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### OFF

#### Debate is structured as a marketplace for information where we fetishize notions of “pedagogy” and is an extension of semiocapitalist logic through immaterial manors. Communication within the university isn’t one that develops subjectivities and psychic identity rather a system geared towards fragmentation and futuristic productivity.

**Berardi 12** [David Hugill and Elise Thorburn, 9-26-2012, "Interview with 'Bifo': Reactivating the Social Body in Insurrectionary Times," Critical Legal Thinking, [https://criticallegalthinking.com/2012/09/26/interview-with-bifo-reactivating-the-social-body-in-insurrectionary-times //](https://criticallegalthinking.com/2012/09/26/interview-with-bifo-reactivating-the-social-body-in-insurrectionary-times%20//) JB]

* TW – mentions of suicide
* Impact turns policy advocacy skills
* Debate bad and communication bad

A: First of all because **students are increasingly learning in** small parcels, **small fragments**, small fractals **of knowledge**, and they are becoming **more** and more **accustomed to think** of their **knowledge not as knowledge but** as **intellectual availability to exploitation**.  In North American forms of education this is already well established, it is nothing new. It is new in much of Europe and it has begun to provoke some reactions. But it is also a **fact of a networked and globalized world**.  What does precariousness mean today? What is the relationship between precariousness and globalization? It means that you can **buy a fragment of labor** in Bangkok, a fragment in Buenos Aires, and **a fragment in Milan** and that these three **fragments become** the **same product from** the point of view of **capital**.  **Knowledge is** headed the **same** way. You no longer need – from the point of view of capital – to know in the **humanistic sense**, the meaning, the finality, the **intimate contradictions of knowledge**, you just need to know how **particular parcels of knowledge** can be made **functional**. There is something new and something old in this. Herbert Marcuse’s (1964) One Dimensional Man already identified this problem of the functionalization of knowledge but in his time it was only a kind of prediction about how capitalism would be transformed. Today, this functional consideration is the dominant form of our **relationship to knowledge**. So, we should question people about **what is happening to our knowledge**. Are we really learning things, knowing things? Or are we simply learning how to **become part of** the **productive machine**? Additionally, I think we need to ask people, especially young people, **about** their **suffering in the relationship with knowledge**, with communication and so on. I think that the problem of psychic suffering is of central importance our time. Problems of depression, panic, massive suicide, are **very real**.  Do you know that suicide has become the main cause of death among people between 18-25 years old? **Suicide is** becoming a **political weapon**. I’m not only thinking of Columbine or of Mohamed Bouazizi, the man who killed himself and started the Tunisian revolution.  Suicide has something to do with knowledge.  When your **knowledge** is becoming **more and more something** that does **not belong to you**, this is a problem of personal identity, of **psychic identity**.

#### The new dawn of capitalism has created an age of constant information and signifiers floating through our phones and computers as media. This creates a dyslexia – reduced attention spans, no time for true human interaction – this leads to information overload, which is too fast for our organic minds to keep up with – that causes depression and drug use. It’s no coincidence that the rise of tech in the 80s was complimented with a drug epidemic. These signifiers come prior to action, thus debate should disrupt semiocapitalism.

**Berardi 09** [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism Precarious Rhapsody, by Franco Bifo Berardi et al., AK Press, 2009. P. 40-42 // JB]

* TW – mentions of suicide, not read, but it’s in the card if you chose to read it after the round

The acceleration of information exchange has produced and is producing an effect of a pathological type on the individual human mind and even more on the collective mind. Individuals are not in a position to consciously process the immense and always growing mass of information that enters their computers, their cell phones, their television screens, their electronic diaries and their heads. However, it seems indispensable to follow, recognize, evaluate, process all this information if you want to be efficient, competitive, victorious. The practice of multitasking, the opening of a window of hypertextual attention, the passage from one context to another for the complex evaluation of processes, tends to deform the sequential modality of mental processing. According to Christian Marazzi, who has concerned himself in various books with the relations between economics, language and affectivity, the latest generation of economic operators is affected by a real and proper form of dyslexia, incapable of reading a page from the beginning to the end according to sequential procedures, incapable of maintaining concentrated attention on the same object for a long time. And dyslexia spreads to cognitive and social behaviors, leading to rendering the pursuit of linear strategies nearly impossible. Some, like Davenport and Beck , speak of an attention economy. But when a cognitive faculty enters into and becomes part of economic discourse this means that it has become a scarce resource. The necessary time for paying attention to the fluxes of information to which we are exposed and which must be evaluated in order to be able to make decisions is lacking. The consequence is in front of our eyes: political and economic decisions no longer respond to a long term strategic rationality and simply follow immediate interests. On the other hand, we are always less available for giving our attention to others gratuitously. We no longer have the attention time for love, tenderness, nature, pleasure and compassion. Our attention is ever more besieged and therefore we assign it only to our careers, to competition and to economic decisions. And in any case our temporality cannot follow the insane speed of the hypercomplex digital machine. Human beings tend to become the ruthless executors of decisions taken without attention. The universe of transmitters, or cyberspace, now proceeds at a superhuman velocity and becomes untranslatable for the universe of receivers, or cybertime, that cannot go faster than what is allowed by the physical material from which our brain is made, the slowness of our body, the need for caresses and affection. Thus opens a pathological gap and mental illness spreads as testified by the statistics and above all our everyday experience. And just as pathology spreads, so too do drugs. The flourishing industry of psychopharmaceuticals beats records every year, the number of packets of Ritalin, Prozac, Zoloft and other psychotropics sold in the pharmacies continually increases, while dissociation, suffering, desperation, terror, the desire not to exist, to not have to fight continuously, to disappear grows alongside the will to kill and to kill oneself. When, towards the end of the 1970s, an acceleration of the productive and communicative rhythms in occidental metropolitan centers was imposed, a gigantic epidemic of drug addiction made its appearance. The world was leaving its human epoch to enter the era of machinic posthuman acceleration: many sensitive organisms of the human variety began to snort cocaine, a substance that permits the acceleration of the existential rhythm leading to transforming oneself into a machine. Many other sensitive organisms of the human kind injected heroin in their veins, a substance that deactivates the relation with the speed of the surrounding atmosphere. The epidemic of powders during the 1970s and the 1980s produced an existential and cultural devastation with which we still haven’t come to terms with. Then illegal drugs were replaced by those legal substances which the pharmaceutical industry in a white coat made available for its victims and this was the epoch of anti-depressants, of euphorics and of mood regulators. Today psychopathy reveals itself ever more clearly as a social epidemic and, more precisely, a socio-communicational one. If you want to survive you have to be competitive and if you want to be competitive you must be connected, receive and process continuously an immense and growing mass of data. This provokes a constant attentive stress, a reduction of the time available for affectivity. These two tendencies, inseparably linked, provoke an effect of devastation on the individual psyche: depression, panic, anxiety, the sense of solitude and existential misery. But these individual symptoms cannot be indefinitely isolated, as psychopathology has done up until now and as economic power wishes to do.

