### Off 1

#### Interp: reduction is to make something smaller

**Oxford Dictionary** "reduce verb," No Publication, https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/us/definition/english/reduce

**Reduce: to make something less or smaller in size, quantity**

#### Violation: They eliminate and do not reduce

Perrin [Marcus Perrin Knowlton,Late Chief Justice Of The Supreme Judicial Court Of Massachusetts, Opinion in Dora Green v. Abraham Sklar, June 20, 1905, Lexis Academic]

#### **The first question is whether, in applying the statute, the judge may consider the costs of the different cases together as one aggregate, and reduce them to an amount "not less than the [\*364] ordinary witness fees and other costs recoverable in one of the cases"; or, whether he is to consider the costs of each case by itself, and make the reduction in each case separately. If he is limited tothe latter mode, he cannot extinguish or disallow the costs altogether in any case, for the word "reduce," in its ordinarysignification, does not mean to cancel, destroy or bring to naught, but to diminish, lower or bring to an inferior state. We think HN2Go to this Headnote in the case.the words above quoted indicate that, in reducing the costs, the amount in all the cases together is to be considered and reduced. This makes it possible for the judge, in his discretion, to reduce them in such a way as to leave nothing in some of the cases, providing he leaves in the aggregate an amount not [\*\*\*3] less than the largest sum recoverable in any of the cases.**

**Standards:**

#### Limits: allowing elimitation justifies teams to broadly interpret other words in the resolutions --- kills limits because we never know the resoultio is we are debating

#### Ground: allowing elimination aff’s kills neg ground – circumvention, elimination counterplans, mechanism links etc.

#### Voter for fairness and education.

#### No RVI’s – a. topicality is a stock issue which tests affirmatives interation with the topic b. rvi’s disencitivize teams running T – kills the ability of the neg to test the aff c. their model allows affs to get abusive and just prep the T debate

### Off 2

**The regime of biopolitical control changed *drastically* after World War Two: the body has become the final frontier of control, in which *sex* is the principal resource. In this pharmacopornographic society, bodies no longer *inhabit* disciplinary spaces, but *are inhabited* to the point of being indistinguishably incorporated.**

Preciado 13 <Paul Preciado Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, and Biopoliticsprofessor of Political History of the Body, Gender Theory, and the History of Performance at Paris VIII //AK>

The changes within neoliberalism that we are witnessing are characterized not only by the transformation of “gender,” “sex,” “sexuality,” “sexual identity,” and “pleasure” into objects of the political management of living, but also by the fact that this management itself is carried out through the new dynamics of advanced techno-capitalism, global media, and biotechnologies. We are being confronted with a new type of hot, psychotropic punk capitalism. These recent transformations are imposing an ensemble of new micro-prosthetic mechanisms of control of subjectivity by means of biomolecular and multimedia technical protocols. Our world economy is dependent upon the production and circulation of hundreds of tons of synthetic steroids, on the global diffusion of a flood of pornographic images, on the elaboration and distribution of new varieties of synthetic legal and illegal psychotropic drugs (e.g., enaltestovis, Special K., Viagra, speed, crystal, Prozac, ecstasy, poppers, heroin, Prilosec), on the flood of signs and circuits of the digital transmission of information, on the extension of a form of diffuse urban architecture to the entire planet in which megacities of misery are knotted into high concentrations of sex-capital. In order to distinguish this new capitalism from the nineteenth century disciplinary regime, I shall call “pharmacopornographic capitalism” this new regime of the production of sex and sexual subjectivity. After World War II, the somatopolitical context of the production of subjectivity seems dominated by a series of new technologies of the body (which include biotechnology, surgery, endocrinology, and so forth) and representation (photography, cinema, television, cybernetics, videogames, and so forth) that infiltrate and penetrate daily life like never before. These are biomolecular, digital, and broadband data transmission technologies. The invention of the notion of gender in the 1950s as a clinical technique of sexual reassignment, and the commercialization of the Pill as a contraceptive technique, characterized the shift from discipline to pharmacopornographic control. This is the age of soft, feather-weight, viscous, gelatinous technologies that can be injected, inhaled—“incorporated.” The testosterone that I use belongs to these new gelatinous biopolitical technologies. When I take a dose of testosterone in gel form or inject it in liquid form, what I’m actually giving myself is a chain of political signifiers that have been materialized in order to acquire the form of a molecule that can be absorbed by my body. I’m not only taking the hormone, the molecule, but also the concept of a hormone, a series of signs, texts, and discourses, the process through which the hormone came to be synthesized, the technical sequences that produce it in the laboratory. I inject a crystalline, oil-soluble steroid carbon chain of molecules, and with it a fragment of the history of modernity. I administer to myself a series of economic transactions, a collection of pharmaceutical decisions, clinical tests, focus groups, and business management techniques. I connect to a baroque network of exchange and to economic and political flow-chains for the patenting of the living. I am linked by T to electricity, to genetic research projects, to mega-urbanization, to the destruction of forests and the biosphere, to pharmaceutical exploitation of living species, to Dolly the cloned sheep, to the advance of the Ebola virus, to HIV mutation, to antipersonnel mines and the broadband transmission of information. In this way, I become one of the somatic connectives that make possible the circulation of power, desire, release, submission, capital, rubbish, and rebellion. As a body—and this is the only important thing about being a subject-body, a techno-living system—I’m the platform that makes possible the materialization of political imagination. I am my own guinea pig for an experiment on the effects of intentionally increasing the level of testosterone in the body of a bio-female. Instantly, the testosterone turns me into something radically different than a cis-female. Even when the changes generated by this molecule are socially imperceptible. The lab rat is becoming human. The human being is becoming a rodent. And, as for me: neither testo-girl nor techno-boy. I am just a port of insertion for C19H28O2. I’m both the terminal of one of the apparatuses of neoliberal governmentality and the vanishing point through which escapes the will to control of the system. I’m the molecule and the State, and I’m the laboratory rat and the scientific subject that conducts the research; I’m the residue of a biochemical process. I am the future common artificial ancestor for the elaboration of new species in the perpetually random process of mutation and genetic drift. I am T.

