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#### Interpretation: affirmative debaters must delineate what intellectual property they reduce in the 1AC.

#### Four types of IP that are vastly different.

Ackerman 17 [Peter; Founder & CEO, Innovation Asset Group, Inc; “The 4 Main Types of Intellectual Property and Related Costs,” Decipher; 1/6/17; <https://www.innovation-asset.com/blog/the-4-main-types-of-intellectual-property-and-related-costs>] Justin

Intellectual property protection isn’t as simple as declaring ownership of a particular product or asset. In most countries, there are four primary types of intellectual property (IP) that can be legally protected: patents, trademarks, copyrights, and trade secrets. Each has their own attributes, requirements and costs.

Before narrowing your focus on which form of protection to use, know that these forms of protection are not mutually exclusive. Depending on what you’re doing, you might be able to use a “belt & suspenders” approach and apply multiple forms of protection, or one approach might be the most sensible. Read the descriptions below to get some of the basics.

Used to protect inventive ideas or processes – things that are new, useful and nonobvious - patents are what most often come to mind when thinking of IP protection. **Patents** are also used to protect newly engineered plant species or strains, as well.

Procedure For most companies, patents result from the following stages: Conceptualization Typically, innovation teams work to address a common problem facing their organization, industry, or the world at large when developing their idea. When they’ve arrived at a solution or concept, they’ll draw up plans and gather the resources necessary to make it a reality. Prototypes or drawings can be created to provide a more accurate description of the end product or process. Invention Disclosure An internal review process often occurs with every invention. The innovation team consists of internal counsel and an invention review panel of varying disciplines. The reviewers assess, rate, rank, score, and highlight potential flaws in the supporting documents and descriptions for the invention, which are then addressed by the inventor. These reviews can and often do take place multiple times for a single invention. Patent Application If the invention is deemed meritorious enough for the pursuit of patent protection, some organizations prepare their own provisional or nonprovisional patent applications. Others will farm this stage out. There may be more tweaks as an application is prepared, and then submission to the appropriate patent office and the prosecution stage begins (the back & forth with the government patent office). Typically it is outside counsel that manages this process and related docketing activities. Docketing is the overarching name for activities that include management of paperwork and meeting filing deadlines specified by the government patent office. Because the application process is often very complicated, patent offices highly recommend working with experienced patent attorneys to handle this process. Maintenance Once a patent is approved, it has a finite lifetime. Patent holders are responsible for maintaining and tracking the usage of their patents and paying the appropriate periodic government renewal fees. If a given technology or other patented asset is collecting dust, you might not want to renew it. Instead, you can try and sell, license or donate it. Conversely, if a patented asset is performing well through product sales or licensing activities and its life is getting shorter, you might think about innovating ahead and maintaining competitive momentum. Costs Costs will vary depending on the country or countries where you file an application, and can run into tens of thousands of dollars depending on the invention’s complexity, plus attorney fees. Maintenance fees over the lifetime of the patent can run into thousands more per patent, per country where patent rights have been granted. You have to keep your eyes on these costs.

Trademark

A trademark is unlike a patent in that it protects words, phrases, symbols, sounds, smells and color schemes. Trademarks are often considered assets that describe or otherwise identify the source of underlying products or services that a company provides, such as the MGM lion roar, the Home Depot orange color scheme, the Intel Inside logo, and so on.

Procedure Trademarks do not necessarily require government approval to be in effect; they can apply through abundant use in interstate commerce. Still, registration of a trademark affords far superior protection and is gained by filing an application with the proper government office. A trademark application requires the company or user to provide a clear description and representation of the mark and its uses in conjunction with associated products or services. As with patents, it’s a good idea to partner with outside counsel that specializes in trademark applications and/or search services so they can help ensure there is a clear path for your desired mark. Costs Trademarks are generally quite less expensive to obtain. According to the US Patent and Trademark Office, trademark registration currently costs between $225 and $325 for each class code you use per mark. Attorney and search fees are extra. There are also periodic (and relatively inexpensive) government maintenance fees for trademarks.

Copyrights do not protect ideas, but rather the manner in which ideas are expressed (“original works of authorship”) - written works, art, music, architectural drawings, or even programming code for software (most evident nowadays in video game entertainment). With certain exceptions, copyrights allow the owner of the protected materials to control reproduction, performance, new versioning or adaptations, public performance and distribution of the works. Procedure Copyrights in general attach when the original works become fixed in a tangible medium, but should be registered with the government copyright office for optimal protection in the form of damages, injunctions and confiscation. Copyright registration applications are much simpler than patents or trademarks, and typically can be obtained by the author alone. The US Copyright Office encourages use of their online application system, and requires a sample of the work to be protected and some background information about the author. Costs Depending on the type of work being protected, currently fees vary between $25-$100 in the US. The most frequent copyright registration sought is for one work by one author, and costs about $35.

Trade Secret

Trade secrets are proprietary procedures, systems, devices, formulas, strategies or other information that is confidential and exclusive to the company using them. They act as competitive advantages for the business. Procedure There actually isn’t a federally-regulated registration process for trade secrets. Instead, the onus is on the company in possession of the secret to take necessary precautions to maintain it as such. This is an ongoing, proactive process and can include clearly marking relevant documents as “Confidential,” implementing physical and data security measures, keeping logs of visitors and restricting access. The issuance of nondisclosure agreements or other documented assurances of secrecy can also be employed. One of the first defenses typically put up when you assert that someone misappropriated your trade secret is that you failed to adequately treat it as a trade secret. Costs Though there are no official registration costs, there are costs associated with taking appropriate precautions and security measures. You must weigh the competitive significance of your secrets against the cost of protecting them.