#### Questions regarding ethics are irrelevant in the world of the infosphere. All information gets coopted by the inescapability of capitalism – it’s search is cruelly optimistic in the infosphere.

Berardi 11 [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism “0. Bifurications.” Precarious Rhapsody, by Franco Bifo Berardi et al., AK Press, 2011. P. 14-15 // LEX JB]

Because of this, I believe that it is necessary to identify the new forms of social consciousness beginning from generational belonging. And for this reason I will speak of two decisive successive shifts in a mutation that has led to the draining of humanistic categories and of the perspectives on which modern politics was based. These two passages are constituted in the subsumption of the human mind in formation within two successive technological configurations of the media-sphere. The first is that which I call video-electronic, meaning the technologies of televisual communication. It is a case of the passage that Marshall McLuhan speaks of in his fundamental 1964 study, Understanding Media. McLuhan looks at the transition from the alphabetic sphere to the video-electronic one and concludes that when the simultaneous succeeds the sequential, the capacity of mythological elaboration succeeds that of critical elaboration. The critical faculty presupposes a particular structuring of the message: the sequentiality of writing, the slowness of reading, and the possibility of judging in sequence the truth or falsity of statements. It is in these conditions that the critical discrimination that has characterized the cultural forms of modernity becomes possible. But in the sphere of video-electronic communication, critique becomes progressively substituted by a form of mythological thinking in which the capacity to distinguish between the truth and falsity of statements becomes not only irrelevant but impossible. This passage took place in the techno-sphere and media-sphere of the 1960s and 1970s and the generation that was born at the end of the 1970s began to manifest the first signs of impermeability to the values of politics and critique that had been fundamental for the preceding generations of the twentieth century. The more radical mutation was the diffusion of digital technologies and the formation of the global internet during the 1990s. Here, the functional modality of the human mind changes completely, not only because the conditions of communication become infinitely more complex, saturated and accelerated, but rather because the infantile mind begins to form itself in a media environment completely different from that of modern humanity.

#### Financial absolutism is framed by accelerationism – appropriation of resources becomes the end goal of desire. Extinction has already happened but the race for space through appropriation allows that semiotic cycle of wealth to survive.

**Berardi 18** [Excerpted from *Breathing: Chaos and Poetry* by Franco “Bifo” Berardi, published by Semiotext(e) © Franco “Bifo” Berardi, 2018. All Rights Reserved, [https://courtauld.ac.uk/research/events-archive/vital-exhaustion/expiration-the-last-breath-franco-bifo-berardi-2018 //](https://courtauld.ac.uk/research/events-archive/vital-exhaustion/expiration-the-last-breath-franco-bifo-berardi-2018%20//) JB]

According to an **Oxfam report** that was made public at the Davos conference in January 2018, in 2016 inequality peaked: **82 percent of** the **wealth** produced that year **was hijacked by** the **1 percent** of the world’s population that already owns two-thirds of the world’s wealth.3 This is **not a joke** or an **exaggeration**: this is a documented **proof of** the demented nature of **financial absolutism**. Like a drain pump, financial capitalism has been sucking life from the organism of human society, at a rate that is accelerating by the second. The question is, why are people doing this? Why is a small fraction of humankind accumulating an unimaginable amount of wealth, while the gross majority of humankind is regressing toward misery? **What motivates this enormous appropriation** of common resources? Indeed, is there a motivation, or does the logic of financial accumulation automatically produce this irrational and immoral effect? Lastly, what is the point of accumulating and hoarding uncountable billions that could never all be exchanged for goods or pleasure in this lifetime? I don’t think that greed sufficiently explains this extreme concentration of wealth in the hands of a precious few. Should we rather explain this irrational inequality in terms of an evolutionary survival instinct? Can I even speak of an evolutionary instinct of humankind, does such a thing exist? Probably not, but I’m trying to find a sort of autopilot in human evolution. The survival instinct is alert today, because we sense (even if we tend to deny the evidence and reject this knowledge in our collective unconscious) **that** civilized **life on planet earth is approaching its end**. Our collective unconscious senses that the **final stampede** is drawing near because of so many unstoppable and irreversible processes: proliferation of **nuclear weapons**, global **warming**, water **scarcity, demographic expansion** and **desertification**, and, last but not least, **mental collapse**, spreading depression and panic. It is totally understandable at this point for **a human to be**, whether consciously or not, **preparing for a flight from planet hell**. And preparing to escape from hell is inconceivably expensive. **The 1 percent** of humankind **is preparing for this flight**, and they need huge amounts of **financial resources** to do so. Dystopian science fiction? Perhaps. Don’t forget, however, that in the last fifty years dystopian **science fiction has** produced the **most accurate roadmaps of our social and political becoming**.

#### Vote negative to symbolically take the system hostage through it’s own method of exhaustion. It’s a reimagination of the status quo through the lens of a radically passive Wu Wei society – the only way to escape the infosphere which proves contradictions negate because it confuses productivity in debate.

