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#### The WTO can’t enforce the aff- causes circumvention.

Lamp 19 [Nicholas; Assistant Professor of Law at Queen’s University; “What Just Happened at the WTO? Everything You Need to Know, Brink News,” 12/16/19; <https://www.brinknews.com/what-just-happened-at-the-wto-everything-you-need-to-know/>] Justin

Nicolas Lamp: For the first time since the establishment of the WTO in 1995, the Appellate Body cannot accept any new appeals, and that has knock-on effects on the whole global trade dispute settlement system. When a member appeals a WTO panel report, it goes to the Appellate Body, but if there is no Appellate Body, it means that that panel report will not become binding and will not attain legal force.

The absence of the Appellate Body means that members can now effectively block the dispute settlement proceedings by what has been called appealing panel reports “into the void.”

The WTO panels will continue to function as normal. When a panel issues a report, it will normally be automatically adopted — unless it is appealed. And so, even though the panel is working, the respondent in a dispute now has the option of blocking the adoption of the panel’s report. It can, thereby, shield itself from the legal consequences of a report that finds that the member has acted inconsistently with its WTO obligations.

#### The plan’s reinvigoration of IP waivers opens the floodgates for regional trade agreements that counterbalance the free trade effects of the aff.
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\*RTA=Regional Trade Agreement

How do multilateral, regional, and bilateral trade liberalization efforts relate to one another? In particular, is the ‘‘Bicycle Theory’’ of trade negotiations correct, whereby these efforts must continue (as a cyclist must keep pedaling to move forward) or they will come to a halt (as a cyclist would stop, even fall off)? Competitive liberalization presumes there are three bicycles, and trade talks at the multilateral, regional, or bilateral level will spur such talks on another level, or the other two levels. But, the right metaphor for trade negotiations may be not a bicycle but a hedge. The Financial Times Guy de Jonquie`res puts the concern this way: Washington has claimed … that its use of muscular bilateral trade diplomacy will re-energize the multilateral trading system by unleashing a wave of ‘‘competitive liberalization.’’ The Doha [Round] debacle has exposed that theory for what it is. In practice, bilateralism has fed off itself, intensifying the rush into preferential deals while draining energy from the Doha talks, polarizing the US Congress and further diminishing its appetite for trade initiatives of all descriptions.7 Moreover, a reverse causal directional arrow may exist: stalled or failed talks at one level (e.g., the Doha Round) may bring out calls for talks at another level (e.g., bilateral FTAs).8 There is plenty of evidence in favor of a reverse directional arrow. Israel, for example, began pursuing FTA negotiations with MERCOSUR in December 2005, the month of the unsuccessful WTO Hong Kong Ministerial Conference, and talks continue apace.9 India boasted FTAs with Singapore, Sri Lanka, and Thailand. In light of the July 2006 collapse of Doha Round negotiations, India announced it would pursue FTAs vigorously, including with the EU and Japan. Even Chile, well disposed to unilateral trade barrier reduction, has not sat on the sidelines. It has FTAs with China and South Korea, a ‘‘Partial Scope Agreement’’ with India, and (as of June 2006) is discussing a comprehensive ‘‘Economic Association Agreement’’ with Japan. The Collective Action Problem WTO Members did not commitment themselves to ensuring regional integration compliment their Doha Round negotiations. They could have entered into an ‘‘RTA Peace Clause,’’ whereby they placed a standstill on all new FTAs and CUs until they completed the Round. Instead, they raced each other to seal RTA deals. Does this behavior suggest it would be easier for the roughly 150 WTO Members to reach consensus in a multilateral trade round if they did not have the option of joining an FTA? That is, does this option give them an exit strategy, which in turn creates a collective action problem – namely, no one Member is willing to forego the RTA option unless all other Members do, but each Member passes the responsibility to others to take the lead in exerting discipline.

#### That forces countries to protect IP beyond TRIPs standards – turns case.
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\*FTA=Free Trade Agreement

