## 1.

#### Our Interpretation is the affirmative should instrumentally defend the resolution – hold the line, CX and the 1AC prove there’s no I-meet – anything new in the 1AR is either extra-T since it includes the non-topical parts of the Aff or effects-T since it’s a future result of the advocacy which both link to our offense.

#### Violation - the aff does not defend the resolution OR they are extra-topical

#### Voter for limits and ground - justifies infinite unpredictable aff advantage ground which overstretches research burdens while spiking core generics

#### Fairness - manipulating the balance of prep structurally favor’s the aff - people come to debate for different reasons but pursuit of the ballot is the only unifying characteristic

#### Clash - unpredictability destroys research accessibility and nuanced refinement - empathy and value clarification are key to fight dogma and create better advocates - turns case because precluding testing means the aff should be considered presumptively false

#### Any dissad’s to the TVA are neg ground - it’s: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.

#### No Impact Turn’s - Infinite prior resolutional questions and procedural issues bring into question if the debate should have happened in the first place AND reading it on the neg and switch side solve

#### Vote negative for deterrence - at worst agree with the aff and vote neg because I shouldn’t be burdened to debate it

#### Not specifying the actor and/or method of the aff is a voting issue - decimates core neg ground and nuanced method debates - Cross X is too late for the 1NC strat

## 2.

#### CP: I endorse the entirety of their affirmative except for their decision to attend this tournament and read it here. Instead they should have gone to ALIEF ELSIK EARLY COLLEGE RAM KNIGHT SWING.

<https://www.tabroom.com/index/tourn/index.mhtml?tourn_id=20870>

#### They use zoom – net benefit of better solvency

#### 1] Actual Ed-tech

#### 2] Scope You’ve already read zoom bad at Nat circ but local circuit debaters/judges will never have seen it.

#### 3] Uniqueness – nat circuit people already discussed about the ethics of online debate but trad debaters and novices either probably haven’t been exposed to the aff’s scholarship or joined debate after quarantine. That also turns their academic elitism args since nat circ judges are the types of hired teachers that you critique whereas local circuit judging is from volunteer alumni and parents.

## 3.

#### CP: Debaters ought to attend Grapevine In Person – perms incoherent since Joey chose to stay home

#### Solve their offense cuz no zoom fatigue.

#### They’ll say still uses tech but that’s non-unique since debate always uses tech

#### Their forwarding of the resolution and zoom solely to evidence its violent qualities is an affective investment in the violent norms of debate that they’ve critiqued---this ev is oddly specific.

Lundberg 12 – Dr. Christian Lundberg, Co-Director of the University Program in Cultural Studies and Professor of Rhetoric at the University of North Carolina, PhD in Communication Studies from Northwestern University, MA in Divinity from Emory University, BA from the University of Redlands, Lacan in Public: Psychoanalysis and the Science of Rhetoric, p. 174-177

Thus, "as hysterics you demand a new master: you will get it!" At the register of manifest content, demands are claims for action and seemingly powerful, but at the level of the rhetorical form of the demand or in the register of enjoyment, demand is a kind of surrender. As a *relation of address* the hysterical demand is more a demand for recognition and love from an ostensibly repressive order than a claim for change. The limitation of the students' call on Lacan does not lie in the end they sought but in the fact that the hysterical address never quite breaks free from its framing of the master. The fundamental problem of democracy is not articulating resistance over and against hegemony but rather the practices of enjoyment that sustain an addiction to mastery and a deferral of desire.

Hysteria is a politically effective subject position in some ways, but it is politically constraining from the perspective of organized political dissent. If not a unidirectional practice of resistance, hysteria is at best a politics of interruption. Imagine a world where the state was the perfect and complete embodiment of a hegemonic order, without interruption or remainder, and the discursive system was hermetically closed. Politics would be an impossibility: with no site for contest or reappropriation, politics would simply be the automatic extension of structure. Hysteria is a site of interruption, in that hysteria represents a challenge to our hypothetical system, refusing straightforward incorporation by its symbolic logic. But, stepping outside this hypothetical non-polity, on balance, hysteria is politically constraining because the form of the demand, as a way of organizing the field of political enjoyment, requires that the system continue to act in certain ways to sustain its logic. Though on the surface it is an act of symbolic dissent, hysteria represents an affirmation of a hegemonic order and is therefore a particularly fraught form of political subjectivization.

