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#### AFFIRMATIVES must demonstrate how they engage efforts to advocate the plan BEYOND hypothetical imagination – ONLY this model centers wake work beyond after-life of slavery EVEN IF content of non resolutional theory or black framework is bad it’s form signals spiritual life AND prevents ascetic tourism.

Shanara Reid-Brinkley 2020, “The Future is Black: Afropessimism, Fugitivity, and Radical Hope in Education”, Edited by Carl Grant, Ashley Woodson, Michael Dumas, https://books.google.com/books?id=SMHyDwAAQBAJ&pg=PR5&source=gbs\_selected\_pages&cad=2#v=onepage&q&f=false//WY

What lies in the wake" of competitive policy debate? How are Black debaters doing wake work? In the following section I take two examples from the National Debate Tournament Final Round to demonstrate wake work in competitive debate. Next, I ana-lyze the central argument in the final round characterizing the current clash of civilizations in debate and the ramifications of building community in debate. The final round of the 2017 National Debate Tournament was not just a com- petition, it was a referendum on the notion of a universal community and the structural exclusions and fairness issues that characterize the traditions and norms of competitive practice. Georgetown is affirmative in the debate and of fer a federal policy toward Alaska as an example of a specific proposal to combat catastrophic climate change. Based on the norms of competition, Georgetown presents a coherent affirmative argument providing an effective stasis point for fair deliberation of the climate change resolution. After the affirmative's speech Rutgers is allowed to cross-examine the speaker. Devane Murphy asks, “When is the first life saved as a result of the afffirmative]?” (2017). While Georgetown admits that a debate round cannot save lives directly, they argue that discuss- ing climate change policy is a valuable academic conversation. Rutgers then asks a series of questions about Georgetown's relationship as individuals to the people and places targeted by the federal policy they suggest: “Do you know any people in the arctic? Do you know any communities in the arctic? Can you name a family in the arctic?” (Murphy, 2017). While Georgetown answers no to these questions, they argue that a focus on debaters as individuals rather than the policy option they have presented is a distraction from the stasis point they have set for the debate. Using Afropessimism as a heuristic for engaging the resolution, debaters like Rutgers, reject any affirmation of the United States Federal Government. For these students, the federal government is always an unethical actor. In as much as the resolutional statement requires the affirmative to posit federal govern- ment action as an ethical response to public need, the vast majority of Black debaters refuse to take such a position. To combat this refusal to follow com- petitive norms, the Framework argument developed to confront the disruption of the normative form and content of policy debate competition. Framework debaters (mostly White and non-Black POCs) argue that if a team violates the norms of common practice they reject the normative stasis points for delibera-tion destroying the educational benefits of policy debate. Framework has operated as a strategic tool of capture and exclusion of Black thought in competitive debate. However, as "the holds multiply" so too does Black innovation. Rutgers' strategy in the final round took the form of the traditional Framework argument, but using Black thought to revise the content and turn it against the norms of traditional debate. Black Framework, Rutgers' strategy, argued that the affirmative must embody their politics and demonstrate how they directly engage in efforts to reduce climate change. Rutgers' argues that Georgetown is disconnected from their politics which is why they can advocate a policy that may affect the people of the Arctic while having little knowledge of those people or their lives. This kind of orientation toward policy action is dangerous, encouraging what Rutgers refers to as “ascetic tourism" by which debaters role-playing policy advocates “tour [the] trauma of various populations without ever acting to alleviate the harm” (Murphy, 2017). When Georgetown seeks further clarification of Black Framework, Rutgers' responds: "We provided an interpretation of what we think debate should look like, the same way in which when you're negative and you read my affirmative and you say we should not be able to do what we do. Very simple” (Murphy, 2017). Georgetown often runs the traditional Framework argument against Black Debate teams who fall outside their interpretation of a fair stasis point for debate about the resolution. Rutgers' turns the tables on Georgetown argu- ing that the traditional form of policy debate produces poor policy advocates and that Black Debate practice which centers embodied political practice is a superior method of training political advocates**.** Black Framework is an exam- ple of political theorizing from the hold. It operates from the perspective that anti-blackness is the stage upon which all political deliberation is played and then strategically identifies a tactic and an exigency for disruption.Rutgers capitalizes on the growing middle majority of judges who agree that Black Debate practice is an effective training tool for political advocacy. The use of Black Framework flips the script; it is a jarring (re)performance of the acts of exclusion that Black debaters have faced for decades. It took the form of Framework, paired with Black content, to argue that the neo-liberal norms of civil society would no longer get a free pass as the base frame for political negotiation. Rutgers turned a mirror on debate and offered a reflection of itself haunted by the specter of Black death. Arguing Black Framework was an act of bringing out the dead.

#### **Temporal Time DA – The After Life Of Slavery proves centering blackness requires** calling ancestral planes to map black space policy in debate to avoid psychic burn

Murillo’16 (John Murillo III. Quantum Blackanics: Untimely Blackness, and Black Literature out of Nowhere. Diss. Brown University, 2016.B.A., University of California, Irvine, PhD in Philosophy in Departmnet of English at Brown University)//Joey

