### 1NC

#### Interpretation and violation – the affirmative must solely advocate that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### Appropriation means use, exploitation, or occupation that is permanent and to the exclusion of others

Babcock 19 Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Cente. Babcock, Hope M. "The Public Trust Doctrine, Outer Space, and the Global Commons: Time to Call Home ET." Syracuse L. Rev. 69 (2019): 191.

Article II is one of those succeeding provisions that curtails “the freedom of use outlined in Article [I] by declaring that outer space, including the [m]oon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation.”147 It flatly prohibits national appropriation of any celestial body in outer space “by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.”148 However, “many types of ‘use’ or ‘exploitation’. . . are inconceivable without appropriation of some degree at least of any materials taken,” like ore or water.149 If this view of Article II’s prohibitory language is correct, then “it is not at all farfetched to say that the OST actually installs a blanket prohibition on many beneficial forms of development.”150 However, the OST only prohibits an appropriation that constitutes a “long-term use and permanent occupation, to the exclusion of all others.”151

#### Resolved indicates a policy action.

Parcher 1. [Jeff. 2/26/01. “Re: Jeff P--Is the resolution a question?” <https://web.archive.org/web/20050122044927/http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html>] Justin

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision.

(2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature.

(3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committtee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon.

(4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not.

#### “Is unjust” can require positive action to rectify the injustice

Pomerleau [Wayne, PhD, Professor of Philosophy at Gonzaga] “Western Theories of Justice”, IEP, <https://iep.utm.edu/justwest/>, last date cited is 2010, RE

Nozick (a departmental colleague of Rawls at Harvard) was one of the first and remains one of the most famous critics of Rawls’s liberal theory of justice. Both are fundamentally committed to individual liberty. But as a libertarian, Nozick is opposed to compromising individual liberty in order to promote socio-economic equality and advocates a “minimal state” as the only sort that can be socially just. In Anarchy, State, and Utopia (1974), especially in its famous chapter on “Distributive Justice,” while praising Rawls’s first book as the most important “work in political and moral philosophy” since that of Mill, Nozick argues for what he calls an “entitlement conception of justice” in terms of three principles of just holdings. First, anyone who justly acquires any holding is rightly entitled to keep and use it. Second, anyone who acquires any holding by means of a just transfer of property is rightly entitled to keep and use it. It is only through some combination of these two approaches that anyone is rightly entitled to any holding. But some people acquire holdings unjustly—e.g., by theft or fraud or force—so that there are illegitimate holdings. So, third, justice can require the rectification of unjust past acquisitions. These three principles of just holdings—“the principle of acquisition of holdings, the principle of transfer of holdings, and the principle of rectification of the violations of the first two principles”—constitute the core of Nozick’s libertarian entitlement theory of justice. People should be entitled to use their own property as they see fit, so long as they are entitled to it. On this view, any pattern of distribution, such as Rawls’s difference principle, that would force people to give up any holdings to which they are entitled in order to give it to someone else (i.e., a redistribution of wealth) is unjust. Thus, for Nozick, any state, such as ours or one Rawls would favor, that is “more extensive” than a minimal state and redistributes wealth by taxing those who are relatively well off to benefit the disadvantaged necessarily “violates people’s rights” (State, pp. 149, 183, 230, 150-153, 230-231, 149).

#### Outer space refers to the space beyond the Earth’s atmosphere.

Vereshchetin 06 [Vladlen, former Member of the ICJ, Chairman of the International Law Commission, and Professor of International Law] “Outer Space,” Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law, <https://spacelaw.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/p_spacelaw/EPIL_Outer_Space.pdf>, 2006

A. Definition of the Term ‘Outer Space’

1 The term ‘outer space’, like several other basic notions of space law (‘outer space activity’, ‘space flight’, ‘space object’), although frequently used in space agreements and other space law instruments, has never been defined by them. There are a number of reasons for this, not least the objective difficulty for the States concerned to agree on legal definitions in the context of rapidly developing technology and their apprehension that legally binding definitions might restrict their sphere of operation.

2 The absence of a formal definition of outer space does not mean that no general perception exists as to what is meant by outer space, even if the use of the term in natural sciences and in law may not always be exactly the same. It should be remembered that there is no definitive physical boundary between atmospheric space and extra-atmospheric space, the transition from one to the other being gradual. Although at 100 km the density of the air is but one millionth of what it is at sea level, for natural scientists these two regions of space, in some respects, may be perceived as one single whole. However, with the launching of the first satellite in 1957 the notion of outer space became inextricably linked with the exploration and uses of space by means of man-made spacecraft (→ Spacecraft, Satellites, and Space Objects). The physical and technical factors are directly relevant to the legal regulation of the region of space concerned. The atmospheric space of the earth and most of the activities in this space fall within the ambit of → Air Law. The space beyond the atmosphere is governed by space law. The ‘spatial’ element of each of the two above-mentioned branches of law is reflected in their denominations: the first being known as air (ie atmospheric) law, the second as space law, often referred to as outer space (ie extra-atmospheric) law.

3 The legal regimes governing → airspace and outer space are fundamentally different. Thus, logically and jurisprudentially it is necessary to know where air space ends and outer space begins. In theory, there must be no ‘outer’ boundary of application of space law, since outer space itself is limitless, but in practice space law, keeping pace with the development of space technology, does not purport to regulate space activity beyond the solar system (see Art. 1 Agreement Governing the Activities of State on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [(adopted 18 December 1979, entered into force 11 July 1984) 1363 UNTS 3]). At the same time, ‘celestial bodies’ of the solar system, other than the earth, but comprising the Moon, are included in the legal notion of outer space (→ Moon and Celestial Bodies). This follows from the title and text of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies ([signed 27 January 1967, entered into force 10 October 1967] 610 UNTS 205) (‘Outer Space Treaty’).

#### Extra topicality independently links to our offense – it allows the affirmative to add on random unpredictable planks to generate extra advantages and solve net benefits, which ruins neg preparation, especially when the majority of their offense and framing comes from the extra-topical part.

#### Vote negative for predictable limits and ground—-allowing the affirmative to pick any grounds for the debate makes negative engagement impossible, by skirting a predictable starting point and making our preparation and research useless.

#### TVA: Defend a US reduction in space appropriation by private entities – foundation of modern capitalism, first card in the aff says we’re spending too much money – the resolution

#### There are two impacts –

#### 1] Fairness – unlimited aff choice shifts the goalposts for topical debate. Pre-tournament negative preparation is structured around topical plans. Fairness is an intrinsic good—-debate is fundamentally a game and requires effective competition between the aff and the neg—-the only way for any benefit to be produced from debate and the reason why people are incentivized to do prep and research is to help them do better in their next round is if the judge can make a decision between two sides who have had a relatively equal chance to prepare for a common point of debate. Concluding fairness doesn’t matter would justify intervening on behalf of T even if we lose and extending your favorite critique in your head against the aff even though we never read it because they have no reason why they need to win a competitive game.

#### 2] Clash -- debate creates pressures for research, focused clash, and argument testing which is a standalone impact for their movement to spill over. The external impact is movements -- activism requires learning to defend a proposal against rigorous negation to develop skills for strategy, organizing, problem-solving, using resources, and creating coalitions

Lakey 13. (George Lakey co-founded Earth Quaker Action Group which just won its five-year campaign to force a major U.S. bank to give up financing mountaintop removal coal mining. Along with college teaching he has led 1,500 workshops on five continents and led activist projects on local, national, and international levels. Among many other books and articles, he is author of “Strategizing for a Living Revolution” in David Solnit’s book Globalize Liberation. 8 skills of a well-trained activist. June 11, 2013. <https://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/8-skills-of-a-well-trained-activist/>)

Why more training now? The history of training is a history of playing catch-up. Very few movements seem to realize that the pace of change can accelerate so rapidly that it outstrips the movement’s ability to use its opportunities fully. In Istanbul a small group of environmentalists sit down to save a park, and suddenly there are protests in over 60 Turkish cities; the agenda expands, from green space to governance to capitalism; doors open everywhere. It would be a good moment to have tens of thousands of skilled organizers ready to seize the day, supporting smart direct action and building prefigurative institutions. But excitement alone may slacken; as with the Occupy movement, spontaneous creativity has its limits. With the right skills, movements can sustain themselves for years against punishing, murderous resistance. The mass direct action phase of the civil rights movement pushed on effectively for a decade after 1955. Mass excitement doesn’t need to fizzle in a year. A movement thrives by solving the problems it faces. Anti-authoritarians don’t want to count on a movement’s top leaders to be the problem-solvers, but instead to develop shared leadership by fostering problem-solving smarts at the grassroots. There’s nothing automatic about grassroots problem-solving. How well people strategize, organize, invent creative tactics, reach effectively to allies, use the full resources of the group and persevere at times of discouragement — all that can be enhanced by training. Nothing is more predictable than that there will be increased turbulence in the United States and many other societies. Activists cause some of the turbulence by rising up; other turbulence results from things like climate change, the 1 percent’s austerity programs and other forces outside activists’ immediate control. Increased turbulence scares a lot of people. It’s only natural that people will look around for reassurance. The ruling class will offer one kind of reassurance. The big question is: What reassurance will the movement offer? When students in Paris in May 1968 launched a campaign that quickly moved into nationwide turbulence, with 11 million workers striking and occupying, there was a momentary chance for the middle class to side with the students and workers instead of siding with the 1 percent. The movement, though, didn’t understand enough about the basic human need for security and failed to use its opportunity. That was a strategic error, but to choose a different path the movement would have required participants with more skills. Training would have been necessary. We can learn from this, inventory the skills needed and train ourselves accordingly. What is training ready to do for us? Here are a few of the key benefits that we should expect to gain from one another through training: 1. Increase the creativity of direct action strategy and tactics. The Yes Men and the Center for Story-Based Strategy lead workshops in which activist groups break out of the lockstep of “marches-and-rallies.” We need to have a broad array of tactics at our disposal, and we have to be ready to invent new ones when necessary. 2. Prepare participants psychologically for the struggle. The Pinochet regime in Chile depended, as dictatorships usually do, on fear to maintain its control. In the 1980s a group committed to nonviolent struggle encouraged people to face their fears directly in a three-step process: small group training sessions in living rooms, followed by “hit-and-run” nonviolent actions, followed by debriefing sessions. By teaching people to control their fear, trainers were building a movement to overthrow the dictator. 3. Develop group morale and solidarity for more effective action. In 1991 members of ACT UP — a militant group protesting U.S. AIDS policy — were beaten up by Philadelphia police during a demonstration. The police were found guilty of using unnecessary force and the city paid damages, but ACT UP members realized they could reduce the chance of future brutality by working in a more united and nonviolent way. Before their next major action they invited a trainer to conduct a workshop where they clarified the strategic question of nonviolence and then role-played possible scenarios. The result: a high-spirited, unified and effective action. 4. Deepen participants’ understanding of the issues. The War Resisters League’s Handbook for Nonviolent Action is an example of the approach that takes even a civil disobedience training as an opportunity to assist participants to take a next step regarding racism, sexism and the like. When we understand how seemingly separate struggles are connected, it helps us create a broader, stronger, more interconnected movement. 5. Build skills for applying nonviolent action in situations of threat and turbulence. In Haiti a hit squad abducted a young man just outside the house where a trained peace team was staying; the team immediately intervened and, although surrounded by twice their number of guards with weapons, succeeded in saving the man from being hung. Through training, we can learn how to react to emergencies like this in disciplined, effective ways. 6. Build alliances across movement lines. In Seattle in the 1980s, a workshop drew striking workers from the Greyhound bus company and members of ACT UP. The workshop reduced the prejudice each group had about the other, and it led some participants to support each other’s struggle. Trainings are a valuable opportunity to bring people from different walks of life together and help them work toward their common goals. 7. Create activist organizations that don’t burn people out. The Action Mill, Spirit in Action, and the Stone House all offer workshops to help activists to stay active in the long run. I’ve seen a lot of accumulated skill lost to movements over the years because people didn’t have the support or endurance to stay in the fight. 8. Increase democracy within the movement. In the 1970s the Movement for a New Society developed a pool of training tools and designs that it shared with the grassroots movement against nuclear power. The anti-nuclear movement went up against some of the largest corporations in America and won. The movement delayed construction, which raised costs, and planted so many seeds of doubt in the public mind about safety that the eventual meltdown of the Three Mile Island plant brought millions of people to the movement’s point of view. The industry’s goal of building 1,000 nuclear plants evaporated. Significantly, the campaign succeeded without needing to create a national structure around a charismatic leader. Activists learned the skills of shared leadership and democratic decision-making through workshops, practice and feedback. In my book Facilitating Group Learning, I share many lessons that have evolved from Freire’s day to ours. I hope that readers of this column will add to the list of training providers in the comments, since I’ve only named some. My intention is to remind us that this could be the right moment, before the next wave of turbulence has all of us in crisis-mode again, to increase training capacity for grassroots skill-building. We’ll be very glad we did.

#### Switch side debate – critiques of liberalism and performance can be read on the neg – solves dogmatism by testing different viewpoints

#### filter their impacts through predictable testability ---debate inherently judges relative truth value by whether or not it gets answered---a combination of a less predictable case neg, the burden of rejoinder, and them starting a speech ahead will always inflate the value of their impacts, which makes non-arbitrarily weighing whether they should have read the 1ac in the first place impossible within the structure of a debate round so even if we lose framework, vote neg on presumption.

#### No RVIs and this means we can kick out of topicality and none of their impact turns apply

#### 1. Topicality is a conditional - we’ve presented a model we think is good for debate, but if you disprove that model we have the right to kick out it. It’s key to negative flexibility because the affirmative gets plan choice and advantage area and the negative only has the burden of rejoinder, so we have to be able to attack them from both the left and the right to produce the best debates.

#### 2. Their impact turns don’t exist in a vacuum - they’re reliant on them winning the case, but if we win the PIC that disproves the thesis of the case, so they can’t go for impact turns unless they’re winning anyways.

#### 3. Neg teams will exclude your aff and say to reject it regardless, they will say your Aff is messed up and tell you not to vote for it whether it’s a DA, CP, or Framework

### 1NC

#### CP: We endorse the entirety of the affirmative with the exception of their defense of the under commons.

#### The undercommons is an intellectual mirage – it imagines that symbolic and representational disruptions in benign academic spaces implicate material violence and buys off material tactics for resistance

Webb, 18—Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Sheffield (Darren, “Bolt-holes and breathing spaces in the system: On forms of academic resistance (or, can the university be a site of utopian possibility?),” Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 40:2, 96-118, dml)

It is easy to be seduced by the language of the undercommons. Embodying and enacting it, however, is difficult indeed. Being within and against the university, refusing the call to order through insolent obstructive unprofessionalism, is almost impossible to sustain. Halberstam (2009, 45) describes the undercommons as “a marooned community of outcast thinkers who refuse, resist, and renege on the demands of rigor, excellence, and productivity.” A romantic and appealing notion for sure but refusing and reneging on “the university of excellence” will cost you your job. When Moten describes subversion as a “series of immanent upheavals” expressed through “vast repertoires of high-frequency complaints, imperceptible frowns, withering turns, silent sidesteps, and ever-vigilant attempts not to see and hear” (2008, 1743), one is reminded instantly of Thomas Docherty, disciplined and suspended for his negative vibes.7

Being with and for the maroon community is difficult too. First of all, “Where and how can we find/see the Undercommons at work?” (Ĉiĉigoj, Apostolou-Hölscher, and Rusham 2015, 265). Where and how can one find those liminal spaces of sabotage and subversion, and how does one occupy them in a spirit of hapticality, study, and militant arrhythmia that brings the utopic underground to the surface of the fierce and urgent now? Beautiful language, but how does one live it? Networks do, of course, exist—the Undercommoning Collective, the Edu-Factory Collective, the International Network for Alternative Academia, to name but a few. These are promising spaces for bringing together and harboring the maroons and the fugitives. But networks are typically short-lived, and—as Harney and Moten warned—there is a danger of institutionalization, of taking institutional practices with you into alternative spaces “because we’ve been inside so much” (Harney and Moten 2013, 148). And so, predictably, meetings of the fugitives come with structure, order, an official agenda, and circulated minutes. The outcasts convene in conventional academic conferences, with parallel sessions, panels of papers, lunch breaks, wine and nibbles (e.g., Edu-Factory 2012). These spaces offer time out, welcome respite, a breathing space, a trip abroad, and then one returns to work.

