# Theory

**Interp: The aff must disclose their case**

**Violation: They don’t**

**Standards:**

**(1) Real World Education - disclosure allows debaters to pursue more information on an opponents case and exposes us to more literature. More reading means we get the most holistic education from the preparation process, rather than having the shallow process of reading tag lines and hearing only what’s high lighted**

**(2) Predictability - having preround time to prepare responses enables targeted research that is tailored to the specific arguments in the round. This makes for higher quality dialogue with two opposed perspectives who have had time to adequately educated themselves about the problems in the round**

**(3) Strat Skew – Since the Aff has infinite prep, Aff can frontline every argument whilst Neg cannot prepare for infinite Aff positions.**

**Paradigms**

**Competing interps- reasonability is subjective, no jurisdiction**

**Drop the debater- only way to prevent future abuse**

**No RVIs: Don’t make sense, people do not automatically win arguments by saying, “I’m fair and play by the rules”**

**Voters**

**Education - debate gets funded by schools because the education it provides**

**Inclusivity- the ballot is ideally supposed to test the argumentative capacity of the debater. eliminate external influence over this decision as it is the only intrinsic guiding principle to the purpose of debate**

# KRITIK

#### Link:

**1) The AFF’s proposition to reduce IPP is a policy rooted in futuristic activism; an attempt to change the world for the better. However, this is impossible under the semio-capitalist system and only serves to increase our reliance on the digitalized medium.**

**Berardi 11**, [Berardi, Franco. “After The Future”. 2011, WW]

**The Futurists** – and the moderns in general – **thought that the future is reliable and trustworthy.** In the first part of the century **Fascists and Communists and the supporters of Democracy** held very different ideas, and followed divergent methods, but all of them **shared the belief that the future will be bright, no matter how hard the present.** Our **post-futurist mood is based on the consciousness that the future is not going to be bright, or at least we doubt that 17 the future means progress**. **Modernity started with the reversal of the theocratic vision of time** as Fall and distancing from the City of God. **Moderns are those who live time as the sphere of a progress towards perfection, or at least towards improvement, enrichment, and rightness**. **Since the turning point of the century that trusted in the future** – and I like to place this turning point in the year **1977 – humankind has abandoned this illusion**. The insurgents of ’68 believed that they were fulfilling the Modern Hegelian Utopia of the becoming true of thought, the Marcusean fusion of reason and reality. By the **integration of Reality and Reason (embedded in social knowledge, information and technology) turned history into a code-generated world.** **Terror and Code took over the social relationship and utopia went dystopic. The century that trusted in the future could be described as the systematic reversal of utopia into dystopia**. **Futurism chanted the utopia of Technique, Speed and Energy, but the result was Fascism in Italy and totalitarian communism in Russia.Futurist dynamism wants to infuse in the painting the perception of temporal progression,** as we can see in Balla’s painting Signorina con cagnolino, and in Boccioni’s Stati d’animo. **Futurist innovation expolits the rhythm of technomedia innovation: photography, cinema, radio**. Cubo-futurist painters intend to capture the dynamic of the movement by the simultaneous presentation of different sides of the object, preparing the sensibility of cinema and television. Khlebnikov and Kruchonykh sing the praises of radio as the medium of universal love and sympathy among men. **After dreaming of the evolution of the media, after proclaiming the advent of universal communication and wireless imagination, in the second half of the century the avant-garde will 19 perceive the conversion of the media into tools of domination over the collective mind. But the ambiguity is there from the beginning**