#### Persecution of witches, druids, midwives and alchemists during colonization and industrialization of society exemplify a regime of knowledge based on supposedly True, Expert western epistemologies. It mimics the premium placed on objective analysis and credibility in phyres of medicine.

Preciado 13 [Paul (formerly Beatriz), Prof of Political History of the Body, Gender Theory, and History of Performance at Paris VIII, Testo Junkie, trans. Bruce Benderson, p. 145-152] TS

Pharmacopornographic hegemony, which wouldn’t become explicit until the end of the twentieth century, has its roots in the origins of modern capitalism, transformations of medieval systems of production at the end of the fifteenth century that would open the way to industrial and colonial economies, to the biopolitical fiction of the nation-state and to regimes of scientific and technical knowledge. In order to understand how new relationships of body-power, pleasure-knowledge, and pharmakon-subjectivities were established in the West, we must first make an indispensable detour through the relationship between capitalism and the destruction of our entheogenic traditions. To gain access to the question of the pharmakon, we have to go the way of witches. Farmers, harvesters, and preparers of medicinal plants were condemned during the Inquisition. Witches, alchemists, and midwives were declared to be heretics and satanic deviants. At the same time, Europe colonized the Americas. “Witch-hunt[s] occurred simultaneously with the colonization and extermination of the populations of the New World, the English enclosures, [or] the beginning of the slave trade.” Feminist historian Silvia Federici has shown that the witch hunt was a double attempt to appropriate women’s bodies as reproductive force and to end the use of natural resources as “commons” (meadows, forests, rivers, lakes, wild pastures). The process of enclosing land, expropriating folk wisdom, criminalizing practices of “voluntary intoxication,” and privatizing plant germ plasm was only beginning. It reached its apex in the modern period with the colonial expropriation of plants, animals, human bodies, and knowledges; the persecution of the producers, consumers, and traffickers of “drugs”; the gradual transformation of natural resources into pharmaceutical patents; and the confiscation by juridical-medical institutions of all experiments that involved self-administration. Most medieval preparations with hallucinogenic properties were topically absorbed, dissolved in an oil-based ointment and smeared on the neck, armpits, or stomach. The way these salves were applied closely resembles transgender people’s use of testosterone in gel form today. Contemporary historians of medieval pharmacological traditions and the Inquisition hypothesize that most of the visions and acts of magic condemned as satanic by the tribunals of the Inquisition were the result of the accidental or intentional ingestion of psychoactive substances. By consulting the records of the inquisitors of the period and the ancient treatises of herbalists, today’s researchers have been able to identify the different hallucinogenic and narcotic substances extracted from vegetable and animal matter that were then in use. A number of these recipes for ointments and concoctions mention psychoactive solanaceous ingredients, substances such as henbane (of the nightshade family), stramonium (thorn apple), belladonna, and mandrake. All of them included extracts of such plants as the poppy (source of opium, heroin, and morphine) and hemp (marijuana, hashish); toads, whose skin, we now know, contains a strong psychotropic substance; and a certain kind of “flour of damp cereals,” probably having to do with the ergot fungus that attacks rye and from which LSD would be extracted. Hallucinogenic visions worthy of the rhetoric of Deleuze and Guattari (becoming animal, becoming a plant, having sexual relations with animals, talking with trees, astral projection, etc.) could have been caused by the psychotropic effects on the organism after the ingestion or cutaneous application of these plants with hallucinogenic or aphrodisiac powers. In the 1960s, Walter Pahnke scrupulously followed the formula for an ointment appearing in a fifteenth-century book and then experimented, along with other colleagues, by smearing it on the area of the neck and armpits. All the researchers reported having been plunged into “a twenty-four-hour sleep during which they dreamed of daredevil flights, frenetic dancing and other strange adventures similar to those that took place during medieval orgies.” During periods of drought and severe food shortages, to increase the production of bread, substitute grains like rye were used, and these might have contained mycotoxins, which were metabolites produced by the bread molds, the effects of which were poisonous to mammals, causing hallucinations and vomiting. Today we know that the victims of Ignis Sacer (Saint Anthony’s fire) were suffering from the effects of the hallucinogen lysergic acid diethylamide (abbreviated after 1938 as LSD)—a mycotoxin that appeared during the baking of bread contaminated with ergot—as well as from other mycotoxins, such as belladonna alkaloids, extracted from the fruit of the mandrake root. Several more centuries were necessary before some of these mycotoxins would appear again, in the manufacture of antibiotics. 6 The transcript of the sentencing of a woman accused of witchcraft during the Inquisition in Carcassonne, from 1330 to 1340 (the period in which the term witch’s Sabbath first came into use), records, “She encountered and greeted a gigantic goat to which she gave herself. In exchange, the goat taught her about venomous plants cooked in a cal- dron over an evil fire, and poisonous plants. . . . Since that time, she has devoted herself to the preparation of certain noxious ingredients and potions.” The 1580 treatise De la démonomanie des sorciers by Bodino established a criminal relationship between herbcraft and witchcraft. 7 That was how herbalists, bonesetters, bards, and druids and priests and priestesses of other faiths, including all those who dared practice herbcraft (for therapeutic, ritu- alistic, or simply recreational purposes) came to be listed under the category of the “unspeakable” and were persecuted, without any further distinction, for “sorcery.” The Inquisition would function as an authority of control and repression as much for the pharmacological knowledge of women belonging to the lower class as for the potentia gaudendi generated by the body’s metabolism of the chemical composition of these plants, as well as by the discourse and shared knowledge attached to social rituals. The feminist activist and pagan witch Starhawk argues that the persecution of witches in Europe (and eventually in the American colonies) from 1430 to 1740 was part of a larger process of eradicating knowledge and lower-class power while simultaneously working to reinforce the hegemonic knowledge of the expert, something indispensable to the gradual insertion of capitalism on a global scale. The Malleus Maleficarum, a handbook for the Inquisition and its techniques for extracting knowledge, condemns female sexuality, nonproductive sexuality (anal practices and masturbation), and all experimentation with psychoactive substances. As Starhawk points out, the Inquisition punished aggressiveness and pleasure in women and imposed passivity, submission, and silence on them in the domain of sexual practices. 10 All of it was connected: the emergence of proto-industrial capitalism and its scientific forms of production and transmission of knowledge; the extermination of a part of the population that had been endowed with pharmacological awareness; the use of racial discourses as religious and biological arguments for enslavement and oppression; the appearance of new methods of segmenting, demarcating, and enclosing land; the raising of livestock that would sustain the future textile industry; colonial expansion in America, Africa, the Indies, and the Far East; and the invention in Europe of servile and pro-slavery models of labor. Contrary to the generally accepted idea, women did not wait until the twentieth century to become part of the labor market. Their practice of fields of knowledge and their production of wealth were carefully ousted from the circuits of medieval economy so that such exclusion would strengthen early capitalism. Angela Davis has taught us that the “white woman” as mother and housewife is an invention of modern capitalism: the creation of bourgeois concepts of wife and reproductive mother are accompanied by the economic devaluation of the household and the exclusion of house- work from the productive sphere. 12 Starhawk finds a correlation between this economic analysis and the criminalization of witchcraft: The Witch persecutions were tied to another of the farreaching changes in consciousness that occurred during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The rise of professionalism in many arenas of life meant that activities and services that people had always performed for themselves or for their neighbors and families were taken over by a body of paid experts, who were licensed or otherwise recognized as being the guardians of an officially approved and restricted body of knowledge. The Catholic Church had for centuries served as a model for an approved body that dispensed approved grace. Many of the charges against Witches and heretics can be seen as charges of giving or receiving “Brand X” grace, one that lacked the official seal of approval; of transmitting knowledge without approval. Witches’ powers, whether used for harming or for healing, were branded as evil because they came from an unapproved source. 13 During the medieval period, women were in charge of caring for and healing the body by employing traditional forms of knowledge that were based on the use of herbs in the context of ritualistic practice. Female caregivers, whether scholars or midwives, represented a threat to the professional orders, at the center of which were the new information experts, who would soon be legitimized as scientific, and who included those in the field of medicine. Such members of these orders would organize to form guilds at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Licenses to regulate the exercise of the medical profession were created. These excluded white women and nonwhite people of all genders who were learned in pharmacology. At the end of the Middle Ages, the drainage of lakes and swamps, the cutting of forests, the fencing of land, the institution of private property for farming and cattle raising worked simultaneously to crush the pagan community, where the mythical forces of the popular imagination and the ecosystem were located, and in which grew those plants and substances used in the “art of witchcraft.” From this perspective, the persecution of witches can be interpreted as a war between expert knowledge and the non-professional knowledge of the multitude, a war between white patriarchal power and narcosexual knowledge as it was traditionally practiced by women, colonized peoples, and nonauthorized sorcerers. It became a matter of exterminating or confiscating a certain ecology of body and soul, hallucinogenic treatments, and forms of pleasure or excitation. Modern colonial capitalist knowledge came to pathologize those technologies of subjectification produced by the collective and physical experience of rituals, the process of the transmission of symbols, and the absorption of any hallucinogenic or sexually arousing substances. Using the accusation of heresy and apostasy (denial of God), witch hunts did nothing more than conceal the criminalization of practices of “voluntary intoxication” and sexual and hallucinogenic self-experimentation. It was on this forced oversight that electrical and hormonal modernity would be erected.

