# 1NC

### 1NC – T

#### I don’t disclose my framework shell to prevent prepping it out and reading an abusive aff – you don’t disclose your 1AR counter interps / answers either –

#### Contact me if you have questions

### 1NC – PIK

#### Advocacy Text – Do the aff but reject their framing of a middle passage –

#### its competitive – we indite their framing of the problem – the PIK solves the aff – the explicit framing of middle passage isn’t key to any of their advocacy

#### Their starting point of a Middle Passage creates a reverse linear narrative that erases the history of the African diaspora and lacks the grammar to explain particular violence

Michelle M. Wright 15 (associate professor of Black European and African Diaspora studies at Northwestern University. She is the author of Becoming Black: Creating Identity in the African Diaspora] Physics of Blackness: Beyond the middle passage epistemology. Michelle M. Wright. 2015. Published by: [University of Minnesota Press](https://muse.jhu.edu/search?action=browse&limit=publisher_id:23)

Most discourses on Blackness in the United States and the Caribbean locate themselves in the history of the Middle Passage, linking our cultural practices and expressions, our politics and social sensibilities, to the historical experience of slavery in the Americas and the struggle to achieve full human suffrage in the West. These histories are both constructed and phenomenological: they are a chosen arrangement of historical events (spaces and times) perceived to be the defining moments of collective (p.8) Blackness. At the same time, for the purposes of this theoretical analysis of Blackness, it is important to underscore that these are not so much histories as epistemologies: narratives of knowledge that are taught, learned, relayed, exchanged, and debated in discussions on the “facts” of Blackness. These historical-cum-epistemological events are usually linked by or narrated under the theme of overcoming obstacles through struggle (or “uplift”), with the defining aspect of contemporary Black collective histories focusing primarily on slavery (Middle Passage histories), European colonization (postcolonial histories), or the dominance of ancient African civilizations (Afrocentric histories). These themes create either a linear progress narrative or, when reversed (as in Afropessimism), a reverse linear narrative indicating that no Black progress has been made because of the continual oppression by white Western hegemonies that began with slavery, moved through colonialism, and now deploy an array of cultural, political, economic, and military power through social and governmental technologies to keep Blacks not only as subalterns—those who are subordinated by power—but also as the (white) Western Other. The question of defining Blackness has become more urgent as the collectives that perceive themselves through these multiple histories find themselves encountering each other more frequently. As recent anthologies such as The Other African Americans show, many Western nations are now (and in many cases have been since the postwar era) receiving Black African immigrants whose histories, while certainly tied to Atlantic slavery, more often narrate themselves through colonialism or postwar socioeconomic changes than through the Middle Passage. These two collectives of historical and ancestral Blackness, while most certainly intertwined (and at times also often facing the same kinds of racist violence) nonetheless understand themselves differently. Denoted simply as “Black” almost anywhere outside of Africa, their encounters must negotiate their differences even as Blackness enjoins them to work together toward the common goal of racial uplift. In short, they have experienced differences that these linear progress narratives of Blackness strongly encourage them not to discuss, perhaps not even to see, much less acknowledge. However, in many of these moments, experienced or expressed, the phenomenological aspects of Blackness subvert even the most eloquent construct of collective unity. In other words, perceived differences will be expressed, but because most dominant constructs of Blackness cannot understand differences within, difference is often expressed as a dichotomy between “Black” and “not Black.”

## Case

### ROB

#### The Role of the ballot is to evaluate the material consequences of the aff and neg world. Prefer:

#### A] Fairness—Arbitrary self-serving frameworks moot the 1NC and destroy our possibility of engaging with the affirmative.

#### B] Clash—Debate is about process of iterative testing through specific points of contestation. This turns the Aff—critical thinking skills through an unrestrained framework is necessary for any revolutionary strategy.

C] Only our ROB is evaluative and allows discussions about the effects of various forms of violence – their ROB excludes indigenous violence

#### D] Recognition alone fails – must be paired with solutions or they get co-opted and ignored – turns case

### Substance — Top Level

#### Top level –

#### 1] They don’t get any offense from vague taglines & we get new responses to any conceded arguments – an example: their Keeling 2 ev tag – its all metaphors that aren’t implicated

#### 2] Vote neg on presumption —

#### A) They have no intrinsic benefit to reading their aff within debate and thus no reason to affirm their strategy.

#### B) Movements don’t spill up – competition means you ally yourself with people who vote for you and alienate those who are forced to debate you ensuring the failure of the movement.

