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## **1**

#### **Interpretation: The affirmative must defend the hypothetical implementation of the resolution.**

#### **Resolved means a legislative policy**

**Words and Phrases 64** Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964. ED

**Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature**;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “**to establish by law**”.

#### **Outer space means anything above Earth’s Karman line**

**Dunnett 21** (Oliver Tristan, lecturer in geography at Queen’s University Belfast). Earth, Cosmos and Culture: Geographies of Outer Space in Britain, 1900–2020 (1st ed.). Routledge. 2021.<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780815356301> EE

In such ways, this book argues that Britain became a home to rich discourses of outer space, both feeding from and contributing to iconic achievements in space exploration, while also embracing the cosmos in imaginative and philosophical ways.2

**INSERT FOOTNOTE 2**

2 **This book primarily uses the term ‘outer space’ to describe the realm beyond the Earth’s atmosphere, conventionally accepted as beginning at the Kármán line of 100km above sea level**. Other terms such as ‘interplanetary space’, ‘interstellar space’, ‘cosmos’, and ‘the heavens’ are used in specific contexts.

**END FOOTNOTE 2**

Cognisant of this spatial context, a central aim is to demonstrate how contemporary geographical enquiry can provide specific and valuable perspectives from which to understand outer space. This is an argument that was initiated by Denis Cosgrove, and his critique of Alexander von Humboldt’s seminal work Cosmos helped to demonstrate geography’s special relevance to thinking about outer space.3 The key thematic areas which provide the interface for this book’s research, therefore, are the cultural, political and scientific understandings of outer space; the context of the United Kingdom since the start of the last century; and the geographical underpinnings of their relationship.

#### **In the context of space, “Appropriation” means to take as property**

**Leon 18** (Amanda M., Associate, Caplin & Drysdale, JD UVA Law) "Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources." Virginia Law Review, vol. 104, no. 3, May 2018, p. 497-547. HeinOnline.

**Appropriation**. The term "appropriation" also remains ambiguous. **Webster's defines** the verb "**appropriate**" **as** "**to take to oneself in exclusion of others**; **to** claim or **use as by an exclusive or pre-eminent right**; as, let no man appropriate a common benefit."16 5 Similarly, **Black's** Law Dictionary **describes "appropriate" as an act "[t]o make a thing one's own; to make a thing the subject of property**; to exercise dominion over an object to the extent, and for the purpose, of making it subserve one's own proper use or pleasure."166 Oftentimes, **appropriation refers to the setting aside of government funds, the taking of land for public purposes, or a tort of wrongfully taking another's property as one's own**. The term appropriation is often used not only with respect to real property but also with water. According to U.S. case law, a person completes an appropriation of water by diversion of the water and an application of the water to beneficial use.167 This **common use** of the term "appropriation" with respect to water **illustrates** two key points: (1) **the term applies to natural resources-e.g., water or minerals-not just real property**, **and** (2) **mining space resources and putting them to beneficial use**-e.g., selling or manufacturing the mined resources **could reasonably be interpreted as an "appropriation" of outer space**. While **the ordinary meaning of "appropriation"** reasonably **includes the taking of natural resources as well as land**, whether the drafters and parties to the OST envisioned such a broad meaning of the term remains difficult to determine with any certainty. **The prohibition against appropriation "by any other means" supports such a reading**, though**, by expanding the prohibition to other types not explicitly described**.168

#### **Private entity = majority nonstate**

**Warners 20** (Bill, JD Candidate, May 2021, at UIC John Marshall Law School) "Patents 254 Miles up: Jurisdictional Issues Onboard the International Space Station." UIC Review of Intellectual Property Law, vol. 19, no. 4, 2020, p. 365-380. HeinOnline.

To satisfy these three necessary requirements for a new patent regime, the ISS IGA must add an additional clause ("Clause 7") in Article 21 specifically establishing a patent regime for private nonstate third parties onboard the ISS. First, Clause 7 would define **the term "private entity" as an individual, organization, or business which is primarily privately owned and/or managed by nonstate affiliates**. Specifically defining the term "private entity" prevents confusion as to what entities qualify under the agreement and the difference between "public" and "private."99 This definition would also support the connection of Clause 1 in Article 21 to "Article 2 of the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization." 100 A succinct definition also alleviates international concerns that the changes to the ISS IGA pushes out Partner State influence. 101 Some in the international community may still point out that Clause 7 still pushes towards a trend of outer space privatization. However, this argument fails to consider that private entities in outer space have operated in space almost as comprehensively as national organizations. 102

