## 1

#### Interpretation: the affirmative debater must not specify which member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines

#### Violation: They only defend specific states in the doc, but the WTO has 164 members

https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/tif\_e/org6\_e.htm

#### Standards:

#### 1] Pecision – “The” indicates reference to a noun as a whole

Webster’s 5 (Merriam Webster’s Online Dictionary, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary)

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole

#### Anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words from the resolution

#### which means it kills the strongest link to pragmatics.

#### Semantics first – A] key to predictability since the res is the only stable stasis

#### point for pre round prep, B] the only brightline for affs is topical or not and

#### their model allows affs to be completely non-T which judges can’t vote on due

#### to jurisdictional boundaries C] pragmatics collapses to semantics cuz our interp

#### of the res is based on the textbook definition D] jurisdiction – the judge only has the jurisdiction to vote on whether the topic was affirmed or not – means that they cannot vote aff because there literally was no aff

#### 2] Limits and Ground – Their model allows them to defend any of 164 states

#### and their INFINITE permutations. Kills neg prep and debatability since there are

#### no DAs that apply to every aff, e.g. the effects of IP protections in the US differ

#### from those in India - unlimited topics incentivize obscure affs that negs won’t

#### have prep on. Generics don’t work since each has its own political situation and

#### the aff will always be ahead. Leads to random state of the week affs which

#### destroys reciprocal prep burden.

#### 3] TVA Solves – read the aff as an advantage and defend whole res. PICs don’t

#### matter cuz they have built in asymmetry solvency deficits.

#### Voters

#### 1] fairness is a voter- debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for

#### objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate –

#### all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to

#### be justified.

#### 2] Drop the debater –deter future abuse and set better norms for debate.

#### 3] Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge

#### intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where

#### we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### 4] No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of

#### being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other

#### argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to

#### maximally abusive practicesVoters

#### 1] fairness is a voter- debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### 2] Drop the debater –deter future abuse and set better norms for debate.

#### 3] Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### 4] No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 2

#### Semiotic transmissions accelerate through the subject in a world dominated by the info-sphere. In this new world, we become the subway worker – overwhelmed by information proliferation which results in exhaustion and apathy. Thus the ROTB is to vote for the debater who better rejects semiocapitalism. Berardi:

[Franco “Bifo” Berardi, 08-23-2011, Edited by Gary Genosko and Nicholas Thoburn Translated by Arianna Bove, Melinda Cooper, Erik Empson, Enrico, Giuseppina Mecchia, and Tiziana Terranova, “After the Future”] shs bs