Many of America’s newer FTAs, especially accords negotiated after the Uruguay Round, call upon partner countries to go beyond IP protection and enforcement measures set out in the TRIPs Agreement. In part, that reflects America’s bitter experience with lax IP enforcement in major markets like China. US trade negotiators relied, to the detriment of the American IP sector, on promises made by China of future implementation and enforcement during talks for Chinas accession to the WTO, which culminated in a November 1999 US–China bilateral agreement, and accession effective 11 December 2001.30 The subsequent history, from the US vantage point, was one of failure to adhere to the promises. One lesson learned by US trade negotiators was to insist on results – actual implementation and enforcement – before accession. They drilled the point in WTO accession talks with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which culminated with a bilateral accord in the fall of 2005, and accession on 11 December 2005.31 A second lesson from the adverse experience with China was to use FTAs as a vehicle to go beyond the TRIPs Agreement, i.e., to demand TRIPs Plus commitments from a would-be FTA partner. Consider the following examples: In the U.S.–Jordan FTA, Jordan agreed to ratify and implement within two years two IP agreements that are not part of its TRIPs obligations: the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Copyright Treaty, and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty. The aim of these agreements, which are known as ‘‘Internet Treaties,’’ is to protect copyrighted works in a digital network environment. Thus, for example, they provide a creator with the exclusive right to make its creative works available online. The same TRIPs Plus provisions, incorporating the most up-to-date international copyright protection standards, exist in the U.S.–Morocco FTA. In the U.S.–Chile FTA and U.S.–Singapore FTA, Chile and Singapore agreed to TRIPs Plus commitments not only for patents, trademarks, and copyrights, but also for trade secrets. The two countries also accepted the obligation of ensuring its legal system contains meaningful penalties for piracy and counterfeiting. In negotiations for a U.S.–Australia FTA, the US had two key objectives concerning IP. First, it sought better IP protection, especially with respect to grey (parallel) market products. The US achieved this objective through provisions in the FTA that not only complement, but also enhance, existing international standards for both protection and enforcement of IP rights. These TRIPs Plus provisions include strong penalties for counterfeiting and piracy. Second, the US opposed the Australian pharmaceutical benefits scheme of pricing. On this point, agreement proved difficult and the end result – though TRIPs Plus – was nebulous. The two countries affirmed their shared objectives of (1) maintaining high quality healthcare and (2) improving public health standards. They agreed on three principles in pursuit of these objectives: (1) the importance of innovative pharmaceuticals, (2) the significance of research and development in the pharmaceutical industry, with appropriate governmental support including IP protection, and (3) the need for timely and affordable access to innovative pharmaceuticals through procedures that value objectively pharmaceuticals based on their therapeutic relevance. The sticking point was the procedures by which a federal health care program lists and prices new pharmaceuticals for reimbursement. Both sides agreed the procedures should demand transparency and accountability. But, how could the US be certain Australia would not discriminate against drugs from US pharmaceutical companies when listing and pricing medicines in its Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme? From Australias perspective, how could its consumers be assured they would have access to effective US drugs at non-astronomical prices? The FTA establishes a Medicines Working Group to continue the conversation between the two countries on pharmaceutical issues, and creates in Australia an independent review process for listing decisions. The conversation indeed continues on this and other controversies. For example, when approving the FTA, the Australian Parliament added an ‘‘Anti-Evergreening’’ amendment to Australian law.32 This change blocks a pharmaceutical company from evergreening a patent or using the judicial process to preclude introduction of a generic medicine. The US opposes the amendment. In June 2006, NGOs – 416 of them, including the AFL-CIO, Citizens Trade Campaign, Communications Workers of America, Friends of the Earth, National Farmers Union, Sierra Club, and United Steel Workers – signed a letter urging Congress to reject the U.S.–Oman FTA (which Congress ultimately passed that summer.) They argued the accord not only lacked meaningful labor and environmental protections, but also would hurt poor and sick Omanis. The FTA IP provisions benefited large pharmaceutical companies by protecting their ‘‘unprecedented monopoly rights’’ of large pharmaceutical companies, forbidding for extended periods competition from generic products, and limiting access to affordable medicines.33 In the U.S.–Colombia FTA, signed in February 2006, but not implemented as of November 2006, Colombia agreed to join the WTO Information Technology Agreement (ITA).34 The ITA, an outgrowth of the Uruguay Round, lists a large number of computer and computer-related products subject to duty-free, quota-free treatment. However, it is a plurilateral accord, hence joining is required neither by TRIPs nor any other WTO accord. In January 2006, the US and Thailand were engaged in FTA negotiations, which commenced in June 2004. US insistence on TRIPs Plus IP commitments contributed to large-scale protests in Chiang Mai, Thailand, against an FTA, and brought talks to a halt.35 Four specific TRIPs Plus controversies arose:36 (1) The US insisted on 25-year span for patent protection, beyond the TRIPs Agreement norm of 20 years. (2) The US called for compensatory patent extensions by the Thai government to pharmaceutical companies, if the government ‘‘unreasonably’’ delayed either the grant of a drug patent, or approval of a drug for market use. The TRIPs Agreement does not contain this mandate. (3) The US sought a data exclusivity provision not found in the TRIPS Agreement. This provision would preclude manufacturers of generic drugs (which, of course, tended to be Thai companies) from using clinical trial data, or other scientific information, from any other company (e.g., an American pharmaceutical giant), to prove its generic product was safe and effective after the product had entered the market. Thailands Government Pharmaceutical Organization (GPO) objected. The GPO provides ‘‘first line’’ anti-retroviral medicines (i.e., older ones, some of which the patent had lapsed) to 80,000 AIDS patients (as of 2006), and sought to expand this program to 150,000 patients (by 2008). The GPO planned to offer generic ‘‘second line’’ drugs (i.e., newer, more sophisticated medicines still subject to a patent). Data exclusivity would inhibit its ability to do so. Further, data exclusivity would apply even to an unpatented drug, where no patent had been sought because the market for the drug was thought to be too small. (4) The US required tight language that would limit the terms and conditions under which the GPO could effect a compulsory license of a new drug. The US offered a side letter assurance that the language would be consistent with the November 2001 Doha Ministerial Conference Declaration on TRIPs and Public Health. Again, the GPO replied the language would adversely affect its ability to provide drugs to Thai AIDS patients. Thousands of Thai health care workers, AIDS victims, and activists – fearful of high-priced medicines should their government ‘‘cave’’ to the demands, demonstrated noisily, but peacefully (in front of the Sheraton Chiang Mai!) for about two days. Farmers, who were upset at US demands concerning agricultural trade (e.g., that Thailand reduce rice tariff barriers), joined them. The US team left the Sheraton as inconspicuously as possible, through a side door behind the concierge desk, into an unmarked van, and down a side street. The USTR blamed the ensuing stall in negotiations on Thai political unrest.37 Not surprisingly, some international trade law scholars offer persuasive arguments for the proposition that ‘‘TRIPs Plus’’ is ‘‘TRIPs Minus’’ for poor countries. For example, Dr Mohammed El-Said of the University of Central Lancashire cogently argues TRIPs Plus commitments in deals like the U.S.–Jordan and U.S.–Bahrain FTA end up doing greater harm than good to the US partners, hence rendering those countries worse off than under WTO disciplines.38 This line of argumentation would appear to be consistent with the competitive imperialism paradigm. In that paradigm, major trading powers race against one another to get the best possible deal for themselves. They neither intend to, nor hope to see, the IP provisions in their FTA and CU deals multilateralized. Obviously, if their provisions become WTO law, then their benefits no longer are specially tailored. All WTO Members, consisting of a not inconsiderable number of free riders (from the American or European perspective, at least), would enjoy whatever benefits they can realize for whatever IP industry they have.
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#### CP text: The member nations of the WTO should:

#### ---Loan an additional 4 billion dollars of additional funding to close the pre-purchase gap of 350 million vaccines to achieve world-wide immunity

#### ---The World Bank should relax the conditions to receive a loan as per Goldberg 21

#### ---Eliminate export restriction on critical medicines during pandemics.

#### The CP solves pandemics better – the aff misidentifies the problem.

Goldberg 20 [PINELOPI KOUJIANOU; Former World Bank Group chief economist and editor-in-chief of the American Economic Review, Professor of Economics at Yale University; “Forget the Vaccine Patent Waiver,” Project Syndicate; 5/13/21; <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/wto-vaccine-waiver-is-beside-the-point-by-pinelopi-koujianou-goldberg-2021-05>] Justin

What’s the issue, then? According to Agarwal and Reed, it is that companies are reluctant to activate their existing production capacity without pre-purchase commitments. There is currently a large gap between the number of doses that could be produced and the number that have been pre-ordered. And, as one would expect, this gap is unevenly distributed. High-income countries have ordered more doses than they need and thus will end up with a surplus, whereas lower-income countries are far behind in pre-purchasing vaccines.

Under these circumstances, efforts to increase capacity by relaxing patent protections would do nothing to accelerate vaccinations in lower-income countries. A far more promising strategy is to help lower-income countries purchase vaccines, while channeling surplus doses from richer countries to wherever they are needed most.

To a large extent, this strategy is already being implemented, thanks to the efforts of the COVAX Advanced Market Commitment facility, together with concessional loans by multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, and regional initiatives such as the one being led by the African Union. Remarkably, Agarwal and Reed show that the COVAX AMC facility and the AU initiative already have ensured that most African countries have ordered enough vaccines to cover at least 50% of their populations.

Still, three critical challenges remain. First, closing the pre-purchase gap of 350 million vaccines will requires an additional $4 billion – a trivial cost relative to the potential benefit of achieving worldwide immunity. Providing this support, either through additional funding for the COVAX AMC facility or by sending surplus vaccines to developing countries as soon as possible, should not be too difficult or costly for high-income countries to manage.

Second, the World Bank needs to relax its conditions for extending loans for vaccine pre-purchases. Currently, such loans can be used only for vaccines approved by three stringent regulatory authorities (SRAs) in three different regions. Among these are Japan and certain Western countries, which naturally prioritize approval of vaccines intended for their own populations. They have little incentive to grant emergency-use authorization to alternative vaccines that have shown high efficacy in Phase 3 clinical trials, such as Bharat Biotech’s Covaxin (India), and Gamaleya’s Sputnik V (Russia), and Sinovac Biotech’s CoronaVac (China). Extending the list of national regulators classified as SRAs would go a long way toward increasing lending for vaccine purchases.1

Finally, existing vaccine manufacturers will be unable to meet their production targets if vaccine nationalism gives rise to export restrictions on critical inputs and raw materials. We saw such behavior early in the pandemic with respect to personal protective equipment, but the resulting export restrictions proved short-lived. One hopes the same will be true for vaccines. International cooperation and coordination will be crucial in the coming months.

There are many ways for advanced economies to assist poorer countries in vaccinating their populations as soon as possible. But relaxing patent protections – however appealing the idea may be in other contexts – is not one of them. The focus should be on providing additional funding and less restrictive lending for pre-ordering vaccines, and on funneling surpluses from high-income countries to the rest of the world.

#### Solves legitimacy as well – 1AC Meyer says that if public perception is that WTO is solving COVID, it shores up legitimacy
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#### The question of this debate is our orientation toward the world. Their conception of death as a biological end to life denies the value of death as subjective transformation. The result is the securitization against death from which social control is made possible and life is reduced to a capitalist prolongation and prohibition of death.