Living,” “dying “and creating in the “**afterlife of slavery**,”3 the **undying, haunting** and **structural subjection** of Blacks that seals us into “crushing objecthood,” (Fanon, 82) is **to “live,” “die**” and create in relation to an **antagonism** that is **temporal**, spatial, and political-ontological in nature. As Dionne Brand writes in A Map to the Door of No Return, slavery violently disfigures time and space, creating a rift or “tear in the world…a rupture in history, **a rupture** in the quality of being [and] a physical rupture, a rupture of geography” (Brand, 4-5). Time and space shatter in slavery’s unending wake, such that slavery persists as an afterlife, framing and disfiguring the scenes of subjection4 we endure and to which we bear witness across time and space. My dissertation reads time and space in and through Black literature, and draws from Physics—from modern and emergent theories in quantum mechanics, astrophysics, and general relativity—to help develop a nuanced, unique approach that both merges my interests in Black Studies and theoretical physics, but also illuminates what I understand to be two, underthought— or uncritically thought of—fundamental features of being (time and space). On the one hand, it is as if time “shows no movement,” slavery’s persistence in “endless disguise” (e.g. see: footnote 3) throwing the idea of linear progress (read: temporal movement away from slavery) into **violent disarray**.5 On the other, it is as if all possible temporal movement and “all moments” in the antiblack world “somehow gesture back” (24-5) to this inaugural “tear,” creating a series of endless, **overlapping loops entangling** all of time with the time of enslavement. This untimely problem is what girds the longue durée of social death: that slavery creates a problem that halts and loops time **disperses the political-ontological position** of the socially dead across all temporal moments and movements in its wake. Blackness and Slaveness collapse into the same political-ontological position, in part because of a distortion, or warping, of time as we know it. Untimeliness characterizes part of the Black position, and this has consequences for the possibilities of Black creation. The second chapter, “Untimely Wor(l)ds in the Key of Love,” seeks to examine the kind of (literary) creation this “untime” renders available to Black folk. Animated by Christina Sharpe’s recent essay in The Black Scholar, I read untimely Black creation as a form of “wake work,” a kind of work in the ceaseless wake of Slavery that seeks to “care for, comfort, and defend the dead, the dying, and those lives consigned, in the aftermath of legal chattel slavery, to death that is always-imminent and immanent” (Sharpe, 59-60). I aim to unpack Sharpe’s conceptualization in order to examine how Black literature, Black literary work, inhabits the untimeliness of the “wake” and works from the Black position of that inhabitation. Kiese Laymon’s Long Division wields untime’s force while metafictionally meditating on questions about the connections between Black “life” and Black “death,” Black words, and Black (literary) creation. I read his text as asking: How do we write and string together sentences while Black in an antiblack world? And how does Black writing relate to the untimely relation between Blackness and time? I then turn to Toni Morrison’s Beloved, which provides an interesting set of questions about “narrative” and the way these stories never “pass on” (Morrison, 323)—never die, become ghastly and ghostly— are, or must not be, “passed on”—either avoided or dismissed—and must be “passed on”—shared, distributed, dispersed. The fourth and final chapter of my dissertation, “Dark and Black Matter – The Gravity of Being Together” turns more directly to what “making space” to perform literary “wake work” might actually look like. Specifically, I am guided by a question undercutting a comment Kiese Laymon left in response to a piece entitled “Masa, Massa, Matter” I wrote for Out of Nowhere, a blog cofounded by myself and Nicholas Brady: simply, “so much ‘we’ in your work.” The question was/is, “who, and/or what, is ‘we,’ anyway?” In terms of the questions raised and analysis contained by the third chapter, what is the nature of a communal space for Black folk—a Black space—and how do the Blacks that occupy it move, think, create, and destroy in relation to one another? What is at stake in that relation, that kinship, and what might it mean when considering the possibility of making time and space for Black folk, collectively, to do the “wake work” with which Christina Sharpe tasks us? Sharpe moves us through these multiple meanings, and we move through them at length, in order to demand at least the cursory dissection we offer thus far because the kind of deathly and untimely work that “wake work” encodes and signals is complex both in its form, and in the demands it places those/we who seek to do it. If “work” and “imagine” overlap as the verb that describes the movement and thought of Black Studies and Black beings, and if this imaginative work is a shaping or kneading of the unimaginable into a construct that might best be thought of as an inner working or mechanical element of some vaster, unimaginable machine, then “wake work” situates this unimaginable process and product spatially and temporally “in the wake” of the shipped, mourning, gazed-upon, shot-at, flying, swimming, and drowning Black flesh of the ‘variously dead and deathly.’ And it also characterizes this unthinkable imagining of the unimaginable as “disturbing,” and as a waking and woken “disturbance” of the “flow” (read: cohesion; linearity; progression) of an antiblack world. All this might necessitate a kind of impossible condensation, which is really a kind of violent collapse: “wake work” might best be conceived of as a simultaneously fleshy and mechanical **imagining** of **the unimaginable** while subject to the ceaseless, violent, and deathly force of antiblackness, animated by, in defense of, and, perhaps, with love for we who occupy the Black position. The ghost of enslavement, the multifarious “afterlife of slavery—skewed life chances, **limited access to health** and **education**, **premature death**, **incarceration**, **and impoverishment**,” litters the arrangements of bodies, practices, and spaces in the scenes of Mabry’s film: the crushing impoverishment experienced by everyone in the film; the limited access to affordable and quality healthcare, embodied by Anna, sick with diabetes, and Delores, devastated by lung or breast cancer; the limited access to education, captured by repeated reference to Kari’s collegiate prospects; the incarceration of Charlie, Kari’s aunt and Sammy’s mother, midway through the film. In all, we glimpse the ways slavery’s enduring legacy in rural Mississippi variably and multiply manifests in and around the lives of the Black folk who dwell within and beyond the frames of the film. What Sharpe’s analysis of the possession of kinship by the ghost of slavery demands is an attention to the ways this grammatical or structural haunting “maps onto,” or, more messily, becomes entangled with, the relational possibilities and problems of Black folk in and beyond the film. As the alternative that forms the answer to her critiques of work and thought that too easily accepts, if not completely reinforces, the singularity of a Middle Passage Epistemology, Wright presents “epiphenomenal time,” a more fluid time of the evershifting “now” she draws from philosophy and quantum mechanics. Rather than a straight line or arrow, epiphenomenal time appears more like “a circle with many arrows pointing outward in all directions;”22 presumably, the center of the circle houses the observer as the circle encircles the “now” the observer occupies, while the arrows move toward the many (possibly infinite) “times,” past and future, inextricably bound to the shifting “now.” As the differences between the two representations of time, in conjunction with the critique of linear progressivity, suggests, what Wright seeks to do is simple in concept, if difficult in execution: depart from the exclusivity of a limiting understanding of the relation between Blackness and time; seek out, or (re)create, and adopt a radically different conception of time that can account for “the greatest number of Blacknesses that are possible and viable”23—that is, that can be inclusive of a Blackness that is complex, multidimensional, of different identifications, histories, and origins. This is why, of the thinkers she credits with being emblematic of crafting analyses dependent on a Middle Passage Epistemology (namely Henry Louis Gates, Jr., W.E.B. Du Bois, and Paul Gilroy24) she aligns herself most closely with the latter who, unlike Gates and Du Bois, at least frames his understanding of Blackness as transitory, “rhizomorphic,” complex, and fundamentally untethered from the fixedness of a single origin, identification, or destination.

#### **Vio – They don’t provide us with wake work**

#### Their focus is bad – The judge is an ethical critic whose job is to open communal spaces of black care that create difficult debates that center questions of spiritual affirmation That’s best to avoid anti-black tools of violence. Prefer

#### (1) Black Care – plan-focus can never account for the discursive nature of Anti-Black – always footnoting black spiritual life in favor of hypothetical consequences, always subjugating black bodies to cruel hope by affirming a need for that psychological extermination of black spirit. Only vote on impacts you can control – ballots don’t pass plans BUT they affirm ethical models of debate which means Anti-Black exclusion always comes 1st and turns portability.

#### (2) Imaginations – their model of consequences rely on a Eurocentric model of temporality that rationally reads the world excluding the “irrational” standpoint of black futures which makes debate inaccessible to black bodies as a site of care.

#### **Default to competing interpretations – debating about debate is good. Reasonability justifies judge intervention which is intensified in the context of debates about debate. No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive. Reject 1AR theory- A] 7-6 time skew means it’s endlessly aff biased B] I don’t have a 3nr which allows for endless extrapolation**
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**They seal Russia within a Cold War box that prevents any possibility of solvency proven by the shitty Koffler tag on bombings**

**Crosston, ’15** [Matthew Crosston, Professor of Political Science, Miller Chair for Industrial and Internaitonal Security and Director of the International Security and Intelligence Studies program at Bellevue University. PhD from Brown; “NEMESIS: Keeping Russia an Enemy through Cold War Pathologies”; from Crosston’s academia page, <https://bellevue.academia.edu/MatthewCrosston>]//Nae

