**Baudrillard K**

**We live in a third-order simulacrum. Capitalism and mass production have separated us from what is “real:” we now understand it through self-referential symbols. This prevents us from acknowledging our desire from lack, which increases our determination to colonize and assimilate the “other.”**

**Mclennan 16** Mark McLennan is a graduate student at the London School of Economics and Political Science, having completed a BA and a JD at the University of Sydney. Simulacra and Simulated Policing: Baudrillard and Criminology.

After describing a novel sociological position that regards **semiology, rather than capital, as the key component of domination** (Baudrillard [1968] 1998), **Baudrillard’s radical social theory emerges in light of considerations of consumerism, media, information and technology—all of which conspire to create what Baudrillard calls a ‘hyperreal’ society**. This is a contemporary world where all boundaries, categories and values implode into the ‘end of the social’. Baudrillard (1972) begins elaborating this theory in an article titled ‘Design and Environment or How Political Economy Escalates into Cyberblitz’ (Baudrillard, 1972, Chapter 10). In this essay, he points to the importance of ‘the passage out of a metallurgic into a semiurgic society’ (Ibid.: 185). Here, **consumer objects take on a life of their own ‘as an embodiment and functional part of a system of signs, independent of its status as a commodity**’ (Kellner, 1989: 76). He uses the German Bauhaus movement as an example to anticipate the ‘universal semantisation of the environment in which everything becomes the object of a calculus of function and signification’ (Baudrillard, 1972: 185-86). This is achieved by the synthesis ‘of form and function, beauty and utility, of art and technology’ in the design of objects that produces a functionalised universe whereby the meaning and function of **every object is determined by its place in the system**. As a result, ‘the whole environment becomes a signifier, objectified as an element of signification’ (Ibid.: 186-87). This is analogous to Derrida’s concept of ‘difference’ whereby meaning is never present ‘in a sufficient presence that would refer only to itself’ (Derrida, 1965: 27). E**ssentially, objects, words and images have no direct relationship to the things in which they refer, they inherent meaning only by interacting with one another in an ongoing system of contrast. Baudrillard refers to this system as a ‘cybernetic code’,** and argues that **reality itself is shut out from this system of because the system is wholly self-referencing. This code creates ‘a functionalised, integrated and self-reproducing universe’ of meaning, controlled by simulacra and simulation**. And, like Derrida’s text, there is nothing outside of the code.In ‘The Orders of Simulacra’, **Baudrillard (1995) outlines the stages of the transition from traditional society to the contemporary society defined by simulations** (Baudrillard, 1995). First, according to Baudrillard, the feudal era had a fixed social order established by a hierarchy of obligatory signs indicating social class and rank. Here, a ‘natural law of value’ dominates the stage. **Simulacra, a representation of another image, first emerge as ‘counterfeits’ of the real**. For example, representations of class, law or value are said to be grounded in nature: art imitates life and democracy is legitimised by ‘natural rights’. Baudrillard indicates, however, that **the inherent goal of simulacra is to produce a controllable and universal system of power**. At this stage, counterfeit simulacra is working ‘only on substance and form, not yet on relations or structures’, but **its evolution will create ‘a pacified society, ground up into a deathless substance … that will guarantee an eternity of … cultural hegemony’** (Baudrillard, 1983b: 91). Next, the **second-order of simulacra appears during the industrial revolution**. Importantly, infinite reproducibility is introduced into society. For example, exact **replicas of objects are produced by assembly lines and automation**. No longer is there nostalgia for a natural order; **nature is to be dominated by production;** counterfeit simulacra are now obsolete. Most importantly, however, the infinite reproducibility of objects, augmented by the rise of capitalism, enables the emergence of the cybernetic code and contemporary society. Baudrillard claims that ‘**we are in the third-order simulacra’**, **where simulation models come to constitute the world and all referential finalities are abolished** (Ibid.: 100-01): God, Man, Nature, History, Society and others. This is because **images are only understood by reference to other images**. Thus, **society has moved from ‘a capitalist-productivitist society to a neo-capitalist cybernetic order’** (Ibid.: 111). As a result of this code, images no longer refer to an object; rather, they refer to another commutable image on the code. But, through models contained in common societal narrative and institutional discourse, simulations are able to produce a ‘reality effect’, which conceals the fact they are merely referring to other simulations (Bogard, 1996: 10). For example, the code continually sets up simulations of events, which test individuals and ‘[inscribe] them into the simulated order’ through a ‘process of signalisation’ (Kellner, 1989: 80). For example, every advertisement, choice of commodity, choice of entertainment, and political candidate presents a chance for a binary response of affirmation or negation. It is in this way that individuals are inserted into a dominating ‘coded system of similarities and dissimilarities, of identities and programed differences’ (Ibid.). Thus, Baudrillard’s contemporary social theory is distinguishable from previous determinist social theories that postulate powerful individuals, classes, or corporations manipulating the public for certain ends. Instead, Baudrillard suggests that social organisation is determined by individual’s responses to the pre-coded messages that are derived from simulations of economics, politics, culture or the banal decisions of everyday life (Baudrillard, 1983b: 111). Importantly for the third-order of simulacra, the binary system of the code creates a ‘deterrence model’ in which all ‘radical change is ruled out, since the very fact of an option between different political parties, [for example], acts as a deterrent against demands for radical social change’ (Kellner, 1989: 81). This is the end of society as traditionally theorised. In Symbolic Exchange and Death Baudrillard (1983c: 20) announces the end of traditional conceptions of society—the end of ‘labour, production, political economy’, and the ‘dialectic signifier/signified that permeated the accumulation of knowledge and of meaning’ (Baudrillard, 2002: 127). Baudrillard argues that **we are in a new era where media and the consumption of semiotic codes that inform images, have replaced production and political economy as the organising foundation of society**. For example, **labour is now a ‘sign among signs’** (Baudrillard, 1995b: 23), a symbol of one’s status and integration: ‘the choice of occupation, the utopia of an occupation custom-made for everyone … labour power is no longer violently bought and sold; **it is designed, it is marketed, it is merchandised. Production thus joins the consumerist system of signs’** (Baudrillard, 2002: 134). Because social reality is constituted by the ‘chess pieces’ of the signs and symbols that are mobilised through the media, **nothing is objectively determined and everything can be simulated** (Kellner, 1989: 62). **Thus, political economy is no longer the determinant that can explain social phenomena.**