#### Politics is snuff porn: the negs performance creates moments of excitation through sexual investment into the feel-good affect of pursuing political solutions – which sanitizes the global war against that which falls outside the Western frame of representation. Instead, opt to use our bodies, speeches and debates as laboratories of experimental subjectivities that can foment new political subjectivities to resist normalization.

Preciado 13 “Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, and Biopolitics in the Pharmacopornographic Era” (Paul, professor of Political History of the Body, Gender Theory, and History of Performance at Université Paris VIII)//pday

The fact is that we’re being fucked right off the bat: becoming a punk civilization. The sudden emergence of the punk movement in 1977 was not a simple microphenomenon, but the last lucid explosion of what seems today to be the only ideal shared by the members of what has been called the human species: the pleasure instinct as a death instinct. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, no cultural production has entailed such a punk dimension as much as snuff has—the filming of death (or its representation) as it happens. In popular culture, snuff refers to those films that show the murder of a person or animal with the unique objective of making that death visible, transforming it into public, marketable representation.

Everything, in fact, begins as something sham. In 1971, Z-series directors Michael and Roberta Findlay made The Slaughter, a small-budget film production that combined erotic scenes with horror scenes. That same year, Ed Sanders interviewed Charles Manson. Manson claimed to have recorded some of the celebrity murders perpetrated by his followers under his authority. No trace of such films were found, but the myth of snuff was born. In 1972, the distributor Alan Shackleton got ahold of The Slaughter, added a last scene in which one of the actresses is disemboweled (fictionally) in front of the camera, and rereleased this new edit under the title Snuff. The premiere of the film took place in 1976 and provoked an unprecedented debate over the verity of the actress’s death. Antiporn groups, pro-censorship feminists, and the media took part in this debate. The film, which had no other cinematographic or narrative interest outside the evisceration scene, would garner unexpected profits.

