#### Private and military appropriation of outer space has led to copious amounts of space debris that is only viewed through hegemonic ways. What happens in space affects terrestrial bodies; Racial Capitalism provides the appropriate explanation for the dilemma posed by the topic. The constant drive to hold supremacy in space leads to space debris that negatively affects racialized bodies on Earth. We must forefront discussions of racialized inequalities before we can fully understand our relationship to outer space, the Arctic, and global power writ large. Hunter & Nelson, 21
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Orbital debris are also risks in military imaginations of outer space. Orbital space has become integral to the modern military strategy of many nations (Hildreth and Arnold 2014; MacDonald 2007). For instance, the US military relies on satellite data for communications, surveillance, and weaponry deployment (Hildreth and Arnold 2014). Thus, the potential compromise of satellites via collision damage is considered a major threat to military operations, such that debris may be regarded as national security risks (Bowen 2014). Indeed, China's deliberate destruction of its own satellite in 2007 to demonstrate antisatellite weaponry is often foregrounded in militaristic American narratives regarding the dangers of debris (e.g. Hildreth and Arnold 2014; Imburgia 2011). Here, orbital debris are transformed into a foreign security concern—an antagonistic threat to the safety of US troops and citizens (Imburgia 2011). This threat is cast in relation to an outer space that has been imaginatively denied significance beyond strategic value (Klinger 2019). In these militaristic and legislative narratives, orbital debris are again considered in relation to the risk they pose to expected and desired operations in orbital space. It becomes clear that risk is constructed in ways relative to different actors’ imaginations of what “should be” or “should happen” in orbital space. Preoccupations with risk are also focused on the danger that debris pose to future exploration and endeavor. Beyond the aforementioned issues of uneven access, scholars have raised concerns about an imminent “economic Kessler syndrome” in which debris accumulation will render certain orbits “unprofitable” (Adilov et al. 2018). Orbital debris have also cast doubt on some speculative NewSpace endeavors, such as space tourism (Gorman 2020). Katarina Damjanov argues that the anxious mitigation of debris through legislation or a proposed “antiwaste arsenal” of “nets,” “lasers,” and “robots” (2017: 179) attempts not only to secure current assets, but also to “preserve the possibility of our extraplanetary expansion” (2017: 180). In this way, orbital debris are not only considered threatening in imminent concerns of collision in orbital space, but also present a risk to potential futures in outer space. Further hegemonic preoccupations with orbital debris focus on the risk they may pose to the ability to access or study spaces beyond orbit. Scientists have expressed concerns about how increasing orbital objects may impact astronomical observation. This is not a new concern, nor one that is restricted to defunct objects. As Rand notes in her analysis of Project West Ford—a US Cold War communications “experiment that culminated in the launch of hundreds of millions of tiny copper needles into space” (2016: 29)—astronomers have long been concerned with the ways that “industrial products and byproducts” (2016: 106) can obscure optical and radio observations of outer space. Recently, astronomers have spoken against the launch of mega-constellations by NewSpace corporations, which could increase the threat of collision and disrupt astronomical observations (Hainaut and Williams 2020; Radtke et al. 2017). This could “imperil scientific progress and humanity's access to dark skies” in the name of “technological and socio-economic advancements” (Massey et al. 2020). In these narratives, astronomers consider debris as just one part of their concern with the crowding of orbital space and its impact on scientific endeavor. This remains a question of risk and mitigation, but one that asks which orbital objects count as “polluting” within a geographical imagination of outer space as a crucial more-than-human fieldsite. Here, functional objects may be considered as polluting as debris. Inequality and Orbital Debris Despite their occurring “out there,” many materially impactful activities in orbital space—such as satellite launches, spaceflight, and space-based astronomical observation—produce social and environmental inequalities. Engagements with debris are inextricably linked to the modern market economy, rely upon racial capitalism, and perpetuate transnational environmental inequalities (Pellow 2007; Pulido 2017). The creation and management of debris objects and the placement and operation of their associated industries contributes to global economic, racial, and environmental injustices (Klinger 2019). In turn, these inequalities shape knowledge production and inform imaginations of orbital space and debris. The idealistic imagination of space as a common resource for humankind (UNOOSA 1967) is waylaid by global political economy and racial capitalism such that orbital space and debris cannot be removed