# Baudrillard K

**Welcome to hyperreality, where the Symbolic no longer stands in for the Real as a copy, but instead stands on its own as a copy of a copy. Here is a small example—a photo is a copy of reality but a painting of a photo is a copy of a copy. This is the simulacra and operates through an endless expansion of information.**

**Berardi 1 brackets in original** [“After the Future” by Franco Berardi (“Bifo”) 2011]

“**Reality** itself **founders in hyperrealism, the** meticulous **reduplication of the real**, preferably through another, reproductive medium, **such as photography. From medium to medium, the real is volatilized, becoming an allegory of death.** But **it is also**, in a sense, **reinforced through its own destruction. It becomes reality for its own sake**, the fetishism of the lost object: no longer the object of representation, but the ecstasy of denial and of its own ritual extermination: the hyperreal. [...] ¶ The reality principle corresponds 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. The principle of simulation governs us now, rather that the outdated reality principle.We feed on those forms whose finalities have disappeared. No more ideology, only simulacra. We must therefore reconstruct the entire genealogy of the law of value and its simulacra in order to grasp the hegemony and the enchantment of the current system.A structural revolution of value. This genealogy must cover political economy, where it will appear as a second-order simulacrum, just like all those that stake everything on the real: the real of production, the real of signification, whether conscious or unconscious. Capital no longer belongs to the order of political economy: it operates with political economy as its simulated model. The entire apparatus of the commodity law of **value is absorbed and recycled in the** larger apparatus of the structural law of value, this becoming part of the third order of **simulacra. Political economy is** thus **assured** a second life, **an eternity, within the confines of** an apparatus in which it has lost all its strict determinacy, but maintains an effective presence as a system of reference for **simulation.** (Baudrillard 1993a: 2) ¶ **Simulation is the new plane of consistency of capitalist growth:** financial speculation, for instance**,** has displaced the process of exploitation from the sphere of material production to the sphere of expectations, desire, and immaterial labor. **The** simulation **process** (Cyberspace) **is** proliferating **without limits, irradiating signs that go everywhere** in the attention market. **The brain is the market, in semiocapitalist hyper-reality. And** the brain is not limitless, **the brain cannot expand** and accelerate **indefinitely.**” (105-106)

**Politics and futurism is not a natural occurrence but an ideological relation to time and capitalism that arose in the 20th century. Today, the myth of futurism persists and is now shifting towards a cyberculture whereby connectivity and information expand indefinitely while dystopia is increasing around the world. Their contribution towards the globalization of knowledge banks on a new form of semiocapital that produces endless war through continuous fear and despair.**