They violate— cross ex

#### **Vote neg**

#### **1] Predictable limits – absent topical constraints affirmative there is no stasis point for neg preparation which means we can’t predictably research your affirmative since there are thousands of literature bases you could choose to base your affirmative on. That outweighs – a) you can dedicate 4 years to learning one literature base creating a structural skew to debaters who switch topics every 2 months and b) you can cherry pick advocacies that are hard to contest like “racism is bad”. Kills clash since it forces us into generic positions killing our ability to test intricate details about the aff and turns the debate into a one sided monologue for you.**

#### **2] TVA – Defend a normal cap aff where you say space colonization is what capitlaism needs to continue expanding but banning appropriation means capitalism can’t expand anymore and we are forced to withdraw. Memorial, HWL affs make a similar claim.**

#### **Procedural Fairness first—a) ballot pic – at the end of the day they care about competition and want their arguments to be flowed which proves they care about competition, if they don’t care about winning then just vote neg. Solves their offense, there is no reason a ballot is key – our interp precludes voting on non-topical affs but not the reading of them b) scope of solvency – one ballot can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews which means the only impact to a ballot is fairness and resolving skews, c) competitive incentives – debate is a game and games are silly without a level playing field. There is no incentive to prep and research for hundreds of hours if you know you’ll be at a structural disadvantage which makes the game bad and prevents rigorous contestation of positions which produces the best advocates.**

#### 

#### **Competing interps – a) you either defend the rez or don’t – there’s no in between.**

#### **Drop the debater – Changing your advocacy kills NC strat because the 1ac advocacy is the only stasis point for NC offense, anything else moots all clash and fairness. No cross apps from the aff since framework proves that that layer was skewed to begin with so we can’t actually test the truth of cross applications to the affirmative.**

#### **New 2nr answers to AC preempts because they are hidden, and implications are unknown until the 1ar.**

#### **No impact turns or rvis - A] Perfcon – if T’s bad and you vote for them on that arg, you’re voting on T. B] Substance – if T’s bad then we should try debating on substance – impact turns force me to go for T since I need to defend my position.**

## **2**

#### **Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.**

#### **Violation – they don’t (neg wiki screenshot, nothing is open sourced). Screenshots but can also check the wiki.**

#### **1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs who can’t bypass paywalled articles.**

**Louden 10** – Allan D. Louden, professor of Communication at Wake Forest (“Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century” Wake Forest National Debate Conference. IDEA, 2010)

Groups interested in engaging in competitive National Debate Tournament (NDT)-Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA)-style policy debate are entering an exciting time in the debate community where **digital resources are making research and networking increasingly accessible**. Those developing programs should be encouraged to choose their own topics and resolutions, but they should also make use of the massive resources available by focusing on the official NDT-CEDA resolution. **New initiatives in the field of open-source debate make evidence sharing, such as the Open Caselist, a powerful tool for new programs to engage and compete against established teams**. It is no coincidence that **the winners of the NDT tend to be the schools with the largest coaching staffs, but the increased distribution and free sharing of evidence and resources have made smaller debate programs increasingly capable of competing against larger institutions**. We are now seeing the beginnings of **increased resource sharing**, with multiple initiatives focusing on regional evidence sharing for groups of developing debate programs. This **is one example of dramatic changes occurring in the community that are capable of opening the doors for new participation in debate**. Regardless of outside influence, such as an organized campaign by preexisting debate organizations to increase resource distribution, students are independently capable of establishing the foundations for a larger competitive program. The following suggestions are a nonlinear set of options available to students who wish to establish a struc-tured and coached debate program, and eventually developing the capability to maintain multiple professional teaching positions, such as those discussed earlier in the chapter.

#### **2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat**

3] Depth of clash – it allows debaters to have nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate, which leads to higher quality ev comparison – outweighs cause thinking on your feet is NUQ but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

Turns their method offense – if you disclose then more people will be able to see your aff, read through it and begin to read it in the debate space which means your method spreads faster.

Impact turns to osource are a double turn cuz screenshots prove they open sourced some rounds and didn’t others which proves that not disclosng isn’t some radical move its just laziness.