If hapticality, the touch of the undercommons, is “a visceral register of experience … the feel that what is to come is here” (Bradley 2014, 129–130), then this seems elusive. It is hard to detect a sense of the utopic undercommons rising to the surface of the corporate-imperial university. Moten describes the call to disorder and to study as a way to “excavate new aesthetic, political, and economic dispositions” (Moten 2008, 1745). But this notion of excavating is highly problematic. It is common within the discourse of “everyday utopianism”—finding utopia in the everyday, recovering lost or repressed transcendence in “everydayness” (Gardiner 2006)—to describe the process of utopian recovery in terms of excavating: excavating repressed desires, submerged longings, suppressed histories, untapped possibilities. But the fundamental questions of where to dig and how to identify a utopian “find” are never adequately addressed (see Webb 2017). Gardiner defines utopia as “a series of forces, tendencies and possibilities that are immanent in the here and now, in the pragmatic activities of everyday life” (2006, 2). But how are these forces, tendencies and possibilities to be identified and recovered? For Harney and Moten, it is through study, hapticality and militant arrhythmia. These are slippy concepts, however, evading concrete material referents.

What is it to inhabit the undercommons? Those who have written of their experiences refer to “small acts of marronage” such as poaching resources and redeploying them in ways at odds with the university’s designs and demands (Reddy 2016, 7), or exploiting funding streams “to form cracks in the institution that enable the Others to invade the university” (Smith, Dyke, and Hermes 2013, 150). For Adusei-Poku (2015), the undercommons is a space of refuge which is all about survival (2015, 4–5). We who feel homeless in the university are forced into refuge. We gather together to survive. We may gain satisfaction from small acts of marronage, but this is less about bringing the utopic common underground to the surface as it is a form of “radical escapism” (Adusei-Poku 2015, 4). Benveniste (2015, v) tells us that: “The undercommons has no set location and no return address. There is no map for entering and no guide for staying. The only condition is a living appetite. Listen to its hunger for difference.” We need more than poetry, however. And we need more than a series of minor acts of resistance. As Srnicek and Williams rightly emphasize, resistance is a defensive, reactive gesture, resisting against. Resistance is not a utopian endeavour: “We do not resist a new world into being” (Srnicek and Williams 2016, 47). The undercommons, when one can find it, is a bolt hole, a place of refuge, a breathing space in the system. We need something more.

The occupation Can the occupied building operate as a site of utopian possibility within the corporate-imperial university? Reflections on, and theorizations of, two recent waves of occupation—“Occupied California” 2009–2010 and the UK Occupations 2010–2011—have answered this question affirmatively. The “occupation” should not be understood here as solely or necessarily “student occupation.” It goes without saying—though sadly so often does need saying —that “faculty also have a responsibility to fight with and for students” (Smeltzer and Hearn 2015, 356). Though led by a new historical subject, “the graduate without a future” (Schwarz-WeinStein 2015, 11), the importance of faculty support for the occupations was emphasized on both sides of the Atlantic (Research and Destroy 2010, 11; Dawson 2011, 112; Holmes and R&D and Dead Labour 2011, 14; Ismail 2011, 128; Newfield and EduFactory 2011, 26). Long before Occupy took shape in Zuccotti Park, “occupation” was being heralded as the harbinger of a new society and a new way of being. If we return to the notion of creating utopian spaces, the key aim for some of the occupiers was to create communes within the university walls—to communize space (Inoperative Committee 2011, 6).8 Communization here is understood as a form of insurrectionary anarchism that refuses to talk of a transition to communism, insisting instead upon the immediate formation of zones of activity removed from exchange, money, compulsory labor, and the impersonal domination of the commodity form (Anon 2010a, 5). As one pamphlet declared: We will take whatever measures are necessary both to destroy this world as quickly as possible and to create, here and now, the world we want: a world without wages, without bosses, without borders, without states. (Anon 2010d, 34) This is a revolutionary anarchism that takes the university campus as the site for a practice—communization—that not only prefigures but also realizes the vision of a free society. Heavily influenced by The Coming Insurrection (Invisible Committee 2009), but tapping into a long tradition of anarchist theory and practice from Hakim Bey’s Temporary Autonomous Zones (Bey 1985) to David Graeber’s Direct Action (Graeber 2009), occupation becomes “the creation of a momentary opening in capitalist time and space, a rearrangement that sketches the contours of a new society” (Research and Destroy 2010, 11). It is “an attempt to imagine a new kind of everyday life” (Hatherley 2011, 123). Firth (2012) refers to these momentary openings as critical, experimental utopias: Such utopias are … simultaneously immanent and prefigurative. They are immanent insofar as they allow space for the immediate expression of desires, satisfaction of needs and also the articulation of difference or dissent. They are prefigurative to the extent that they allow one to practice and exemplify what one would like to see at a more proliferative range in the future (26) The ultimate aim is for the practice to spread beyond the campus through a dual process of provocative rupture—the idea that insurrectionary moments can unleash the collective imagination and stimulate an outpouring of creativity that blows apart common sense and offers glimpses of a future world (Gibson-Graham 2006, 51; Shukaitis and Graeber 2007, 37)—and “contaminationism,” that is, spreading by means of example (Graeber 2009, 211). It may well have been the case that communism was realized on the campuses of Berkeley and UCL, that a momentary opening in capitalist space/time appeared through which another world could be glimpsed. The occupation, however—whether California, London, or anywhere else—is likely always to remain a localized temporary disruptive practice. A practice with utopian potency, for sure, in terms of suspending normalized forms of discipline and opening new egalitarian discursive spaces (Rheingans and Hollands 2013; Nişancioğlu and Pal 2016). In terms of wider systemic change, however, “small interventions consisting of relatively non-scalable actions are highly unlikely to ever be able to reorganise our socioeconomic system” (Srnicek and Williams 2016, 29). What “the occupation” demonstrates more than anything is the reality of the corporate-imperial university, as the institutional hierarchy, backed by the carceral power of the police and criminal justice system, inevitably disperses the occupiers—often using militarized force—and repossesses the occupied space in a strong assertion of its ownership rights not only to university buildings but also to what constitutes legitimate thought and behavior within them (on this see Docherty 2015, 90). The significance, and utopian potential, one attaches to campus occupations depends in part upon the significance one attaches to the university as a site of struggle. For the Edu-Factory Collective: As was the factory, so now is the university. Where once the factory was a paradigmatic site of struggle between workers and capitalists, so now the university is a key space of conflict, where the ownership of knowledge, the reproduction of the labour force, and the creation of social and cultural stratifications are all at stake. This is to say the university is not just another institution subject to sovereign and governmental controls, but a crucial site in which wider social struggles are won and lost. (Caffentzis and Federici 2011, 26) Clearly, if this is true, then the form the struggle takes, and the example it sets, is of immense significance. Srnicek and Williams describe as “wishful thinking” the idea that the occupation might spread beyond the campus by means of rupture or contamination (2016, 35). However, if the university really is a key site of class struggle (Seybold 2008, 120; Haiven and Khasnabish 2014, 38), a site through which wider struggles are refracted and won or lost, then the transformative potential of the occupation needs to be attended to seriously. The analysis of the university offered by the Edu-Factory Collective is, however, outdated. Sounding like Daniel Bell writing in 1973 about how universities had become the “axial structures” of post-industrial society (Bell 1973, 12), the analysis does not hold water today. Moten overdoes it when he tells us that “the university is a kind of corpse. It is dead. It’s a dead institutional body” (Moten 2015, 78). What is clear, however, is that “focusing on the university as a site of radical transformation is a mistake” (Holmes and R&D and Dead Labour 2011, 13). As has been widely noted, there is very little distinguishing universities from other for-profit corporations (Readings 1996; Lustig 2005; Washburn 2005; Shear 2008, Tuchman 2009). What does separate them is their inefficiency, due in large part to the fact that universities operate also as medieval guilds, with faculties “ruled by masters who lord over journeymen and apprentices in an artisanal system of production” (Jemielniak and Greenwood 2015, 77). If the university is a sinister hybrid monstrosity—part medieval guild, part criminal corporation—which has no role other than reproducing its own privilege, then no special status can be attributed to campus protests. In this case, “A free university in the midst of a capitalist society is like a reading room in a prison” (Research and Destroy 2010, 10). A reading room in a prison. Another apposite metaphor. The occupation is a safe space, offering temporary respite, a place to hide, a refuge, a bolt-hole, a breathing space. As with the utopian classroom and the undercommons, what the occupation suggests is that “defending small bunkers of autonomy against the onslaught of capitalism is the best that can be hoped for” (Srnicek and Williams 2016, 48). Conclusion Zaslove was right to characterize utopian pedagogy within the corporateimperial university as the search for bolt-holes and breathing spaces in the system. He himself suggests that, “All university classes should become dialogic-experiential models that educate by expanding the zones of contact with wider communities” (2007, 102). Like so many others, Zaslove sees dialogic-experiential models of education beginning in the classroom then expanding outward. The literature is full of references to “exceeding the limits of the university classroom” (Coté, Day, and de Peuter 2007a, 325), “extend [ing] beyond the boundaries of the campus” (Ruben 2000, 211), and “breeching the walls of the university compounds and spilling into the streets” (Research and Destroy 2010, 10). This all brings to mind Giroux’s notion of academics as border crossers (Giroux 1992), but it also paints a picture of academics taking as their starting point the university and from there crossing the border into the community and the street.

The University can be the site for fleeting, transitory, small-scale experiences of utopian possibility—in the classroom, the undercommons, the occupation. It cannot be the site for transformative utopian politics. It cannot even be the starting point for this. Given the corporatization and militarization of the university, academics are increasingly becoming “functionaries of elite interests” inhabiting a culture which serves to reproduce these interests (Shear 2008, 56). Within the university, “radical” initiatives or movements will soon be co-opted, recuperated, commodified, and neutralized (Gibson-Graham 2006, xxvi; Seybold 2008, 123; Neary 2012b, 249; Rolfe 2013, 21). Institutional habitus weights so heavily that projects born in the university will be scarred from the outset by a certain colonizing “imaginary of education” (Burdick and Sandlin 2010, 117). And we have long known that the university is but one space of learning, and perhaps not a very important one at that. Identifying the academy as the starting point for a utopian pedagogy privileges this arcane space over sites of public pedagogy such as film, television, literature, sport, advertising, architecture, media in its various forms, political organizations, religious institutions, and the workplace (Todd 1997).

Perhaps the emphasis on creating radical experimental spaces within the academy needs to shift toward operating in existing spaces of resistance outside it. Haiven and Khasnabish argue that many social movements function already as “social laboratories for the generation of alternative relationships, subjectivities, institutions and practices” (2014, 62), providing “a space for experiments in knowledge production, radical imagination, subjectification, and concrete alternative-building” (Khasnabish 2012, 237). Why locate utopian pedagogy in the university when “critical utopian politics” can take place in “infrastructures of resistance” such as intentional communities, housing collectives, squats, art centers, community theatres, bars, book shops, health collectives, social centers, independent media and, increasingly of course, the digital sphere (Firth 2012; Shantz 2012; Amsler 2015; Dallyn, Marinetto, and Cederstrom 2015)? Moving beyond short-term, localized, temporary modes of resistance, utopian pedagogy would work across these sites to develop a long-term strategy and vision.

There is a role for the academic in utopian politics, but not in the university-as-such. The utopian pedagogue has a responsibility to exploit their own privilege and to work with students, communities and movements outside and divorced from the university. As Shear rightly notes, academics (and especially those working in the humanities and social sciences) “inhabit a privileged space in which critical inquiry concerning social hegemony and political-economic domination” is possible (Shear 2008, 56). Within the university, however, spaces for embodying and enacting this kind of inquiry have become constrained, compromised, monitored, surveilled, co-opted, and recuperated. As I have argued throughout this article, utopian pedagogy has become a search for bolt-holes and breathing spaces in the system. Beyond the academy, however, there is a role to play. As Chomsky (2010) tells us, with privilege comes responsibility. And as Giroux frames it, this is an ethical and political responsibility to provide “theoretical resources and modes of analysis” to help forge “a utopian imaginary” (Giroux 2014a; 153; 2014b, 200). This means putting one’s knowledge and resources to use in the service of a collaborative process of memory- and story-making, pulling together disparate inchoate dreams and yearnings in order to generate a utopian vision that can help inform, guide, and mobilize long-term collective action for systemic change.

#### Fugitivity is not the answer- the world is compositional and can be remade- subjectivity is malleable

Mbembe and Goldberg, PhDs, 18

(Achille, History@Harvard David Theo, Director, University of California Humanities Research Institute, <https://www.theoryculturesociety.org/conversation-achille-mbembe-and-david-theo-goldberg-on-critique-of-black-reason/>, 7-3)

DTG: A final round of questions. So, we’ve been talking, in a way, about the malleability, the plasticity of subjectivity, of making and self-making, the way the human is plastic in the sense of metamorphizing and the capacity to make something of themselves. This also requires being open to the world. And so I want to end by asking, really, about your final reflections in the book, which are also final reflections in that they close your book but are an opening up to perhaps a longer term set of reflections around world-thinking. What does a world-thinking in your understanding amount to: a thinking of the world, a thinking from the world, thinking with and through the world? What does it open up? Where do you see it leading? Thinking in circulation, thinking in crossings? And linked, in a kind of negative dialectic, I’d say, to a notion of fugitivity but not reducible to fugitivity either, right? In thinking of and with and about the world, one is not fleeing the world as such, or even a set of worlds. One is trying to take it up in its own sense but also in one’s own sense, and to negotiate the conditions of possibility … AM: Here again, one of the main interlocutors is Amos Tutuola. Tutuola’s world is, first of all, a world of multiplicity and heterogeneity, a world of doubles, of sudden reversals and discontinuity – structural, not just an incident. Multiplicity and proliferation are its flesh. Always having to start anew, too. It’s a dangerous and threatening world which can and must be navigated carefully. One can even navigate it successfully provided one is capable of mobilizing, orchestrating, the entirety of the resources it makes available. It is also a world in which the most efficient logic of action is not flight and escape or fugitivity as, I would say, clearing the pathways of composition. This is not about fugitivity; it is about the capacity to assemble and to compose, including things that at first do not appear to be compatible. For instance, in Tutuola’s novel, you can be given the head of somebody else and you have to live with it. Or you can borrow a leg from another, for a time. Its compositional logic is much more important than anything else, precisely because of the proliferating multiplicity that structures such a world. It’s also a world where mobility is a scarce resource but a fundamental one. Actual, physical mobility of people. People are on the move constantly, the main struggles are around the capacity to be able to go from one point to another, and to be able to cross boundaries. When faced with crossroads, one needs to know what path to follow. So what I am trying to say is that we have, here, conceptual resources that allow us to imagine a geography of our times, of life, which is not at all linear, which is not about fugitivity. It is about the compositional nature of the human. All of that is really in line with recent discoveries, in biology, in science, and in technology. And from debates concerning the Anthropocene. So those are the conceptual resources of my imagination of the world in the last chapter of the book. In that sense it’s not really – I keep coming back to this concept of fugitivity – it is not the African-American naturalizing paradigm, it’s something else. DTG: It’s not a fleeing from … AM: … not at all. It is a different way of inhabitation of the world. It’s not a matter of running away to form some separate space of seclusion, it’s not about marronage, as in the Caribbean text. It is not that the world is a prison we need to escape from in order to start all over again in an entirely new planet or galaxy as in the Afrofuturist text. Freedom consists in the full inhabitation of the world, an embrace of its contradictions. And the best way to do it is through the principle of compositional logics. DTG: And the compositional has multi-dimensionality. AM: Yes, it does have multi – … many, many different dimensions. And it’s not exactly what some call plasticity, although plasticity is involved in it. But it’s really a kind of radical openness to all kinds of knowledges and the disposition towards the encounter with the unknown. The determination to go in search of the unknown. That’s what it is; that’s what the African continental archive brings to these discussions.

