but also women’s and girls’ choices, safety and behaviour.

## **Cruel Optimism Kritik**

### **O/V**

#### **The 1AC is utilizing the depictions of suffering with extinction level scenarios and impacts to create the justification for their suffering. The performance of the 1AC produces the existing reality from which oppression comes as a natural state of affairs rather than a politicized existence to be questioned through the withdrawal of agency, which means they desire their oppression continues so they can feel the success it brings them.**

#### **This turns the case and takes out solvency—your frame produces the revolutionary hope that debate and society might change but ultimately reinstitutes the same in a way that solidifies and naturalizes the brutal logic of the economy centered on the exchange value.**

**Berlant 2006** (Lauren, Professor of Literature at the University of Chicago, “Cruel Optimism” in *differences* 17.3)

It is striking that these **moments of optimism, which mark a possibility that the habits of a history might not be reproduced, release an overwhelmingly negative force: one predicts such effects in traumatic scenes, but it is not usual to think about an optimistic event as having the same potential consequences. The conventional fantasy that a revolu- tionary lifting of being might happen in proximity to a new object/scene would predict otherwise than that a person or a group might prefer, after all, to surf from episode to episode while leaning toward a cluster of vaguely phrased prospects. And yet: at a certain degree of abstraction both from trauma and optimism, the experience of self-dissolution, radi- cally reshaped consciousness, new sensoria, and narrative rupture can look similar; the emotional flooding in proximity to a new object can also produce a similar grasping toward stabilizing form, a reanchoring in the symptom’s predictability**.¶ I have suggested that the particular ways in which **identity and desire are articulated and lived sensually within capitalist culture produce such counterintuitive overlaps**. But it would be reductive to read the preceding as a claim that anyone’s subjective transaction with the optimistic structure of value in capital produces the knotty entailments of cruel optimism as such. This essay focuses on artworks that explicitly remediate singularities into cases of nonuniversal but general abstraction, providing narrative scenarios of how people learn to identify, manage, and maintain the hazy luminosity of their attachment to being x and having x, given that their attachments were promises and not possessions after all. Geoff Ryman’s historical novel Was provides a different kind of limit case of cruel optimism. Linking agrarian labor, the culture industries, and therapy culture through four encounters with The Wizard of Oz, its pursuit of the affective continuity of trauma and optimism in self-unfold- ing excitement is neither comic, tragic, nor melodramatic, but metaformal: it absorbs all of these into a literary mode that validates fantasy (from absorption in pretty things to crazy delusion) as a life-affirming defense against the attritions of ordinary history.¶ Was constructs a post-traumatic drama that is held together by the governing consciousness of Bill Davison, a mental health worker, a white heterosexual Midwesterner whose only intimate personal brush with trauma has been ambivalence toward his fiancée but whose profes- sional capacity to enter into the impasse with his patients, and to let their impasses into him, makes him the novel’s optimistic remainder, a rich witness. The first traumatic story told is about the real Dorothy Gale, spelled Gael, partly, I imagine, to link up the girl who’s transported to Oz on a strong breeze to someone in prison, and also to link her to the Gaelic part of Scotland, home of the historical novel, the genre whose affective and political conventions shape explicitly Ryman’s quasi-documentary inclusion of experiences and memories whose traces are in archives, land- scapes, and bodies scattered throughout Kansas, Canada, and the United States. Like Cooter, this Dorothy Gael uses whatever fantasy she can scrap together to survive her scene of hopeless historical embeddedness. But her process is not to drift vaguely, but intensely, by way of multigeneric inven- tion: dreams, fantasies, private plays, psychotic projection, aggressive quiet, lying, being a loud bully and a frank truth teller. Dorothy’s creativity makes a wall of post-traumatic noise, as she has been abandoned by her parents, raped and shamed by her Uncle Henry Gulch, and shunned by other children for being big, fat, and ineloquent.¶ Part 2 of Was tells the story of Judy Garland as the child Frances Gumm. On the Wizard of Oz set she plays Dorothy Gale as desexualized sweetheart, her breasts tightly bound so that she can remain a child and therefore have her childhood stolen from her. It is not stolen through rape, but by parents bound up in their own fantasies of living through children in terms of money and fame (Gumm’s mother) or sex (Gumm’s father, whose object choice was young boys). The third story in Was is about a fictional gay man, a minor Hollywood actor named Jonathan, whose fame comes from being the monster in serial killer movies titled The Child Minder and who, as the book begins, is offered a part in a touring Wizard of Oz company while he is entering aids dementia. All of these stories are about the cruelty of optimism for people without control over the material condi- tions of their lives and whose relation to fantasy is all that protects them from being destroyed by other people and the nation. I cannot do justice here to the singularities of what optimism makes possible and impossible in this entire book but want to focus on a scene that makes the whole book possible. In this scene, Dorothy Gael encounters a substitute teacher, Frank Baum, in her rural Kansas elementary school.