## **3**

**The meta ethic is practical reason.**

#### 

#### **1] Is/Ought Gap – experience in the phenomenal world only tells us what is since we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be. But it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises, so there needs to be additional a priori premises within the noumenal world to make a moral theory.**

#### 

#### **Any moral system faces the problem of regress – I can keep asking “why should I follow this.” Regress collapses to skep since no one can generate obligations absent grounds for accepting them. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” asks for a reason for reasons, which concedes its authority.**

#### **Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.**

#### **The counter role of the ballot is to determine the debater that moves us towards a society of universal freedom**

#### **Applied Kantianism is key to abstract over the state’s influences on our desires towards a universal demand for equality within civil society.**

**Farr 02** Arnold Farr (prof of phil @ UKentucky, focusing on German idealism, philosophy of race, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and liberation philosophy). “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?” JOURNAL of SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, Vol. 33 No. 1, Spring 2002, 17–32. // NB

One of the most popular criticisms of **Kant’s** moral philosophy is that it is too formalistic.13 That is, the universal nature of the categorical imperative leaves it devoid of content. Such a principle is useless since moral decisions are made by concrete individuals in a concrete, historical, and social situation. This type of criticism lies behind Lewis Gordon’s rejection of any attempt to ground an antiracist position on Kantian principles. The rejection of universal principles for the sake of emphasizing the historical embeddedness of the human agent is widespread in recent philosophy and social theory. I will argue here on Kantian grounds that although a distinction between the **universal and** the **concrete** is a valid distinction, the **unity** of the two **is required** for an understanding of human agency. The attack on Kantian formalism began with Hegel’s criticism of the Kantian philosophy.14 The list of contemporary theorists who follow Hegel’s line of criticism is far too long to deal with in the scope of this paper. Although these theorists may approach the problem of Kantian formalism from a variety of angles, the spirit of their criticism is basically the same: The universality of the categorical imperative is an abstraction from one’s empirical conditions. Kant is often accused of making the moral agent an abstract, empty, noumenal subject. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Kantian subject is an embodied, empirical, concrete subject. However, this concrete subject has a dual nature. Kant claims in the Critique of Pure Reason as well as in the Grounding that human beings have an intelligible and empirical character.15 It is impossible to understand and do justice to Kant’s moral theory without taking seriously the relation between these two characters. The very concept of morality is impossible without the tension between the two. By “empirical character” Kant simply means that we have a sensual nature. We are physical creatures with physical drives or desires. The very fact that **I cannot simply satisfy** my **desires without considering** the **rightness** or wrongness of my actions suggests that my **empirical character must be** held **in check** by something, or else I behave like a Freudian id. My empiri- cal character must be held in check by my intelligible character, which is the legislative activity of practical reason. It is through our intelligible character that we formulate **principles** that keep our empirical impulses in check. The categorical imperative is the supreme principle of morality that is constructed by the moral agent in his/her moment of self-transcendence. What I have called self-transcendence may be best explained in the following passage by Onora O’Neill: In restricting our maxims to those that meet the test of the categorical imperative we refuse to base our lives on maxims that necessarily make our own case an exception. The reason why a universilizability criterion is morally signiﬁcant is that it makes our own case no special exception (G, IV, 404). In accepting the Categorical Imperative we accept the moral reality of other selves, and hence the possibility (not, note, the reality) of a moral community. The Formula **of Universal Law** enjoins no more than that **we act only on maxims that are open to others also**.16 O’Neill’s description of the universalizability criterion includes the notion of self-transcendence that I am working to explicate here to the extent that like self-transcendence, universalizable moral principles require that the individ- ual think beyond his or her own particular desires. **The individual is** **not allowed to exclude others** as rational moral agents who have the right to act as he acts in a given situation. For example, if I decide to use another person merely as a means for my own end I must recognize the other person’s right to do the same to me. I cannot consistently will that I use another as a means only and will that I not be used in the same manner by another. Hence, the universalizability criterion is a principle of consistency and a principle of inclusion. That is, in choosing my maxims I attempt to include the perspective of other moral agents. … Whereas most criticisms are aimed at the formulation of universal law and the formula of autonomy, our analysis here will focus on the formula of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends, since we have already addressed the problem of universality. The latter will be discussed ﬁrst. At issue here is what Kant means by “kingdom of ends.” Kant writes: “By ‘kingdom’ I understand a systematic union of different rational beings through common laws.”32 The above passage indicates that Kant recognizes different, perhaps different kinds, of rational beings; however, the problem for most critics of Kant lies in the assumption that Kant suggests that the “kingdom of ends” requires that we abstract from personal differences and content of private ends. The Kantian conception of rational beings requires such an abstraction. Some feminists and philosophers of race have found this abstract notion of rational beings problematic because they take it to mean that rationality is necessarily white, male, and European.33 Hence, the systematic union of rational beings can mean only the systematic union of white, European males. I ﬁnd this interpretation of Kant’s moral theory quite puzzling. Surely another interpretation is available. That is, the implication that in Kant’s philosophy, rationality can only apply to white, European males does not seem to be the only alternative. The problem seems to lie in the requirement of abstraction. There are two ways of looking at the abstraction requirement that I think are faithful to Kant’s text and that overcome the criticisms of this requirement. First, the **abstraction** requirement may be best understood **as a demand for intersubjectivity** or recognition. Second, it may be understood as an attempt **to avoid ethical egoism** in determining maxims for our actions. It is unfortunate that Kant never worked out a theory of intersubjectivity, as did his successors Fichte and Hegel. However, this is not to say that there is not in Kant’s philosophy a tacit theory of intersubjectivity or recognition. The abstraction requirement simply demands that in the midst of our concrete differences we recognize ourselves in the other and the other in ourselves. That is, we recognize in others the humanity that we have in common. Recognition of our common humanity is at the same time recognition of rationality in the other. We recognize in the other the capacity for selfdetermination and the capacity to legislate for a kingdom of ends. This brings us to the second interpretation of the abstraction requirement. **To avoid** ethical **egoism one must abstract from** (think beyond) one’s own personal interest and **subjective maxims**. That is, the categorical imperative requires that I recognize that I am a member of the realm of rational beings. Hence, I organize my maxims in consideration of other rational beings. Under such a principle other people cannot be treated merely as a means for my end but must be treated as ends in themselves. The merit of the categorical imperative for a philosophy of race is **that** it **contravenes racist ideology** to the extent that racist ideology is based **on the use of persons** of a different race **as a means to an end** rather than as ends in themselves. Embedded in the formulation of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends is the recognition of the common hope for humanity. That is, maxims ought to be chosen on the basis of an ideal, a hope for the amelioration of humanity. This ideal or ethical commonwealth (as Kant calls it in the Religion) is the kingdom of ends.34 Although the merits of Kant’s moral theory may be recognizable at this point, we are still in a bit of a bind. It still seems problematic that the moral theory of a racist is essentially an antiracist theory. Further, what shall we do with Henry Louis Gates’s suggestion that we use the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime to deconstruct the Grounding? What I have tried to suggest is that instead of abandoning the categorical imperative we should attempt to deepen our understanding of it and its place in Kant’s critical philosophy. A deeper reading of the Grounding and Kant’s philosophy in general may produce the deconstruction35 suggested by Gates. However, a text is not necessarily deconstructed by reading it against another. Texts often deconstruct themselves if read properly. To be sure, the best way to understand a text is to read it in context. Hence, if the Grounding is read within the context of the critical philosophy, the tools for a deconstruction of the text are provided by its context and the tensions within the text. Gates is right to suggest that the Grounding must be deconstructed. However, this deconstruction requires much more than reading the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime against the Grounding. It requires a complete engagement with the critical philosophy. Such an engagement discloses some of Kant’s very signiﬁcant claims about humanity and the practical role of reason. With this disclosure, deconstruction of the Grounding can begin. What **deconstruction will reveal** is not necessarily the inconsistency of Kant’s moral philosophy or the racist or sexist nature of the categorical imperative, but rather, it will disclose the **disunity** between Kant’s theory and his own feelings about blacks and women. Although the theory is consistent and emancipatory and should apply to all persons, **Kant** the man **has his own** personal and moral **problems**. Although Kant’s attitude toward people of African descent was deplorable, **it would be equally deplorable to reject** the categorical imperative **without ﬁrst exploring** its **emancipatory potential**.