The case of the hysteric produces an additional problem in defining jouissance as equivalent with hegemony. One way of defining hysteria is to say that it is a form of enjoyment that is defined by its very disorganization. As Gerard Wajcman frames it, the fundamental analytical problem in defining hysteria is precisely that it is a paradoxical refusal of organized enjoyment by a constant act of deferral. This deferral functions by asserting a form of agency over the Other while simultaneously demanding that the Other provide an organizing principle for hysterical enjoyment, something the Other cannot provide. Hysteria never moves beyond the question or the riddle, as Wajcman argues: the "hysteric ... cannot be mastered by knowledge and therefore remains outside of history, even outside its own .... [I]f hysteria is a set of statements about the hysteric, then the hysteric is what eludes those statements, escapes this knowledge .... [T]he history of hysteria bears witness to something fundamental in the human condition-being put under pressure to answer a question.T'" Thus, a difficulty for a relatively formal/ structural account of hegemony as a substitute for jouissance without reduction: where is the place for a practice of enjoyment that by its nature eludes nanling in the order of knowledge? This account of hysteria provides a significant test case for the equation betweenjouissance and hegemony, for the political promise and peril of demands and ultimately for the efficacy of a hysterical politics. But the results of such a test can only be born out in the realm of everyday politics.

*On Resistance: The Dangers of Enjoying One's Demands*

The demands of student revolutionaries and antiglobalization protestors provide a set of opportunities for interrogating hysteria as a political practice. For the antiglobalization protestors cited earlier, demands to be added to a list of dangerous globophobes uncannily condense a dynamic inherent to all demands for recognition. But the demands of the Mexico Solidarity Network and the Seattle Independent Media project demand more than recognition: they also demand danger as a specific mode of representation. "Danger" functions as a sign of something more than inclusion, a way of reaffirming the protestors' imaginary agency over processes of globalization. If danger represents an assertion of agency, and the assertion of agency is proportional to the deferral of desire to the master upon whom the demand is placed, then demands to be recognized as dangerous are doubly hysterical. Such demands are also demands for a certain kind of love, namely, the state might extend its love by recognizing the dangerousness of the one who makes the demand. At the level the demand's rhetorical function, dangerousness is metonymically connected with the idea that average citizens can effect change in the prevailing order, or that they might be recognized as agents who, in the instance of the list of globalophobic leaders, can command the Mexican state to reaffirm their agency by recognizing their dangerousness. The rhetorical structure of danger implies the continuing existence of the state or governing apparatus's interests, and these interests become a nodal point at which the hysterical demand is discharged. This structure generates enjoyment of the existence of oppressive state policies as a point for the articulation of identity. The addiction to the state and the demands for the state's love is also bound up with a fundamental dependency on the oppression of the state: otherwise the identity would collapse. Such demands constitute a reaffirmation of a hysterical subject position: they reaffirm not only the subject's marginality in the global system but the danger that protestors present to the global system. There are three practical implications for this formation.

First, for the hysteric the simple discharge of the demand is both the beginning and satisfaction of the political project. Although there is always a nascent political potential in performance, in this case the performance of demand comes to fully eclipse the desires that animate content of the demand. Second, demand allows institutions that stand in for the global order to dictate the direction of politics. This is not to say that engaging such institutions is a bad thing; rather, it is to say that when antagonistic engagement with certain institutions is read as the end point of politics, the field of political options is relatively constrained. Demands to be recognized as dangerous by the Mexican government or as a powerful antiglobalization force by the WTO often function at the cost of addressing how practices of globalization are reaffirmed at the level of consumption, of identity, and so on or in thinking through alternative political strategies for engaging globalization that do not hinge on the state and the state's actions.

Paradoxically, the third danger is that an addiction to the refusal of demands creates a paralyzing disposition toward institutional politics. Grossberg has identified a tendency in left politics to retreat from the "politics of policy and public debate.":" Although Grossberg identifies the problem as a specific coordination of "theory" and its relation to left politics, perhaps a hysterical commitment to marginality informs the impulse in some sectors to eschew engagements with institutions and institutional debate. An addiction to the state's refusal often makes the perfect the enemy of the good, implying a stifling commitment to political purity as a pretext for sustaining a structure of enjoyment dependent on refusal, dependent on a kind of paternal "no." Instead of seeing institutions and policy making as one part of the political field that might be pressured for contingent or relative goods, a hysterical politics is in the incredibly difficult position of taking an addressee (such as the state) that it assumes represents the totality of the political field; simultaneously it understands its addressee as constitutively and necessarily only a locus of prohibition.