**Berardi 11** [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism “Chapter 4 Exhastion and Subjectivity.” After the Future, by Franco Bifo Berardi et al., AK Press, 2011. P. 107-108 // LEX JB]

* TW – mentions of suicide, not read, but it’s in the card if you chose to read it after the round

The process of collective subjectivation (i.e. social recomposition) implies the development of a common language-affection which is essentially happening in the temporal dimension. The semiocapitalist acceleration of time has destroyed the social possibility of sensitive elaboration of the semio-flow. The proliferation of simulacra in the info-sphere has saturated the space of attention and imagination. Advertising and stimulated hyper-expression (“just do it”), have submitted the energies of the social psyche to permanent mobilization. Exhaustion follows, and exhaustion is the only way of escape: Nothing, not even the system, can avoid the symbolic obligation, and it is in this trap that the only chance of a catastrophe for capital remains. The system turns on itself, as a scorpion does when encircled by the challenge of death. For it is summoned to answer, if it is not to lose face, to what can only be death. The system must itself commit suicide in response to the multiplied challenge of death and suicide. So hostages are taken. On the symbolic or sacrificial plane, from which every moral consideration of the innocence of the victims is ruled out the hostage is the substitute, the alter-ego of the terrorist, the hostage’s death for the terrorist. Hostage and terrorist may thereafter become confused in the same sacrificial act. (Baudrillard 1993a: 37) In these impressive pages Baudrillard outlines the end of the modern dialectics of revolution against power, of the labor movement against capitalist domination, and predicts the advent of a new form of action which will be marked by the sacrificial gift of death (and self-annihilation). After the destruction of the World Trade Center in the most important terrorist act ever, Baudrillard wrote a short text titled The Spirit of Terrorism where he goes back to his own predictions and recognizes the emergence of a catastrophic age. When the code becomes the enemy the only strategy can be catastrophic: all the counterphobic ravings about exorcizing evil: it is because it is there, everywhere, like an obscure object of desire. Without this deep-seated complicity, the event would not have had the resonance it has, and in their symbolic strategy the terrorists doubtless know that they can count on this unavowable complicity. (Baudrillard 2003: 6) This goes much further than hatred for the dominant global power by the disinherited and the exploited, those who fell on the wrong side of global order. This malignant desire is in the very heart of those who share this order’s benefits. An allergy to all definitive order, to all definitive power is happily universal, and the two towers of the World Trade Center embodied perfectly, in their very double-ness (literally twin-ness), this definitive order: No need, then, for a death drive or a destructive instinct, or even for perverse, unintended effects. Very logically – inexorably – the increase in the power heightens the will to destroy it. And it was party to its own destruction. When the two towers collapsed, you had the impression that they were responding to the suicide of the suicide-planes with their own suicides. It has been said that “Even God cannot declare war on Himself.” Well, He can. The West, in position of God (divine omnipotence and absolute moral legitimacy), has become suicidal, and declared war on itself. (Baudrillard 2003: 6-7) In Baudrillard’s catastrophic vision I see a new way of thinking subjectivity: a reversal of the energetic subjectivation that animates the revolutionary theories of the 20th century, and the opening of an implosive theory of subversion, based on depression and exhaustion. In the activist view exhaustion is seen as the inability of the social body to escape the vicious destiny that capitalism has prepared: deactivation of the social energies that once upon a time animated democracy and political struggle. But exhaustion could also become the beginning of a slow movement towards a “wu wei” civilization, based on the withdrawal, and frugal expectations of life and consumption. Radicalism could abandon the mode of activism, and adopt the mode of passivity. A radical passivity would definitely threaten the ethos of relentless productivity that neoliberal politics has imposed. The mother of all the bubbles, the work bubble, would finally deflate. We have been working too much during the last three or four centuries, and outrageously too much during the last thirty years. The current depression could be the beginning of a massive abandonment of competition, consumerist drive, and of dependence on work. Actually, if we think of the geopolitical struggle of the first decade – the struggle between Western domination and jihadist Islam – we recognize that the most powerful weapon has been suicide. 9/11 is the most impressive act of this suicidal war, but thousands of people have killed themselves in order to destroy American military hegemony. And they won, forcing the western world into the bunker of paranoid security, and defeating the hyper-technological armies of the West both in Iraq, and in Afghanistan. The suicidal implosion has not been confined to the Islamists. Suicide has became a form of political action everywhere. Against neoliberal politics, Indian farmers have killed themselves. Against exploitation hundreds of workers and employees have killed themselves in the French factories of Peugeot, and in the offices of France Telecom. In Italy, when the 2009 recession destroyed one million jobs, many workers, haunted by the fear of unemployment, climbed on the roofs of the factories, threatening to kill themselves. Is it possible to divert this implosive trend from the direction of death, murder, and suicide, towards a new kind of autonomy, social creativity and of life? I think that it is possible only if we start from exhaustion, if we emphasize the creative side of withdrawal. The exchange between life and money could be deserted, and exhaustion could give way to a huge wave of withdrawal from the sphere of economic exchange. A new refrain could emerge in that moment, and wipe out the law of economic growth. The self-organization of the general intellect could abandon the law of accumulation and growth, and start a new concatenation, where collective intelligence is only subjected to the common good. The global recession started officially in September 2008 and lasted officially until the summer of 2009. Since the summer of 2009 the official truth in the media, in political statements, in economic talk was: recovery. The stock exchange began to rise again and the banks started again paying huge bonuses to their managers and so on. Meanwhile, unemployment was exploding everywhere, salaries were falling, welfare was curtailed, 90 million more are expected to join the army of poverty in the next year. Is this recovery? Our conditional reflex (influenced by the Keynesian knowledge that recovery is the recovery of the “real economy”) answered: no, this is not recovery, capitalism cannot recover only by financial means. But we should reframe our vision. Finance is no longer a mere tool of capitalist growth. The financialization of capitalism has made finance the very ground of accumulation, as Christian Marazzi (2010) has explained in recent works such as The Violence of Financial Capitalism. In the sphere of semiocapitalism, financial signs are not only signifiers pointing to some referents. The distinction between sign and referent is over. The sign is the thing, the product, the process. The “real” economy and financial expectations are no longer distinct spheres. In the past, when riches were created in the sphere of industrial production, when finance was only a tool for the mobilization of capital to invest in the field of material production, recovery could not be limited to the financial sphere. It took also employment and demand. Industrial capitalism could not grow if society did not grow. Nowadays we must accept the idea that financial capitalism can recover and thrive without social recovery. Social life has become residual, redundant, irrelevant.