As a questioning of representational limits, snuff has served as a pornographic paradigm for both pro-censorship feminists and antiporn Christians, and also as a formal model of realism to which the dramatization of sex in pornography must tend: a film is that much more pornographic if the sexual scene that is filmed is real, in the same way that a representation is snuff when the crime has actually taken place. Radically postmodern, the notion of snuff is opposed to the dramatic or simulated and mimetic quality of all representation. On the contrary, it affirms the performative power of representation to modify reality, or a desire for the real to exist in and by representation. This brings us to the theatrical relationship between pornography, snuff, and politics. Today, some snuff film catalogs offer images filmed by Allied or Nazi soldiers in concentration camps, Zapruder’s film of the John F. Kennedy assassination, the film of the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin, videos of the executions of prisoners of war in Afghanistan and Iraq, videos showing the American army destroying Iraqi villages, images of the destruction of New York’s Twin Towers and of the execution of Saddam Hussein. Politics has become snuff: extermination by and for representation.

The mushroom cloud left in the sky by the atomic bomb, the photograph of the completely naked little girl running away from the Vietnam village Trang Bang in flames after a napalm attack, the sperm-filled lips of Linda Lovelace, piles of mutilated limbs in Rwanda, double penetration, the terrifying feats performed in Big Brother and the surgical scenes in Nip/Tuck, the liters of fat suctioned from the buttocks of American housewives for the cameras of Extreme Makeover, murders at the maximum-security San Quentin State Prison filmed by security cameras—all of them say more about the current state of our species than any philosophy book of the twentieth century, from Husserl to Sartre. The distinctive feature of the techno-porno-punk moment is snuff politics: rip away everything from life to the point of death and film the process, record it in writing and image, distribute it live over the Internet, make it permanently accessible in a virtual archive, an advertising medium on the global scale. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, our species had literally stuck good philosophical intentions up our ass, filming the thing before marketing the images from it. The philosophy of the pharmacopornographic regime has been reduced to an enormous, dripping butt-plug camera. In such circumstances, the philosophy of such high-punk modernity can only be autotheory, autoexperimentation, auto-techno-penetration, pornology.

When surmising about the future of the planet, Donna J. Haraway encourages us to avoid two kinds of narrative traps of the metaphysical and semiotico-fascist kind. First, there is the messianic temptation: someone will come to save us—some unique religious or technical force, an all-powerful understanding that possesses all the answers needed to transform the human condition. Second, there is the apocalyptic temptation: nothing can be done, and the disappearance of the species is imminent. Haraway tells us, “We might profitably learn to doubt our fears and certainties of disasters as much as our dreams of progress. We might learn to live without the bracing discourses of salvation history.”11 The problem resides precisely in the fact that no one will come to save us and that we are still some distance from our inevitable disappearance. It will thus be necessary to think about doing something while we are on the way out, undergoing mutation or changing planets, even if this something consists in intentionally accelerating our own disappearance, mutation, or cosmic displacement. Let us be worthy of our own fall and imagine for the time left the components of a new pornopunk philosophy.

The Principle of the Auto–Guinea Pig

The first principle of a trans-feminism movement capable of facing porno-punk modernity: the fact that your body, the body of the multitude and the pharmacopornographic networks that constitute them are political laboratories, both effects of the process of subjection and control and potential spaces for political agency and critical resistance to normalization. I am pleading here for an array of politics of physical experimentation and semiotechnology that (in the face of the principle of political representation, which dominates our social life and is at the core of political mass movements, which can be as totalitarian as they are democratic) will be regulated by the principle that—in accordance with Peter Sloterdijk’s intuitions—I will call the “principle of the auto-guinea pig.”12

In China, in 213 BC, all books were burned by order of the emperor. In the fifth century, after a series of wars had ransacked and decimated the library at Alexandria, it was accused of harboring pagan teachings contrary to the Christian faith and was destroyed by the decree of Emperor Theodosius. The greatest center of research, translation, and reading disappeared. Between 1330 and 1730, thousands of human bodies were burned during the Inquisition, thousands of books were destroyed, and hundreds of works related to the expertise and production of subjectivity were relegated to oblivion or to the underground. In 1813, American soldiers took York (now Toronto) and burned the parliament and legislative library. A year later, the Library of Congress was razed. In 1933, one of the first actions of the Nazi government was the destruction of the Institut für Sexualwissenschaft (Institute for Sexual Research) in Berlin. Created in 1919 by Magnus Hirschfeld, this center had for years played a role in the research and dissemination of progressive ideas and practices concerning sex and sexuality. Twenty thousand books from the Hirschfeld Institute were burned on May 10, 1933, on Opernplatz on a gigantic pyre whose flashing flames were imprinted on the camera film of Hitler’s reporters. On the night of March 9, 1943, an air raid on a library in Aachen destroyed five hundred thousand books. In 1993, Croatian militia destroyed dozens of libraries (among them, those in Stolac). In 2003, American bombs and Saddam loyalists sacked and destroyed the National Library of Baghdad13 . . .

The theorico-political innovations produced during the past forty years by feminism, the black liberation movement, and queer and transgender theory do seem to be lasting acquisitions. However, in the context of global war, this collection of scholarship could be destroyed also, as fast as a microchip melting under intense heat. Before all the existing fragile archives about feminism and black, queer, and trans culture have been reduced to a state of radioactive shades, it is indispensible to transform such minority knowledge into collective experimentation, into physical practice, into ways of life and forms of cohabitation. We are no longer pleading, like our predecessors in the 1970s and 1980s, for an understanding of life and history as effects of different discursive regimes. We are pleading to use discursive productions as stakeholders in a wider process of the technical materialization of life that is occurring on the planet. A materialization that each day resembles more and more a total technical destruction of all animal, vegetable, and cultural forms of life and that will end, undoubtedly, in the annihilation of the planet and the self-extinction of most of its species. Alas, it will become a matter of finding ways to record a planetary suicide.