#### Stick them to every word of their advocacy—they chose to initiate a debate without a plan and have thus forgone the right to “plan focus” style arguments—they can’t pick and chose which parts of their advocacy to include in the permutation—if we win a link to anything that should be sufficient to vote negative

#### No permutations in a methods debate –

#### They don’t get a permutation—a permutation is a test of competitiveness between policy options—that model doesn’t make sense when the debate is between amorphous philosophical positions because you can’t really tie them down to anything. They can always explain why in the abstract certain things they said are compatible with diaspora studies but that just begs the question of why they included the rest

### 1NC

#### CP: We endorse the entirety of the affirmative with the exception of Large Satellite Constellations for the purposes of 6G development and research. Significant subsidization and funding directed towards private entities developing 6G is just. The utilization of cryptocurrency by state and non-state actors is unjust.

#### Private LEO appropriation drive rapid SatCom 6G innovations – that’s key to pervasive communication services that solve medical data flow deficits and solve UN SGDs

Höyhtyä et al 22 Marko Höyhtyä, Senior Member, IEEE, Sandrine Boumard, Anastasia Yastrebova, Pertti Järvensivu, Markku Kiviranta, Senior Member, IEEE and Antti Anttonen, Senior Member, IEEE. "Sustainable Satellite Communications in the 6G Era: A European View for Multi-Layer Systems and Space Safety." arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.02408 (2022)

THE two main disruptions driving the development and rapid growth of satellite communications (SatCom) are increasing satellite constellations sizes and integration of satellite and terrestrial networks. The former also aims to provide broadband services to currently underserved areas with improved performance. The latter is related to the evolution of mobile networks where different wireless and wired technologies converge together. This creates vast amount of new opportunities in different application fields such as public safety, digital health, logistics and Internet services in developing countries. The annual space business related to 5th generation (5G) and 6th generation (6G) of communication systems is expected to grow to more than €500B during the next two decades [1]–[3]. This is more than the whole space business currently including scientific missions, earth observation (EO) and navigations. At the same time the whole space sector is in the transformation phase due to so called New Space Economy. Significant reduction of launch costs and easy and affordable access to space have attracted new innovative players to space business [4], [5]. Especially Low Earth Orbit (LEO) systems and small satellites are increasing rapidly. The most typical orbit heights are above 500 km but there are significant efforts to use also very low Earth orbits (vLEO) to provide sensing and communications services. The so called Karman line, defining where atmosphere ends and space begins, is above 80 km and orbiting objects can survive multiple perigees passages at altitudes around 80–90 km [6]. Small satellites in the range of 80-220 kg can be seen as a sweet spot [5] since they are large enough for payloads to support e.g. broadband communications [7]–[9] or synthetic aperture radar (SAR) imaging [10], [11]. A. Multi-Layer Networks 6G systems will be used to provide pervasive services worldwide in order to support both dense and less dense areas. To achieve this goal, 6G systems will need to integrate terrestrial, airborne (drones, high-altitude platforms (HAPs)) and satellite communications at different orbits [12], [13]. This means that in contrast to traditional research and development (R&D) work, network analysis, planning and optimization will be updated from two dimensions to three dimensions (3D), where also the heights of communications nodes are taken into consideration [12]–[15]. In this way, 6G networks will be able to provide drastically higher performance to support e.g., passengers in ships and airplanes. The initiatives spawned recently range from very high throughput geostationary orbit (GEO) systems to unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) [16]–[18] and small satellite systems dedicated to machine-to-machine (M2M) and Internet-of- things (IoT) services [19]–[21]. Especially interesting are mega-constellations consisting of hundreds to thousands of small and medium size satellites like those proprietary ones envisaged by OneWeb, Starlink, Orbcomm and Telesat to mention but a few. There is also ongoing active work in the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) standardization to define non-terrestrial networks (NTN) with interoperable interfaces in order to have truly seamless connectivity in the future, described in detail in Section V.B. B. Space Safety and Sustainability There are not only technical drivers in the development of the multi-layer 6G networks. It is essential to develop services and technologies in a sustainable way in order to ensure high quality services also to coming generations. To mention a few examples: 1) According to International Telecommunication Union (ITU) only half of the world’s population has access to broadband services above 256 kbits/s currently [22]. 2) The COVID-19 pandemic has shown that video communications provide means for people and businesses, including medical professionals, and their patients to remain in virtual contact, avoiding the need for travel while remaining socially, professionally, and commercially active [23]. A comprehensive analysis to linkage between 6G and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs) from technological, business and regulation perspectives has been provided in [24], [25]. A very good overview on how European Space Agency (ESA) programs support SDGs is given in [26]. For instance, satellite communication technologies provide e-learning in Congo, tools for telemedicine and transmission of key medical data to and from remote locations, and means to gather and share data on arctic sea and climate conditions. Thus, it supports multitude of SDGs including good health and wellbeing, climate action, quality education, sustainable cities and communities, reduced inequalities, and life on land by helping to protect terrestrial ecosystems. Therefore, modern communication networks will be purposefully designed to be socially, economically and environmentally sustainable, and they will provide means to support equality globally. The main sustainability aspects are visualized in Figure 1. In the following, we list a couple of key points from the SatCom point of view.

#### solves emerging biodisasters – extinction

**Su ’21** [Zhaohui; 2021; Center on Smart and Connected Health Technologies, Mays Cancer Center, School of Nursing, UT Health San Antonio; The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, “Addressing Biodisaster X Threats with Artificial Intelligence and 6G Technologies: Literature Review and Critical Insights,” https://arxiv.org/pdf/2105.08870.pdf]

A disaster can be defined as “a serious disruption of the functioning of a community or society involving widespread human, material, economic, or environmental losses and impacts, which exceeds the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources” [47]. Based on the contributing causes, disasters are usually categorized as **natural** (eg, **earthquakes**, infectious disease-inducing epidemics, or **pandemics** of natural origin) and **anthropogenic** (eg, armed **conflicts**, **nuclear accidents**, or the release of **pathogenic genetically modified organisms** from laboratory settings). In the context of this study, **biodisasters** are defined as disasters that occur as a result of **infectious** **pathogens** **with bioweapon potential**, which are unleashed by state or nonstate actors **accidentally** and **intentionally** (eg, the Japanese government’s controversial decision to dump Fukushima’s contaminated water into the boundless and borderless ocean shared by all life forms on earth, including humans and sharks [48]). In the context of biodisasters, a state actor often takes the form of a nation that deliberately and systematically designs and develops infectious pathogens with its national interest in mind. In contrast, a nonstate actor is an individual or group acting independently to obtain or manufacture a pathogen either owing to misguidance or malice. Of note, although existing multilateral agreements prohibit the production and use of bioweapons by state actors (termed biowarfare) [49], the presence of signed agreements **does not imply** that accidental or intentional development and release of pathogens by state actors **will not occur**. The concept of “bioterrorism,” defined as the deliberate release of pathogens that could cause illnesses and deaths in society, is not the focus of this study because “**bioterrorism**” entails both deliberation and malice (eg, to elicit terror to the public) [50]; antecedents **may not necessarily apply** to Biodisaster X threats. Insights from behavioral science [51-53] and evidence regarding individual-caused mass casualty events (eg, indiscriminate mass shootings) [54-56] suggest that individual actors’ behaviors, potentially leading to the onset of Biodisaster X, may or may not include conscious deliberation to harm. In other words, while it is possible that individual actors’ malicious actions might cause **some** biodisasters, it is also possible that some individual-caused biodisasters are **accidental**. Furthermore, the term bioterrorism is **limited**, in that “**terror**” is the main outcome. We believe that for Biodisaster X, which could **upend lives**, **livelihoods**, and **economies**, “**disaster**” is a more appropriate description that sheds light on the **scale** and **severity** of its consequences and is more diverse than “terror.” Drawing insight from real-world examples, similar to the prevalent ransomware hacks, it is possible that state or individual actors could develop and utilize infectious pathogens as “ransomgens” for financial gain rather than merely aiming to generate terror in society. Therefore, under the current research context, we adopted the term “biodisaster” instead of “bioterrorism.” Furthermore, considering that various studies have discussed approaches to address state actor–initiated biodisasters [57-61], this study focuses on biodisasters that are infectious in nature, caused by individual actors, and can result in catastrophic human and economic consequences. Biodisaster X vs Disease X The risk of biodisasters, such as Biodisaster X, is **increasing** **in likelihood**: advances in technology, particularly the **availability** and **maturity** of **biotech**nology, have grown **considerably** in recent years. Inadvertently, these advances may resemble those of **Oppenheimer** [62] in facilitating the release of destructive factors. One example of the misuse of biotechnology is a microbiologist, vaccinologist, and senior biodefense researcher who worked at the United States Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases, who allegedly engineered the 2001 anthrax attacks [63-65]. While the scale of the 2001 **anthrax** attacks was minor, it demonstrated how **easily** biodisasters can occur and how **unprepared** society was for these events. As seen in the lack of **adequate preparation** and **coherent responses** to infectious disease–induced **pandemics**, including **COVID**-19 [66-69], Biodisaster X’s effects may be **compounded** to the same, if not greater, degree by **incompetence** across international, national, and regional agencies and organizations. The concept of Biodisaster X can be best understood in contrast with Disease X. In terms of similarities, both Biodisaster X and Disease X are driven by pathogens unknown to humans and have the potential to cause crippling effects on society. Furthermore, based on previous inadequacies in response to emergency events including pandemics [66-74], the world at large may be ill-prepared for both Biodisaster X and Disease X. In terms of unique attributes, compared to Disease X, Biodisaster X is more likely to have the following characteristics: (1) having a pathogen directly affiliated to a laboratory; (2) having distinctive and engineered attributes tailored by the capabilities and intentions of the developer; and (3) the origin, development, and history can be definitively ascertained upon identification of the developer, which is not possible for naturally occurring pathogens (eg, the 1918 influenza pandemic), where there is always uncertainty regarding the origin and evolutionary history of the disaster [75-77]. The Imperative of Preparing for Biodisaster X Some of the **deadliest** **pandemics**—the most recent ones ranging from AIDS, severe acute respiratory syndrome, Middle East respiratory syndrome, Ebola, and COVID-19—all have zoonotic origins [78]. Studies have further shown that for viruses that can transmit from animals to humans, especially those that can infect a diverse range of host species, the transmission speeds are **substantially amplified** once human-to-human transmission is established, and the diseases can **quickly evolve** into **global pandemics** [79]. Consequently, once a pathogen is transmissible within a population, there is a **low access threshold**: an individual actor can “obtain” these deadly pathogens **without** the need for **advanced laboratory skills** or **extensive financial resources**. However, costs to physical and mental health may reveal a counternarrative. Based on available evidence, it is difficult to determine whether an individual can be a malicious “patient zero”; an individual who intentionally contracts a novel virus intending to cause infectious disease outbreaks in a society [80]. It is not impossible to purposely study and capture known or unknown deadly pathogens that can trigger infectious diseases; microbial surveys are commonly conducted to identify novel pathogens before they pose a threat to public health [81-84]. In theory, there could be individual actors, with adequate knowledge or experience (similar to the microbiologist allegedly behind the 2011 anthrax attacks [63-65]), who may take the same actions but with different motives, ranging from scientific curiosity to ill-guided intentions. Considering the **rich biodiversity** of wildlife, along with the large number of “**missing viruses**” and “missing **zoonoses**” that remain unidentified [85], close contacts with latent deadly pathogens are **nearly impossible** to control, which in turn, renders it challenging to locate or identify individual actors who might utilize them. Advances in **synthetic biology** may further compound the situation, especially considering the scholarly endeavors using pathogens in laboratory settings, which could amount to the level of real-world pandemics (eg, laboratory-cultured viruses such as smallpox [86-88]). The likelihood of Biodisaster X increases in proportion to these factors. Overall, considering the species diversity of wildlife, the unknown factors related to the scale and severity of viruses in animals, which have the latent potential to infect humans, and the varying degrees of competency of community health centers in detecting infectious disease outbreaks in a bottom-up manner, it could be tremendously difficult for health experts and government officials to monitor potentially emerging Biodisaster X threats. However, not all hope is lost. Technology-based solutions, especially those utilizing AI and 6G technologies, can help address these issues. The Need for Advanced Technology Solutions for Monitoring and Managing Biodisaster X The Need for Technology-Based Solutions Once Biodisaster X becomes a reality, human contact will drive transmission and become the primary fuel for exacerbating infections and deaths caused by the disaster. As seen during the COVID-19 pandemic, owing to virus spread and subsequent public health policies (eg, lockdowns), many **critical** **societal** **functions** could be **substantially** **disrupted**. The potential to **control** and **contain** human and economic **consequences** of Biodisaster X, such as the functionality of the health care systems (eg, infected health care professionals) [89-91], may also become **critically undermined**. In these circumstances, **tech**nology-based solutions could be the **key** to addressing these crises, as they are different from conventional solutions; they are **not** **highly** **dependent** on physical interactions and transportation. Overall, technology-based solutions require **limited** human resources (eg, with the ability to operate without human input), can be delivered **independent** of physical human contact (eg, web-based and remote deployment), and are **immune** to infectious diseases (eg, can function in contaminated environments). Furthermore, technology-based solutions are **less vulnerable** to issues ranging from physical fatigue to mental health burdens, which are health challenges that frontline workers often face amid emergency events. The Need for Advanced Technologies To effectively predict, control, and manage Biodisaster X, which is an event with a low probability (ie, difficult to detect preemptively) and a high impact (ie, difficult to control and contain), advanced technologies are needed. While many emerging technologies can address the dangers and damages associated with Biodisaster X [92,93], 2 families of advanced technology-based solutions show particular promise, namely AI techniques and 6G technologies. Unique Capabilities of AI AI is generally considered synonymous with “thinking machines” [94], or techniques that can facilitate “a computer to do things which, when done by people, are said to involve intelligence” [95]. With AI technologies, machines can identify patterns too intricate for humans to identify and process quickly. AI techniques are widely used in areas such as natural language processing, speech recognition, machine vision, targeted marketing, and health care, including efforts to combat COVID-19 [96-99]. While technologies such as virtual reality, smart sensors, drones, and robotics could play a positive role in supporting health care professionals to cope with the pandemic [100-102], AI technologies are arguably most instrumental in addressing some of the most prominent issues health experts and government officials are faced with, ranging from pandemic surveillance to COVID-19 drug and vaccine development [103-106]. AI and machine learning techniques are particularly valuable in their ability to identify trends and patterns across large amounts of data promptly and cost-effectively; for example, in identifying or searching for specific patterns. With natural language processing, for instance, data can be extracted retrospectively from clinical records or prospectively in real time and statistically processed for insights, which, in turn, can supplement existing structured data to enrich actionable information [86]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, natural language processing models have been used to analyze publicly available information such as tweets, tweet timestamps, and geolocation data, to identify and map potential COVID-19 cases cost-effectively, without utilizing testing devices or other medical resources that involve health care professional [107]. Overall, most, if not all, AI techniques are irreplaceable in regard to administering complex tasks such as extracting useful information from large data sets. Moreover, with the continuously increasing speed of its technological advancements and applications, AI technologies are often utilized as core components in other emerging technologies [108]. Smart sensors that perform advanced tasks, such as effectively identifying and recognizing captured motions and images, often need to integrate deep learning technologies (a subgroup of AI) [109-111]. These combined insights suggest that AI techniques have great potential in monitoring and managing Biodisaster X threats. Unique Capabilities of 6G Networks 6G technologies are the next generation of wireless communication systems following 5G networks [112]. While 6G is still under development, it is envisioned as the most capable communication network currently available [112-119]. The advantages of 6G networks derive from their high data transmission speed (up to 1 terabyte per second), wireless hyper-connectivity (100 million connections per km2), low end-to-end latency (< 1 ms), reliability (1-10-9) (reliability in terms of the frame error rate, which is defined as the ratio of the number of incorrectly decoded frames to that of total transmitted frames), and high-accuracy positioning capabilities (indoor: <10 cm in 3D; outdoor: <1 m in 3D) [112-119]. Adding the fact that 6G networks also excel in their energy efficiency and spectrum efficiency, these networks can provide fast and efficient wireless

reporting and access to remote computational facilities, facilitating mobile biomonitoring and disaster management. For instance, the high reliability and data transmission speed of 6G technologies will be of critical importance amid global emergency events with the scale of Biodisaster X. At the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, many internet companies and service providers experienced outrage and were forced to reduce the amount of data individuals and organizations could utilize to ensure continuous communication for all [120]. This limitation of existing communication networks could compromise the ability of health experts and government officials to monitor and manage COVID-19–related threats and other disasters promptly and properly. Of note, in the face of an extremely deadly, contagious, and fast-developing Biodisaster X, information will be predominantly updated and exchanged remotely and over the internet. The speed and success of updating and exchanging information are highly dependent on the reliability of communication networks, in which 6G technologies excel, especially when spatial big data have been introduced for disease control and prevention since the COVID-19 pandemic [27,108,121]. Figure 1 lists visual comparisons in communication capabilities between 6G and 5G networks.

