## 1 – Method DA

#### First, their model of debate produces insular debates that destroy education, ethics and reproduces anti-blackness as Conviction Based Debate is based off an assumption of mastery embedded in whiteness. Being able to interpret the topic to mean whatever the aff wants kills the transformative power of this activity. Star this card because it answers the aff’s generic T preempts super well.

Evans 12 [Rashad, JD., Black debate extraordinare and JD, “The 1NC,” Nov 20, http://www.rwesq.com/the-1nc/]

Now, the debate! First, let me look at Casey Harrigan’s (“CH”) definition of SSD. He says that : Definition: switch side debate (SSD) is the practice that requires debaters to argue both for and against a given topic in alternating rounds. In effect, it has meant that debaters’ arguments are divorced from personal conviction and instead made contingently as a means of “testing” the truth value of a proposition. I will accept this definition, but I think it requires some more refinement. In a practical sense, SSD, at a minimum, requires that the affirmative defend the resolution. For the most part, the negative is unconstrained (except by competition) and most debates in which SSD comes up the question is whether the affirmative team should be required to affirm the topic, including some defense of an action by the United States Federal Government (“USFG”). **The essential question posed by SSD is whether the affirmative team should be required to defend the resolution even when they (1) fundamentally disagree with all or part of it and/or (2) are compelled to affirm other ideas because of their “personal convictions.”** The answer to this question must be yes. First, there are multiple ways to skin a cat and even more ways to affirm the resolution in the world of parametric debate because one need only affirm an interpretation of the resolution and not the resolution writ large. Therefore, there are rare instances in which there is no interpretation of the resolution that you cannot defend and these rare instances are most likely the product of lack of creativity and research. So in reality, the question is an even simpler one: should the affirmative team be required to defend an interpretation of the resolution. There are immense constitutive and instrumental benefits to SSD that cannot be otherwise obtained and therefore must be required. I ask that the judges: George, Justin and Kyla evaluate this debate holistically, which requires that they evaluate the benefits of SSD to the speaker (constitutive) and to society (instrumental). This also requires that they exclude nothing in their analysis of this debate. The Constitutive Debaters benefit from SSD. It requires that they engage in topics that they may not otherwise engage. The resolution poses a unique question and the debate round is a unique time to answer that question. One is much more likely to consider their personal convictions outside of the debate round than they are to consider the resolution outside the debate round. Therefore, independently of whether one agrees with the resolution or not, there are benefits to defending an interpretation of the resolution in that it requires you to consider something you may not have otherwise considered. These thought expiriments create more informed and thoughtful debaters and citizens. SSD creates a unique opportunity for self-reflexivity. The idea is to let your personal convictions guide you in the debate. The resolution doesn’t require that you suppress your identity or convictions, but is instead an opportunity to infuse that identity and those convictions into the resolution and public policy discussion. So, given who you are, what you believe and what you know what say you regarding energy production? What say you regarding democracy assistance? What say you regarding federal control in Indian Country? Therefore, the resolution is an opportunity for you to refine your personal convictions and put your identity in politics instead of relying exclusively on identity politics.SSD allows you to check your own privilege. Here, I will rely on my personal experience. I once participated in a 30 day creative challenge where the challenge leader would pose questions on facebook and the group would answer them in the comments section. One day he asked us to imagine we could be the other gender for 3 days and to discuss what would we do. I thought about this on the A-train from Harlem to Chelsea and again from Chelsea to Harlem and had no answer because I couldn’t imagine being a woman. I explained that as a gay man I don’t need to be a woman to have sex with a man, I don’t want a baby in me and more importantly I don’t want the physical vulnerability of being a woman. This realization really forced me to reevaluate my previous jokes even that as a gay many I was ontologically indistinct from a woman. I am not. I am gay and I am black…in many ways I am the the worlds bottom, but even I could would not want to occupy the body of a woman. That thought experiment taught me a lot about myself, privilege and the world. Sometimes, you have to take a walk in someone else’s stiletto to learn who you really are. Seriously CH, have you walked in stilettos? It will change your life. SSD is both necessary and sufficient to ensure that you debate your personal convictions. Remember, if you are staunchly opposed to the resolution you get to lodge those complaints on the negative. Also, remember that what is good for the goose is good for the gander and if you don’t have to debate the resolution then no one has to debate the resolution. This loosening of the restrictions on the resolution may mean that no one gets to debate anything they want. I mean lets face it, no one wants to be topical! There’s always a better version of your aff that isn’t topical. Every 2AC considers severance or intrinsicness because the resolution is flawed or insufficient. However, a true debater understands that they both have to debate on the affirmative and the negative and that in order to do either effectively there must be stability in the relationship between the affirmative and the negative. Therefore, committing yourself to the resolution is key preserving your own negative ground to engage in your critique of the resolution. As goes the resolution so goes your personal convictions about that resolution. The Instrumental SSD is the only way to organize a fair debate tournament. We must have a topic. There must be rules and allowing any and everyone go rogue because of their “personal convictions” it is a recipe for disaster. I don’t want to live and debate in that world. There must be strict requirements on defending the resolution to allow for fair and predictable negative ground. By the way, protecting fair negative ground is easier and more important than all other concerns regarding fairness. All people of all convictions have to be negative at some point. Which means that the affirmative-negative dialiectic is the only intersectional analysis that can be performed because all people of all identities will eventually find themselves on the affirmative or negative side in debate. Preserving negative ground then preserves the ground of women, minorities and hippies.SSD ensures that we have all hands on deck in these extraordinary times. We need all perspectives and all peoples to engage in all debates. SSD facilitates this. Allowing students to pick their own topic because of their “personal convictions” may mean that important issues get ignored all together. I mean, what would happen if we let the students set the curriculum? Would they learn anything, ever? How many times have you heard these questions in a classroom: why do I have to learn this? Will this be on the exam? My major is X, why do I need to learn Y? Blah. Yes, students would almost always like to do what they want to do. If we allowed this where would we be as a country? Who will be there to tackle the important questions pertaining to immigration, energy production, the Arab Spring, etc? Engaging the resolution from your specific social location can cause others to change their views. There are several examples of creative interpretations of the resolution that have inspired folk to view the topic and life differently. This is when debate is at its best and when it’s engaging in important knowledge production. Debate and debaters have the potential to infuse new arguments, ideas and perspectives into the resolution and into the broader discussion. Now, the line by line! CH says: 1. It presumes debate as a “pedagogical bull-pen”, which undermines the activity’s potential for radical change. Students are told “you can’t know anything until you debate both sides”, ignoring the VAST WEALTH of lived experience that underwrites specific claims about identity, the world, praxis, and the topic. In some ways, it is like Loyola’s argument about info accumulation – we are told to place a hold on “conviction” until we have “enough information” and “enough testing” when in reality there is either never a point where “enough is enough” OR we have \*already\* crossed that point and should be able to utilize the debate space for advocacy. It makes debate into a game about hypothetical action rather than a potential site for social justice. First, there are radically topical interpretations of the resolution. Second, how does one know that their lived experience is dispositive of any debate without testing it against the research and lived experiences of others. It’s not that you can’t know anything until you debate both sides but more importantly that you debate both sides before you conclude you know anything. Lastly, there is no internal link between resolutional debate and the loss of social justice. In fact, one should always debate the resolution in a way that produces social justice. 2. It is anti-Black. The norm of SSD and topic construction mandating USFG action presume that public policy is valuable because it is equally accessible to all participants, when in reality access is ANYTHING BUT that, relies on a belief that USFG action is a locus for change when in reality and history it has produced the opposite, marginalizes individual perspectives as “too local”, and does not account for the specific conditions of Black participation in debate. Your anti-Blackness argument is without warrant. To the extent that anti-Blackness is a problem, SSD is the solution. Certainly, holding on to ones conviction in avoidance of debate has never benefited Black people in the past. Thinking itself is Blackness (whiteness is anti-thought), so avoiding a debate because of personal conviction is quintessentially anti-Black.