#### Violation:

#### Negate:

#### 1] Shiftiness- they can redefine what intellectual properties the 1ac defends in the 1ar which decks strategy and allows them to wriggle out of negative positions which strips the neg of specific IP DAs, IP PICs, and case answers. They will always win on specificity weighing.

#### CX can’t resolve this and is bad because A] Not flowed B] Skews 6 min of prep and pre-round prep C] They can lie and no way to check D] Debaters can be shady.

#### 2] Real World- policy makers will always specify what the object of change is. That outweighs since debate has no value without portable application. It also means zero solvency since the WTO, absent spec, can circumvent aff’s policy since they can say they didn’t know what was affected.

#### This spec shell isn’t regressive- it literally determines what the affirmative implements and who it affects

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse, b] set better norms for debate and c] we indict the entire advocacy – dta makes no sense.

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 2

#### The shift to digital labor has forced the subject to become overwhelmed by the speed of process and unattuned to its environment. Global Governance is a managerial system where even in the aff’s attempt to increase access to research, it paradoxically reduces the paradigmatic function of knowledge.

Berardi, Franco. “Cognitarian Subjectivation.” E-Flux.com, November 2010, [www.e-flux.com/journal/20/67633/cognitarian-subjectivation/](http://www.e-flux.com/journal/20/67633/cognitarian-subjectivation/) |Harun|