### Framing

#### The K OW and turns the aff –

#### (1) Form v Content – the K indicts the rhetoric or the pedagogical way that the aff is exported to fit in the debate space and is also the best model for clash because you clash with our theory of power instead of plan focus which we’ve indicted. It’s not unfair to expect you to defend your epistemological consequences anything else is academically irresponsible.

#### (2) Epistemology – neoliberalism imposes that our knowledge is formed through an endless cycle of production which means the 1AC “skills” are irrelevant and the exportation of their pedagogy is flawed

#### (3) Neoliberalism controls the value to life through affectivity which presupposes evaluation of body counts. Extinction has already happened and the criticism controls that value.

#### (4) It’s illogical – form over content because it doesn’t matter how right you are if you used violent discourse to get there – just like how “all lives matter” semantically means all lives matter but we know it’s racist because of it’s representations – logic outweighs because it’s a litmus test to determining what is an argument. No amount of fairness can make an argument logical

#### (5) Fiat is illusory none of their policymaking offense is solved but our representations can be rectified with a rejection which outweighs on ballot proximity

### Case

#### The affirmative’s securitization model for politics is uniqueness

Bifo 12 [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism, “After the Future”, Published: 2012, DOA: 7/5/19 // JB]

As soon as the economic breakdown began, as if by miracle, three planes flew through the skies of Washington and New York. After the events of September 11, 2001 (S11), miraculously, the capitalism on the verge of bankruptcy could 59 invest the energies of the whole society (that displayed signs of exhaustion) in the direction of war. **The general** **mobilization of these energies began with a call to a Holy War** **of the West** **against the** **evils of the** **world**. Here begins the great Manichean campaign of **Good versus Evil**. The **Good is represented by a group of oil magnates** who have notoriously **robbed public funds that led to the collapse of giant companies**. Since the **war on** the **Afghan** **population** **failed to produce any of the promised results**, i.e. the arrest of the heads of the Al Qaida organisation accused of being responsible for the S11 attacks, **the war must be re-launched**. A new target is chosen: the former ally and accomplice Saddam Hussein is the target. The motivations for a war on Iraq are ridiculous. “Saddam is an enemy of humanity”. Of course, he was one already when he acted on behalf of the American administration and occupied Iran, as are many of the American allies such as Sharon and the Saudi dynasty. “He used illegal weapons”. As he did in 1988 with the financial and political support of the US. “He can make nuclear weapons”. Which is improbable. Anyway, the violations of the nonproliferation treaty are multiple, starting from Israel. “We need to bring democracy to the Middle East”. Nothing could be more hypocritical. Democracy in the Middle East would require the departure of Israeli forces from the occupied territories, the recognition of the political rights of the Kurdish people, and a reduction of the role of the large oil corporations that for fifty years have been robbing the resources of those countries whilst influencing their political life in a direct and authoritarian manner ever since they sponsored a military coup in 1953 against Premier Mohammed Mossadeq for trying to nationalize the Iranian oil industry. **The ideology of** **security is the product of** **a paranoia** **fuelled** **by** **the** **media and geared to** **create** **an economic system of global security that** **can** **always feed on new paranoia**. “We need to protect our quality of life”. **This is the only sentence that corresponds to truth in the whole of the war propaganda**: 20% of humanity does not wish to give up the consumption of 80% of the world resources. What are the possible scenarios of war in Iraq? One is that of a rapid victory for the aggressors, the capture and trial of Baghdad’s criminal, the imposition of a relatively peaceful protectorate, the American democratization of the Middle East, the progressive clearance of conflict zones, the imposition of a planetary military dictatorship for good purposes. But does anyone believe this to be possible? The **more realistic scenario entails the possibility of a fall of the Pakistani regime with** the gain of **two hundred nuclear warheads** for the Islamic fundamentalists. The most probable consequence of aggression against Iraq is the explosion of Empire, the inauguration of the Empire of Chaos. Meanwhile, something came to change the whole scenario: in the framework of a paranoid **clash between fundamentalist and nationalist fanaticism and nazi-capitalist fanaticism**, a third actor has finally emerged, that we have been 60 waiting for since S11, which has been built with the stubborn labor of the global movement against corporations. The third actor came into being on February 15th, 2003 as millions upon millions marched in cities around the globe in protest against the war in Iraq. It is the movement of global everyday life that rebels against war mongering dementia. What we saw on F15 is a movement that is destined to expand and radicalize. **But at that stage it will be a matter of working towards pushing the process of exiting the war to coincide with that of dissolving of the neoliberal domination of global capitalism, in order to repose the dynamic of anti-capitalist conflict in society. Capitalism brings war as clouds bring storms, but in the course of the war the conditions for a re-dislocation of capitalism are created. The question of subverting the forces that produced the war will emerge. Then it will not be sufficient to eliminate the criminal class that produced the war. It will be necessary to clarify that war is only the continuation of liberalist devastation by other means, hence, it will be necessary to cut the roots of the process that led to catastrophe.**

#### No cap good – it caused the aff scenario and is a double turn the aff’s uniqueness which also proves alt solves case – lex reads green

Ahadi 20 [Ahadi 2/10/20 [Blake Ahadi works in project finance and operations at a private renewable energy developer. Before this, he worked in private banking, advising on investments, lending, and estate planning to clients in the Chicago private equity industry. He holds a B.A. in Economics from the University of Michigan and is pursuing an M.S. in Space Resources from the Colorado School of Mines. "Alternative financing for lunar mining exploration." https://www.thespacereview.com/article/3880/1]

The proliferation of a **lunar economy rests upon** patient access to **capital** and fostering innovative ideas for large-scale development. At the moment, capital requirements for lunar miners are too high for companies to succeed in a perfectly **competitive market**. For the lunar economy, the emergence of large, vertically integrated companies will **lead to** the economies of scale necessary for **proliferation**. Terrestrially, when an industry becomes mature and beholden to traditional economics, like scarcity, a focus on profit margins takes over, and limitations emerge in the form of price manipulation and a lack of competition. As mentioned, the lunar economy will operate privately, and independent of scarcity, using profit margins to increase cash flow for innovation. An oligopoly of dedicated space holding companies, each comprised of diverse companies along the value chain, funded by the parent company and incentivized by prizes, will maintain a culture of innovation and competition. Rather than a few concentrated entities, each sacrificing their identity to their acquirer, the lunar economy will be an oligopoly of teams.