**We are witnessing a process of proliferation of technological tools for simulation**. **The social technology of communication is aimed to connect imagination and projection of the individuals and groups.** This projection-web could be called Technomaya, neuro-telematic network endlessly projecting a movie shared by all the conscious organisms who are connected. This technoimagination, this mutual implication in the koinos kosmos is socialization itself. Through the proliferation of machines for electronic, holographic stimulation, and of programmed neuro-stimulation, we can enter the domain of Techno-maya, because we can produce worlds of Meaning, and we can transmit these worlds, triggering the imaginations of other people. Futurism and the avant-garde set themselves the task of violating rules. Deregulation was the legacy left by Rimbaud to the experimentation of the 1900s. **Deregulation was also the rallying cry of the hyper-capitalism of late modernity, paving the way for the development of semiocapital.** In the totalitarian period of the external machine and mechanical speed, having previously used the state form to impose its rule on society, **capitalism decided to do without state mediation as the techniques of recombination and the absolute speed of electronics made it possible for control to be interiorised**. **In the classical form of manufacturing capitalism, price, wages and profit fluctuations were based on the relationship between necessary labor time and the determination of value.** Following the introduction of microelectronic technologies and the resulting intellectualisation of productive labor, the relationship between different magnitudes and different productive forces 25 entered a period of indeterminacy. Deregulation, as launched by Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, marked the end of the law of value and turned its demise into a political economy. In his main work, Symbolic Exchange and Death, Jean Baudrillard (1993a: 2) intuitively infers the overall direction of the development of the end of the millennium: “The reality principle corresponded to a certain stage of the law of value. **Today, the whole system is swamped by indeterminacy, and every reality is absorbed by the hyperreality of the code and simulation**.”From this standpoint, **there is no difference between fascism, communism and democracy:** art **[Activism] functions as the element of aestheticization and mobilisation of everyday life. Total mobilization is terror, and terror is the ideal condition for a full realisation of the capitalist plan to mobilise psychic energy**. The close relation between Futurism and advertising is an integral part of this process. In Art and Revolution: Transversal Activism in the Long Twentieth Century, Gerald Raunig (2007) writes on **the relationship between the artistic avantgarde and activism**. His work provides a useful phenomenological account of the relation between art and political mobilisation in the 20th century, but it fails to grasp the absolute specificity of the current situation, that is, **the crisis and exhaustion of all activism**. The term “activism” became largely influential as a result of the antiglobalisation movement, which used it to describe its political communication and the connection between art and communicative action. However, this definition is a mark of its attachment to the past and its inability to free itself from the conceptual frame of reference it inherited from the 20th century.

**2) Reducing IPPs and proliferating medicine only serves to make us more dependent on the semio-capitalist market, in turn allowing for more imperial control and more panic for individuals.**

**Ahuja 16** Neel Ahuja, Professor of English @ University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, *Bioinsecurities: Disease Interventions, Empire, and the Government of Species*, 2016