#### Second, presume negative. By pretend to be topical with this linguistics argument they create the affirmative burden to prove the resolution, even if it is based on a reinterpretation of what the terms in the topic mean. They may say they’re talking about appropriation but literally 0 evidence in the AC actually mentions appropriation, which shows that the aff isn’t key.

#### Third, their use of debate as a site of empowerment places the judge into the role of the authoritarian adjudicator who molds students in accordance to a particular political end, which turns case by recreating a politics of respectability.

**Rickert 1** Rickert, Thomas. ""Hands Up, You're Free": Composition in a Post-Oedipal World." JacOnline Journal

“An example of the connection between violence and pedagogy is implicit in the notion of being "schooled" as it has been conceptualized by Giroux and Peter Mclaren. They explain, "Fundamental to the principles that inform critical pedagogy is the conviction that schooling for self- and social empowerment is ethically prior to questions of epistemology or to a mastery of technical or social skills that are primarily tied to the logic of the marketplace" (153-54). A presumption here is that it is the teacher who knows (best), and this orientation gives the concept of schooling a particular bite: though it presents itself as oppositional to the state and the dominant forms of pedagogy that serve the state and its capitalist interests, it nevertheless reinscribes an authoritarian model that is congruent with any number of oedipalizing pedagogies that "school" the student in proper behavior. As Diane Davis notes, radical, feminist, and liberatory pedagogies "often camouflage pedagogical violence in their move from one mode of 'normalization' to another" and "function within a disciplinary matrix of power, a covert carceral system, that aims to create useful subjects for particular political agendas" (212). Such oedipalizing pedagogies are less effective in practice than what the claims for them assert; indeed, the attempt to "school" students in the manner called for by Giroux and McLaren is complicitous with the malaise of postmodern cynicism. Students will dutifully go through their liberatory motions, producing the proper assignments, but it remains an open question whether they carry an oppositional politics with them. The "critical distance" supposedly created with liberatory pedagogy also opens up a cynical distance toward the writing produced in class.” (299-300)

#### Fourth, it doesn’t matter how great of an academic you are. Without a specific defense of action to be taken, you’ll never be the radical that the system needs because you just bind the revolution inside of a book. Instead, the meaningless production of the 1AC only recreates the system it critiques by attempting to combat monolithic ideals.

Bryant 12 (Levi Bryant is Professor of Philosophy at[Collin College](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collin_College)“McKenzie Wark: How Do You Occupy an Absnatraction” August 4, 2012 <http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/08/04/mckenzie-wark-how-do-you-occupy-an-abstraction/> )