#### Extinction outweighs---it’s the upmost moral evil and disavowal of the risk makes it more likely.

Burns 2017 (Elizabeth Finneron-Burns is a Teaching Fellow at the University of Warwick and an Affiliated Researcher at the Institute for Futures Studies in Stockholm, What’s wrong with human extinction?, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00455091.2016.1278150?needAccess=true>, Canadian Journal of Philosophy, 2017)

Many, though certainly not all, people might believe that it would be wrong to bring about the end of the human species, and the reasons given for this belief are various. I begin by considering four reasons that could be given against the moral permissibility of human extinction. I will argue that only those reasons that impact the people who exist at the time that the extinction or the knowledge of the upcoming extinction occurs, can explain its wrongness. I use this conclusion to then consider in which cases human extinction would be morally permissible or impermissible, arguing that there is only a small class of cases in which it would not be wrong to cause the extinction of the human race or allow it to happen. 2.1. It would prevent the existence of very many happy people One reason of human extinction might be considered to be wrong lies in the value of human life itself. The thought here might be that it is a good thing for people to exist and enjoy happy lives and extinction would deprive more people of enjoying this good. The ‘good’ in this case could be understood in at least two ways. According to the first, one might believe that you benefit a person by bringing them into existence, or at least, that it is good for that person that they come to exist. The second view might hold that if humans were to go extinct, the utility foregone by the billions (or more) of people who could have lived but will now never get that opportunity, renders allowing human extinction to take place an incidence of wrongdoing. An example of this view can be found in two quotes from an Effective Altruism blog post by Peter Singer, Nick Beckstead and Matt Wage: One very bad thing about human extinction would be that billions of people would likely die painful deaths. But in our view, this is by far not the worst thing about human extinction. The worst thing about human extinction is that there would be no future generations. Since there could be so many generations in our future, the value of all those generations together greatly exceeds the value of the current generation. (Beckstead, Singer, and Wage 2013) The authors are making two claims. The first is that there is value in human life and also something valuable about creating future people which gives us a reason to do so; furthermore, it would be a very bad thing if we did not do so. The second is that, not only would it be a bad thing for there to be no future people, but it would actually be the worst thing about extinction. Since happy human lives have value, and the number of potential people who could ever exist is far greater than the number of people who exist at any one time, even if the extinction were brought about through the painful deaths of currently existing people, the former’s loss would be greater than the latter’s. Both claims are assuming that there is an intrinsic value in the existence of potential human life. The second claim makes the further assumption that the forgone value of the potential lives that could be lived is greater than the disvalue that would be accrued by people existing at the time of the extinction through suffering from painful and/or premature deaths. The best-known author of the post, Peter Singer is a prominent utilitarian, so it is not surprising that he would lament the potential lack of future human lives per se. However, it is not just utilitarians who share this view, even if implicitly. Indeed, other philosophers also seem to imply that they share the intuition that there is just something wrong with causing or failing to prevent the extinction of the human species such that we prevent more ‘people’ from having the ‘opportunity to exist’. Stephen Gardiner (2009) and Martin O’Neill (personal correspondence), both sympathetic to contract theory, for example, also find it intuitive that we should want more generations to have the opportunity to exist, assuming that they have worth-living lives, and I find it plausible to think that many other people (philosophers and non-philosophers alike) probably share this intuition. When we talk about future lives being ‘prevented’, we are saying that a possible person or a set of possible people who could potentially have existed will now never actually come to exist. To say that it is wrong to prevent people from existing could either mean that a possible person could reasonably reject a principle that permitted us not to create them, or that the foregone value of their lives provides a reason for rejecting any principle that permits extinction. To make the first claim we would have to argue that a possible person could reasonably reject any principle that prevented their existence on the grounds that it prevented them in particular from existing. However, this is implausible for two reasons. First, we can only wrong someone who did, does or will actually exist because wronging involves failing to take a person’s interests into account. When considering the permissibility of a principle allowing us not to create Person X, we cannot take X’s interest in being created into account because X will not exist if we follow the principle. By considering the standpoint of a person in our deliberations we consider the burdens they will have to bear as a result of the principle. In this case, there is no one who will bear any burdens since if the principle is followed (that is, if we do not create X), X will not exist to bear any burdens. So, only people who do/will actually exist can bear the brunt of a principle, and therefore occupy a standpoint that is owed justification. Second, existence is not an interest at all and a possible person is not disadvantaged by not being caused to exist. Rather than being an interest, it is a necessary requirement in order to have interests. Rivka Weinberg describes it as ‘neutral’ because causing a person to exist is to create a subject who can have interests; existence is not an interest itself.3 In order to be disadvantaged, there must be some detrimental effect on your interests. However, without existence, a person does not have any interests so they cannot be disadvantaged by being kept out of existence. But, as Weinberg points out, ‘never having interests itself could not be contrary to people’s interests since without interest bearers, there can be no ‘they’ for it to be bad for’ (Weinberg 2008, 13). So, a principle that results in some possible people never becoming actual does not impose any costs on those ‘people’ because nobody is disadvantaged by not coming into existence.4 It therefore seems that it cannot be wrong to fail to bring particular people into existence. This would mean that no one acts wrongly when they fail to create another person. Writ large, it would also not be wrong if everybody decided to exercise their prerogative not to create new people and potentially, by consequence, allow human extinction. One might respond here by saying that although it may be permissible for one person to fail to create a new person, it is not permissible if everyone chooses to do so because human lives have value and allowing human extinction would be to forgo a huge amount of value in the world. This takes us to the second way of understanding the potential wrongness of preventing people from existing — the foregone value of a life provides a reason for rejecting any principle that prevents it. One possible reply to this claim turns on the fact that many philosophers acknowledge that the only, or at least the best, way to think about the value of (individual or groups of) possible people’s lives is in impersonal terms (Parfit 1984; Reiman 2007; McMahan 2009). Jeff McMahan, for example, writes ‘at the time of one’s choice there is no one who exists or will exist independently of that choice for whose sake one could be acting in causing him or her to exist … it seems therefore that any reason to cause or not to cause an individual to exist … is best considered an impersonal rather than individual-affecting reason’ (McMahan 2009, 52). Another reply along similar lines would be to appeal to the value that is lost or at least foregone when we fail to bring into existence a next (or several next) generations of people with worth-living lives. Since ex hypothesi worth-living lives have positive value, it is better to create more such lives and worse to create fewer. Human extinction by definition is the creation of no future lives and would ‘deprive’ billions of ‘people’ of the opportunity to live worth-living lives. This might reduce the amount of value in the world at the time of the extinction (by killing already existing people), but it would also prevent a much vaster amount of value in the future (by failing to create more people). Both replies depend on the impersonal value of human life. However, recall that in contractualism impersonal values are not on their own grounds for reasonably rejecting principles. Scanlon himself says that although we have a strong reason not to destroy existing human lives, this reason ‘does not flow from the thought that it is a good thing for there to be more human life rather than less’ (104). In contractualism, something cannot be wrong unless there is an impact on a person. Thus, neither the impersonal value of creating a particular person nor the impersonal value of human life writ large could on its own provide a reason for rejecting a principle permitting human extinction. It seems therefore that the fact that extinction would deprive future people of the opportunity to live worth-living lives (either by failing to create either particular future people or future people in general) cannot provide us with a reason to consider human extinction to be wrong. Although the lost value of these ‘lives’ itself cannot be the reason explaining the wrongness of extinction, it is possible the knowledge of this loss might create a personal reason for some existing people. I will consider this possibility later on in section (d). But first I move to the second reason human extinction might be wrong per se. 2.2. It would mean the loss of the only known form of intelligent life and all civilization and intellectual progress would be lost A second reason we might think it would be wrong to cause human extinction is the loss that would occur of the only (known) form of rational life and the knowledge and civilization that that form of life has created. One thought here could be that just as some might consider it wrong to destroy an individual human heritage monument like the Sphinx, it would also be wrong if the advances made by humans over the past few millennia were lost or prevented from progressing. A related argument is made by those who feel that there is something special about humans’ capacity for rationality which is valuable in itself. Since humans are the only intelligent life that we know of, it would be a loss, in itself, to the world for that to end. I admit that I struggle to fully appreciate this thought. It seems to me that Henry Sidgwick was correct in thinking that these things are only important insofar as they are important to humans (Sidgwick 1874, I.IX.4).5 If there is no form of intelligent life in the future, who would there be to lament its loss since intelligent life is the only form of life capable of appreciating intelligence? Similarly, if there is no one with the rational capacity to appreciate historic monuments and civil progress, who would there be to be negatively affected or even notice the loss?6 However, even if there is nothing special about human rationality, just as some people try to prevent the extinction of nonhuman animal species, we might think that we ought also to prevent human extinction for the sake of biodiversity. The thought in this, as well as the earlier examples, must be that it would somehow be bad for the world if there were no more humans even though there would be no one for whom it is bad. This may be so but the only way to understand this reason is impersonally. Since we are concerned with wrongness rather than badness, we must ask whether something that impacts no one’s well-being, status or claims can be wrong. As we saw earlier, in the contractualist framework reasons must be personal rather than impersonal in order to provide grounds for reasonable rejection (Scanlon 1998, 218–223). Since the loss of civilization, intelligent life or biodiversity are per se impersonal reasons, there is no standpoint from which these reasons could be used to reasonably reject a principle that permitted extinction. Therefore, causing human extinction on the grounds of the loss of civilization, rational life or biodiversity would not be wrong. 2.3. Existing people would endure physical pain and/or painful and/or premature deaths Thinking about the ways in which human extinction might come about brings to the fore two more reasons it might be wrong. It could, for example, occur if all humans (or at least the critical number needed to be unable to replenish the population, leading to eventual extinction) underwent a sterilization procedure. Or perhaps it could come about due to anthropogenic climate change or a massive asteroid hitting the Earth and wiping out the species in the same way it did the dinosaurs millions of years ago. Each of these scenarios would involve significant physical and/or non-physical harms to existing people and their interests. Physically, people might suffer premature and possibly also painful deaths, for example. It is not hard to imagine examples in which the process of extinction could cause premature death. A nuclear winter that killed everyone or even just every woman under the age of 50 is a clear example of such a case. Obviously, some types of premature death themselves cannot be reasons to reject a principle. Every person dies eventually, sometimes earlier than the standard expected lifespan due to accidents or causes like spontaneously occurring incurable cancers. A cause such as disease is not a moral agent and therefore it cannot be wrong if it unavoidably kills a person prematurely. Scanlon says that the fact that a principle would reduce a person’s well-being gives that person a reason to reject the principle: ‘components of well-being figure prominently as grounds for reasonable rejection’ (Scanlon 1998, 214). However, it is not settled yet whether premature death is a setback to well-being. Some philosophers hold that death is a harm to the person who dies, whilst others argue that it is not.7 I will argue, however, that regardless of who is correct in that debate, being caused to die prematurely can be reason to reject a principle when it fails to show respect to the person as a rational agent. Scanlon says that recognizing others as rational beings with interests involves seeing reason to preserve life and prevent death: ‘appreciating the value of human life is primarily a matter of seeing human lives as something to be respected, where this involves seeing reasons not to destroy them, reasons to protect them, and reasons to want them to go well’ (Scanlon 1998, 104). The ‘respect for life’ in this case is a respect for the person living, not respect for human life in the abstract. This means that we can sometimes fail to protect human life without acting wrongfully if we still respect the person living. Scanlon gives the example of a person who faces a life of unending and extreme pain such that she wishes to end it by committing suicide. Scanlon does not think that the suicidal person shows a lack of respect for her own life by seeking to end it because the person whose life it is has no reason to want it to go on. This is important to note because it emphasizes the fact that the respect for human life is person-affecting. It is not wrong to murder because of the impersonal disvalue of death in general, but because taking someone’s life without their permission shows disrespect to that person. This supports its inclusion as a reason in the contractualist formula, regardless of what side ends up winning the ‘is death a harm?’ debate because even if death turns out not to harm the person who died, ending their life without their consent shows disrespect to that person. A person who could reject a principle permitting another to cause his or her premature death presumably does not wish to die at that time, or in that manner. Thus, if they are killed without their consent, their interests have not been taken into account, and they have a reason to reject the principle that allowed their premature death.8 This is as true in the case of death due to extinction as it is for death due to murder. However, physical pain may also be caused to existing people without killing them, but still resulting in human extinction. Imagine, for example, surgically removing everyone’s reproductive organs in order to prevent the creation of any future people. Another example could be a nuclear bomb that did not kill anyone, but did painfully render them infertile through illness or injury. These would be cases in which physical pain (through surgery or bombs) was inflicted on existing people and the extinction came about as a result of the painful incident rather than through death. Furthermore, one could imagine a situation in which a bomb (for example) killed enough people to cause extinction, but some people remained alive, but in terrible pain from injuries. It seems uncontroversial that the infliction of physical pain could be a reason to reject a principle. Although Scanlon says that an impact on well-being is not the only reason to reject principles, it plays a significant role, and indeed, most principles are likely to be rejected due to a negative impact on a person’s well-being, physical or otherwise. It may be queried here whether it is actually the involuntariness of the pain that is grounds for reasonable rejection rather than the physical pain itself because not all pain that a person suffers is involuntary. One can imagine acts that can cause physical pain that are not rejectable — base jumping or life-saving or improving surgery, for example. On the other hand, pushing someone off a cliff or cutting him with a scalpel against his will are clearly rejectable acts. The difference between the two cases is that in the former, the person having the pain inflicted has consented to that pain or risk of pain. My view is that they cannot be separated in these cases and it is involuntary physical pain that is the grounds for reasonable rejection. Thus, the fact that a principle would allow unwanted physical harm gives a person who would be subjected to that harm a reason to reject the principle. Of course the mere fact that a principle causes involuntary physical harm or premature death is not sufficient to declare that the principle is rejectable — there might be countervailing reasons. In the case of extinction, what countervailing reasons might be offered in favour of the involuntary physical pain/ death-inducing harm? One such reason that might be offered is that humans are a harm to the natural environment and that the world might be a better place if there were no humans in it. It could be that humans might rightfully be considered an all-things-considered hindrance to the world rather than a benefit to it given the fact that we have been largely responsible for the extinction of many species, pollution and, most recently, climate change which have all negatively affected the natural environment in ways we are only just beginning to understand. Thus, the fact that human extinction would improve the natural environment (or at least prevent it from degrading further), is a countervailing reason in favour of extinction to be weighed against the reasons held by humans who would experience physical pain or premature death. However, the good of the environment as described above is by definition not a personal reason. Just like the loss of rational life and civilization, therefore, it cannot be a reason on its own when determining what is wrong and countervail the strong personal reasons to avoid pain/death that is held by the people who would suffer from it.9 Every person existing at the time of the extinction would have a reason to reject that principle on the grounds of the physical pain they are being forced to endure against their will that could not be countervailed by impersonal considerations such as the negative impact humans may have on the earth. Therefore, a principle that permitted extinction to be accomplished in a way that caused involuntary physical pain or premature death could quite clearly be rejectable by existing people with no relevant countervailing reasons. This means that human extinction that came about in this way would be wrong. There are of course also additional reasons they could reject a similar principle which I now turn to address in the next section. 2.4. Existing people could endure non-physical harms I said earlier than the fact in itself that there would not be any future people is an impersonal reason and can therefore not be a reason to reject a principle permitting extinction. However, this impersonal reason could give rise to a personal reason that is admissible. So, the final important reason people might think that human extinction would be wrong is that there could be various deleterious psychological effects that would be endured by existing people having the knowledge that there would be no future generations. There are two main sources of this trauma, both arising from the knowledge that there will be no more people. The first relates to individual people and the undesired negative effect on well-being that would be experienced by those who would have wanted to have children. Whilst this is by no means universal, it is fair to say that a good proportion of people feel a strong pull towards reproduction and having their lineage continue in some way. Samuel Scheffler describes the pull towards reproduction as a ‘desire for a personalized relationship with the future’ (Scheffler 2012, 31). Reproducing is a widely held desire and the joys of parenthood are ones that many people wish to experience. For these people knowing that they would not have descendants (or that their descendants will endure painful and/or premature deaths) could create a sense of despair and pointlessness of life. Furthermore, the inability to reproduce and have your own children because of a principle/policy that prevents you (either through bans or physical interventions) would be a significant infringement of what we consider to be a basic right to control what happens to your body. For these reasons, knowing that you will have no descendants could cause significant psychological traumas or harms even if there were no associated physical harm. The second is a more general, higher level sense of hopelessness or despair that there will be no more humans and that your projects will end with you. Even those who did not feel a strong desire to procreate themselves might feel a sense of hopelessness that any projects or goals they have for the future would not be fulfilled. Many of the projects and goals we work towards during our lifetime are also at least partly future-oriented. Why bother continuing the search for a cure for cancer if either it will not be found within humans’ lifetime, and/or there will be no future people to benefit from it once it is found? Similar projects and goals that might lose their meaning when confronted with extinction include politics, artistic pursuits and even the type of philosophical work with which this paper is concerned. Even more extreme, through the words of the character Theo Faron, P.D. James says in his novel The Children of Men that ‘without the hope of posterity for our race if not for ourselves, without the assurance that we being dead yet live, all pleasures of the mind and senses sometimes seem to me no more than pathetic and crumbling defences shored up against our ruins’ (James 2006, 9). Even if James’ claim is a bit hyperbolic and all pleasures would not actually be lost, I agree with Scheffler in finding it not implausible that the knowledge that extinction was coming and that there would be no more people would have at least a general depressive effect on people’s motivation and confidence in the value of and joy in their activities (Scheffler 2012, 43). Both sources of psychological harm are personal reasons to reject a principle that permitted human extinction. Existing people could therefore reasonably reject the principle for either of these reasons. Psychological pain and the inability to pursue your personal projects, goals, and aims, are all acceptable reasons for rejecting principles in the contractualist framework. So too are infringements of rights and entitlements that we accept as important for people’s lives. These psychological reasons, then, are also valid reasons to reject principles that permitted or required human extinction.