Recent years have witnessed a new techno-social framework of contemporary subjectivation. And I would like to ask whether a process of autonomous, collective self-definition is possible in the present age. The concept of “general intellect” associated with Italian post-operaist thought in the 1990s (Paolo Virno, Maurizio Lazzarato, Christian Marazzi) emphasizes the interaction between labor and language: social labor is the endless recombination of myriad fragments producing, elaborating, distributing, and decoding signs and informational units of all kinds. Every semiotic segment produced by the information worker must meet and match innumerable other semiotic segments in order to form the combinatory frame of the info-commodity, semiocapital. Semiocapital puts neuro-psychic energies to work, submitting them to mechanistic speed, compelling cognitive activity to follow the rhythm of networked productivity. As a result, the emotional sphere linked with cognition is stressed to its limit. Cyberspace overloads cybertime, because cyberspace is an unbounded sphere whose speed can accelerate without limits, while cybertime (the organic time of attention, memory, imagination) cannot be sped up beyond a certain point—or it cracks. And it actually is cracking, collapsing under the stress of hyper-productivity. An epidemic of panic and depression is now spreading throughout the circuits of the social brain. The current crisis in the global economy has much to do with this nervous breakdown. Marx spoke of overproduction, meaning the excess of available goods that could not be absorbed by the social market. But today it is the social brain that is assaulted by an overwhelming supply of attention-demanding goods. The social factory has become the factory of unhappiness: the assembly line of networked production is directly exploiting the emotional energy of the cognitive class. I wish to pinpoint the problem of organic limits, which is often eclipsed by an emphasis on the limitless potential of technology. We should speak of technology in context, and the present context of technology is culturally oriented towards economic competition. Info-producers are neuro-workers. Their nervous systems act as active receiving terminals. They are sensitive to semiotic activation throughout the entire day. What emotional, psychic, existential price does the constant cognitive stress of permanent cognitive electrocution exact? The acceleration of network technologies, the general condition of precariousness, and the dependence on cognitive labor all induce pathological effects in the social mind, saturating attention time, compressing the sphere of emotion and sensitivity, as is shown by psychiatrists who have observed a steep increase in manic depression and suicide in the last generation of workers. The colonization of time has been a fundamental issue in the modern history of capitalist development: the anthropological mutation that capitalism produced in the human mind and in daily life has, above all, transformed the perception of time. But we are now leaping into the unknown—digital technologies have enabled absolute acceleration, and the short-circuiting of attention time. As info-workers are exposed to a growing mass of stimuli that cannot be dealt with according to the intensive modalities of pleasure and knowledge, acceleration leads to an impoverishment of experience. More information, less meaning. More information, less pleasure. Sensibility is activated in time. Sensuality is slow. Deep, intense elaboration becomes impossible when the stimulus is too fast. A process of desensitization is underway at the point where electronic cyberspace intersects with organic cybertime. The prospect of individual subjectivation, and of social subjectivation, has to be reframed in this context, and a series of radical questions arise: Is it still possible to envisage a process of collective subjectivation and social solidarity? Is it still possible to imagine a “movement” in the sense of a collective process of intellectual and political transformation of reality? Is it still possible to forge social autonomy from capitalist dominance in the psycho-economic framework of semiocapitalism? Dismantling General Intellect The refusal of work—which is better defined as a refusal of the alienation and exploitation of living time—has been the main engine of innovation, of technological development and knowledge. The organic composition of capital (as a relationship between dead labor and living labor) progressively changed throughout the twentieth century as the workers’ resistance, their sabotage and insubordination, forced capitalists to hire engineers to replace human labor with machines. Similarly, the intellectualization of human activity is—from any perspective—a consequence of the workers’ insubordination and resistance to exploitation. When the cost of labor increases (as happened in the 1960s and ’70s), the capitalist replaces worker with machine, as the machine is less costly in the long run. Since the massive wave of industrial workers’ resistance, information technology has helped to replace human toil with intelligent machines, and this has provoked the enhancement of the sphere of intellectual labor and cognitive activity linked to value production. The ’90s were a decade of alliances: cognitive labor and venture capital met and merged in the dot-com. Expectations were high, judging by the amount of investment, and creativity became an inherent feature of social labor. Then, after the dot-com bubble burst in spring of 2000, neoliberalism broke the alliance of cognitive labor and venture capital. Using technology itself, neoliberalism managed to subvert the social and political rapport de force between labor and capital. As far as we can see now, the result of neoliberal politics is a general reduction of labor cost and an impoverishment of the cognitarians. Both industrial labor, delocalized to the peripheral areas of the world, and cognitive labor, are devalued and underpaid, as precarization has fragmented and finally destroyed social solidarity. In this new context, defined by precarization of cognitive labor, we must rethink the question of subjectivation. Just after the financial collapse of spring 2000, the dot-com crash and the crumbling of big corporations like Enron and WorldCom, the Swiss philosopher and economist Christian Marazzi, a sharp analyst of the social implications of financial crises, wrote an article on the danger of privatizing the general intellect, in which he predicted the trend that ten years later is in full swing: the reduction of research financing, the manipulation and militarization of state-financed research, and the impoverishment and precarization of cognitive labor. If we look at the politics of the European neoliberal ruling class, we see that they are doing exactly this: in some countries (such as Italy) they are reducing the financing for school and for research, privatizing public schools, and provoking a large-scale de-scholarization that has already begun showing signs of producing widespread ignorance and fanaticism. In some countries (like France), they increasingly limit the public financing of research to that which can immediately translate into the politics of economic growth. Subjugating research to immediate economic interests reduces the role of research, rendering it a mere tool for governance, for the repetition of an existing framework of social activity. As cognitive workers are forced into precarity, they are also denied the possibility of deciding the scope of their own research. This obviously reduces the creativity invested by cognitarians in their work, as well as the pace of innovation and progress in technology. In the long run, this trend obliterates the progressive features of capitalism. As the cost of labor becomes so low that exploiting the physical force of a worker costs less than looking for some technological replacement, the push toward innovation slows to a halt. The interest in immediate profit prevails over the long-term development of productive force. Notwithstanding the shortsighted opinions prevailing in the field of neoliberal economics, a decrease in labor cost suggest that the progressive impulse of capitalism is fading; capitalism becomes a factor of de-civilization, of intellectual and technological regression. Cognitarians Searching for a Body Cognitarians are those who embody the general intellect in its many forms: they process information in order to give birth to goods and services. As the cognitive function of society is inscribed in the process of capital valorization, the infinitely fragmented mosaic of cognitive activity becomes a fluid process within a universal telematic network, redefining the shape of labor and capital. Capital becomes the generalized semiotic flux that runs through the veins of the global economy, while labor becomes the constant activation of the intelligence of countless semiotic agents linked to one another. Cognitarians are the social body of the soul at work in the sphere of semiocapital, but this body is dimidiated in a sphere isolated from the other’s body. The form of alienation that is spreading in the living sphere of the cognitarians is a form of psychic suffering that escapes the Freudian definition