# 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend that a just government ought to recognize the right of workers to strike

#### Violation: Arab Republic of Egypt is not a just government

Dorn 12 James A. Dorn, Cato Journal, "The Scope of Government in a Free Society", Fall 2012,pg. 633, <https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/12/v32n3-10.pdf>/

In short, the purpose of a just government is not to do good with other people’s money, but to prevent injustice by protecting property and securing liberty.

#### Egypt commits human rights violations and thus isn’t just

**Un Member,** 3-12-20**21**, "States condemn Egypt's abuses at UN Human Rights Council," Amnesty International, https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/03/states-break-silence-to-condemn-egypts-abuses-at-un-rights-body/

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) from around the world expressed their strong support today for a joint declaration by UN member states condemning the human rights situation in Egypt which was delivered at the UN Human Rights Council. In the declaration governments expressed “deep concern” for widespread human rights violations committed with impunity by the Egyptian authorities. The joint declaration, signed by 31 states and delivered by Finland at the Council’s 46th session highlighted “restrictions on freedom of expression and the right to peaceful assembly, the constrained space for civil society and political opposition.” It also condemned the use of counter-terrorism laws to punish peaceful critics. “The 12 March declaration ends years of a lack of collective action at the UN Human Rights Council on Egypt, despite the sharply deteriorating human rights situation in the country,” said Bahey Hassan, Director of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies. “Countries should continue to make it clear to the Egyptian government that it will no longer have a carte blanche to arbitrarily imprison, torture or violate the right to life or unlawfully kill people.” More than 100 NGOs from around the world [wrote to UN member states](https://cihrs.org/egypt-human-rights-council-countries-should-take-bold-action/?lang=en) in early 2021, warning that the Egyptian government is attempting to “[annihilate](https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2017/05/egypt-ngo-law-threatens-to-annihilate-human-rights-groups/)” human rights organizations and [eradicate](https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/09/20/egypt-ruling-risks-eradicating-human-rights-work) the human rights movement in the country through sustained, widespread, and systematic attacks. The [organizations had asked UN](https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/02/09/human-rights-council-countries-should-take-bold-action-egypt) member states to adopt a resolution establishing a monitoring and reporting mechanism on Egypt. The declaration delivered on 12 March is a significant step and should be followed up by concrete action toward achieving this goal, the organizations said. The declaration was on the Council’s agenda under Item 4, which provides a space to raise concerns about grave and systematic human rights violations, including country-specific situations. The last joint declaration on the human rights situation in Egypt at the Human Rights Council was [delivered](https://www.refworld.org/docid/531f0f5b4.html) by Iceland and co-signed by 26 countries in March 2014. Since that time the human rights situation in Egypt has deteriorated dramatically. The Egyptian authorities have virtually obliterated almost all space for [free expression,](https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/mde12/9107/2018/en/) peaceful [assembly,](https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/09/27/egypt-hundreds-arrested-nationwide-crackdown) and [association](https://cihrs.org/egypt-implementing-regulations-of-ngo-law-intended-to-cripple-civil-society/?lang=en). Under President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi’s rule security forces, with the complicity of prosecutors and judges, have arrested, detained or prosecuted thousands, including hundreds of human rights defenders, religious minorities’ rights activists, peaceful protesters, journalists, academics, artists, politicians and lawyers. Many have been forcibly disappeared, [tortured](https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=dtYoAzPhJ4NMy4Lu1TOebJtOzHl9Ya%2Bxza%2BE%2BvtPfEMjvoay0x2iV30x2zj4TLGEMjRXVex9Q%2FNhnR3%2FZHIww27bw4ZF3htxFLucJ9b7NxE%3D) or otherwise ill-treated, and detained for months or years in [inhumane conditions](https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/mde12/3538/2021/en/) without trial. Those detained are regularly held on the basis of [unfounded terrorism-related charges](https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/mde12/1399/2019/en/). If referred to trial individuals are often convicted in grossly unfair proceedings before [military](https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/04/13/egypt-7400-civilians-tried-military-courts) courts and through [mass trials](https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2018/09/egyptdeath-sentences-and-heavy-prison-terms-handed-down-in-disgraceful-mass-trial/). Many have been sentenced to death and [executed](https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/12/egypt-chilling-rise-in-executions-reveals-depth-of-human-rights-crisis/) after unfair trials that have relied on statements likely obtained through torture. The authorities have also used morality and debauchery laws to arrest and detain [women influencers](https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/08/egypt-survivors-of-sexual-violence-and-online-abuse-among-prosecuted-women-tiktok-influencers/), sexual violence survivors and witnesses, and LGBTI individuals and activists. The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention has [found](https://www.ohchr.org/en/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=25676&LangID=E) that arbitrary detention is a systematic problem in Egypt. The UN Committee against Torture [said](https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=dtYoAzPhJ4NMy4Lu1TOebJtOzHl9Ya%2Bxza%2BE%2BvtPfEMjvoay0x2iV30x2zj4TLGEMjRXVex9Q%2FNhnR3%2FZHIww27bw4ZF3htxFLucJ9b7NxE%3D) in 2017 following an inquiry on Egypt that the facts gathered by the committee “lead to the inescapable conclusion that torture is a systematic practice in Egypt.”

