# Above Us Only Sky AC

***‘Ethno-’ is the link to the national and the indigenous; ‘futurism’ is the attempt to find a place and be competitive in the post-modern contemporary world. – Viktor Shibanov***

## Part 1: Three-Dimensional Thought

#### [ROJ & Giroux 1] CORPORATIONS ARE TAKING OVER EDUCATION – we desperately need critical pedagogy to resist that.

**Giroux 1:** Giroux, Henry A. [Waterbury Chair Professor, Pennsylvania State University] “Radical Politics in the Age of American Authoritarianism: Connecting the Dots.” *Truthout*,April 2016. https://truthout.org/articles/radical-politics-in-the-age-of-american-authoritarianism-connecting-the-dots/ CH

At the root of this notion of developing a comprehensive view of politics is the need for educating ourselves by developing a critical formative culture along with corresponding institutions that promote a form of permanent criticism against all elements of oppression and unaccountable power.**One important task of emancipation is to fight the dominant culture industry by developing alternative public spheres and education**al institutions **capable of nourishing critical thought and** action. The time has come for educators, artists, workers, young people and others to push forward **a** new **form of politics** in which public values, trust and compassion trump neoliberalism's celebration of self- interest, the ruthless accumulation of capital, the survival-of-the-fittest ethos and the financialization and market-driven corruption of the political system. Political responsibility is more than a challenge -- it is the projection of a possibility in which new modes of identification and agents must be enabled that can sustain new political organizations and transnational anti-capitalist movements. Democracy must be written back into the script of everyday life, and doing so demands overcoming the current crisis of memory, agency and politics by collectively struggling for a new form of politics in which matters of justice, equity and inclusion define what is possible. Such struggles demand an increasingly broad-based commitment to a new kind of activism. As Robin D. G. Kelley has recently noted there is a need for more pedagogical, cultural and social spaces that allow us to think and act together, to take risks and **to get to the roots of the conditions that are submerging the United States into a new form of authoritarianism wrapped in the flag, the dollar sign and the cross.** Kelley is right in calling for a politics that places justice at its core, one that takes seriously what it means to be an individual and social agent while engaging in collective struggles. We don't need tepid calls for repairing the system; instead, we need to invent a new system from the ashes of one that is terminally broken. We don't need calls for moral uplift or personal responsibility. We need calls for economic, political, gender and racial justice. Such a politics must be rooted in particular demands, be open to direct action and take seriously strategies designed to both educate a wider public and mobilize them to seize power. The left needs a new political conversation that encompasses memories of freedom and resistance. Such a dialogue would build on the militancy of the labor strikes of the 1930s, the civil rights movements of the 1950s and the struggle for participatory democracy by the New Left in the 1960s. At the same time, there is a need to reclaim the radical imagination and to infuse it with a spirited battle for an independent politics that regards a radical democracy as part of a never-ending struggle. **None of this can happen unless progressives understand education as a political and moral practice crucial to creating new forms of agency, mobilizing a desire for change and providing a language** that underwrites the capacity to think, speak and act so as to challenge the sexist, racist, economic and political grammars of suffering produced by the new authoritarianism. The left needs a language of critique that enables people to ask questions that appear unspeakable within the existing vocabularies of oppression. We also need a language of hope that is firmly aware of the ideological and structural obstacles that are undermining democracy. We need a language that reframes our activist politics as a creative act that responds to the promises and possibilities of a radical democracy. Movements require time to mature and come into fruition. They necessitate educated agents able to connect structural conditions of oppression to the oppressive cultural apparatuses that legitimate, persuade, and shape individual and collective attitudes in the service of oppressive ideas and values. Under such conditions, radical ideas can be connected to action once diverse groups recognize the need to take control of the political, economic and cultural conditions that shape their worldviews, exploit their labor, control their communities, appropriate their resources, and undermine their dignity and lives. Raising consciousness alone will not change authoritarian societies, but it does provide the foundation for making oppression visible and for developing from below what Étienne Balibar calls "practices of resistance and solidarity." We need not only a radical critique of capitalism, racism and other forms of oppression, but also a critical formative culture and cultural politics that inspire, energize and provide elements of a transformative radical education in the service of a broad-based democratic liberation movement.

