## Off

### 1NC – OFF

**Interpretation: Debaters must, on the page with their name and the school they attend, disclose their contact information**

**Violation: They didn’t**

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

**Prefer**

**1] Inclusion – Novices would have a way to contact you about your positions and learn from them and debaters would tell you before round about triggering positions that you’ve read before, accessibility formatting. Independent voter because inclusion is a gateway issue for debate to occur in the first place**

**2] Prep Skew- Pre-round disclosure can’t happen if you don’t have a preferable means of contact because I would never know the aff.**

#### 3] Round effiency – allow you to set up the effiency which saves time. Delayed rounds skew prep and scheduling which results in sleep loss which is crucial to health. Comes first since you need to be healthy to debate, decrease immunity and turns engagement.

#### Not regressive or unpredictable since its on my wiki.

### 1NC – OFF

#### interp - the aff must use the free press as the actor.

#### violation - they say democracy and fiat a governmental action, not the free press

#### Precision – imprecisely includes democracies as the actor when it is a location.

#### In denotes location – no dictionary because this is common sense.

#### limits -- it arbitrarily adds a verb to the resolution which is infinitely unpredictable because they can choose any action since it isn't bound by the resolution

#### Ground - skirts core topic generics of objective freepress good/bad by shifting it to policy actions that allow them to fiat cherrypicked policies that don't have predictable responses

**4] Paradigm Issues –**

**a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.**

**b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.**

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

#### TVA: A free press ought to adhere to the

**1NC – OFF**

**Interp: The affirmative must define democracy in a delimited text in the 1AC.**

**Democracy is flexible and has too many interps – normal means shows no consensus and makes the round irresolvable since the judge doesn’t know how to compare between types of offense and o/w since it’s a side constraint on decision making.**

**Wikipedia**, xx-xx-xxxx, "Democracy Index," No Publication, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy_Index> SJCP//JG

[**Full democracies**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_democracy) **are nations where civil liberties and fundamental political freedoms are not only respected but also reinforced by a political culture conducive to the thriving of democratic principles**. These nations have a valid system of governmental checks and balances, an independent judiciary whose decisions are enforced, governments that function adequately, and diverse and independent media. These nations have only limited problems in democratic functioning.[[6]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy_Index#cite_note-index2015-6) [**Flawed democracies**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Illiberal_democracy) **are nations where elections are fair and free and basic civil liberties are honoured but may have issues (e.g. media freedom infringement and minor suppression of political opposition and critics)**. These nations have significant faults in other democratic aspects, including underdeveloped political culture, low levels of participation in politics, and issues in the functioning of governance.[[6]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy_Index#cite_note-index2015-6) [**Hybrid regimes**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hybrid_regime) **are nations with regular** [**electoral frauds**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electoral_fraud)**, preventing them from being fair and free democracies.** These nations commonly have governments that apply pressure on political opposition, non-independent judiciaries, widespread corruption, harassment and pressure placed on the media, anaemic rule of law, and more pronounced faults than flawed democracies in the realms of underdeveloped political culture, low levels of participation in politics, and issues in the functioning of governance.[[6]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy_Index#cite_note-index2015-6)

**Violation – you don’t.**

**Prefer –**

**1] Stable Advocacy – they can redefine in the 1AR to wriggle out of DA’s which kills high-quality engagement and becomes two ships passing in the night – triggers presumption since the aff wasn’t subject to well researched scrutiny. We lose access to American politics DA’s, Xi lashout DA’s, basic case turns, and core process counter plans that have different definitions and 1NC pre-round prep.**

**2] Ground – not defining hurts my strategy since they can shift out as I ask DA questions, so I err on the side of caution and read generics which get destroyed by AC frontlines.**

**3] Real World – Policy makers will always how they are implementing a law. It also means zero solvency, absent spec, private entities can circumvent since there is no delineated way to enforce the aff and means their solvency can’t actualize.**