These paradoxes become nearly insufferable when one makes an analytical cut between the content of a demand and its rhetorical functionality. At the level of the content of the demand, the state or institutions that represent globalization are figured as illegitimate, as morally and politically compromised because of their misdeeds, Here there is an assertion of agency, but because the assertion of agency is simultaneously a deferral of desire, the identity produced in the hysterical demand is not only intimately tied to but is ultimately dependent on the continuing existence of the state, hegemonic order, or institution. At the level of affective investment, the state or institution is automatically figured as the legitimate authority over its domain. As Lacan puts it: "demand in itself ... is demand of a presence or of an absence ... pregnant with that Other to be situated within the needs that it can satisfy. Demand constitutes the Other as already possessing the 'privilege' of satisfying needs, that it is to say, the power of depriving them of that alone by which they are satisfied."46

## Case

### O/V

#### 1] Presumption - there is no relationship between voting aff and their advocacy or solvency – if online learning makes life impossible and techno capitalism is inevitable then self-reflection doesn’t solve anything and instead creates the same kind of “toy” activism games about fighting technocap that they say are bad which is cruel optimism.

#### Graphical user interface, text, application, email Description automatically generated

#### 2] Next – They also read both policy and K affs during online debate which proves that they think that both policy and activist discussions over zoom is good OR they link into their own impacts which is a terminal solvency deficit and a reason to reject their method.

#### 3] And we’ve done practice rounds on zoom before which proves they voluntarily use zoom and it isn’t forced

#### They also can’t stop reliance on technology

#### A] other ed-tech

#### B] People keep using zoom

### Mirrlees and Alvi

#### 1] Specificity loses them the debate – NSDA campus is a free technology that’s run by a non-profit body and isn’t the same “ed-Tech” giants that they say are evil.

#### 2] We’ve already had debates about the ethicality of virtual communication over massive Facebook threads before online-TOC. Independent silencing DA for ignoring the protests of Black Debaters and co-opting their scholarship.

### Reed

#### 1] Their method of violent discourse and frustration as solvency is toxic and useless

#### A] People with anxiety, trauma or unique coping mechanisms causes psychological violence and makes debate unsafe.

#### B] There is no causal warrant behind losing a round, getting mad and changing your mindset. Turn – People who get mad about losing just double down by drilling more or complaining about the judge screw.

#### Empirically proven – you lost on TFW to Adam last week but you still read zoom bad

#### 2] Online debates are good under gamer theory

#### A] We escape institutions and institutions by playing games with strategy, silly tricks friv theory and facetious impact turns.

#### B] Institutions are cracking down on critical race theory within education – NSDA campus debates are good because they prevent spectators and minimize the risk of surveillance. Means no UQ for their turns because education about activist theory doesn’t exist anywhere else.

### Disability Turn

#### 1] Being unfair vs people with learning disability guts their solvency

#### A] No self-reflection since I already view myself as disadvantaged.

#### B] pathologizes psychic attachments for people who use debate to cope stress like me debating even though I’m immunocompromised and have covid and literally can’t leave my room.

2] Virtual debates good

#### **A] exposure**

#### B] Accommodation technology

#### C] Campus Size

### Tech Disadvantage

#### Virtual reduces our carbon footprint by over 90%

**Trappes et al. 20** (“The Online Alternative: Sustainability, Justice, and Conferencing in Philosophy.” Rose Trappes of Bielefeld University, Daniel Cohnitz of Utrecht University, Viorel Pâslaru of University of Dayton, T. J. Perkins of University of Utah and Ali Teymoori of Helmut Schmidt University for European Journal of Analytic Philosophy, Vol. 16 No. 2, November 2020. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=361108>) JET + BMC