Thus, **the Role of the Judge is to Promote Critical Thinking**, which means helping students develop the skills to question the squo.

#### [ROB & Kellner] AND that requires rejecting the one-dimensional thought that underlies capitalistic culture.

**Kellner:** Kellner, Douglas. [George Kneller Chair in the Philosophy of Education in the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles]. “One-Dimensional Man: Introduction to the Second Edition.” Beacon Press,1964. https://tinyurl.com/2tpwevjk EM/CH

Thus, I would propose interpreting “one-dimensional” as conforming to existing thought and behavior and lacking a critical dimension and a dimension of potentialities that transcend the existing society. In Marcuse's usage the adjective **“one-dimensional” describes practices that conform to pre-existing structures, norms, and behavior, in contrast to multidimensional discourse, which focuses on possibilities that transcend the established state of** affairs. This epistemological distinction presupposes antagonism between subject and object so that the subject is free to perceive possibilities in the world that do not yet exist but which can be realized. In the one**-dimensional society, the subject is assimilated into the object and follows the dictates of external, objective norms and structures, thus losing the ability to discover more liberating possibilities and to engage in transformative practice to realize them.** Marcuse's theory presupposes the existence of a human subject with freedom, creativity, and self-determination who stands in opposition to an object-world, perceived as substance, which contains possibilities to be realized and secondary qualities like values, aesthetic traits, and aspirations, which can be cultivated to enhance human life.

He adds:

In his early works, Marcuse himself attempted to synthesize Heidegger's phenomenological existentialism with Marxism, and in One-Dimensional Man one recognizes Husserl and Heideggerian motifs in Marcuse's critiques of scientific civilization and modes of thought. In particular, Marcuse develops a conception of a technological world, similar in some respects to that developed by Heidegger, and, like Husserl and Heidegger, sees technological rationality colonizing everyday life, robbing individuals of freedom and individuality by imposing techno- logical imperatives, rules, and structures upon their thought and behavior. Marcuse thought that **dialectical philosophy could promote critical thinking.** One-Dimensional Man is perhaps Marcuse's most sustained attempt to present and develop the categories of the dialectical philosophy developed by Hegel and Marx. For Marcuse, **dialectical thinking involved the ability to abstract one's perception and thought from existing forms in order to form more general concepts.** This conception helps explain the difficulty of One-Dimensional Man and the demands that it imposes upon its reader. For Marcuse abstracts from the complexity and multiplicity of the existing society its fundamental tendencies and constituents, as well as those categories which constitute for him the forms of critical thinking. **This demands that the reader also abstract from existing ways of looking at society and modes of thinking and attempt to perceive and think in a new way. Uncritical thinking derives its beliefs, norms, and values from existing thought and social practices, while critical thought seeks alternative modes of thought and behavior from which it creates a standpoint of critique. Such a critical standpoint requires developing what Marcuse calls “negative thinking,” which “negates” existing forms of thought and reality from the perspective of higher possibilities.** This practice presupposes the ability to make a distinction between existence and essence, fact and potentiality, and appearance and reality. Mere existence would be negated in favor of realizing higher potentialities while norms discovered by reason would be used to criticize and overcome lower forms of thought and social organization. Thus grasping potentialities for freedom and happiness would make possible the negation of conditions that inhibited individuals' full development and realization. In other words, perceiving the possibility of self-determination and constructing one's own needs and values could enable individuals to break with the existing world of thought and behavior. Philosophy was thus to supply the norms for social criticism and the ideal of liberation which would guide social change and individual self- transformation.

Thus, **the Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Rejection of One-Dimensional Thought.** This means distancing ourselves from essentializing modes of thinking – e.g., the notion that value can only come from money. We measure the standard based on whether we remain open to multiple ways of knowing or approaching problems; the more restrictive the approach, the less we adhere to the framework.