**DSpec isn’t regressive or arbitrary – its core topic lit for what happens when the aff is implemented and cannot be discounted from policies that require enforcement to function.**

### 1NC – OFF

**Western Communication is on the brink of implosion – oversaturated by endless signs and images. Reality is dead, information is dissuasive, and truth no longer exists – any critical content of the Aff is over-coded by the hyperreal form of communication.**

**Artrip and Debrix 18**, Ryan E., and François Debrix. "The viral mediation of terror: ISIS, image, implosion." Critical Studies in Media Communication 35.1 (2018): 74-88. (Philosophy and Political Science at Guilford College and Elon University)//Elmer

Mediation and the virality of the image A crucial feature of the contemporary media system (and its accompanying global circulation of images) is oversaturation. This oversaturation of media **is characterized by** so-called **viral** patterns of production, **dissemination, and consumption** of content, often achieved through globally networked digital platforms. Enabled by a seemingly exponential growth of networks and by ever-widened thresholds of social connectivity, digital technologies have ushered in an unprecedented intensity of information production. Today’s global mediascape is perhaps best defined by its immeasurable volume of communicative activity, constituted by an interminable accumulation/circulation of representational images (thus, it may be more apt to call it a global media circuitry). In order to theorize the relevance of the accumulative/circulatory effects of representation taking place throughout contemporary media processes, we turn to Jean Baudrillard’s theory of simulation. According to Baudrillard’s theory of simulation, images have a tendency to “exceed” their original or intended function to represent, reflect, or describe some facet of reality. Images eventually overtake, overwhelm, and erase the possibility of originality or referential certainty. For Baudrillard (1983b), this takes place over the course of four “successive phases of the image” (p. 11). The first stage corresponds to the representational function of the image in its most ideal form. It describes a moment in the development of western thought—less likely an actual historical moment than one retroactively imposed on or assumed by western thought itself—whereby any reality can be perfectly reflected by an image. A second stage emerges as a response or opposition to the notion of representational faithfulness. It introduces the possibility of representational malfunction (often deployed intentionally), and it relates to what Baudrillard (1993) refers to in Symbolic Exchange and Death as “the counterfeit,” something that, Baudrillard claims, is “the dominant schema in the ‘classical period’” (p. 50). With the counterfeit, the image does not accurately represent anymore but rather “masks or perverts a basic reality” (Baudrillard, 1983b, p. 11). Representation gives way to distortion. Or, to put it somewhat differently, representation as distortion can now mislead, hide, cheat, dissimulate, or facilitate the production (and valuation) of lies and untruths (or counter-realities). In a third stage, Baudrillard (1983b) theorizes that the image now “masks the absence of a basic reality” (p. 11). The third stage marks a radical break from the first and second stages, and from representation in general. Representation becomes more or less a ruse or a lure; it can no longer be trusted (it cannot even be trusted to spread lies or falsehoods). In the third stage, the image’s “true” function is neither to reflect nor to distort, but rather to mask the impossibility of representation. Baudrillard (1996) conceptualizes that a crater has been left in the wake of a reality whose referentiality/representability has been “murdered” by the image itself, by the lure of representation, and by the desire to over-signify by way of the image. This third stage is marked by an over or hyperactive global (re)production of images and meanings in a panic mode eager to restore reality/referentiality at all costs. The demands that the real always be meaningful are everywhere in excess. “There is a proliferation of myths of origin and signs of reality; of second-hand truth, objectivity and authenticity. […] there is a panic-stricken production of the real and the referential, above and parallel to the panic of material production,” writes Baudrillard (1983b, pp. 12– 13). A **panic-driven sense of reality’s** radical **absence generates a crisis about the capacity of verifiable truth and representable meaning.