Let us think of the crowd of people sitting in the subway every morning. They are precarious workers moving towards the industrial and financial districts of the city, towards the places where they are working in precarious conditions. Everyone wears headphones, everybody looks at their cellular device, everybody sits alone and silent, never looking at the people who sit close, never speaking or smiling or exchanging any kind of signal. They are traveling alone in their lonely relationship with the universal electronic flow. Their cognitive and affective formation has made of them the perfect object of a process of de-singularization. They have been pre-emptied and transformed into carriers of abstract fractal ability to connect, devoid of sensitive empathy so to become smooth, compatible parts of a system of interoperability. Although they suffer from nervous aggression, and from the exploitation that semiocapitalism is imposing on them, although they suffer from the separation between functional being and sensible body and mind, they seem incapable of human communication and solidarity; in short, they seem unable to start any process of conscious collective subjectivation. The info-sphere is the dimension of intentional signs surrounding the sensible organism. Sensibility is an interface between organism and world, and particularly we may see it as the ability to understand the meaning of what cannot be said through words: the point of connection between sensitivity and language. Sensibility rather than judgment is the place of the mental mutation produced by the info-sphere. Changes of perception are intertwined with the technological architecture surrounding the perceptive organism. Prior to modernity, a regime of slow transmission characterized the info-sphere and man’s psychic time and expectations of events and signals. The acceleration of semiotic transmission and the proliferation of sources of information 102 transformed the perception of living time. The info-sphere became more rapid and dense, and sensibility underwent a process of increasing exposure to the flow of info-stimuli. Due to an intensification of electronic signals, sensibility was dragged into a vertigo of simulated stimulation that increased its speed to panic levels. The perception of the other and its body is reshaped, too. Pressure, acceleration and automation affect gestural, postural behavior and the whole of social proxemics, the disposition and interaction of bodies in space. At the foundation of social proxemics lies a way of elaborating, hiding, exciting or repressing eroticism. Social proxemics intervene to change the disposition of the bodies that meet in the street and are nearby in the office or at school. Societies experience conditions of varying degrees of tension and aggressiveness also according to how they develop eroticism in the circulation of bodies. Throughout the history of civilization, perception has been molded by artificial regimes of images and techniques of representation. Through digital technology the image begins to proliferate vertiginously and our faculty of imagination undergoes vortices of acceleration. The image should not be considered as the brute perception of empirical data brought to our visual attention by matter: it is rather the effect of a semi-conscious elaboration. The technical mode in which we receive and elaborate images acts upon the formation of the imaginary. The imaginary in turn shapes the imagination, the activity whereby we produce images, and imagine worlds and thus make them possible in real life. The repertoire of images at our disposal limits, exalts, amplifies or circumscribes the forms of life and events that, through our imagination, we can project onto the world, put into being, build and inhabit. Techno-communicative and psycho-cognitive mutations are as interdependent as the organism and its ecosystem. The conscious organism is also sensuous; it is a bundle of sensitive receptors. The world we inhabit increasingly resembles the outcome of a projective zapping where we combine sequences of different linguistic derivations. The social unconscious does not easily adapt to this transformation of the info-sphere, because the social investment of desire is structured around the nucleus of identity, and this nucleus is fleeing and dissolving in all directions. Suddenly awoken by the eruption of semiotic proliferation, and deprived of the filters that the critical and disciplinary mind of modernity once possessed, the conscious organism reacts with panic. The communicative power of digital technology produces an excess of information with respect to the time of attention socially available. How is sensibility redefined and how does it adapt to over stimulation? I think that the effect of semiocapitalist acceleration and over-exploitation of nervous energies is exhaustion. Nervous breakdown, psychopathology, panic, depression, suicidal epidemic. “A titanic battle is about to begin, a Darwinian 103 struggle between competing psychopathies”, says Ballard in Super-Cannes, the book about the psychic catastrophe of the virtual class, published in the year 2000.

#### The aff’s use of fiat is an instance of mythological progress – the notion of a better future was fabricated by capitalism to expand the economy and knowledge but now in the age of semiocapitalism nothing is changed besides our infiltrated psyche. Berardi:

[Franco ‘Bifo’ Berardi is a writer and theorist based in Bologna. His work revolves mainly around the aesthetics of the contemporary psychosphere. His latest books include Futurability, Phenomenology of the End, and The Soul at Work. In the 1970s he was one of the founders of the pirate radio station Radio Alice, the magazine A/traverso and of the political movement Autonomia, “After the Future”, <https://libcom.org/files/AfterFuture.pdf>] shs bs