## Part 2: Unimaginable

#### [Jones 1] PROFIT OVER PEOPLE – capitalism values space only if people can make money from it.

**Jones 1:** Jones, Craig Henry. [Writer at Society and Space] “Enclosing the Cosmos: Privatising Outer Space and Voices of Resistance” *Society and Space,* 2021. https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/enclosing-the-cosmos-privatising-outer-space-and-voices-of-resistance JP

**Along with increasing interest from private actors**, **discussions surrounding the enclosure of Outer Space – and asteroid mining more specifically – has seen growing coverage in recent years, several countries having passed legislation to begin legalising and encouraging extraterrestrial extractivism** [5]. Manoeuvres to enclose the extraterrestrial common and begin mining operations necessitate the establishment of a rights regime to ensure any disputes over access and ownership can be resolved. **This opens a regulatory ‘frontier’ through which** issues of **land** tenure and **ownership can be thrashed out, taking on significance through its ability to greatly influence influxes of capital into these operations and mineralogical deposits (Bridge, 2004).** Through the regulatory enclosure of Outer Space, a regime of exclusion can be implemented whereby (il)legitimate forms of use and abuse can be differentiated and associated boundaries inscribed through physical and discursive means (Li, 2014: Steinberg, 2018). Private NSE actors have sought to influence these legislative processes through lobbying, advertising materials, press conferences, business forums, and public and private talks. This has culminated in a process of enclosure wherein similar justifications to past enclosures are mobilised and reanimated. **Once more, ‘production’ and the ability to ‘work’ a resource are becoming the modus operandi through which ownership over the common is being exerted (Wood, 2017), finding explicit articulation in the US SPACE Act 2015. The mobilisation and perpetuation of this discourse is coupled with the perversion of the common heritage principle. To refrain from extracting minerals throughout Outer Space is to (supposedly) ‘waste’ their potential and deprive future generations of the benefits this industry purports to provide (Steinberg, 2018).**

#### [Jones 2] This perpetuates disimagination that seeks to enclose the “elsewhere” for profit, similar to the Gold Rush.

**Jones 2:** Jones, Craig Henry. [Writer at Society and Space] “Enclosing the Cosmos: Privatising Outer Space and Voices of Resistance” *Society and Space,* 2021. https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/enclosing-the-cosmos-privatising-outer-space-and-voices-of-resistance JP

However, despite the enthusiasm of asteroid mining advocates, the proposed extractive industry is not unproblematic. Whilst the narratives surrounding asteroid mining frame this industry’s future as something certain – discussed in advertising material, websites, and NSE circles in the affirmative – there are still many unanswered questions. Aside from issues of technological and fiscal viability, uncertainty remains surrounding ownership, land rights, and whose future this industry speaks of, for, and mobilises. Due to **such uncertainties, actors with vested interests are seeking to enclose the Global Common of Outer Space, ‘opening’ the ‘final frontier’ to what some commentators** are **refer**ring **to as a modern Gold Rush (Cofield, 2016: Elvis and Milligan, 2019: Pandya, 2019).** This pursual of enclosure relies – broadly speaking – on the same underlying principle(s) as the enclosure of commons historically and lobbying efforts have resulted in these arguments appearing in legislation in several countries [3]. **These manoeuvres to privatise Outer Space rely not only on the enclosure of physical and legislative places but also seek to enclose imaginative spaces through the process(es) of disimagination. Broadly conceived, disimagination is a process that curtails our ability to think critically and imagine new futures through cultural apparatuses and public pedagogies designed to erase the multiplicity of historical realities that deviate from the hegemonic ‘norm’ (Didi-Huberman, 2008: Giroux, 2014).** Whilst this concept has been used in Didi-Huberman’s discussion of the destruction of concentration camp materials and Giroux’s work on critical pedagogy and civic rights, the process of disimagination is operating within and upon discourses of Outer Space, as I discuss later in this piece. These attempts at disimagination are not going unchallenged, however, with Ethnofuturist works disrupting the oftentimes de facto futures of Outer Space and asteroid mining. Ethnofuturism critically responds to the disimagination process as it combines the Ethno- (the archaic, indigenous, or cultural histories of peoples) and -futurism (deemed the cosmopolitan, urban, and technological) (Hennoste, 2012). Consequently, Ethnofuturism can be construed as a process by and through which histories that deviate from the hegemonic ‘norm’ are reinvigorated and mobilised to (re)produce alternative discourses of futurity. ‘Ethnofuturism’ here is used as an umbrella term that contains within it futurisms from a variety of groups and people. Examples of such futurisms include, but are not limited to: Afrofuturism, Aotearoa futurism, Cambrofuturism, and Sinofuturism. **The following discusses enclosure, disimagination, and Ethnofuturism to problematise these futures of asteroid mining**: **highlight**ing **how popular NSE discourses draw** up**on a Eurocentric rendition of a ‘Grand Historical Narrative’. Through this, we may begin to challenge the totalising concept of ‘humanity’ [4] oft-invoked by asteroid mining advocates and turn a more critical lens to these purported futures and the discourses (re)created to justify them.‍**