There have been numerous articles on the authoritarian strengthening of power in Russia and Putin’s backsliding from democracy throughout the 2000s. Russian positions and initiatives in Syria and Ukraine have been portrayed within media venues across the West as evidence of quasi-Soviet revanchism. In the midst of this there has been very little consideration of the impact of American positioning on the Russian perspective. This article examines that influence, whether it is the openly adversarial neoconservative foundation under George Bush or the Republican Party in general, the so-called ‘reset’ interaction under Barack Obama, or American foreign policy analysts and academics meant to be experts on Russia. What will be exposed is a fairly uninspired and non-innovative American policy that not only fails to consider Russian initiatives from Russia’s own national security interests, but aims to contain Russia within a continued **Cold War box that** not only sours opportunities for collaboration but **guarantees the absence of partnership** **in** important **global security** areas. The idea that Russia’s contemporary positions have not evolved beyond the residue of Cold War mentalities seems to be more a product of scholars and practitioners in the West rather than in the institutions of Russia itself. This piece examines the consequences of imagining Russia only as nemesis and whether the West is more responsible for this Cold War pathology than it is willing to admit. Unlike many pundits that have considered Russia a superpower also-ran since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, or even those who simply bristle at the idea of giving Russia a major global platform on international issues today, the fact of the matter is that Russia does indeed still matter: it will remain a key United Nations member; a new entrant into the World Trade Organization; a formidable military power; and a significant player with countries that overall tend to be unfriendly or openly adversarial to the United States.1 America, however, seems either reluctant to accept this reality and thus cuts itself off from creating new dialogues with Russia. There seems to be an element of purposeful disdain in the way Russia is viewed, analyzed, and engaged. Russia most certainly is not blameless and at times only intensifies its bravado, apparently in a fairly petulant display meant to encourage American irritation. Perhaps most disappointing, it will be shown that two of the biggest culprits in this process will be none other than the two respective presidents, Barack Obama and Vladimir Putin. This article highlights some fairly intriguing and balanced work being done on Russian national security positions and how American interests endemically conflict with those policies. Unfortunately, these works are not getting near enough attention. Instead there is a public American perspective that seems wholly committed to portraying all Russian initiatives in the harshest light. Whether that portrayal accurately reflects on-the-ground reality sometimes seems recklessly uneven. The raging and disjointed conflict in Eastern Ukraine will be highlighted as a critical case example, where an obvious line of thought has been pushed and trumpeted regardless of ambiguous facts and vetted counter-information. When taken in sum, all of these angles reveal what should be considered **a ‘Cold War pathology’** that **is** actually **emanating** most **vociferously from the American side** rather than the Russian. A final section will elaborate how this pathology, based on historical legacies, may carry stark political consequences far into the future, leaving what could be a major potential partner no choice but to be the enemy. Flaming Punditry and Cold War Triumphalism: Pushing an Adversarial Agenda There are numerous think tanks, both in the United States and Russia, which are deeply concerned about the state of Russian-American relations. Places like the Moscow Carnegie Centre or the Brookings Institute in Washington DC are regular go-to places for the media when seeking expert opinion and analysis. However, these centers have had a decided slant in allocating blame for the poor bilateral relations to the Russians, with the explanations ranging from the fairly simple to the rather mystically esoteric. “If America did not exist, Russia would have to invent it. In a sense it already has: first as a dream, then as a nightmare. No other country looms so large in the Russian psyche. To Kremlin ideologists, the very concept of Russia’s sovereignty depends on being free of America’s influence. Anti-Americanism has long been a staple of Vladimir Putin, but it has undergone an important shift. Gone are the days when the Kremlin craved recognition and lashed out at the West for not recognizing Russia as one of its own. Now it neither pretends nor aspires to be like the West. Instead, it wants to exorcise all traces of American influence.”2 **It is not difficult to find this Freudian popcorn political psychology today when it comes to ‘analyzing’ Russian positions.** It portrays the United States as the **victim of a global oedipal complex** when it comes to Russia: first Putin desperately craves daddy’s attention only to then defiantly and recklessly reject him, petulantly trying to run away from home. It is important to remark how most countries around the world would actually find it dangerously myopic and unhealthy to base its own foreign policy on earning the ‘approval’ of another country. With ease the far more standard approach to foreign policy formulation is to determine a country’s own national interests within its local security dilemma and craft an independent and fierce strategy that can best achieve its optimal goals. That normal process, ironically, is often described in America as a ‘shift’ away from craving attention to exorcising American demons. In reality there is no shift: Russia has always been about Russia, as it expects America to be about America, France to be about France, Nigeria to be about Nigeria, so forth and so on. What Russia usually finds so irksome is that when it does what everyone else does in terms of exercising global power, it is judged as psychologically unstable or deficient. What the American media outlets and think tank personalities fail to recognize is how much of this judgment is coming not from explicitly observable behavior or direct quotes from Russian actors but is placed upon Russia by the so called experts themselves as they push a decidedly one-sided interpretation. Russia is not supposed to aspire to be a copy of the West nor should it be allowing particular American influence over its policies. This is not said as anti-Americanism but rather as simple logic: America would never strive to copy another country and it most certainly would not allow another country to force-influence its foreign policy. So why should Russia? It is this very simple and straightforward question that seems to never be asked by what are otherwise august media institutions and impressive political think tanks in the West. Sometimes this tendency can reach near farcical levels. When Alexei Pushkov, chairman of the Russian parliament’s foreign-relations committee, received so much media attention here when he spoke about ridding Russia of dependence on America and even fining cinemas that showed too many foreign films, Western experts needed to recognize the absurd for absurdity. But they did not. Failure to do so is perplexing given Western analysis always laments the strengthening of Putin’s own presidential power system and decries how little power sits within the legislative or judiciary branches of Russian government. Thus, it is nonsensical to highlight parliamentarians as having real impact. But this happens often in America with no sense of diplomatic irony. There also tends to be a failure to focus Russian analysis through the looking glass of reciprocity. What this means is that current American thinking emphasizes how untrustworthy Moscow decision-makers are while completely ignoring the same Russian criticism lobbed back at Washington. President Putin openly and publicly discusses his lack of trust in American power and in the specific policy decisions emanating from the White House. It is this skepticism that supposedly forces his own lack of desire to engage the United States. There are simply too few voices at present in the West trying to analyze this mindset as a legitimate position. As far as can be determined, the only reason this is not analyzed more seriously is because the competing alternative – that Putin is untrustworthy and Moscow is the cause of all communication breakdown – is simply accepted as a de facto axiom. In short, if the United States does not trust Russia, it is because of how Russia behaves on the global stage and its untrustworthy history. If Russia does not trust the United States, that is simply Russian posturing and a case of political transference, wanting to blame its own selfmade problems on someone else so that it can avoid any accountability. The problem is how readily this is unquestioningly accepted and how few so-called Russian experts are willing to step forward and shine a light on such intellectual superficiality.