Even at their most powerful, states are rarely ever able to remake life in their own sovereign image.1 The difference in the case of an imperial state is not simply that it has incrementally more power to control, but that its scale of intervention and fantasies of mastery doom it to ever more desperate interventions that seek to postpone its overextension and demise. Imperial states extend tentacles of intervention into varied domains of life in order to displace the crises of reproduction and legitimacy they inevitably generate. Given this precarious, adaptive, and expansionist form of empire, it is unsurprising in the early twenty-first century that basic controversies about the protection of biological life have become major concerns of a United States that brands its own rule as a defense of democracy and thus both freedom and life. Indeed, as in past eras of empire, many of the most intimate bodily experiences of living and dying drive political debate.2 With steady media attention to health care policy, humanitarian intervention, abortion, prenatal genetic testing, drug patents, assisted suicide, animal rights, environmental regulation, and biosecurity, the idea of the vulnerable body as an object of governance—its transformation for better or worse through state policies, technological intervention, and ecological forces—is today quite conventional. **One element common to this biopolitics of empire is an anxiety about the dependence of the human body on forces that appear inhuman, even inhumane: medical technologies to extend, optimize, or end life; markets and institutions that unequally distribute resources for sustaining life; environmental processes that support, deprive, or injure bodies.** Such concerns were, of course, entirely common to twentieth-century modernist fears of alienation from nature, as well as to liberal, socialist, and fascist states that each proclaimed to defend the life of the people in the major imperial wars. Yet due to the ongoing expansion of government into life through technological, economic, and environmental interventions, **a growing number of crises that advertise dreaded risks to life as we know it—climate change, nuclear toxicity, disease pandemics, biological weapons, and financial speculation**, to name a few—have recently pressed critical studies of empire to think politics and agency at queer scales of relation, from the grand vantage of planetary geology and climate, through the lively migrations of commodities and animals, all the way down to the microbial, molecular, and quantum worlds of matter in which advanced sciences produce new technologies and knowledge. In an era in which **excessive hope is invested in the idea that empire’s so-called free markets will inevitably deliver resources for improving life**, discussions of risk and security increasingly provoke concern about how bodies are either threatened or safeguarded in links to other species, to ecology, and to technology. Public fears and hopes are thus invested in questions about how bodies interface beyond the skin of the organism. The living body is not only an ecology reproduced by constituent species (think of the life-sustaining work of gut bacteria or the ingested flesh of animals or plants). It is also an assemblage crosscut by technological, economic, and environmental forces (medical technologies, insurance markets, agricultural systems, toxic pollution) that render the body vulnerable as they reproduce its conditions of possibility. Yet there remains a sense of tension concerning how social theorists frame the vulnerability of human life between biopolitics and these emerging posthumanist ideas. While biopolitical analysis foregrounds the contested figure of the human, emphasizing that the human body is an effect of power crafted through the social reproduction of nationality, race, sex, and/or class factors conjoined in inhuman fields of power, emerging posthumanist and newmaterialist fields including animal studies, environmental humanities, and object-oriented ontology more often emphasize the agency of the nonhuman and the surprising liveliness of physical matter. As such, despite the avowed critique of the human, they may take for granted the apparent universality of the human lifeworld from which they flee, foreclosing attention to the processes that anthropomorphize the human in order to characterize the human’s sovereign domination of the nonhuman. This move allows some posthumanist critics to project upon an outside, the nonhuman (in the form of environment, animal, machine, or other object), the possibility of resistance to anthropocentrism. Such thinking might be seen as a ruse of transcendence—an assumption that turning attention from the human to the nonhuman could bypass Marxist, feminist, critical race, and postcolonial critiques of imperial systems that proliferate inequality under the guise of universal human freedom. Despite this liberal, idealist trend among posthumanists (which is more pronounced in the humanities than it is in the social sciences), studies of empire increasingly confront the fact that the apparent exteriority of the subject (the worlds of body, physical matter, and interspecies exchange) has more often formed the center of the politics of empire rather than its excluded outside. It is thus my hope that the collision of biopolitical and posthumanist thought may be salvaged in a practical if unexpected crossing: a more robust accounting of the ways in which politics, including **the liberal and neoliberal politics of empire, is embedded in living bodies and planetary environments, which are themselves constituted as objects of knowledge and intervention for imperial science**. Such an understanding goes beyond an assertion that life is controlled by human government, which would embrace the strong postEnlightenment division between government and life, human and nonhuman. I instead hope to explore the queer hypothesis that the adaptability, risk, and differentiation central to life increasingly constitute the very matter of politics. This book is about how **disease outbreaks**, **med**ical **tech**nologies, **and the relations between humans, animals, bacteria, and viruses galvanized racialized fears and hopes that determined the geopolitical form of US empire** during the long twentieth century, following the continent-wide establishment of Euro-American settler networks. Before explaining that argument, however, this brief preface explores how—in addition to established methods of postcolonial study that define empire through histories of conquest, settlement, and the exploitation of labor and resources—the inequalities and violences of imperialism can productively be understood from the vantage of species, the field of life itself. Research on colonial environmental history and disease control is long established in postcolonial studies, even as today there is growing attention to Global South environmental activism, advanced biotechnologies, and human-animal and human-plant interactions as significant concerns in the planetary routes of European and US empire. Yet my sense of an interspecies politics is still relatively unfamiliar from even the vantage of these studies. Extant studies have long highlighted questions of representation, agency, influence, and domination, explaining the unequal distribution of the privileges accorded for being anthropomorphized, for being made human through colonial ideological and social processes. **While maintaining focus on such racialized inequalities fracturing the figure of the human in the worldwide routes of European and US imperialisms, it is the aim of this book to articulate an additional sense of the political as a lively zone of embodied connection and friction.** “Interspecies relations form the often unmarked basis upon which scholarly inquiry organizes its objects, political interventions such as ‘human rights’ stake their claims, and capitalist endeavors maneuver resources and marshal profit.”3 A critique of the interspecies zone of the political—which at its broadest would expand beyond the human-animal and human-microbial relations discussed in this book to include the diversity of living species, matter, energies, and environmental systems that produce everyday life out of biosocial crossings—helps us understand the persistence of empire in a postcolonial age precisely because it conjoins power to forces that retreat into the seemingly natural and ahistorical domains of body and matter.

#### Impact: The proliferation of signs and signifiers under semio-capitalism creates a perpetual state of panic that overwhelms subjects and makes us slaves to the info-sphere. This makes us constantly over-stimulated and destroys our time to be empathetic towards one another, which desensitizes us to violence and makes us apathetic. – can lead to fascism?