** Still, according to this (il)logic, it is not enough to say that the absence of the real creates a void of meaning and truth inside which the entirety of western thought and its belief-systems disappear. Frantically, this void also stimulates and simulates reproductive effects driven by disappointment (that the real is no more) but also by desire (that the quest for the real produce more and more reality). Thus, this stage of “representation” or of reality-production also inevitably turns toward proliferation and saturation of all the signs that can stand for the real itself. The **less reality is present**, **the more** its **signs**, as substitutes for the real, proliferate. As Baudrillard (2005) puts it: “We live in terror both of the excess of meaning and of total meaninglessness” (p. 134). Demands on reality to be exponentially re-enacted, displayed, and proliferated (the new modalities of representation in this third phase) further deepen the absence of the real. Demands for evermore meaning (everything must make sense, be meaningful) exacerbate a general loss of certainty. Meaning, too, is about the exponential production and display of signs, signs that stand for what is meaningful. As Baudrillard (1988) writes, “Everywhere one seeks to produce meaning, to make the world signify, to render it visible. We are not, however, in danger of lacking meaning; quite to the contrary, we are gorged with meaning and it is killing us” (p. 63). Lastly, Baudrillard (1983b) arrives at a fourth stage of the image/simulation. Here, the image, indebted to the effects of absence-proliferation resulting from the third stage, “bears no relation to any reality whatever: it is its own pure simulacrum” (p. 11). This stage of the image relates to a phase of the “real” in which the effects of representation (or what formerly could be called representation) can now be conceptualized as a series of independent operations. Images now circulate and reproduce in more or less complete abstraction from the demands of referentiality. In effect, the “real” has been hollowed out by its own representations (as we saw in the third stage). Nothing is left of the real but its simulacra, its sign-images that circulate and are exchanged indiscriminately throughout a global mediascape. At this stage, when we point to a “real” object in the world, we actually point **to a hyper-mediation** of the object and of its sign-function, often to manifold images, void of originality by virtue of having been hyper-circulated. The mediation of reality has led to the **disappearance of the** real and representation, and we find instead a hallucinatory complex of “hyperreality” whereby things appear and in fact are “more real than the real” (Baudrillard, 1983a, p. 99). Baudrillard’s diagnosis about representation, reality, and their fateful (hyper)- mediation is reflected through many of the operations of contemporary media, particularly those that involve the proliferation and saturation of inputs and outputs in the global circuitry. The immeasurable **volume** of hyper-produced digital contents seems to have overwhelmed the **global circuits of** communication, representation, and meaning/**signification**. The globalized world is faced with an irreducible complexity of interdependent transmissions, exchanges, and always expanding and morphing communication channels occurring between a multitude of networked actors/actants, interests, and media across the shifting realms of speculative finance, statecraft, international intelligence, the management of political processes, journalism, news-reporting/making, publishing, academia, or “scientific” expertise, and everyday consumer practices, on and on, ad nauseam. There occurs a widespread hyper-generation, hyper-distribution, and hyper-signification of causality and connectivity that, in turn, become virtually indistinguishable categories, excreted by digitally mediated social exchange, and often emerging as a series of signs or symptoms of the boundless growth of an implosive global system. As the system grows, all meanings, certainties, and **truth-claims implode**. Within this implosive global system, mediation of the true and the real may remain operative, but only according to a logic of functional contradiction. Indeed, the promise of certainty is continually (re)produced concomitantly with its disappointment or deferral. This is perhaps the fateful or fatal strategic extension of the culture industry’s logic of domination and libidinal exploitation that had once been outlined by Horkheimer and Adorno (2002). As Horkheimer and Adorno put it, [t]he culture industry endlessly cheats its consumers out of what it endlessly promises. The promissory note of pleasure issued by plot and packaging is indefinitely prolonged: the promise, which actually comprises the entire show, disdainfully intimates that there is nothing more to come, that the diner must be satisfied with reading the menu. (p. 111) Today, however, the operationalization of promise-disappointment functions beyond the strategic scope of consumer marketing and the culture industry. The **mediatized subject** is constantly hit by a barrage of direct and indirect promissory notes about various forms and versions of certainty, security, and **truth** emanating from multiple news media pundits, commentators, ideologues, technocrats, politicians, community activists, and