#### The goal cannot be the extension of the welfare state – the welfare state is a mechanism to overcome the crisis of capitalism that enables the realization of surplus value through transforming the lumpen into the consumer through debt or social welfare, or into commodity through carcerality. In fact, these processes cannot be separated – the goal must be not to redirect productive forces, but to sabotage them – anything short is the extension of state sponsored carceral capitalism

**Wang ‘18** Jackie, writer, poet, musician, and academic whose writing has been published by Lies Journal, HTML Giant, and BOMBlog, PhD African-American Studies @ Harvard, p.56-63//NAE

The Black Panther Party, Lumpenization and Automation In contemporary discussions of automation, there is rarely any acknowledgment of black Marxist theorizations of automation, such as those produced by the Black Panther Parry (BPP). The BPP was not only a revolutionary political organization, it was a political movement that produced many significant contributions to black political thought. Before the Black Panthers, few thinkers beyond Malcolm X had undertaken the daunting endeavor of both organizing the lumpen proletariat into a political organization and theorizing how and why the lumpen could be included in a revolutionary struggle. The BPP was also singular insofar as many of its leaders and theoreticians-such as George Jackson, Huey P. Newton, and Eldridge Cleaver-were former hustlers and members of the same class they were theorizing. BPP theorizations of the lumpenproletariat are somewhat distinct from traditional Marxist conceptions of the lumpen. In the Marxist view, unemployed people (the lumpen class) are essentially workers without work: a labor reserve that is necessary to keep wages down and weaken the power of labor unions. However, historically, they have not been considered a revolutionary class in themselves by Marxists because they do not control the means of production and are notoriously difficult to organize, as there are few social, political, and material forces that bind them to one another. For instance, factory workers are considered organizable because they share material interests (similar working conditions and a shared opposition to their bosses) as well as a physical space through which they can develop a workingclass consciousness and coordinate their actions. The lumpen class, on the other hand, is an aggregate of mostly de-skilled people who sometimes operate outside the licit economy. In Newton's, Cleaver's, and Jackson's postMarxist theorizations of the new capitalist economy, most of humanity (aside from a small class of technocrats) will eventually be subjugated by technology. This is a significant departure from the techno-opt

imism of Marxism, and the view that capitalism is a necessary stage in the development of communism because it catalyzes technological innovations that will reduce the human labor required to provide for the material needs of humanity. Supposedly this would liberate the masses from the enervating drudgery of alienated work and allow people to cultivate themselves through more satisfying activities. However, for the BPP, the lumpen and the working class have a negative relationship with technology. These thinkers predicted that rapid technological innovation would lead to a "lumpenization" of the lower classes, who would become permanently unemployable as automated production rapidly supplanted human laborers. For the BPP, black Americans would be the first to feel the negative effects of automation (as well as deindustrialization), though eventually chis condition would become generalized and affect all workers. Black Americans are what some might call "the canary in the coal mine" insofar as they are the first to suffer the consequences of political and economic restructuring. Newton writes: In this country the Black Panther Party ... sees that while the lumpen proletarians are the minority and the proletarians are the majority, technology is developing at such a rapid rate that automation will progress to cybernation, and cybernation probably to technocracy. ... If the ruling circle remains in power it seems to me that capitalists will continue to develop their technological machinery because they are not interested in the people. . . . If revolution does not occur almost immediately, and I say almost immediately because technology is making leaps (it made a leap all the way to the moon), and if the ruling circle remains in power the proletarian working class will definitely be on the decline because they will be unemployable and therefore swell the ranks of the lumpens, who are the present unemployables. Every worker is in jeopardy because of the ruling circle, which is why we say that the lumpen proletarians have the potential for revolution, will probably carry out the revolution, and in the near future will be the popular majority. Of course, I would not like to see more of my people unemployed or become unemployables, but being objective, because we're dialectical materialists, we must acknowledge the facts. 21 Thus, according to Newton, there would be a massive shift in class composition: as the working class shrank, the lumpen class would grow and eventually become the majority. But how, as workers are lumpenized, will the lumpen consume goods? Consumption, Cleaver argues, drives economic growth, and profits fall when there are coo few people with enough disposable income to purchase the products being produced. However, in "On Lumpen Ideology" Cleaver theorized that the problem of underconsumption would be solved by the state and the creation of a welfare system that would allow the lumpen to participate in the economy as consumers without participating in the process of production. Perhaps one could say that today the problems of underconsumption and the falling rate of profit identified by Cleaver have been temporarily solved (or deferred) by the creation of a debt economy that allows people to consume commodities using borrowed money. For the BPP, the technological transformation of the process of production requires the creation of political strategies and tactics that are responsive to the new situation. Since they were prophesying that the working class would eventually be demoted to the ranks of the lumpen, it was necessary that the lumpen class be the point of departure for their political theories, and that their strategies attend to the question of how the lumpen could be converted into a revolutionary class. For Jackson, U.S. blacks are-as former slaves and the hyper-exploited stratum of the working class-revolutionary because they have a "desperate historical relation to the violence of the productive system" that makes them more committed to uprooting the whole system, while the white working class would be more susceptible to neutralization because they did not have a fully antagonistic relation to production and thus could be bought off, as they had a stake in maintaining the system. 22 This antagonistic relationship to production also redefines how the People's War is waged: rather than seizing the means of production, Jackson emphasized the destruction of the protective and productive forces. He advocated destabilizing capitalism by halting production through sabotage, thus making the terrain uninhabitable for capitalists as well as unfit for capital investment. He writes, "The objective, I repeat, of the destruction of a city-based industrial establishment and its protective forces is to create perfect disorder, to disrupt all of their interacting processes that allow them to produce and distribute goods, and this can be done from within the process much more easily than from without."23 But sabotaging production also meant that the BPP would have to simultaneously develop autonomous infrastructure that could ensure, as the Panthers would say, *survival pending revolution.*

The last of Jackson's contributions to political theorizations of the lumpen class that I want to examine is Jackson's analysis of the function of prisons and prisoners as a class. When Jackson was writing Blood in My Eye in the early 1970s, prisons in the U.S. were in the process of becoming-but were not yet-majority black. In one of his letters he noted that he was in his eleventh year of being held in the "largest prison system in the world," but it was not until the l 980s and l 990s, after his death, that races of incarceration began to skyrocket, marking the expansion of a process that is now commonly referred to as "mass incarceration." For these reasons, Jackson's remarks about prisons are particularly prescient. There are several layers to his analysis of prisons and the prisoner class. The first and most basic one is an argument that is now routinely made by social scientists: incarceration has little to do with "crime" as such, but is driven by economic and political forces. Jackson wrote that in 1969, 87 percent of all crimes were property crimes.24 For him it was no coincidence that a disproportionate number of blacks were incarcerated and that "everyone" of the "thousands of prisoners" he encountered "was from the working or lumpenproletariatc."25 According to Jackson, law itself is a political construction designed specifically to manage "poor, desperate people like me."26 He writes, "Bourgeois law protects property relations and not social relationships.'' 27 His discussion of "crime" and the "law" attempts to denaturalize these terms and reveal how class determines the way the law is applied. "Crime," Jackson writes, "is simply the result of a grossly disproportionate distribution of wealth and privilege, a reflection of the present state of property relations." 28 In other words, socioeconomic conditions are what cause crime as well as what determine which kinds of activities get counted as criminal. In addition to Jackson's class analysis of prison, he also argues that prisons have a political function: they are one of the chief repressive institutions that make up what he calls the "totalitarian capitalist state," which he asserts exists to "discourage and prohibit certain activity." 29 In other words, prisons are used as an instrument of political repression. He writes, "Throughout its history, the United Scares has used its prisons to suppress any organized efforts to challenge its legitimacy-from its attempts to break up the early Working Men's Benevolent Association to the banning of the Communist Party ... to the attempts to destroy the Black Panther Party."30 For Jackson, all actions that threaten the capitalist social order automatically set the repressive apparatus into motion, which is why he believes that a civil war is the only means through which a total revolution can be achieved.