2. Three Reasons for Online Conferences 2.1. Environmental Issues We believe that it is roughly accurate that most philosophers are committed to social justice, inclusivity and have accepted the findings and recommendations of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). A result of this commitment is that some philosophers have addressed the moral implications of greenhouse gas pollution and the responsibility of governments and of individuals to act toward preventing, reducing and eliminating this pollution that causes widespread harm. An example of such an argument for environmental action can be found in John Broome (2016, 161): “Justice requires you not to harm other people, at least not for your own benefit. Since emissions of greenhouse gas do harm, you should not make them”. Arguments like this speak in favor of online conferences. The two models of online conferences that we present here are ways to effectively realize the moral argument for greenhouse gas reduction. In the absence of estimates for philosophy conferences, we can use those for science conventions to gauge their environmental impact. Burtscher et al. (2020) estimate the total carbon footprint of the virtual meeting of the European Astronomical Society to be 582 kg, roughly 3,000 times smaller than the carbon footprint of the 2019 in-person meeting in Lyon. Klöwer et al. (2020) estimate that travel to the 2019 meeting in San Francisco of the American Geophysical Union resulted in 80,000 tons of carbon emissions, whereas choosing a venue with the explicit goal to minimize transport emissions, increasing virtual attendance and meeting biannually in person instead of annually would have reduced about 90% of travel-related carbon emissions. Despite the existence of philosophical arguments for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, professional organizations of philosophers have not implemented measures to effectively reduce and offset greenhouse gas emissions that result from their activities. And thirty years after the first IPCC report, philosophers appear to do mostly business as usual.2 This is despite the environmental impact of philosophers’ research activities, and while forcefully objecting to politicians and businesspeople who advocate business as usual to ensure economic growth. Critics of philosophers would be right to label philosophers’ talk not supported with substantial measures as a hypocritical and glaring departure from professed moral principles. The two models of online conferences described here allow professional organizations of philosophers to close the wide gap between their public defense of environmental causes and actual actions. In addition to professional ethics, there is also an argument based on inclusivity towards personal preferences. Public statements of philosophical organizations show various efforts to be inclusive not just towards needs like childcare or accessibility, but also towards the preferences of those who have made principled decisions to be vegetarians and vegans. For several years, a number of philosophers have joined a growing number of scientists who object to flying to conferences. Some of them have self-reported on https://noflyclimatesci.org/. These academics are conscientious climate change objectors. The traditional model of inperson conferences is not inclusive toward them. To be inclusive toward these academics, and given the moral and justice principles to which philosophers are committed as well as the aforementioned precedents, virtual models of conference participation should be implemented.

#### The economic consequences of pandemic response would prevent many debaters from attending tournaments – online resolves this and increases access from baseline

**Trappes et al. 20** (“The Online Alternative: Sustainability, Justice, and Conferencing in Philosophy.” Rose Trappes of Bielefeld University, Daniel Cohnitz of Utrecht University, Viorel Pâslaru of University of Dayton, T. J. Perkins of University of Utah and Ali Teymoori of Helmut Schmidt University for European Journal of Analytic Philosophy, Vol. 16 No. 2, November 2020. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=361108>) JET + BMC