#### C) The 1AC’s regurgitation of knowledge proves they’re not a departure from the status quo, but they get coopted by academia.

#### 3] Only grant them the amount of offense they prove they solve – they fail to prove how their advocacy results in anything outside the debate space ---

### Substance – LBL

#### Exploring and establishing colonies in Space fails without private sector

WAMU 20 [(interviewing Ariel Ekblaw, founder and lead of MIT Media Lab’s Space Exploration Initiative and Charles Bolden, NASA administrator from 2009-2017) “How Private Companies Are Changing The Future Of Space Exploration,” February 6, 2020, https://wamu.org/story/20/02/06/how-private-companies-are-changing-the-future-of-space-exploration/] TDI

How Private Companies Are Changing The Future Of Space Exploration LISTEN SpaceX founder Elon Musk addresses the media alongside NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine, and astronauts Doug Hurley and Bob Behnken, during a press conference announcing new developments of the Crew Dragon reusable spacecraft, at SpaceX headquarters in Hawthorne, California on October 10, 2019. (Philip Pacheco / AFP) Private companies like SpaceX are testing vehicles for manned space missions. We’ll peer out into the near future and next steps in human space exploration. Guests Ariel Ekblaw, founder and lead of MIT Media Lab’s Space Exploration Initiative. (@ariel\_ekblaw) Charles Bolden, NASA administrator from 2009-2017, and a former astronaut and Marine Corps general. (@cboldenjr) Interview Highlights American astronaut Christina Koch broke the record for the longest-ever space flight by a woman today. Where is human space exploration going next? Ariel Ekblaw: “It’s a huge milestone. Part of her story around the spacesuit, and the sizing of the spacesuits, and the all-female spacewalk is something that we pay a lot of attention to at our group at M.I.T. And then being able to be in space for that length of time provides an invaluable sense of knowledge of what is the human lived experience of space. “How might we better design for her comfort to delight her in space? To now, thanks to standing on the shoulders of groups like NASA and Charlie’s work, think about not just a survivalist mode for space exploration, but what are the artifacts, and the tools, and the experiences that we could design for Christine in the future? Given her experience of this 300-plus-day journey and stay to really delight her for her experience in space exploration. And in the future, scale that to space tourists and others besides astronauts.” On how close we are to regular space tourism Ariel Ekblaw: “I would say we’re both close — we’re dangerously close — and yet so far away. So companies like Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic are racing to be able to send some of the first space tourists into low Earth orbit on some of their crafts, in either this year, or upcoming years. With Axiom and the announcement from NASA about the first commercial space station to be attached to the International Space Station. “We’re beginning to build up that infrastructure that could support real space tourism. There are still, as I’m sure Charlie can also speak to, large unanswered questions about how do you prepare someone if not off the street — A space enthusiast — for the experience of space when they’re not necessarily going to have the same in-depth, extensive training as a NASA astronaut? How do we keep them safe? How do we handle mental health? How do we prepare them for both the excitement and the responsibility that they might have as a member of a crew in a resource constrained environment?” On whether people who aren’t trained as astronauts should be able to go into space Charles Bolden: “Yes, without a doubt. … They’ve got to have some training. But I would say it depends on what the flight is going to be. I haven’t had a chance to talk to Beth Moses from Virgin Galactic. But Beth would be — she’s not a normal person off the street, because she’s the astronaut training officer at Blue Origin. But Beth had an opportunity to fly, and she didn’t go through years of training. You know, I think there’s some fundamental things that you teach someone about mobility. And, ‘don’t touch that.’ And you let them go.” On whether it’s possible to go to Mars without commercial interest involved Ariel Ekblaw: “I think it’s critical to have both. As Charlie and Dava Newman — another colleague of mine — have shown: the path from moon to Mars is going to be a public-private partnership path. And we need the capability that private brings and the inspiration that NASA and that the governments can still bring to the task.” On what it’s like to go to space Charles Bolden: “It’s much more spectacular than the pictures portray. We have great cameras nowadays. They’re better and better than they ever were before, but they just cannot capture what the human eye sees. God’s camera is pretty awesome. The ability to play around with Newton’s law, the fact that, you know, because gravity is overcome by the speed at which you’re going around the planet allows us to seem like we’re floating. And that’s a lot of fun to get to play with. You know, a body at rest stays at rest, a