**Berardi 2** [“After the Future” by Franco Berardi (“Bifo”) 2011]

“As far as we think of the avant-garde as a conscious movement devoted to revolution in society, in communication, and in the relationship between society and communication, Futurism, namely Italian Futurism, can be considered as the avant-garde’s first conscious declaration. The Manifesto Futurista [Futurist Manifesto] of 1909 is an act of faith in the future. I would argue that it is also the cultural and ideological inauguration of the history of the 20th century, the century that trusted in the future. ¶ During the 20th century Futurism, both in its Italian and in its Russian form, became the leading force of imagination and of project, giving birth to the language of commercial advertising (especially in the Italian variation) and to the language of political agit-propaganda (in the Russian variation). The idea of **the future is central in the ideology** and in the energy **of the 20th century**, and in many ways it is **mixed with the idea of utopia.** Notwithstanding the horrors of the century, the Utopian imagination has never stopped to give new breath to the hope of a progressive future, until the high point of ’68, when the modern promise was expected to be on the brink of fulfilment. ¶ In the last three decades of the century the utopian imagination was slowly overturned, and has been replaced by the dystopian imagination. For many reasons the year 1977 can be seen as a turning point: this was the year when the punk movement exploded, whose cry – “No Future” – was a self-fulfilling prophecy that has slowly enveloped the world. ¶ **A new utopia appeared** on the stage during the last decade of the century **that trusted in the future: cyberculture, which has given way** to the imagination of **a global mind, hyper-connected** and infinitely powerful. **This last utopia ended in depression**, after the sudden change of light that followed the 9/11 event, **and it** has finally **produced a growing system of virtual** life and actual death, of virtual **knowledge and actual war. The artistic imagination**, since that day, **seems unable to escape the territory of fear and of despair.** Will we ever find a path beyond the limits of the Dystopian Kingdom? ¶ In this book I want to reconsider the cultural history of the century from this point of view: the mythology of the future. The future is not an obvious concept, but a culturalconstruction and projection. **For the** human of **the Middle Ages**, living in the sphere of a theological culture, **perfection was placed in the past**, in the time when God created the universe and humankind. Therefore, historic existence is the dimension of the Fall, abandonment and forgetting of the original perfection and unity.¶ 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 is defined by an act of 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 sphere of** material **goods and knowledge.** ¶ In the second part of the 19th century, and in the first part of the 20th, **the myth of the future reached its peak**, becoming something more that an implicit belief: 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. It is not a new idea, as you know: born with punk, the 1970s and ’80s witnessed the beginning of the slow cancellation of the future. Now those bizarre predictions have become true. The idea that the future has disappeared is of course rather whimsical, as while I write these lines the future is not stopping to unfold. ¶ 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 Hegelo-Marxist mythology of Aufhebung and instauration 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.” (12-13)

#### The provision of the right to strike incorporates the core of the strike’s radicalism into the state, diffusing radical potential and erasing the spectacle of disaster from the collective imaginary. That ensures the serial policy failure through the acceleration of their impacts.

Korstanje 16 [Maximiliano E Korstanje, 2016, “DIFFICULT LEGACY: a radical criticism on the book Working Through the Past,” International Journal of Safety and Security in Tourism/Hospitality, available at https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Difficult-Legacy%2C-a-radical-criticism-on-the-book-Korstanje/493d3ff240a12471a24b245000f16e91133513d3]