### 1NC

#### Rob: Vote for the better debater

#### Presumption flips neg against K affs – they have the burden of proof since they aren’t defending the rez. That’s key to ensure the neg has a shot at engagement.

#### Vote neg on presumption:

#### 1] Systems--the 1AC says institutions create social realities that replicate violence but in-round discourse does nothing to alter conditions. All you do is encourage teams to write better framework blocks.

#### 2] Spillover--they are missing an internal link as to why they need the ballot or why the reading of the aff forwards change. Empirically denied – judges vote on these affs all the time and nothing happens.

#### 3] Competition--debate is the wrong forum for change and competition moots any ethical value of the aff. Winning rounds just makes it seem like you want to win and a loss is internalized as a technical mistake. They broke new

#### afro-futurism devoid of political agitation and attunement to present conditions that block the realization of spectacular futures devolves into coop-table spectacle which reinforces the capitalist status quo---an afrofuturist aesthetic combined with a political praxis of leftist organizing and legal work is key

M.I. Jazz Freeman 18, writer on Medium, self-described “Agender Jazz Aesthete ⊙ Dedicated to the development of new humanizing praxis to combat Imperialist White Supremacist Capitalist Patriarchy”, 2/18/18, “Aesthetic vs. Praxis in Afro-futurism,” https://medium.com/@amai.m.i.freeman/aesthetic-vs-praxis-in-afro-futurism-12d966efea44

It’s not news to anyone to say that black cultural, political, and socio-economic life in America has undergone a renaissance of sorts. An upwelling of fervor, dreams, insights, rage, creativity, vision, and determination have all marked the increase of black visibility in the public arena. And yet, this new reality, a cyclical reappearance of unapologetically black social currents in the media, in the streets, and in the public imagination are all born from the profound contradictions we have been forced to acknowledge. Two terms of America’s first black president alongside ritualized police murders of black-life, a rise of white apologism for an accumulating white supremacist violence that destroys black bodies. We saw a dramatic increase in deportations, the emergence of drone warfare, and an economic crises that prompted a new wave of political movements against inequity, followed by an uprising of black lead direct actions and black revolt. It is in these various contexts that the visibility of blackness is more present than ever before. The opportunities for expression, the platforms for protest, and the historically significant struggles we find ourselves within have inspired and ignited showcases of black life — real as well as creatively re-imagined. It is not a coincidence that this era has given birth to a resurgence of Afro-Futurism.

Afro-Futurism is the practice of constructing new ways of existing, retrieving the past ancestry of the black diaspora, inventing styles of presenting ourselves in the world, and projecting our visions of how we would like to see ourselves in the future. There are a number of figures who stand out in our collective memory as highly imaginative and sharply perceptive of what was their reality. Octavia E. Butler and Sun Ra are a few who have passed away only to have new generations engage and ultimately embody their work today. Despite this stirring in the cultural life of black americans, there exists a significant gulf — a distance between intentions and practices in this movement and I would like to focus my attention on those differences. In doing so, I hope to uncover some salient lessons and distinctions that lay beneath the surface of Afro-Futurism.

An indisputable element of Afro-Futurism is its aesthetic. It is this difference from the normal — what we might otherwise expect to be created or adorned by black people — that comes focused into view in such a way that suggests that it has arrived from the future. This element alone is what people are most likely to see, grasp in passing, and consume as art. It’s relatively easy to replicate if one is interested purely in the profit to be yielded from its commodification. These are the nods we see celebrities make in set stages, album covers, films, and the like. To sift out the intention and impact of Afro-Futurism from its aesthetics, there are two simple questions that prove useful:

What is the future being presented?

How do we get there?

Depending on the particular conjurer of Afro-Futurism, the utility of their vision can vary widely from others. An “afro future” can be a site of grief as much as it can be a site of hope. In summoning the figures of black ancestry, we situate our present in the context of who brought us here, honoring their past struggles, sacrifices, and joys. The perspective that comes with this sort of time-travel can aid efforts to appreciate what is in front of us today, and it can embolden us to pursue a greater life. Whether one dimension outweighs the other or balances in union together of course determines whether or not we witnesses to afro-futurism grow complacent or more courageous in the face of the status quo.

It what is commonly viewed as the opposite of the past, the futures of afro-futurism can be spaces of mourning over the goals that feel locked away from the realm of possibility today. Inversely, they can be an insightful warning or a positive suggestion for what can be or must be done today. Stated a different way, Afro-Futurism is a portal into black desires that have yet to be manifested or actualized. Now some possible political consequences become more clear as we pass over some of the intentions behind the speculative nature of Afro-Futurism. I wish now to place some Afro-Futurist media under a magnifying glass so that we can answer the two instructive questions I mentioned above.

Following the very recent Black Panther Movie release, the excitement around this blockbuster spectacle has been at its peak. The representation of black people in so visible a medium has generated a crossover appeal for Disney’s Marvel Franchise. The cast, the soundtrack, the black history evoked by its very title all draw from the cultural wellspring of black culture that has been generated over the past several decades.

At the same time, what is the future Black Panther presents us? We have Wakanda, a fictionalized black african nation that’s become the most advanced in the world. This is based on the premise that one fictional precious metal, Vibranium, was never ruthlessly extracted by exploiting wakandans, allowing them to remain untouched by white supremacy. It follows from these circumstances that Wakanda was granted with an opportunity to actualize a vision of black self-determination that produced inconceivable wealth, technology, and a preserved patriarchal monarchist hierarchy. The story is a reinvention of co-opted and dismantled black power that is a fictional doppelganger for the fate of the real-life black panthers, as the main conflict is about imperialist powers meddling with Wakandan affairs and social movements. If we peel away the impossible embellishments of the fictional story, the premise is simply that Africa would not be destitute were it not for Colonialism, Slavery, Capitalism, and Imperialism.

So how do we actualize Wakanda? We cannot. War, Slavery, Genocide, Global Imperialism ravaged Africa and fractured the diaspora permanently, changing the trajectory of every African nation. The black diaspora is ensnared globally within imperialism and there is no Wakanda to protect us. Not all of us can be wealthy. We are largely outgunned within and outside our respective nations. We have only ourselves. For these reasons I posit that the Black Panther Movie is a commodification of Afro-Futurist grief, and it grieves for those who define black liberation as the freedom to amass wealth and wield a nation state in our modern age of Globalism. It presents us with a media commodity that we want to consume because we so rarely see ourselves empowered in reality and in media. As we watch, we get exciting entertainment and time to reflect on our historic victories and losses as the film not-so-subtly reinforces the current state of affairs.

Compare this to, say, Sun Ra’s humorous but combative songs about nuclear war, black invisibility, or his pursuit of the “green note” that would abolish money with a single sound! Another is Octavia Butler’s Earthseed from her Parable Novels, which conceived of a communal culture of resilience, cooperation, and agency that would “deliver us to the stars,” away from a planet made uninhabitable by capitalism. She identified real obstacles that are suffocating we who live in the present, and she evokes a culture of resistance with a common target in mind. Octavia Butler, who despised super-heroes, details her afro futures vividly and directs readers attention to explicit systems of oppression that must be dismantled. While her stories often portray dystopias or post-apocalyptic futures, we have very clear answers regarding to how we might end up in such an oppressive predicament: unchecked climate change and environmental destruction, a defeated anti-racist movement, endless imperialist war, the privatization of water along with public institutions, unchallenged hierarchical power and authority, and patriarchal male chauvinism and violence that feminists have not eradicated. She answers our question in the negative: we will end up in terrible futures if we do not act now against everything that will lead to our extinction!

Turning now to the realm of music, I would like to call attention to how often the political potency and portrayals of agency in Afro Futures seem to show a correlation wherein black women and queer black folks tend to have more radical and optimistic visions, contrast with cis-straight black men risking fatalism, and sometimes misogyny in their iterations of Afro-futurism and their lived praxis. A perfect example of these poles would be Flying Lotus, who is a critically acclaimed music producer known for innovating afro-futurist soundscapes contrast with Wizard Apprentice, underground black feminist afro-futurist musician known also for her organizing projects and work as a healer who helps black folks process trauma. Despite being a descendant of the late Afro-Futurist Alice Coltrane, Flying Lotus over the years has consistently become more fatalistic, hedonistic, and indifferent to politics as he pursues a career as an avante-garde musician and filmmaker. He’s found himself time-after-time mired by his own chauvinist comments, apologies for a rapist associated with his own music label, and increasingly vulgar masturbatory art as evidenced by his full-length feature film, Kuso. All beg the question of whether he may even find himself exposed by today’s #Metoo movement.

Another example of the opposite ends of the afro-futurist political spectrum would be the dynamic duo Rasheedah Phillips and Camae Ayewa (a.k.a. Moor Mother) of the Philadelphia-based Afro-Futurist Affair contrast with Ishmael Butler and Tendai “Baba” Maraire of Shabazz Palaces. The experimental music the Afro-futurist Affair duo creates is explicitly about confronting — through unapologetic revolt — racial injustice, ancestral trauma, police violence and the prison industrial complex, patriarchy and sexual assault. While their essays, music, poetry, and fiction all embody the spirit of their determination to get free, their work in the community harmoniously compliments their creativity. Rasheedah Phillips works as a housing defense lawyer combating homelessness and gentrification, while she and Camae Ayewa run the House of Future Sciences for training political organizers to literally build futures and heal from trauma. Shabazz Palaces,\

albeit sonically inventive and clever, make lyrical critiques that lean very heavily towards their careers and the stagnation of the rap industry today. They borrow from and transform aesthetics of Sun Ra and they collaborate with Flying Lotus, Funkadelic, and George Clinton, creating songs that inspire black pride, occasionally scrutinizing systems of oppression in passing. Their impact on their respective genres have been powerful, but they leave something to be desired for how the rest of us can get free or at least be “successful” under capitalism, given that their praxis is limited to their music.

Returning just briefly to the Black Panther film, Kendrick Lamar scored its soundtrack and is facing a copyright violation lawsuit for using Lina Iris Viktor’s work in one of his music videos. Here we have a multiple grammy winning artist, lifting a black woman’s work without her consent and without compensating her. This reflects a parallel between Wakandan’s tightly protected wealth, and a real-world media industry that leaves women out in the pursuit of men’s profit.

As for Afro-Futurism as political praxis, adrienne maree brown’s emergent strategy is incredibly exemplary! In it she distills an actionable praxis from Octavia Butler’s novels and weaves them with her wealth of experience facilitating political work and organizational affinity within the left as well as the collective wisdom she’s accumulated from a plethora of organizers, healers, writers, and collectives. Her mantra “all organizing is science fiction” brings the future-building part of Afro-Futurism squarely into view. She provides an optimistic and empowering manual for us who are ready to “bury capitalism” while also “moving towards pleasure.”

I have a special fondness for N.K. Jemison’s multiple award winning Broken Earth Trilogy, which I believe is one of the greatest stories told to date that uses racial, environmental, and socio-economic allegory to masterful effect reminiscent of Octavia Butler’s own writing.

Black people are not a monolith. We all have different ideas about what a livable life looks like for us. Spaces to grieve collectively, stories that help us escape the reality of white supremacy for a while, strategies that help us achieve our liberation are all avenues that can help lead us towards life. All of these practices prepare us for our own black futurity when deployed in authentic contexts that allow us to keep our present in perspective. Afro-Futurism contains infinite possibilities, all of which help black folks live in a deeply flawed world. Still, it is important that we consider which future we are on a trajectory towards actualizing as the afro futures wash over us and enter our lives.

#### Even in failure, non-violent resistance sets the ground for future victories for subjugated populations domestically and internationally by adding to bases of transnational knowledge and experience

Bartkowski 13, Senior Director at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict

(Maciej, Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles, pg. 339)

With each victory – and failure – popular resisters lean from experiences of their own as well as those of others while international institutions, scholars, and trainers have transnationalized the knowledge of strategic nonviolent conflict through publications, workshops, and other educational initiatives. The role and impact of these international actors is important, though it bears mention that it has always been the inventiveness and resourcefulness of the population itself that has driven civil resistance. Dissemination of the knowledge of nonviolent resistance, combined with its skillful application to indigenous conditions, has been historically notable as a factor in the proliferation of civil resistance movements and subsequent academic studies and research. Gandhi learned, among others, from the Hungarian civil resistance of the 1850s – 1860s and the Russian Revolution of 1905. Also the Hungarian nonviolent struggle was an inspiration for Arthur Griffith, the leader of the Irish nationalist movement Sinn Fein, and the Finnish constitutionalists who resisted czarist Russia. The Russian revolution of 1905 created ripple effects of largely nonviolent popular uprisings in Russia’s near and far abroad. As described in Chapter 8, at the end of 1905, unarmed Iranians took to the streets and built citizens committees to press for constitutional changes, including a democratically elected parliament. At the same time, as highlighted in Chapter 14, the Russian part of partitioned Poland, awakened by the events in Russia proper, was soon engulfed in waves of workers’ and school strikes, demonstrations, political, and national rights, including the use of the Polish language in schools and public offices. The process of transnationalization of civil resistance practice and knowledge has continued during decolonization struggles in Africa where, among others, Ghanian and Zambian leaders – see Chapters 3 and 4, respectively – read Gandhi’s work and drew lessons from the Indian resistance against the British, including Gandhi’s idea to devise and lead their own independence campaigns. Decades later, sharing civil resistance experience across borders has been especially visible, first with the so – called color revolutions (Serbia, 2000; Georgia, 2003; Ukraine, 2004) and later with the Arab Spring. The transnational diffusion of civil resistance has also included specific methods adopted from the tactical repertoire of past victorious nonviolent struggles in other, more contemporary, conflicts with the goal of emulating earlier successes. In November 2011, for example, the Palestinian freedom riders, without required permits, boarded an Israeli public bus headed to Jerusalem and were subsequently arrested before being able to reach the city. By establishing a transnational and timeless linkage between their struggle and the famous freedom riders’ campaigns of the US civil rights movement against segregated buses, Palestinians sought to dramatize the discriminatory policies they face on a daily basis. Through the adoption of what are now considered legendary tactics from another historical struggle, Palestinians attempted to appeal to the conscience of the American public and strike an emotional chord with potential supporters in the United States, Israel, and other countries.