One of the many impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic has been economic. The measures recommended to prevent transmission of infection—social distancing, reduced numbers in groups, wearing masks, isolating when exposed, restricted international travel, etc.—spell disaster for the normal maintenance of many businesses. This has had ramifications for the economy as a whole as many are not working (whether laid off or on leave) and businesses have closed, many not to open again. For the purposes of this paper, the impact that networks around universities have faced is most salient. This includes students, staff, and the institutions themselves. The online conference format, we argue, may provide some relief to the monetary strains placed on universities given the economic impact of the pandemic, and will also be worth considering even in times of relative normalcy. Further, even in times of non-acute crisis, online conferences provide those without the fiscal means to travel an opportunity to attend and be involved. Many universities are reporting large budget shortfalls due to the recommended COVID-related changes in student activities. Just as one example, according to Lee Gardener (2020), “The University of Wisconsin system […] has estimated it will lose $170 million in the spring semester alone from refunding room, dining, and parking fees to students, and other unexpected expenses”. While each university will be impacted differently, there is no doubt that many universities will be impacted in this or similar ways. The impacts of these budget shortfalls are trickling down into the budgets of the individual departments, often resulting in the suspension of admissions to graduate programs. As of September 28, more than 50 humanities and social sciences departments in the US have suspended PhD admissions (Zahneis 2020). Largely, the justification to cut admissions has been to allocate what little resources remain to their existing students. While this paper is not about the larger effects of COVID-19 on universities, the point is that philosophy departments are likely going to be feeling a fiscal crunch for some time. This will potentially impact travel budgets: money allocated for both sending students out and bringing guest faculty in. Even small conferences often require many thousands of dollars for flying and housing speakers, booking conference spaces, catering, software, staffing, and social events like day-trips or city tours depending on the location (De Cruz 2015). Online conferences offer a way to alleviate a lot of the spending, and associated risks, that accompanies an in-person conference. Nevertheless, some costs will remain, including for staff, technical support, software, and potentially also reimbursements for speakers. To offset these kinds of costs, conference organizers will often require a registration fee which can be hundreds of dollars for larger conferences. For example, the 2019 Pacific American Philosophical Association meeting registration fee ranges from $90 to $290 depending on career status (https://www.apaonline.org/page/2019P\_RegInfo). Registration and travel costs are especially difficult for graduate students and early career researchers. Large proportions of doctoral students report feeling stressed about money on a regular basis (Kasia 2016). Even a domestic flight can be quite a burden for a graduate student, not to mention the costs of international travel, visas, hotels, and dining out. Attendance at conferences is thought to be a necessary component of career-advancement for early career scholars, so not attending has implications for career prospects later. Virtual conferences alleviate much of the financial burden, enabling attendance by those affected by financial worries. In addition to students, the reduction in attendance cost promises to be especially beneficial for researchers from low-funded universities or countries with little public funding for research, a condition that may increase in many post-pandemic economies, especially given the facts about university budgets discussed above. Virtual formats promise to reduce many of the costs associated with organizing and attending conferences, and thereby reduce the required registration fee. Indeed, lower costs and avoiding travel were overwhelmingly recorded as positives in the survey responses (see below), suggesting that this mattered greatly to the attendees of online conferences.

#### Extinction is the only coherent and egalitarian framework – prefer it

Khan 18 (Risalat, activist and entrepreneur from Bangladesh passionate about addressing climate change, biodiversity loss, and other existential challenges. He was featured by The Guardian as one of the “young climate campaigners to watch” (2015). As a campaigner with the global civic movement Avaaz (2014-17), Risalat was part of a small core team that spearheaded the largest climate marches in history with a turnout of over 800,000 across 2,000 cities. After fighting for the Paris Agreement, Risalat led a campaign joined by over a million people to stop the Rampal coal plant in Bangladesh to protect the Sundarbans World Heritage forest, and elicited criticism of the plant from Crédit Agricolé through targeted advocacy. Currently, Risalat is pursuing an MPA in Environmental Science and Policy at Columbia University as a SIPA Environmental Fellow, “5 reasons why we need to start talking about existential risks,” https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/01/5-reasons-start-talking-existential-risks-extinction-moriori/)