This begs a more than interesting question, where capitalism intersects with terrorism? During XIXth century, millions European workers migrated from the Old World to United States in quest of better conditions of life. Within these files, a bunch of anarchists struggled against Status Quo planning terrorist attacks against Chief Police officers, or politicians. Traced, jailed and deported some of them opted to organize the incipient unions introducing their ideologies in favor of workers. At a closer look, the nation-state endorsed to the new unions the right to strike conjoined to other benefits as less working hours and wage enhancement. All these improvements paved the ways for the advent of leisure practices that helped workers to enjoy holidays and other derived consumption practices. Basically, US disciplined terrorism by the incorporation of its ideological core. The organizations of labor, even the right to strike is terrorism by other means. Today, whenever tourists or travelers are stranded at an international airport by a sudden strike, they are instrumentalized in order for union demands to be accepted by State. Beyond the degree of cruelty or violence, the same happens with terrorism. In any case, what beyond the boundaries of capitalist society is dubbed as “terrorism”, inside sounds as “the right of workers to strike”. As Michel Foucault puts it, the power of discipline does not rest on the violence it generates, but in the fact that threats are mitigated of their negative assets in the same way, the vaccine represents an inoculated virus (Foucault, 1991). In this point, the danger, terrorism was disciplined to take a more mitigated form, strike. It is tempting to say that social order is replicated by the articulation of binomial construes. The processes of reification by means citizens engage with their institutions are based on two trends. The first and most important is education. In the art of education peoples learn the rules, and most important steps to coexist with others. In retrospect, education plays a crucial role by formatting the minds of citizens to understand the concept of reality. The self should not be studied in isolation of social institutions, even the social fact encompasses individuals, culture, and the institutions where social life evolves. At some extent, institutions are created not only to solve problems surfacing in daily life, but also endorse to citizens a much deeper understanding of world. The micro-interaction among agents comprises the connection of self with others (Mead 1934; Ryle 2009). Structuralism as cultural and scientific project showed that culture is constructed by the imposition of contrasting values, which are expressed in combination with the opposite. To put this in other terms, black cannot be understood apart from white, in the same way, high has no sense for us without knowing what low is. As language the society should be divided into two halves, whose rules are pitted against the other side but working altogether (Levi-Srauss 2013; Dreyfus & Rabinow, 2014). However, structuralism gives a weak argument to explain how this world of contrasts is formed. Echoing Niklas Luhmann, society is the sum of different subsystems which are centered on communication. People are unable by communicating since only society communicates. By means of a reduction of complexity, which means that society only works by limiting the environmental complexity into two binomial codes in its core, Luhmann adds, people do not influence in communicative process but they are determined by environment (Luhmann, 2013). The legacy of Luhmann to the sociological discussion is very important simply because he introduces the concept of binomials. These observations can be endorsed to the outcome of Korstanje in his recent book A Difficult World, examining the roots of capitalism, where author discusses to what extent capitalism expanded across the world thanks to two key elements. At a first look, the industries of leisure as tourism and mobility were conducive to reduce the conflict instilled by terrorism in the first decade of Twenty century. The disciplinary mechanisms of control inoculate from threats the negative features but incorporating their core. In some respect, the process of education only tells part of the truth, covering part of the reasons why events happened. At the time we learn from media terrorists are hatred-filled criminals, we are not told the main of their ideologies remained in capitalist society. Extortion is the bridge between terrorism and the organization of labor. Not only terrorists or jihadists are native-born of the societies they attack, they look like us, even they may be our neighbors (Howie 2011). In this token, psychoanalysis has advanced in their studies of fear considering what is unsaid, is enrooted in the social imaginary causing an extreme sentiment of panic (Howie 2011). In fact, as Zizek puts it, the power of ideology is not given by what ideology says, but by what it hides (Zizek 1989). One of the best examples of this is the gap left by disasters when hit a community. The presence of mass-death causes ambivalent feeling within community. The uncontrollable nature of death undermines the social trust in institutions and officialdoms. In other terms, disasters produce a hole in society which should be fulfilled with ideology. Dark tourism, a new trends documented by various scholars recently offers a fertile ground to understand how politicians impose a discourse that leads society to interpret events within the hat of ideology (Stone & Sharpley, 2008; Reijinders, 2011; Sather-Wagstaff, 2011; Tzanelli 2015). Tourists visit spaces of mass death or extreme mourning but without knowing what these tragedies really happened. Politicians to protect their interests poses a biased message which is commercialized by different tour operators (Guidotti Hernandez, 2011). As a result of this, since the real reasons of disasters are covered, the probabilities it repeats in a near future are higher. This was what Korstanje (2010) dubbed as the “end of resiliency”, or Baudrillard (2006) called “the spectacle of disaster”. The same applies to ground-zero or cities attacked by international terrorism where today were commoditized as important tourist attractions.

**Information is fundamentally dissuasive, so vote negative on presumption. The amassing of facts and evidence – and especially truth – only makes the world more unreal. Political movements are turned into machines to maximize meaning, thus the role of the ballot it to vote for the advocacy which best confronts hyperreality.**

**BAUDRILLARD 81** (Jean, “*Simulacra and Simulations*,” pg. 79-81) SJCP//NM

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 neg

entropic 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 impact is desensitization and panic. While information expands indefinitely, our ability to process information in time is organic and limited. This over demand for semiocapital reduces sensibility and empathetic understanding producing fascism and totalitarianism.**