of neurosis. If Freud’s definition of neurosis lingered on repression of desire, semiocapital is pushing demand for consumerist hyper-expression: just do it. Panic, depression, and a de-activation of empathy—it is here that we find the cognitariat’s problem. Precarious cognitive workers are forced to think in terms of competition. You can become friends with another person on Facebook, but genuine friendship is difficult under conditions of virtual isolation and intense economic competition. If we want to find the way towards autonomous collective subjectivation we have to generate cognitarian awareness with regard to an erotic, social body of the general intellect. The way to autonomous and collective subjectivation starts here: from the general intellect searching for a body. Our main political task must be handled with the conceptual tools of psychotherapy, and the language of poetry—much more than the language of politics and the conceptual tools of modern political science. The political organizer of cognitarians must be able to do away with panic and depression, to speak in a way that sensibly enacts a paradigm shift, a resemiotization of the social field, a change in social expectations and self-perception. We are forced to acknowledge that we do have a body, a social and a physical body, a socioeconomic body. Cyber-optimists were fashionable in the ’90s, and they were able to interpret the spirit of an alliance between venture capitalists and artists or engineers. But the alliance was broken in the Bush years, when technology was submitted to the laws of war, and financial capitalism provoked a collapse that may still lead to the destruction of modern civilization. Today, cyber-optimism sounds fake, like advertising for a rotten product. In his recent book, You Are Not a Gadget, Jaron Lanier, the same person who engineered the tools of virtual reality, writes: true believers in the hive mind seem to think that no number of layers of abstraction in a financial system can dull the efficacy of the system. According to the new ideology, which is a blending of cyber-cloud and neo–Milton Friedman economics, the market will not only do its best, it will do better the less people understand it. I disagree. The financial crisis brought about by the U.S. mortgage meltdown of 2008 was a case of too many people believing in the cloud too much. Governance and Cognitive Subjugation In the present, agonizing phase of neoliberalism (an agony that is more ferocious and destructive than the previous phases) European governments are staging an assault on the educational system—and particularly on scientific research—as a part of a war against cognitive labor, a war aimed at its subjugation. The university system across Europe is based on a huge amount of precarious, underpaid, or unpaid labor. Researchers and students have staged protests against this trend, attempting to return the educational system to its original vocation: a place of non-dogmatic knowledge, of the public sharing of culture. Research should not be subjected to any restraining criterion of functionality, because its very function is to explore solutions that, although dysfunctional in the present paradigm, may reveal new paradigmatic landscapes. This is the role of scientific research, especially when we are facing conundrums that seem unresolvable within the capitalist paradigm. The European ruling class aims to reduce research to a method for the governance of complexity. The ideology of governance is based on the naturalization (hypostatization, I would say in Hegelian parlance) of economic reasoning. The economy has achieved the status of a universal language, of the ultimate standard of choice, whereas economics should be just a branch of knowledge among others. The normative role that the economy has acquired is unwarranted from an epistemological point of view, and devastating at the social level. If research is subjected to economic conceptualization, it is no longer research, but technical management. The so-called reform of the European educational system launched in 1999 (the year of the Bologna Charter) is aimed at the separation of applied research from the questioning of the very foundations and finalities of scientific knowledge, accompanied by the subjugation of research to standards set by economic evaluation. The epistemic implications of this move are enormous: to submit research to the laws of economic growth obliterates the most important purpose of knowledge, what Thomas Kuhn calls its “paradigmatic” function. The ability to produce paradigm shifts in the field of knowledge and in the field of experimentation depends on the autonomy of research from established standards of evaluation. Only when research can work and discover and create concepts regardless of established social interests can knowledge move beyond repetition, and open new prospects to imagination and technology. “Governance” is the keyword for this process. Governance produces pure functionality without meaning, the automation of thought and of will. It embeds abstract connections in the relation between living organisms, technologically subjecting choices to logical concatenation. It recombines compatible (compatibilized) fragments of knowledge. Governance is the replacement of political will with a system of automatic technicalities forcing reality into a logical framework that cannot be questioned. Financial stability, competitiveness, labor cost reduction, increase of productivity: the systemic architecture of EU rule is based on such dogmatic foundations that cannot be challenged or discussed, because they are embedded in the technical function of managerial subsystems. No enunciation or action is operational if it does not comply with embedded rules of techno-linguistic dispositifs of daily exchange. Governance is the management of a system that is too complex to be governed. The word “government” means the understanding (as a reduction to a rational model) of the social world, and the ability of the human will (despotic, democratic, and so forth) to control a flow of information sufficient for the control of a relevant part of the social whole. The possibility of government requires a low degree of complexity with regard to social information. Information complexity grew throughout the late modern age, and exploded in the age of the digital network. Therefore, the reduction of social information to comprehensive knowledge and political control becomes an impossible task: control becomes aleatory, uncertain, almost impossible, and an increasing number of events escape the organized will. At this point, capitalism shifts to the mode of governance. It employs abstract concatenation of technological functions in place of the conscious processing of a flow of information. It connects asignifying segments in place of dialogic elaboration. It automatically adapts in place of forming consensus, using technical language in place of shared meaning resulting from dialogue and conflict. In place of planning, it manages disruption. It assesses the compatibility of agents entering the social game in place of mediating conflicting political interests and projects. And it employs the rhetoric of systemic complexity in place of a rhetoric of historical dialectics. Looking for Autonomy As the governance model functions perfectly, in itself, it destroys the social body. Conceptualizing the field of cybernetics, Norbert Wiener argued that a system exhibiting positive feedback, in response to perturbation, increases the magnitude of perturbation. In contrast, a system that responds to a perturbation in a way that reduces its effect is said to exhibit negative feedback. A logic of positive feedback is installed in the connection between digital technology and financial economy, because this connection tends to induce technological automatisms, and psycho-automatisms too, leading to the advancement of destructive tendencies. Look at the discourse of the European political class (almost without exception): If deregulation produced the systemic collapse with which the global economy is now confronted, we need more deregulation. If lower taxation on high incomes led to a fall in demand, let’s lower high-income taxation. If hyper-exploitation resulted in the overproduction of unsold and useless cars, let’s intensify car production. Are these people insane? I don’t think so. I think they are incapable of thinking in terms of the future; they are panicking, terrorized by their own impotence; they are scared. The modern bourgeoisie was a strongly territorialized class, linked to material assets; it could not exist without a relationship to territory and community. The financial class that dominates the contemporary scene has no attachment to either territory or material production, because its power and wealth are founded on the perfect abstraction of a digitally multiplied finance. And this digital-financial hyper-abstraction is liquidating the living body of the planet, and the social body. Only the social force of the general intellect can reset the machine and initiate a paradigm shift, but this presupposes the autonomy of the general intellect, the social solidarity of cognitarians. It presupposes a process of autonomous subjectivation of collective intelligence.