#### No permutations – they sever the bonds between different theories and integrate them into new symbolic formations.

**Sondey 14** “Capital As Master-Signifier: Žižek, Lacan, And Berardi” William Sondey- A Thesis submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green State University for a Master of Arts Degree AHS//EMM

Berardi argues that the internal logic to semio-capital‘s and its various subsystems is one of recombination. According to Berardi, cognitive activity has always been the foundation upon which all human production is based, but to a lesser extent in industrial capitalism (34). In industrial production, the mind primarily served as the driving force behind routine muscle movements. However, in semio-capitalism, the need to innovate and communicate in a variety of languages and media increases the importance of cognitive capacity (34). Berardi argues that **cognitive activity within the context of the post-mechanical economy of semio-capitalism now follows a logic of recombination. Recombination is both a form of cognition as well as a mode of operation. It is the breaking down info-commodities into their basic elements, the organization of these discrete parts in new ways, and finally the construction of entirely new assemblages of data from these parts.** Recombination is fundamentally the boiling down of semio-capital‘s signs and symbols into their fundamental elements and the quilting of those elements together in a novel formation. **Examples of such recombinant elements include the ones and zeros of binary code as well as the four components that make up human DNA sequencing.** Both of these coding languages provide the constituent elements for human life and computer software just as the raw data elements of info-commodities provide the necessary coding for the construction of semio- capital‘s signs and symbols. **The logic of recombination is problematic according to Berardi because it is not dialectical** (149). **The constant re-articulation of elements in novel formulations results in the erasure of histories; there is no traceable linear progression of an element‘s existence. Elements are frozen in time in a sort of perpetual present until their bonds are radically severed and are integrated into a new symbolic formation. As such, recombination precludes the possibility of sustaining meaning as all elements appear in a static present without reference to other instances of signification.**

AT: Pummer 15

1] Uncertainty is wrong because if I win the debate we are certain

2] Even if extinction bad you should prioritize probability because it's verified and outweighs bc it accesses their impact. Any other framing freezes action because extinction can happen any way and 1% of it means devoting resources is impossible

3] Fiat is illusory so none of this has an impact because of ballot proximity BUT the K indicts their practices - if you feel bad for them for not having offense remember they chose to read a whole aff without any method cards

4] Value to life comes first - determines whether or not extinction has an impact - semiocap drains us of that value and turns us into mental automatons that waste away thie life

5] Futurity DA - preserving life is only part of the capitalist regime to extend life but only to live further in the system like anti-aging cremes

Greene 10

1] Ground the greene cards - our theory isn't incompatible with this framing, our theory just says that these signifiers indict our ability and overdetermine feeling pain or pleasure - the line between the two gets blured

2] Harker needs to stop reading Greene - this evidence bases moral readings based on evolution and "intuitions" - that's exclusionary to kids who evolved to be different like disabled kids with ADHD - it tells them that they didn't evolve to fit the model of the reasoner - reject their answer that "util explains why its painful to exclude" because this doesn't indict util, it indicts evolution as the starting point for util - drop them for justifying unsafe arguments in debate because you can't debate if you can't participate – 1NC CX should frame this – they said the ideal subject cannot exist without evolution which brackets out those whoe volve differently as not ideal

### Adv

WHEN THE 1AR GETS UP AND SAYS EXTINCTION OUTWEIGHS REMEMBER THEY DID NOT JUSTIFY NUKE WAR CAUSES EXTINCTION

#### Comets are not likely or avoidable enough to justify allowing other existential risks

Kent 4 [Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge. A Critical Look at Risk Assessments for Global Catastrophes. 2004. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.0272-4332.2004.00419.x?casa\_token=7YtWdAgcOtEAAAAA%3ALsFF220rqWTeap5nJ2SLRlOFEsQkxvr1NCR5JVPEuMyrF6EbaYs7wxArpuxejPYs2D\_sKqC6f8PSr7c]

Large asteroid impact seems to be the greatest known natural extinction risk that can be reasonably well estimated. The risk of the Earth being hit by an asteroid of diameter 10 km is estimated to be 10−8 per year.(17) Such an impact would be so devastating that it is generally thought very likely that it would cause mass extinctions of species, and very plausible that we would be among the species extinguished. Accepting that last hypothesis, perhaps at the price of another order of magnitude, gives an estimate of 10−8–10−9 per year for this natural extinction risk. Following the argument of dominant risk leads to the so‐called asteroid test, according to which an artificial extinction risk is acceptable if smaller than ≈10−9 per year, or in the more conservative version, very small compared to 10−9 per year.10 My impression from discussions is that many thoughtful people find some version of the argument of dominant risk reasonable, but that many equally thoughtful people find this line of argument entirely irrational. My sympathies are with the latter. Why should the existence of one risk, which may be distressingly high, justify taking another easily avoidable risk, which, even if much lower, may still be unacceptably high? Unavoidable natural risks are not normally believed to justify wilfully inflicting avoidable risks on third parties. Everyone now living is very likely to die within the next 120 years, and would be very likely to die of natural causes in that timespan even if exposed to no other risks. An industry that added slightly to the natural risk level, annually killing 10,000 people who had made no choice to accept the extra risk, would not find much sympathy for the defense that these extra deaths were more or less lost in the noise compared to natural wastage.