#### [Arendt] THAT’S THE ESSENCE OF ONE-DIMENSIONAL THOUGHT – the notion that space can only be used one way utilitarianizes the world, as people only value outer space if they can *use* it. This makes it impossible to find meaning in *anything*: if everything’s a means, nothing can be an end.

Arendt: Arendt, Hannah. [Political philosopher] *The Human Condition*, 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958, reprinted 1998. <https://monoskop.org/images/e/e2/Arendt_Hannah_The_Human_Condition_2nd_1998.pdf> CH

The implements and tools of homo faber, from which the most fundamental experience of instrumentality arises, determine all work and fabrication. Here it is indeed true that the end justifies the means; it does more, it produces and organizes them. The end justifies the violence done to nature to win the material, as the wood justifies killing the tree and the table justifies destroying the wood. Because of the end product, tools are designed and implements invented, and the same end product organizes the work process itself, decides about the needed specialists, the measure of co-operation, the number of assistants, etc. During the work process, everything is judged in terms of suitability and usefulness for the desired end, and for nothing else. The same standards of means and end apply to the product itself. Though it is an end with respect to the means by which it was produced and is the end of the fabrication process, it never becomes, so to speak, an end in itself, at least not as long as it remains an object for use. The chair which is the end of carpentering can show its usefulness only by again becoming a means, either as a thing whose durability permits its use as a means for comfortable living or as a means of exchange. The trouble with the utility standard inherent in the very activity of fabrication is that the relationship between means and end on which it relies is very much like a chain whose every end can serve again as a means in some other context. In other words, in a strictly utilitarian world, all ends are bound to be of short duration and to be transformed into means for some further ends.19 This perplexity, inherent in all consistent utilitarianism, the philosophy of homo faber par excellence, can be diagnosed theoretically as an innate incapacity to understand the distinction between utility and meaningfulness, which we express linguistically by distinguishing between "in order to" and "for the sake of." Thus the ideal of usefulness permeating a society of craftsmen-— like the ideal of comfort in a society of laborers or the ideal of acquisition ruling commercial societies—is actually no longer a matter of utility but of meaning. It is "for the sake of" usefulness in general that homo faber judges and does everything in terms of "in order to." The ideal of usefulness itself, like the ideals of other societies, can no longer be conceived as something needed in order to have something else; it simply defies questioning about its own use. Obviously there is no answer to the question which Lessing once put to the utilitarian philosophers of his time: "And what is the use of use?" The perplexity of utilitarianism is that it gets caught in the unending chain of means and ends without ever arriving at some principle which could justify the category of means and end, that is, of utility itself. The ‘in order to’ has become the content of the ‘for the sake of’; in other words, utility established as meaning generates meaninglessness. Within the category of means and end, and among the experiences of instrumentality which rules over the whole world of use objects and utility, there is no way to end the chain of means and ends and prevent all ends from eventually being used again as means, except to declare that one thing or another is "an end in itself."

#### [Jones 3] And threats of extinction DON’T outweigh – they destroy resistance to cap and prevent us from imagining any other possibilities.