Infinite future possibilities I find the story of the Moriori profound. It teaches me two lessons. Firstly, that human culture is far from immutable. That we can struggle against our baser instincts. That we can master them and rise to unprecedented challenges. Secondly, that even this does not make us masters of our own destiny. We can make visionary choices, but the future can still surprise us. This is a humbling realization. Because faced with an uncertain future, the only wise thing we can do is prepare for possibilities. Standing at the launch pad of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the possibilities seem endless. They range from an era of abundance to the end of humanity, and everything in between. How do we navigate such a wide and divergent spectrum? I am an optimist. From my bubble of privilege, life feels like a rollercoaster ride full of ever more impressive wonders, even as I try to fight the many social injustices that still blight us. However, the accelerating pace of change amid uncertainty elicits one fundamental observation. Among the infinite future possibilities, only one outcome is truly irreversible: extinction. Concerns about extinction are often dismissed as apocalyptic alarmism. Sometimes, they are. But repeating that mankind is still here after 70 years of existential warning about nuclear warfare is a straw man argument. The fact that a 1000-year flood has not happened does not negate its possibility. And there have been far too many nuclear near-misses to rest easy. As the World Economic Forum’s Annual Meeting in Davos discusses how to create a shared future in a fractured world, here are five reasons why the possibility of existential risks should raise the stakes of conversation: 1. Extinction is the rule, not the exception More than 99.9% of all the species that ever existed are gone. Deep time is unfathomable to the human brain. But if one cares to take a tour of the billions of years of life’s history, we find a litany of forgotten species. And we have only discovered a mere fraction of the extinct species that once roamed the planet. In the speck of time since the first humans evolved, more than 99.9% of all the distinct human cultures that have ever existed are extinct. Each hunter-gatherer tribe had its own mythologies, traditions and norms. They wiped each other out, or coalesced into larger formations following the agricultural revolution. However, as major civilizations emerged, even those that reached incredible heights, such as the Egyptians and the Romans, eventually collapsed. It is only in the very recent past that we became a truly global civilization. Our interconnectedness continues to grow rapidly. “Stand or fall, we are the last civilization”, as Ricken Patel, the founder of the global civic movement Avaaz, put it. 2. Environmental pressures can drive extinction More than 15,000 scientists just issued a ‘warning to humanity’. They called on us to reduce our impact on the biosphere, 25 years after their first such appeal. The warning notes that we are far outstripping the capacity of our planet in all but one measure of ozone depletion, including emissions, biodiversity, freshwater availability and more. The scientists, not a crowd known to overstate facts, conclude: “soon it will be too late to shift course away from our failing trajectory, and time is running out”. In his 2005 book Collapse, Jared Diamond charts the history of past societies. He makes the case that overpopulation and resource use beyond the carrying capacity have often been important, if not the only, drivers of collapse. Even though we are making important incremental progress in battles such as climate change, we must still achieve tremendous step changes in our response to several major environmental crises. We must do this even while the world’s population continues to grow. These pressures are bound to exert great stress on our global civilization. 3. Superintelligence: unplanned obsolescence? Imagine a monkey society that foresaw the ascendance of humans. Fearing a loss of status and power, it decided to kill the proverbial Adam and Eve. It crafted the most ingenious plan it could: starve the humans by taking away all their bananas. Foolproof plan, right? This story describes the fundamental difficulty with superintelligence. A superintelligent being may always do something entirely different from what we, with our mere mortal intelligence, can foresee. In his 2014 book Superintelligence, Swedish philosopher Nick Bostrom presents the challenge in thought-provoking detail, and advises caution. Bostrom cites a survey of industry experts that projected a 50% chance of the development of artificial superintelligence by 2050, and a 90% chance by 2075. The latter date is within the life expectancy of many alive today. Visionaries like Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk have warned of the existential risks from artificial superintelligence. Their opposite camp includes Larry Page and Mark Zuckerberg. But on an issue that concerns the future of humanity, is it really wise to ignore the guy who explained the nature of space to us and another guy who just put a reusable rocket in it? 4. Technology: known knowns and unknown unknowns Many fundamentally disruptive technologies are coming of age, from bioengineering to quantum computing, 3-D printing, robotics, nanotechnology and more. Lord Martin Rees describes potential existential challenges from some of these technologies, such as a bioengineered pandemic, in his book Our Final Century. Imagine if North Korea, feeling secure in its isolation, could release a virulent strain of Ebola, engineered to be airborne. Would it do it? Would ISIS? Projecting decades forward, we will likely develop capabilities that are unthinkable even now. The unknown unknowns of our technological path are profoundly humbling. 5. 'The Trump Factor' Despite our scientific ingenuity, we are still a confused and confusing species. Think back to two years ago, and how you thought the world worked then. Has that not been upended by the election of Donald Trump as US President, and everything that has happened since? The mix of billions of messy humans will forever be unpredictable. When the combustible forces described above are added to this melee, we find ourselves on a tightrope. What choices must we now make now to create a shared future, in which we are not at perpetual risk of destroying ourselves? Common enemy to common cause Throughout history, we have rallied against the ‘other’. Tribes have overpowered tribes, empires have conquered rivals. Even today, our fiercest displays of unity typically happen at wartime. We give our lives for our motherland and defend nationalistic pride like a wounded lion. But like the early Morioris, we 21st-century citizens find ourselves on an increasingly unstable island. We may have a violent past, but we have no more dangerous enemy than ourselves. Our task is to find our own Nunuku’s Law. Our own shared contract, based on equity, would help us navigate safely. It would ensure a future that unleashes the full potential of our still-budding human civilization, in all its diversity. We cannot do this unless we are humbly grounded in the possibility of our own destruction. Survival is life’s primal instinct. In the absence of a common enemy, we must find common cause in survival. Our future may depend on whether we realize this.

