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## 1

#### Interpretation: the aff may not claim offense from anything other than the instrumental implementation of a policy stating a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### Resolved means a policy

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

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

#### Definition of unconditional right to strike:

NLRB 85 [National Labor Relations Board; “Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947: Volume 1,” Jan 1985; <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=7o1tA__v4xwC&rdid=book-7o1tA__v4xwC&rdot=1>] Justin

\*\*Edited for gendered language

As for the so-called absolute or unconditional right to strike—there are no absolute rights that do not have their corresponding responsibilities. Under our American Anglo-Saxon system, each individual is entitled to the maximum of freedom, provided however (and this provision is of first importance), his [their] freedom has due regard for the rights and freedoms of others. The very safeguard of our freedoms is the recognition of this fundamental principle. I take issue very definitely with the suggestion that there is an absolute and unconditional right to concerted action (which after all is what the strike is) which endangers the health and welfare of our people in order to attain a selfish end.

#### Violation – they’re not a policy action that involves the unconditional right to strike

#### Limits-- radical aff choice shifts the grounds for the debate and puts the aff far ahead. Neg prep is structured around topical plans as points of offense, proves their aff was read for strategic incentives- consider this a library DA to their interp – they’ll say we get to read cap and generics but that’s concessionary ground that they can pigeonhole us into--– the process of debate outweighs the content – only our interp generates the argumentative skills needed to rigorously defend their affirmative out of round and create engaged citizens who have the self-reflexivity to advocate for positive change

#### Topical version of the aff: defend the unconditional right to strike while also advocating for the K of .

#### Second is Testing – topical debate allows in depth analysis of tangible solutions for real world problems. Abstracting to arbitrary advocacies deteriorates from those skills, making debate meaningless. The aff's forecloses productive political dialogue and ensures that we dont learn the skills to contest hegemonic ideology

Daniel R. **Schwartz** is a 5th year PhD student in Russian History at Brandeis University. He also serves as the research assistant and paralegal for frequent Minding the Campus contributor Harvey Silverglate, and as a Program Associate for the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE). November 8, 20**11** "The Harvard Protest: Theatricality Mixed with Incoherence" http://www.mindingthecampus.com/forum/2011/11/the\_harvard\_protest\_theatrical.html

Like their compatriots in Zuccotti square, the 70 Harvard college students who walked out of Greg Mankiw’s economics class were larger on theatrics than on message, and failed to articulate a reasonable, much less coherent, justification for their protest.

Gabriel Bayard and Rachel J. Sandalow-Ash, the two organizers of the protest, discuss the reasoning behind the walk-out in­­ today’s Harvard Crimson: The walkout should be seen in the context of Occupy Boston and the Occupy Movement nationwide, which seeks to curb the trends of rising income inequality and concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few over the past thirty years. We believe that Professor N. Gregory Mankiw, a former economic advisor to President Bush, played a key role in creating the policies which have exacerbated economic inequality and led to financial instability and collapse. If their argument had ended there, one could maintain that the protest was absolutely reasonable, if a few years late. Mankiw was an advisor to President Bush, and President Bush’s economic policies angered many members of the Harvard Community. Now that Mankiw is back lecturing, it is understandable why some students might want to share with him—and the rest of the Harvard community—their displeasure with his job as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors. A peaceful walk-out on Mankiw’s class—while perhaps inelegant—could be just such a way to spread that message. But Bayard and Sandalow-Ash’s next sentence severely undercuts their credibility: We argue that it is unfair that he teaches this foundational course, which greatly impacts the attitudes of Harvard students, every year.That’s just silly. One skill students are supposed to learn in college is critical thinking; the ability to recognize that all speech—whether coming from in front of the classroom, from a novel, or from a textbook—reflects a certain ideology, point-of-view or, yes, bias. It is up to the student to recognize, and then pull apart, the assumptions inherent in any given academic exercise. Then, utilizing tools like analysis and evidence, the student should discuss, and perhaps rebut, the material at hand. Any professor who claims pure objectivity is, simply put, lying; what professors do is present the material as they view it in as coherent, structured, and pedagogically oriented manner as they can. Mankiw may be a conservative, but there is absolutely nothing “unfair” about his teaching an introductory course. The professor teaching introduction to women’s studies may be a liberal feminist; the instructor teaching intro to Judaic Studies might be an anti-Zionist; the professor teaching intro to sociology might be a Marxist: what we are supposed to learn in college is to parse through an academic playground (or battleground) and develop our own ideas and thoughts, not to complain about fairness when we disagree with the person in the front of the room! We learn in the university not what to think, but how to think. Disagreement is part of that, and diversity of opinion—and the occasional bias with which it is disseminated—is the beauty of the university, not the academy’s undoing. Bayard and Sandalow-Ash’s editorial goes on to disagree with Mankiw’s views on the minimum wage, his “uncritically supportive position on free trade,” and, most strangely, his assertion that “equity and efficiency in the economy are ‘two goals [which] often conflict.’” In each case, Bayard and Sandalow-Ash present a different economist who disagrees with Mankiw’s ideas. Rather than proving Mankiw unfit for introductory courses, all Bayard and Sandalow-Ash show is that they care deeply about the material and have been inspired by their professor; what better endorsement for Mankiw’s teaching capabilities than that? The students are angry; they see the United States’ income inequality, and they desire to foster a dialogue about how to stop it. Such an urge is laudable. But for a protest to be effective, it should have a clear, well-defended point, and the Econ 10 walkout clearly does not. So what was the Econ 10 walkout actually about? Was it a protest of the state of the macro-economy? Or, more likely, was it merely a theatrical complaint about a professor some students do not like? From Bayard and Sandalow-Ash’s column, I would argue the latter. There may be plenty of reasons to walk out of Greg Mankiw’s 700 person class, first and foremost the notion that a student is paying fifty thousand dollars a year to be 1 out of 700 individuals in a class. But to protest Mankiw’s teaching of Introductory Economics because he’s a conservative? That’s ridiculous, and in an academic community, counter-productive.