In the language of my machine-oriented ontology or onticology, we would say that we only ever encounter local manifestations of hyperobjects, local events or appearances of hyperobjects, and never the hyperobject as such. Hyperobjects as such are purely virtual or withdrawn. They can’t be directly touched. And what’s worse, contrary to Locke’s principle of individuation whereby an individual is individuated by virtue of its location in a particular place and at a particular time, hyperobjects are without a site or place. They are, as Morton says, non-local. This, then, is a central problem, for how do you combat something that is everywhere and nowhere? How do you engage something that is non-local? If an army is over there I can readily target it. If a particular munitions factor is over here, then I can readily target it. But how do we target something that is non-local and that is incorporeal? This is the problem with occupying an abstraction. Second, contemporary capitalism is massively redundant. This, I think, is what Wark is getting at when he speaks of contemporary power as “vectoral”. Under what Wark calls “vector power”, we have configurations of power where attacks at one site have very little impact insofar as flows can simply be re-channeled through another set of nodes in the network. Like a hydra, you cut off one head only to have another head appear in its place. The head can never be cut off once and for all because there is no single head. The crisis of contemporary politics is thus the crisis of the erasure of site. In the age of hyperobjects, we come to dwell in a world where there is no clear site of political antagonism and therefore no real sense of how and where to engage. Here I’m also inclined to say that we need to be clear about system references in our political theorizing and action. We think a lot about the content of our political theorizing and positions, but I don’t think we think a lot about how our political theories are supposed to actually act in the world. As a result, much contemporary leftist political theory ends up in a performative contradiction. It claims, following Marx, that it’s aim is not to represent the world but to change it, yet it never escapes the burrows of academic journals, and conferences, and presses to actually do so. Like the Rat-Man’s obsessional neurosis where his actions in returning the glasses were actually designed to fail, there seems to be a built in tendency in these forms of theorization to unconsciously organize their own failure. And here I can’t resist suggesting that this comes as no surprise given that, in Lacanian terms, the left is the position of the hysteric and as such has “a desire for an unsatisfied desire”. In such circumstances the worst thing consists in getting what you want. We on the left need to traverse our fantasy so as to avoid this sterile and self-defeating repetition; and this entails shifting from the position of political critique (hysterical protest), to political construction– actually envisioning and building alternatives. So what’s the issue with system-reference? The great autopoietic sociological systems theorist, Niklas Luhmann, makes this point nicely. For Luhmann, there are intra-systemic references and inter-systemic references. Intra-systemic references refer to processes that are strictly for the sake of reproducing or maintaining the system in question. Take the example of a cell. A cell, for-itself, is not for anything beyond itself. The processes that take place within the cell are simply for continuing the existence of the cell across time. While the cell might certainly emit various chemicals and hormones as a result of these processes, from its own intra-systemic perspective, it is not for the sake of affecting these other cells with those hormones. They’re simply by-products. Capitalism or economy is similar. Capitalists talk a good game about benefiting the rest of the world through the technologies they produce, the medicines they create (though usually it’s government and universities that invent these medicines), the jobs they create, etc., but really the sole aim of any corporation is identical to that of a cell: to endure through time or reproduce itself through the production of capital. This production of capital is not for anything and does not refer to anything outside itself. These operations of capital production are intra-systemic. By contrast, inter-systemic operations would refer to something outside the system and its auto-reproduction. They would be for something else. Luhmann argues that every autopoietic system has this sort of intra-systemic dimension. Autopoietic systems are, above all, organized around maintaining themselves or enduring. This raises serious questions about academic political theory. Academia is an autopoietic system. As an autopoietic system, it aims to endure, reproduce itself, etc. It must engage in operations or procedures from moment to moment to do so. These operations consist in the production of students that eventually become scholars or professors, the writing of articles, the giving of conferences, the production of books and classes, etc. All of these are operations through which the academic system maintains itself across time. The horrifying consequence of this is that the reasons we might give for why we do what we do might (and often) have little to do with what’s actually taking place in system continuance. We say that our articles are designed to demolish capital, inequality, sexism, homophobia, climate disaster, etc., but if we look at how this system actually functions we suspect that the references here are only intra-systemic, that they are only addressing the choir or other academics, that they are only about maintaining that system, and that they never proliferate through the broader world. Indeed, our very style is often a big fuck you to the rest of the world as it requires expert knowledge to be comprehended, thereby insuring that it can have no impact on broader collectives to produce change. Seen in this light, it becomes clear that our talk about changing the world is a sort of alibi, a sort of rationalization, for a very different set of operations that are taking place. Just as the capitalist says he’s trying to benefit the world, the academic tries to say he’s trying to change the world when all he’s really doing is maintaining a particular operationally closed autopoietic system. How to break this closure is a key question for any truly engaged political theory. And part of breaking that closure will entail eating some humble pie. Adam Kotsko [wrote a wonderful and hilarious post](http://itself.wordpress.com/2012/08/04/the-practical-know-how-of-humanities-academics/) on the absurdities of some political theorizing and its self-importance today. We’ve failed horribly with university politics and defending the humanities, yet in our holier-than-thou attitudes we call for a direct move to communism. Perhaps we need to reflect a bit on ourselves and our strategies and what political theory should be about.

#### Five, affective manipulations can’t result in political outcomes, meaning that the aff’s promise of a possible future with broken down institutional walls is lie.

Sherwin 15. Richard - New York Law School. “Too Late for Thinking: The Curious Quest for Emancipatory Potential in Meaningless Affect and Some Jurisprudential Implications.” Law, Culture and the Humanities. October 13. 1-13.