fellow “digizens.” Increasingly, the reality of power (social, political, economic, etc.) is being scrambled by a hyper-real overproduction of conflicting “truths” and “untruths,” “reals” and “unreals,” “facts” and “alternative facts,” or “news” and “fake news” that exacerbate the implosion of ideologically incoherent and semantically fragmented images purporting to represent some sort of social/ political/economic reality (Artrip & Debrix, 2014). Put differently, in seeking to diagnose and represent the true and the real, media today often produce a series of “undecidable symptoms, and an assortment of vague and contradictory diagnoses” (Baudrillard, 1995, p. 48). Even mainstream news commentaries today echo a vaguely postmodern concern that we have somehow entered a dangerous “post-truth” era of mediated social and political reality (Davies, 2016; Flood, 2016). One widespread sentiment in response to this “posttruth crisis” is to fetishize “fact-checking” technologies and related epistemic media/ truth policing practices. This sentiment commonly implores that countermeasures be taken in response to “fake news” proliferation. Yet, the machineries that produce and disseminate the true and the untrue are one and the same. Both involve the same conditions of reproduction, the same thirst for reality, and the same system of operationalized promise/disappointment. The imperative to “fact-check” suggests that media need to fight against a threat to their own legitimacy and against the endangerment of truth. But journalists and pundits who tout “fact-checking” as some panacean form of political/social resistance appear to do so in complete ignorance or denial of the hyper-real effects of today’s global media. They fail to see that, in the words of Baudrillard (2005), “[t]he excess of information engenders undecidability of facts and confusion of minds. […] The excess of transparency engenders terror” (p. 193). The ethos/pathos of “factchecking” assumes that the immediacy of truth is still possible, or that media can or must remain neutral conduits for the transmission of reality. Thus, the fetishization of “fact-checking” does not care to address (or cannot make itself address) the more difficult situation, but one that is arguably at the root of the so-called post-truth condition: truth is always already **mediated**. Truth is always already **vulnerable to the challenges of “alternative” forms of reality assessment** and representation. The viral form of today’s media simultaneously demands and prohibits a hegemonic instantiation of truth. Perhaps this simultaneous and contradictory demand for and prohibition of epistemological hegemony has always been a central feature of liberal democracies and their quests for truth. The devout faith in the “marketplace of ideas” in (neo)liberal democratic designs—rooted in the virtues of transparency, freedom, and competition—promises that (like the infamous invisible hand of the market, perhaps) it will eventually always be able to sort out fact from fiction. But the radical equivalency and universal fungibility of all ideas make it such that each attempt to instantiate a hegemonic truth tends only to energize an **oppositional** or contradictory attempt. In the domain of news and political media, the user-subject’s search for truth resembles a shell game, the plight of which is perhaps nowhere more evident than with Counselor to President Trump Kellyanne Conway’s insistence on “alternative facts” in opposition to the seemingly more measured, documented, quantitative, and conventional facts reported about public attendance at Trump’s presidential inauguration (Bradner, 2017). The new U.S. executive’s blatant disregard for referential reality, made evident by the continual torrent of images, signs, and contradictory truth-claims disseminated from the state apparatus (or via the president’s Twitter account), reflects a stage of simulation in which the lie operates as a self-sustaining simulacrum. The lie is no longer a “counterfeit” (as it was in Baudrillard’s second phase of the image), but rather a free-floating signifier. The lie no longer antagonizes truth or the real. Rather, the lie makes sense only in relation to other lies that do not even care anymore to appear truthful. The lie mirrors the hyper-real condition and operations of media because it functions according to a framework of “truth” that assumes no weight about reality, assigns no inherent value to the real, and makes no referential claims. There is no certainty left when it comes to truths and lies. What is left is an unending play of symptoms emanating from the oversaturation (an oversaturation of images, signs, statements, and “realities,” once again) of an undifferentiated global system. Everything becomes uncertain (Baudrillard might say that it is indifferent), reduced to the universally fungible mode of information/news. As Baudrillard (1995) intimated, “everything which is turned into information becomes the object of endless speculation” (p. 41).