**Jones 3:** Jones, Craig Henry. [Writer at Society and Space] “Enclosing the Cosmos: Privatising Outer Space and Voices of Resistance” *Society and Space,* 2021. https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/enclosing-the-cosmos-privatising-outer-space-and-voices-of-resistance JP

**The process of disimagination selectively edits the historical narrative, removing certain voices, modes of resistance, and alternative accounts, distorting the ability to imagine futures outside of the EuroAmerican neoliberal present [6] (Didi-Huberman, 2008: Giroux, 2014).** It is through the processes of disimagination that the condition of capitalist realism is enabled – a state of affairs wherein it is easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism (Fisher, 2009 [7])**.** Consequently, the futures curated, maintained, and promoted by NSE actors are structured through a white-ethnocentric rendition of history. **The resultant imaginaries and narratives implicitly and explicitly draw** up**on familiar tropes of white settler colonialism, such as enclosure, working land to produce ‘value’, and the displacing of indigenous/non-Western onto-epistemological frameworks, if not the people themselves [8] (Bhabha and Comaroff, 2002: Hesse, 2002: Loomba et al., 2005: Parry, 2002: Wilkes and Hird, 2019: Wood, 2017: Young, 2001).** Through imbibing popular discourses of Outer Space futurity with this history, similar arguments to past enclosures are made. Specifically, that **‘production’ and the ability to ‘work’ a resource operate**s **as the basis through which ownership may be exerted** [9]; extractive industries not taking anything away but adding something, and issues coming to centre upon not occupancy or fruitful use but relative value (Wood, 2017).

## Thus, I affirm:

#### [Advocacy] Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### [Jones 4] I defend the topic through Ethnofuturism, abbreviated “EF,” a method that emphasizes critical thinking by confronting colonialist capitalism.

**Jones 4:** Jones, Craig Henry. [Writer at Society and Space] “Enclosing the Cosmos: Privatising Outer Space and Voices of Resistance” *Society and Space,* 2021. https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/enclosing-the-cosmos-privatising-outer-space-and-voices-of-resistance CH

These manoeuvres to privatise Outer Space rely not only on the enclosure of physical and legislative places but also seek to enclose imaginative spaces through the process(es) of disimagination. Broadly conceived, disimagination is a process that curtails our ability to think critically and imagine new futures through cultural apparatuses and public pedagogies designed to erase the multiplicity of historical realities that deviate from the hegemonic ‘norm’ (Didi-Huberman, 2008: Giroux, 2014). Whilst this concept has been used in Didi-Huberman’s discussion of the destruction of concentration camp materials and Giroux’s work on critical pedagogy and civic rights, the process of disimagination is operating within and upon discourses of Outer Space, as I discuss later in this piece. These attempts at disimagination are not going unchallenged, however, with Ethnofuturist works disrupting the oftentimes de facto futures of Outer Space and asteroid mining. Ethnofuturism critically responds to the disimagination process as it combines the Ethno- (the archaic, indigenous, or cultural histories of peoples) and -futurism (deemed the cosmopolitan, urban, and technological) (Hennoste, 2012). Consequently, Ethnofuturism can be construed as a process by and through which histories that deviate from the hegemonic ‘norm’ are reinvigorated and mobilised to (re)produce alternative discourses of futurity. Ethnofuturism here is used as an umbrella term that contains within it futurisms from a variety of groups and people. Examples of such futurisms include, but are not limited to: Afrofuturism, Aotearoa futurism, Cambrofuturism, and Sinofuturism. The following discusses enclosure, disimagination, and Ethnofuturism to problematise these futures of asteroid mining: highlighting how popular NSE discourses draw upon a Eurocentric rendition of a ‘Grand Historical Narrative’. Through this, we may begin to challenge the totalising concept of ‘humanity’ [4] oft-invoked by asteroid mining advocates and turn a more critical lens to these purported futures and the discourses (re)created to justify them.

## Part 3: It’s Easy if You Try



#### [Jones 5] THE PRESENT ISN’T THE FUTURE – reimaginations are possible. The figure above is an instance of Indigenous EF, representing a challenge to Eurocentric futurity through art. Such forms of EF disrupt dominant, one-dimensional narratives about how space ought to be.