In the history of western culture we can point to three historic moments of epistemological de-centering. The Copernican revolution taught humanity that we do not dwell at the center of the universe. The Freudian revolution taught us that the ‘‘I’’ is a lonely island besieged on all sides by a raging sea of irrational, unconscious forces. Then quantum theory taught us that the universe is indeterminate: subject to uncanny chance operations. Affect theory, perhaps as an extension of the Darwinian evolutionary account of selective adaptation, humbles rationalist pretensions further by subordinating mind to material, bio-chemical processes. If thinking is always an after-thought, an after-the-fact construction, then we can never reliably account for how we’ve actually been affected by things and others in the world around us. How oppressive never to escape the grip of contingent social constructs. How depressing, if endless deconstruction yields only more fragmentation. Surely something must abide, some Higgs Boson-like elementary particle that can withstand deconstruction’s powerful blows. Is there anything real enough to withstand critique? Is there any basis left to hope for emancipation from the destabilizing mutability of human fabrication? In Brian Massumi’s view, there is. As he puts it: “The world always already offers degrees of freedom ready for amplification.”22 This takes us to the heart of the vitalist/ liberation impulse, namely: “escape from crystallized power structures.”23 In Massumi’s writings, affect operates as a cipher – a black box into which he can pack his emancipatory ideal.24 (“‘Affect’ is the word I use for ‘hope.’”25) What Massumi does not and perhaps cannot, or simply does not care to do is formulate a coherent basis for political judgment. While he at some points expresses a preference for “caring” and “belonging,”26 he offers no basis in affect theory for why those forms of behavior are preferable to other perhaps more intense alternatives, such as “anger” and “shock,” which he also embraces.27 But choices must be made. As Martha Nussbaum has noted, a society that cultivates conditions of anger and disgust, for example, is different from one that promotes empathy, dignity, and love.28 Massumi is enamored of the anti-structural,29 the spontaneous emergent process that Deleuze called “pure immanence.” But with affective intensity as his ultimate value30 Massumi remains trapped in a double bind. No critical judgment is forthcoming so long as intensity may be amplified.31 Because of this Massumi cannot coherently critique manifestly oppressive political structures (such as futurism, Nazism, and other intensity-fueled political regimes). How could he if the masses have opted to embrace such regimes for the intensity they provide? Massumi’s resistance to making judgments is consistent with his theory, which minimizes to the vanishing point the human capacity for choice. For Massumi, the very notions of ‘‘individual will’’ and ‘‘subjective reflection’’ are a fiction. (“There is no individual outside its own trans-individual becoming.”32) Body is always conditioning mind – presumably without our conscious awareness. In the end, “events decide.”33 What could human freedom mean under such conditions? The upshot is plain: in Massumi’s politics of affect, human freedom loses its capacity to signify. Choices are a fiction, and in any event no apparent normative basis exists for affirming, much less institutionalizing a preferred set of power structures. Affective intensity lacks structure by definition. Indeed, that is its appeal. (“Intensity is a value in itself.”34) But as Anthony Kronman has eloquently argued, without coherent structures, the legal, political, and cultural conditions necessary for the meaningful exercise of freedom (including political judgment) are unlikely to emerge – and if they do, they are unlikely to be sustainable.35 The latter point is borne out by the very political events that Massumi identifies as exemplary of his theory. If the “Arab Spring” and the “Occupy Movement”36 illustrate anything it is the effervescence of political action based on spontaneous intensity. In the absence of adequate political structures, this kind of political action is destined to pass with the next day’s tide. The emancipatory cri du coeur that can be heard echoing in the work of cultural theorists like Massumi may have landed on “trans-individual” affect as the intensive Higgs Boson wave-particle of political science. Its indeconstructability promises freedom from subjective and cultural contingency – the prison house of “crystallized power structures.” But there is a price to be paid. The radical devaluation of reflective consciousness produces a species of freedom that signifies nothing. Perhaps this is what it is like to embrace a Zeitgeist of “de-humanism.”37 In Massumi’s politics of affect we can discern the impetus for ‘‘vitalist/liberation’’ ideology. As Ben Anderson writes: “There is always already an excess [affect] that power must work to recuperate but is destined and doomed to miss. It is that excess that is central to the creativity of bio-political production and thus the power of naked life.”38 Affect in this sense is “a movement of creative production” that always eludes capture. And this is what conveys a sense of its emancipatory power.39 The intensity of affect liberates us from bondage to contingent cultural entanglement. Corporeal ontology precedes cultural epistemology. This move away from the centrality of cognition marks the demise not only of identity politics, but of identity itself, perhaps even of psychology.40 Simply stated, affect theorists like Massumi romanticize the unknowable “fluid materiality of excitable networks” as a way of disrupting familiar social and cultural hierarchies.41 In so doing, they elevate raw process over social and cultural regimentation and subjugation. It is the neurobiological equivalent of Rousseau’s primitive origin of society, an updated version of the Romantics’ myth of enchantment. If only questions about freedom and responsibility for shared values, justice included, could be resolved by so simple an expedient as the vitalist/liberation category shift from human agency to ‘‘trans-individual affective process.’’ Much can be learned about the various forms of political violence that affective intensity has assumed over the course of human history. But one needn’t take the historical path to discern trouble for Massumi’s emancipatory project. One can start with neuroscience itself.42 Theorists like Massumi play down (as they must) a variety of obstacles that stand in the way of affective emancipation: from the constraints of evolution to the biological programming of the amygdala itself.43 Indeed, what constitutes ‘‘fearfulness,’’ for example, depends upon programming the amygdala based on a habituated pattern of external stimuli.44 There are other problems as well. For instance, a great deal of uncertainty surrounds the question of how communication occurs among different levels of the mind/body complex. As Steve Pile writes, for theorists like Massumi “affect is defined in opposition to cognition, reflexivity, consciousness and humanness.”45 Feelings, on the other hand, occupy a space between non-cognitive affect and highly socialized emotions. Feelings in this sense are pre-cognitive (“a response to transpersonal affects”).46 Our response to affects personalizes them. Through feelings we associate affects with the subject who experiences them. For their part, emotions reflect a shift from pre-cognitive subjectivity to the cognitive domain of socially constructed experience.47 Emotions, in this sense, are how I interpret what I’m feeling through language and other representational or cultural symbolic practices. Affect theorists like Massumi insist that my choices and perhaps even my feelings may turn out to have nothing to do with the affect my body has already processed without my knowing it. This view preserves the purity of affective intensity by keeping it free of subjective or social significance. If you are in the ‘‘vitalist/liberation’’ camp of affect theory along with Massumi, affect can never be symbolized, which means it can never be cognized. Affect, in this view, is always beyond consciousness. It’s like the dark matter that makes up the universe: we know it’s there, we just can’t say anything about it. The problem for ‘‘vitalist/liberation’’ theorists like Massumi is that they want to eat their cake and have it too. Affects for them are ciphers – free-ranging radicals incapable of signifying. Yet, at the same time, many of these same theorists engage in searing critiques of those “in power” who use mass media along with other instrumentalities of affective manipulation for purposes of enhancing social or political control.48 The difficulty is this: If affect is being actively engineered to manipulate people’s behavior – whether in the form of habits of consumption, political judgments, or jury verdicts – it is incumbent upon the theorists to account for how exactly this manipulation is being carried out. As Pile cogently notes, how are the agents of affective manipulation able to “know the unknowable” sufficiently well to control their course and impact in society?49 Thrift’s recourse to metaphors such as “pipes and cables” is hardly sufficient to bear the burden of scientific explanation. Indeed, the nomenclature that has emerged to account for the engineering of affect – ranging from “affect flow between bodies,” “transmissions,” and “contagion”50 – all seem to suffer from the same fundamental lack of explanatory power. If we cannot know what affects are, it stands to reason that we cannot know how to control their flow and impact in society.