**Berardi 11**, [Berardi, Franco. “After The Future”. 2011, WW]

The urban territory is increasingly traversed by streams of diasporic, heterogeneous and de-territorialized imaginaries. **Panic** tends to become the urban psychic dimension. It **is the reaction of a sensitive organism submitted to stimulation that is too strong and too rapid.** The reaction of an organism urged on by too frequent and intense impulses to be emotively and conversationally elaborated

Today, panic has become a form of psychopathology: we can speak of panic when we see a conscious organism (individual or social) being overwhelmed by the speed of processes s/he/it is involved in, and has no time to process this information input., or **even that generated by the organism itself. Technological transformations have displaced the focus from the sphere of the production of material goods towards the sphere of semiotic goods.** With this**, semio-kapital becomes the dominant form of the economy**. **The accelerated creation of surplus value depends on the acceleration of the info-sphere.** **The digitalization of the info-sphere opens the way for this kind of acceleration.** **Signs are produced and circulated at a growing speed but the human terminal of the system (the embodied mind) is put under growing pressure and finally cracks under it.** I think that **the current economic crisis has something to do with this imbalance in the field of semio-production and the field of semio-demand**. This imbalance in the relationship between the supply of semiotic goods and the socially available time of attention **is** the **core of the economic crisis as well as the core of the intellectual and the political crises that we are living through now**

Semiocapital is in a crisis of overproduction, but the form of this crisis is not only economic, but also psychopathic. **Semiocapital, in fact, is not about the production of material goods, but about the production of psychic stimulation**. **The mental environment is saturated by signs that create a sort of continuous excitation**, a permanent electrocution, **which leads the individual, as well as the collective mind, to a state of collapse**. The problem of **panic is generally connected with the management of time.** But we can also see a spatial side to panic. During the past centuries, the building of the modern urban environment used to be dependent on the rationalist plan of the political city. **The economic dictatorship of the last few decades has accelerated the urban expansion**. The interaction between cyberspatial sprawl and urban physical environment has destroyed the rational organization of city space. In the intersection of information and urban space we see the proliferation of a chaotic sprawl following no rule, no plan, dictated by the sole logic of economic interest. Urban panic is caused by the perception of this sprawl and this proliferation of metropolitan experience. Proliferation of spatial lines of flight. The metropolis is a surface of complexity in the territorial domain. **The social organism is unable to process the overwhelmingly complex experience of metropolitan chaos**. The proliferation of lines of communication has created a new kind of chaotic perception. 73 In the summer of 2001, Fury, a novel by Salman Rushdie, was published. On the cover, the Empire State building is hit by a bolt of lightning. Not long after the release of the book from the printers that cover looked like a frightful premonition. But this premonition was not just on the cover for the novel describes (or rather evokes) the psychic collapse of the western metropolis. Rushdie depicts the virtual class nervous system, intended as a social class of producers of signs as well as a class of those living a common condition of evanescence and existential fragility: cellularized splinters, fragments in a perpetual abstract recombination of connected terminals. You feel the psychopathic vibration that is amassing, after the decade of permanent electrocution, after the desire for economic investment decade. You feel anxiety growing, and the urban libidinal economy going insane. **Millions of mobile phones are calling each other, mobilizing the lipid energy postponing the contact**, the pleasure of orgasm from one side to the other of the city, **from a moment of compressed urban time to another**. The action of Rushdie’s novel develops mainly on the roofs of Manhattan skyscrapers. Scary black birds wondering about the fates of buildings announce the next collapse. Some time ago, Mike Davis mapped the urban territorial perception of Los Angeles in City of Quartz (1990), and the New York City version in Dead Cities (2003) through the rebuilding of the mythologies of fear, security and privatization policies that have a devastating effect on social space. For Davis: “**The neo-military syntax of contemporary architecture insinuates violence and averts imaginary threats. The pseudo-public spaces of today, the big malls and the executive centers, the cultural acropolis and so on are full of invisible signs to keep the underclass far away**” (Davis 1990: 226). After S11, the securitization paranoia became the main tendency in the imaginary, in the production of high technology goods, and in urban design. Again, Davis writes: The fear economy grows in the middle of an overall famine... . The low paid security guard army will grow by 50% during the decade**, while videosurveillance fed by facial recognition software will snatch what is left of privacy from the daily routine. The airports’ departure security regime will provide a model for the regulation of the urban masses, in the shopping centers, in the sporting events and elsewhere... . Security, in other words, will become an urban service completely developed like water, electricity and telecommunications.** (Davis 2003: 12-13) The city of **panic is the place where there is no longer time to get close to each other; there is no more time for caresses, for the pleasure and slowness of whispered words**. Advertising exalts and stimulates the libidinous attention, person-to-person communication multiplies the promises of encounters, but 74 these promises never get fulfilled. **Desire turns into anxiety and time contracts.**

#### ROTB: The ROTB is the course of action that best resists Semio-Capitalism.

#### Alternative: The only way to free ourselves from the world of semio-capitalism is by disengaging with the need to progress and to return to a more primitive state, unperturbed by the digitalized age. Thus, the alternative is to engage in exhaustion and leave the technological world.