**Berardi 3** [“After the Future” by Franco Berardi (“Bifo”) 2011]

“The question of the relationship between an unlimited expansion of cyberspace and the limits of cyber time opens up here. Being the point of virtual intersection of the projections generated by countless issuers, **cyberspace is unlimited and in** a process of **continuous expansion. Cybertime**, which is **the ability** of social attention **to process information in time**, is **organic**, cultural **and** emotional, therefore it is everything but un**limited. Subjected to the infinite acceleration** of the info-stimuli, **the mind reacts with either panic or de-sensitisation.** The concept of sensibility (and the different but related concept of sensitivity) are crucial here: sensitivity is the ability of the human senses to process information, and **sensibility is the faculty that makes empathic understanding possible**, the ability to comprehend what words cannot say, the power to interpret a continuum of non-discrete elements, non- verbal signs and the flows of empathy. This faculty, which enables humans to understand ambiguous messages in the context of relationships, might now be disappearing. **We are witnessing now the development of a generation** of human beings **lacking** competence in sensibility, **the ability to empathically understand the other and decode signs** that are not codified in a binary system. When the punks cried “No Future”, at the turning point of the year 1977, that cry seemed a paradox not to be taken too seriously. Actually, it was the announcement of something quite important: the perception of the future was changing. Future is not a natural dimension of the mind, rather it is a modality of perception and imagination, a feature of expectation and attention, and its modalities and features change with the changing of cultures. **Futurism** is the artistic movement that embodies and **asserts the accomplished modernity of the future.** The movement called Futurism announces what is most essential in the 20th century because this century is pervaded by a religious belief in the future. We do not believe in the future in the same way. Of course, we know that a time after the present is going to come, but we don’t expect that this time will fulfill the promises of the present. 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 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.” (17-18)

**Vote negative to exhaust the system and turn it against itself. The simulacra has oversaturated imagination making exhaustion the only way out. Put away your Baudrillard blocks—our alternative is not centered on self-sacrifice and instead begins with depression to emphasize its potential to destroy semiocapitalism, accumulation, and growth.**