## DA – Space Colonization

#### Rather than refuse to engage in material analysis we should engage in infiltration. This is key to learning the skills of subversion and sabotage—speaking the language of power allows debaters to imagine ways to redirect the state against itself and avert environmental disaster and western imperialism. That imaginary is also good for micro-political spaces because it helps us identify the weak-points in hegemonic institutions. If the aff really cared about breaking down institutional walls it wouldn’t operate as an disinterested outsider.

DeLeon 12 (Abraham P. - Associate Professor & Assistant Dean for Curriculum and Programming Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at UTSA, “Chapter 17: Against the Grain of the Status Quo: Anarchism behind Enemy Lines,” in Anarchist pedagogies: collective actions, theories, and critical reflections on education, edited by Robert H. Haworth, Published: Oakland, CA: PM Press, p. 312-15)

Infiltration: a word that may evoke a host of thoughts and fantasies from soldiers operating behind enemy lines, police informants gaining access to criminal organizations, or to scenarios of radicals inserting themselves into corporations or research labs. Whatever the scenario, infiltration can be tactic that anarchists pursue when thinking about operating within current institutional realities, especially if interested in teaching in public schools. Although this claim is entangled within complex relationships of power and privilege, struggle arises wherever domination coalesces, especially within institutional structures and settings (Sharp, Routledge, Philo & Paddison, 2000). Power conjures, “the threadings, knottings and weavings” of social relationships through a intertwining of the social, political, moral, educational, and historical realities of a given society. In this way, power is “crucially and unavoidably spun out across and through the material spaces of the world” (Sharp, et al., 2000, p. 22). This chapter thus looks to situate itself and build radical pedagogy within the threads and knots of contemporary relationships of power; in-between what Holloway (2010) has called the “cracks” of capitalism, trying to “desperately find . . . faults beneath the surface, or to create cracks by banging the walls” (p. 8). Cracks have emerged through environmental disaster, economic collapse, psychological alienation, a crisis of identity, and decades of war and imperial aggression conducted by the West. It is under these historical conditions that resistance needs to be conceptualized. Creating, finding and exploiting “cracks” within a diffused and networked capitalism demonstrates that dated narratives of revolutionary struggle are no longer viable and there is “no guarantee of a happy ending” (Holloway, 2010, p. 9). Unfortunately, although these narratives may provide comfort amid an onslaught of capitalism, war, death, terror, and alienation, they do not open up, nor allow, alternative possibilities of resistance to form outside the boundaries they construct. In some ways, these may only help to reproduce the current order we find ourselves in. This does not mean that we should resign ourselves to the throngs of nihilistic defeat, as there is indeed potential for radical hope within the cracks of Empire. The multitude, with its potential for infinite possibilities, can build a complex and dispersed resistance through the breaks, tears, and folds of our social order (Deleuze, 1992), and the tactics and pedagogies that we envision as radicals can attempt to capture this spirit. Although the manifestations of these cracks and folds is yet to be seen, I leave the reader to their own radical imaginations in devising ways to subvert a networked and diffused machine (Shukaitis, 2009). Evoking the metaphor of a “machine,” as I describe the multifaceted nature of contemporary capitalism, harkens to Trotter’s (1990) claim that colonialism operated in a very similar way, divorced from individual interactions and operating abstractly through “official” and “unofficial” discourses, forms of knowledge, ways of knowing, the morality of a given era, and the reproduction of knowledge to name a few. The analogy of a machine also challenges that human agency is solely at the center of how social system operate, because machines, “create, distribute, and organize populations and impose regimes of conduct, agency and effectivity” outside of individual actors and agency (Grossberg, 2010, p. 36). Radicals (within and outside the labor movement) had ingenious ways in which to deal with the machines of capitalism, occurring through tactics that spanned strikes, sit-ins, walking out, and subversion to even more direct forms like sabotaging machinery, bringing production to a halt. Sabotage is a tactic that anarchists need to rethink in light of how labor is now dispersed among a wide variety of institutional realities (factories, banks, corporations, and public institutions, for example), as well as the contemporary knowledge and abstract economies. The machines of capitalism that produced goods during the height of the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century provide us a way in which to think of societal machines and tactics that can be adapted for current conditions. How do we as anarchists, who want to teach and work with students, deal with the contradictions of being located within the same institutions that seek to discipline bodies and coerce us? How do we sabotage these machines and build a radical pedagogy from this perspective? Sabotage provides a provocative conceptual framework in which to think about building alternative forms of resistance and aligns with ways in which anarchists have historically conceptualized direct political action. This is even more interesting when we think of how this will emerge through educational practice, as teaching allows us to directly engage ideology, challenging students’ conceptions about the world around them. With this type of important, dare I say political work, why do some anarchists shun the world of public teaching and service? Education is at the “front lines” of the contemporary ideological war conducted by corporate media, official organs of the State, and influential economic institutions. Whether that emerges through corporate textbooks that omit subaltern experiences and worldviews, standardized testing that stress rote memorization, or a curriculum that reproduces Eurocentrism and Western ways of knowing, education is invested in reproducing dominant conceptions of the world. However, sabotage can take myriad forms, and this chapter will build