body in motion stays in motion. And for every action, there’s an equal and opposite reaction. It makes all that stuff that you learned in middle school, if you learned it, or if you avoided it, it brings it to life for you. So that’s incredible.” From The Reading List Wall Street Journal: “Space Is Poised for Explosive Growth. Let’s Get It Right.” — “In the 19th century, urban planners wrangled the chaotic metropolises of Paris and New York into “planned cities,” turning warrens of streets into orderly grids, building sewage systems and transit lines, and allowing for new types of architecture, such as apartment buildings. Today, we face a similar inflection point in developing the nearest reaches of space. “The next decade is set to bring explosive commercial growth and more private industry players to low-earth orbit, the area spanning 100 to 1,240 miles above the planet’s surface. SpaceX has proposed a satellite-based internet, and Planet is growing its fleet of Earth-imaging satellites. NASA plans a transition towards commercial management of the international space station. Several startups are developing low-earth orbit advertisements—logos or other designs, visible in the night sky, made from tiny, reflective satellites. Entrepreneurs are making plans for space hotels. “Before we let rampant development go unchecked, we should consider how these efforts might conflict with or complement each other. We still have the chance to intentionally design humanity’s first ‘planned orbit.’” MIT Media Lab: “Democratizing Access to Space” — “The Space Exploration Initiative’s founding mission is to rigorously, vigorously build out the technologies of our sci-fi space future while keeping our innovations and team as open and accessible as possible. When we say we’re ‘democratizing access to space exploration,’ what do we mean? In the context of our blue sky goal — to realize an inclusive, impactful — we approach democratization in four core ways. We are: “1. Democratizing access by inviting and uniting new disciplines in our creative practice] “2. Democratizing access by designing space tools, products, and experiences for all of us, not just the pinnacle of human talent embodied by astronauts. “3. Democratizing access by developing hands-on, widely accessible opportunities to shape the technologies of our space future. “4. Democratizing access through the celebration of new narratives through which we can tell the story of Space Exploration, writ large.” The Verge: “This was the decade the commercial spaceflight industry leapt forward” — “Two years into the decade, on May 25th, 2012, a small teardrop-shaped capsule arrived at the International Space Station, packed with cargo and supplies for the crew living on board. Its resupply mission at the ISS wasn’t remarkable, but the vehicle itself was unique: it was a Dragon cargo capsule, owned and operated by a private company called SpaceX. “Before 2012, only vehicles operated by governments had ever visited the ISS. The Dragon was the first commercial vehicle to dock with the station. The milestone was a crowning achievement for the commercial industry, which has permanently altered the spaceflight sector over the last 10 years. “This decade, the space industry has seen a shift in the way it does business, with newer players looking to capitalize on different markets and more ambitious projects. The result has been an explosion of growth within the commercial sector. It’s allowing for easier access to space than ever before, with both positive and negative results. Such growth is providing the commercial space industry with lots of momentum coming into the 2020s, but it’s unclear if this pace is something that can be kept up.” Axios: “NASA’s murky commercial space future” — “NASA’s plans to create a robust economy in low-Earth orbit where private spaceflight companies can flourish could eventually leave the agency’s astronauts stranded on Earth with nowhere to go. “Why it matters: NASA hopes to play a lead role in developing a private spaceflight economy, including private sector astronauts. The agency sees this as a way to free it up to focus on farther afield goals like bringing humans back to the Moon and, eventually, to Mars.

#### We’ll concede Keeling 3—

#### A] Space col GOOD for black people to exist outside racism – any escape to space by black people requires private entities – means you negate

#### B] you negate even if they win private entities bad now because it still enables a potential future for black people in space whereas the plan destroys that possibility by blocking off space forever

#### C] Private entities are *key* to enable black existence in space – unlike public entities they actively *want* black people in space and *don’t leave them* behind – this *thumps* their Keeling 4 and Baldwin ev that black folk aren’t invited because Blue Origin *paid* Strahan, a black man, to fly with them to space

Pearlman 21, Robert Z. “Blue Origin Launches Michael Strahan and Crew of 5 on Record-Setting Suborbital Spaceflight.” Space.com, Space, 11 Dec. 2021, [www.space.com/blue-origin-michael-strahan-new-shepard-record-launch](http://www.space.com/blue-origin-michael-strahan-new-shepard-record-launch) //AA