Robinson ‘12. (Andrew Robinson, political theorist and activist based in the UK, “An A to Z of Theory | Jean Baudrillard: The Rise of Capitalism & the Exclusion of Death” Ceasefire Magazine, March 30, 2012, <https://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-baudrillard-2/>) ABatt

The passage to capitalism: **Symbolic exchange – or rather, its suppression – plays a central role in** the emergence of **capitalism**. Baudrillard sees a change happening over time. Regimes based on **symbolic exchange** (differences are exchangeable and related) are **replaced by** regimes based on **equivalence (**everything is, or means, the same). Ceremony gives way to spectacle, immanence to transcendence. Baudrillard’s view of capitalism is derived from Marx’s analysis of value. Baudrillard accepts Marx’s view that capitalism is based on a general equivalent. Money is the general equivalent because it can be exchanged for any commodity. In turn, it expresses the value of abstract labour-time. Abstract labour-time is itself an effect of the regimenting of processes of life, so that different kinds of labour can be compared. Capitalism is derived from the autonomisation or separation of economics from the rest of life. It turns economics into the ‘reality-principle’. It is a kind of sorcery, connected in some way to the disavowed symbolic level. It subtly shifts the social world from an exchange of death with the Other to **an eternal return of the Same.** Capitalism functions by reducing everything to a regime based on value and the production of value. To be accepted by capital, something must contribute value. This creates an immense regime of social exchange. However, this social exchange has little in common with symbolic exchange. It ultimately depends on the mark of value itself being unexchangeable. Capital must be endlessly accumulated. States must not collapse. Capitalism thus introduces the irreversible into social life, by means of accumulation. According to Baudrillard, **capitalism rests on an obsession with the abolition of death**. Capitalism tries to abolish death **through accumulation**. It **tries to ward off ambivalence (associated with death) through value (associated with life. But this is bound to fail. General equivalence – the basis of capitalism – is itself the ever-presence of death. The more the system runs from death, the more it places everyone in solitude, facing their own death. Life itself is fundamentally ambivalent**. **The attempt to abolish death through fixed value is itself deathly.** Accumulation also spreads to other fields. **The idea of progress, and linear time**, comes from **the accumulation of time**, and of stockpiles of the past. The idea of truth comes from the accumulation of scientific knowledge. Biology rests on the separation of living and non-living. According to Baudrillard, such accumulations are now in crisis. For instance, the accumulation of the past is undermined, because historical objects now have to be concealed to be preserved – otherwise they will be destroyed by excessive consumption. Value is produced from the residue or remainder of an incomplete symbolic exchange. The repressed, market value, and sign-value all come from this remainder. To destroy the remainder would be to destroy value. Capitalist exchange is always based on negotiation, even when it is violent. The symbolic order does not know this kind of equivalential exchange or calculation. And capitalist extraction is always one-way. It amounts to a non-reversible aggression in which one act (of dominating or killing) cannot be returned by the other. It is also this regime which produces scarcity – Baudrillard here endorses Sahlins’ argument. Capitalism produces the Freudian “death drive”, which is actually an effect of the capitalist culture of death. For Baudrillard, the limit to both Marx and Freud is that they fail to theorise the separation of the domains they study – the economy and the unconscious. It is the separation which grounds their functioning, which therefore only occurs under the regime of the code. Baudrillard also criticises theories of desire, including those of Deleuze, Foucault, Freud and Lacan. He believes desire comes into existence based on repression. It is an effect of the denial of the symbolic. Liberated energies always leave a new remainder; they do not escape the basis of the unconscious in the remainder. Baudrillard argues that indigenous groups do not claim to live naturally or by their desires – they simply claim to live in societies. This social life is an effect of the symbolic. Baudrillard therefore criticises the view that human liberation can come about through the liberation of desire. He thinks that such a liberation will keep certain elements of the repression of desire active. Baudrillard argues that the processes which operate collectively in indigenous groups are repressed into the unconscious in metropolitan societies. This leads to the autonomy of the psyche as a separate sphere. It is only after this repression has occurred that a politics of desire becomes conceivable. He professes broad agreement with the Deleuzian project of unbinding energies from fixed categories and encouraging flows and intensities. However, he is concerned that capitalism can recuperate such releases of energy, disconnecting them so they can eventually reconnect to it. Unbinding and drifting are not fatal to capitalism, because capitalism itself unbinds things, and re-binds things which are unbound. What is fatal to it is, rather, reversibility. Capitalism continues to be haunted by the forces it has repressed. Separation does not destroy the remainder. Quite the opposite. The remainder continues to exist, and gains power from its repression. This turns the double or shadow into something unquiet, vampiric, and threatening. It becomes an image of the forgotten dead. Anything which reminds