The rise of the myth of the future is rooted in modern capitalism, in the experience of expansion of the economy and knowledge. The idea that the future will be better than the present is not a natural idea, but the imaginary effect of the peculiarity of the bourgeois production model. Since its beginning, since the discovery of the new continent and the rewriting of the maps of the world, modernity has been defined by an amplification of the very limits of the world, and the peculiarity of capitalist economy resides exactly in the accumulation of the surplus value that results in the constant enhancement of the spheres of material goods and knowledge. In the second part of the nineteenth century, and in the first part of the twentieth, the myth of the future reached its peak, becoming something more than an implicit belief: it was a true faith, based on the concept of "progress," the ideological translation of the reality of economic growth. Political action was reframed in the light of this faith in a progressive future. Liberalism and social democracy, nationalism and communism, and anarchism itself, all the different families of modern political theory share a common certainty: notwithstanding the darkness of the present, the future will be bright. In this book I will try to develop the idea that the future is over. As you know, this isn't a new idea. Born with punk, the slow cancellation of the future got underway in the 1970s and 1980s. Now those bizarre predictions have become true. The idea that the future has disappeared is, of course, rather whimsical-since, as I write these lines, the future hasn't stopped unfolding. But when I say "future," I am not referring to the direction of time. I am thinking, rather, of the psychological perception, which emerged in the cultural situation of progressive modernity, the cultural expectations that were fabricated during the long period of modern civilization, reaching a peak in the years after the Second World War. Those expectations were shaped in the conceptual frameworks of an ever progressing development, albeit through different methodologies: the HegeloMarxist mythology of Aujhebung and founding of the new totality of Communism; the bourgeois mythology of a linear development of welfare and democracy; the technocratic mythology of the all-encompassing power of scientific knowledge; and so on.

#### The emergence of neoliberalism changed the material world— the affirmative’s fantasy of political strategies is no longer sufficient to alter the constantly evolving infosphere— information is oversaturated by semiocapitalism and the idea that change can occur re-entrenches us further.

**Bifo** [Franco ‘Bifo’ Berardi, edited by Gary Genosko and Nicholas Thoburn, translated by Arianna Bove, Melinda Cooper, Erik Empson, Enrico, Giuseppina Mecchia, and Tiziana Terranova, after the future] ZS // CL