on the conceptual idea of building politics of infiltration. It has been well established that police and other State agents have infiltrated radical political movements, especially with the rise of anarchist praxis over the past two decades (Borrum & Tilby, 2004). Anarchists should think about assuming this same tactic, using the idea of infiltration as a guiding way to think about our praxis within institutional realities and as a way to think about diffused forms of sabotage. Although anarchism is rife with identity and lifestyle politics that detests any signs of “selling out,” this has only proven to further marginalize us in the eyes of the larger society that we must work at convincing how terribly oppressive the current social arrangement is. In the end, our movement is going to have to be broadbased and span multiple identities, social locations, political affiliations, and a renewed sense of politics that seeks to look at how, “the contemporary world has been made to be what it is [and] make visible ways in which it can become something else” (Grossberg, 2010, p. 1). Stoler (2010) discusses the idea of reading and analyzing “against the grain” of archival documents to unearth new interpretations and voices. This chapter urges radicals to think of our social actions along these same lines of thought: against the grain of dominant ideologies that serve to support historically oppressive realities. In this chapter, I will attempt to propose a politics of infiltration through a peculiar anarchist lens that seeks to subvert capitalism and its accompanying institutional realities through a diffused resistance stemming from bodies; bodies immersed in oppressive institutional realities. I dance through theoretical traditions to demonstrate how infiltration can be conceptualized as not only a physical practice (such as our work in classrooms), but also can be a theoretical framework in which to situate our practice, always looking for cracks, weaknesses, and opportunities to sabotage dominant conceptions of the world that demonstrates another world is possible. Although radicals may think of this action as “selling out,” I want to reframe teaching and working within institutions as a potential form of infiltration, inserting other ways of knowing and being into the academy to challenge systemically oppressive realities. Shannon (2009) reminds us that cooptation lurks around every corner and Shukaitis (2009) warns us of the recuperative nature of capitalism. Both of these realities are firmly acknowledged as risks, however, it should not immobilize us into inaction. Nor should this resign us to “ghettoizing” ourselves into intellectual enclaves where conversations are more about nodding our collective heads in agreement rather than challenging our own practices with alternative voices and tactics. Indeed, tensions can be the basis for a critical reflection about what we are actually doing in our practice and engaging a wide variety of techniques and approaches to explore these, such as writing and political organization. Communities of practice, whether in activism or through qualitative research, are an essential feature of building bridges with other like-minded activists and scholars (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Cooptation and recuperation are indeed challenges we will face but should not stop us from doing something, keeping in mind the question that Lorde (2003) had when she struggled with the tools of the master (p. 25). This chapter will hopefully allow the conversation to continue about the role of anarchist theory in building alternative forms of praxis, pedagogy, and direct action, especially within the context of public education and the contradictions that anarchists face within hierarchical and coercive institutions.

#### Space col brings infinite expected value – outweighs.

Baum 16

[Seth D. Baum, Executive Director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, “The Ethics of Outer Space: A Consequentialist Perspective,” 2016, Springer, pp. 115-116, EA]

Space colonization is notable because it may be able to bring utterly immense increases in intrinsic value. Early colonies might start small, given that other planets and moons have inhospitable environments. However, it may be possible to build large indoor colonies or create more hospitable outdoor environments (i.e., terraforming). Even just on other planets and moons in the Solar System, space colonies could multiply the total area available for human habitation. And there are many more planets around other stars, as ongoing research on exoplanets is now learning. One recent study estimates 22 % of Sun-like stars have Earth-like exoplanets (Petigura et al. 2013), implying billions to tens of billions of potentially habitable planets across the galaxy. Opportunities at any given star may also be quite a bit greater than those available only on planets. Earth only receives about one two-billionth of the Sun’s radiation. To collect all the Sun’s radiation, humanity would need a Dyson swarm (named after Dyson 1960), which is a series of structures that surrounds a star, collecting its radiation to power a civilization. A Dyson swarm around the Sun could potentially enable a civilization a billion times larger than is possible on Earth. Likewise, Dyson swarms around one billion stars would bring humanity approximately 1018 (one billion–billion) times more energy per unit time. Space colonies could also increase the amount of time available for human civilization. Earth will remain habitable for a few billion more years (O’Malley-James et al. 2014). Stars will continue shining for about 1014 more years (Adams 2008). That gives us an additional 105 times more energy, for a total of 1023 times more energy than is available on Earth. After the stars fade, other energy sources may be available. And even if our current universe eventually becomes uninhabitable, it may be possible to move to other universes (Kaku 2005). The physics here is speculative, but it cannot be ruled out, and hence there is a nonzero chance of a literally infinite opportunity for space colonization (Baum 2010a). Whether the opportunity is infinite or merely, say, 1023 times larger than what can be done on Earth, the opportunity is clearly immense. As long as space colonization is an improvement (Sect. 8.3.1), then it would seem that the consequentialist should prioritize space colonization. The sooner space colonization begins, the more of its immense opportunity can be gained. Indeed, Ćirković (2002) estimates 5 × 1046 human lifetimes are lost for every century in which space colonization is delayed.