#### Paradigms:

#### Drop the debater. Drop the arg is severance since you jump ship from your advocacy which perpetuates abuse since it allows you to restart the round.

#### Competing interps: 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom where we read increasingly unfair practices that minimally fit the brightline 2. Collapses- you use offense-defense to determine reasonability being good which concedes the authority of competing interps

#### No RVIs: 1. Illogical- being topical doesn’t mean you should win, it’s just a burden. 2. Chilling effect- debaters will be scared to read theory for fear of losing to a prepped out counter interp, proliferating abuse

#### Fairness first:

#### 1] It’s a constitutive process of debate since debate is a game with a winner and loser, speech times, and flipping 30 min before the round – Constitutive Rules means any DA to our interpretation are inevitable and terminally non-unique

#### 2] Self Defeating- All the 1ar's arguments assume that the judge will evaluate them fairly which concedes it's authority – actively hack against them

#### 3] Ballot proximity – the ballot can’t solve their offense or actualize their method since arguments we read have no effect on our subjectivity, but voting negative can set good norms.

#### 4] Deliberation – Every discussion of an liberation strategy assumes an level playing field with the ability to contribute to the discussion

#### 5] Misses the boat – Their impact turns shows a misapplication of fairness not a reason why the very structure of it is bad.

#### 6] Fair Testing – since I can’t answer the aff you should assume their arguments are presumptively false – we can only come to conclusions about the world via rigorous testing of them

## 2

**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)

#### All external critique feeds the system because it operates on the plane of the nonexistent real—our only option is by using our lives as weapons – implodes the system.

Baudrillard 76. [Jean, raging alcoholic. “Symbolic Exchange and Death”]