### **Offense**

#### **1] The aff has a deontological obligation to be topical.**

Nebel 15 Jake Nebel,"The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel," Briefly,<https://www.vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/> //Lex VM

A second strategy denies that such pragmatic benefits are relevant. **This strategy is more deontological. One version of this strategy appeals to the importance of consent or agreement. Suppose that you give your opponents prior notice that you’ll be affirming the September/October 2012 resolution instead of the current one.** There is a sense in which your affirmation of that resolution is now predictable: your opponents know, or are in a position to know, what you will be defending. And suppose that the older resolution is conducive to better (i.e., more fair and more educational) debate. Still, **it’s unfair of you to expect your opponents to follow suit. Why? Because they didn’t agree to debate that topic. They registered for a tournament whose invitation specified the current resolution, not the Sept/Oct 2012 resolution or a free-for-all. The “social contract” argument for topicality holds that accepting a tournament invitation constitutes implicit consent to debate the specified topic.** This claim might be contested, depending on what constitutes implicit consent. What is less contestable is this: given that some proposition must be debated in each round and that the tournament has specified a resolution, no one can reasonably reject a principle that requires everyone to debate the announced resolution as worded. This appeals to Scanlon’s contractualism. Someone who wishes to debate only the announced resolution has a strong claim against changing the topic, and no one has a stronger claim against debating the announced resolution (ignoring, for now, some possible exceptions to be discussed in the next subsection). So it is unfair to expect your opponent to debate anything other than the announced resolution. **This unfairness is a constraint on the pursuit of education or other goods: it wrongs and is unjustifiable to your opponent.**