"It was surreal ... it was unbelievable, it's hard to even describe it," Strahan said in a Twitter video after the flight. "It's going to take a little bit to process it, but it couldn't have gone better." Lifting off at 10 a.m. EST (1500 GMT) from Blue Origin's Launch Site One here in Van Horn, Texas, the single stage New Shepard rocket lofted the crew on a 10-minute flight that soared just above the internationally-recognized boundary between Earth and space. Strahan and Churchley, together with paying passengers Dylan Taylor, Evan Dick and Lane and Cameron Bess, experienced about three minutes of weightlessness while they looked down at our planet from 65 miles high (106 km). The crew capsule, dubbed "RSS FIrst Step," then descended back to the ground, using three large parachutes and a last second burst of air from downward facing thrusters to slow and cushion the touchdown. Jeff Bezos, the former chief executive of Amazon and founder of Blue Origin, was on hand to welcome the six back to Earth and present each with their Blue Origin astronaut wings. At 6 feet, 5 inches tall (196 cm), Strahan set a new record as the tallest person to fly into space. The Super Bowl champion who now co-hosts "Good Morning America" on ABC surpassed the previous Guinness World Record height by one inch, which up until now was jointly held by NASA astronauts James "Ox" van Hoften and James Wetherbee. Blue Origin paid Strahan a stipend to fly as a crew member on the mission, which he in turn donated to The Boys & Girls Club. Strahan is not the first TV news personality to fly into space — that distinction goes to Toyohiro Akiyama, who launched to Russia's space station Mir as a correspondent for the Tokyo Broadcasting System (TBS) in 1990 — but Strahan is the first journalist to fly on a suborbital spaceflight. Strahan is also now the first Black person to fly on a suborbital spaceflight out of the now 38 people who have made the hop into space and back. (Sixteen Black astronauts and cosmonauts have flown higher and faster and Strahan on missions that entered Earth orbit.)

#### D] On Bogle – that just proves Amazon benefited as a company – or the risk of it being racist – the aff doesn’t do anything do derail Amazon – wealthy people can and will continue to make more money OR could become public astronauts to fly for governments

#### On McKinson --- Their ev just says space exploration is also implicated in racism –

#### A] that doesn’t prove private entitles are the problem

#### B] public entities will continue the same harms, so the 1AC doesn’t solve anything – star this on the flow -- Negate to engage in Afrofuturist narratives – two ways:

#### 1] through embracing space as a place for black futures by enabling private entities to innovate and enable a future in space

#### 2] Rejecting the 1AC’s attempt to block space exploration by rejecting private entities from space – blocking private entities means *governments* will be involved in all space affairs making black life away from colonization impossible

#### C] Lupro 9 says space is uniquely key to resist antiblack violence – the 1AC forecloses any possibility of change AND this answers any claims that civil society isn’t perfect now – it creates the impetus for future change

### Afro K

#### Their use of the pre-fix ‘afro’ to avoid a wider discussion of futurism begs the question of why they called their args futurist in the first instance – it only creates racial dissonance that causes their argument to become incoherent

Tshepo Mahasha, black philosopher and filmmaker, 13 – Phetogo, “Art Criticism: is the prefix ‘Afro-’ (as in "Afro-futurism") arresting our imagination and manifesto salesmanship?” July 14, <http://www.thisisafrica.me/visual-arts/detail/19943/art-criticism-is-the-prefix-afro-as-in-afro-futurism-arresting-our-imagination-and-manifesto-salesmanship>.