**Jones 5:** Jones, Craig Henry. [Writer at Society and Space] “Enclosing the Cosmos: Privatising Outer Space and Voices of Resistance” *Society and Space,* 2021. https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/enclosing-the-cosmos-privatising-outer-space-and-voices-of-resistance JP/CH

Despite the seeming dominance of the NSE discourses of Outer Space futurity in the popular imaginary and the apparent effectiveness of the disimagination process vis-à-vis these futures, they are not unchallenged. Instead, the hegemonic imaginary of EuroAmerican futurism is disrupted and challenged via the provocations and (re)conceptualisations offered through Ethnofuturism writings and artwork [10]. If we understand Ethnofuturism at its most basic – an imaginative process that engages the Ethno- (referring to the archaic, indigenous, or cultural histories of peoples) and -futurism (deemed as the cosmopolitan, urban, and technological) (Hennoste, 2012) – and accept that texts are not neutral but socio-political artifacts (Aitken, 2005: Driver, 2005: Kitchin and Kneale, 2001: Kneale and Kitchin, 2002: Fairclough, 1992: 2001), then we can look upon Ethnofuturist works that draw upon non-Western histories and cultural specificities as sites wherein – and whereby – the hegemony of the EuroAmerican onto-epistemological framework is agitated, contested, and refuted [11]. The ability of Ethnofuturist work to disrupt the normative discourses of Outer Space is described by Nalo Hopkinson in their introduction to the short story collection So Long Been Dreaming: Postcolonial Science Fiction and Fantasty. Hopkinson succinctly relays that: “Arguably, one of the most familiar memes of science fiction is that of going to foreign countries and colonizing the natives, and as I’ve said elsewhere, for many of us, that’s not a thrilling adventure story, it’s non-fiction, and we are on the wrong side of the strange-looking ship that appears out of nowhere” (2011; p.7). In **creating artwork that draws** up**on histories and experiences other than those embedded within the ethnocentric discourses of NSE imaginaries,** Ethnofuturism **operates as a powerful space wherein ‘traditional’ conceptions of extraterrestrial extractivism can be critiqued, frustrated, and reimagined** **(Quan, 2017).** These challenges are presented through multiple media, including art (e.g. Curtis et al., 2018: Tate, 2020), literature (e.g. Hopkinson and Mehan, 2011), music (e.g. Alien Weaponry, Indigenous Futurisms Mixtape (RPMfm, 2014), Mbongwana Star, Patea Maori Club), film (see The Walker (2020) for a list of indigenous short films and Clark (2015)), and much more. **Through challenging the normative discourse of Outer Space futurity – where** the **familiar tropes of history and enclosure are meted out once more – E**thno**f**uturism **offers us a means of thinking outside of this framework, asking and imagining what other futures may be possible and how these may be thought and done differently. E E**thno**f**uturism**, therefore, is a fertile area** by and **through which we may attempt to decolonise the future – both conceptually and in practice. It provides a space where**in **Eurocentric futurity – informed through a ‘Grand Historical Narrative’ that (re)creates** and perpetuates **a totalising concept of ‘humanity’ – is disrupted** and problematised**, asking whose future is being spoken of and for.**

#### [Sullivan] And EF brings different identity groups together – empirics prove.

**Sullivan, brackets in original:** Sullivan, Miranda. [Florida State University – English Department] “Ethnofuturisms Symposium brings in scholars for two days of discussions, workshops, and readings” *The English Department – Florida State University,* 2020. JP