#### **2] K – affs are non-universalizable because if everyone read a k-aff there would be no topic in the first place and therefore no debate**

## **Case**

A2 no stable definitions

#### **Vote neg on presumption**

#### **[1] They have no intrinsic benefit to specifically reading [x] within the debate space and thus no reason to affirm their strategy**

#### **[2] Movements don’t spill up – competition means you ally yourself with people who vote for you and alienate those who are forced to debate you ensuring the failure of the movement**

#### **[3] The regurgitation of knowledge from the 1ac proves that it is not a departure from the status quo, but rather gets coopted by academia**

Reading ths in debate is a MASSIVE double turn – the ballot just feeds into another exhaustive system as data points for one of 10,000 debate tournaments that go on. You reading this aff invests in such exchaustive systems as showing up and agreeing to debate for a tournament that runs because the entry fees give it a PROFIT is a huge investment into this exhaustive system. Their method won’t do anything for debate since people have been reading berardi affs forever – animesh won tournaments with this aff but semiocap is strong so they have no offense.

### **AT: Exhaustion Thesis**

#### **1] Exhaustion is not verifiable – yes semio cap exists but we never know when we reach that point of exhaustion and lose understanding of the world which proves their thesis is non falsifiable. That means we can’t verify any of their claims.**

#### **2] We aren’t constantly processing information since we can filter out and forget unimportant information while remembering the important stuff. You don’t remember every ad or pay attention to every capitalist sign since your brain choses what to remember. Proves we do have sensibility.**

#### **3] If so that’s inevitable since everyone desires to perfect the world — brokenness will exist no matter what. Exhaustion is good - produces the best technology through a desire to perfect the world even if we can’t reach perfection it maximizes quality, doesn’t link to depression the proliferation of images is equivalent to the proliferation of signs which is bound in language - proves they don’t solve and if so speaking is a proliferation of signs.**

#### **Bifo says don’t trust him – vote neg on presumption**

**Bifo 15** (Franco, Professor of Social History of Communication at the Accademia di Belle Arti of Milan, Marxist Theorist, “Heroes: Mass Murder and Suicide”, Verso 2015)

Remember that **despair and joy are not incompatible**. **Despair is a consequence of understanding**. **Joy is a condition of the emotional mind. Despair is to acknowledge the truth of the present situation**, but the sceptical mind knows that the only truth is shared imagination and shared projection. **So do not be frightened by despair. It does not delimit the potential for joy.** **And joy is a condition for proving intellectual despair wrong.** Finally, don’t take me too seriously. **Don’t take too seriously my catastrophic premonitions**. And **in case it is diffi cult to follow these prescriptions, don’t take too seriously my prescriptions**. **Irony is about the independence of mind from knowledge; it is about the excessive nature of the imagination. So, at the very end: don’t believe (me).**

#### **Bifo pessimism wrong- causes massive die off**

**Lear 12**

(Ben,<https://viewpointmag.com/2012/05/18/lifeboat-communism-a-review-of-franco-bifo-berardis-after-the-future/> 5-18)