#### Colonization of Mars is feasible but requires private investment incentive to motivate the required tech developments – private appropriation now is key.

Martin & Saydam 21

(BA Journalism University of Central Lancashire, Media & Content Coordinator for The University of New South Wales Serkan Saydam received his BSc, MSc and PhD degrees in Mining Engineering from the Dokuz Eylul University, Izmir, Turkey and completed his Postdoctoral Fellowship at the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. He then worked at De Beers for 3 years as project manager in Johannesburg, South Africa. Serkan joined the School of Mining Engineering as a Senior Lecturer in 2006 and was promoted to Associate Professor in 2012. Serkan then was then promoted to the Professorial role in 2017 and he is currently working as a Professor and Director of Research at the School of Minerals and Energy Resources Engineering at UNSW. A key focus of his research is to address the current needs and future challenges faced by the mining industry. These are generally very complex engineering problems, as mining environments become more extreme and constraints are imposed due to increasing social, environmental, and health and safety standards. His fields of research include ground control, mine planning & design, technology integration, new mining methods and off-Earth mining. In addition, he established research collaboration with NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory & Kennedy Space Center, and Luxembourg Space Agency as well more than 20 research organisations and universities globally. He has more than 250 publications and graduated 18 PhD students. Serkan is currently Fellow Member of Australian Institution of Mining and Metallurgy; President of the ISRM Commission on Planetary Rock Mechanics; Deputy Director of the Australian Centre for Space Engineering Research (ACSER) at UNSW; Deputy Secretary General and Council Member of the SOMP (The Society of Mining Professors). <https://newsroom.unsw.edu.au/news/science-tech/mars-settlement-likely-2050-says-unsw-expert-%E2%80%93-not-levels-predicted-elon-musk>, USNW Sydney Newsroom, 3/10/21, NCS, <https://newsroom.unsw.edu.au/news/science-tech/mars-settlement-likely-2050-says-unsw-expert-%E2%80%93-not-levels-predicted-elon-musk> brackets for spelling mistake

Robotic mining that can provide water and fuel is the key to developing a colony on the red planet within the next 30 years. Mars will be colonised by humans by the year 2050, as long as autonomous mining processes quickly become more commercially viable. That’s the view of Professor Serkan Saydam from UNSW Sydney in the wake of the amazing landing on Mars by NASA’s Perseverance rover. Perseverance is expected to provide answers about whether forms of life ever existed on the red planet, but it is also designed to help address the challenges of future human expeditions there. Professor Saydam, from the School of Mineral Energy Resources Engineering, says the main focus in terms of creating a colony on Mars is finding water – and being able to extract it and process it using robots before humans land. “Everything is all about water,“ Prof. Saydam says. “You use water as a life support, plus also being able to separate out the hydrogen to use as an energy source. “The process for having humans on Mars will be to set up operations, go there and produce water with robots first, and then be able to extract the hydrogen to make the energy ready before people arrive. “Innovation in robotics and autonomous systems are clearly important so that we have the water ready and the hydrogen separated and ready for when human beings land. “At the moment, we don’t have ability to do it. There are significant research efforts, specifically here at UNSW under ACSER (Australian Centre for Space Engineering Research), about the best way to do it, but there is no consensus yet. It also depends on how many people we expect to be living on Mars. Is it five, or 5000, or 50,000, or even more?“ Entrepreneur Elon Musk has claimed he’s confident there will be a city of 1 million on Mars by 2050, transported there by 1000 Starships proposed by his SpaceX venture, with plans for up to three rocket launches per day. Prof. Saydam says that may be unrealistic in the specific timeframe, but admits that demand for travel and a potential colonisation of Mars is what’s needed to drive the technological developments required. “I think the technology is ready and we already have the knowledge, but the main problem is having the focus,“ says Prof. Saydam, who is organising an International Future Mining Conference in December 2021 that will feature former NASA astronaut Pamela Melroy and Honeybee Robotics vice-president Kris Zacny. “It’s a bigger question: ‘Why don’t we do that already on earth? Why are we still using human beings for physical work in mining here?’ We have huge experience in mining, but still heavily depend on humans. “One issue is that demand is not there. For companies to get involved in developing products (for Mars missions), they need to be able to produce minerals or something that can be used for manufacturing goods and then sell it. “At the moment, everything is just a cost and there is no revenue for companies.“ However, that could be starting to change. United Launch Alliance, a joint venture between Lockheed Martin and Boeing who are heavily invested in the rockets used to launch spaceships, has publicly announced they will pay $500 per kilogram for fuel – derived from water – supplied on the moon. That rises to $3000 per kilogram if the fuel is available in a low-earth orbit. “That immediately creates a market,“ Prof. Saydam says. “Plus, if Elon Musk does what he says and puts people on the surface of Mars in 20 years, then that also creates a market. “I believe a colony on Mars is going to happen, but between 2040 and 2050 is more feasible. This could be shortened depending on the technological advances that can reduce the costs or [form] from stronger motivation. “What I think will happen is that first of all we will do these activities on the moon and have a colony there. Then we can use the moon as a petrol station to get to Mars and beyond. “But before 2050, I think we will have settlements on both the moon and Mars.“