By the end of the decade, notwithstanding the victory of Barack Obama in the United States, the prospect was gloomy. **Corporate capitalism and neoliberalism have produced lasting damage in the material structures of the world** and in the social, cultural, and nervous systems of humankind. In the century's last decade, a new movement emerged and grew fast and wide, questioning everywhere the power of capitalist corporations. I use the word "movement" to describe a collective displacing of bodies and minds, a changing of consciousness, habits, expectations. **Movement means conscious change, change accompanied by collective consciousness and collective elaboration, and struggle**. Conscious. Collective. Change. This is the meaning of "movement." From Seattle 1999 to Genoa 2001 a movement tried to stop the capitalist devastation of the very conditions of civilized life. These were the stakes, no more, no less. Activists around the world had a simple message: if we don't stop the machine of exploitation, debt, and compulsory consumption, human cohabitation on the planet will become dismal, or impossible. Well, ten years after Seattle, in the wake of the 2009 Copenhagen summit failure, we can state that those people were speaking the truth. **The global movement against capitalist globalization reached an impressive range and pervasiveness, but it was never able to change the daily life of society. It remained an ethical movement, not a social transformer. It could not create a process of social recomposition, it could not produce an effect of social subjectivation**. Those people were silenced by President Bush, after the huge demonstrations of February 1 5, 2003, when many millions of people worldwide gathered in the streets against the war in Iraq. The absence of movement is visible today, at the end of the zero zero decade: the absence of an active culture, the lack of a public sphere, the void of collective imagination, palsy of the process of subjectivation. The path to a conscious collective subject seems obstructed. What now? **A conscious collective change seems impossible at the level of daily life**. Yes, I know, **change is happening everyday**, at a pace that we have never experienced before. What is the election of a black President in the United States if not change**? But change is not happening in the sphere of social consciousness**. **Change happens in the spectacular sphere of politics, not in daily life-and the relationship between politics and daily life has become so tenuous, so weak**, that sometimes I think that, whatever happens in politics, **life will not change**. The fantastic collapse of the economy is certainly going to change things in daily life: you can bet on it. But is this change consciously elaborated? Is this connected with some conscious collective action? It isn't. This is why neoliberal fanaticism, notwithstanding its failure, is surviving and driving the agenda of the powers of the world. **The so-called counter globalization movement**, born in Seattle at the close of the century, **has been a** collective conscious actor, a **movement of unprecedented strength and breadth**. But, I repeat, **it has changed nothing in the daily life of the masses**; it hasn't changed the relationship between wage labor and capitalist enterprise; it hasn't changed daily relationships among precarious workers; it hasn't changed the lived conditions of migrants. It hasn't created solidarity between people in the factories, in the schools, in the cities. **Neoliberal politics have failed, but social autonomy hasn't emerged**. The ethical consciousness of the insanity of neoliberal politics spread everywhere, but it did not shape affective and social relations between people. The movement remains an expression of ethical protest. It has, nonetheless, produced effects. The neoliberal ideology that was once accepted as the word of God, as a natural and indisputable truth, started to be questioned and widely denounced in the days following the Seattle riots. But the ethical demonstrations did not change the reality of social domination. Global corporations did not slow the exploitation of labor or the massive destruction of the planet's environment. Warmongers did not stop organizing and launching deadly attacks against civilian populations in Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine, and many other parts of the world. Why? Why did the largest demonstration in human history, the antiwar Global Action that the movement launched on February 15, 2003, fail to stop the bombing of Baghdad? Why was conscious collective action, although massive and global, unable to change things? This is the question I've been trying to answer for the last ten years. This is the question that I am trying to answer in this book. I'll say here, in shore, **that the answer is not to be found in the political strategy of the struggle, but in the structural weakness of the social fabric**. During the twentieth century, social struggle could change things in a collective and conscious way because industrial workers could maintain solidarity and unity in daily life, and so could fight and win. Autonomy was the condition of victory, because autonomy means the ability to create social solidarity in daily life, and the ability to self-organize outside the rules of labor and exploitation. Autonomous community was the condition of political strength. When social recomposition is possible, so is collective conscious change. In social history we can speak of recomposition when the forces of labor create common cultural flows and a common ground of sensibility, so that they become a collective actor, sharing the same questions and sometimes the same answers. In conditions of social recomposition, social autonomy from capital becomes possible. Autonomy is the possibility of meeting the power of capital, with counterpower in daily life, in factories, neighborhoods, homes, in the affective relationships between people. That seems to be over. **The organization of labor has been fragmented by the new technology, and workers' solidarity has been broken at its roots. The labor market has been globalized, but the political organization of the workers has not. The infosphere has dramatically changed and accelerated, and this is jeopardizing the very possibility of communication, empathy, and solidarity.**

**The aff’s vague allusion to helping women in the third world is resilience par excellence – their investment in third-world women of color as needing assistance from the benevolent West is simply the latest tactic of visualization by mutli-racial white supremacist patriarchy, sanctioning the expansion into new affective markets and global intervention under the guise of imperialist feminism**

**James ‘15**

[Robin, Associate Professor of Philosophy @ UNC Charlotte. 2015. “Resilience & Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism.”] pat – I have this eBook on my kindle account, can’t find a PDF of it anywhere so just DM me if you want access,

Resilience discourse turns objectification (being looked at) into a means of subjectificatlon (overcoming). It also makes looking even more efficient and profitable than simple objectification could ever be. Recognizing and affirming the affective labor of the resilient performer, the spectator feeds the performer’s individual overcoming Into a second-order therapeutic narrative: our approbation of her overcoming is evidence of our own overcoming of our past prejudices. This spectator wants to be seen by a wider audience as someone who answers the resilient feminine subject’s hail, “Look, I Overcame’. Just as individual feminine subjects use their resilience as proof of their own goodness, MRWaSP uses the resilience of its “good girls” as proof that they’re the “good guys” — that its social and ethical practices are truly just, and that we really mean it this time when we say everyone is equal. For example, the “resilience” of “our” women is often contrasted with the supposed “fragility” of Third-World women of color. Or, in domestic US race-gender politics, the resilience of some African-American women (their bootstraps-style class ascendance) is contrasted to the continued fragility of other African-American women, and thus used to reinforce class distinctions among blacks. There are a million different versions of this general story: “our” women are already liberated — they saved themselves —but, to riff on Gayatri Spivak, “brown women need saving from brown men.” Most mainstream conversations about Third-World women are versions of this story: discussions of “Muslim” veiling, female circumcision, sweatshops, poverty ‘development,” they’re all white-saviorist narratives meant to display MRWaSP’s own resilience.