us of the repressed aspects excluded from the subject is experienced as uncanny and threatening. It becomes the ‘obscene’, which is present in excess over the ‘scene’ of what is imagined. This is different from theories of lack, such as the Lacanian Real. Baudrillard’s remainder is an excess rather than a lack. It is the carrier of the force of symbolic exchange. Modern culture dreams of radical difference. The reason for this is that it exterminated radical difference by simulating it. The energy of production, the unconscious, and signification all in fact come from the repressed remainder. Our culture is dead from having broken the pact with monstrosity, with radical difference. The West continues to perpetrate genocide on indigenous groups. But for Baudrillard, it did the same thing to itself first – destroying its own indigenous logics of symbolic exchange. **Indigenous groups have also increasingly lost the symbolic dimension, as modern forms of life have been imported or imposed. This** according to Baudrillard **produces chronic confusion and instability. Gift-exchange is radically subversive** of the system. This is not because it is rebellious. Baudrillard thinks the system can survive defections or exodus. It is **because it counterposes a different ‘principle of sociality**’ to that of the dominant system. According to Baudrillard, the mediations of capitalism exist so that nobody has the opportunity to offer a symbolic challenge or an irreversible gift. They exist to keep the symbolic at bay. The affective charge of death remains present among the oppressed, but not with the ‘properly symbolic rhythm’ of immediate retaliation. The Church and State also exist based on the elimination of symbolic exchange. Baudrillard is highly critical of Christianity for what he takes to be a cult of suffering, solitude and death. He sees the Church as central to the destruction of earlier forms of community based on symbolic exchange. Baudrillard seems to think that earlier forms of the state and capitalism retained some degree of symbolic exchange, but in an alienated, partially repressed form. For instance, the imaginary of the ‘social contract’ was based on the idea of a sacrifice – this time of liberty for the common good. In psychoanalysis, symbolic exchange is displaced onto the relationship to the master-signifier. I haven’t seen Baudrillard say it directly, but the impression he gives is that this is a distorted, authoritarian imitation of the original symbolic exchange. Nonetheless, it retains some of its intensity and energy. Art, theatre and language have worked to maintain a minimum of ceremonial power. It is the reason older orders did not suffer the particular malaise of the present. It is easy to read certain passages in Baudrillard as if he is bemoaning the loss of these kinds of strong significations. This is initially how I read Baudrillard’s work. But on closer inspection, this seems to be a misreading. Baudrillard is nostalgic for repression only to the extent that the repressed continued to carry symbolic force as a referential. He is nostalgic for the return of symbolic exchange, as an aspect of diffuse, autonomous, dis-alienated social groups. Death: Death plays a central role in Baudrillard’s theory, and is closely related to symbolic exchange. According to Baudrillard, what we have lost above all in the transition to alienated society is the ability to engage in exchanges with death. Death should not be seen here in purely literal terms. Baudrillard specifies early on that he does not mean an event affecting a body, but rather, a form which destroys the determinacy of the subject and of value – which returns things to a state of indeterminacy. Baudrillard certainly discusses actual deaths, risk-taking, suicide and so on. But he also sees death figuratively, in relation to the decomposition of existing relations, the “death” of the self-image or ego, the interchangeability of processes of life across different categories. For instance, eroticism or sexuality is related to death, because it leads to fusion and communication between bodies. Sexual reproduction carries shades of death because one generation replaces another. Baudrillard’s concept of death is thus quite similar to Bakhtin’s concept of the grotesque. Death refers to metamorphosis, reversibility, unexpected mutations, social change, subjective transformation, as well as physical death. According to Baudrillard, indigenous groups see death as social, not natural or biological. They see it as an effect of an adversarial will, which they must absorb. And they mark it with feasting and rituals. This is a way of preventing death from becoming an event which does not signify. Such a non-signifying event is absolute disorder from the standpoint of symbolic exchange. For Baudrillard, the west’s idea of a biological, material death is actually an idealist illusion, ignoring the sociality of death. Poststructuralists generally maintain that the problems of the present are rooted in the splitting of life into binary oppositions. For Baudrillard, the division between life and death is the original, founding opposition on which the others are founded. After this first split, a whole series of others have been created, confining particular groups – the “mad”, prisoners, children, the old, sexual minorities, women and so on – to particular segregated situations. The definition of the ‘normal human’ has been narrowed over time. Today, nearly everyone belongs to one or another marked or deviant category. The original exclusion was of the dead – it is defined as abnormal to be dead. “You livies hate us deadies”. This first split and exclusion forms the basis, or archetype, for all the other splits and exclusions – along lines of gender, disability, species, class, and so on. This discrimination against the dead brings into being the modern experience of death.