from a consideration of the inequalities inherent in terrestrial life (Collis 2017; Pulido 2017). Many outer space activities require access to an upper echelon of capital and power, where stakeholders craft core narratives that shape contemporary engagements with orbital space and debris objects around hegemonic ideologies (Genovese 2017). If we wish to understand orbital debris in their entirety beyond such narratives, we must consider orbital debris in relation to geographies of global power. The reentry of Cosmos 954, a Soviet intelligence satellite that fell over the Great Slave Lake area of the Northern Territories in Canada in 1978, has been well studied (e.g., Parks 2012; Power 2018; Power and Keeling 2018; Rand 2016, 2019) and is a revealing case when it comes to considering inequality and orbital debris. Though no one was directly harmed by the initial impact, the satellite's nuclear reactor prompted a governmental effort to recover and dispose of the potentially radioactive debris scattered over 30,000 square miles (Parks 2012). Despite official reports claiming that the debris posed no significant risk to humans or nature, Ellen Power's (2019) interviews with Dene and Métis communities in the vicinity of the crash reveal that they have ensuing fears about lingering satellite debris and radioactivity. This has impacted their traditional use of the land, as “the Dene fish and trap in almost every square mile of this area … there is no place where the debris fell which is not used by the Dene” (Erasmus 1980, in Power 2019: 41). One interviewee explained that she still “washed all the berries she picked before she ate them, just in case there might still be debris resting on the plants” (Power 2019: 49). Such anxieties are compounded by an understandable mistrust of Southern authority and a lack of follow-up after the initial cleanup operation (Power 2019). The background contamination of the crash site, caused in part by routine toxic externalization into this region (see Hird 2016), has made it difficult to discern the exact source of increased levels of illness since the crash (Power 2019). Considering orbital debris in the context of reentry (i.e., not just debris in orbit, but that have been in orbit), reveals how they are defined in relation to place. Though Cosmos 954 fragments were seen as a potential threat to humans and animals by the Canadian government, this risk was downplayed due to the colonially imagined “emptiness” of the Canadian North (Hird 2016; Rand 2019). Official reports and media presented satellite fragments as somewhat “in place” in the Northern Territories—somewhere that “stoically and harmlessly absorbed the nuclear detritus of Cosmos 954” (Rand 2019: 90). Though these reentered debris did not fall in the Pacific Ocean—the usual destination for earthbound orbital objects (De Lucia and Iavicoli 2019)—the Arctic, the deep sea, and outer space are similarly imagined through colonial logics as empty and lifeless (Collis 2017; Klinger in Dunnett et al. 2019; Rand 2016, 2019). The impact of this colonial geographical imagination on the perfunctory American–Canadian cleanup effort was well summarized by a community member who asked, in Chipewyan: “Would the government have done more if the satellite had fallen in the middle of Toronto?” (Knight 1978, in Rand 2019: 90). For these communities, debris are not innocuous or trivial, but deeply out of place and ongoing threats to their lives and land (Power 2019). Responses to Cosmos 954 demonstrate how different actors carry their geographical imaginations into practice, as well as how these imaginations can perpetuate inequalities. Reentry events also draw attention to other externalities of the space industry (Gorman 2011). The material externalities of orbital objects are not limited to orbital space, and the terrestrial burden of outer space activities is not equally shared. For instance, scholars have noted the unequal geographies of rocket launch sites, which are often placed in areas inhabited by marginalized communities (Gorman 2005; Klinger 2019; Kopack 2019; Redfield 2000). The people and environments in the proximity of launch sites are at risk from toxic and material fallout, and the placement of such operations often follows the strategic, racist geographies of sacrifice zones (Klinger 2019). This refers to the geographical “pattern of environmental injustices in which low-income and minority populations are at greater risk of being exposed to health destroying toxic chemicals” (Lerner 2010: 297), often the toxic fallout of corporate or state activities. For example, the land that surrounds the Baikonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan is in ecological crisis following thousands of rocket launches, something that Robert A. Kopack argues “continue[s] [the] historical disposability” (2019: 560) of this landscape and its inhabitants. Additionally, Daniel Sage (in Dunnett et al. 2019) has highlighted the uneven labor geographies of the space industry, in which private commercial endeavors such as SpaceX rely on an increasingly nonunionized, precarious workforce. Understanding the externalities of outer space industries in the context of power and injustice is essential for postulating a departure from hegemonic considerations of orbital debris and their impacts.