**The aff’s vague allusion to helping women in the third world is resilience par excellence – their investment in third-world women of color as needing assistance from the benevolent West is simply the latest tactic of visualization by mutli-racial white supremacist patriarchy, sanctioning the expansion into new affective markets and global intervention under the guise of imperialist feminism**

**James ‘15**

[Robin, Associate Professor of Philosophy @ UNC Charlotte. 2015. “Resilience & Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism.”] pat – I have this eBook on my kindle account, can’t find a PDF of it anywhere so just DM me if you want access,

Resilience discourse turns objectification (being looked at) into a means of subjectificatlon (overcoming). It also makes looking even more efficient and profitable than simple objectification could ever be. Recognizing and affirming the affective labor of the resilient performer, the spectator feeds the performer’s individual overcoming Into a second-order therapeutic narrative: our approbation of her overcoming is evidence of our own overcoming of our past prejudices. This spectator wants to be seen by a wider audience as someone who answers the resilient feminine subject’s hail, “Look, I Overcame’. Just as individual feminine subjects use their resilience as proof of their own goodness, MRWaSP uses the resilience of its “good girls” as proof that they’re the “good guys” — that its social and ethical practices are truly just, and that we really mean it this time when we say everyone is equal. For example, the “resilience” of “our” women is often contrasted with the supposed “fragility” of Third-World women of color. Or, in domestic US race-gender politics, the resilience of some African-American women (their bootstraps-style class ascendance) is contrasted to the continued fragility of other African-American women, and thus used to reinforce class distinctions among blacks. There are a million different versions of this general story: “our” women are already liberated — they saved themselves —but, to riff on Gayatri Spivak, “brown women need saving from brown men.” Most mainstream conversations about Third-World women are versions of this story: discussions of “Muslim” veiling, female circumcision, sweatshops, poverty ‘development,” they’re all white-saviorist narratives meant to display MRWaSP’s own resilience.

Look, I Overcame!” upgrades ‘Look, a Negro’ by (a) recycling objectification into overcoming and (b) compounding looking, so that one can profit from others’ resilience, treating their overcoming as one’s own overcoming. This upgrade in white supremacist patriarchy requires a concomitant upgrade in looking.” This shift in looking practices parallels developments in film and media aesthetics. As Steven Shaviro has argued, the values, techniques, and compositional strategies most common in contemporary mainstream Western cinema — like Michael Bay’s Transformers—are significantly different than the ones used in modernist and post-modernist cinema, and that these differences in media production correlate to broader shifts in the means of capitalist and ideological production. Neoliberalism’s aesthetic is, he argues, “post-cinematic.” This post-cinematic aesthetic applies not just to film and media, but to resilience discourse. Its performance practices and looking relations configured by the “Look. I Overcame!” imperative, resilience is, in a way, another type of post-cinematic medium. In the next section I use Shaviro’s theory of post-cinematic media to identify some specific ways in which traditional patriarchal tools are updated to work compatibly with MRWaSP resilience discourse. The looking in the “Look, I Overcame!” narrative is not the same kind of looking described by concepts like “the male gaze” or “controlling images” This looking is a type of deregulated MRWaSP visualization.

#### Transparency is performative and otherness is inevitably assimilated – the academy’s relationship to their feminist scholarship and performance turns and outweighs the case because it means the 1AC is inevitably wedded to militarized liberal logics of openness – remember, we control uniqueness with how technologies of communication within the university overdetermine their intentions and aims.

Hoofd ‘15

[Ingrid, communication at National University of Singapore. Very cool. 2015. “The Financialization of the Communicative Ideal in the Activist Social Sciences,” <https://www.narcis.nl/publication/RecordID/oai%3Adspace.library.uu.nl%3A1874%2F367060>] pat

The enactment of the university’s ideals of justice, community, and equality then exceedingly takes to the new technologies of communication, as these have always been mistakenly perceived as the straightforward embodiment or incarnation of these ideals. Logically then, we can see that many academic and non-academic research centers around social change have taken the Internet by storm. This is also unsurprising because it was the intimate collaboration during the Cold War period between American universities and the United States military that led to the birth of the early Internet (the ArpaNet) in the first place. This means that academia on a fundamental level shares with the military its ideals of transparency, connectivity, and communication, as well as a general tendency to incorporate more and more people and places under its regime. In “Becoming-Media” Joseph Vogl for this reason argues that the new media intensify the fact that any medium, in “the very act of communication simultaneously communicates the specific event-character of the media themselves,” (628) so that these new technologies with their militaristic logic of targeting, as he in turn claims in “On Hesitation,” translate the “global world [into] a world of universal addressability.” (144) Since the prime logic of new media technologies, as I also discussed via the work of Baudrillard earlier, consists therefore of a combination simulation and dissimulation, we can expect to find that the websites of those research centers in important ways obscure the ways in which their use of new media are implicated in an increasingly dire economic and social situation for many globally. One more obvious example of this consists in how the prefix ‘social’ in social media in fact hides its complicity in social fragmentation; the ‘social’ media pretend to be about a sociality that actually erases the possibility of coming into contact with radical otherness (that what or those who do not gel with or abide by the Lyotardian ‘communicationalist ideology.’) Another example is how many websites of those research centers display the domain name suffix ‘.edu’ or ‘.org’ in their online addresses, as if they are unrelated or in opposition to capitalist entities that carry the ‘.com’ or ‘.gov’ suffix. A case in point is for instance the Amherst-based center for Communication for Sustainable Social Change (CSSC, http://csschange.org), the University of Queensland Centre for Communication and Social Change (CfCSC, http://uq.edu.au/ccsc/), or the non-governmental Communication for Social Change Consortium (CFSC, http://www.communicationforsocialchange.org) which has head offices in New Jersey and in London. All the traffic to and from these websites nonetheless flows via ISPs and IXPs that, as I mentioned before, are by and large owned by a handful of mostly North-American companies.