**Berardi 4** [“After the Future” by Franco Berardi (“Bifo”) 2011]

“The process of **collective subjectivation** (i.e. social recomposition) **implies** the development of **a common language-affection** which is essentially happening in the temporal dimension. **The semiocapitalist acceleration of time has destroyed the** social **possibility of sensitive elaboration** of the semio-flow. The proliferation of simulacra in the info-sphere has saturated the space of attention and imagination**.** Advertising and stimulated hyper-expression (“just do it”), have submitted the energies of the social psyche to permanent mobilization. Exhaustion follows, and **exhaustion is the only way of escape**: Nothing, not even the system, can avoid the symbolic obligation, and it is in this trap that the only chance of a catastrophe for capital remains. **The system turns on itself**, as a scorpion does **when encircled by the challenge of death. For it is summoned to answer, if it is not to lose face**, to what can only be death. The system must itself commit suicide in response to the multiplied challenge of death and suicide. So hostages are taken. On the symbolic or sacrificial plane, from which every moral consideration of the innocence of the victims is ruled out the hostage is the substitute, the alter-ego of the terrorist, the hostage’s death for the terrorist. Hostage and terrorist may thereafter become confused in the same sacrificial act.(Baudrillard 1993a: 37) ¶ In these impressive pages Baudrillard outlines the end of the modern dialectics of revolution against power, of the labor movement against capitalist domination, and predicts the advent of a new form of action which will be marked by the sacrificial gift of death (and self-annihilation). After the destruction of the World Trade Center in the most important terrorist act ever, Baudrillard wrote a short text titled The Spirit of Terrorism where he goes back to his own predictions and recognizes the emergence of a catastrophic age. When the code becomes the enemy the only strategy can be catastrophic: all the counterphobic ravings about exorcizing evil: it is because it is there, everywhere, like an obscure object of desire. Without this deep-seated complicity, the event would not have had the resonance it has, and in their symbolic strategy the terrorists doubtless know that they can count on this unavowable complicity. (Baudrillard 2003: 6) ¶ This goes much further than hatred for the dominant global power by the disinherited and the exploited, those who fell on the wrong side of global order. This malignant desire is in the very heart of those who share this order’s benefits. An allergy to all definitive order, to all definitive power is happily universal, and the two towers of the World Trade Center embodied perfectly, in their very double-ness (literally twin-ness), this definitive order: No need, then, for a death drive or a destructive instinct, or even for perverse, unintended effects. Very logically – inexorably – the increase in the power heightens the will to destroy it. And it was party to its own destruction. When the two towers collapsed, you had the impression that they were responding to the suicide of the suicide-planes with their own suicides. It has been said that “Even God cannot declare war on Himself.” Well, He can. The West, in position of God (divine omnipotence and absolute moral legitimacy), has become suicidal, and declared war on itself. (Baudrillard 2003: 6-7) ¶ In Baudrillard’s catastrophic vision I see **a new way of thinking subjectivity: a reversal of the energetic subjectivation** that **animates the revolutionary theories** of the 20th century, and the opening of an implosive theory of subversion, based on depression and exhaustion. ¶ In the activist view exhaustion is seen as the inability of the social body to escape the vicious destiny that capitalism has prepared: deactivation of the social energies that once upon a time animated democracy and political struggle. But **exhaustion could** also **become the beginning of a slow movement towards a “wu wei” civilization, based on the withdrawal, and frugal expectations of life and consumption.** Radicalism could abandon the mode of activism, and adopt the mode of passivity. **A radical passivity would** definitely **threaten the ethos of relentless productivity that neoliberal politics has imposed.** ¶ The mother of all the bubbles, **the work bubble, would finally deflate.** We have been working too much during the last three or four centuries, and outrageously too much during the last thirty years. The current depression could be the beginning of a massive abandonment of competition, consumerist drive, and of dependence on work**.** Actually, if we think of the geopolitical struggle of the first decade – the struggle between Western domination and jihadist Islam – we recognize that the most powerful weapon has been suicide. 9/11 is the most impressive act of this suicidal war, but thousands of people have killed themselves in order to destroy American military hegemony. And they won, forcing the western world into the bunker of paranoid security, and defeating the hyper-technological armies of the West both in Iraq, and in Afghanistan. ¶ The suicidal implosion has not been confined to the Islamists. Suicide has became a form of political action everywhere. Against neoliberal politics, Indian farmers have killed themselves. Against exploitation hundreds of workers and employees have killed themselves in the French factories of Peugeot, and in the offices of France Telecom. In Italy, when the 2009 recession destroyed one million jobs, many workers, haunted by the fear of unemployment, climbed on the roofs of the factories, threatening to kill themselves. **Is it possible to divert this implosive trend from the direction of death**, murder, and suicide, **towards a new kind of autonomy**, social creativity and of life? ¶I think that **it is** possible **only if we start from exhaustion**, if we emphasize the creative side of withdrawal. The exchange between life and money could be deserted, and **exhaustion could give way to a huge wave of withdrawal from** the sphere of **economic exchange**. A new refrain could emerge in that moment, **and wipe out the law of economic growth**. The self-organization of the general intellect could abandon the law of accumulation and growth, and start a new concatenation, where collective intelligence is only subjected to the common good.” (106-108)

#### To clarify:

1. Only offense that links under our role of the ballot is an advocacy—that can be post-fiat and pre-fiat. You win my proving your method is net better for fighting the simulacra
2. We can weigh offense using general util weighing—timeframe, magnitude, probability
3. A legitimate advocacy is any form of method or policy which can break down the fractute between signifiers and signified

**No perms:**

**[1] mutually exclusive—we’re not a violent revolution, but rather a radical passivity which denied legitimacy to the system**

**[2] sequencing issue—our alt is a prior question—we must confront hyperreality before trying to do af**

#### Don’t allow AC offense weighing:

#### [1] Your aff analysis starts from the wrong point, that’s an epistemological indict, all your offense just feeds back into the simulacra.