**The Impact is implosive violence as we seek to exterminate otherness by imposing meaning onto the globe.**

**Artrip and Debrix 14**, Ryan E., and François Debrix. "The digital fog of war: Baudrillard and the violence of representation." (2014). (Philosophy and Political Science at Guilford College and Elon University)//Elmer

The story that needs to be told is thus not about the undoubtedly deplorable “truth” or fact of explosive and warlike violence, but about a violence of another sort. In the radical digital **transparency** of the global scene, we (members of the demos) often **have** full or direct exposure to explosivity, as we saw above with the image of terror. But what still needs to be thought and problematized is implosivity or what may be called **implosive violence.** Implosive violence is a violence for which we do not, and perhaps will never, have much of a language (Rancière, 2007: 123). Although, not having a language for it or, rather, as we saw above, seeking to find a language to talk about it and, perhaps, to make sense of it is still sought after. This is, perhaps, what digital pictures of war/terror violence seek to capture or want to force through. Implosive violence, often digitally rendered these days, is in close contact with media technologies and representational devices and techniques because **it seeks** representation and **meaning**. This is why implosive violence insists **on calling in wars** (against terror, for example) and on **mobilizing war machines** (against terrorist others, against **vague enemy figures**), but wars and war machines that no longer have—to the extent that they ever had—a clearly identifiable object and subject, or **a clear mission/purpose**. As such, this implosive violence and its wars (the new Western/global way of war, perhaps) **must remain** uncertain, **unclear**, foggy, inwardly driven, representational, and indeed virulent. They must remain uncertain and confused even as they are digitally operative and desperately capture events/images **to give the impression that meanings/significations can and will be found.** Yet, as we saw above, it is not meanings exactly that must be found, but information and the endless guarantee of its immediate circulation. As information occupies the empty place of meaning, certainty, or truth, images must be instantaneously turned into appearances that search for meanings that will never be discovered because, instead, a proliferation of information-worthy facts and beliefs will take over (perhaps this is what US fake pundit and comedian Stephen Colbert famously referred to as “truthiness”). Or, as Baudrillard puts it, “free from its former enemies, humanity now has to **create enemies from within**, which in fact produces a wide variety of inhuman metastases” (Baudrillard, 2003). Thus, this implosive violence is destined to be a global violence since it "is the product of a system that tracks down any form of negativity and singularity, including of course death as the ultimate form of singularity. […] It is a violence that, in a sense, puts an end to violence itself and strives to establish a world where anything related to the natural must disappear  […] Better than a global violence, we should call it a global virulence. This form of violence is indeed viral. It moves by contagion, produces by chain reaction, and little by little it destroys our immune systems and our capacities to resist" (2003; our italics).

**The 1AC’s reliance on Media as a conduit of images and facts is an abolishment of reality that replaces human interaction with spectacle, image, and simulation reinforcing the hegemony of the Sign Economy.**

**Pawlett 7**, William. Jean Baudrillard: against banality. Routledge, 2007. (Senior Lecturer in Cultural Studies at the University of Wolverhampton)//Elmer