Now I want to stress that no doubt a lot of good work is done under the umbrella of these centers and organizations, and that I by no means wish to dissociate myself from the general left-wing spirit of justice and equality that these entities stand for. But I do think that especially the recourse of these entities to new communication and visualization technologies illustrates how the acceleration and subsequent displacement of these ideals has reached its apex today. This is because the usage of the new media naturalizes for its audiences – who are anyway already foremost the privileged sections of society for whom such techniques work to their advantage – the paradigm of transformation, communication, and innovation, both via the websites’ content and their design. The CSSC website for instance proclaims as one of their key objectives the creation of awareness among policy-makers and administrators of “innovative applied communication and technology processes” for community development in so-called ‘developing’ countries. It also professes to the creation of interdisciplinary and international alliances for the purposes of communication and social change. The CFSC website meanwhile claims that “within marginalized communities, there is tremendous untapped potential to use communication for collective good,” since “communication has been an essential tool for development since early in the 20th century.” Part of their mission is “to help people living in poor communities communicate effectively.” The website also, much in line with the neoliberal obsession with technological change, strongly emphasizes the role of “nurturing innovation, research and scholarship in communication.” It displays many photographs of African peoples and communities going about their daily business, like fishing, preparing food, and dancing, so as to imply a link between the dissemination of communication tools and the supposed ‘improvement’ in efficiency around these daily activities. Once more, there is a distinct sense of condescension present in these developmental narratives that claim to help people help themselves, which shows that these organizations still operate much in line with its colonialist and messianistic heritage of ‘good works’ for the purposes of the ‘enlightenment of the natives.’

Similar to the CFSC website, the CfCSC website is profusely laced with images of Australian aboriginal, Indian, and other Asian rural communities, together with a smattering of white faces. The showcasing of these photographs appears to be functioning as ‘proof’ of the overall positivity of the imperative of communication and the joys of using the media. This ‘proving’ is similar to the case of for instance the protesters in Egypt during the so-called ‘Arab Spring’ holding up signs with “Facebook” and “Twitter,” not because these are at all intrinsically revolutionary, but because these protests’ spectacular imagery was set up for consumption by a largely Western and privileged global audience in dire need of a re-affirmation of the emancipatory promise of technological innovation as such. The ‘other’ is in the case of the CfCSC and CFSC website namely portrayed as ‘authentically’ desiring ommunication and collaboration with these centers, where in fact such a ‘need’ is conjured up or produced by the unequal relations of power globally that the new media tools are implicated in, as well as between the facilitators and such ‘others.’ Again, true radicality is erased by way of displaying an ‘other’ who apparently posits no challenge to this global financial regime of development and innovation, and who can be ‘coddled’ and ‘liberated’ by the well-meaning academic and activist. As Vogl astutely remarks in “On Hesitation,” such images and stories of happy collaboration render an impression that “friend and foe are just as close, almost indistinguishable from one another.” (144) They therefore obscure the manifold ways in which organizers and researchers are not in any way in some kind of ‘horizontal’ dialogue with these peoples, whose entire ways of being in the world is challenged at a fundamental level in favor of a capitalist logic of mere survival. It may be for example of interest here that Australian aboriginal culture traditionally emphasizes the vital non-communicability and secrecy that is part and parcel of earthly existence; a worldview that is bound to perish in a global world obsessed with universal communicability and transparency. The general conceptual and opportunistic error that these academics, researchers, and activists therefore make, is to rely on an analogy between technologically improved communications – again, much in the vein of Shannon and Weaver – and the general democratization, perfection, or emancipation of communities under threat. In some socially engaged humanities scholarship of the 1990s, a very similar slippage concerned the misplaced overlapping of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s rhetoric of ‘assemblages’ and ‘rhizomes’ in Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, with the supposedly ‘horizontal’ structure of the Internet. This misconception of the function of new media is due to the confluence of the semiotic realm with the capitalist acceleration of information flows; under such conditions, ‘radical’ content comes to render opaque and legitimize the actual function of new media in the ongoing financialization of the globe. Once more then, the true purpose of these new and social media lies on their operational, and no longer the representational, level.