What does the end of the future mean for rad­i­cal pol­i­tics? It is at this point that Bifo’s argu­ment becomes prob­lem­atic. In an argu­ment that inter­sects with groups such as Tiqqun, Bifo argues that we must see “Com­mu­nism as a neces­sity in the col­lapse of cap­i­tal.” Dis­tant from the vol­un­tarism of pre­vi­ous forms of Com­mu­nist pol­i­tics, this “post-growth Com­mu­nism” will be best under­stood as a nec­es­sary response to capital’s refusal of labour. Cut adrift from the “oppor­tu­nity” to work, with wel­fare sys­tems dis­man­tled, Bifo argues that we will wit­ness the pro­lif­er­a­tion of zones of auton­omy respond­ing to the needs of an increas­ingly pre­car­i­ous and super­flu­ous social body. Com­mu­nist pol­i­tics will emerge from an exo­dus, both vol­un­tary and com­pul­sory, from a stag­nat­ing and increas­ingly preda­tory state-capital nexus. This exo­dus is both social, in the devel­op­ment of an alter­na­tive infra­struc­ture, and per­sonal, in the with­drawal from the hyper-stimulation of the semi­otic econ­omy. Bifo aban­dons hope in col­lec­tive con­tes­ta­tion at the level of the political. Bifo’s pol­i­tics could be described as a kind of “lifeboat com­mu­nism.” As the cri­sis rip­ples, mutates, and deep­ens, Bifo sees the role of com­mu­nism as the cre­ation of spaces of sol­i­dar­ity to blunt the worst effects of the cri­sis of social repro­duc­tion. Gone is the demand for a bet­ter world for all, the lib­er­a­tion of our col­lec­tive social wealth, or the unlock­ing of the social poten­tials of tech­nol­ogy. Rather, Bifo’s pol­i­tics are based around insu­lat­ing a **nec­es­sar­ily small** por­tion of soci­ety from the dic­tates of cap­i­tal. By with­draw­ing from the polit­i­cal sphere, we accept the like­li­hood of los­ing the final scraps of the wel­fare state and **con­cede the ter­rain of the polit­i­cal to zom­bie pol­i­tics and preda­tory cap­i­tal.** Rather than seek­ing new forms of orga­ni­za­tion to re-enter the polit­i­cal stage, Bifo seems to sug­gest that we seek shel­ter beneath it as best we can. This shy­ing away from the polit­i­cal stage is the weak­ness at the heart of the book. Recent erup­tions of polit­i­cal strug­gle have cap­tured the col­lec­tive imag­i­na­tion because they demon­strate that polit­i­cal con­tes­ta­tion is **still pos­si­ble today**, in spite of the obsta­cles Bifo has described. The Occupy move­ment and the upris­ings in the Mid­dle East and North Africa have res­onated with all those who still have hope in col­lec­tive strug­gle. Although these move­ments have encoun­tered vary­ing prob­lems, to which we must develop solu­tions, they dis­pel the idea of an unchange­able present. The cur­rent block­ages to suc­cess­ful organ­is­ing have been shown to be **strate­gic and tac­ti­cal**, not ter­mi­nal. **Mis­di­ag­nos­ing** the cur­rent iner­tia of post-political pub­lic life **as** a ter­mi­nal con­di­tion leads the left towards an **evac­u­a­tion of the polit­i­cal**, while we should instead reassert its pri­macy. If we aban­don any hope of fight­ing in, against, and beyond the exist­ing archi­tec­ture of the state and cap­i­tal, and instead seek refuge in small com­munes, and go-slow prac­tices, we aban­don all real hope of a gen­er­al­ized, or gen­er­al­iz­able, eman­ci­pa­tory pol­i­tics. Although Bifo’s analy­sis of the dif­fi­cul­ties of col­lec­tive action res­onates with all of us who have attempted to orga­nize strug­gles in the past few decades, the pro­posal for a **sim­ple with­drawal from cap­i­tal­ism is a bleak pol­i­tics indeed** – which, at its most opti­mistic, calls for an orderly default by por­tions of the pro­le­tariat. The hori­zons of com­mu­nist pol­i­tics appear much nar­rower when cap­i­tal­ism is no longer seen as the repos­i­tory of a vast store of social wealth await­ing col­lec­tive redis­tri­b­u­tion, but rather rede­fined as an unas­sail­able site of uni­ver­sal and per­ma­nent aus­ter­ity com­bined with widen­ing social redundancy. It is hard to imag­ine a net­work of self-organized projects and sys­tems sup­port­ing the **major­ity of the pop­u­la­tion** in the con­text of an increas­ingly preda­tory cap­i­tal­ism. Emerg­ing from the and iso­lated left­ist scenes, this lifeboat com­mu­nism will by its very nature have a **lim­ited car­ry­ing capac­ity**, as the anar­chist expe­ri­ence in post-Katrina New Orleans attests. The lifeboats that Bifo calls for will undoubt­edly be too small and makeshift to har­bor us all. The cri­sis is twofold. It is a cri­sis of cap­i­tal­ist prof­itabil­ity, and of an increas­ingly pre­car­i­ous and sur­plus global pro­le­tariat whose repro­duc­tion (as both labour and body) is under threat. It is unlikely that the pro­lif­er­a­tion of com­munes, squats, food co-ops, file shar­ers, urban gar­den­ers, and vol­un­tary health ser­vices will bring forth a new, bet­ter world. But while the cur­rent seem­ingly post-political sit­u­a­tion throws up mas­sive obsta­cles to orga­niz­ing, there is still a poten­tial for col­lec­tive con­tes­ta­tion. The cap­i­tal­ist state, racked by its own legit­i­macy cri­sis and weekly polit­i­cal scan­dals, is more vul­ner­a­ble than it appears. We need only recall the period of unex­pected hope built by stu­dents in Britain, occu­piers in Oak­land, and vast swathes of North Africa and the Mid­dle East dur­ing the past two years. These move­ments were mobilised through the betrayal of a vision of the future – but along­side their rage, they put forth a hope which can guide our politics. The task at hand is to unlearn old behav­iour and to forge new tac­ti­cal and organ­i­sa­tional weapons for strug­gle. Bifo’s con­tri­bu­tion is a timely and chal­leng­ing one, but it ulti­mately leads us back towards a DIY cul­ture and “out­reach” pol­i­tics. As our move­ments come to terms with these lim­its, we must also hold onto the belief that lux­ury for all is pos­si­ble. The social poten­tial of unfilled blocks of flats, emerg­ing tech­nolo­gies like [3D-printing](http://www.open-designism.com/profiles/blogs/finally-it-has-happened-the-pirate-bay-goes-product-bay), and the desires of the mil­lions of under­em­ployed, should remind us of this. This will not be pos­si­ble with­out a col­lec­tive strug­gle against the state and the demands of cap­i­tal, one which simul­ta­ne­ously defends what we have and attempts to move beyond it. A retreat to lifeboat pol­i­tics is both pre­ma­ture **and a self-fulfilling prophecy**. While Bifo cor­rectly analy­ses the cur­rent con­junc­ture – clearly iden­ti­fy­ing the post-political state, the weak­ness of the Left, the cri­sis of prof­itabil­ity and new forms of labour, **and** their impact on the sub­ject – his polit­i­cal pre­scrip­tions lead us in the wrong direc­tion. Just as Bifo does, we place the strug­gle against work at the cen­ter; but we can also seek to lib­er­ate social wealth, rather than insu­late a lucky few from the rav­ages of cap­i­tal. Rather than “No Future,” we must raise a dif­fer­ent ban­ner: “The future’s here, it just needs reorganizing.”