#### The affirmatives attempt at subjectivity-based change is complicit in the overproduction of meaning – the amassing of facts and evidence – and especially truth – only make the world more unreal. Thus, the role of the ballot is to decide the ethicality of debate's communicative form, which is prior to all of the content based arguments they've made.

**Baudrillard 81** (Jean, “*Simulacra and Simulations*,” pg. 79-81)

We live in a world where there is more and more information, and less and less meaning. Consider three hypotheses. Either information produces meaning (a negentropic factor), but cannot make up for the brutal loss of signification in every domain. Despite efforts to reinject message and content, meaning is lost and devoured faster than it can be reinjected. In this case, one must appeal to a base productivity to replace failing media. This is the whole ideology of free speech, of media broken down into innumerable individual cells of transmission, that is, into "antimedia" (pirate radio, etc.). Or information has nothing to do with signification. It is something else, an operational model of another order, outside meaning and of the circulation of meaning strictly speaking. This is Shannon's hypothesis: a sphere of information that is purely functional, a technical medium that does not imply any finality of meaning, and thus should also not be implicated in a value judgment. A kind of code, like the genetic code: it is what it is, it functions as it does, meaning is something else that in a sense comes after the fact, as it does for Monod in Chance and Necessity. In this case, there would simply be no significant relation between the inflation of information and the deflation of meaning. Or, very much on the contrary, there is a rigorous and necessary correlation between the two, to the extent that information is directly destructive of meaning and signification, or that it neutralizes them. The loss of meaning is directly linked to the dissolving, dissuasive action of information, the media, and the mass media. The third hypothesis is the most interesting but flies in the face of every commonly held opinion. Everywhere socialization is measured by the exposure to media messages. Whoever is underexposed to the media is desocialized or virtually asocial. Everywhere information is thought to produce an accelerated circulation of meaning, a plus value of meaning homologous to the economic one that results from the accelerated rotation of capital. Information is thought to create communication, and even if the waste is enormous, a general consensus would have it that nevertheless, as a whole, there be an excess of meaning, which is redistributed in all the interstices of the social just as consensus would have it that material production, despite its dysfunctions and irrationalities, opens onto an excess of wealth and social purpose. We are all complicitous in this myth. It is the alpha and omega of our modernity, without which the credibility of our social organization would collapse. Well, the fact is that it is collapsing, and for this very reason: because where we think that information produces meaning, the opposite occurs. **Information devours its own content. It devours communication and the social**. And for two reasons. 1. Rather than creating communication, it exhausts itself in the act of staging communication. Rather than producing meaning, it exhausts itself in the staging of meaning. A gigantic process of simulation that is very familiar. The nondirective interview, speech, listeners who call in, participation at every level, **blackmail through speech: "You are concerned, you are the event**, etc." More and more information is invaded by this kind of phantom content, this homeopathic grafting, this awakening dream of communication. A circular arrangement through which one stages the desire of the audience, the antitheater of communication, which, as one knows, is never anything but the recycling in the negative of the traditional institution, the integrated circuit of the negative. Immense energies are deployed to hold this simulacrum at bay, to avoid the brutal desimulation that would confront us in the face of the obvious reality of a radical loss of meaning. It is useless to ask if it is the loss of communication that produces this escalation in the simulacrum, or whether it is the simulacrum that is there first for dissuasive ends, to short-circuit in advance any possibility of communication (precession of the model that calls an end to the real). Useless to ask which is the first term, there is none, it is a circular process that of simulation, that of the hyperreal. The hyperreality of communication and of meaning. More real than the real, that is how the real is abolished. Thus not only communication but the social functions in a closed circuit, as a lure to which the force of myth is attached. Belief, faith in information attach themselves to this tautological proof that the system gives of itself by doubling the signs of an unlocatable reality. But one can believe that this belief is as ambiguous as that which was attached to myths in ancient societies. One both believes and doesn't. One does not ask oneself, "I know very well, but still." A sort of inverse simulation in the masses, in each one of us, corresponds to this simulation of meaning and of communication in which this system encloses us. To this tautology of the system the masses respond with ambivalence, to deterrence they respond with disaffection, or with an always enigmatic belief. Myth exists, but one must guard against thinking that people believe in it: this is the trap of critical thinking that can only be exercised if it presupposes the naivete and stupidity of the masses. 2. Behind this exacerbated mise-en-scène of communication, the mass media, the pressure of information pursues an irresistible destructuration of the social. Thus information dissolves meaning and dissolves the social, in a sort of nebulous state dedicated not to a surplus of innovation, but, on the contrary, to total entropy.\*1 Thus the media are producers not of socialization, but of exactly the opposite, of the implosion of the social in the masses. And this is only the macroscopic extension of the implosion of meaning at the microscopic level of the sign. This implosion should be analyzed according to McLuhan's formula, the medium is the message, the consequences of which have yet to be exhausted. That means that all contents of meaning are absorbed in the only dominant form of the medium. Only the medium can make an event whatever the contents, whether they are conformist or subversive. A serious problem for all counterinformation, pirate radios, antimedia, etc. But there is something even more serious, which McLuhan himself did not see. Because beyond this neutralization of all content, one could still expect to manipulate the medium in its form and to transform the real by using the impact of the medium as form. If all the content is wiped out, there is perhaps still a subversive, revolutionary use value of the medium as such. That is and this is where McLuhan's formula leads, pushed to its limit there is not only an implosion of the message in the medium, there is, in the same movement, the implosion of the medium itself in the real, the implosion of the medium and of the real in a sort of hyperreal nebula, in which even the definition and distinct action of the medium can no longer be determined. Even the "traditional" status of the media themselves, characteristic of modernity, is put in question. McLuhan's formula, the medium is the message, which is the key formula of the era of simulation (the medium is the message the sender is the receiver the circularity of all poles the end of panoptic and perspectival space such is the alpha and omega of our modernity), this very formula must be imagined at its limit where, after all the contents and messages have been volatilized in the medium, it is the medium itself that is volatilized as such. Fundamentally, it is still the message that lends credibility to the medium, that gives the medium its determined, distinct status as the intermediary of communication. Without a message, the medium also falls into the indefinite state