To exemplify his position regarding information, Baudrillard focuses on news reports where there is ‘a discontinuum of signs and messages in which all orders are equivalent (1998a: 121). **News reports** **on ‘war, famine and death are interspersed with adverts** for washing powder and razors’ and, we might add, with the self-advertising of journalists, news organisations and TV companies. But this is not merely a chaotic, confused abundance of signs: ‘it is the imposition upon us, by the systematic succession of messages, of the equivalence of history and the minor news item, of the event and the spectacle, of information and advertising at the level of the sign’ (1998a: 122). Not only events, but also **the world** itself, **are ‘segmented’**, cut up **into** ‘discontinuous, successive, **non-contradictory messages’. We** do not **consume** a spectacle or an image as such, but **the principle of the succession of all possible spectacles** or images: ‘there is no danger of anything emerging that is not one sign among others’ (1998a: 122). Baudrillard engages with the theories of McLuhan and his infamous slogan ‘The medium is the message’, arguing that the really signiﬁcant level at which media inﬂuence people is not that of the content of its messages. It is in ‘the constraining pattern – linked to the very technical essence of those media – of the disarticulation of the real into successive and equivalent signs’ (1998a: 122). Marxist attempts to theorise the effects of the media on audiences and consumers fail because such critiques focus on the ideological nature of content and the ownership of networks but pay little attention **to the medium** itself and to its possible affects on perception and social relations (1981: 166–72). In exploring the medium Baudrillard postulates a ‘law of technological inertia’, suggesting that the closer the medium gets to ‘the real’, **through** techniques such as **documentary** style **ﬁlm-making and live coverage**, the greater the ‘**real absence from the world’**. In other words, ‘the world’ as space of perspective – of seeing and knowing – is increasingly replaced by a sequence of images in which ‘the primary function of each message is to refer to another message’ (1998a: 122). In this way the medium, not the message, imposes a certain **way of seein**g the world on the audience. Rather than a space for reﬂection and critical distance we have information sliced and diced as a commodity-sign. This is no Luddite hatred of technology. Both McLuhan and Baudrillard note that the medium of the printed book, dating back to the ﬁfteenth century, imposes a particular mechanics of perception, a form of constraint favouring solitary reﬂection and linearity. But the distinctive nature of the electronic mass media is, for Baudrillard, that they ‘function to neutralise the lived, unique, eventual character of the world and substitute for it a multiple universe of media which are homogeneous’ (1998a: 123). The electronic media are ideological in the sense that they declare through their form, and often also in content, ‘the omnipotence of a system of reading over a world become a system of signs’. The ‘confused’ and ‘conﬂicted’ world is transformed into an abstract, ordered one, a world of consumable signs where ‘the signiﬁer becomes its own signiﬁed . . . we see the abolition of the signiﬁed and the tautology of the signiﬁer . . . the substitution of the code for the referential dimension deﬁnes mass media consumption’ (1998a: 124–5). For Baudrillard the media are, in fact, ‘anti-mediatory’ (1981: 169). They prevent response, the reciprocal exchange of meaning, allowing only simulatory responses, responses drawn from a predeﬁned range or code. Indeed, for Baudrillard ‘the code is the only agency that speaks’ (1981: 179). Today, ‘interactive’ TV is far more developed but the ‘interactivity’ on offer remains that of the medium or the code. We are confronted with a myriad of choices, channels, spectator angles and phone-in options, but all are generated from the medium: we merely complete the circuit. Human interaction is replaced by simulatory interactivity.

**The Will to Objectivity turns the world into a Global Target – Academic Rationality and the Will to Know culminates in Extermination.**