#### Prefer our scholarship

#### a) Applied study – constant testing and validation in ongoing global events ensures accuracy

Bartkowski 13, Senior Director at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict

(Maciej, Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles, pg. 339)

Perhaps to a greater degree than in other social science disciplines, scholarship on civil resistance is an applied form of study that is necessarily derived from real events. In fact, civil resistance is gaining further credibility as a field of serious academic analysis because of spectacular outcomes exemplified by those regarded as powerless who are effectively challenging ostensibly invincible rulers, most recently in the Arab world. Even though there is no formally established academic discipline of civil resistance studies or advanced degrees offered in this subject, civil resistance as an organized interdisciplinary field of scholarship and research has been advancing since the 1950s. And a number of doctoral dissertations about strategic nonviolent conflict and nonviolent campaigns and movements have been written at leading universities in recent decades. A self-standing graduate specialization in civil resistance and the first endowed chair “in the study of nonviolent direct action and civil resistance” have been established. These reflect an important, though still limited, shift in academia to provide more permanent, structured, and multidisciplinary frameworks and repositories for specialized knowledge on civil resistance, including an institutional home for a growing number of academic courses solely focused on strategic nonviolent conflict. Since knowledge about nonviolent strategies is constantly tested and validated by the testimony of practitioners and by ongoing events, it ensures that civil resistance research – its hypotheses, findings, and recommendations directed to various audiences of academics, present and future action takers, journalists, policy experts, nongovernmental organization professionals – stays relevant and adequately explanatory. Because of the remarkable outcomes achieved by civil resistance (the shifting of power structures that governments and regional experts had tended to treat as permanent), there has been an accelerating interest on the part of universities, research centers, governments, democracy-promotion organizations, and international institutions in the means of civil resistance and the possibilities that it offers.

#### Space policy is porous and not amenable to totalizing theories, but nuanced debates about the details of emerging regulatory policy is key to prevent right wing capture and militarization.

Weeks 12 [Adjunct Professor of International Relations Online Program, Webster University (Edythe, “OUTER SPACE DEVELOPMENT: THE SOLUTION FOR GLOBAL INEQUALITY,” *Outer Space Development, International Relations and Space Law: A Method for Elucidating Seeds*, Chapter 7, pg 171-174]

This is the time to discuss equality. Once societies in outer space are established it will be too late. The first wave of outer space development in the last half of the 20th century changed the world. This process included establishing a satellite telecommunications infrastructure in the geostationary orbit along with the globalization of new high-tech products and services. The retirement of the NASA space shuttle program symbolized the start of the second wave of outer space development, which is likely to be propelled by the privatization of space tourism and space mining. This type of space industrialization will undoubtedly result in extreme wealth for a few who know what is happening, while those who have no knowledge will be left behind. Decision makers, scholars, trouble-shooters, and others worry constantly about existing inequality gaps, lack of development, poverty, and economic hardship. This chapter suggests a method for preventative maintenance prior to humankind’s next development project. It argues that education, information, and sharing knowledge can become tools for generating perpetual equality as we embark on our journey to colonize the final frontier. Those historically disenfranchised can gain a fresh advantage through preparation and education to develop an expertise aimed at providing valuable knowledge useful for space endeavors. In addition, in these times of crashing economies, job loss, high unemployment rates, and school system failures, people are searching for ways to create prosperous futures for themselves and their families. Outer space could prove to be a way for many to find their answer. Newly Emerging Trends Relevant for Outer Space Development The passage of the NASA Authorization Act of 2010 demonstrates a willingness by the U.S. to fund a stepped-up phase of space activities. During bad economic times, this Act provides $58,400,000,000 for various space-related programs from 2011 to 2013. In 2010/2011, media reports constantly alerted the general public to be ready for the retirement of the NASA Space Shuttle program. This initiative complemented the New Vision for U.S. Space Exploration Policy (2004), as well as various other laws and policies initiated by the United States and discussed in previous chapters. When read together, it is fair to assume the newly emerging space industries will be related to achieving advanced space transportation systems, private spacecraft development, commercial space habitats, space stations, space settlements, commercial space mining, spacecraft trajectory optimization techniques for landing on near-Earth asteroids, commercial spaceport construction, interplanetary telecommunications, and space exploration missions. The thing for teachers, students, and members of the general public to do in order to prepare to take advantage of these linked opportunities is to imagine how these goals are likely to play out, and what types of goods, services, and skill-sets will be needed. Education as the Solution Outer space development historically has been the purview of skilled professionals in the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields. The STEM-oriented opportunities for those proficient in physics, astrophysics, space medicine, engineering, calculus, etc., have always been limited to a few select students. But now global society is calling for something, more since the STEM fields have failed to attract diverse people on an equal footing.186 A bridge can be created by using social and behavioral sciences curricula, thereby to attract people from a wider range of backgrounds to learn about outer space development and newly emerging industries. New education paradigms can help ensure equity and enable wider citizen participation throughout the international community. Curricula using the new paradigm can be used to motivate and inspire a new generation of scholars who can play a key role in the process of outer space development. In effect, an educational system that unleashes human creativity and curiosity will empower students with the knowledge and competencies not only for the second wave of outer space development, but also for the global engagement necessary for the 21st century and beyond (Weeks and Tamashiro, 2011). It is never too early to begin cultivating a person’s intellectual and academic talents. Most children are naturally curious. As part of the curriculum, students of all ages can be shown how to do research, how to write a research paper, to compile and present data, perform critical analytical thinking, and to anticipate and develop relevant skill-sets for newly emerging industry trends. Learning these skills will enable more people to develop an expertise aimed at supplying talent that will be in demand as future industries emerge. This can change people’s lives. Students can learn how to anticipate and prepare for future emerging industries while they are at the K-12 level. Students can also learn at young ages how to get recognized by publishers, editors, the mass media, and others. In situations where the resources necessary for teaching science are unavailable, space studies can be introduced through the social and behavioral sciences and the arts. For many years, space studies has remained the exclusive purview of engineers, scientists, and technology experts. However, there is room at the table for social and behavioral sciences students to join in and develop a specialty area of expertise. Key actors within the outer space development community have expressed an interest in advancing space studies to a broader audience. Orchestrating such a process carries with it the power to improve international relations, education, inspiration, dreams, and creativity, and to boost the global economy by creating a myriad of new jobs and degree programs. We can open an additional door to allow a broader range of knowledge into the minds of more people by introducing outer space development studies through the social and behavioral sciences (Hammond and Weeks, 2011). Unlike engineering, an interdisciplinary social and behavioral sciences lens enables us to interpret the meaning behind sets and patterns of human behaviors—this includes the behavior of individuals, institutions, groups, presidents, members of congress, business and other organizations, mass media, international organizations, and lawmakers. Humankind can progress beyond the “STEMs = space studies” model by including, encouraging, involving, and preparing a new breed of social and behavioral sciences geniuses. These would be people who are naturals in international relations, conflict resolution, and peace studies, as well as versed in international law, politics, social psychology, critical analysis, discourse analysis, international communication, artistic architecture, race and ethnic studies, gender studies, religious studies, economics, finance, business and entrepreneurship, history, and political economy, while also being concerned with inequality gaps, oppression, subjugation, revolts, uprisings, revolutions, and various other social and behavioral phenomena. People who understand the issues concerning human beings now have a way of participating in future emerging space industries. The audience of learners scheduled to receive cutting-edge knowledge of fields relevant for outer space development will be expanded by online learning techniques and sharing of information through the open-source technologies of the Internet. Shaping Ideology Imagine teaching students about the newly emerging trends related to outer space development. This would give students permission to envision and carve out their role in designing future space societies. Students from all disciplines can be taught to see what’s coming next by learning to research and interpret economic policies, laws, and international relations. This will enable them to detect newly emerging industries and to anticipate the elements likely to be in demand. Students can then shape their skill-sets and prepare to satisfy these emerging needs. Students can be taught to perform this type of interdisciplinary analysis and to research combined dynamics—government hearings and transcripts, policy statements and speeches, laws, economic initiatives, and international treaties. They can also be taught to combine this type of primary data with theoretical understandings of historical, ideological, institutional, political, economic, psychological, and structural phenomena.

#### That process prevents militarization – it creates windows for public pressure that reclaim space policy from war hawks.

Weeden 15 [Brian Weeden is a former U.S. Air Force space and missile operations officer and currently technical adviser for Secure World Foundation, a non-profit organization dedicated to the long-term sustainable use of outer space for benefits on Earth. He is also a doctoral candidate in public policy and public administration at George Washington University. 1/7. "The End of Sanctuary in Space." https://medium.com/war-is-boring/the-end-of-sanctuary-in-space-2d58fba741a]

Plus, there’s the larger question of whether a more aggressive approach is in the best interest of all of America’s space organizations, including the burgeoning commercial space sector.

We live in an age of proliferating anti-satellite capabilities. There is a growing body of evidence that China is actively developing at least two hit-to-kill ASAT weapon systems. The development process has included at least five tests of these systems, including one that created thousands of pieces of space debris.

Russia has fielded operational ASAT capabilities in the past, and Russian officials have recently stated that development work has started again on an air-based ASAT system. Not to be outdone, elements of the Indian government have also signaled interest in developing both missile defense and ASAT capabilities themselves.

The United States and many of its allies in Europe and Asia are fielding missile defense capabilities that have significant ASAT capabilities, as demonstrated by the United States’ use of the same missile defense system to destroy a non-functioning satellite in 2008.

The number of other countries that already possess ballistic missile and space launch technology—and could thus develop their own crude ASAT capabilities—is growing.

The U.S. national security space community sees this shift towards a more “contested” space environment as a very worrisome trend. There are currently more than 150 U.S. military and intelligence satellites in orbit, providing important national security capabilities such as precision navigation and timing, global communications, missile warning, and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance.

The proliferation of ASAT capabilities and the threat they are thought to pose to these space systems presents a serious challenge to the United States’ military and intelligence capabilities. The concern extends not only to the ability of the United States to defend its own national security interests, but also to its ability to continue to contribute to the defense of its allies.

The United States announced a new National Security Space Strategy in early 2011 that detailed five strategic approaches for dealing with a more “congested, competitive and contested space environment.” The strategy includes a strong push for developing and promoting responsible norms of behavior in space, increased partnership and cooperation with allies and commercial firms and a shift toward making U.S. national security space capabilities more resilient to attacks. The strategy also includes preventing and deterring aggression on U.S. national security space systems, and, should deterrence fail, defeating attacks on said systems. Since the release of the strategy, the U.S. government has been relatively public about how it will implement the first three approaches, but less so about the last two. That has now changed. Congress has included language in the National Defense Authorization Act for the 2015 fiscal year, the primary piece of legislation that authorizes and directs the activities of the U.S. military, calling on the U.S. national security space community to report to Congress how it plans to deter and defeat adversary attacks on U.S. space systems. The NDAA language requires the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to produce a study on the role of offensive space operations, and specifies that the majority of the $32.3 million that Congress gave to the Space Security and Defense Program in 2015 must be used for “the development of offensive space control and active defensive strategies and capabilities.” The NDAA language does not stipulate what is meant by offensive or active defensive capabilities, but when combined with recent academic writings from within the U.S. military, it suggests that America’s strategy for protecting its satellites is taking a more aggressive turn. This essay discusses the evolution of U.S. national security space community’s approach to using space and protecting space assets over the last several decades, and explains why some in the community are now contemplating a more aggressive approach. It frames the discussion through four established schools of thought on the military uses of space: sanctuary, space control, high ground and survivability. These schools were first developed as potential space power doctrines by David Lupton in an article for Strategic Review in 1983, and more fully fleshed out in his 1988 book On Space Warfare: A Space Power Doctrine. They were re-conceptualized as schools of thought, rather than doctrine, by Peter Hays in his 1994 doctoral dissertation. In Hays’ view, the four schools of thought are less codified and have more overlap between them than a strict doctrinal definition.

U.S. policy on national security space is a conglomeration of the four schools of thought, with one school of thought usually prioritized over the others. This conglomeration is a result of the interagency process for creating policy on national security issues, and the bargaining that takes place between the different agencies involved in the decision.

The U.S. government is not a unitary actor, and the perspective of each of the many agencies within the interagency decision-making process usually reflects a preference for one of these schools over the other. As a result, decisions made by the U.S. government on national security space policy often reflect a compromise between multiple schools of thought, rather than a strict adherence to one over all the others.

Why choose to contextualize this issue from the perspective of the military when space activities encompass much more than just the military? The reason is that in the realm of policy, and space policy in particular, national security has dominated decision making since the very beginning of the Space Age, and still holds a privileged position in space policy debates.

This dominance is seen in the size of the U.S. national security space budget—nearly $27.5 billion compared to NASA’s $17.8 billion in 2012—but also in the use of the National Security Council process to make many space policy decisions.

Finally, it is important to understand why the focus of this essay is on the policies and activities of the United States and not on the other countries involved. The intent is not to place blame for the current strategic instability in space solely on the United States.

The situation is the result of the actions of several different countries, as well as the overarching geopolitical dynamics present in the world today. As a result of America’s democratic and pluralistic nature, its policies and actions are subject to more scrutiny and debate than others.

That should be seen as a virtue and not a defect. The United States is still the world leader in space, in terms of both soft and hard power. The intent of this essay is to encourage constructive debate on this important issue in the hope that it leads to policies and actions that continue to enable the United States to be a force for good and a world leader for the foreseeable future.

#### Grove is too pessimistic about modernity’s potential—means at best they solve nothing and at worst they actively empower fascists.

Tallis, 20—senior researcher, Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy, University of Hamburg (Benjamin, “Un-cancelling the future,” New Perspectives, OnlineFirst, July 8, 2020, dml)

Examples of this way of thinking are plentiful but, for convenience, one need to look no further than Jairus Grove’s scintillatingly pessimistic keynote at the Hamburg Sessions (forthcoming as an essay in NP and based on his 2019 book, Savage Ecology).3 It is not that Grove doesn’t make compelling critical arguments – he does and in brilliant, imaginative ways – but that they lack balance. And balance matters, whether we are reckoning with horrendous pasts or trying to boldly imaging new futures.

To see, or certainly to dwell on, only the bad in what we in the West have collectively done (however, Grove or anyone else defines who we are), over the entire course of our past and present is grossly unfair. It also amounts, in effect, to a counsel of despair, however much Grove protests to the contrary or claims to eschew nihilism. In his keynote, having written off our past and present, Grove also explicitly urged us in Europe and the West to stop imagining better, progressive futures, arguing that this has led to precisely the problems he identified. Grove’s critique thus not only leaves us out of time (without an avowable past, present or future) but also leaves us without space for contesting negative, regressive and repressive political trends. In his book, he laments the ‘debilitating stupor’ in which the work of thinkers like Theodor Adorno and Giorgio Agamben leaves us (Grove, 2019: 238). But Grove’s own pessimism, if we took it seriously, would leave Europeans without a political leg to stand on. It would leave us in just such a stupor – or worse – with no solid ground and no lever: no way to move the world and no platform for positive, progressive change.

Why bother, if everything we do only makes things worse?

However much harm we Europeans and Westerners have done, we haven’t done, don’t and won’t only do harm. The real danger of Grove’s type of timelessly pessimistic and literally hopeless critique is that (again, if taken seriously) it breeds only damaging inertia, inaction and resentment – its hopelessness makes it a debilitating critique; its timelessness offers no possibility of salvage, let alone progress. It cedes the ground of action to those who many of us (including Grove) would explicitly disagree with – whether to exponents of ‘traditional’ approaches to IR who are more than happy to offer policy advice or, worse, to authoritarians and populists in practical politics (as ably described in Johanna Sumuvuori’s essay in this issue). Critical scholars too rarely see it as their task to construct positive visions of better worlds. Instead, too often they content themselves (if no one else) with evermore thoroughgoing deconstructive critique – including of other critical academics. Whether totalising or parasitic, even some of its leading proponents admit that IR’s critical project has, thus far, had insufficient impact on the world at large (Austin, 2017, 2019).