Until the end of the eighteenth century, self-experimentation was still a part of the research protocols of pharmacology. Animal experimentation was not yet called into question, but an ethical precept dictated that the researcher take on the risk of unknown effects on his or her own body before enacting any test on the body of another human. Relying on the rhetoric of objectivity, the subject of scientific learning would progressively attempt to generate knowledge outside him- or herself, to exempt his or her body from the agonies of self-experimentation. In 1790, the physician Samuel Hahnemann self-administered strong daily doses of quinine in order to observe its effects in fighting malaria. His body reacted by developing symptoms that resembled the remittent fever characteristic of malaria. The experiment would serve as the basis for the invention of the homeopathic movement, which, based on the law of similars, maintains that it is possible to treat illness using minute doses of a substance that, in much larger amounts, would provoke the same symptoms of that illness in a healthy body, in the manner of a therapeutic mirror. Peter Sloterdijk, inspired by Hahnemann, will call the process of controlled and intentional poisoning “voluntary auto-intoxication” and will sum it up as follows: “If you intend to be a doctor, you must try to become a laboratory animal.”14

In order to transform conventional frameworks of the “cultural intelligibility”15 of human bodies, it is necessary to evolve toward practices of voluntary autointoxication. From Novalis to Ritter, the romanticism from which Sloterdijk draws his inspiration for a counterproject to modernity will make auto-experimentation the central technique of the self in a dystopian society. Nevertheless, romantic auto-experimentation carries the risk of individualism and depolitization. On the other hand, two of the discourses around which the critique of modern European subjectivity will develop—those of Sigmund Freud and Walter Benjamin—will begin under the form of the invention of new techniques of the self and repertories of practices of voluntary intoxication. But the dominant discourse of disciplinary modernity will brush them aside; the process of institutionalization that both psychoanalysis and the Frankfurt School will experience will go hand in hand with the pathologizing of intoxication and the clinical industrialization of experimentation.

“It would be a good thing if a doctor were able to test many more drugs on himself,” declared the young doctor Mikhail Bulgakov in 1914, in “Morphine,” a text in which the protagonist describes the effects of morphine on his own body.16 Likewise, it seems urgent today, from the perspective of a trans-feminist project, to use our living bodies as biopolitical platforms to test the pharmacopornopolitical effects of synthetic sex hormones in order to create and demarcate new frameworks of cultural intelligibility for gender and sexual subjects. In an era in which pharmaceutical laboratories and corporations and state medico-legal institutions are controlling and regulating the use of gender and sex biocodes (the active molecules of progesterone, estrogen, and testosterone) as well as chemical prostheses, it seems anachronistic to speak of practices of political representation without going through performative and biotechnological experiments on sexual subjectivity and gender. We must reclaim the right to participate in the construction of biopolitical fictions. We have the right to demand collective and “common” ownership of the biocodes of gender, sex, and race. We must wrest them from private hands, from technocrats and from the pharmacoporn complex. Such a process of resistance and redistribution could be called technosomatic communism.

As a mode of the production of “common” knowledge and political transformation, the auto–guinea pig principle would be critical in the construction of the practices and discourses of trans-feminism and the coming liberation movements of gender, sexual, racial, and somatic-political minorities. To echo Donna J. Haraway’s expression, it will consist of a positioned, responsible corporal political practice, so that anyone wishing to be a political subject will begin by being the lab rat in her or his own laboratory.

#### Each body has a potential for orgasmic force which is exploited by pharmaporn. Heterosexuality then should be understood as a politically assisted procreation technology for the continuation of the species, using this orgasmic force to propel itself. The bodies most exploited by pharmaporn are also those most oppressed. Bodies becomes reduced to bare technolife, where they regulate themselves and are turned into consumable media as sources of ejaculatory capital

Preciado 13 [Paul, Prof of Political History of the Body, Gender Theory, and History of Performance at Paris VIII, *Testo Junkie*, trans. Bruce Benderson, p.46-50] TS