#### Debate is no different. We think that what’s happens “out there,” external to debate doesn’t affect us here but it does. The arguments we make and defend have material consequences. A Heg disad or a China Rise disad may seem like harmless arguments yet that endorse covert forms of fascism that create material impacts for racialized bodies. We must look at how Racial Capitalism has infiltrated not just norms but also rhetoric throughout the activity.

#### Debate has become too insular and full of itself; only concerned with white sensibilities while protecting power and privilege. Judges, and debaters alike, must change their relationship to arguments and each other; focusing on normative interps crowds out discussions about privilege and power. Students should be allowed to kritik debate because the things we discuss inherently AFFECT debate; disregard “dropped arguments” if we win our top-level framing. Smith, 14
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Despite popular opinion, I think you should be rooted in the topic no matter what your politics, performance, or method of engagement is. Having a conversation about military force, animal rights, or economic sanctions provides unique moments for conversation that leads us to unearth scholarship buried in libraries and catalogues that inspire us each and every year. A lot of arguments on the January/February topic seem to be about avoiding or being able to initiate topicality debates to preserve the value in these conversations. What is seldom done in this search for the perfectly balanced conversation at the Tournament of Champions, unfortunately, is to question what do T debates mean outside of wins and losses? Even if a given topic is great, what does it mean for the individual competitors that might not share your subject position? What does a conversation mean and who is it for if it’s not accessible for the most disadvantaged students who find the time to compete? The conversations I’ve heard include people making bold statements about not footnoting structural violence who then destroy the names of non-Western countries and authors and amalgamate “Africa” as a country instead of a continent full of unique and diverse nations and identities. A development topic should be one of the best opportunities to learn about difference, but if debaters are going to continue to reduce both the topic and the debate space to a comfortable Western discussion of people who don’t have our geographic or national privilege, without including their voices or concerns on both sides of the topic, that should be up for discussion as well. No matter how wonderful your team’s interpretation of the topic is it doesn’t preclude linking that to the currents state of debate to shed light on the issues of power, privilege, and identity. They are already part of the conversation so we should both allow and encourage students to confront the apparatuses of power as they reveal themselves by engaging in radical speech acts that can expand our conception of what an argument even is. It is easy to get caught in the mold of debate, to be seduced by the wins, and to aim to reproduce arguments that are in “vogue”, however that isn’t a model of engagement that has changed anyone’s heart or mind. Debate has become so insular that when we say advocacy skills and education we forget that those are just buzz words absent a willingness to turn politics into action. Proponents of accessible debate invested in critical education should start to think of their politics as a question of praxis. Debate’s static notions of what it means to be topical (or even political for that matter) will fail students unless they can be allowed to grapple with those issues that are literally right in front of them. When I say “Activist model” I really mean that we should make room for students to practice the skills needed to activate their politics in the real world. Assumptions, performances, and discourses should be voting issue whether they indict the topic, an opponent, or even the debate community itself. Advocates who practice by allowing their contemporaries to garble the names of African nations, trade their stories and bodies like poker chips, and marginalize their voices in the process aren’t individuals I ever want advocating on my behalf. Portable skills start with how the activist chooses to engage in topical discussion or discussions of the topic, but their vision of a more accessible debate space itself. When competitors get settled into a room and ask me what I want to see for the next 45 minutes I tell them that it’s not my job to tell them. I don’t really care if they sit, stand, backflip, recite poems, or spread cards in and between every speech because LD isn’t my activity anymore, it’s theirs. My only job is to render a decision and remain invested and responsible for what norms I endorse for debate. A major requirement for making room for the activist model in LD is changing the way judges situate themselves. First and foremost, realize high school debate isn’t about you. Sucks to grow up, huh? As an adult you aren’t just some cool “first year out” or a point fairy but an adult and role model that coaches have left responsible for the care of their students until they can get back to their chaperone. That puts you in a unique position to