characteristic of all our great systems of judgment and value. A single model, whose efficacy is immediate, simultaneously generates the message, the medium, and the "real." Finally, the medium is the message not only signifies the end of the message, but also the end of the medium. There are no more media in the literal sense of the word (I'm speaking particularly of electronic mass media) that is, of a mediating power between one reality and another, between one state of the real and another. Neither in content, nor in form. Strictly, this is what implosion signifies. The absorption of one pole into another, the short-circuiting between poles of every differential system of meaning, the erasure of distinct terms and oppositions, including that of the medium and of the real thus the impossibility of any mediation, of any dialectical intervention between the two or from one to the other. Circularity of all media effects. Hence the impossibility of meaning in the literal sense of a unilateral vector that goes from one pole to another. One must envisage this critical but original situation at its very limit: it is the only one left us. It is useless to dream of revolution through content, useless to dream of a revelation through form, because the medium and the real are now in a single nebula whose truth is indecipherable. The fact of this implosion of contents, of the absorption of meaning, of the evanescence of the medium itself, of the reabsorption of every dialectic of communication in a total circularity of the model, of the implosion of the social in the masses, may seem catastrophic and desperate. But this is only the case in light of the idealism that dominates our whole view of information. We all live by a passionate idealism of meaning and of communication, by an idealism of communication through meaning, and, from this perspective, it is truly the catastrophe of meaning that lies in wait for us. But one must realize that "catastrophe" has this "catastrophic" meaning of end and annihilation only in relation to a linear vision of accumulation, of productive finality, imposed on us by the system. Etymologically, the term itself only signifies the curvature, the winding down to the bottom of a cycle that leads to what one could call the "horizon of the event," to an impassable horizon of meaning: beyond that nothing takes place that has meaning for us but it suffices to get out of this ultimatum of meaning in order for the catastrophe itself to no longer seem like a final and nihilistic day of reckoning, such as it functions in our contemporary imaginary. Beyond meaning, there is the fascination that results from the neutralization and the implosion of meaning. Beyond the horizon of the social, there are the masses, which result from the neutralization and the implosion of the social. What is essential today is to evaluate this double challenge the challenge of the masses to meaning and their silence (which is not at all a passive resistance) the challenge to meaning that comes from the media and its fascination. All the marginal, alternative efforts to revive meaning are secondary in relation to that challenge. Evidently, there is a paradox in this inextricable conjunction of the masses and the media: do the media neutralize meaning and produce unformed [informe] or informed [informée] masses, or is it the masses who victoriously resist the media by directing or absorbing all the messages that the media produce without responding to them? Sometime ago, in "Requiem for the Media," I analyzed and condemned the media as the institution of an irreversible model of communication without a response. But today? This absence of a response can no longer be understood at all as a strategy of power, but as a counterstrategy of the masses themselves when they encounter power. What then? Are the mass media on the side of power in the manipulation of the masses, or are they on the side of the masses in the liquidation of meaning, in the violence perpetrated on meaning, and in fascination? Is it the media that induce fascination in the masses, or is it the masses who direct the media into the spectacle? Mogadishu-Stammheim: the media make themselves into the vehicle of the moral condemnation of terrorism and of the exploitation of fear for political ends, but simultaneously, in the most complete ambiguity, they propagate the brutal charm of the terrorist act, they are themselves terrorists, insofar as they themselves march to the tune of seduction (cf. Umberto Eco on this eternal moral dilemma: how can one not speak of terrorism, how can one find a good use of the media there is none). The media carry meaning and countermeaning, they manipulate in all directions at once, nothing can control this process, they are the vehicle for the simulation internal to the system and the simulation that destroys the system, according to an absolutely Mobian and circular logic and it is exactly like this. There is no alternative to this, no logical resolution. Only a logical exacerbation and a catastrophic resolution. With one caution. We are face to face with this system in a double situation and insoluble double bind exactly like children faced with the demands of the adult world. Children are simultaneously required to constitute themselves as autonomous subjects, responsible, free and conscious, and to constitute themselves as submissive, inert, obedient, conforming objects. The child resists on all levels, and to a contradictory demand he responds with a double strategy. To the demand of being an object, he opposes all the practices of disobedience, of revolt, of emancipation; in short, a total claim to subjecthood. To the demand of being a subject he opposes, just as obstinately and efficaciously, an object's resistance, that is to say, exactly the opposite: childishness, hyperconformism, total dependence, passivity, idiocy. Neither strategy has more objective value than the other. The subject-resistance is today unilaterally valorized and viewed as positive just as in the political sphere only the practices of freedom, emancipation, expression, and the constitution of a political subject are seen as valuable and subversive. But this is to ignore the equal, and without a doubt superior, impact of all the object practices, of the renunciation of the subject position and of meaning precisely the practices of the masses that we bury under the derisory terms of alienation and passivity. The liberating practices respond to one of the aspects of the system, to the constant ultimatum we are given to constitute ourselves as pure objects, but they do not respond at all to the other demand, that of constituting ourselves as subjects, of liberating ourselves, expressing ourselves at whatever cost, of voting, producing, deciding, speaking, participating, playing the game a form of blackmail and ultimatum just as serious as the other, even more serious today. To a system whose argument is oppression and repression, the strategic resistance is the liberating claim of subjecthood. But this strategy is more reflective of the earlier phase of the system, and even if we are still confronted with it, **it is no longer the strategic terrain: the current argument of the system is to maximize speech**, the maximum production of meaning. **Thus the strategic resistance is that of the refusal of meaning** and of the spoken word or of the hyperconformist simulation of the very mechanisms of the system, which is a form of refusal and of non-reception. It is the strategy of the masses: it is equivalent to returning to the system its own logic by doubling it, to reflecting meaning, like a mirror, without absorbing it. This strategy (if one can still speak of strategy) prevails today, because it was ushered in by that phase of the system which prevails. To choose the wrong strategy is a serious matter. All the movements that only play on liberation, emancipation, on the resurrection of a subject of history, of the group, of the word based on "**consciousness raising**," indeed a "raising of the unconscious" of subjects and of the masses, do not see that they are going in the direction of the system, whose imperative today is precisely the overproduction and regeneration of meaning and of speech.