#### The first space race was defined by spectacularization of space. Americans latched onto space as a world-making strategy that expanded the carceral state under the premise of beating the Soviet menace in the cosmos. The space race is deeply entangled with the development of carceral power and carcerality in the United States and around the world, for example, the Apollo missions were funded by wealth extracted from black communities through policing, exploitative labor, and the War on Poverty. The use of space as a symbol of progress, exploration, and national purpose obfuscated racial and economic divisions and cohered an ideological understanding of white upward mobility and black immobility that encapsulates the Global South and blackness through a cosmic view of the planet.

Loyd ‘15. Jenna M. 2015. "Whitey on the Moon: Space, Race, and the Crisis of Black Mobility." In Montegary, Liz and Melissa White, eds. Mobile Desires: The Politics and Erotics of Mobility Justice. Palgrave Pivot, 41-52.//NAE

But Watts is a country which lies, psychologically, uncounted miles further than most whites seem at present willing to travel. (Pynchon, 1966) From the days of chattel slavery until today, the concept of travel has been inseparably linked in the minds of our people with the concept of freedom. (Robeson, 1988, original emphasis) In the 1960 presidential election, candidate John F. Kennedy invoked moon exploration to displace the salience of religious division by focusing on unifying issues, including the spread of Communism that was ‘fester[ing] only 90 miles from the coast of Florida’ and crises in family farms, hunger, and unaffordable medical care that ‘know no religious barrier.’ The real problem was ‘an America with too many slums, with too few schools, and too late to the moon and outer space.’ This listing of ‘real issues which should decide this campaign’ suggested urgent, yet equally solvable, concerns. The space race ratified a national challenge, suggesting that returning the gaze from this ‘new frontier’ to domestic problems was the next step for technoscientific progress. When Dr Martin Luther King spoke of the moon in 1967, he was a world away from Kennedy’s Cold War hopefulness (Jordan, 2003). He delivered his final speech, ‘Where Do We Go From Here?: Chaos or Community?’, to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) on the ten-year anniversary of the organization’s formation following the Montgomery bus boycott. Despite the gains of the civil rights move- ment, King concluded, ‘the Negro still lives in the basement of the Great Society.’ He went on to question the consonance between scientific and social progress that had seemed so central to Kennedy’s understanding of the nation: Today our exploration of space is engaging not only our enthusiasm but our patriotism.... No such fervor or exhilaration attends the war on poverty.... Without denying the value of scientific endeavor, there is a striking absurdity in committing billions to reach the moon where no people live, while only a fraction of that amount is appropriated to service the densely populated slums. If these strange views persist, in a few years we can be assured that when we set a man on the moon, with an adequate telescope he will be able to see the slums on earth with their intensified congestion, decay and turbulence. King concluded his remarks by asking: ‘On what scale of values is this a program of progress?’ (King, as cited in Gilroy, 1991 [1987], pp. 345–346). Spectacular Cold War images of space travel drew on and renovated a constellation of meanings associated with mobility that inform US national identity, including celebratory narratives of continental exploration, limitless possibility, and freedom. Kennedy did not see any conflict between mastering space travel and meeting domestic needs – each a concrete signification of American capitalist providence in the Cold War period. King’s speech marks both of these registers. His imagined telescopic view of the earth traverses an expansive scale of human possi- bility, but under Pax Americana, King finds that ‘common humanity’ is an ideological vision papering over the reality of grave economic and racial divisions. Even before a man (much less The Man) was on the moon, liberal and radical social critics alike were deploying a rhetorical device I call lunar criticism – ‘If we can put a man on the moon, we can do X, Y, or Z’ – to question US national priorities and narratives of progress. Liberal iterations of lunar criticism suggested that the gap between promise and practice could be bridged as part of fulfilling the national creed. Radical social critics argued that what appeared to be an incidental gap was in fact a racialized conflict. Reaching the moon began to look less like a virtuous American project than a white American project that furthered Black economic exploitation and abandonment. The space race as a spectacle of freedom and (white) upward mobility must be held in tension with the deepening ‘urban crisis’ (Beauregard, 2003). As both a powerful discourse and material geography, the urban crisis was constituted through Cold War investments in suburban housing, freeways, and defense industry construction, relative disinvestment in central cities, and through militarized, counter-insurgency responses to the urban unrest of the 1960s (Loyd, 2014). Yet, the interrelations between these spaces have been obscured through enduring spectacular productions of capitalist suburban hyper-mobility and ‘ghetto’ immobilization and backwardness (Siddiqi, 2010). As novelist Thomas Pynchon dissected, ‘Watts’ was another country to white Americans, represent- ing a psychological distance that white Americans were disinclined to travel. This chapter situates radical iterations of lunar criticism within the context of urban crisis and on the cusp of what Jodi Melamed, following Howard Winant, calls the post-World War II ‘racial break’ after which ‘state-recognized US antiracisms replaced white supremacy as the chief ideological mode for making the inequalities that global capitalism generated appear necessary, natural, or fair’ (Melamed, 2011, p. xvi). By contrast, race-radical antiracisms ‘have made visible the continued racialized historical development of capitalism and have persistently foregrounded antiracist visions incompatible with liberal political solutions to destructively uneven global social-material relations’ (p. xvii). In the spectacular treatment of urban uprisings, the space called the ‘ghetto’ ideologically and tactically cohered the problems of urban crisis, which were actually metropolitan (urban-suburban) in form and imperial in process. To develop this argument, I analyze the work of Gil Scott-Heron whose poetry, songs, and writing exemplify the race-radical tradition. His poem ‘Whitey on the Moon’ delivers a radical antiracist critique of the US space program that ties otherworldly investments to ongoing histories of Black forced im/mobility and immiseration. To that end, this essay responds to the call within the new mobilities scholar- ship to examine the ‘role of past mobilities in the present constitution of modern notions of security, identity and citizenship’ (Cresswell, 2012, p. 646). I begin by situating mobilities within post-war militarized spectacle and racial politics. I then move to an analysis of how race-radical lunar criticism grappled with the dialectics of urban crisis, which included the simultaneous deployment of rhetorics of mobility and new means of social control and state power. I conclude by exploring how Scott-Heron’s race-radical vision offers insights into contemporary mobilizations for mobility justice. Cold War spectacles of (upward) mobility What sort of national spectacle was the moon when King spoke? Spectacle tends to be understood as an ideological mask or distortion of reality, but Shiloh Krupar usefully conceptualizes spectacle as ‘a tactical ontology – meaning a truth-telling, world-making strategy’ (2013, p. 10). Indeed, in Blank Spots on the Map (2009), Trevor Paglen shows how NASA was the visible institutional face of an expansive and largely secret Cold War military geography. Krupar and Paglen show how US militarization has developed through institutional apparatuses and personnel that create a world of plausible appearances. Visuality and material landscapes are interconnected such that hypervisibility (that is, the space race) is a technological apparatus simultaneously creating unseen spaces of waste and sacrifice. Thus, spectacle is a tool of reification and division that works by disconnecting spaces and categories – delineating human from nature, valued from abjected – that are actually produced together. Caren Kaplan’s work on the visual logic of modern war-making connects such spectacles to the mobility of states and imperial citizens. Air power is an iteration of the cosmic view, a ‘unifying gaze of an omniscient viewer of the globe from a distance’ (Kaplan, 2006, p. 401). Kaplan ties this viewpoint – which claims universality, neutrality, and freedom ‘from bounded embeddedness on earth’ – to Euro-American colonization (Kaplan, 2006, p. 402; also see Cosgrove, 1994). Modern military ‘air power is seamlessly linked to the cosmic view through its requirements for a unified, universal map of the globe that places the home nation at the center on the ground and proposes an extension of this home to the space above it, limitlessly’ (Kaplan, 2006, p. 402). The upshot, according to Kaplan, is that the mobility of air