Look, I Overcame!” upgrades ‘Look, a Negro’ by (a) recycling objectification into overcoming and (b) compounding looking, so that one can profit from others’ resilience, treating their overcoming as one’s own overcoming. This upgrade in white supremacist patriarchy requires a concomitant upgrade in looking.” This shift in looking practices parallels developments in film and media aesthetics. As Steven Shaviro has argued, the values, techniques, and compositional strategies most common in contemporary mainstream Western cinema — like Michael Bay’s Transformers—are significantly different than the ones used in modernist and post-modernist cinema, and that these differences in media production correlate to broader shifts in the means of capitalist and ideological production. Neoliberalism’s aesthetic is, he argues, “post-cinematic.” This post-cinematic aesthetic applies not just to film and media, but to resilience discourse. Its performance practices and looking relations configured by the “Look. I Overcame!” imperative, resilience is, in a way, another type of post-cinematic medium. In the next section I use Shaviro’s theory of post-cinematic media to identify some specific ways in which traditional patriarchal tools are updated to work compatibly with MRWaSP resilience discourse. The looking in the “Look, I Overcame!” narrative is not the same kind of looking described by concepts like “the male gaze” or “controlling images” This looking is a type of deregulated MRWaSP visualization.

#### The alternative is to embrace depression politics. It utilizes exhaustion as a means of escaping the vicious cycle of semiocapital and brings about withdrawal from the system. Berardi:

[Franco “Bifo” Berardi, 08-23-2011, Edited by Gary Genosko and Nicholas Thoburn Translated by Arianna Bove, Melinda Cooper, Erik Empson, Enrico, Giuseppina Mecchia, and Tiziana Terranova, “After the Future”] shs bs

In Baudrillard’s catastrophic vision I see a new way of thinking subjectivity: a reversal of the energetic subjectivation that animates the revolutionary theories of the 20th century, and the opening of an implosive theory of subversion, based on depression and exhaustion. In the activist view exhaustion is seen as the inability of the social body to escape the vicious destiny that capitalism has prepared: deactivation of the social energies that once upon a time animated democracy and political struggle. But exhaustion could also become the beginning of a slow movement towards a “wu wei” civilization, based on the withdrawal, and frugal expectations of life and consumption. Radicalism could abandon the mode of activism, and adopt the mode of passivity. A radical passivity would definitely threaten the ethos of relentless productivity that neoliberal politics has imposed. The mother of all the bubbles, the work bubble, would finally deflate. We have been working too much during the last three or four centuries, and outrageously too much during the last thirty years. The current depression could be the beginning of a massive abandonment of competition, consumerist drive, and of dependence on work. Actually, if we think of the geopolitical struggle of the first decade – the struggle between Western domination and jihadist Islam – we recognize that the most powerful weapon has been suicide. 9/11 is the most impressive act of this suicidal war, but thousands of people have killed themselves in order to destroy American military hegemony. And they won, forcing the western world into the bunker of paranoid security, and defeating the hyper-technological armies of the West both in Iraq, and in Afghanistan. The suicidal implosion has not been confined to the Islamists. Suicide has became a form of political action everywhere. Against neoliberal politics, Indian farmers have killed themselves. Against exploitation hundreds of workers and employees have killed themselves in the French factories of Peugeot, and in the offices of France Telecom. In Italy, when the 2009 recession destroyed one million jobs, many workers, haunted by the fear of unemployment, climbed on the roofs of the factories, threatening to kill themselves. Is it possible to divert this implosive trend from the direction of 107 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.

## Case