**The Aff is a move to innocence and mere liberal reformism, an action that allows the state to paper over semiocapitalism’s exploitation by pretending that progress is possible within hyperreality. Strikes can do nothing but encourage passivity.**

**Pawlett, 90** William Pawlett, “Jean Baudrillard: Against Banality” (Taylor and Francis: November 12, 2007),<https://www.google.com/books/edition/Jean_Baudrillard/mhe87OZYJXIC?hl=en&gbpv=0>.

In a characteristic reversal strategy, directed at Marxist theory, **Baudrillard argues that capitalism, rather than being 'transcended' by socialism, has actually leapt over the dialectic as it 'substitutes the structural form of value, and currently controls every aspect of the system's strategy'** (1993a: 7). Given this metamorphosis, Baudrillard asks whether we are still living within capitalism. 'Hyper-capitalism' may be a more accurate term, he suggests, but what is not in doubt is that the structural law of value is the purest, most illegible form of social domination . . . it no longer has any references within a dominant class or a relation of forces' (1993a: 10-11). These are bold claims, yet Baudrillard, at this stage in his thought, does offer considerable substantiation in a discussion of the effects of the sign on labour, on wages and on strikes. Instead of labour we have signs of labour. In other words, **labour as living historical agency, as force with the power to transform social relations, becomes a 'dead' abstraction in the economic calculations of capitalism**. This process was well under way in Marx's time and Marx produced the concepts of abstract labour and commodity fetishism to describe the way in which the living force of labour is hidden behind finished commodities. But, for Baudrillard, the living agency of labour is not just hidden or reified into commodities, it is also rendered symbolically dead — it is less and less a living principle of exchange. **In an age of structural, permanent high unemployment, labour cannot be exchanged for employment, for a salary or for a comfortable life.** Labour, then, is a slow death; it is neutralisation by slow death, by 'total conscription'. **Labour no longer possesses a determinate relationship to production, having no meaningful equivalence in wages. Further, production no longer exists in a determinate relationship to profit or surplus value.** There is in political economy, Baudrillard contends, a gen-eral loss of representational equivalence: 'the monetary sign is severed from every social production and enters a phase of speculation' (1993a: 21). In this new reign of indeterminacy there is 'nothing with which to fight capital in determinate form' (1993a: 19; see also 1993b: 26-35). Capital flows in global, deregulated money markets without reference to labour, work, production — **without equivalence in terms of a 'gold standard'**. Similarly, Baudrillard contends, strikes once functioned within a binary system of equivalence held in dialectical tension, that of labour and capital, unions and management. But this notion of **the strike is now 'dead' because striking cannot affect capitalism as 'the reproduction of the form of social relations'** (1993a: 24). **Capitalism can endure the lowering of profit margins, strike disruption and even the collapse of share values.** These 'contents' are no longer fundamental to its opera-tion. **Capital need only impose itself as form in order to reproduce itself endlessly and it achieves this by investing all individuals with needs, wants and desires — the apparatus of the active consumer. Any 'gains' won by unions, such as pay increases or improvements in working conditions, are immediately realised as benefits to the functioning of the system; for example, as wages poured into consumer spending or in proliferating signs of an attractive progressive workplace.** Baudrillard allows that new fractures and instabilities emerge. He gives the example of non-unionised immigrant workers destabilising the game of signs carried out by managers and unions. However, such instabilities are quickly neutralised by strategies of incorporation and assimilation. **Increasingly management is able to appeal directly to workers without the intermediary of unions; such strategies, Baudrillard argues, were central to the events of May 1968 when unions backed down, compromising with management to maintain their role as rep-resentatives of labour.** Nevertheless, Baudrillard never suggests that the integrated, coded system is complete or invulnerable. Quite the reverse! The system's construction of the person as individual, productive, rational unit never really convinces anyone and is 'beginning to crack dangerously'. Further, the system is constantly under threat from symbolic challenges, as we shall see in the next chapter. **Finally, wages, Baudrillard argues, do not measure the amount we produce in our jobs, as both liberal and Marxist theories proclaim; instead, they are now 'a sacrament, like a baptism (or the Extreme Unction)' (1993a: 19). They mark us as full and genuine citizens of the consumer capitalist system.** Workers today are less producers of measurable, determinate value than consumers, and their wage is access to the world of consumerism. Moreover, achieving wage status makes one a 'purchaser of goods in the same way that capital is the purchaser of labour' (1993a: 19). **We are, according to Baudrillard, invested, colonised, occupied by capital, and apply a 'capitalist mentality' to all affairs. Wages do not guarantee any 'thing' in particular — that you are able to support yourself, afford somewhere to live, afford to have children — they simply insert us within the system of consumption.** Consumption — the understanding of oneself as consumer and of the system around us as consumerist — becomes 'obligatory' and so is a sym-bolic relation.