A prefix modifies a word/statement. The prefix ‘Afro-’ as used in art criticism modifies existing manifestos. In my opinion, it does not promote the generation of wholly new ideas and manifestos, but only the modification of the creativity of others. The prefix ‘afro-’ has acquired a parasitic character, leeching off manifestos: Afro-Surrealism, Afro-Punk, Afro-Futurism and Afro-etc. I think it has the capacity to arrest African imagination, so that the African imagination only follows other manifestos, only to attach itself to them and never coming up with an original of its own. I wouldn’t have a problem with it because creativity is about modifying elements that are already there to create something new, but given what’s out there at this point I have an objection. Just a quick internet search reveals that the movie The Matrix is listed as Afro-futurism on some websites. It can go to the point where Afro-futurism can only be about a person of colour in a future space, when in fact for a project like ‘The Matrix’, the faces and races are interchangeable, it would still be what it is without black people in it. I read an Afro-Surrealist manifesto written by D. Scot Miller and it had me asking a few questions. In this manifesto, Miller outlines what isn’t Afro-Surrealism. He writes, “Afro-Surrealism is not surrealism.” “…Leopold Senghor, poet, first president of Senegal, and African Surrealist, made this distinction: ‘European Surrealism is empirical. African Surrealism is mystical and metaphorical.’” And then he says of Afro-Surrealism, “[it] presupposes that beyond this visible world, there is an invisible world striving to manifest, and it is our job to uncover it.” And he goes on to say, “Afro-Surrealists restore the cult of the past. We revisit old ways with new eyes. We appropriate 19th century slavery symbols, like Kara Walker, and 18th century colonial ones, like Yinka Shonibare. We re-introduce ‘madness’ as visitations from the gods, and acknowledge the possibility of magic. We take up the obsessions of the ancients and kindle the dis-ease, clearing the murk of the collective unconsciousness as it manifests in these dreams called culture” Miller claims that Afro-Surrealism is NOT Surrealism. And then he goes on to define something that’s different from ‘Surrealism’ and calls it ‘Afro-Surreal’. My question when I read Miller’s Manifesto was why call it Afro-Surrealism if it is not Surrealism? Why prefix the word Surrealism with ‘Afro-’? Most importantly, since it is so different from surrealism, why not call it something entirely new? Miller considers The Neptunes early music Afro-futurist. Would that same music if it was produced by a person of a different race still be considered Afro-futurist? What made it fundamentally Afro-futurist except for race?

#### Their use of ‘afro’ as a signifier to modify and distinguish their argument from other forms of criticism must be rejected – it limits imaginative possibilities and homogenizes experience

Tshepo Mahasha, black philosopher and filmmaker, 13 – Phetogo, “Art Criticism: is the prefix ‘Afro-’ (as in "Afro-futurism") arresting our imagination and manifesto salesmanship?” July 14, <http://www.thisisafrica.me/visual-arts/detail/19943/art-criticism-is-the-prefix-afro-as-in-afro-futurism-arresting-our-imagination-and-manifesto-salesmanship>.

As I have explored my views, I concluded: a) The use of the prefix ‘afro-’ needs to be minimized for the sake of freeing African imagination. Since I can’t foresee and cover the entire use of the prefix, I am referring to the points that I’ve covered in this essay in relation to art-criticism. I see it as a necessity for the sake of encouraging imagination to grow, and not be restricted to – or attached to - other pre-existing manifestos and make it harder for ourselves to come up with something unique. Minimizing the ‘afro’ prefix would promote fresh thinking. Afro-manifestos have a “leeching” tinge to them. They are forms of reacting to things instead of all out attempt at ‘originality’ - Black people reacting to other manifestos: Punk (Afro-Punk), Surrealism (Afro-Surrealism) etc. I haven’t even taken into account that Afro-futurism may be a misnomer, when looked at with the “Futurism” manifesto. b) Art critics need to be bold enough to give things stand-alone names. Everything is about encouraging invention. ‘High-life’ music is highlife. The implication being that any person of any descent can do Highlife music; can the same be easily said for any of the ‘Afro-’ prefixed semi-manifestos? Or does it pivot on race? Can a Japanese person do ‘Afro-punk’ and if so, would it require another prefix to be Japanese-Afro-Punk? I have difficulty answering these questions. I don’t think I’m way off in imagining the South American manifesto of ‘Magic Realism’ would be called ‘Afro-something’ if it was being done by people of African descent. We need to encourage new names and manifestos. c) The African Renaissance is about creating a floor in a much larger context, one that aims for African people to be free amongst other free people. It’s about freeing the African from the “struggle for reason” by collecting and restoring artefacts, and projecting these into the future so that this base will always be available to future generations. It is either within the context of ultimate freedom (Free to explore and create new black African identities, new Manifestos) and/or the offsetting of “the struggle for reason” that cultural production takes place and should be evaluated in. It must be recognized that ‘some’ current African Art cannot be contextualized without mention of the Renaissance and its excavations. Even as I write this I have doubts that of course I may be biased. It took a long time to finish this essay and to publish it. I wouldn’t like to speak only for myself, I’d like to believe that there must be others who feel the same as I do. I don’t, for a second, doubt the force of my imagination. My mind may change in time about the contents of this essay but at this point I am convinced.