No extinction –

#### 1. New studies prove it’s far away and nearly impossible

Robert **Walker 16**. Software Developer of Tune Smithy, Wolfson College, Oxford. 12-14-2016. "Why Resilient Humans Would Survive Giant Asteroid Impact." Science 2.0. https://www.science20.com/robert\_inventor/we\_wont\_go\_extinct\_after\_a\_major\_asteroid\_impact\_even\_96\_of\_species\_extinct\_0\_chance\_of\_humans\_extinct-187383

This is something you hear said so often - that we risk being hit by an asteroid that could make humans extinct. But do we really? This is the article I’m commenting on, a recently breaking news story: Earth woefully unprepared for surprise comet or asteroid, Nasa scientist warns. Some are already worrying that it means that we are all due to die in the near future from an asteroid impact. Well, no, it doesn't mean that. So, what is the truth behind it? The source of all this is a comment by Dr Joseph Nuth who warns: “But on the other hand they are the extinction-level events, things like dinosaur killers, they’re 50 to 60 million years apart, essentially. You could say, of course, we’re due, but it’s a random course at that point.” Photograph of comet Siding Spring by Hubble - right hand image is more processed. This comet did a close flyby of Mars and at one point was predicted to have a tiny chance of hitting Mars. In the end it missed Mars by more than a quarter of the distance from Earth to the Moon If you read the rest of the article, it’s a worthy goal, to prepare us for asteroid impacts of all sizes from the small Chelyabinsk one up to really large 10 km ones. There are a number of things potentially confusing about this statement however, if you read it as a non scientist. Although there is a risk of “mass extinction” if a large asteroid hit Earth, “mass extinction” there doesn’t mean “extinction of humans”, we are such a resilient species that we would certainly survive a giant asteroid impact. We are not “due” an extinction at all. Next giant impact is most likely to happen many millions of years into the future. As we'll see, there is almost zero chance of a giant impact in the next century. There is however much we can do to protect ourselves from smaller asteroids. As a result of extensive asteroid surveys over the last couple of decades: We can be pretty sure (as in perhaps 99.999999% sure) that there isn’t an extinction level asteroid headed our way in the next century. We know the orbits of all the Near Earth Asteroids that could do this and none will hit Earth over that timescale. That leaves comets, and the chance of that is something like 1 in 100 million per century, as a very rough guess (since 99% of the impacts are thought to be from asteroids). This risk has been pretty much retired due to the automated asteroid searches by the likes of Pan STARRS. But the chance of a smaller asteroid impact is still high enough to make it worth working on it, especially since this is the one natural hazard we can not only predict to the minute, decades in advance, with enough information but also prevent also, given a long enough timeline. We are already close to completing the survey of 1 km asteroids (90% done). With a bit more funding we could also find most of the asteroids down to 45 meters in diameter. As a result of new developments in the science of asteroid detection, this could be done for a cost of only $50 million to protect the entire Earth. We would then be able to deflect asteroids decades before they are due to hit, which is a far easier task than a last minute deflection. First when he said "You could say, of course, we’re due, but it’s a random course at that point.”" - that is a scientist speaking as a scientist. But of course people sharing this on social media, retweeting, writing new stories about it, pick up the “we are due” and omit the scientific qualification “but it’s a random course at that point”. To say that we are “due” a mass extinction is a bit like saying that after you throw nine heads, you are due to throw a tail. Not true. The chance that the next coin toss is a tail is always going to be 50/50 for a fair coin no matter how many heads you throw. It's the same with extinctions. So long as it is a random process, then an extinction that happens every 60 million years could happen tomorrow or it could be 60 million years or 120 million years before it happens. On average we would still expect to wait 60 million years for the next such mass extinction even if the last one happened hundreds of millions of years ago. It’s just as for the coin toss. Same for an extinction event of a size that happens every 100 million years. If you look at the diagram the big five are irregularly spaced. The last one happened 66 million years ago. But they are irregularly spaced so we can't conclude either that we need to wait 44 million years for the next big extinction either. Some scientists have tried to discern a periodicity in the extinctions of perhaps 26 to 30 million years. If they are right then we are due the next extinction perhaps 15 million years or so from now. But that is very controversial and if true, it wouldn’t cover all mass extinctions. At any rate that's so far into the future it makes no difference to us now, if they are right or wrong. We could get a mass extinction in the next few millions of years. But it is nearly impossibly unlikely in the next century.

#### 2. The individual odds are nonexistent

Ethan Siegel 10, PhD in theoretical astrophysics at the University of Florida, 11-2-2010, "How Afraid of Asteroids Should You Be?," No Publication, https://scienceblogs.com/startswithabang/2010/11/02/how-afraid-of-asteroids-should

First off, we learn that the Torino Scale -- the scale that scientists have agreed upon for alerting the public about possible asteroid strikes -- only matters if we consider numbers that are eight or higher. These are the asteroids that will actually hit us. And second off, we find that your odds of being killed or injured by an asteroid strike, in any given year, are about one-in-70,000,000. Which means, if you live to be 80, your personal odds of being harmed by an asteroid strike in your lifetime are one-in-875,000. You are more than 100 times more likely to be struck by lightning, or die in other nasty ways. Those are your odds. Those are your scientifically, number-crunched odds of being killed or injured by an asteroid here on Earth. If you're terrified of those odds, so be it. But don't let anyone exaggerate these odds to you, don't let something with a Torino scale rating of 1 or 2 or 3 cause you to lose sleep at night, and please, if you're a policymaker, consider this reality when you make your policy.