**The Alt is negation and nihilism, which breaks down the hyperreal. This is the strategy of the masses, who have no other options left.**

**Baudrillard, 90** Jean Baudrillard and James Benedict, “The Transparency of Evil : Essays on Extreme Phenomena,” 2009,

<https://www.worldcat.org/title/transparency-of-evil-essays-on-extreme-phenomena/oclc/286421990>

In Simmel's words, '**Negation is the simplest thing imaginable**. That is why the broad masses, whose component elements cannot achieve agreement as to goals, come together here.' **It is useless to expect a positive opinion or a critical will from the masses**, for they have none: **all they have is an undifferentiated power, the power to reject.** **Their strength flows solely from what they are able to expel, to negate** - and that is, first and foremost, any project that goes beyond them, any class or understanding that transcends them. **There is something here of a philosophy of cunning born of the most brutal experience - the experience of animals, or of peasants:** 'They won't put that over on us again, we won't fall for their calls to sacrifice, or listen to their pie in the sky.' **Profound disgust for the political order - though one that may well coexist with specific political opinions. Disgust for the pretension and transcendence of power, for the inevitability and abomination of the political sphere. Where once there were political passions, we now find only the violence peculiar to a fundamental disgust with everything political.** [...] It is true in a sense that nothing really disgusts us any more. In our eclectic culture, which embraces the debris of all others in a promiscuous confusion, nothing is unacceptable. But for this very reason disgust is nevertheless on the increase - the desire to spew out this promiscuity, this indifference to everything no matter how bad, this viscous adherence of opposites. To the extent that this happens, what is on the increase is disgust over the lack of disgust. **A**n allergic **temptation to reject everything en bloc: to refuse all the gentle brainwashing, the soft-sold overfeeding, the tolerance, the pressure to embrace synergy and consensus. All the talk of immunity, antibodies, grafting and rejection should not surprise anyone.** In periods of scarcity, absorption and assimilation are the order of the day. In periods of abundance, rejection and expulsion are the chief concerns. Today, **generalized communication and surplus information threaten to overwhelm all human defences. Symbolic space, the mental space of judgement, has no protection** whatsoever. Not only am I unable to decide whether something is beautiful or not, original or not, but the biological organism itself is at a loss to know what is good for it and what is not. **In such circumstances everything becomes a bad object, and the only primitive defence is abreaction or rejection.**