#### **Semiocapitalism is nonsense – nothing but nostalgia and condescension.**

**Yilmaz 9-19-10**

(Onur http://mastersofmedia.hum.uva.nl/2010/09/19/review-franco-berardi-precarious-rhapsody/)

Berardi presents several more arguments in his book: about intellectual labor and its appropriation by capitalist institutions, about the disconnect between the amount of information generated within networks (cyberspace) and the human inadequacy of processing this information fast enough (cybertime), about the collapse of democracy under the influence of the capitalist free-market system. Some of his arguments are reasonable and interesting; others can be tenuous and veer into the metaphysical at times, like his connection between the semiocapitalist system and pathological disorders. However, the true problem with Berardi’s work is in the way the book is structured. The first two chapters of Precarious Rhapsody contain the entirety of Berardi’s arguments. However, these chapters are written in a dense, labyrinthine manner that makes it nigh on **impossible to ascertain just what it is that is being argued.** Berardi introduces all his concepts at once without defining them, and forgets to explain just **how this premise leads to that conclusion**. Over the course of the book the same points are repeated over and over again, becoming more clearer as the tightly spun manifesto of the opening chapters unspools into more intelligible arguments and lines of reasoning. It is as if Berardi placed the summary of his thesis at the very beginning of the book and worked backwards from there. Besides the obfuscating prose and circuitous way of presenting his arguments, the repeating pattern of the book leads to a great deal of redundancy. Some parts are repeated word for word from one chapter to the next, and deja vu sets in quite often. Part of this seems to owe to the fact that many of the chapters have appeared in various forms before being collected in this book. Whatever the case may be, Precarious Rhapsody would have benefitted a great deal from a bit of editing. Another issue is the underlying **current of nostalgia** that is present throughout. It is no surprise that Berardi places the last moment of true, hopeful revolt against the capitalist domination of everyday life in his student years. The notion that everything used to be better in the past and kids these days just don’t understand nags around the corner of every page. When Berardi argues that the disconnect between cyberspace and cybertime leads to an empty lifestyle where people have lost the ability to love, to imagine, to enjoy life, it comes across as condescending. Moreover, **he fails to provide any evidence** for his claims. No case studies or statistics. The same is the case when he states that pathological disorders like depression spring from labor relations in semiocapitalism. These are interesting claims, but they are **built solely on rhetoric**. If you have the patience to stick through to the end and decipher Berardi’s arguments, Precarious Rhapsody is a rewarding book to read. Not per se because it presents a workable theory to apply on the field of media studies- it might be better described as media philosophy. But in the end Berardi manages to present a unique and interesting view of the modern world and the role media play in it. It makes you think in new ways and about issues you might not have considered otherwise. And it contains at least one sentiment that anyone can agree with. Berardi places the “source of intelligence, of technology, of progress” in the simple statement:”I don’t want to go to work because I prefer to sleep”.