#### The world has lost the will for positive action and now all that is left in the power of the masses is negation – our alternative is the strategy of the masses.

**Baudrillard ’93.** Baudrillard, Jean. “The Transparency of Evil: Essays on Extreme Phenomena.” 1993 / djb

In Simmel's words, 'Negation is the simplest thing imaginable. That is why the broad masses, whose component elements cannot achieve agreement as to goals, come together here.' It is useless to expect a positive opinion or a critical will from the masses, for they have none: all they have is an undifferentiated power, the power to reject. Their strength flows solely from what they are able to expel, to negate - and that is, first and foremost, any project that goes beyond them, any class or understanding that transcends them. There is something here of a philosophy of cunning born of the most brutal experience - the experience of animals, or of peasants: 'They won't put that over on us again, we won't fall for their calls to sacrifice, or listen to their pie in the sky.' Profound disgust for the political order - though one that may well coexist with specific political opinions. Disgust for the pretension and transcendence of power, for the inevitability and abomination of the political sphere. Where once there were political passions, we now find only the violence peculiar to a fundamental disgust with everything political. Power itself is founded largely on disgust. The whole of advertising, the whole of political discourse, is a public insult to the intelligence, to reason - but an insult in which we collaborate, abjectly subscribing to a silent interaction. The day of hidden persuasion is over: those who govern us now resort unapologetically to arm-twisting pure and simple. The prototype here was a banker got up like a vampire, saying, 'I am after you for your money'. A decade has already gone by since this kind of obscenity was introduced, with the government's blessing, into our social mores. At the time we thought the ad feeble because of its aggressive vulgarity. In point of fact it was a prophetic commercial, full of intimations of the future shape of social relationships, because it operated, precisely, in terms of disgust, avidity and rape. The same goes for pornographic and food advertising, which are also powered by shamelessness and lust, by a strategic logic of violation and anxiety. Nowadays you can seduce a woman with the words, 'I am interested in your cunt'. The same kind of crassness has triumphed in the realm of art, whose mounds of trivia may be reduced to a single pronouncement of the type, 'What we want from you is stupidity and bad taste'. And the

### t-vaccines-not-medicine

#### Interp – “medicines” treat or cure, whereas vaccines prevent – o/w on specificity since it’s about the COVID vaccine

Vecchio 7/22 (Christopher Vecchio, [CFA, Senior Strategist,], 7-22-2021, “Delta Variant Concerns Won't Cripple Markets, US Economy“, DailyFX, accessed: 8-9-2021, https://www.dailyfx.com/forex/video/daily\_news\_report/2021/07/22/market-minutes-delta-variant-concerns-wont-cripple-markets-us-economy.html) ajs

Let’s stick to the facts. The COVID-19 vaccines are not medicines, which by definition “treat or cure diseases.” Vaccines “help prevent diseases,” an important distinction. Why does this matter? Because data coming out of some of the world’s developed economies with high adult vaccination rates suggest that the vaccines are working as intended: tail-risks have been reduced, with hospitalizations and deaths falling relative to the recent spike in infections (which have been occurring primarily among the unvaccinated at this point). Put another way, vaccines are like a Kevlar vest for the immune system; while they don’t make you bulletproof, they dramatically increase the odds of surviving an adverse event.

#### Violation –they only provide evidence about vaccines

#### Negate –

#### 1] Limits – expanding the topic to preventative treatment or medical interventions allows anything from surgery to medical devices to education strategies or mosquito repellent to prevent malaria. Destroys core generics like innovation which are exclusive to disease curing – core of the topic is about proprietary information.

#### Voters:

#### Drop the debater – they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to,

#### Use competing interps reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter,

#### No RVIs –illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance,

#### Evaluate T before 1AR theory – norms – we only have a couple months to set T norms but can set 1AR theory norms anytime,