### Method

**Performance politics allow for the socialization of hegemonic domination. Ceding the authority of interpretation to external forces allows for the eradication of meaning. The introduction of the 1AC into the economy of exchange eradicates its solvency.**

Terry **Eagelton 90**, Distinguished Professor of English Literature at Lancaster University, The Ideology of the Aesthetic, Pages 27-8

**The aesthetic**, then, **is from the beginning** a contradictory, **double-edged** concept**, On the one hand, it** **figures as a genuinely emancipatory force** — **as a community of subjects now finked by sens**uous impulse **and fellow-feeling** **rather than** by heteronomous **law**, **each safeguarded in its unique particularity while bound at the same time into social harmony**. The aesthetic offers the middle class a superbly versatile model of their political aspirations, exemplifying new forms of autonomy and self-determination, transforming the relations between law and desire, morality and knowledge, recasting the links between individual and totality, and revising social relations on the basis of custom, affection and sympathy. **On the other hand**, **the aesthetic signifies** what Max Horkheimer has called a kind of `**internalised repression'**, **inserting social power more deeply into the very bodies of those it subjugates**, **and so operating as a supremely effective mode of political hegemony**. **To lend** fresh **significance to bodily pleasures** and drives, however, if only f**or the purpose of colonizing them more efficiently**, **is always to risk foregrounding and intensifying them beyond one's control**. The aesthetic as custom, sentiment, spontaneous impulse may consort well enough with political domination; but these phenomena border embarrassingly on passion, imagination, sensuality, which are not always so easily incorporable. As Burke put it in his Appeal from the NM to the Old Wags: 'There is a boundary to men's passions when they act from feeling; none when they are under the influence of imagination.'" `Deep' **subjectivity is just what the ruling social order desires**, **and exactly what it has most cause to fear.** **If the aesthetic is** a **dangerous**, ambiguous affair**, it is because**, as we shall see in this study, **there is something in the body which can revolt against the power which inscribes it; and that impulse could** only **be eradicated by extirpating along with it the capacity to authenticate power** itself**.**

### 1NC – Game Over

#### They get coopted and crushed by the state.

King, 16—has been active in campaigning for refugee rights and against border controls for over a decade, has taught at the University of Nottingham and worked as a caseworker with the British Refugee Council (Natasha, *No Borders: The Politics of Immigration Control and Resistance* pg 39-42, dml)