This theory of “orgasmic force” should not be read through a Hegelian paranoid or Rousseauist utopian/dystopian prism; the market isn’t an outside power coming to expropriate, repress, or control the sexual instincts of the individual. On the other hand, we are being confronted by the most depraved of political situations: the body isn’t aware of its potentia gaudendi as long as it does not put it to work. Orgasmic force in its role as the workforce finds itself progressively regulated by a strict techno-biopolitical control. The sexual body is the product of a sexual division of flesh according to which each organ is defined by its function. A sexuality always implies a precise governing of the mouth, hand, anus, vagina. Until recently, the relationship between buying/selling and dependence that united the capitalist to the worker also governed the relationship between the genders, which was conceived as a relationship between the ejaculator and the facilitator of ejaculation. Femininity, far from being nature, is the quality of the orgasmic force when it can be converted into merchandise, into an object of economic exchange, into work. Obviously, a male body can occupy (and in fact already does occupy) a position of female gender in the market of sex work and, as a result, see its orgasmic power reduced to a capacity for work. The control of orgasmic power (puissance) not only defines the difference between genders, the female/male dichotomy, it also governs, in a more general way, the techno-biopolitical difference between heterosexuality and homosexuality. The technical restriction of masturbation and the invention of homosexuality as a pathology are of a pair with the composition of a disciplinary regime at the heart of which the collective orgasmic force is put to work as a function of the heterosexual reproduction of the species. Heterosexuality must be understood as a politically assisted procreation technology. But after the 1940s, the moleculized sexual body was introduced into the machinery of capital and forced to mutate its forms of production. Biopolitical conditions change drastically when it becomes possible to derive benefits from masturbation through the mechanism of pornography and the employment of techniques for the control of sexual reproduction by means of contraceptives and artificial insemination. If we agree with Marx that “workforce is not actual work carried out but the simple potential or ability for work,” then it must be said that every human or animal, real or virtual, female or male body possesses this masturbatory potentiality, a potentia gaudendi, the power to produce molecular joy, and therefore also possesses productive power without being consumed and depleted in the process. Until now, we’ve been aware of the direct relationship between the pornification of the body and the level of oppression. Throughout history, the most pornified bodies have been those of non-human animals, women and children, the racialized bodies of the slave, the bodies of young workers and the homosexual body. But there is no ontological relationship between anatomy and potentia gaudendi [orgasmic force]. The credit goes to the French writer Michel Houellebecq for having understood how to build a dystopian fable about this new capacity of global capitalism, which has manufactured the megaslut and the megaletch. The new hegemonic subject is a body (often codified as male, white, and heterosexual) supplemented pharmacopornographically (by Viagra, coke, pornography) and a consumer of pauperized sexual services (often in bodies codified as female, childlike, or racialized): “When he can, a westerner works; he often finds his work frustrating or boring, but he pretends to find it interesting: this much is obvious. At the age of fifty, weary of teaching, of math, of everything, I decided to see the world. I had just been divorced for the third time; as far as sex was concerned, I wasn’t expecting much. My first trip was to Thailand, and immediately after that I left for Madagascar. I haven’t fucked a white woman since. I’ve never even felt the desire to do so. Believe me,” he added, placing a firm hand on Lionel’s forearm, “you won’t find a white woman with a soft, submissive, supple, muscular pussy anymore. That’s all gone now.”41 Power is located not only in the (“female,” “childlike,” or “nonwhite”) body as a space traditionally imagined as prediscursive and natural, but also in the collection of representations that render it sexual and desirable. In every case it remains a body that is always pharmacopornographic, a technoliving system that is the effect of a widespread cultural mechanism of representation and production. The goal of contemporary critical theory would be to unravel our condition as pharmacopornographic workers/ consumers. If the current theory of the feminization of labor omits the cum shot, conceals videographic ejaculation behind the screen of cooperative communication, it’s because, unlike Houellebecq, the philosophers of biopolitics prefer not to reveal their position as customers of the global pharmacopornomarket. In the first volume of Homo Sacer, Giorgio Agamben reclaims Walter Benjamin’s concept of the “naked life” in order to define the biopolitical status of the subject after Auschwitz, a subject whose paradigm would be the concentration camp prisoner or the illegal immigrant held in a temporary detention center, reduced to existing only physically and stripped of all legal status or citizenship. To such a notion of the “naked life,” we could add that of the pharmacopornographic life, or naked technolife; the distinctive feature of a body stripped of all legal or political status is that its use is intended as a source of production of potentia gaudendi [orgasmic force]. The distinctive feature of a body reduced to naked technolife, in both democratic societies and fascist regimes, is precisely the power to be the object of maximum pharmacopornographic exploitation. Identical codes of pornographic representation function in the images of the prisoners of Abu Ghraib,42 the eroticized images of Thai adolescents, advertisements for L’Oréal and McDonald’s, and the pages of Hot magazine. All these bodies are already functioning, in an inexhaustible manner, as carnal and digital sources of ejaculatory capital. For the Aristotelian distinction between zōē and bios, between animal life deprived of any intentionality and “exalted” life, that is, life gifted with meaning and self-determination that is a substrate of biopolitical government, we must today substitute the distinction between raw and biotech (biotechnoculturally produced); and the latter term refers to the condition of life in the pharmacopornographic era. Biotechnological reality deprived of all civic context (the body of the migrant, the deported, the colonized, the porn actress/ actor, the sex worker, the laboratory animal, etc.) becomes that of the corpus (and no longer that of homo) pornographicus whose life (a technical condition rather than a purely biological one), lacking any right to citizenship, authorship, and right to work, is composed by and subject to self-surveillance and global mediatization. No need to resort to the dystopian model of the concentration or extermination camp—which are easy to denounce as mechanisms of control— in order to discover naked techno-life, because it’s [is] at the center of postindustrial democracies, forming part of a global, integrated multimedia laboratory-brothel, where the control of the flow of affect begins under the pop form of excitation-frustration.

### Framing

#### We concede that racism comes first --- the affirmative expands racism through allowing the expansion of pharmapornographic capitalism – justifies imperialism..

### Adv

#### **WTO cred is dead no one will listen – proves the link – the aff is just an upgrade of feel good politics**

Schmucker 8/18 [Dr. Claudia Schmucker, 8-18-2021, "Geo-Economics and Trade," No Publication, https://dgap.org/en/research/publications/geo-economics-and-trade]ISEE

The WTO is currently experiencing its deepest crisis since its creation, affecting trade liberalization and the modernization of its rules, its dispute settlement function, and trade policy monitoring. The Doha Round, which began in November 2001, stalled in 2008 and has still not recovered. In December 2001, China joined the WTO, which gave an important boost to global trade. However, the current lack of progress on international trade negotiations and two decades of tensions surrounding China’s WTO membership are raising fundamental questions about the credibility and future of the WTO. The WTO’s weakness is the backdrop to the growing geo-economic rivalry between the economic powers of the United States and China. In recent years, the WTO’s credibility has been undermined by the “America First” approach adopted by Donald Trump’s administration, which viewed international economic and trade relations as a zero-sum game in which the United States could gain only if others lost out. Trump consequently blocked the WTO’s international dispute settlement mechanism and began to place economic and political pressure on trading partners and allies, such as the EU, to induce them to open their markets to American products. Although there are signs of a return to multilateralism under the Biden administration, many of the WTO’s problems will not be resolved in the foreseeable future.