We will not destroy the system by a direct, dialectical revolution of the economic or political infrastructure. Everything produced by contradiction , by the relation of forces, or by energy in general , will only feed back into the mechanism and give it impetus, following a circular distortion similar to a Moebius strip. We will never defeat it by following its own logic of energy, calculation , reason and revolution , history and power, or some finality or counterfinalityThe worst violence at this level has no purchase , and will only backfire against itself. We will never defeat the system on the plane of the real: the worst error of all our revolutionary strategies is to believe that we will put an end to the system on the plane of the real: this is their imaginary, imposed on them by the system itself, living or surviving only by always leading those who attack the system to fight amongst each other on the terrain of reality, which is always the reality of the system. This is where they throw all their energies, their imaginary violence, where an implacable logic constantly turns back into the system. We have only to do it violence or counter-violence since it thrives on symbolic violence - not in the degraded sense in which this formula has found fortune, as a violence 'of signs' , from which the system draws strength, or with which it 'masks' its material violence: symbolic violence is deduced from a logic of the symbolic (which has nothing to do with the sign or with energy): reversal , the incessant reversibility o f the counter-gift and, conversely, the seizing of power by the unilateral exercise of the gift. 25 We must therefore displace everything into the sphere of the symbolic, where challenge , reversal and overbidding are the law, so that we can respond to death only by an equal or superior death. There is no question here of real violence or force, the only question concerns the challenge and the logic of the symbolic. If domination comes from the system's retention of the exclusivity of the gift without counter-gift - the gift of work which can only be responded to by destruction or sacrifice, if not in consumption , which is only a spiral of the system of surplus-gratification without result, therefore a spiral of surplus-domination , a gift of media and messages to which , due to the monopoly of the code , nothing is allowed to retort; the gift , everywhere and at every instant, of the social , of the protection agency, security, gratification and the solicitation of the social from which nothing is any longer permitted to escape - then the only solution is to turnthe principle of its power back against the system itself: the impossibility of responding or retorting. To defy the system with a gift to which it cannot respond save by its own collapse and death. 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's. Hostage and terrorist may thereafter become confused in the same sacrificial act. The stakes are death without any possibility of negotiation , and therefore return to an inevitable overbidding. Of course , they attempt to deploy the whole system of negotiation, and the terrorists themselves often enter into this exchange scenario in terms of this calculated equivalence (the hostages' lives against some ransom or liberation , or indeed for the prestige of the operation alone). From this perspective, taking hostages is not original at all, it simply creates an unforeseen and selective relation of forces which can be resolved either by traditional violence or by negotiation. It is a tactical action. There is something else at stake, however, as we clearly saw at The Hague over the course of ten days of incredible negotiations: no-one knew what could be negotiated, nor could they agree on terms, nor on the possible equivalences of the exchange. Or again, even if they were formulated, the 'terrorists' demands' amounted to a radical denial of negotiation. It is precisely here that everything is played out, for with the impossibility of all negotiation we pass into the symbolic order, which is ignorant of this type of calculation and exchange (the system itself lives solely by negotiation, even if this takes place in the equilibrium of violence).The system can only respond to this irruption of the symbolic (the most serious thing to befall it, basically the only ' revolution' )by the real, physical death of the terrorists. This, however, is its defeat, since their death was their stake, so that by bringing about their deaths the system has merely impaled itself on its own violence without really responding to the challenge that was thrown to it. Because the system can easily compute every death, even war atrocities, but cannot compute the death-challenge or symbolic death, since this death has no calculable equivalent, it opens up an inexpiable overbidding by other means than a death in exchange. Nothing corresponds to death except death. Which is precisely what happens in this case: the system itself is driven to suicide in return , which suicide is manifest in its disarray and defeat. However infinitesimal in terms of relations of forces it might be, the colossal apparatus of power is eliminated in this situation where (the very excess of its) derision is turned back against itself. The police and the army, all the institutions and mobilised violence of power whether individually or¶ massed together, can do nothing against this lowly but symbolic death. For this death draws it onto a plane where there is no longer any response possible for it (hence the sudden structural liquefaction of power in '68, not because it was less strong, but because of the simple symbolic displacement operated by the students' practices) . The system can only die in exchange, defeat itself to lift the challenge. Its death at this instant is a symbolic response, but a death which wears it out. The challenge has the efficiency of a murderer. Every society apart from ours knows that, or used to know it. Ours is in the process of rediscovering it. The routes of symbolic effectiveness are those of an alternative politics. Thus the dying ascetic challenges God ever to give him the equivalent of this death. God does all he can to give him this equivalent 'a hundred times over' , in the form of prestige , of spiritual power, indeed of global hegemony But the ascetic's secret dream is to attain such an extent of mortification that even God would be unable either to take up the challenge , or to absorb the debt . He will then have triumphed over God, and become God himself. That is why the ascetic is always close to heresy and sacrilege , and as such condemned by the Church , whose function it is merely to preserve God from this symbolic face-to-face, to protect Him from this mortal challenge where He is summoned to die, to sacrifice Himself in order to take up the challenge of the mortified ascetic. The Church will have had this role for all time, avoiding this type of catastrophic confrontation (catastrophic primarily for the Church) and substituting a rule-bound exchange of penitences and gratifications, the impressario of a system of equivalences between God and men. The same situation exists in our relation to the system of power.All these institutions, all these social, economic, political and psychological mediations, are there so that no-one ever has the opportunity to issue this symbolic challenge, this challenge to the death, the irreversible gift which, like the absolute mortification of the ascetic, brings about a victory over all power, however powerful its authority maybe. It is no longer necessary that the possibility of this direct symbolic confrontation ever takes place. And this is the source of our profound boredom. This is why taking hostages and other similar acts rekindle some fascination: they are at once an exorbitant mirror for the system of its own repressive violence, and the model of a symbolic violence which is always forbidden it, the only violence it cannot exert: its own death.

**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 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 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)

**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 aff**

#### 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.**