**The Role of the Ballot is to vote for the debater who best disengages from the hyperreal: this is key to avoiding tyranny, hierarchies, and fascism. Roleplaying in debate forces us to adopt masks that erase our identities, and we must disengage from this.**

**Antionio, 95** Robert J. Antonio, “Nietzsche's Antisociology: Subjectified Culture and the End of History,” 1995,<https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/handle/1808/17941>

According to Nietzsche, **the "subject" is** Socratic culture's most central, durable foundation. This prototypic **expression of resentment, master reification, and ultimate justification for slave morality and mass discipline** "separates strength from expressions of strength, as if there were a neutral substratum . . . free to express strength or not to do so. But there is no such substratum; there is no 'being' behind the doing, effecting, becoming; 'the doer' is merely a fiction added to the deed" (Nietzsche 1969b, pp. 45-46). **Leveling** of Socratic **culture's "objective" foundations makes its "subjective" features all the more important.** For example, the subject is a central focus of the new human sciences, apoearing prominently in its emphases on neutral standpoints, motives as causes, and selves as entities, objects of inquiry, problems, and targets of care (Nietzsche 1966, pp. 19-21; 1968a, pp. 47-54). Arguing that subjectified culture weakens the personality, Nietzsche spoke of a "remarkable antithesis between an interior which fails to correspond to any exterior and an exterior which fails to correspond to any interior" (Nietzsche 1983, pp. 78-79, 83). The "problem of the actor," Nietzsche said, "troubled me for the longest time."'12 He considered "roles" as "external," "surface," or "foreground" phenomena and viewed close personal identification with them as symptomatic of estrangement. While modern theorists saw differentiated roles and professions as a matrix of autonomy and reflexivity, Nietzsche held that **persons** (especially male professionals) in specialized occupations **overidentify with their positions and engage in gross fabrications to obtain advancement**. They look hesitantly to the opinion of oth- ers, asking themselves, "How ought I feel about this?" **They are so thoroughly absorbed in simulating effective role players that they have trouble being anything but actors-"The role has actually become the character."** This highly subjectified social self or simulator suffers devas- tating inauthenticity. The powerful authority given the social greatly amplifies Socratic culture's already self-indulgent "inwardness." Integ- rity, decisiveness, spontaneity, and pleasure are undone by paralyzing overconcern about possible causes, meanings, and consequences of acts and unending internal dialogue about what others might think, expect, say, or do (Nietzsche 1983, pp. 83-86; 1986, pp. 39-40; 1974, pp. 302-4, 316-17). **Nervous rotation of socially appropriate "masks" reduce**s **persons to hypostatized "shadows," "abstracts," or simulacra.** One adopts "many roles," playing them "badly and superficially" in the fashion of a stiff "puppet play." Nietzsche asked, "Are you genuine? Or only an actor? A representative or that which is represented? . . . [Or] no more than an imitation of an actor?" **Simulation is so pervasive that it is hard to tell the copy from the genuine article; social selves "prefer the copies to the originals"** (Nietzsche 1983, pp. 84-86; 1986, p. 136; 1974, pp. 232- 33, 259; 1969b, pp. 268, 300, 302; 1968a, pp. 26-27). Their inwardness and aleatory scripts foreclose genuine attachment to others. This type of actor cannot plan for the long term or participate in enduring net- works of interdependence; such a person is neither willing nor able to be a "stone" in the societal "edifice" (Nietzsche 1974, pp. 302-4; 1986a, pp. 93-94). Superficiality rules in the arid subjectivized landscape. Neitzsche (1974, p. 259) stated, "One thinks with a watch in one's hand, even as one eats one's midday meal while reading the latest news of the stock market; one lives as if one always 'might miss out on something. ''Rather do anything than nothing': this principle, too, is merely a string to throttle all culture. . . . Living in a constant chase after gain compels people to expend their spirit to the point of exhaustion in continual pretense and overreaching and anticipating others." **Pervasive leveling, improvising, and faking foster an inflated sense of ability and an oblivious attitude about the fortuitous circumstances that contribute to role attainment (e.g., class or ethnicity).** The most medio- cre people believe they can fill any position, even cultural **leaders**hip. Nietzsche respected the self-mastery of genuine ascetic priests, like Socra- tes, and praised their ability to redirect ressentiment creatively and to render the "sick" harmless. But he deeply feared the new simulated versions. Lacking the "born physician's" capacities, these impostors **amplify the worst inclinations of the herd; they are "violent, envious, exploitative, scheming, fawning, cringing, arrogant, all according to cir- cumstances. " Social selves are fodder for the "great man of the masses." Nietzsche held that "the less one knows how to command, the more urgently one covets someone who commands, who commands severely- a god, prince, class, physician, father confessor, dogma, or party conscience. The deadly combination of desperate conforming and overreaching and untrammeled ressentiment paves the way for a** new type of **tyrant.**