power simultaneously produces an imagination of fixed sovereign territories. Indeed, for Kaplan, modern war is paradoxical in that it ‘requires the movements of large armies and instigates the mass displacement of refugees, yet it also polices borders and limits freedom of movement’ (p. 396). I take these theories of spectacle to suggest that the Cold War space race produced a modern, white, upwardly mobile subject that obscured the simultaneous co-production of an immobilized, unfree population confined to a knowable, tactical domestic space. That is, the militarization of the ‘cosmic view’ facilitates not only abstract targets of foreign war, but also targets of domestic state and state-sanctioned violence and confinement. The militarized logic of the ‘home front’ both coercively compels a patriotic citizen subject and obscures the racial, gender, class, and other social divides within the nation that belie the state’s claim to national unity (Lutz 2002; Young 2003; Loyd 2011). As the United States faced vulnerability to charges of racism during the Cold War, a cultural project of racial liberalism enabling mobility of the US empire would simultaneously entail efforts to confine Black mobility and dissident thought. For example, Rachel Buff (2008) shows how the US government deployed the terror of deportation as a means of disrupting political organizing. In the immediate post-World War II era, both W. E. B. Du Bois and Paul Robeson were barred from foreign travel for their views on peace, nuclear abolition, and decolonization (Kinchy, 2009; Robeson, 1988). The experience, no doubt, contributed to the observation that the Robeson epigraph makes on the race-radical desire for free mobility. Race-radical lunar criticism The United States would not make its lunar touch down until 1969 (after Kennedy’s and King’s assassinations), but King found a moon landing a more plausible future than a Second Reconstruction. And it was more plausible. By the time of his speech, long, hot summers of urban uprisings punctured the image of freedom and opportunity that the United States projected around the world. Moreover, the War on Poverty, while less than three years old, was virtually dead letter. The 1966 midterm elections ushered in legislators who claimed a mandate to terminate the War on Poverty and urban social investments. The ‘great rat debate’ of 1967 captured the level of political polarization as Congress quibbled over a miserly sum of ‘no more than $16.5 million to combat rodent infestations in ghetto neighborhoods.’ A year later, the Los Angeles Times observed, ‘[r]ats are still coexisting with the poor as comfortably as ever’ (Abramson, 1968). It is within this context that Gil Scott-Heron’s ‘Whitey on the Moon’ makes landing in 1970 on his first album, Small Talk at 125th and Lennox. The poem’s narrative arc is wryly humorous and brief, delivered in less than two minutes, with a simple drum accompaniment common in street poetry. Scott-Heron tells the story of sister Nell, who has been attacked by a rat even as Neil Armstrong lands on the moon: A rat done bit my sister Nell with Whitey on the moon. Her face and arms began to swell and Whitey’s on the moon. I can’t pay no doctor bills, but Whitey’s on the moon. Ten years from now I’ll be payin’ still while Whitey’s on the moon. Debts for Nell’s medical treatment, which would not have been incurred were there basic tenant rights and public health investments, will extend into the foreseeable future as costs for rent, food, and taxes will continue to rise to pay for the voyage. The final line of the song offers a sardonic resolution to the outlandish situation. When the next doctor bills arrive, he will forward them ‘air mail special to Whitey on the moon.’ Marvin Gaye’s 1971 song ‘Inner City Blues (Make Me Wanna Holler)’ likewise links high taxes and inflation to an imperial project that results in the devastation of Black lives: ‘Markets, moon shots, spend it on the have-nots/Money, we make it, ‘fore we see it, you take it.’ Scott-Heron and Gaye flip racist narratives of the welfare queen as responsible for poverty, naming instead state neglect and the theft of Black wealth. Their songs reclaim the value being appropriated to a desirable national project that denies it rests on Black expropriation and death. In this reading, the moon counters temporalities and spatialities of racial liberalism that rendered white supremacy as historical and anachronistic by insisting that American white supremacy is part of the modern geopolitical order. Visual artist Faith Ringgold also depicted this reality in her 1969 paint- ing of an American flag entitled ‘Flag for the Moon: Die Nigger.’ The word ‘die’ reads across the block of stars in the flag’s upper left corner. The stripes of the flag are formed by elongated black letters aligned from the bottom to the top edge of the flag, spelling out the word ‘nigger’ between the customary 13 red stripes. The painting’s message is three-fold: the use of black paint in place of white draws attention to the negative space between the lines to illustrate the tense interrelation between the invis- ibility of white supremacy and Black people to the history of the United States. Ringgold indicts the act of placing the flag on the moon as sending a spectacular message underscoring the abandonment of Black needs. Yet, the painting’s reference to H. Rap Brown’s Die, Nigger, Die! suggests the immediate tension between structural racism and the possibility for liberatory Black politics and identity (Patton, 1998, p. 198). ‘Whitey on the Moon’ is often cited as an expression of afrofuturism, which Mark Dery defines as a genre of Black social thought concern- ing ‘culture, technology, and things to come’ (Dery, as cited in Nelson, 2002, p. 9). For Kodwo Eshun, afrofuturism provides a ‘resource for speculation’ that traces the ‘potentiality of space and distance within the high-pressure zone of perpetual racial hostility’ (Eshun, 2003, p. 299). He explains that afrofuturism ‘uses extraterrestriality as a hyper- bolic trope to explore the historical terms, the everyday implications of forcibly imposed dislocation, and the constitution of Black Atlantic subjectivities: from slave to negro to coloured...to black to African to African American’ (pp. 298–299). In an afrofuturist reading, radical lunar criticism uses the vast physi- cal distance of the earth to the moon to imagine alternative futures to the gaping racial divides in earthly living conditions and well-being. As Stevphen Shukaitis suggests, ‘the imaginal machine based around space imagery is made possible by its literal impossibility. In the sense that this possibility cannot be contained or limited, it becomes an assemblage for the grounding of a political reality that is not contained but opens up to other possible futures that are not foreclosed through their pre-given definition’ (2009, p.107). Given the coloniality of the cosmic view and the simultaneous construction of Black ‘placelessness and constraint’ (McKittrick, 2011, p. 948), I suggest that Scott-Heron’s lunar criticism is not so much concerned with the otherworldly as a space for imagining the earthly impossible, but for assembling earthly sites of decolonization and liberation. Scott-Heron’s race-radical critique explores what Katherine McKittrick calls ‘spaces of encounter that hold in them useful anticolonial practices and narratives’ (2011, p. 950). He offers a theory of militarized spectacle in which juxtaposition, or division, falls way to connection, to shared production. He shows how a landscape of rat-infested housing produces the man on the moon – through taxes and a vanishing horizon of medical debt – and names the spectacle obscuring this process ‘Whitey.’ In contrast to liberal iterations of lunar criticism, which suggested that solving poverty was possible within the terms of American capitalism, Scott-Heron linked American capitalism to the production of poverty, militarism, environmental devastation, and human abandonment. These themes found in ‘Whitey on the Moon’ are consistent across his work, and include persistent criticism of spectacular popular culture and consumerism, war and state violence (‘No Knock,’ ‘King Alfred’s Plan,’ ‘Did You Hear What They Said?,’ ‘H20 Gate Blues,’ ‘B Movie’), concern for children’s well being (‘Speed Kills,’ ‘Who Will Save the Children?’), the threat of nuclear destruction and climate change (‘We Almost Lost Detroit,’ ‘South Carolina (Barnwell),’ ‘Spacesong’), drugs and habituation to other people’s suffering (‘Billy Green Is Dead,’ ‘Angel Dust,’ ‘Home is Where the Hatred Is’), and structural unemployment (‘Who Will Pay Reparations on My Soul?’). Scott-Heron’s poems link histories of forced mobility to the development of blues consciousness and revolution, exemplifying what Clyde Woods (2000) calls a ‘blues epistemology.’ Indeed, Scott-Heron described himself as a ‘bluesologist’ (Ward, 2011), pursuing the science of the blues, offering a diagnostic that the ‘I ain’t got no money blues, I ain’t got no job blues, I ain’t got no woman blues’ are the same things (Mugge, 1982). For Woods, the blues ‘has been used repeatedly by multiple genera- tions of working-class African Americans to organize communities of consciousness....It was used to confront the daily efforts of plantation powers to erase African American leadership and the memory of social progress. ... The blues and its extensions are actively engaged in providing intellectually brutal confrontations with the “truths” of working-class African American life. It draws on African American musical practices, folklore, and spirituality to re-organize and give a new voice to working- class communities facing severe fragmentation’ (2005, p. 1008). The economic and racial forces of displacement and fragmentation were not distant from Scott-Heron. He was born in Chicago and spent much of his childhood living with his grandmother in the small town of Jackson, Tennessee. He saw the African American section of Jackson demolished to build the new highway between Memphis and Nashville before moving at the age of 13 with his mother to New York City (Scott- Heron, 2012). They first lived with his uncle in the Bronx and later in the Robert Fulton Houses in Chelsea. From there, he rode the subway for over an hour to Fieldston, a private high school in the Bronx. After his first year of college at Lincoln University in Oxford, Pennsylvania, which he chose to attend because Black writers and leaders such as Langston Hughes, Kwame Nkrumah, and Thurgood Marshall studied there, he took a leave of absence to complete his first novel, The Vulture. The book was published in 1970, the same year as his first album (and book of poetry), Small Talk at 125th and Lennox, which also debuted the well-known poem ‘The Revolution Will Not Be Televised.’ Scott-Heron’s blues offered an anticolonial vision of race-radical revo- lutionary consciousness, evident on the album From South Africa to South Carolina (1975), which ties together nuclear colonialism in South Carolina with apartheid in South Africa. Claudrena Harold (2011) observes that, ‘Scott-Heron’s descriptions of “down home” routinely moved beyond the geographical borders of the former Confederacy and into the transna- tional terrain commonly referred to as the Global South.’ ‘Delta Man,’ for example, traces the development of revolutionary consciousness along the sites of the plantation and Great Migration, from the Mississippi Delta during slavery, to Nebraska following the Civil War, and then to the inner city. The bridge between each of these places – ‘revolution outta be where I’m comin’ from’ – shuttles possibility between sites of forced mobility. The history lessons found in ‘Spacesong’ and ‘Who’ll Pay Reparations on My Soul?’, moreover, speak of white settler dispossession of Native inhabitants. Such an expansive internationalist, decolonial desire tempers the feeling of despair otherwise dominant in ‘Winter in America.’ The song was written in 1975 at a moment when the possibility of the Black freedom and peace movements had been betrayed, leaving ‘nobody fight- ing ‘cause nobody knows what to save.’ Within an internationalist blues epistemology, however, the hopeful suggestion is that spring can still be found in movements outside of the United States (Peddie, 2011, 122). Mobilizing urban crisis The militarization of the urban crisis was accompanied by an ideological project to enclose the racialized ‘Black ghetto’ as a place separate from modern white suburbia, reifying it as a space of dangerousness that may be subject legitimately to exceptional rules and abandoned. The great rat debate contributed to this ideological crystallization. Southern Democrats and Republican opponents of the bill used innuendo (‘rats of the two-legged variety’ and ‘rats of the four-legged variety’) to tie the bill to race and rioting in Newark (Strickland, 1969, p. 342). Another congressman mockingly referred to it as the ‘civil “rats” bill’ (McLaughlin, 2011, p. 542). ‘Whitey on the Moon,’ by turn, revealed the truth that state abandonment is not just an afterthought, but a productive absence directly abetted by state violence. In drawing together the exploration of the moon with the extraction of value from and suppression of Black freedom movements, race-radical lunar criticism rejected the bifurcated militarized spectacle of limitless space and anachronistic ghetto confinement. Indeed, Scott-Heron offers a documentary trace of the new ‘great confinement’ that was then in the making (de Giorgi, 2006). In ‘No Knock,’ Scott-Heron invites listeners to take an incredulous interpretation of new legislation that enabled the police to enter a dwelling without notice: Long rap about “No Knock” being legislated for the people you’ve always hated in this hell hole that you/we call home. “No Knock,” the Man will say to keep this man from beating his wife. “No Knock,” the Man will say to protect people from themselves. His poem ‘King Alfred’s Plan’ discusses a Nixon plan for preventive detention that would create a caged future in the absence of Black political unity. ‘Locked in cages, pens, hemmed in shoulder to shoulder arms outstretched for just a crust of bread...Let us unite out of love and not hate / Let us unite on our own and not because of barbed wire death.’ As race-radical lunar criticism illustrates, the material and ideological struggle over urban crisis constituted a space for grappling with intersecting structures of white racial rule and empire, namely whether and how they could be democratically reconstructed. This offers a cultural trace of the shift from military Keynesianism to post-Keynesian militarism that Ruth Wilson Gilmore (1998) names as the conjuncture for the sharp expansion of the carceral state. In contrast to the ‘symbiotic’ progression from ‘ghetto’ to prison confinement offered by Wacquant (2001), race-radical lunar criticism illustrates both the tremendous contests over shifting forms of unfreedom and their situatedness within a broader crisis of imperialism that anticolonial and ‘domestic’ freedom struggles provoked. The uneven geography that the warfare-welfare state produced was the grounds of struggle over the costs and harms of militarization. Investments in defense were widespread but concentrated in New South and New West sites in the so-called Sunbelt, what Markusen and colleagues (1991) dubbed the Gunbelt. This unevenness was not only regional, but also shaped patterns of development at the metropolitan scale (Loyd, 2014). This social and spatial struggle was deeply racialized and gendered. For this reason, it is misleading to interpret the space race as a form of militarization that uniformly trumps basic needs, as liberal versions of spending priorities suggest. Conflicts over who would pay for the costs of empire and militarization were mediated through strug- gles over racism that took a spectacular form, splitting inner city from suburb in ways that obscured the intersections among race, class, and gender. The Black welfare mother was enlisted as the spectacular figure of national disorder, even though most welfare recipients were white and most Great Society spending supported middle class suburban homes. Scott-Heron’s retort to this scapegoating restored the racial economic context within which Black families and communities struggled for freedom. Cross-class welfare rights and peace movements questioned military Keynesianism, meaning that they increasingly rejected the wages of empire and believed that a democratic reconstruction of US society was possible only by ending its wars. Conclusion: race-radical lunar criticism for the prison home front As a sublime symbol of progress, exploration, and national purpose, the moon represented a material symbol of upward mobility and possibility for the nation. The Cold War space race as spectacle cohered an ideological understanding of upward mobility and progress. This spectacle, moreover, was not simply a mode of visuality, but also built material spaces of the economically buoyant Sunbelt-Gunbelt and fostered confinement of Black central city spaces and dislocation of residents from industries being developed elsewhere. Urban crisis, then, was fundamentally a crisis over Black ‘upward’ mobility in terms of movement through space (that is, the Great Migration and moving beyond confines of racial ghettos) and claims to political power and presence in public spaces. Race-radical lunar criticism defied the Cold War spectacle that would split the world in two, the nation into Black and white, American or failed American, by illustrating the relationships between the ghetto and suburb, the ghetto and empire. Critical interpretations of the relationship between racialized poverty and wealth, as offered through Black lunar criticism, did not disappear, but were submerged within a discourse that naturalized Black confinement in ghetto and prison spaces while obscuring the consolidation of political and economic forces responsible for a new, multiscalar regime of mobility and immobility. The political and cultural contest over this lived and ideological space of urban crisis underscores the uncertain future of the prison resolution. With mass incarceration in question from the left and right, race-radical lunar criticism offers some guidance for understanding how the present crisis may be resolved in favor of mobility justice. Scott-Heron’s song ‘Alien (Hold Onto Your Dreams)’ criticizes divide and conquer tactics, and ties the trajectories of transnational Latino/a migrants to African American histories of forced mobility. Moreover, Scott-Heron’s dialectical blues understanding of the politics of space suggests that dismantling the United States’ unprecedented carceral state will hinge not so much on comparing rates of spending on confinement versus welfare but on analyzing their interconnection and on developing political unity and (even) love. The peaceful promise of outer space – displacing the Man from the moon – remains tied to liberatory, decolonial projects on earth.