#### The affirmative reifies colonial violence through painting the WTO as the savior to non western peoples – turns case

Abraar Karan, 12-30-2019, "Opinion: It's Time To End The Colonial Mindset In Global Health," NPR.org, https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2019/12/30/784392315/opinion-its-time-to-end-the-colonial-mindset-in-global-health/ISEE

To young Western doctors working in poor communities, no more important words could be heard. Today, the field of "global health" strives to create equitable and just relationships between wealthy and impoverished regions, places and peoples. But it is still a field with markedly unequal power dynamics: racism, classism and many of the residual exploitations of a terrible colonial past. I fear that this point often goes missed or ignored, possibly because we are subconsciously or consciously engaged in a neocolonial narrative in which wealthy people are "saving" poor people even as they build their own careers. It is not a relationship in which Western visitors and local people are collaborating equally — or perhaps even more appropriately, where local leaders take the dominant role. I recently completed a global health course. There were lectures on AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis treatment and on noncommunicable diseases such as diabetes and hypertension in Africa. But not one of these discussions addressed the remnants of colonial mentality. If anything, that mentality was pervasive in the academic framework. Most of the lecturers were from high-income countries as were most of the students, including myself. Yet our discussions were largely about other people in other countries, most of which had been colonies in the past. I could not help but think that there should have been more people from the countries we were talking about both on the stage and in the seats. First, do no harm If you are from a high-income country working in a low-income setting, and you don't think and rethink about this topic often, there is a good chance you are contributing to the problem. Admittedly, I know that I have contributed to it. As a college student, I participated in a volunteer trip to the Dominican Republic in 2008 — my first experience with international health. I was a Spanish translator for American doctors seeking to create a program with the local community. This was meant to become a long-standing annual trip for medical and public health work — including potentially creating a permanent clinic where alumni could come to work. But this project was not continued after our two-week "parachute-trip." Logistical issues precluded us from forming a longer, more meaningful connection. But now as I look back, I recognize that this project certainly connected to themes from the colonial era: Western doctors traveling to unknown territories to help less-educated locals. That experience made me realize how problematic short-term trips could be and steered me into a career in global health as a way to make a sustained contribution to the field rather than just dropping in for quick missions. Back in 2008, on one of our many evening drives home in the back of flatbed trucks through the Dominican countryside, I remember a candid discussion with one of the doctors. We lamented that even though we were working to treat coughs, colds, diarrhea and fevers, we were doing nothing to treat all of the reasons contributing to these diseases: poverty, the lack of paved roads and latrines, food insecurity, insufficient education and even political disenfranchisement — if you're not able to vote in fair elections, how can you hope to have any impact on government health care decisions? A drop-in medical mission trip certainly was not the way to solve these problems. While the local people had a continual struggle against poverty, we as the Western visitors had the luxury of leaving whenever we wanted. They also had no recourse against us if we were to behave inappropriately — no way to hold us accountable. There was nothing they could do about the group of foreigners who came, saw and ultimately did not stay or return. Certainly those of us working on the program were better than brutal colonizers. But were we that different in the very basic power dynamics between light and dark skin? Between wealthy and poor? Moreover, the nature of our mission perhaps confirmed the worst fears of the local community: We would not be coming back there. Many times, we were asked when we would return, but most of us knew that the answer was at best uncertain. So we only vaguely could respond with "en el futuro" — in the future. And admittedly, I benefited: In 2008, having a global health experience on your CV was a big deal. Today, I feel guilt that I benefited because of it, even if that was not my primary reason for being there. At that time, I really did not know what I wanted to do with my career, and this was an opportunity to see if it might be global health care. Dismantling our own power Having reflected on the harm that we from the West have caused, I'm now asking the obvious question: What can we do about it? Even if you have never worked in global health, the color of your skin and the accent of your voice may unduly confer upon you a level of authority in poor communities that you likely do not deserve and should not have. This is a symptom of inequity that calls upon all of us in this seat of privilege to dismantle our own power — to push back against colonial legacy with humility; to say to yourself, your colleagues, and the people you are working with: "We are not experts here; we are the students." Furthermore, the relationships within global health are still heavily (and falsely) dominated by the idea that the Global North is "helping" the Global South. The opposite is rarely acknowledged or encouraged in any meaningful way. Even when doctors from impoverished countries are brought to wealthy countries as part of exchange programs, it is under the assumption that they are coming to learn from us. This is, of course, not true. Much of what I have learned has been from the wisdom, ingenuity and perseverance of doctors and other health care staff who live and work in low-income settings. From them, I have learned how to rely on a physical exam rather than expensive and overutilized technology. I've also become more sensitive and aware of the challenges suffered by my underserved patients in the U.S. For instance, the same challenges that my patients in sub-Saharan Africa faced are commonly shared by patients I see in my predominantly Latin American clinic in Boston. They cannot afford or find healthy foods, they lack disposable income for convenient transportation to a medical center, and for many, English is not a first language, if they can speak it at all. When a patient of mine misses an appointment, I call to figure out why. I do not write this to say that there is no role for doctors from high-income places to work in global health. There certainly is, and in fact, it is more than a role. It is a responsibility. Part of the legacy and inequity of colonialism is that we in the Global North benefit from access to new technologies, drugs, equipment and money as well as sanitation, electricity, transportation. The list goes on. But that is not because we are any better than doctors in poor countries. It is because our leaders have collectively and systematically done everything possible to make sure those countries stayed less economically empowered than our own for centuries. Our role in global health as practitioners from wealthy countries is then not a practice in which we are "helping" poor countries; it is one in which we are hoping they can forgive us for having decimated them in the first place. In the 1899 poem, The White Man's Burden, the English poet Rudyard Kipling talks about what he sees as the responsibility of wealthy countries to help poor countries as the burden placed upon the white man. In response, a black clergyman, H.T. Johnson, wrote a piece, The Black Man's Burden just a few months later. He rightly points out that the burden is the other way around — that actually, black and brown people have suffered the burden of white colonialism and imperialism, forces that have not helped them but exploited and killed them. Today, the same holds true, just repackaged. The burden is carried by black and brown people (as well as poor white people from disenfranchised groups) because of the ills of a still-thriving imperialist white dominance. We see this burden in global health research, which is still largely dominated by Western researchers building their careers off studies of vulnerable, marginalized groups who often don't understand their roles or participation. We see this in pandemic disease response, which has been disruptive to local cultural and health systems (Ebola, for instance, pulled many financial and operational resources away from other health and human rights maladies in the Congo that are killing even more Congolese). We see this in short-term global health trips, which help students from Western institutions gain "experience" at the expense of poor people in faraway places. Certainly not all is bad in global health, but the bad seems to be far less talked about than the good. At its worst, global health today is a self-congratulatory neocolonial machine in which doctors, professors, researchers and others from wealthy places with abounding privilege are further exalted because they are doing work that their Global South counterparts do as part of their everyday lives with little to no recognition. At its best, it is a humble attempt to equal the playing field of life between North and South by trying to unravel the tightly bound chains of colonialism. I'm now a physician at Harvard University and Brigham and Women's Hospital with a strong record of long-term global health partnerships. Our programs have a particular emphasis on establishing human relationships and building, empowering and supporting local health leaders as central tenets of the work. One example of this is the University of Global Health Equity, a medical and public health school in Rwanda with a focus on training African students to become leaders in global health and to lead health care efforts in their home countries. From many of the impoverished patients I have worked with, I have learned that the challenges that help a Western doctor build a career or feel altruistic are the harsh never-ending realities of their life — every day, every year, from birth until death. When we fail to recognize this harsh truth, we end up taking our power for granted. There is nothing more dangerous than that.