¶ “The children,” writes Ryman, “knew the Substitute was not a real teacher because he was so soft” (168). “Substitute” derives from the word “succeed,” and the sense of possibility around the changeover is deeply embedded in the word. A substitute brings optimism if he hasn’t yet been defeated—by life or by the students. He enters their lives as a new site for attachment, a dedramatized possibility. He is by definition a placeholder, a space of abeyance, an aleatory event. His coming is not personal—he is not there for anyone in particular. The amount of affect released around him says something about the intensity of the children’s available drive to be less dead, numb, neutralized, or crazy with habit; but it says nothing about what it would feel like to be in transit between the stale life and all its others, or whether that feeling would lead to something good.¶ Of course, often students are cruel to substitutes, out of excite- ment at the unpredictable and out of not having fear or transference to make them docile or even desiring of a recognition that has no time to be built. But this substitute is special to Dorothy: he is an actor, like her parents; he teaches them Turkish, and tells them about alternative histo- ries lived right now and in the past (171). Dorothy fantasizes about Frank Baum not in a narrative way, but with a mixture of sheer pleasure and defense: “Frank, Frank, as her uncle put his hands on her” (169); then she berates herself for her “own unworthiness” (169) because she knows “how beautiful you are and I know how ugly I am and how you could never have anything to do with me” (174). She says his name, Frank, over and over: it “seemed to sum up everything that was missing from her life” (169). Yet, face to face she cannot bear the feeling of relief from her life that the substitute’s being near provides for her. She alternately bristles and melts at his deference, his undemanding kindness. She mocks him and disrupts class to drown out her tenderness, but obeys him when he asks her to leave the room to just write something, anything.¶ What she comes back with is a lie, a wish. Her dog, Toto, had been murdered by her aunt and uncle, who hated him and who had no food to spare for him. But the story she hands in to the substitute is a substitute: it is about how happy she and Toto are. It includes sentences about how they play together and how exuberant he is, running around yelping “like he is saying hello to everything” (174). Imaginary Toto sits on her lap, licks her hand, has a cold nose, sleeps on her lap, and eats food that Auntie Em gives her to give him. The essay suggests a successful life, a life where love circulates and extends its sympathies, rather than the life she actually lives, where “[i]t was as if they had all stood back-to-back, shouting ‘love’ at the tops of their lungs, but in the wrong direction, away from each other” (221). It carries traces of all of the good experience Dorothy has ever had. The essay closes this way: “I did not call him Toto. That is the name my mother gave him when she was alive. It is the same as mine” (175).¶ Toto, Dodo, Dorothy: the teacher sees that the child has opened up something in herself, let down a defense, and he is moved by the brav- ery of her admission of identification and attachment. But he makes the mistake of being mimetic in response, acting soft toward her in a way he might imagine that she seeks to be: “I’m very glad,” he murmured, “that you have something to love as much as that little animal.” Dorothy goes ballistic at this response and insults Baum, but goes on to blurt out all of the truths of her life, in public, in front of the other students. She talks nonstop about being raped and hungry all the time, about the murder of her dog, and about her ineloquence: “I can’t say anything,” she closes (176). That phrase means she can’t do anything to change anything. From here she regresses to yelping and tries to dig a hole in the ground, to become the size she feels, and also to become, in a sense, an embodiment of the last thing she loved. After that, Dorothy goes crazy, lives in a fantasy world of her own, wandering homeless and free, especially, of the capacity to reflect on loss in the modalities of realism, tragedy, or melodrama. To protect her last iota of optimism, she goes crazy.¶ In Was, Baum goes on to write The Wizard of Oz as a gift of alternativity to the person who can’t say or do anything to change her life materially and who has taken in so much that one moment of relief from herself produces a permanent crack in the available genres of her survival. **In “What Is a Minor Literature?” Deleuze and Guattari exhort people to become minor in exactly that way, to deterritorialize from the normal by digging a hole in sense, like a dog or a mole. Creating an impasse, a space of internal displacement, in this view, shatters the normal hierar- chies, clarities, tyrannies, and confusions of compliance with autonomous individuality**. **This strategy looks promising** in the Ashbery poem. **But in “Exchange Value,” a moment of relief produces a psychotic defense against the risk of loss in optimism**. For Dorothy Gael, in Was, **the optimism of attachment to another living being is itself the cruelest slap of all**.¶ From this cluster we can understand a bit more of the magnetic attraction to cruel optimism, with its suppression of the risks of attach- ment. **A change of heart, a sensorial shift, intersubjectivity, or transference with a promising object cannot generate on its own the better good life: nor can the collaboration of a couple, brothers, or pedagogy. The vague futurities of normative optimism produce small self-interruptions as the utopias of structural inequality. The texts** we have looked at here **stage moments when it could become otherwise, but shifts in affective atmo- sphere are not equal to changing the world.** They are, here, only pieces of an argument about the centrality of optimistic fantasy to reproducing and surviving in zones of compromised ordinariness. And that is one way to take the measure of the impasse of living in the overwhelmingly present moment.