* Answers Science/Objective Truth Args

**Chow 06**. Rey Chow, professor of comparative literature at Brown, The Age of the World Target, 2006, pg. 40 //Elmer

Often under the modest and apparently **innocuous agendas of fact gathering** and documentation, the "scientific" and "objective" production of knowledge during peacetime about the various special "areas" became the institutional practice that substantiated and **elaborated the militaristic conception of the world as target**.52 In other words, despite the claims about the apolitical and disinterested nature of the pursuits of higher learning, activities undertaken under the rubric of area studies, such as language training, historiography, anthropology, economics, political science, and so forth, are fully inscribed in the politics and ideology of war. To that extent, the disciplining, research, and development of so-called academic information are **part and parcel of a strategic logic**. And yet, if the production of knowledge (with its vocabulary of aims and goals, research, data analysis, experimentation, and verification) in fact shares the same scientific and military premises as war—if, for instance, the ability to translate a difficult language can be regarded as equivalent to the ability to break military codes 53—is it a surprise that it is doomed to fail in its avowed attempts **to "know" the other cultures**? Can "knowledge" that is derived from the same kinds of bases as war put an end to the violence of warfare, or is such knowledge not simply warfare's accomplice, destined to destroy rather than preserve the forms of lives at which it aims its focus? As long as knowledge is produced in this self-referential manner, as a circuit of targeting **or getting the other** that ultimately consolidates the omnipotence and omnipresence of the sovereign "self"/"eye"—the "I"—that is the United States, the other will have no choice but remain just that—a target whose existence justifies only one thing, **its destruction by the bomber**. As long as the focus of our study of Asia remains the United States, and as long as this focus is not accompanied by knowledge of what is happening elsewhere at other times as well as at the present, such study will ultimately confirm once again the self-referential function of virtual worlding that was unleashed by the dropping of the atomic bombs, with the United States always **occupying the position of the bomber**, and other cultures always viewed as the military and information target fields. In this manner, events whose historicity does not fall into the epistemically closed orbit of the atomic bomber—such as the Chinese reactions to the war from a primarily anti-Japanese point of view that I alluded to at the beginning of this chapter—will never receive the attention that is due to them. "Knowledge," however conscientiously gathered and however large in volume, will lead only to further silence and to the silencing of diverse experiences.54 This is one reason why, as Harootunian remarks, area studies has been, since its inception, haunted by "the absence of a definable object"-and by "the problem of the vanishing object."

**The Alternative is Radical Thought, catching debate in a trap of its own making. Instead of subsuming to the demand for truth, we are masters of illusion – bet on our critique of form, an enigma that reveals the contradiction of it all.**

**Pawlett 7**, William. Jean Baudrillard: against banality. Routledge, 2007. (Senior Lecturer in Cultural Studies at the University of Wolverhampton)//Elmer