#### Alt causes to the aff – their notion that medical colonialism started and ended with intellectual property protections denies history and the way that colonialism has existed for centuries.

#### More ev – aff reifies colonialism

Ezell and Cory 19, [Stephen (Stephen Ezell is vice president, global innovation policy, at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF). He focuses on science and technology policy, international competitiveness, trade, manufacturing, and services issues. He is the coauthor of Innovating in a Service-Driven Economy: Insights, Application, and Practice (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015) and Innovation Economics: The Race for Global Advantage (Yale, 2012). B.S Georgetown, SFS) and Nigel,(Cory holds a master’s degree in public policy from Georgetown University and a bachelor’s degree in international business and commerce from Griffith University in Brisbane, Australia)4-25-2019, "The Way Forward for Intellectual Property Internationally," No Publication, https://itif.org/publications/2019/04/25/way-forward-intellectual-property-internationally/]ISEE

Claim: Intellectual property harms innovation by limiting the diffusion of ideas and technologies. Given the central role technology and innovation play, intellectual property represents a central point of contention in the debate about the best way to support economic development, especially in emerging economies. Proponents of weak intellectual property protection and enforcement view the twain as an essential part of a broader economic framework that sees imitation and the theft of intellectual property as a shortcut to technological upgrading and economic restructuring (typically from agriculture to export-focused manufacturing activities). In their ideal framework, the state uses weak intellectual property in an effort to improve the productivity of firms in specific sectors (typically export-focused, low-value manufacturing) as part of protectionist-minded industrial development strategies. In line with this, IPR opponents tend to make three main points: developed countries (“the North”) purposely wield IP as a political and economic tool, in such a way as to prevent others (“the South”) from using it; this power dynamic is central to the lack of development and innovation in developing countries; and as developing countries have less money, developed countries should hand over their IP and technology for cheap or free. IPR opponents blame developed countries (especially the United States), as they view these countries as using IP as a form of “economic imperialism.” This is a mainstay position for opponents who remain entrenched in the traditional “North vs. South” view of international relations, economics, and political policy. This view is well articulated by Argentinean law and economics scholar (and head of the prominent anti-IP NGO, the South Centre) Carlos Correa, who contends, “The monopoly rights granted by intellectual property rights [are] regarded as an instrument to avoid further catching-up based on imitative paths of industrialization; that is, as a tool to freeze the comparative advantages that had so far ensured U.S. technology supremacy.”110 Unfortunately, this view permeates the positions of many developing-country representatives to organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Office, WTO, and of course, UNCTAD. As this report outlines, this view of IP provides a misguided approach to economic development that diverts attention and resources from domestic policies that could actually support the development, deployment, adoption, and absorption of new technologies by emerging economies. IPR opponents paint developing countries as the victim when they argue that developed countries should hand over IP, as they contend the state (i.e., the broader public) in developing countries should have the freedom to exploit or undermine intellectual property, especially if it is to address key societal issues. It (again) shows how IPR opponents pursue a state-directed model of development, often involving protectionism, import-substitution, and other traditional industrial development strategies. Also, by focusing on the supposed political power and role of developed-country governments, it reveals a central point that goes to the core of ideological opposition to intellectual property: a recognition (and disdain) for the fact that firms (not governments) hold the private rights to the intellectual property embedded in most technology. Such IP is held by private-sector enterprises and driven by market forces, rather than the state or local community. In their eyes, intellectual property represents a static cost to be minimized or avoided. Reveals a central point that goes to the core of ideological opposition to intellectual property: a recognition (and disdain) for the fact that firms (not governments) hold the private rights to the intellectual property embedded in most technology. In summary, this North-South power dynamic and negative-sum view of intellectual property leads many opponents to frame and view the debate through the singular (distorted) lens of the distribution of technology and its forced redistribution by the state.