#### The alternative is to engage in a schizoanalytic framework in response to the affirmative’s call for global economic interdependency. The ROB is interrogate the aff’s relationship to the affective economy.
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The political and economic knowledge we have inherited from modern rationalist philosophy is now useless, because the current collapse is the effect of the infinite complexity of immaterial pro-duction and of the incompatibility or unfitness of the general intellect when confronted with the framework of capitalist governance and private property. Chaos (i.e. a degree of complexity which is beyond the ability of human understanding) now rules the world. Chaos means a reality which is WO complex to be reduced to our current paradigms of understanding. The capitalist paradigm can no longer be the uni-versal rule of human activity. We should not look at the current recession only from an eco-nomic point of view. We must see it as an anthropological turning point that is going to change the distribution of world resources and of world power. The model based on growth has been deeply interiorized, since it pervaded daily life, perception, needs, and consumption styles. But growth is over and will never be back, not only because people will never be able to pay for the debt accumulated during the past three decades, but also because the physical planetary resources are close to exhaustion and the social brain is on the verge of collapse. Catastrophe and morphogenesis The process underway cannot be defined as a crisis. Crisis means the destructuration and restructuration of an organism which is nonetheless able to keep its functional structure. I don't think that we will see any re-adjustment of the capitalist global structure. We have entered a major process of catastrophic morphogenesis. The capitalist paradigm, based on the connection between revenue and work performance is unable to frame (semiotically and socially) the present configuration of the general intellect. In the 1930s the opportunity for a New Deal rested on the availability of physical resources and in the possibility of increasing individual demand and consumption. All that is over. The planet is running out of natural resources and the world is heading towards an environmental catastrophe. The present economic downturn and the fall in oil prices ate feeding the depletion and exhaustion of planetary resources. At the same time, we cannot predict any boom in individual consumption, at least in the Western societies. So it is simply non- sensical to expect an end to this crisis, or a new policy of full employment. There will be no full employment in the future. The crash in the global economy is not only an effect of the bursting of the financial bubble. It is also and primarily an effect of me bursting of the work bubble. We have been working too much during the last five centuries, this is the simple truth. Working so much has implied an abandonment of vital social functions and a commodification of language, affections, teaching, therapy and self-cate. Society does not need more work, more jobs, more competition. On the contrary: we need a massive reduction in work-time, a prodigious liberation of life from the social factory, in order to reweave the fabric of the social relation. Ending the connection between work and revenue will enable a huge release of energy for social tasks that can no longer be conceived as a part of the economy and should once again become forms of life. As demand shrinks and factories close, people suffer from a lack of money and cannot buy what is needed for everyday life. This is a vicious circle that the economists know very well but are completely unable to break, because it is the double bind that the economy is doomed to feed. The double bind of over-production cannot be solved by economic means, but only by an anthropological shift, by the abandonment of the economic framework of income in exchange for work. We have simultaneously an excess of value and a shrinking of demand. A redistribution of wealth is urgendy needed. The idea that income should be the reward for a performance is a dogma we must absolutely get rid of. Every person has the right to receive the amount of money that is needed for survival. And work has nothing to do with this. Wages are not a natural given, but the product of a specific cultural modeling of the social sphere: linking survival and subordination to the process of exploitation was a necessity of capitalist growth. Now we need to allow people to release their knowledge, intelligence, affects. This is today's wealth, not compulsive useless labour. Until the majority of mankind is free from the connection between income and work, misery and war will be the norm of the social relationship. How to heal a depression? Although they seldom, if ever, used the "D" word, Felix Guattati and Gilles Deleuze say very interesting things on the subject in their last books, Chaosmosis, and What is philosophy.' In the final chapter of What is philosophy? they speak of Chaos. Chaos, in their woods, has very much to do with the acceleration of the semiosphere and the thickening of the info-crust. The acceleration of the surround-ing world of signs, symbols and info-stimulation is producing panic, as I have already said in the previous parts of this book. Depression is the deactivation of desire after a panicked acceleration. When you are no longer able to understand the flow of information stimulating your brain, you tend to desert the field of communication, disabling any intellectual and psychological response. Let's go back to a quote that we have already used: "Nothing is more distressing than a thought that escapes itself, than ideas that fly off, that disappear hardly formed, already eroded by forgetfulness or precipitated into others that we no longer master. », We should not see depression as a mere pathology, but also as a form of knowledge. James Hillman says that depression is a condition in which the mind faces the knowledge of impermanence and death. Suffering, imperfection, seniliry, decomposition: this is the truth that you can see from a depressive point of view. In the introduction to What is philosophy? Ddeuze and Guattari speak of friendship. They suggest that friendship is the way to overcome depression, because friendship means sharing a sense, sharing a view and a common rhythm: a common reftain (ritournelle) in Guattari's parlance. In Chaosmosis Guattari speaks of the "heterogenetic comprehension of subjectivity" : "Daniel Stern, in The Interpersonal World of the Infant, has notably explored the pre-verbal subjective formations of infants. He shows that there are not at all a matter of 'stages' in the Freudian sense, but of levels of subjectivation which maintain themselves in parallel through life. He thus rejects the overrated psychogenesis of Freudian complexes, which have been presented as the structural 'Universals' of subjectivity. Furthermore he emphasizes the inhetently trans-subjective character of an infant's early experiences:J2 The singularity of psychogenesis is central in Guattari's schizoanalytic vision. This implies also the singularity of the therapeutic process. it's not simply a matter of remodeling a patient's subjectivity—as it existed before a psychotic crisis—but of a production sui genesis... these complexes actually offer people diverse possibilities for recomposing their existential corporeality, to get WI of their repetitive impasses and, in a certain way to resin-gularize themselves." These few lines must be read, in my opinion, not only as a psychotherapeutic manifesto but also as a political one. The goal of schizoanalysis is not, in Guattari's words, to reinstall the universal norm in the patient's behavior, but to singularize him/her, to help him/her becoming conscious of his or her differ-ence, to give him/her the ability to be in good stead with his being different and his actual possibilities. When dealing with a depression the problem is not to bring the depressed person back to normality, to reintegrate behavior in the universal standards of normal social language. The goal is to change the focus of his/her depressive