Radical thought, as Baudrillard styles it, **is not scientific**, but **nor is it critical**. Both scientific and critical thought purport to operate on ‘reality’, but for Baudrillard, following Nietzsche, belief in ‘reality’ is an ‘otherworldly spiritual consolation . . . one of the elementary forms of the religious life . . . the last refuge of the moral zealots’ (1996c: 94). Baudrillard insists that ‘No one believes fundamentally in the real, nor in the self-evidence of their real lives’ (ibid.). Scientific and critical thought posit a ‘comforting’ and ‘necessary’ relationship between thought and reality. Baudrillard’s radical thought, in contrast, claims a fundamental ‘incompatibility between thought and the real’ (1996c: 96). As they are not naturally connected, thought is singular. Radical thought occurs ‘at the **violent intersection of meaning and non-meaning, of truth and non-truth’, it ‘wagers on the illusion of the world’** (1996c: 97–8). Any **attempt by thought to remain faithful to the world or to the ‘real’ is doomed because ‘It arises from a total misunderstanding about language, which is illusion in its very movement**, since it is the bearer of that continuity of the void, that continuity of the Nothing . . . at the very heart of what it says, since it is, in its very materiality, the deconstruction of what it signifies’ (1996c: 98). Baudrillard’s position here is in accord with that expressed, some twenty years earlier, in Symbolic Exchange; language should not be confused with its meaning alone, it is also material – the material illusion. That is, language is a medium, a form, a singularity: no language can be faithfully translated into another and no language faithfully translates ideas or thoughts. The physical form of language – sounds, silences, marks, spaces – ‘deconstructs’ the content of signified meanings. As with the anagrammatic dispersal, noble ideas and figures – gods and heroes alike – are ‘sacrificed’, becoming no more than a series of sound effects, sensuous forms of breath and song: ‘Words move quicker than meaning, but if they go too quickly, we have madness’ (1996c: 99). Scientific and critical thought tends to treat language as a neutral medium of representation, or at least attempts to find a language that is adequate to representation, a tool that can ‘extract’ truths. The task of extraction is an exacting one, requiring much discipline and toil. Baudrillard plays with a reversal of this image of thought, suggesting that ‘reality asks nothing other than to submit itself to hypotheses. **And it confirms them all. That, indeed, is its ruse and its vengeance’ (1**996c: 99). By contrast, radical thought must advance behind a mask and constitute itself as a decoy, without regard for its own truth. It must pride itself on not being an instrument of analysis, not being a critical tool. For it is the world which must analyse itself. It is the world itself which must reveal itself not as truth, but as illusion. (Baudrillard, 1996c: 99) Writing should not aim to ‘capture’ the object, but should make the object more enigmatic by seducing it, by allowing it to ‘disappear for itself’ through a ‘poetic resolution’ (1996c: 100). In **other words, as the object is abstracted, limited, coded, preceded by simulated models of itself, forced under the glaring lights of scientific rationality, it is allowed, by radical thought, to disappear from its coded position**. Thought is allowed to be meaningless, poetic, ‘useless’: ‘Cipher, do not decipher’ (1996c: 104). In any case the object takes its revenge both on those who believe in its reality – scientists, technicians, critical realists – and on those, like Baudrillard, who do not, by ‘wreak[ing] vengeance on those who deny it by paradoxically proving them right’ (ibid.). Baudrillard refers to his own hypothesis of simulation, which he put forward in the late 1970s, as ‘the most cynical, most provocative hypothesis’. Yet reality, or the social world, he argues, refused to prove him wrong. Indeed, social reality seems to become more simulatory, more unreal, by the day. One example, if any more are needed, might be TV news channels, such as BBC News 24. The programmes begin with, and repeat at nauseatingly frequent intervals, the most portentous and strident clashing sounds accompanied by pulses of light (or ‘information’) beaming across the globe, strafing it and enclosing it within a matrix. These are interspersed with stock images of ‘people’: shanty towns in China, the business classes in the USA, cultured people in Europe, flashpoints in the Middle East, smiling children in Africa, the ‘global world’ reduced to a series of signs for your consumption. And then the reassuring images of ‘our’ professional news team: the energetic young career girl in designer specs, the mature and tenacious foreign correspondent in linen suit; all attentive, all on message, nodding sagely as they receive the latest updates, working for us, to deliver to us . . . the truth! And the BBC is, of course, a beacon of restraint in comparison to the fully commercial channels. Yet descriptive and critical thought are so redundant, so banal, because ‘The simulated disorder of things has moved faster than we have’. Hence radical thought must be ‘exceptional, anticipatory and at the margin’ (1996c: 101). **Baudrillard denies that radical thought is depressive; it is meaning and critique that are ‘unhappy’ and disillusioned.** Banal thought may aim to be optimistic but it is also ‘maddeningly tedious and demoralizingly platitudinous’. For Baudrillard ‘the definition of a radical thinking [is]: a happy form and an intelligence without hope’ (1996c: 103). Radical thought plays with the beautiful materiality of language and generates ideas, rather than platitudes, and ‘as for ideas, everyone has them. More than they need’ (ibid.). Fatal theory or radical thought are unexchangeable; they have no equivalence in use-value or exchange-value, but play with ‘a reciprocal alteration between matter and thought’ (2001c: 24). What might this mean for sociology? We analysed a deterministic society deterministically. Today we have to analyse a non-deterministic society non-deterministically – a fractal random, exponential society, the society of the critical mass and extreme phenomena, a society entirely dominated by relations of uncertainty. (Baudrillard, 2001c: 18)

## ON

#### Solvency is ludicris – what does the aff do

#### No nationality key – media literacy not key. Big gap between national securiyty threats by polciymakers and local schools. Qualifications

#### They can’t solve Russia if they are right – no info in Russia

#### Resilience to what – no threshold. They say nationalism key to leadership but sounds like more propoganda