#### Life on earth is doomed – countless eventualities and unforeseen dangers.

Meyer 16

(Robinson Meyer is a staff writer at The Atlantic. He is the author of the newsletter The Weekly Planet, and a co-founder of the COVID Tracking Project at The Atlantic.), "Human Extinction Isn't That Unlikely", The Atlantic, 4/29/16, NCS, https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/04/a-human-extinction-isnt-that-unlikely/480444/

Nuclear war. Climate change. Pandemics that kill tens of millions. These are the most viable threats to globally organized civilization. They’re the stuff of nightmares and blockbusters—but unlike sea monsters or zombie viruses, they’re real, part of the calculus that political leaders consider everyday. A new report from the U.K.-based Global Challenges Foundation urges us to take them seriously. The nonprofit began its annual report on “global catastrophic risk” with a startling provocation: If figures often used to compute human extinction risk are correct, the average American is more than five times likelier to die during a human-extinction event than in a car crash. Partly that’s because the average person will probably not die in an automobile accident. Every year, one in 9,395 people die in a crash; that translates to about a 0.01 percent chance per year. But that chance compounds over the course of a lifetime. At life-long scales, one in 120 Americans die in an accident. Yet the risk of human extinction due to climate change—or an accidental nuclear war, or a meteor—could be much higher than that. The Stern Review, the U.K. government’s premier report on the economics of climate change, assumed a 0.1-percent risk of human extinction every year. That may sound low, but it adds up when extrapolated to century-scale. Across 100 years, that figure would entail a 9.5 percent chance of human extinction. And that number might even underestimate the risk. Another Oxford survey of experts from 2008 posited the annual extinction risk to be a higher figure, 0.2 percent. And the chance of dying from any major global calamity is also likely higher. The Stern Review, which supplies the 9.5-percent number, only assumed the danger of species-wide extinction. The Global Challenges Foundation’s report is concerned with all events that would wipe out more than 10 percent of Earth’s human population. “We don’t expect any of the events that we describe to happen in any 10-year period. They might—but, on balance, they probably won’t,” Sebastian Farquhar, the director of the Global Priorities Project, told me. “But there’s lots of events that we think are unlikely that we still prepare for.” For instance, most people demand working airbags in their cars and they strap in their seat-belts whenever they go for a drive, he said. We may know that the risk of an accident on any individual car ride is low, but we still believe that it makes sense to reduce possible harm. So what kind of human-level extinction events are these? The report holds catastrophic climate change and nuclear war far above the rest, and for good reason. On the latter front, it cites multiple occasions when the world stood on the brink of atomic annihilation. While most of these occurred during the Cold War, another took place during the 1990s, the most peaceful decade in recent memory: In 1995, Russian systems mistook a Norwegian weather rocket for a potential nuclear attack. Russian President Boris Yeltsin retrieved launch codes and had the nuclear suitcase open in front of him. Thankfully, Russian leaders decided the incident was a false alarm. Climate change also poses its own risks. As I’ve written about before, serious veterans of climate science now suggest that global warming will spawn continent-sized superstorms by the end of the century. Farquhar said that even more conservative estimates can be alarming: UN-approved climate models estimate that the risk of six to ten degrees Celsius of warming exceeds 3 percent, even if the world tamps down carbon emissions at a fast pace. “On a more plausible emissions scenario, we’re looking at a 10-percent risk,” Farquhar said. Few climate adaption scenarios account for swings in global temperature this enormous. Other risks won’t stem from technological hubris. Any year, there’s always some chance of a super-volcano erupting or an asteroid careening into the planet. Both would of course devastate the areas around ground zero—but they would also kick up dust into the atmosphere, blocking sunlight and sending global temperatures plunging. (Most climate scientists agree that the same phenomenon would follow any major nuclear exchange.) Yet natural pandemics may pose the most serious risks of all. In fact, in the past two millennia, the only two events that experts can certify as global catastrophes of this scale were plagues. The Black Death of the 1340s felled more than 10 percent of the world population. Eight centuries prior, another epidemic of the Yersinia pestis bacterium—the “Great Plague of Justinian” in 541 and 542—killed between 25 and 33 million people, or between 13 and 17 percent of the global population at that time. No event approached these totals in the 20th century. The twin wars did not come close: About 1 percent of the global population perished in the Great War, about 3 percent in World War II. Only the Spanish flu epidemic of the late 1910s, which killed between 2.5 and 5 percent of the world’s people, approached the medieval plagues. Farquhar said there’s some evidence that the First World War and Spanish influenza were the same catastrophic global event—but even then, the death toll only came to about 6 percent of humanity. The report briefly explores other possible risks: a genetically engineered pandemic, geo-engineering gone awry, an all-seeing artificial intelligence. Unlike nuclear war or global warming, though, the report clarifies that these remain mostly notional threats, even as it cautions: [N]early all of the most threatening global catastrophic risks were unforeseeable a few decades before they became apparent. Forty years before the discovery of the nuclear bomb, few could have predicted that nuclear weapons would come to be one of the leading global catastrophic risks. Immediately after the Second World War, few could have known that catastrophic climate change, biotechnology, and artificial intelligence would come to pose such a significant threat.
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