support or break down someone in the middle of a tournament they hope to do well at or the end of their career. This is especially important in a world where students are trying to broaden the scope of the conversation and bring marginalized students into the space. If you are about to give an RFD to one of the few black or Latino students in the activity, think about what your words sound like in the context of a student who probably thought you were going to vote against them because of the subject matter of their arguments regardless of the substance of the debate. Additionally, we’ve got to continue to ease off the gas on the blip-spread debate. I think that there has been overall improvement but we can do better in the case of students who are advocating positions because of the value of that advocacy in and of itself. Sometimes truth outweighs tech, a dropped argument just isn’t true, and big framing moments should be used to determine if the line by line is even relevant. Finally, if you are part of a dominant group (white/male/ heterosexual/cisgender/abled/ etc.) students shouldn’t care that your sensibilities are offended-- that’s kind of the point. Since oppression exists, and I assure you it does, they might have something to say that you have never had to even think about because of what your subject position spares you from confronting. Unless their argument is “X group’s oppression good” then you have to embrace your discomfort and listen as the responsible adult in the back of the room. Calling out White Supremacy, Capitalism, or Patriarchy isn’t a call for you to die during the back of a debate round. At best, 17 year old students are doing analysis that theorists spend their life on. Getting the argument right is hard enough without having to worry about your feelings during a 3 minute speech e.g. talking about black oppression does not mean Jews never were/ aren’t in conflict with larger society . If someone defends a theoretical framework that says that the Holocaust was good or even ok deserves to be ejected from the tournament and their team, however you will be hard pressed to point to a mass of students who that defend identity based politics in this way. As a minority educator, my job isn’t to be nice or smile in your face; it’s to keep my foot in the door long enough to let more students who were never supposed to even know what debate was in the cracks. Debates may get heated, they get personal, and they can make us think about things we wished we could lock away (i.e., the domestic violence fiasco of Jan/ Feb’12) but we have a pedagogical obligation to make sure these very same conversations have a point beyond talking fast and winning shiny trophies students won’t care about after the first party during move-in week their Freshman year of college. Maintaining this environment, developing a space that prioritizes disadvantaged students, and sowing the seeds for activism, are comparatively more important. Supplementing the current model will have a lasting impact on not only LD debate for future generations but the students better prepared to advocate on behalf of those who cannot advocate for themselves.

#### Prioritize the racializing violence of racial capitalism over the spectacle of extinction - the universal humanity presumed by util calculus mystifies the bifurcation of life worlds and the devaluation that is the condition of possibility for extinction in the first place. **Farman, 20**
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This is the logic of terminality: A threat is looming over all of humanity, and if humanity is to be saved, we can’t be caught up in parochial issues! We must do everything we can to save our unique species, the only conscious life form in an empty universe–even if saving “humans” means having to save a few rich Europeans or Americans, for after all they too are part of our species. This was argued by Dipesh Chakrabarty, who started his career defending the subaltern of India and has ended up at the University of Chicago, propagating the Anthropocene argument and mounting a universalist position. In a 2009 article that helped popularize the term Anthropocene in the social sciences and humanities, he appealed to a “shared sense of catastrophe” only to justify a particularistic argument: “Suppose all the radical arguments about the rich always having lifeboats and therefore being able to buy their way out of all calamities including a Great Extinction event are true; and imagine a world in which some very large-scale species extinction has happened and that the survivors among humans are only those who happened to be privileged and belonged to the richer classes. Would not their survival also constitute a survival of the species…?”3 As the world gets mobilized around various imaginaries of protection, as power gets organized under the sign of survival, the old problem of the erasure of “difference” by the universal figure of humanity has reached a new apex . Ongoing catastrophes, signposts of the terminal, continue to produce their uneven consequences along the fault lines of race and power, although these get overshadowed by a defanged secular and scientific authority that projects the existential ticking on an abstract universal timeline. Yet, as one of my insightful students, Camila Salvagno, said in class: “There are different doomsday time zones!” For those in Europe and the Americas suffering from what *New York Times* columnist Charles Blow called “White Extinction Anxiety,” “existential threats” present with different symptoms and generate different diagnoses, prognoses, and planning than, for example, black and poor survivors of Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans;4 Candomblé practitioners in coastal Bahia; Indigenous nations in the Amazon; residents of small islands from East Asia to the Caribbean; Berbers in the dry mountains of northern Africa; war and mining survivors in the Congo; and so on. As the historically derived accumulation of wealth and power digs in to protect its advantages, we see phenomena such as the emergence of European eco-fascism as a real movement invoking the supposedly universal threat of climate change hazards to argue for the survival of Europe as the prime goal of humanity.5 Elite-funded white protesters in Michigan and elsewhere brandish weapons to clamor for the reopening of the industrial plantations of the ruling class. When people invoke or imagine the end of the world, they are generally imagining the end of their world as the end of the world. Despite the rhetorical power of terminality discourse, there is no universal human world that is going to end nor a universal humanity salvaged; rather, under the rhetoric of universal humanity liberals and conservatives, fascists and socialists, are mobilizing again to save particular “civilized” worlds from destruction. Paris, London, Shanghai… so many other forms of life–-nomads, desert peoples, forest peoples, hill peoples, people in voluntary isolation or marronage–are devalued, invisibilized, or already “socially dead” that they don’t appear in imaginaries of future human survival. If it is crucial to counter this devaluation, it is equally imperative to identify those particular worlds that hegemonic imaginaries are claiming for salvation. Those are the very worlds (racial capitalism, urban consumerism, oligarchic militarism and finance feudalism) that have destroyed lives thus far, and keeping them around with lower emissions is not going to help. It is imperative for a critical approach to the human terminal condition to mark the close connections in the West between whiteness, capitalism, and civilization as the privileged assemblage of survival. In the environmental and climate justice fields the consequences play out on the ground. For a number of privileged activist groups and NGOs, from the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) to the protest group Extinction Rebellion (XR), climate change has surfaced as a universalist device that swallows everything and comes to displace local questions of injustice in favor of the groups’ own plans for salvation. This has happened in many instances, including in contests over the fate of the Amazon rainforest, but let’s take the recent flareup between the arrivistes of XR and local activist groups that have been struggling for health and equality for decades and now see a large, well-publicized mobilization of white bodies *pretending* to die in demonstrations when for many of those communities the deaths and debilities have been all too real, for all too long. No need to pretend, no need to send bloody postcards from the future. From the bunkers of their Euro-universalism, these groups tend to belittle justice struggles as parochial. The white English co-founder of XR, Roger Hallam, has said: “Arguably, the identity politics of the last thirty years have been very good at furthering the rights of minorities . . . but it would be wrong to deny that it also has significant drawbacks, which is that it can’t appeal to everyone.”6 By contrast, he said, the problem of climate change is a moral, not a political matter. “The main issue is everyone’s gonna die in the next thirty years.” In the US, XR has even produced a splinter group, XR America, which explicitly has refused to engage racial politics. As one academic and activist said in a meeting: “They want to organize funeral marches for the species without dealing with the hard structural issues.” The figure of a universal existential catastrophe is repeatedly used by international aid organizations as well as more radical groups of environmental protestors to obscure local struggles. The logic even seeps into climate justice groups. I have heard many community leaders repeat, “climate change is the ultimate disrupter.” But in maintaining this logic, climate will always swallow up justice. It bears repeating instead that “injustice is the ultimate disrupter, climate change is its effect.” My Shipibo colleagues in the Peruvian Amazon say, “*No hay futuro sin futuro indigena*”–there is no future without an Indigenous future, a pronouncement reversing civilizational accounts of history and progress which left indigenous populations for dead, as extinct, remnants of a subhuman past rather than makers of a human future. Or as Alisha Wormsley’s now famous art billboard in Pittsburgh declared, “There are black people in the future.” The future is also a way to defy the present. There may not be a Planet B but there are many other possible worlds if only we could end this one. And so what if we imagined the future from the end rather than imagined the end as the future?