#### Prefer on neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### That’s an independent voter for accessibility- you are forcing people to defend a horrible government tortures and executes innocent protestors and human rights defenders. Accessibility o/w- it’s a pre-req to accessing fairness and education in the first place

#### Standards:

#### [1] precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### Semantics First:

#### [1] Pragmatics collapses to semantics – what makes something pragmatic is the semantic definition of it which makes it a prerequisite.

#### [2] The topic is the stasis point of all debates – only with the correct semantic interpretation can we generate pre-round prep and predict arguments. That controls the internal link to any pragmatic debate.

#### [3] Probability: things like definitions are objective whereas how fair or educational things are is subjective.

# 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not specify a just government in which a right to strike ought to be recognized

#### “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just government” in the res – means that you have to prove the resolution true in a VACCUM, not in a particular instance

CCC (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation) LHSLA JC/SJ

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### Violation: they spec Arab Republic of Egypt

#### Standards:

#### [1] precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### [2] limits – the UN says there are 195 national governments but even that’s not an agreed upon brightline – explodes limits since there are tons of independent affs plus functionally infinite combinations, all with different advantages in different political situations. Kills neg prep and debatability since there are no DAs that apply to every aff – i.e. factors that affect labor shortages or unions in the US are different than in China – means the aff is always more prepared and wins just for speccing. There’s been China, Hungary, EU, Kazakhstan, US, India, UK, Egypt and this is the first major tournament of the topic out of only 3

#### [3] tva – just read your aff as an advantage under a whole res advocacy, solves all ur offense- Potential abuse doesn’t permit 1AC abuse – allows you to be infinitely abusive in the 1AC-– if the neg doesn’t have specific prep, they’ll resort to cheaty word PICs which are net worse

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

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

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

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

# 3

**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)

#### Micropolitics opens up new, localized movements which are a pre-requisite for successful macropolitical movements and is the only way to identify and fight causal factors behind the issues – policies will not be able to combat cultural phenomena or microfascism – empirics

BEST & KELLNER nd summarize an argument Not so critical guys [Steven Best and Douglas Kellner. “Postmodern Politics and the Battle for the Future.” Illuminations: the critical theory project. No date. Accessed 3/26/2018. URL = <https://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/Illumina%20Folder/kell28.htm>] SJCP//NM