#### 3. Tech innovation solves residual risks

Robert Walker 16, mathematician, 12-14-2016, “Why Resilient Humans Would Survive Giant Asteroid Impact - Even With Over 90% Of Species Extinct,” https://www.science20.com/robert\_inventor/why\_resilient\_humans\_would\_survive\_giant\_asteroid\_impact\_even\_with\_over\_90\_of\_species\_extinct-187383

If you look at some of the past extinction events, you might think that humans could go extinct very easily. The worst of all of those was the Permian–Triassic extinction event during which 96% of marine species and 70% of land species went extinct according to one estimate. So based on those figures you might well think that there is a 70% chance that humans would go extinct as a result of whatever causes those extinctions. However, even after the extinction of the dinosaurs, birds, dawn sequoia, river turtles, small mammals and many other plants and creatures survived. Many species would go extinct after a gamma ray burst or a large asteroid impact, but humans are great survivors. We were at risk in the past before we developed tools and clothing. But with clothes, tools, boats, etc, we are an extremely adaptable species, able to survive anywhere from the Kalahari desert to the Arctic, with only stone age technology. We had already colonized most of the world by the end of the neolithic period. Overview of Pre-modern human migration - there is debate and controversy about the details, but generally agreed that humans were already present world-wide by the end of the neolithic period (which ends around 2000 BC), or shortly after. So, as long as we retain at least stone age technology, there isn't much that could make us extinct. Even if we have to go back to beachcombing and surviving on shellfish, which was a staple of early human diet in cold places such as Canada and Scotland where I live, one way or another some humans would survive. Conchero al sur de Puerto Desead - a shell midden in Argentina. For long periods of time ancient humans survived on shellfish, for so long that they built up these huge shell middens in many parts of the world. See Shell Midden We are omnivores able to survive on: Shellfish Insects Fish and other marine life Nuts Fruit Roots Seeds and cereals Birds, Animals Reptiles. So long as any of those survive the extinction event, anywhere in the world and so long as humans retain at least stone age level of understanding of technology - then there would be many survivors and we would not go extinct, even if more than 90% of species went extinct. The dinosaurs weren't a patch on us as far as survival goes. Without any technology, turtles, crocodiles, alligators, small mammals, flying dinosaurs (the birds), dawn redwood trees, pine trees, many lifeforms survived the dinosaur extinction impact. We aren't vulnerable like the early hominids. So long as We retain the ability to make clothes and simple tools and to make boats to cross rivers and seas to find new sources of food There is something edible somewhere on Earth that we can find in our travels, and cultivate or just eat in situ as hunter gatherers Then we could survive anywhere where there is such food, from the Arctic to the hottest of deserts, along the sea shores, or in tropical rainforests. So, for sure, some of us would survive a giant impact like that.

#### Either the asteroids are small and not existential OR we’d have forever to prepare

Martin **Rees 18**. Astronomer Royal, founded the Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, Fellow of Trinity College and Emeritus Professor of Cosmology and Astrophysics at the University of Cambridge. 10/16/2018. On the Future: Prospects for Humanity. Princeton University Press.

You may guess that, being an astronomer, anxiety about asteroid collisions keeps me awake at night. Not so. Indeed, this is one of the few threats that we can quantify— and be confident is unlikely. Every ten million years or so, a body a few kilometres across will hit the Earth, causing global catastrophe— so there are a few chances in a million that such an impact occurs within a human lifetime. There are larger numbers of smaller asteroids that could cause regional or local devastation. The 1908 Tunguska event, which flattened hundreds of square kilometres of (fortunately unpopulated) forests in Siberia, released energy equivalent to several hundred Hiroshima bombs. Can we be forewarned of these crash landings? The answer is yes. Plans are afoot to create a data set of the one million potential Earth- crossing asteroids larger than 50 metres and track their orbits precisely enough to identify those that might come dangerously close. With the forewarning of an impact, the most vulnerable areas could be evacuated. Even better news is that we could feasibly develop spacecraft that could protect us. A ‘nudge’, imparted in space several years before the threatened impact, would only need to change an asteroid’s velocity by a few centimetres per second to deflect it from a collision course with the Earth.

#### Comets create existential deterrence and a taboo

Bowen 18 [(Bleddyn, lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester) “The Art of Space Deterrence,” European Leadership Network, February 20, 2018, https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/] TDI

Fourth, the ubiquity of space infrastructure and the fragility of the space environment may create a degree of existential deterrence. As space is so useful to modern economies and military forces, a large-scale disruption of space infrastructure may be so intuitively escalatory to decision-makers that there may be a natural caution against a wholesale assault on a state’s entire space capabilities because the consequences of doing so approach the mentalities of total war, or nuclear responses if a society begins tearing itself apart because of the collapse of optimised energy grids and just-in-time supply chains. In addition, the problem of space debris and the political-legal hurdles to conducting debris clean-up operations mean that even a handful of explosive events in space can render a region of Earth orbit unusable for everyone. This could caution a country like China from excessive kinetic intercept missions because its own military and economy is increasingly reliant on outer space, but perhaps not a country like North Korea which does not rely on space. The usefulness, sensitivity, and fragility of space may have some existential deterrent effect. China’s catastrophic anti-satellite weapons test in 2007 is a valuable lesson for all on the potentially devastating effect of kinetic warfare in orbit.

#### No miscalc – hits stations all the time.

Cain ’15 (Fraser; 12/23/15; writer for Universe Today; “How Do Astronauts Avoid Debris”; http://www.universetoday.com/121067/how-do-astronauts-avoid-debris)

So, just how do we keep our space stations, ships and astronauts from being riddled with holes from all of the space junk in orbit around Earth? We revel in the terror grab bag of all the magical ways to get snuffed in space. Almost as much as we celebrate the giant brass backbones of the people who travel there. We’ve already talked about all the scary ways that astronauts can die in space. My personal recurring “Hail Mary full of grace, please don’t let me die in space” nightmare is orbital debris. We’re talking about a vast collection of spent rockets, dead satellites, flotsam, jetsam, lagan and derelict. It’s not a short list. NASA figures there are **21,000 bits of junk** bigger than 10 cm, **500,000 particles** between 1 and 10 cm, and more than **100 million** smaller than 1 cm. Sound familiar, humans? This is our high tech, sci fi great Pacific garbage patch. Sure, a tiny rivet or piece of scrap foil doesn’t sound very dangerous, but consider the fact that astronauts are orbiting the Earth at a velocity of about 28,000 km/h. And the Tang packets, uneaten dehydrated ice cream, and astronaut poops are also traveling at 28,000 km/h. Then think about what happens when they collide. Yikes… or yuck. Here’s the International Space Station’s solar array. See that tiny hole? Embiggen and clarinosticate! That’s a tiny puncture hole made in the array by a piece of orbital crap. The whole station is **pummeled by tiny pieces of space program junk drawer contents**. Back when the Space Shuttle was flying, NASA had to **constantly replace their windows because of the damage they were experiencing** from the orbital equivalent of Dennis the Menace hurling paint chips, fingernail clippings, and frozen scabs.