Few critical scholars will thank me for this comparison, but, in their pessimistic, misanthropic zeal, they echo what French President Emmanuel Macron called the ‘sad passions’ of the author Michel Houellebecq4 (Carre`re, 2017). They may not share Houellebecq’s politics, but many critical scholars certainly share his exhaustive (and exhausting) disenchantment with contemporary (neo)liberal societies, the state of Europe and of the West. Too often they also share his miserabilist outlook on the impossibility of change for the better and the futility or harm of even trying to improve things.

Grove does propose several forms of political action: micro-kindnesses, however vague (e.g. ‘the impossible generosity and affirmation of deconstruction’, 2019: 231); resistant acts by brave individuals (e.g. ‘William ‘‘Fox’’ Fallon, who sacrificed his prestigious position as head of [US Military] Central Command because he would not go along with the plan to attack Iran’, 2019: 232); embracing entirely new ‘forms of life 5 ’; or welcoming apocalypse as driver of change (2019: 229–248). Grove will not be confused with Goldilocks anytime soon – these forms of action each seem either too little or (much) too much.

Few of us would question the value of and need for kindness and, indeed, the most hopeful part of Grove’s book is the touching introduction where he details many of the kindnesses he has himself benefitted from, mainly from people in the West where he has spent most of his life. There is also, clearly, a role for resistance and for the kinds of acts that Grove notes have prevented executions and even nuclear war. Yet without a wider programme, without a bigger positive vision, kindness and resistance cannot sufficiently change our world for the better. Apocalypse, on the contrary, changes too much, junks too much that is good and is rarely likely to be an appealing option, or something we can all get behind. The apocalyptic aspect of Grove’s position, like that of many critical scholars, seeks to inflict destructive harm on Western institutions rather than constructively reform them – something Houellebecq would also relish. Apocalyptic change also smacks of the recklessly callous, negative sides of early 20th-century futurism (Marinetti, 1909), as Grove acknowledges when asking ‘How do we go wild without the cruelty of indifference?’ (2019: 280). Again, a more balanced approach to boldness would help.

To be clear, major change is needed – that was the whole point of the Hamburg Sessions and the motivation behind giving it the theme of ‘Un-Cancelling the Future’. I’ve argued elsewhere that the kind of socio-economically regressive, technocratic, defensive liberalisms that have dominated large parts of the last 40 years in the West have a lot to answer for (Tallis, 2018). So too, of course, does the type of narrowly, teleological individually atomising (neo)liberalism that neither saw (Fukuyama, 1992) nor allowed (Fisher, 2009) alternative visions of politics, societies and economies. Mark Fisher (2009), echoing the artist Gerhard Richter (Elger, 2009), called this myopic liberalism ‘Capitalist Realism’. You don’t have to be a Marxist or even a leftist to see that a mandated lack of alternatives and a commensurate narrowing of possibilities and horizons is a bad thing. As noted above, both climate change and sociotechnical upheavals in the ways we work and live need bold visions to address the challenges they pose while also seizing the opportunities they present.

It is, however, eminently possible to recognise the full horrors of Europe’s (colonial) pasts and presents without immediately discounting the possibility of improvement coming from the West, from Europe. Similarly, one can recognise the myriad problems that Europeans have caused while also celebrating the many positive things they have also achieved. Moreover, it is possible to use those achievements as inspirations for better ways of doing things – as catalysts to new, progressive creativity and to positive visions of the future. Just as Kraftwerk did in the fragile yet fertile Germany of the second half of the 20th century when they acknowledged the abyss yet still sought a better future, including as atonement for that past.

The cancellation of the future

William Gibson recently tweeted ‘‘In the 1920s, the phrase ‘the 21st Century’ was already popubiquitous. How often do we see the phrase ‘‘the 22nd Century’’, now?’’. And it’s true – we don’t have these dates anymore. As a boy, as a young man, I had mental pictures of the 21st Century. But I don’t have any sense of 2050 or 2100 – except as a deterioration or a collapse. (Simon Reynolds, Hamburg Sessions 2019, see essay in this issue)

I return to Kraftwerk below but first, a little more is needed on the ramifications of contemporary hopelessness. Rather than striving to create new and compelling positive, progressive visions, many thinkers content themselves with critique (Austin, 2017) while others, like Grove, see positive, progressive visions and futures – especially those coming from Europe or the wider West – as being necessarily harmful in themselves.

This is postmodernism as hangover. The depressed – and depressing – aftermath of the shortcomings, broken promises and unintended consequences of modernisms of different kinds, in which strange connections are made and selective, guilty memory runs amok (Fisher, 2014). Forgetting the good, it fuses the bewitchingly pertinent aspects of the post-positivist critical project (which influenced many of us, myself very much included), with more zealously (self-)destructive and paralysing tendencies. As Fisher puts it: ‘Deconstruction [is] a kind of pathology of scepticism, which induced hedging, infirmity of purpose and compulsory doubt’ (2014: 16). In this mode, scholarship no longer seeks to invent the train but fixates on the train crash or even pre-empts and precludes the train’s invention for fear of the seemingly inescapable imagined train crash to come.

Like Grove’s denunciation of the future, many of the critiques of (popular) modernisms are not so much wrong as imbalanced (although some are wrong of course, others not even). They take insufficient account of modernisms’ multiple and meaningful successes (there’s no time here, but see, e.g. Fisher, 2014: 22; or Meades, 2014, for a flavour). This leaves us in an odd situation where many of the scholars, commentators and others who criticise neoliberalism, capitalist realism and so on, find themselves in de facto agreement with its notion that there should be no alternative. In this view, we simply shouldn’t do big vision politics because our ‘schemes to improve the human condition’ have not only ‘failed’ but will always, inevitably, do more harm than good (Scott, 2008). This approach, all post and no modern, will take us nowhere, even as it fast-forwards the academic careers of its exponents.

The future visions that are left, on the left, tend to be Marxist ones (see, e.g. Grove, 2019: 198– 202). Tarred not only by the brush of the communisms that actually existed (and their distinctly less balanced ledger than that of modernism more widely) they understandably fail to inspire mass enthusiasm. Many of their proponents are still really more interested in explaining the failure to bring about the inevitable (full communism) in the past and present than in imagining new futures that go beyond the narrow world view and limiting subjectivity of too many Marxist approaches (see, e.g. Scribner, 2003; Sˇitera, 2015). This has done little to address the crisis of hope or to countervail prevalent contemporary pessimism.

The loss of the belief in the progressive future – that tomorrow can be better than yesterday and today – and the related erosion of faith in our ability to positively shape our own destiny are what Berardi (2011: 13) called ‘the slow cancellation of the future’. As Simon Reynolds noted in his Hamburg Sessions keynote (included in this issue of NP), the cancellation may have started slowly in the 1970s, but, by the 2000s, it had picked up speed and its effects could start to be seen. The first of these – its more (neo)liberal variant – was the feeling of living in an endless present. For a lot of people in the West, this has been comfortable in many ways (although often unevenly and unfairly) and has had distinct advantages over the past (the extension of rights and opportunities to broader swathes of the population) but without much hope, optimism or greater purpose. Unless it provokes the nostalgic responses outlined below, this endless present can lead to a sense of ennui, a lack of direction and loss of momentum.

The second, more overtly sinister, variant that fills the vacuum left by the dearth of positive, progressive visions for the future takes the form of darker re-enchantments focused on the (imagined) past (e.g. Campanella and Dassu`, 2019). Whether ‘making America great again’, ‘taking back control’ in the United Kingdom or claiming to offer an ‘alternative for Germany’, these movements are fundamentally premised on a backward-looking politics of nostalgia. The pessimism about the present and worries about the future on which these movements have each capitalised have given rise to an increasingly defensive politics of closing down and protecting, at the expense of opening up and integrating. Nativism and pessimism tend to go hand in hand: shrinking pies bring narrowed horizons and hasten the circling of wagons around exclusive and chauvinistic visions of national communities. Too often, this retro-rightism has been met only with retro-leftism or a tired centrism that merely seeks more of the same, to smooth the endless present. But that can change ...

Reclaiming the spirit of Kraftwerk

COVID-19 has cancelled the endless present6 – or at least it can if we make the best of it. The scale of the response to the pandemic highlights the degree to which radical change is possible if people are persuaded of the need. This crisis will be (and is already being) used politically. The challenge for those of us who want a more progressive future is to ensure that the disruption caused by COVID-19 is put to positive effect – to ensure that it is creative rather than wanton disruption – and to spur the kind of action that can address our biggest challenges but also to create new opportunities to make a better ‘Post-Coronial’ world (Tallis and Renic, 2020).

From climate change to the changing world of work, bold action is needed to address the causes of our biggest problems rather than simply alleviating their symptoms. But also seeing these issues as possibilities to be seized for progressive improvement, rather than just seeing them as problems to be managed will be key. As Merje Kuus was at pains to emphasise in her Hamburg Sessions keynote, perspective is vital (see her essay in this issue). Building resilient societies and a more equitable global order calls for the political will to formulate and make the case for positive proactive policy, not the piecemeal passivity, timid tinkering or (critical) conservatism that have characterised too much of European politics and public debate in recent times.

#### Even if realism’s foundations are problematic, it’s theoretically useful for understanding IR – rejecting it outright is ahistorical and causes worse violence by greenlighting ethically untenable positions like the alt

Abraham 17 [Kavi Joseph, Johns Hopkins University. “Making Machines: Unlikely Resonances between Realist and Postcolonial Thought,” https://academic.oup.com/ips/article-abstract/11/3/221/3798787]

This passage marks out one of the biggest obstacles to connecting realist and postcolonial thought: race. One would be hard pressed to find in realist theorizations anything resembling a supple understanding of race and racism (Vitalis 2015)— though Carr (2001b, 107) demonstrates a comparatively great deal of reflexivity on postcolonial liberation (see fn. 2 above). Even in Williams’s (2005) “wilful” realist tradition, there is scant discussion of how an embedded ethic of critical self-limitation fared in the context of racial or other forms of radical difference. Absent an engagement with the analytics of postcolonial thinking, or the diverse ways in which white supremacy, patriarchy, and heteronormativity inflect past and present liberal imperial formations, willful realism does not address the categories that threaten to push prudential skeptics toward violent responses, that pose limitations to an ethos of limits. As evidenced in Morgenthau, failure to think critically about race opens up the way for Morgenthau’s theoretical practice to be driven toward resentful rather than careful ends. It is at this juncture that those concerned with contemporary imperial formations are confronted with a number of possible responses: one is to deem realism, in all its complex and contradictory manifestations, as a failed, unethical, and fundamentally racist/imperial project. A second response is to politically align against liberalism, while holding this partnership at arm’s length. A third response, derived from Ayoob’s (2002) subaltern realism, is to work on an epistemic register, selectively taking insights from realist traditions that help better explain the neocolonial world. Morgenthau’s racist interjections should be critiqued and confronted—perhaps by outlining the innumerable non-Western contributions to the making of so-called Western modernity (Hobson 2004)—but this failing does not delegitimize other realist insights. What is important for Ayoob’s (2002) accommodationist stance is to combine plausible realist insights with other categories that can grasp the extent of global politics, including the dynamics of the postcolonial experience, better.

The final response is the one I advance. To adopt a mode of argumentation concerned with building a counter-imperial machine is to neither dismiss constituencies that become caught up in imperial formations, nor merely to tactically align with them; rather, establishing resonant connections among postcolonial and realist lines of thought, highlighting shared dispositions to difference, is to push the latter toward repositioning itself on new ethical lines that limit contemporary forms of violence. To recover a minor position in realism is not to accept all realist positions, nor is it to synthesize or convert any theoretical line into a coherent framework. It is, however, to amplify the shared spirituality that informs both realist and postcolonial thinking, drawing constituencies toward prudential rather than imperial defenses of difference. It is to furnish current research agendas with an anti-imperial focus, to seek the creative possibilities that may arise when divergent constituencies meet, interfuse, and shift. Thus, our response to Morgenthau, as to other realists, is to cultivate the connections that do exist, not for epistemic reasons but for a political project that strengthens counter-imperial movements.

Thinking from the Present

By way of conclusion, it is important to reiterate the politics that motivates a theoretical project of linking realist and postcolonial thinking. If the ends of this project were to simply gather critiques of liberalism and its relationship to imperial practices, then certainly a return to classical realist thought adds little epistemic value over and above postcolonial approaches. However, the ends of this argument are to outline and energize a counter-imperial machine, to cultivate a shared spirituality that can gather diverse and divergent constituencies to confront dangerous practices. In my estimation, countering an imperial machine that operates in complex ways and at complex sites requires a political strategy as unwieldy and diffuse, linking constituencies that we may otherwise dismiss. That a tradition of realism regularly circulates through halls of power across the globe should be reason not to reject righteously but rather to leverage its authorized status. We can talk about imperialism, knowledge production, and race here, while they can talk about anarchy, power, and self-interest there—or we can theoretically work on the lines of thought that reverberate among us. To reiterate, building a countermachine is not driven to “pragmatic” reconciliation or consensus and, thus, remains distinct from the “eclecticism” of other plural approaches popular in IR today. While the combinatory logic of paradigmatic synthesis has its place, the connections between realist and postcolonial thought articulated here are made in a far more agonistic manner. Rather than produce something like a “postcolonial-realism,” this argument involves pushing contemporary realist scholarship toward new research agendas and new forms of critique that both capture a spirit internal to its own traditions while confronting the realities of contemporary global politics. It engages with minor positions along the realist canon to orient today’s realism away from the logic of great power politics operating under anarchy toward an understanding of how the logic of liberal order permits forms of imperial intervention.

Needless to say, drawing together realist and postcolonial thought, as this essay has done, can be met with analytical skepticism and political hostility. A mode of argumentation that refuses comparisons of theoretical cores or non-truncated readings of select theorists strikes a note of analytical evasion. To this there is no defense—other than that already discussed at length. On the other hand, if the expressly political purpose of this work is accepted, the argument anticipates strong political reservations: why align the project of postcolonial theory with realism, an unethical tradition of militarism and realpolitik? To this I would respond that while a kind of strategic essentialism has its place, reducing “realists” to a coherent body of thought not only obscures the complexity of their thinking (see never-ending interpretations of Machiavelli as an example) but reproduces the narrative of transhistorical unity that some realists use to authorize unethical policy programs in the first place. More critically, however, in embodying an unproductive ahistoricism, it poses conventional realist categories of anarchy, selfinterest, and military power as the political problem to confront whereas the present historical context demands attunement to how some of these drives (militarism, national interest) connect with discrete problems of liberalism and imperial practices. In fact, there are good reasons to think that the dominance of (neo)realism in IR is overstated (Walker and Morton 2005; Maliniak et al. 2011) and that the ascension of liberal IR theory is sociologically tied up with the present hegemony of a US liberal world order (Sterling-Folker 2015). In other words, while realism may have been a productive foil in Cold War bipolarity, we must theorize from the present. In doing so, we may find that countering imperial formations may benefit from resonances established not just among postcolonial, feminist, poststructural, and other “critical” theorists but contemporary realists who identify links between liberalism and imperialism (Walt 2013). Indeed, if realism as a policy program defending the national interest is entangled with current militaristic and imperial interventions, we should push the premise of this statement, that difference should be defended, in anti-imperial and prudential directions. Doing so may allow new openings to emerge in the present sense of closure, new strategies to think and defend alternative politics. In this way, we may more fully embody postcoloniality by not being satisfied with either narrow critique or brash conversion but rather attentive translation.