**Berardi 11**, [Berardi, Franco. “After The Future”. 2011, WW]

In the activist view exhaustion is seen as the inability of the social body to escape the vicious destiny that capitalism has prepared]:[Exhaustion is the 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

**Politics, and society will always have tension, because perfect harmony is an impossibility.**

**Mouffe**, Chantal. *The democratic paradox*. verso, 2000.

Once the theoretical terrain has been delineated in such a way, we can begin formulating an alternative to both the aggregative and the deliberative model, one that I propose to call 'agonistic pluralism'.30 A first distinction is needed in order to clarify the new perspective that I am putting forward, the distinction between 'politics' and 'the political'. By 'the political', I refer to the dimension of antagonism that is inherent in human relations, antagonism that can take many forms and emerge in different types of social relations. 'Politics', on the other side, indicates the ensemble of practices, discourses and institutions which seek to establish a certain order and organize human coexistence in conditions that are always potentially conflictual because they are affected by the dimension of 'the political'. I consider that it is only when we acknowledge the dimension of 'the political' and understand that 'politics' consists in domesticating hostility and in trying to defuse the potential antagonism that exists in human relations, that we can pose what I take to be the central question for democratic politics. This question, pace the rationalists, is not how to arrive at a consensus without exclusion, since this would imply the eradication of the political. Politics aims at the creation of unity in a context of conflict and diversity; it is always concerned with the creation of an 'us' by the determination of a 'them'. The novelty of democratic politics is not the overcoming of this us/them opposition - which is an impossibility - but the different way in which it is established. The crucial issue is to establish this wIthem discrimination in a way that is compatible with pluralist democracy. Envisaged from the point of view of 'agonistic pluralism', the aim of democratic politics is to construct the 'them' in such a way that it is no longer perceived as an enemy to be destroyed. but as an 'adversary', that is. somebody whose ideas we combat but whose right to defend those ideas we do not put into question. This is the real meaning of liberal-democratic tolerance, which does not entail condoning ideas that we oppose or being indifferent to standpoints that we disagree with. but treating those who defend them as legitimate opponents. This category of the 'adversary' does not eliminate antagonism, though. and it should be distinguished from the liberal notion of the competitor with which it is sometimes identified. An adversary is an enemy. but a legitimate enemy. one with whom we have some common ground because we have a shared adhesion to the **ethico**-political principles of liberal democracy: liberty and equality. But we disagree concerning the meaning and implementation of those principles, and such a disagreement is not one that could be resolved through deliberation and rational discussion. Indeed, given the ineradicable pluralism of value. there is no rational resolution of the conflict. hence its antagonistic dimension. 3J This does not mean. of course, that adversaries can never cease to disagree, but that does not prove that antagonism has been eradicated. To accept the view of the adversary is to undergo a radical change in political identity. It is more a sort of conversion man a process of rational persuasion (in the same way as Thomas Kuhn has argued that adherence to a new scientific paradigm is a conversion). Compromises are, of course, also possible; they are part and parcel of politics; but they should be seen as temporary respites in an ongoing confrontation. Introducing the category of me 'adversary' requires complexifying the notion of antagonism and distinguishing two different forms in which it can emerge. antagonism properly speaking and agonism. Antagonism is struggle between enemies. while agonism is struggle between adversaries. We can therefore reformulate our problem by saying that envisaged from the perspective of 'agonistic pluralism' the aim of democratic politics is to transform antagonism into agonism. This requires providing channels through which collective passions will be given ways to express themselves over issues which, while allowing enough possibility for identification, will not construct the opponent as an enemy but as an adversary. An important difference with the model of 'deliberative democracy' is that for 'agonistic pluralism', the prime task of democratic politics is not to eliminate passions from the sphere of the public, in order to render a rational consensus possible, but to mobilize those passions towards democratic designs.