But to what extent are these experiments in autonomy ever entirely autonomous? In response to Richard Day’s book on the newest social movements, Richard Thompson argues that it’s unrealistic to talk about creating wholly autonomous social structures because ‘[t]he second they’re consequential is the second they’ll be noticed [by the state]. At that point, it becomes impossible to break the cycle of antagonism by will alone. They will come after us’ (Thompson n.d., emphasis added). In other words, experiments in autonomy are rarely (if ever) entirely free from a relation to the state, or from state antagonism, and we are rarely able to ignore that antagonism. We may antagonize the state, but we are forced also to respond to the state, as a form of self-defence. This has happened time and time again, from the steady illegalization of squatting in Europe, and the tightening of laws around private property, to the infiltration by the CIA of the Black Panther movement, to the struggle between the Zapatistas and the Mexican state. We see this in the struggle for the freedom of movement when, continuing with the examples above, the EU employs Frontex special missions on the Turkish/Greek borders, or when the living spaces of people without papers are raided or destroyed. Whether people have been forced to, or they have seen it as the best strategy, the history of struggles for liberation has been one that included demands on the state. Often this has taken the form of engagement in a politics of rights and/or recognition. From the movement of the Sans Papiers in France, to ‘a Day without Migrants’ in the USA; from campaigns that fight against the detention and deportation of people without papers, to struggles against police violence, resistance through forms of visible collective action have been central to struggles against the border. In most cases such struggles have made demands on the state, particularly through seeking recognition as a group, and through making claims to rights. But to what extent are demands for rights and/or recognition part of a no borders politics? Demands for rights and recognition have played a big part in the struggle for the freedom of movement. Yet there has been a long history of criticism over the politics of citizenship. Rights claims, for example, have been seen as essentially reinforcing the role of the state as the benefactor and grantor of rights, and reinforcing the notion that rights represent entitlements applicable to those who fit certain descriptions of being a human (cf. Arendt 1973 [1951]; Barbagallo and Beuret 2008; Bojadžijev and Karakayali 2010; Elam 1994). From this perspective, demands for rights and representation amount to disputes over the allocation of equality and therefore can only ever achieve a redistribution of that equality, rather than undermining the idea that equality is somehow qualified in the first place. As Imogen Tyler says, ‘[c]itizenship is a famously exclusionary concept, and its exclusionary force is there by design. The exclusions of citizenship are immanent to its logic, and not at all accidental. Citizenship is meant to produce successful and unsuccessful subjects. Citizenship, in other words, is “designed to fail”’ (Tyler, quoted in Nyers 2015: 31). Similar variations of this critique have appeared in the autonomy of migration debate. Representation can also be thought of as a bordering technology that seeks to pacify and discipline expressions of autonomy (or attempts at escape) (Papadopoulos et al. 2008). In other words, the politics of citizenship is problematic because it only ever brings people into the state. ‘Of course migrants become stronger when they become visible by obtaining rights, but the demands of migrants and the dynamics of migration cannot be exhausted in the quest for visibility and rights’ (ibid.: 219). I have a lot of sympathy with these arguments, and because of them am extremely suspicious of a politics of citizenship. But when it comes to actual practices of struggle against the border, a resolute stand against such strategies seems naïve, and insulting to those who have taken part. Migrant-led struggles have often been claims for rights, and ultimately I don’t want to dismiss such practices because they are philosophically problematic. In fact, sometimes to appeal to rights or recognition is the only available strategy in situations of extreme vulnerability, where people’s options are highly limited. Recognizing that we are in relations of power right now means also recognizing that our situation is imperfect and that we have to struggle in our (imperfect) reality. Youssef, a long-time activist for the freedom of movement in Greece, himself of North African descent, talked about the need for pragmatism in tactics; that sometimes we must engage with the state in order to bring about greater freedoms now. ‘Today, in Creta, in Chania, they will catch five people. How can I take them from the jail? I have something in the police station, OK. I have to talk with them today. OK? But tomorrow I can fuck him. He’s not my friend. He’s not my comrade. OK. We are talking today. Tomorrow we are fucking’ (interview, Youssef). His statement reflects how many practices that refuse the border often come out of necessity. In other words they’re rarely part of some intentional or ‘noble’ act to become a rights-bearer, say, and more often pragmatic decisions based on the need to alleviate immediate situations of oppression. A no borders politics seeks to go beyond claims to representation and rights that ultimately stand to reinforce the state. But claims to representation and rights can sometimes do this too. Building on Foucault’s idea that power can be both positive and empowering or negative and dominating, Biddy Martin and Chandra Mohanty suggest that fighting oppression involves seeing power in a way that refuses totalizing visions of it and can therefore account for the possibility of resistance, as in creating something new, within existing power relations (Martin and Mohanty 2003: 104). Suggesting that representation only ever brings people into power therefore means rejecting a vast range of moments when the oppressed have voiced their refusal to be reduced to non-beings outside of politics (Sharma 2009: 475). In other words, resistance is not only or always a reaction to the constraining effects of dominating power, but can also express power as something positive and liberating. From the Black Panthers to the Sans Papiers, demands for representation, when carried out by minority groups for themselves, can challenge the role of dominant power over that group and create new, emancipated subjectivities (Goldberg 1996; Malik 1996). Depending on who it is that acts, then, in some cases demands for recognition/rights can be a radical and transformative political act (Nyers 2015. See also Butler and Spivak 2007; Isin 2008; Nyers and Rygiel 2012). As Nandita Sharma suggests, in response to Papadopoulos et al.’s book Escape Routes, we must recognise that making life and fashioning our subjectivities are intimately intertwined and making ‘new social bodies’ … is not the same as bringing people back into power through identity politics (or identity policing). It is important to recognise that there are significant qualitative differences between subjectivities. There are those that Papadopoulos et al. rightly discuss as bringing us directly back into power – and which account for most of the subjectivities that people hold today (‘race’, ‘nation’, ‘heterosexual’, ‘homosexual’, ‘native’ and so on) – but there are also those that are born of practices of escape. (Sharma 2009: 473, emphasis in original)