#### Fugitivity from legal structures only strengthens racial neoliberalism – turns the alt

**Love 15** –(2015, Heather, R. Jean Brownlee Term Associate Professor at the University of Pennsylvania, “Doing Being Deviant: Deviance Studies, Description, and the Queer Ordinary,” *differences* Vol. 26.1, p. 89-91)

Today, queer studies—prestigious but unevenly institutionalized—still signals absolute refusal or criticality—all anti- and no normativity. In their influential 2004 essay, “The University and the Undercommons” (and in the 2013 book that followed from it), Fred Moten and Stefano Harney rely on such an understanding of queer (as well as concepts borrowed from black studies, feminism, ethnic studies, and anticolonial thought). They call for betrayal, refusal, theft, and marronage as modes of resisting the iron grip of the academy, pointing to an uncharted, underground, and collective space they call the undercommons. “To enter this space,” they write, “is to inhabit the ruptural and enraptured disclosure of the commons that fugitive enlightenment enacts, the criminal, matricidal, queer, in the cistern, on the stroll of the stolen life, the life stolen by enlightenment and stolen back, where the commons give refuge, where the refuge gives commons” (103). Moten and Harney speculate whether the “thought of the outside” (105) is possible inside the university and suggest that if there is an outside, it is along the margins and at the bottom. Yet their imagination of that outside is indebted to the inside, in particular to the conception of deviance produced within sociology. Their account of the undercommons reads like a rap sheet, a list of the traditional topics of deviance studies: theft, homosexuality, prostitution, incarceration.

Moten and Harney do not describe the undercommons, but rather ask their readers to join it, to participate in active revolt against profes- sional and disciplinary protocols. To o er an objective account of the social position of radical academics would be to further business as usual in the academy; dwelling in the undercommons requires giving up on the usual protocols of description. Moten and Harney argue against the traditional role of the “critical academic” (105), which they see as just another turn of the professional screw, since work that opposes the academy does not challenge its basic structure or everyday operations. They argue that “to be a critical academic in the university is to be against the university, and to be against the university is always to recognize it and to be recognized by it, and to institute the negligence of the internal outside, that unassimilated underground, a negligence of it that is precisely, we must insist, the basis of the professions” (105). In contrast to the figure of the critical academic, they forward the image of the “subversive intellectual” who is “in but not of” the academy (101). Without dismissing the galvanizing effect of such a call to the undercommons, it is important to consider the limits of the refusal of objectification as a strategy. To be unlocatable, to be nowhere, to be in permanent revolt: Moten and Harney describe the path that queer inquiry laid out for itself. Objectification—recognition, description, critique—can be a way to reinforce the status quo, but it is also a way of acknowledging one’s institutional position and the real differences between inside and outside.

Even the most subversive intellectuals in the academy are “on the stroll” in a metaphorical but not a material sense. The fate of those who came “under false pretenses, with bad documents, out of love” (101), if they survive, is to become “superordinates” in Becker’s sense.

Whose side are we on? Can we hold onto the critical and polemical energy of queer studies as well as its radical experiments in style and thought while acknowledging our implication in systems of power, management, and control? Will a more explicit avowal of disciplinary affiliations and methods snuff out the utopian energies of a field that sees itself as a radical outsider in the university? To date, both the political and the methodological antinormativity of queer studies have made it difficult to address our implication in the violence of knowledge production, pedagogy, and social inequality. Such violence is inevitable, and critical histories of the disciplines—and the production of knowledge about social deviance—are essential. Undertaking such work, however, will not allow escape into a radically different relation to our objects because we are (as Moten and Harney also argue) part of that history—we are its contemporary instantiation. To imagine a social world in which those relations are transformed—in what Moten and Harney refer to as the “prophetic organization” (102)—may be crucial for the achievement of social justice, but to deny our own implication in existing structures is also a form of violence.

### 1NC – Heg Good

#### The 1AC is a rejection of liberalism and US power – Their criticism contributes to neo-isolationism and prevents American dominance – Don’t let them get out of the link because the AFF positioned itself in opposition to American power – also during CX they said they remove US power internationally

KAGAN 98 senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace [Robert, “The Benevolent Empire,” Foreign Policy, summer]

Those contributing to the growing chorus of antihegemony and multipolarity may know they are playing a dangerous game, one that needs to be conducted with the utmost care, as French leaders did during the Cold War, lest the entire international system come crashing down around them. What they may not have adequately calculated, however, is the possibility that Americans will not respond as wisely as they generally did during the Cold War. Americans and their leaders should not take all this sophisticated whining about U.S. hegemony too seriously. They certainly should not take it more seriously than the whiners themselves do. But, of course, Americans are taking it seriously. In the United States these days, the lugubrious guilt trip of post-Vietnam liberalism is echoed even by conservatives, with William Buckley, Samuel Huntington, and James Schlesinger all decrying American "hubris," "arrogance," and "imperialism." Clinton administration officials, in between speeches exalting America as the "indispensable" nation, increasingly behave as if what is truly indispensable is the prior approval of China, France, and Russia for every military action. Moreover, at another level, there is a stirring of neo-isolationism in America today, a mood that nicely complements the view among many Europeans that America is meddling too much in everyone else's business and taking too little time to mind its own. The existence of the Soviet Union disciplined Americans and made them see that their enlightened self-interest lay in a relatively generous foreign policy. Today, that discipline is no longer present. In other words, foreign grumbling about American hegemony would be merely amusing, were it not for the very real possibility that too many Americans will forget —- even if most of the rest of the world does not —- just how important continued American dominance is

to the preservation of a reasonable level of international security and prosperity. World leaders may want to keep this in mind when they pop the champagne corks in celebration of the next American humbling**.**

#### Concede they remove the US internationally - Primacy and allied commitments solves arms races and great power war---reject old defense that ignores emerging instability and compounding risk and unipolarity is sustainable and stops power vacuums and escalation across the globe

Brands 18 [Hal, Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies and a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments." American Grand Strategy in the Age of Trump." Page 129-133]

Since World War II, the United States has had a military second to none. Since the Cold War, America has committed to having overwhelming military primacy. The idea, as George W. Bush declared in 2002, that America must possess “strengths beyond challenge” has featured in every major U.S. strategy document for a quarter century; it has also been reflected in concrete terms.6

From the early 1990s, for example, the United States consistently accounted for around 35 to 45 percent of world defense spending and maintained peerless global power-projection capabilities.7 Perhaps more important, U.S. primacy was also unrivaled in key overseas strategic regions—Europe, East Asia, the Middle East. From thrashing Saddam Hussein’s million-man Iraqi military during Operation Desert Storm, to deploying—with impunity—two carrier strike groups off Taiwan during the China-Taiwan crisis of 1995– 96, Washington has been able to project military power superior to anything a regional rival could employ even on its own geopolitical doorstep.

This military dominance has constituted the hard-power backbone of an ambitious global strategy. After the Cold War, U.S. policymakers committed to averting a return to the unstable multipolarity of earlier eras, and to perpetuating the more favorable unipolar order. They committed to building on the successes of the postwar era by further advancing liberal political values and an open international economy, and to suppressing international scourges such as rogue states, nuclear proliferation, and catastrophic terrorism. And because they recognized that military force remained the ultima ratio regum, they understood the centrality of military preponderance.

Washington would need the military power necessary to underwrite worldwide alliance commitments. It would have to preserve substantial overmatch versus any potential great-power rival. It must be able to answer the sharpest challenges to the international system, such as Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990 or jihadist extremism after 9/11. Finally, because prevailing global norms generally reflect hard-power realities, America would need the superiority to assure that its own values remained ascendant. It was impolitic to say that U.S. strategy and the international order required “strengths beyond challenge,” but it was not at all inaccurate.

American primacy, moreover, was eminently affordable. At the height of the Cold War, the United States spent over 12 percent of GDP on defense. Since the mid-1990s, the number has usually been between 3 and 4 percent.8 In a historically favorable international environment, Washington could enjoy primacy—and its geopolitical fruits—on the cheap.

Yet U.S. strategy also heeded, at least until recently, the fact that there was a limit to how cheaply that primacy could be had. The American military did shrink significantly during the 1990s, but U.S. officials understood that if Washington cut back too far, its primacy would erode to a point where it ceased to deliver its geopolitical benefits. Alliances would lose credibility; the stability of key regions would be eroded; rivals would be emboldened; international crises would go unaddressed. American primacy was thus like a reasonably priced insurance policy. It required nontrivial expenditures, but protected against far costlier outcomes.9 Washington paid its insurance premiums for two decades after the Cold War. But more recently American primacy and strategic solvency have been imperiled.

THE DARKENING HORIZON For most of the post–Cold War era, the international system was— by historical standards—remarkably benign. Dangers existed, and as the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrated, they could manifest with horrific effect. But for two decades after the Soviet collapse, the world was characterized by remarkably low levels of great-power competition, high levels of security in key theaters such as Europe and East Asia, and the comparative weakness of those “rogue” actors—Iran, Iraq, North Korea, al-Qaeda—who most aggressively challenged American power. During the 1990s, some observers even spoke of a “strategic pause,” the idea being that the end of the Cold War had afforded the United States a respite from normal levels of geopolitical danger and competition. Now, however, the strategic horizon is darkening, due to four factors.

First, great-power military competition is back. The world’s two leading authoritarian powers—China and Russia—are seeking regional hegemony, contesting global norms such as nonaggression and freedom of navigation, and developing the military punch to underwrite these ambitions. Notwithstanding severe economic and demographic problems, Russia has conducted a major military modernization emphasizing nuclear weapons, high-end conventional capabilities, and rapid-deployment and special operations forces— and utilized many of these capabilities in conflicts in Ukraine and Syria.10 China, meanwhile, has carried out a buildup of historic proportions, with constant-dollar defense outlays rising from US$26 billion in 1995 to US$226 billion in 2016.11 Ominously, these expenditures have funded development of power-projection and antiaccess/area denial (A2/AD) tools necessary to threaten China’s neighbors and complicate U.S. intervention on their behalf. Washington has grown accustomed to having a generational military lead; Russian and Chinese modernization efforts are now creating a far more competitive environment.

#### The US and China are fundamentally distinct – China rise is coterminous with imperial elimination of indigenous ppl

Thayer and Han ’19 (Bradley A. Thayer Professor of Political Science at the University of Texas San Antonio and is the coauthor of How China Sees the World: Han-Centrism and the Balance of Power in International Politics. Lianchao Han is vice president of Citizen Power Initiatives for China and a visiting fellow at the Hudson Institute. After the Tiananmen Square Massacre in 1989, Dr. Han was one of the founders of the Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars. He worked in the U.S. Senate for twelve years, as legislative counsel and policy director for three senators, 6/12/19(Bradley and Lianchao, “The ‘Xi Doctrine’: Proclaiming and Rationalizing China’s Aggression”, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/%E2%80%98xi-doctrine%E2%80%99-proclaiming-and-rationalizing-china%E2%80%99s-aggression-62402)//GA)

Using the occasion of the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore this month, Chinese Minister of National Defense and State Councilor Gen. Wei Fenghe, delivered a sharp message to the United States, which may be termed the “Xi Doctrine” on China’s use of force, after Chinese premier Xi Jinping. Wei declaring both China’s resolve to aggress to advance its interests and a rationalization for the use of force. Wei’s de facto threat of war should not be lost in his nuances, deliberate ambiguity, or in translation. His remarks were so bellicose that the world has noticed, as was certainly intended by the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). Empirical evidence of China’s aggression is increasingly common, from its attempt to dominate the South China Sea, the neo-imperialist effort to gain control of states through the Belt and Road Initiative, to its technological imperialism to control 5G and artificial intelligence technologies. What is rather less frequent are statements from high-level Chinese officials proclaiming the country’s intent to be aggressive and offering an attempted legitimizing principle justifying that aggression. While much of the content of Wei’s remarks were in keeping with the gossamer pronouncements on China’s peaceful intentions, as well as a paean to Xi Jinping’s leadership, they still conveyed that China is ready and willing to resort to war if the United States stands in its way of global expansion; and they made clear that China must go to war, or even a nuclear war, to occupy Taiwan. Specifically, there are four elements that comprise the Xi Doctrine and are indications of China’s signaling its willingness to use force. The first component is a new and alarming proclamation of the undisguised threats to use force or wage an unlimited war. China is becoming bolder as its military power grows. This is evidenced in Wei’s muscular remarks on the People’s Republic of China’s approach against Taiwan, his explicit statement that China does not renounce the use of force against Taiwan, and his effort to deter the United States and its allies from intervention should an attack occur. Wei forcefully stated: “If anyone dares to separate Taiwan from China, the Chinese military has no choice but must go to war, and must fight for the reunification of the motherland at all costs.” “At all cost” means that China will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons or launching another Pearl Harbor to take over Taiwan. This is a clear warning of an invasion. Second, the Xi Doctrine legitimizes territorial expansion. Through his remarks, Wei sought to convince the rest of the world that China’s seizure of most of the South China Sea is an accomplished fact that cannot be overturned. He made bogus accusations, which included blaming the United States for “raking in profits by stirring up troubles” in the region. He insisted that only ASEAN and China must resolve the issue. He claimed that China’s militarization on South China Sea islands and reefs were an act of self-defense. Should this be allowed to stand, then the Xi Doctrine will set a perilous precedent of successful territorial expansion, which will further entice China and jeopardize the peace of the region. Third, the doctrine targets the United States as a cause of the world’s major problems and envisions a powerful China evicting the United States from the region. Wei obliquely identified the United States as the cause wars, conflicts, and unrest, and sought to convey that the United States will abandon the states of the South China Sea (SCS) when it is confronted by Chinese power, a typical divide and conquer strategy used by the CCP regime. The Xi Doctrine’s fourth element is the mendacity regarding China’s historical use of force and current actions. While the distortions of history were numerous, there were three major lies that should be alarming for the states of the region and the global community. First, Wei said that China had never invaded another country, which is a claim so transparently false it can only be a measure of the contempt he held for the audience. China has a long history of aggression, including against the Tibetans and Vietnamese, and perhaps soon against the Taiwanese. Second, Wei argued that hegemony does not conform to China’s values when, in fact, China proudly was Asia’s hegemon for most of the last two thousand years. Lastly, he claimed that the situation in the SCS is moving toward stability—from China’s perspective this stability is caused by its successful seizure of territory. In fact, the SCS is far less stable as a result of China’s actions. Efforts to counter this grab are denounced by Wei as destabilizing, which is a bit like a thief accusing you of a crime for wanting your property returned. Wei’s belligerent rhetoric is an indication that the CCP regime faces deep external and internal crises. Externally, the Trump administration has shocked the CCP with the three major steps it has taken. First, it has shifted the focus of the U.S. national-security strategy and now identifies China explicitly as its primary rival—abandoning the far more muted policies of previous administrations. Second, Trump has acted on this peer competitive threat by advancing tangible measures, such as arms sales to allies and the ban of Huawei. Third, the administration has made credible commitments to assure partners and allies to counter China’s aggression and bullying. These have unbalanced the CCP regime, and its natural reaction is to bully its way out. Additionally, the CCP regime has perceived that the world today has begun to consider the negative implications of China’s rise, and the United States is determined to prevent what heretofore had been considered China’s unstoppable rise. From the perspective of CCP, conflict is increasingly seen as inevitable and perhaps even imminent. Wei’s bellicosity should be seen in this light, and the PLA is tasked with fighting and winning the war. Internally, Xi’s anti-corruption campaign that selectively targets his political rivalries, and his abandoning the established rules such as term limited of presidency, have introduced deep cleavages into the unity of the regime unity. China’s economic slowdown, made worse by the U.S. trade war, is a fundamental challenge to the regime’s legitimacy. Xi’s repression and suppression of the Chinese people, particularly human-rights defenders, Christians, Kazakhs, Uighurs, and other minorities, have miscarried. Drawing from the pages of unfortunate history, in a classic social-imperialist move, the regime wants to direct these internal tensions outward. At the same time, the nationalistic fervor advanced by the CCP’s propaganda and by the rapid military modernization have made many young militant officers in the PLA overconfident. This is infrequently noticed in the West. They can hardly wait to fight an ultimate war to defeat the arch-enemy. This plainly dangerous mentality echoes the Japanese military’s beliefs before Pearl Harbor. The bellicosity evinced in Wei’s speech is serious and is not bluster intended to deter. The United States cannot meet China’s threat with half-measures, which are likely to further encourage China’s aggressive behavior. The United States must respond to China’s belligerence with greater strength, adamantine determination, and more vigorous diplomatic and military measures. With the Xi Doctrine, China has proclaimed and rationalized its aggression. A Trump Doctrine forged in response has to reveal to all global audiences, most importantly the CCP leadership, the recklessness of the Xi Doctrine and the supreme folly of aggression.
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