#### Virtual conferencing raises research quality – turns the aff

**Sarabipour 20** (“Research Culture: Virtual conferences raise standards for accessibility and interactions.” By Sarvenaz Sarabipour of the Institute for Computational Medicine, Department of Biomedical Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, November 4, 2020. <https://elifesciences.org/articles/62668>) [all figures omitted] JET

Many researchers are unable to attend in-person conferences due to financial and logistic barriers (Sarabipour et al., 2020; Figure 1). Virtual conferences lower or remove these barriers by reducing both costs and travel times: they also reduce the 'red tape' (e.g. the need for visas) experienced by some researchers, and make it easier for those with disabilities or vulnerabilities and those with caring responsibilities to take part. Another advantage is that they have a much reduced carbon footprint (Sarabipour et al., 2020). Virtual conferences are also significantly cheaper for scientific societies to organize (Castelvecchi, 2020), allowing lower registration costs than in-person meetings. This enables a more efficient use of funding, since attending in-person conferences costs researchers an aggregate of tens of billions of dollars annually (Sarabipour et al., 2020; Row, 2019). Largely due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of online conferences has increased in 2020, attracting large numbers of participants worldwide (Figure 1, Figure 1—figure supplements 1 and 2). Virtual formats have improved conferencing using a host of audio-visual technologies to facilitate real-time talks, extended Q and A sessions, electronic posters and follow up discussions, training workshops, informal networking, brainstorming events and virtual industry exhibits. A number of conferences have incorporated virtual reality tools to create new conference environments, and apps and machine learning algorithms to match attendees of similar research interests into virtual discussion rooms, enabling networking and collaboration (Achakulvisut et al., 2020; ICLR Organizing Committees, 2020). Some virtual conferences were held for the extended timeframes (weeks instead of days) enabling participation of researchers from multiple time zones via live and recorded talks, asynchronous discussions and social meetups. Recordings allowed talks to be paused or rewound, a useful feature for those who missed details or planned to spend more time pondering a crucial slide. Virtual conferences have further increased structured archiving of and open access to abstracts, posters and other research materials. Live review and analysis of research presentations and other scientific outputs enabled wide ranging engagement between speakers and audiences globally (reaching 100,000 chat messages at a single conference). Virtual conferences can help researchers and scientific societies to meet more frequently as well and build long-term, inclusive, economically sustainable, and easily accessible communities nationally and globally in specific disciplines and across disciplines.

#### Independently, the new paradigm leads to acceleration of innovation

**Sarabipour 20** (“Research Culture: Virtual conferences raise standards for accessibility and interactions.” By Sarvenaz Sarabipour of the Institute for Computational Medicine, Department of Biomedical Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, November 4, 2020. <https://elifesciences.org/articles/62668>) [all figures omitted] JET

Acceleration of knowledge transfer, scientific innovation and progress Virtual conference platforms can provide better file sharing, data presentation, and interactive visualization formats for the speakers and attendees. For instance, the 2020 International Conference on Learning Representations provided interactive figures and animations (ICLR Organizing Committees, 2020), which are often not supported by the platforms used to host conference abstracts or peer-reviewed articles. The virtual format also allows participants to comment on and **exchange** computer **code**, workflows, and other interim research products while the conference is ongoing. Digital libraries of the abstracts, talks, slides, and posters further provide the opportunities to attend and watch the entire conference including parallel oral and poster sessions. This ability to share and present data more efficiently will accelerate scientific progress as researchers can immediately access new information that they can use in their own research. Further, virtual conferences attract record numbers of researchers from all continents and time zones (Figure 1, Figure 1—figure supplement 1, Figure 3, Figure 3—figure supplements 1 and 2). Researchers who have to cope with socioeconomic, geographic and/or physical limitations, and researchers with family commitments and responsibilities can all attend virtual events. Additionally, low or nil registration costs have meant that more researchers can attend multiple virtual conferences per year. This increases the number of people with access to new research and ideas, which will lead to more innovation in more countries compared to in-person conferences.

#### That solves covid – conferences have allowed scientists to group up easier and share research – Zoom has and will result in less time on Zoom – turns the aff.