#### **Capitalism is psychologically inevitable due to evolutionary change – they can’t change anything**

**Wilkinson 5** Will, policy analyst @CATO, “Capitalism and Human Nature”, CATO Policy Report, XXVII(1), January/February,<http://www.cato.org/research/articles/wilkinson-050201.html>)

Perhaps **the most depressing lesson of evolutionary psychology** for politics **is** found in its account of **the deep-seated human capacity for envy** and, related, of our difficulty in understanding the idea of gains from trade and increases in productivity—the idea of an ever-expanding "pie" of wealth. There is evidence that greater skill and initiative could lead to higher status and bigger shares of resources for an individual in the EEA. But because of the social nature of hunting and gathering, the fact that food spoiled quickly, and the utter absence of privacy, the benefits of individual success in hunting or foraging could not be easily internalized by the individual, and were expected to be shared. The EEA was for the most part a zero-sum world, where increases in total wealth through invention, investment, and extended economic exchange were totally unknown. More for you was less for me. Therefore, if anyone managed to acquire a great deal more than anyone else, that was pretty good evidence that theirs was a stash of ill-gotten gains, acquired by cheating, stealing, raw force, or, at best, sheer luck. Envy of the disproportionately wealthy may have helped to reinforce generally adaptive norms of sharing and to help those of lower status on the dominance hierarchy guard against further predation by those able to amass power. Our zero-sum mentality makes it hard for us to understand how trade and investment can increase the amount of total wealth. We are thus ill-equipped to easily understand our own economic system. These features of human nature—that we are coalitional, hierarchical, and envious zero-sum thinkers—would seem to make liberal capitalism extremely unlikely. And it is. However, **the benefits of a liberal market order can be seen in a few further features of the human mind and social organization** in the EEA. Property Rights are Natural The problem of distributing scarce resources can be handled in part by implicitly coercive allocative hierarchies. An alternative solution to the problem of distribution is the recognition and enforcement of property rights. **Property rights are prefigured in nature** by the way animals mark out territories for their exclusive use in foraging, hunting, and mating. Recognition of such rudimentary claims to control and exclude minimizes costly conflict, which by itself provides a strong evolutionary reason to look for innate tendencies to recognize and respect norms of property. New scientific research provides even stronger evidence for the existence of such property "instincts." For example, recent experimental work by Oliver Goodenough, a legal theorist, and Christine Prehn, a neuroscientist, suggests that **the human mind evolved specialized modules for making judgments** about moral transgressions, and transgressions against property in particular. Evolutionary psychology can help us to understand that property rights are not created simply by strokes of the legislator's pen. **Mutually Beneficial Exchange is Natural** Trade and mutually beneficial exchange are human universals, as is the division of labor. In their groundbreaking paper, "Cognitive Adaptations for Social Exchange," Cosmides and Tooby point out that, contrary to widespread belief, **hunter-gatherer life is not "a kind of retro-utopia"** of "indiscriminate, egalitarian cooperation and sharing." The archeological and ethnographic evidence shows that hunter-gatherers were involved in numerous forms of trade and exchange. Some forms of hunter-gatherer trading can involve quite complex specialization and the interaction of supply and demand. Most impressive, Cosmides and Tooby have shown through a series of experiments that **human beings are able easily to solve complex logical puzzles** involving reciprocity, the accounting of costs and benefits, and the detection of people who have cheated on agreements. However, **we are unable to solve formally identical puzzles that do not deal with questions of social exchange**. That, they argue, points to the existence of "functionally specialized, content-dependent cognitive adaptations for social exchange."

### **Kant vs \_\_\_\_\_**

#### **1] Reason precludes – a total rejection requires reason to filter out the truth of everything you hear in the everyday world by recognizing it’s all a product of semiocapitalism, that concedes the validity of our framework.**

#### **2] Our framework controls the internal link – we need to be able to set and pursue the end of rejecting semio capitalism and engaging in depression politics.**

#### **3] The proliferation of information is not relevant to the NC since the categorical imperative is created a priori absent any impact of the empirical world and semio cap which means questions of ethics relating to the categorical imperative are not affected.**

#### **4] Violating the categorical imperative is the root cause of the problems that are isolated – things like charity cannibalism occur as a result of using someone’s problems for your own end.**