#### [2] Alt solves case- we’re a better explanation of the root cause of the AC impacts specifically, which solves back.

**[3] Solvency deficit- your aff does nothing but allow resistance strategies to become known and coopted which turns solvency. It’s actively bad because ruse of solvency means we focus on the wrong part. Also, fiat is illusory because nothing happens when the judge votes aff.**

#### Role of the ballot precludes your standard for a few reasons.

#### [1] The standard speaks to offense leveraged under a normative framework and thus a normative conception of reality. No one consistently abides by normative ethics because we all have subjectivity. The Role of the ballot and role of the judge on the other hand, speak to the judge’s obligation as an individual in the round and thus preclude examination of normativity.

#### [2] My Role of the ballot is a question of ontology – your framework presupposes both epistemology and ontology in the process of making its claims about ethics. If I win that even ONE of those presuppositions is bad, that’s enough to consider ontology first.

# Case

#### 1] The 1AC’s portrayal of oppression is not neutral – the university has reduced otherness to a subject for discussion with no value other than what can be discovered from it, commodifying suffering and ignoring differences which should be deconstructed – by focusing on otherness and not breaking it down, the 1AC makes dehumanization and atrocities inevitable

BAUDRILLARD 90 bracketed for gendered language A Kritikal French Guy [Jean Baudrillard. “The Transparency of Evil.” 1990. Accessed 3/27/2018. Ask me for the PDF] SJCP//NM