### **Framework**

#### **The role of the ballot is to determine the representations of suffering and suffering bodies before determining the praxis we should take toward them. When the impacts of the 1AC are \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ they focus on the success of tackling suffering, rather than the oppression and suffering happening to individuals –**

### **Link Wall**

#### **Go to the link wall – If we win a single one of these links, they also can be cross applied as case turns**

#### **1.** **Stepping Stone Link – The 1AC is simply a stepping stone for their advocacy by utilizing depictions of suffering to create false change that won’t actually provide any betterment. The affirmative is a fantasy and creates more destruction in it’s wake**

#### **2.** **Ballot Link - Their hope for the debate space represents a relationship of cruel optimism to the ballot—a hopeful attachment to the logic of a problematic system of economic exchange that stultifies the potential for politics through—the ballot, the source of subjectification and violence, is invested with optimism rather than productive distance**

**Berlant 2006** (Lauren, Professor of Literature at the University of Chicago, “Cruel Optimism” in *differences* 17.3)

**When we talk about an object of desire, we are really talk- ing about a cluster of promises we want someone or something to make to us and make possible for us**. This **cluster of promises could be embed- ded in a person, a thing, an institution**, a text, a norm, a bunch of cells, smells, **a good idea—whatever**. **To phrase “the object of desire” as a cluster of promises is to allow us to encounter what is incoherent or enigmatic in our attachments, not as confirmation of our irrationality, but as an explanation for our sense of our endurance in the object**, insofar as prox- imity to the object means proximity to the cluster of things that the object promises, some of which may be clear to us while others not so much. In other words, all attachments are optimistic. That does not mean that they all feel optimistic: one might dread, for example, returning to a scene of hunger or longing or the slapstick reiteration of a lover or parent’s typi- cal misrecognition. But the surrender to the return to the scene where the object hovers in its potentialities is the operation of optimism as an affective form (see Ghent). “**Cruel optimism” names a relation of attachment to compro- mised conditions of possibility. What is cruel about these attachments, and not merely inconvenient or tragic, is that the subjects who have x in their lives might not well endure the loss of their object or scene of desire, even though its presence threatens their well-being, because whatever the content of the attachment, the continuity of the form of it provides something of the continuity of the subject’s sense of what it means to keep on living on and to look forward to being in the world**. This phrase points to a condition different than that of melancholia, which is enacted in the subject’s desire to temporize an experience of the loss of an object/scene with which she has identified her ego continuity. **Cruel optimism is the condition of maintaining an attachment to a problematic object in advance of its loss**.¶ One might point out that all objects/scenes of desire are prob- lematic, in that investments in them and projections onto them are less about them than about the cluster of desires and affects we manage to keep magnetized to them. I have indeed wondered whether all optimism is cruel, because the experience of loss of the conditions of its reproduction can be so breathtakingly bad. But **some scenes of optimism are crueler than others: where cruel optimism operates, the very vitalizing or ani- mating potency of an object/scene of desire contributes to the attrition of the very thriving that is supposed to be made possible in the work of attachment** in the first place. This might point to something as banal as a scouring love, but it also opens out to obsessive appetites, patriotism, a career, all kinds of things. **One makes affective bargains about the costliness of one’s attachments, usually unconscious ones, most of which keep one in proximity to the scene of desire/attrition.¶ To understand cruel optimism as an aesthetic of attachment requires embarking on an analysis of the modes of rhetorical indirection that manage the strange activity of projection into an enabling object that is also disabling.** I learned how to do this from reading Barbara Johnson’s work on apostrophe and free indirect discourse. In her poetics of indi- rection, each of these rhetorical modes is shaped by the ways a writing subjectivity conjures other ones so that, in a performance of phantasmatic intersubjectivity, the writer gains superhuman observational authority, enabling a performance of being made possible by the proximity of the object. Because the dynamics of this scene are something like what I am describing in the optimism of attachment, I will describe the shape of my transference with her thought.

#### **3.** **Lives Link – The quantification of the number of lives “saved” in the 1AC highlights the commodification of lives and bodies in order to access the ballot. Focusing on the number and the “try or die” approach of the affirmative creates false promise of change and magnifies the structural issues the 1AC critiques.**

### **Impact Level**

#### **We do this analysis in the O/V but also the Berlant 11 evidence read in the NC depicts the psychological disappointment that cruel optimism thrives on. That disappointment creates a lack of praxis and instead a freeze of action and commodification of the idea of ‘saving others’**