#### No Escalation:

#### 1] Planning Priorities

Bowen 18 Bleddyn Bowen 2-20-2018 “The Art of Space Deterrence” <https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/> (Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester)//Elmer

Space is often an afterthought or a miscellaneous ancillary in the grand strategic views of top-level decision-makers. A president may not care that one satellite may be lost or go dark; it may cause panic and Twitter-based hysteria for the space community, of course. But the terrestrial context and consequences, as well as the political stakes and symbolism of any exchange of hostilities in space matters more. The political and media dimension can magnify or minimise the perceived consequences of losing specific satellites out of all proportion to their actual strategic effect.

#### 2] Military Precedent

Zarybnisky 18, Eric J. Celestial Deterrence: Deterring Aggression in the Global Commons of Space. Naval War College Newport United States, 2018. (Senior Materiel Leader at United States Air Force)//Elmer

PREVENTING AGGRESSION IN SPACE While deterrence and the Cold War are strongly linked in the public’s mind through the nuclear standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union, the fundamentals of deterrence date back millennia and deterrence remains relevant. Thucydides alludes to the concept of deterrence in his telling of the Peloponnesian War when he describes rivals seeking advantages, such as recruiting allies, to dissuade an adversary from starting or expanding a conflict.6F 6 Aggression in space was successfully avoided during the Cold War because both sides viewed an attack on military satellites as highly escalatory, and such an action would likely result in general nuclear war.7F 7 In today’s more nuanced world, attacking satellites, including military satellites, does not necessarily result in nuclear war. For instance, foreign countries have used highpowered lasers against American intelligence-gathering satellites8F 8 and the United States has been reluctant to respond, let alone retaliate with nuclear weapons. This shift in policy is a result of the broader use of gray zone operations, to which countries struggle to respond while limiting escalation. Beginning with the fundamentals of deterrence illuminates how it applies to prevention of aggression in space.

#### Interdependence checks space war.

**Hall 15** [Luke Penn-Hall 15, Analyst at The Cipher Brief, M.A. from the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies, B.A. in International Relations and Religious Studies from Claremont McKenna College, “5 Reasons “Space War” Isn’t As Scary As It Sounds”, The Cipher Brief, 8/18/2015, <https://www.thecipherbrief.com/article/5-reasons-%E2%80%9Cspace-war%E2%80%9D-isn%E2%80%99t-scary-it-sounds>] recut Adam

1. If you are also reading the Pavur evidence then unhighlight the debris stuff

The U.S. depends heavily on military and commercial satellites. If a less satellite-dependent opponent launched an anti-satellite (ASAT) attack, it would have far greater impact on the U.S. than the attacker. However, it’s not as simple as that – for the following reasons:

1. An ASAT attack would likely be part of a larger, terrestrial attack. An attack on space assets would be no different than an attack on territory or other assets on earth. This means that no space war would stay limited to space. An ASAT campaign would be part of a larger conventional military conflict that would play out on earth.

2. Every country with ASAT capabilities also needs satellites. While the United States is the most dependent on military satellites, most other countries need satellites to participate in the global economy. All countries that have the technical ability to play in this space – the U.S., Russia, China and India - also have a vested interest in preventing the militarization of space and protecting their own satellites. If any of those countries were to attack U.S. satellites, it would likely hurt them far more than it would hurt the United States.

3. Destruction of satellites could create a damaging chain reaction. Scientists warn that the violent destruction of satellites could result in an effect called an ablation cascade. High-velocity debris from a destroyed satellite could crash into other satellites and create more high-velocity debris. If an ablation cascade were to occur, it could render certain orbital levels completely unusable for centuries.

4. Any country that threatened access to space would threaten the global economy. Even if a full-blown ablation cascade didn’t occur, an ASAT campaign would cause debris, making operating in space more hazardous. The global economy relies on satellites and any disruption of operations would be met with worldwide disapproval and severe economic ramifications.

5. International Prohibits the Use of ASAT Weapons. Several international treaties expressly prohibit signatory nations from attacking other countries’ space assets. It is generally accepted that space should be treated as a global common area, rather than a military domain.

While it remains necessary for military planners to create contingency plans for a, space war it is a highly unlikely scenario. All involved parties are incentivized against attacking. However, if a space war did occur, it would be part of a larger conflict on Earth. Those concerned about the potential for war in space should be more concerned about the potential for war, period.

#### Deterrence solves.

**Evanoff 19** [Kyle Evanoff, Kyle is a research associate in international economics and U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations “Big Bangs, Red Herrings, and the Dilemmas of Space Security”, Council on Foreign Relations, 6/27/2019, <https://www.cfr.org/blog/big-bangs-red-herrings-and-dilemmas-space-security> accessed 12/11/21] Adam

More important, U.S. policymakers should avoid making decisions on the basis of a possible, though highly improbable, space Pearl Harbor. They should recognize that latent counterspace capabilities—as exemplified in 2008’s Operation Burnt Frost, which saw the United States repurpose a ballistic missile interceptor to destroy a satellite—are more than sufficient to deter adversaries from launching a major surprise attack in almost all scenarios, especially in light of the aforementioned deep interdependence in the space domain. Adding to the deterrence effect are uncertain offensive cyber capabilities. The United States continues to launch incursions into geopolitical competitors’ critical systems, such as the Russian power grid, and has demonstrated a willingness to employ cyberattacks in the wake of offline incidents, as it did after Iran shot down a U.S. drone last week. Unlike in the nuclear arena, where anything short of the prospect of nuclear retaliation holds limited dissuasive power, space deterrence can stem from military capabilities in various domains. For this reason, an attack on a U.S. satellite could elicit any number of responses. The potential for cross-domain retaliation, combined with the high strategic value of space assets, means that any adversary risks extreme escalation in launching a major assault on American space architectures. Again, well-conceived diplomatic efforts are useful in averting such scenarios altogether.