**NEBEL T**

**Interpretation: The Affirmative debater may not specify a particular government or group of governments in which to unconditionally guarantee the right to strike.**

**Violation: They do.**

**The word “workers” is a generic bare plural: the res doesn’t specify Chinese workers, which means that the Aff must defend the right for all workers from all countries to be topical.**

**Nebel, 14** “Jake Nebel on Specifying “Just Governments””, VBriefly, 19 Dec 2014,

I believe that debaters shouldn’t specify a government on the living wage topic. The standard argument for this is simple: “just governments” is a plural noun phrase, so it refers to more than one just government. Most debaters will stop there. But there is much more to say. (Some seem not to care about the plural construction. I plan to address this view in a later article about the parametric conception of topicality.)¶ **Some noun phrases include articles** like “the,” **demonstratives** like “these,” **possessives** like “my,” **or quantifiers** like “some” or “all.” **These words are called determiners**. **Bare plurals,** including “just governments,” **lack determiners.** **There’s no article, demonstrative, possessive, or quantifier in front of the noun to tell you how many or which [workers] are being discussed**.¶ We use bare plurals for two main purposes. Consider some examples:¶ Debaters are here.¶ Debaters are smart.¶ In (1), “debaters” seems equivalent to “some debaters.” It is true just in case there is more than one debater around. If I enter a restaurant and utter (1), I speak truly if there are a couple of debaters at a table. This is an existential use of the bare plural, because it just says that there exist things of the relevant class (debaters) that meet the relevant description (being here). In (2), though, “debaters” seems to refer to debaters in general. **This use of the bare plural is generic.** Some say that generics refer to kinds of things, rather than particular members of their kinds, or that they refer to typical cases. There is a large literature on understanding generics. Here my aim is not to figure out the truth conditions for the generic reading of the resolution; I shall simply work with our pre-theoretical grip on the contrast between sentences like (1) and (2).¶ This distinction bears importantly on the resolution. If “just governments” is a generic bare plural, then the debate is about whether just governments in general ought to require that employers pay a living wage. If it is an existential bare plural, then the debate is about whether some just governments—i.e., more than one—ought to require that employers pay a living wage. Only the second interpretation allows one to affirm by specifying a few governments.

**Impacts:**

**A) Semantics Outweighs – It controls the internal link to any sort of engagement, since it’s the only basis for pre-round prep. B) We can use pragmatics to compare between two legitimate semantic interps of the topic, but theirs isn’t even eligible for comparison. C) Jurisdiction – Regardless of pragmatics, if you aren’t debating the res, you aren’t following the pre-set burden for this tournament. The judge can’t affirm, since there was literally never an Aff read that pertains to this topic.**

**Standards:**

**1) Limits - There are several hundred governments and infinite random subsets you can spec. That gives you a massive prep advantage - it’s impossible for me to prep every single AC out, but you get to frontline just one Aff, so you’ll always be ahead. It’s also uniquely terrible for small-school debaters, which makes debate less accessible.**

**2) Ground - Most of my disads and CPs won’t link to your Aff, which denies me ground. For example, disads relating to US politics won’t interact with an AC discussing Russia or India. This moots education and denies the Neg a route to the ballot.**

**Ground controls the internal link to clash, since I can’t engage substantively with a hyper-specific Aff. I’m forced to read generics, which turns any topic education arguments you may have.**

**TVA Solves Your Offense - You can defend the whole res and read your AC as an advantage, and we’ll still learn about the specifics of your Aff.**

**Fairness and Education are voters.**

* Debate is a competition, so if it were unfair, nobody would participate.
* Education is key to funding for the debate space: schools organize debate teams and fund them solely because of debate’s educational value.

**Drop the debater: 1) To rectify time lost running T. 2) To deter future abuse. 3) Drop the arg on T is drop the debater since you lose your advocacy.**

**Competing interps, since the debate over brightline for reasonability collapses into competing interps. Any brightline is arbitrary, and reasonability causes a race to the bottom to see who can be the most abusive.**

**No RVIs:**

1. **Logic** - My opponent should not win simply because they were able to prove that they did not violate any rules.
2. **Chilling Effect** - RVIs disincentivize people to read theory against abuse.
3. **Baiting** - RVIs incentivize good theory debaters to be as abusive as possible in order to bait out theory and win.