attention, to re-focalize, to deterrito-rialize the mind and the expressive flow. Depression is based on the hardening of one's existential refrain, on its obsessive repetition. The depressed person is unable to go out, to leave the repetitive refrain and s/he keeps going back into the labyrinth. The goal of the schizoanalyst is to give him/her the possibility of seeing other landscapes, to change focus, to open new paths of imagination. I see a similarity between this schizoanalytic wisdom and the Kuhnian concept of paradigmatic shift which needs to occur when scientific knowledge is taken inside a conundrum. In The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962) Kuhn defines a paradigm as "a con-stellation of belies shared by a group of people." A paradigm may therefore be seen as a model which gives way to the understanding of a certain set of realities. A scientific revolution in Kuhn's vision is the creation of a new model which fits the changing reality better than the previous epistemic models. The word aepisteme" in the Greek language means to stand in front of something: the epistemic paradigm is a model that allows us to face reality. A paradigm is a bridge which gives friends the ability to traverse the abyss of non-being. Overcoming depression implies some simple steps: the deterrito-rialization of the obsessive refrain, the re-focalization and change of the landscape of desire, but also the creation of a new constellation of shared beliefs, the common perception of a new psychological environment and the construction of a new model of relationship. Deleuze and Guactari say that philosophy is the discipline that involves creating concepts. In the same way, they argue that schizo-analysis is the discipline that involves creating percepts and affects through the deterritorialization of obsessive frameworks In the current situation, the schizoanalytic method should be applied as political therapy: the Bipolar Economy is falling into a deep depression. What happened during the first decade of the cen-tury can be described in psychopathological terms, in terms of panic and depression. Panic happens when things start swirling around too quickly, when we can no longer grasp their meaning, their eco-nomic value in the competitive world of capitalist exchange. Panic happens when the speed and complexity of the surrounding flow of information exceed the ability of the social brain DJ decode and pre-dict. In this case desire withdraws its investments, and this withdrawal gives way to depression. Here we are, after the subprime crack and the following global collapse. Now what? The economic collapse cannot be solved with the tools of nomic thought, because economic conceptualization is in fact problem and not the solution. The strict correlation between income and labot, the tartatic. pursuit of growth, the dogmas of compatibility and cOlmpetiltiollS these are the pathogenic features that our social culture must get rid of, if we want to come out of our depression. In the nc'mlin.nt) political discoutse, the overcoming of a depression means re';ta':tirtg.' the dynamics of growrh and consumption: this is what they "recovery." But this will be impossible both because the colle,othre:. debt cannot be paid and because the planet cannot support a new phase of capitalist expansion. The economy of growth is itself poison. It cannot be the antidote. Over the last ten years, the French anthropologist Serge Latouche has been talking of dicroissance (Degrowth) as a political goal. But now dissonance is simply a fact: when the Gross National Product is falling everywhere, entire sections of the industrial system are crumbling and demand is plummeting, we can say that degrowth is no longer a program for the future. Degrowth is here. The problem is that social culture is not ready for this, because Our social organization is based on the idea of the interminable expansion of consumption, and the modern soul has been shaped by the concept of privatization and by the affects of an unending increase in consumption. The very notion of wealth has to be reconsidered: not only the concept of wealth, but the perception of being rich. The identification of wealth with purchasing power is deeply embedded in the social psyche and affectivity. But a different understanding of wealth is possible, one that is not based on possession, but on enjoyment. I'm not thinking of an ascetic turn in the collective perception of wealth. I think that sensual pleasure will always be the foundation of well-being. But what is pleasure? The disciplinary culture of modernity has equated pleasure and possessing. Economic thinking has created scarcity and has privatized social need, in order to make possible the process of capitalist accumulation. Therein lies the source of the current depression. The interminable process of therapy We should not expect a swift change in the social landscape, but rather the slow surfacing of new trends: communities will abandon the field of the crumbling economy; more and more individuals will abandon their job searches and will start creating extra-economic networks of survival. The very perception of well being and of being rich will change in the direction of frugality and freedom. The de-privatization of services and goods will be made possible by this much-needed cultural revolution. This will not happen in a planned and uniform manner. It will be the effect of the withdrawal of Singular individuals and communities and of the creation of an economy based on the sharing of common things and services and on the liberation of time for culture, pleasure and affection. The identification of well-being with private property is so deeply rooted that we cannot absolutely rule out the eventuality of a barbarization of the human environment. But the task of the general intellect is precisely this: to escape from paranoia, to create zones of human resistance, to experiment with autonomous forms of production based on high-tech/low-energy models, to interpellated the people with a language that is more therapeutic than political. In the days to come, politics and therapy will be one and the same. The people will feel hopeless and depressed and panicked, because they can't deal with the post-growth economy and they will miss our dissolving modern identity. Our cultural task will be to attend to these people and to take care of their trauma showing them the way to pursue the happy adaptation at hand. Our task will be the creation of social zones of human resistance, zones of therapeutic contagion. Capitalism will not disappear from the global landscape, but it will lose its pervasive, paradigmatic role in our semiorization, it will become one of possible form of social organization. Communism will never be the principle of a new totalization, but one of the possible forms of autonomy from capitalist rule. In the 1 960s, Castoriadis and his friends published a magazine whose title was: Socialism or Barbarism. Bur you will recall that in Rhizome, the introduction to A Thousand Plateaus, Deleuze and Guattari argue that the disjunction (or. .. or. .. or) is precisely the dominant mode of Western Metaphysics that we are trying to forget. They oppose this disjunctive model with a conjunctive approach: "A rhizome has no beginning or end, bur it is always a middle, between things, interbeing, intermezzo. The tree is filiation, bur the rhizome is alliance, uniquely alliance. The tree imposes the verb 'to be: but the fabric of the rhizome is the conjunction, 'and ... and ... and .. .' This conjunction carries enough force to shake and uproot the verb 'to be' [ ... J to establish a logic of the AND, overthrow ontology, do away with foundations, nullifY endings and beginnings.'" The process of autonomy should not be seen as Aufhebung, but as Therapy. In this sense, it is neither totalizing and nor it is intended to destroy and abolish the past. In a letter to his master, Sigmund Freud, the young psychoanalyst Fliess asked when it is possible to consider a therapy to be over and the patient be told, "you are ok." Freud answered that the psychoanalysis has reached its goal when the person understands that therapy is an interminable process. Autonomy is also a process without end.