We are engaged in an orgy of discovery, exploration and 'invention' of the Other. An orgy of differences. We are procurers of encounter, pimps of interfacing and interactivity. Once we get beyond the mirror of alienation (beyond the mirror stage that was the joy of our childhood), structural differences multiply ad infinitum - in fashion, in mores, in culture. Crude otherness, hard otherness - the othernesses of race, of madness, of poverty - are done with. Otherness, like everything else, has fallen under the law of the market, the law of supply and demand. It has become a rare item - hence its immensely high value on the psychological stock exchange, on the structural stock exchange. Hence too the intensity of the ubiquitous simulation of the Other. This is particularly striking in science fiction, where the chief question is always 'What is the Other? Where is the Other?' Of course science fiction is merely a reflection of our everyday universe, which is in thrall to a wild speculation on - almost a black market in - otherness and difference. A veritable obsession with ecology extends from Indian reservations to household pets (otherness degree zero!) - not to mention the other of 'the other scene', or the other of the unconscious (our last symbolic capital, and one we had better look after, because reserves are not limitless). Our sources of otherness are indeed running out; we have exhausted the Other as raw material. (According to Claude Gilbert, we are so desperate that we go digging through the rubble of earthquakes and catastrophes.) Consequently the other is all of a sudden no longer there to be exterminated, hated, rejected or seduced, but instead to be understood, liberated, coddled, recognized. In addition to the Rights of Man, we now also need the Rights of the Other. In a way we already have these, in the shape of a universal Right to be Different. For the orgy is also an orgy of political and psychological comprehension of the other - even to the point of resurrecting the other in places where the other is no longer to be found. Where the Other was, there has the Same come to be. And where there is no longer anything, there the Other must come to be. We are no longer living the drama of otherness. We are living the psychodrama of otherness, just as we are living the psychodrama of 'sociality', the psychodrama of sexuality, the psychodrama of the body - and the melodrama of all the above, courtesy of analytic metadiscourses. Otherness has become sociodramatic, semiodramatic, melodramatic. All we do in psychodrama - the psychodrama of contacts, of psychological tests, of interfacing - is acrobatically simulate and dramatize the absence of the other. Not only is otherness absent everywhere in this artificial dramaturgy, but the subject has also quietly become indifferent to [their] ~~his~~ own subjectivity, to his own alienation, just as the modern political animal has become indifferent to his own political opinions. This subject becomes transparent, spectral (to borrow Marc Guillaume's word) - and hence interactive. For in interactivity the subject is the other to no one. Inasmuch as he is indifferent to himself, it is as though he had been reified alive - but without his double, without his shadow, without his other. Having paid this price, the subject becomes a candidate for all possible combinations, all possible connections. The interactive being is therefore born not through a new form of exchange but through the disappearance of the social, the disappearance of otherness. This being is the other after the death of the Other - not the same other at all: the other that results from the denial of the Other. The only interaction involved, in reality, belongs to the medium alone: to the machine become invisible. Mechanical automata still played on the difference between [people] ~~man~~ and machine, and on the charm of this difference - something with which today's interactive and simulating automata are no longer concerned. Man and machine have become isomorphic and indifferent to each other: neither is other to the other. The computer has no other. That is why the computer is not intelligent. Intelligence comes to us from the other - always. That is why computers perform so well. Champions of mental arithmetic and idiots savants are autistic - minds for which the other does not exist and which, for that very reason, are endowed with strange powers. This is the strength, too, of the integrated circuit (the power of thought-transference might also be considered in this connection). Such is the power of abstraction. Machines work more quickly because they are unlinked to any otherness. Networks connect them up to one another like an immense umbilical cord joining one intelligence and its twin. Homeostasis between one and the same: all otherness has been confiscated by the machine. Does otherness survive anywhere after being banished from this entire psychodramatic superstructure? Is there a physics as well as a metaphysics of the Other? Is there a dual, not just a dialectical, form of otherness? Is there still a form of the Other as destiny, and not merely as a psychological or social partner of convenience? These days everything is described in terms of difference, but otherness is not the same thing as difference. One might even say that difference is what destroys otherness. When language is broken down into a set of differences, when meaning is reduced to nothing more than differentiation, the radical otherness of language is abolished. The duel that lies at the heart of language - the duel between language and meaning, between language and the person who speaks it - is halted. And everything in language that is irreducible to mediation, articulation or meaning is eliminated - everything, that is, which causes language at its most radical level to be other than the subject (and also Other to the subject?). The existence of this level accounts for the play in language, for its appeal in its materiality, for its susceptibility to chance; and it is what makes language not just a set of trivial differences, as it is in the eyes of structural analysis, but, symbolically speaking, truly a matter of life and death. What, then, does it mean to say that women are the other for men, that the mad are the other for the sane, or that primitive people are the other for civilized people? One might as well go on for ever wondering who is the other for whom. Is the Master the slave's other? Yes, certainly - in terms of class and power relations. But this account is reductionistic. In reality, things are just not so simple. The way in which beings and things relate to each other is not a matter of structural difference. The symbolic order implies dual and complex forms that are not dependent on the distinction between ego and other. The Pariah is not the other to the Brahmin: rather, their destinies are different. The two are not differentiated along a single scale of values: rather, they are mutually reinforcing aspects of an immutable order, parts of a reversible cycle like the cycle of day and night. Do we say that the night is the other to the day? No. So why should we say that the masculine is the other to the feminine? For the two are undoubtedly merely reversible moments, like night and day, following upon one other and changing places with one another in an endless process of seduction. One sex is thus never the other for the other sex, except within the context of a differentialistic theory of sexuality - which is basically nothing but a utopia. For difference is itself a utopia: the idea that such pairs of terms can be split up is a dream - and the idea of subsequently reuniting them is another. (This also goes for the distinction between Good and Evil: the notion that they might be separated out from one another is pure fantasy, and it is even more utopian to think in terms of reconciling them.) Only in the distinction-based perspective of our culture is it possible to speak of the Other in connection with sex. Genuine sexuality, for its part, is 'exotic' (in Segalen's meaning of the term) : it resides in the radical incomparability of the sexes - otherwise seduction would never be possible, and there would be nothing but alienation of one sex by the other. Differences mean regulated exchange. But what is it that introduces disorder into exchange? What is it that cannot be negotiated over? What is it that has no place in the contract, or in the structural interaction of differences? What is founded on the impossibility of exchange? Wherever exchange is impossible, what we encounter is terror. Any radical otherness at all is thus the epicentre of a terror: the terror that such otherness holds, by virtue of its very existence, for the normal world. And the terror that this world exercises upon that otherness in order to annihilate it. Over recent centuries all forms of violent otherness have been incorporated, willingly or under threat of force, into a discourse of difference which simultaneously implies inclusion and exclusion, recognition and discrimination. Childhood, lunacy, death, primitive societies - all have been categorized, integrated and absorbed as parts of a universal harmony. ~~Madness~~ [disability], once its exclusionary status had been revoked, was caught up in the far subtler toils of psychology. The dead, as soon as they were recognized in their identity as such, were banished to outlying cemeteries - kept at such a distance that the face of death itself was lost. As for Indians, their right to exist was no sooner accorded them than they were confined to reservations. These are the vicissitudes of a logic of difference. Racism does not exist so long as the other remains Other, so long as the Stranger remains foreign. It comes into existence when the other becomes merely different - that is to say, dangerously similar. This is the moment when the inclination to keep the other at a distance comes into being. 'We may assume', wrote Victor Segalen, 'that fundamental differences will never resolve themselves into a truly seamless and unpatched fabric; increasing unity, falling barriers and great reductions in real distance must of themselves compensate somewhere by means of new partitions and unanticipated gaps:

#### 2] INCARCERATED WORKER’S STRIKES ALREADY WORK IMPROVING WORKING CONDITIONS AND INCREASING PAY

McMahan 11-3 Jim McMahan (<https://www.workers.org/author/jim-mcmahan/>) November 3, 2021, “Prisoners win minimum wage victory” Workers World, <https://www.workers.org/2021/11/59888/> SJMS

Seattle After years of hunger strikes, immigrant workers detained at the Northwest Detention Center in Tacoma, Wash., have won the right to be paid for their labor at the same minimum wage that is mandated for non-incarcerated workers. Washington State’s minimum wage is $13.69 an hour. The private for-profit owner, GEO Group, has been paying the prisoner workers only a dollar a day. These workers do all the real work inside the place where they are incarcerated — the cooking, laundry, cleaning and other maintenance jobs. On Oct. 27, a federal jury found GEO had been violating Washington state minimum wage laws for over 15 years. The company currently operates 57 prisons and detainee facilities inside the U.S. The minimum wage boost comes from a lawsuit filed by Washington State Attorney General Bob Ferguson. In a separate lawsuit, on Oct. 29 a jury awarded $17.3 million in lost wages to all prisoners detained since 2014 in the Northwest Detention Center. GEO will likely appeal these decisions. This prison labor victory comes as a result of years of hunger strikes by incarcerated workers, at least 20 of those at Northwest. The hunger strikes have often been combined with work stoppages, with the minimum wage being one of the top demands. Since the COVID pandemic began, adequate prevention, testing and treatment have been key demands. The migrant detainees have been greatly aided on the outside by the solidarity group La Resistencia. The International Action Center has also brought solidarity. La Resistencia NW held its Seventh Annual Día de los Muertos (Day of the Dead) on Oct. 31 at the Tacoma detention prison. The ceremony honored incarcerated Northwest workers who have died because of the inhumane immigration system: Mergensana Amar, Señor Jose, Jose Quinones and Cipriano Rios, a leader in struggle who died in Mexico in 2020 soon after being released. The Washington state labor victory, which strikes a blow against imprisoned peoples’ conditions of bondage, should help incarcerated people everywhere in the U.S. Prisoners in New Mexico, Colorado and California have also filed suits — not yet successful — demanding the minimum wage in their detention centers. The struggle continues against slave labor in prison, which is still legal under the 13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.