One of the key insights of the postmodern turn, theorized by Foucault, was that power is everywhere, not only in the factories, but in the schools, prisons, hospitals, and all other institutions. This insight is both depressing, since it acknowledges that power saturates all social spaces and relations, and exhilarating, because it allows for and demands new forms of struggle. Hence, multiple forms of resistance open up along every line of identity that is controlled or normalized. The movements of the period challenged capitalism, state power and bureaucracy, the repressive organization of everyday life in the midst of consumer society, along with various modes of ideologically constituted identities. Postmodern politics, following capital and state intervention processes themselves, represents a politicization of all spheres of social and personal existence, which were previously ignored or rejected by modern and Marxist approaches as proper political spaces. With postmodern politics, every sphere of social life becomes subject to questioning and contestation, and the sites of struggle multiply. With the pluralistic approach, power is more vulnerable to attack and hence Foucault emphasized the contingency and frailty of power relations. Where a Leninist would argue that pluralized struggle only dissipates the centralized forces needed to combat capital and the state, a politically radical postmodernist would respond that the new struggles attack the weak links of the system and spread resistance everywhere, thereby allowing for the general attack that Leninists rightly think is necessary for overthrowing capitalism. Hence, the 1960s brought a shift from a macropolitics that focused on changing the structure of the economy and state to a micropolitics that aims to overturn power and hierarchy in specific institutions, and to liberate emotional, libidinal, and creative energies repressed by the reality principle of bourgeois society. An important aspect of micropolitics, as evident in the work of Lyotard, Foucault, and Deleuze and Guattari, is a politics of subjectivity which theorizes the conditions under which the modern subject has emerged as both an effect of power, what Foucault calls the "subjectification" of individuals. This entails primarily a struggle against the "microfascism" latent in everyone, to be combatted by breaking out of, in the terms of Deleuze and Guattari, the "molar" pole of desire (such as informs all normalized subjectivities) and finding the "molecular" lines of escape. For Foucault, the politics of subjectivity involves a "politics as ethics" which creates new subjects on the Greek model of an "aesthetics of existence."[10] Postmodern models of politics are trying to redefine the "political" based on changes in society, technology, economics, and everyday life. A postmodern cultural politics, building on the insights of Gramsci, the surrealists, Lefebvre, and the situationists, thematizes culture as a crucial terrain of power and struggle. To the extent that social reproduction is now largely achieved at the levels of culture and everyday life, where the individual is a target of total administration, questions of subjectivity, ideology, culture, aesthetics, and utopian thought take on a new importance. The instrumentalist, pragmatic, or rationalist conception of political struggle, which attempts to shape "political consciousness," class or otherwise, and mobilize political insight into a political movement that transcends questions of culture, is insufficient because it begs the question of how a political movement will be possible in the first place, given the degree of subjective identification with dominant modes of thought and behavior throughout society. As thinkers like Reich and Adorno saw, fascism has roots not only in the crisis of monopoly capital, but also in the repression of the instinctual structure and the emergence of an "authoritarian personality." Thus, if people live immersed in a culture colonized by capitalism, a culture of spectacles that binds affect and mobilizes pleasures to its sights, sound, and experiences, then the struggle for culture, subjectivity, and identity is no longer secondary to the struggle for society, and both cultural and identity politics are crucial for breaking from the dominant ideologies and creating new forms of life and consciousness. Given the need to produce new subjectivities, political education, rational persuasion, and moral appeals remain of the greatest importance, but they can be very weak opponents of the seductive pleasures of MTV, blockbuster films, the Internet, fashion and advertising, and commodity consumption of all kinds. In Marcuse's words, "no persuasion, no theory, no reasoning can break this prison [of subjectivity], unless the fixed, petrified sensibility of the individuals is `dissolved,'opened to a new dimension in history, until the oppressive familiarity with the given object world is broken - broken in a second alienation: that from the alienated society."[11] It is culture that molds the sensibilities and thus a radical cultural politics attempts to undo the enculturation of the dominant culture by providing new ways of seeing, feeling, thinking, talking, and being. Progressives today must not simply fall back on the old valorization of critical realism and its narrow cognitive models, as valuable as didactic and pedagogical art might be. What is ultimately needed are new affective structures and modes of experience which can act as catalysts and the condition of the possibility of broader social and political transformations. Here, the political function of critical art becomes, negatively, a defamiliarization from the dominant mode of experiencing reality, what Marcuse has termed an alienation from alienation. Such has been the practice of Brecht's epic theater, Artaud's theater of cruelty, or Godard's anti-narrative films, all of which sought to question and displace the dominant mode of experiencing reality, rather than reproduce it through staid aesthetic conventions. Positively, a cultural politics has the task of "aesthetic education," the reshaping of human needs, desires, senses, and imagination through the construction of images, spectacles, and narratives that prefigure different ways of seeing and living. Situationist art, for example, practiced both functions, the negative through its deconstruction of advertisements and other images (detournement), and the positive through experiences with the "constructed situation," a practice earlier advanced by the surrealists in their various exercises and games (such as "the exquisite corpse") designed to liberate unconscious creative forces. Paradoxically, today we find the atrophy of the senses in their hypertrophic extension throughout the sensorium of the spectacle and its images and commodity empires.[12] Against Lukācs, we emphasize the importance of formal innovation and avant-gardism in the arts, where such new techniques and modes of vision can help people break with repressive identifications with both the utilitarian (instrumental reason) and affective (sign value) modes of experience constituted by advanced capitalism. A new society will never be attainable until it is experienced as a need, as a desire for new modes of community, work, experience, social interaction, and relations to the natural world that could never be satisfied within capitalism and therefore cannot be coopted by economic reforms. As Bahro saw,[13] capitalism generates needs and desires it ultimately cannot satisfy for freedom, justice, self-realization, and a good life, and a radical cultural politics will depict both how the current mode of social organization restricts, limits, and deforms desire, freedom, and justice, while projecting visions of how these aspirations could be realized. Both the radical negations of society by certain forms of critical modernism (i.e. Kafka, Beckett, German Expressionism, etc.) and the utopian dimension of art stressed by theorists such as Bloch and Marcuse is thus more relevant than ever today when radical critique is needed to free individuals from forms of oppression of which they are often unaware and when a better way of life is technically possible for all. In addition to cultural politics, postmodern politics has often developed new political strategies and politicized new domains of life. The European autonomous movements that George Katsiaficas, for instance, has described struggle to politicize, among other things, housing and have developed squatters movements to occupy abandoned houses or deteriorating urban neighborhoods.[14] In addition, the automomous movements have been active in local anti-nuclear struggles, attacking local nuclear installations and protesting against the deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe. Indeed, throughout the world postmodern politics have affixed themselves to new social movements and localized struggles.