#### Thus, we affirm destituent power; destituent power is necessary to disrupt status quo formations of power, legal order, and how we understand space itself. Our affirmation is one of a "positive no"; that is creative in nature, opening up space for new social and environmental relations that fundamentally challenge the basis of subjectification. This is essential to disrupt "business as usual" and the capitalism cooption of democratic processes. Macro-economic and macro-political agents merely exist because individuals consent to their hegemony. Bougsty-Marshall 16
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Thus, to weave the necessary federated and transversal links between multiple, diverse political struggles or conditions against the mutilation of our planetary ecosystems requires affirming and connecting at least one consequence or element from each struggle to the other. These shared elements – e.g. practices, actions, tactics, slogans, communications, etc. – operate as relays between these entities, functioning as connections from which other outgrowths may flourish. The connections are made through resonant and complementary practices, by sharing a practice or acting on or through a shared consequence of a political condition. The critical emphasis is upon action, on adopting a practice shared with another political condition through participation in the practice, not inert subscription to a principle. Moreover, to establish mobile connections in a rhizomatic fashion is crucial for experiments in destituent power because, just as with Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987, 506) lines of flight, there is the persistent risk that the escape trajectory of the experiment may fail to connect with other conditions necessary for its creative development and thus may face reabsorption, withering, or implosion (Patton 1985, 66–67). Because struggles or political bodies are singular, the links among them do not result in a new unity or total identification – incremental degrees of identity are achieved as a function of the specific number of conjunctive mutual practices (Nail 2012, 159). The political bodies and their constitutive conditions and elements remain irreducible to one another, the bridge of a shared practice holds them together while keeping them apart in their differentiation (176). Thus, the rhizomatic nature of the formation maintains its affinitive, non-hegemonic, and non-identitarian character even through its sowing of subterranean and aerial connecting flows across struggles. This can be seen nascently and to a modest degree with the numerous offshoots Flood Wall Street generated, particularly in the global actions to block the flows of carbon and capital undertaken as part of #FloodtheSystem. Carrying along the spores of its aesthetics (wearing blue, its song, etc.) and tactics, “Flood” has transformed into a transitive verb of disruption, taking the polymorphous manifestations of capitalism sprawled across the globe as its objects. This viral diffusion is precisely the type of adoption of a shared practice or common participation in a consequence of a political condition that creates connections and generates the potential for offshoots, reinventions, and mutual transformation of practices and the conditions of the practices. And the greater the diffusion, number, and variety of the connections renders the network more robust, adaptive, and capable of producing hybrids of practices and irruptive conflagrations. Through the connection of elements with significant numbers of interacting individuals, groups, and movements comprising a dynamic open system that continually evolves, the network in turn realizes the potential for greater reflexivity and self-transformation through iterative feedback loops that can foster the development of even greater complexity among the network (Chesters and Welsh 2006, 105). In this way the political condition and space opened up by destituent power in which connections can multiply does not subsume or represent its constitutive differentiated elements in reference to a static grounding identity or organization and has no distinct existence apart from these concrete elements it brings together. It functions as a basin of attraction that serves as a contested and mutable marker around which political grievances, problems, crises in power, or any host of other heterogeneous elements nearing escape velocity from the tentacular grasp of the state-capitalist machine can conjugate and take on consistency. The political condition thus “acts as a mobile and flexible point or proper name like ‘Zapatismo,’ ‘Peoples’ ‘Global Action,’ or ‘Occupy,’” through which various collectives, participant-subjects, and practices, holding diverse analyses of microrelations of power, can interrelate and take collective action (Nail 2012, 121–122). Destituent territories can thus mobilize a marker or proper name, like the French “ZADs” (Zones À Défendre, or “zones to be defended”) which constitute an expanding network of autonomous territories proliferating within the cracks in capitalism and the state. These heterogeneous territorial struggles – ranging from resistance against grands projets inutiles imposés (“big useless imposed projects”) to defending urban political squats, and to which the ascription “ZAD” is auto-applied in many cases – have mushroomed across France and into other parts of Europe (Zadist 2014). As such, the cry, “ZAD Partout!” (“ZAD Everywhere!”), already acts as a horizon through and around which links can be forged as various political struggles (with their own conditions, elements and practices, and subjects) circulate and deploy relays fostered through their participation in this porous political space. In this way, destituent territories can come to form a plane of multiplicities with as many dimensions as there are connections among elements, while lacking a supplementary dimension unifying them in a representation or totalization. Seeds of an emerging rhizomatic network also can be seen in the movement towards a transnational social strike inaugurated by the call for “1st March 2016: 24 Hours Without Us! Against Borders and Precarization,” envisioned as a day of decentralized and coordinated actions