The term “ethnofuturisms” refers to the ways in which marginalized groups are able to re-imagine their identities in society through various forms of literature and may speak to how they have sought to claim the future as a site of liberation and potential. **E**thno**f**uturism**s are often presented through the genres of science or speculative fiction, since those** each **allow the author space to use all aspects of the creative landscape to make a statement about our past and present. “This interdisciplinary symposium signals an opportunity for us to take stock of the important scholarly and cultural work that has made it possible to think [about] something like ‘ethnofuturisms’ and to grapple, more broadly, with the stakes [surrounding] ‘futurisms’ as a genre, politics, and mode of being-in-the-world,” according to the symposium’s website**. The topic at hand is multifaceted to say the least, which is why English Assistant Professors Frances Tran and John Ribó—who have collaborated with English Professor Aaron Jaffe in the planning of this symposium—have worked on this event since 2018. Together, they have created an experience that they hope will be engaging, interactive, and influential to all those who attend. **“[I]n many ways this symposium highlights specific literary and artistic modes deployed by writers and artists of color to imagine themselves and their communities back into futures from which they’ve often been erased or in which they** a**re often portrayed as the monstrous or inhuman other,” Ribó explains. “We want**ed to organize this symposium **to bring diverse scholars together to critique** and to analyze **these practices and** to **learn from one another.”** The symposium featured a slew of FSU faculty members and graduate students and others from outside of the English department. This includes Assistant Professor Jeannine Murray-Román of the Department of Modern Languages, Associate Professor Kristin Dowell of the Department of Art History, along with other experts from FSU, Tallahassee Community College, and the Tallahassee area in general. “We each picked one person [to invite to speak],” Tran says. “I picked Dr. Aimee Bahng… who I connected with through the Association for Asian American… I thought that she’d be a great person to bring in since I introduced her work in my graduate course on Visionary Fiction last spring. Professor Ribó chose Dr. Cathryn Merla-Watson, who specializes in Latinx speculative fiction.” Additionally, Susana M. Morris, associate professor of Literature, Media, and Communication from Georgia Tech, delivered Friday evening’s closing keynote talk, titled “Afrofuturism, Joy, and Resistance.” Morris’ work in the past has focused on Afrofuturism and its influences on our world through movies, media, and literature, along with other forms of communication. She related her extensive knowledge to some of the readings discussed over the course of the symposium, following a panel discussion on Ethnofuturisms as Pedagogy. Tran and Ribó appreciated the flow to the symposium, with smooth transitions between the many overarching themes and ideas that panelists and audience members examined throughout. At the heart of the symposium, however, were the discussions and ideas that are raised by the material. The attendees heard people’s input regarding ethnofuturisms, and the organizers encouraged people to expand their scope of knowledge on the subject.

#### [Minniyakhmetova] Next, EF provides an outlet to challenge dominant education.

**Minniyakhmetova:** Minniyakhmetova, Tatiana. [Institute for History and European Ethnology, University of Innsbruck, Austria] “Ethno-Futurism as a New Ideology.” University of Innsbruck, Austria, May 20, 2020. <https://tinyurl.com/7bkb9cd7> JP/CH

**Ethno-futurism became more and more popular. Nowadays e**thno-**f**uturism **is** widely discussed and interpreted.5 at the very beginning it was realized as a new style, and then later it was interpreted that ethno-futurism is a new direction in art. today, one of the main ideologists of ethno-futurism, Kuzi sergi, describes it as an ideology that is based on love for one’s own roots, people, culture, and language, with openness to the world. Genisaretskiy evaluates ethno-futurism as **a “post-national ethnicity”**.6 “an ethnic culture serves as a basis**, a source of creativity of the artist. The artist as an active piece of the cultural process interprets the tradition and represents the artistic/imaginative product to a society; the artist proves its value, the society perceives artistic interpretation and shows interest concerning the sources that brings demand for the ethnic cultures”.7** **The e**thno-**f**uturistic **movement has had an influence on** the participants of those festivals. The initiative to organize festivals proceeds not from above but from below, from **ordinary people, teachers, students, schoolchildren, and even from farmers. And this is a very large army of audiences, ordinary villagers, and school pupils.** It is the provinces of Russia. **This is the animating effect of the light of e**thno-**f**uturism**. “Activity of such creative associations possesses the great practical** and scientific **values in realization of national and regional components in education, in mobilization of intellectual and creative capacity of the inhabitants** of the region**, in solution of ethical challenges”.**

#### [Giroux 2] And dominant forms of education NEED to be changed – reading this in round is the way to create change.

**Giroux 2:** Giroux, Henry A. [Waterbury Chair Professor, Pennsylvania State University] The Violence of Organized Forgetting. 2013. JP

**“Against the politics of disimagination, progressives, workers, educators, young people and others need to develop a new language of radical reform and create new public spheres that provide the pedagogical conditions for critical thought, dialogue, and thoughtful deliberation**. At stake here is a notion of pedagogy that both informs the mind and creates the conditions for modes of agency that are critical, informed, engaged, and socially responsible. **The radical imagination can be nurtured around the merging of critique and hope, the capacity to connect private troubles with broader social considerations, and the production of alternative formative cultures that provide the preconditions for political engagement and for mobilizing democratic movements toward social change—movements willing to think beyond isolated struggles and the limits of a today’s operative form of predatory capitalism**.