and strikes, aimed at disrupting regular production and reproduction, producing communication among different working conditions, making visible hidden situations of exploitation, targeting the border regime and the institutions that govern mobility and precarity. (Transnational Social Strike 2015) Beginning initially and very modestly as a swirling eddy, the transnational social strike could serve to precipitate a vortical political event or condition that could function not as a transcendent cause but as a basin of attraction around which dispersed, concrete-singular struggles can circulate and transform each other, as well as the political condition marked by the “transnational social strike” through which they are acting (Nail 2012, 122). It could operate as a medium from which connections can spring, overspilling not only particularized geographic circumstances but also crucially producing transversal relays across often-siloed movement milieus and issues. This attractor, and the rhizomatic interplay of multiplicities it potentially affords, could enable heterogeneous elements to pass a threshold making possible a conjunction of their energies and generating a shared acceleration of struggles (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 142). To disable the dominant statist and capitalist relations that are global in scope and penetration will require correspondingly extensive and intensive networks of destituent power coordinating and conjoining their capacities for disordering and evacuating the political order of its power and replacing it with new interdependent networks. The coming communities born in the social wilderness onto which we walk out through the operation of destituent power will exist alongside and in the margins or cracks of the system, simultaneously subtracting their energy and rendering it redundant. Insofar as the state is characterized by its operation to create a “milieu of interiority,” to capture elements and interiorize them, a destituent power occupies the opposite pole (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 352; Patton 1985, 75). It is a process of exteriorization, of leaving behind the dual colonizing operations of interiority of the state and of the incessant axiomatic reduction of all values to exchange value by capitalism. In this way, destituent power is entropic vis-à-vis the established order, constantly degrading it and bringing about its decomposition. And from the resultant social cosmic soup, emergent relationships, decisions, and social forms can arise from the new configurations created by political groupings in their adaptive interactions and participative self-organization. For instance, units functioning in a decentralized, highly participatory and democratic manner are recognized from a collective vantage point as providing certain strengths – capacities for expanded interconnectivity, communication, coordination, adaptation, resistance to capture, etc. The advantages afforded by these practices are then reaffirmed in a positive feedback loop and, in turn, redeployed through the reflexivity of the network, which can give rise to emergent properties (Chesters and Welsh 2006, 101–102).

#### Fascism and Racial Capitalism are intertwined THUS THE ROLE OF THE BALLOT is to deplatform fascism. It’s not enough to address those that self-identify but hold rhetoric accountable. Normative debate suffers from the same limitations as political responses to modern day fascism; voting aff reanimates anti-fascist energies. Toscano, 20

[Alberto Toscano is Reader in Critical Theory and Co-Director of the Centre for Philosophy and Critical Thought at Goldsmiths, University of London. He’s the author of Fanaticism: On the Uses of an Idea and of the forthcoming Late Fascism. “The Long Shadow of Racial Fascism,” 27 October 2020, https://bostonreview.net/articles/alberto-toscano-tk/] Cgilbert

What can be gleaned from Davis’s account is the way that fascism and democracy can be experienced very differently by different segments of the population. In this regard, Davis is attuned to the ways in which race and gender, alongside class, can determine how fascist the country seems to any given individual. As Davis puts it, fascism is “primarily restricted to the use of the law-enforcement-judicial-penal apparatus to arrest the overt and latent revolutionary trends among nationally oppressed people, tomorrow it may attack the working class en masse and eventually even moderate democrats.” But the latter are unlikely to fully perceive this phenomenon because of the manufactured invisibility of the site of the state’s maximally fascist presentation, namely, prisons with their “totalitarian aspirations.” The kind of fascism diagnosed by Davis is a “protracted social process,” whose “growth and development are cancerous in nature.” We thus have the correlation in Davis’s analysis between, on the one hand, the prison as a racialized enclave or laboratory and, on the other, the fascist strategy of counterrevolution, which flow through society at large but are not experienced equally by everyone everywhere. As Davis has written more recently: The dangerous and indeed fascistic trend toward progressively greater numbers of hidden, incarcerated human populations is itself rendered invisible. All that matters is the elimination of crime—and you get rid of crime by getting rid of people who, according to the prevailing racial common sense, are the most likely people to whom criminal acts will be attributed. The lived experience of state violence by Black political prisoners such as Davis and Jackson grounded a theory of U.S. fascism and racial capitalism that interrupted what Robinson called the “euphonious recital of fascism” in mainstream political thought. It can still serve as an antidote to the lures and limits of the analogies that increasingly circulate in mainstream debate. As the Black Lives Matter movement has made clear, the threat is not of a “return of the 1930s” but the ongoing fact of racialized state terror. This is the ever-present danger that animates present-day anti-fascist energies in the United States—and it cannot be boiled down to the necessary but insufficient task of confronting only those who self-identify as fascists.