#### This form of spatialization produces a global lockdown that uses the practices of empire-building and captivity, such as black immobilization, sexual violence, and exploitation to produce human surplus as the foundational element for the existence of the citizen subject.
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Global Lockdown and the Ends of Pain We now turn to the threats of pure force and discipline that go hand in hand with the newfound freedoms of empire’s (non)promise projects. In her introduction to the anthology Global Lockdown, Sudbury offers an understanding of lockdown to connect diffuse and varied networks of captivity, punishment, and mass liquidation with transnational practices of empire-building and neoliberal globalization: ‘“Lockdown’ is a term commonly used by prison movement activists to refer to the repressive confinement of human beings as punishment for deviating from normative behaviors. Although prisons and jails are the most visible locations for lockdown, the term encourages us to think about connections with other spaces of confinement such as immigrant detention centers, psychiatric hospitals, juvenile halls, refugee camps, or Indian boarding schools.”40 In this foregrounding passage, Sudbury seeks to create analytical and political possibilities for bringing together various spaces and technologies of confinement that discipline nationally, racially, psychically, and culturally “aberrant” subjects, or those, as she will later theorize, who are “surplus or resistant to the new world order.”41 Sudbury further elaborates on theorizations of the slavery-prison continuum, which have been compellingly argued by W. E. B. Du Bois, Angela Davis, and Joan Dayan. These scholars and activists, among others, have posited that in the wake of the failed project of Emancipation, a vast network of cultural, legal, and politicoeconomic apparatuses were inaugurated to (re)criminalize blackness and ensnare black subjects within intensified forms of punishment, confinement, and expropriation. These included the Thirteenth Amendment’s recodification of slavery in the prison, convict lease systems, black codes, paramilitary terror, and increasingly complex systems of captivity and servitude to extract profit from locked-up black and brown bodies. As the legal scholar Guyora Binder has argued, if we expand our definition of slavery beyond a specific iteration of forced labor and instead look to the culture, custom, and institutions of race themselves, it becomes more difficult to assert that the project of Emancipation has ever been completed.42 Additionally, as Linda Evans, Eve Goldberg, Christian Parenti, and Ruth Wilson Gilmore have argued in their respective works, in the era of globalization, the U.S. government’s successive wars on drugs, poverty, crime, and terror have consolidated a prison industrial complex in which transnational corporations run globalized for-profit prisons, manufacture federal and local military- and law-enforcement technologies, expropriate prison labor, and bid for multibillion-dollar contracts for prison construction.43 These analyses foreground the multiple, overlapping private, public, national, and international investments in the mass lockdown of poor people and people of color transnationally, and the naturalized and strengthened long-term lockdown of black people within U.S. borders. Many of these theorizations of the slavery-prison continuum and of the expansion of the prison industrial complex help us articulate how global lockdown not only naturalizes but also produces capitalist racial, gender, national, and sexual social formations. In this way, global lockdown and its technologies function as central sites for ontological production, for making subjects on all sides of prison walls: those who can and must be killed, warehoused, and watched, and those whose civic duty requires their complicity in the killing. The prison, thus, cannot be understood as outside of social production, but rather as foundational to it. In Are Prisons Obsolete? Angela Davis shows how the prison functions as a mode of social production through her analysis of the “human surplus” produced at the confluence of an intensified capitalist economy and the mobilization of white supremacist imaginaries: In the context of an economy that was driven by an unprecedented pursuit of profit, no matter what the human cost, and the concomitant dismantling of the welfare state, poor people’s abilities to survive became increasingly constrained by the looming presence of the prison. The massive prison-building project that began in the 1980s created the means of concentrating and managing what the capitalist system had implicitly declared to be a human surplus. In the meantime, elected officials and the dominant media justified the new draconian sentencing practices, sending more and more people to prison in the frenzied drive to build more and more prisons by arguing that it was the only way to make our communities safe from murderers, rapists, and robbers.44 In the wake of the neoliberal gutting of an already precarious and punitive welfare state, the prison stepped in to produce, mark, and manage human surplus. It is through the mobilization of racist sexualized fears of “murderers, rapists, and robbers” and through misguided yearnings for safety that the prison binge of the 1980s and its progeny (re)produce subjects who must be locked down, as well as those who must do the locking. These same economies of panic and security legitimize the systematic dismantling of revolutionary social movements that oppose state repression through the mounting use of torture, imprisonment, disappearance, and massacre,45 both within and outside of the United States, and a litany of technologies of antiblack, anti-immigrant, and anti-poor terror narrating the history of racial state formation including lynching, execution, and rape. Continuing her line of thought, Davis argues that the prison operates to naturalize and intensify the generalized violence deployed by the state and its citizens against communities marked as criminal, specifically black, Latino, Native, and poor communities, as well as poor and racially pathologized communities in the global South. In particular, she writes, “prison is a space in which the threat of sexualized violence that looms in the larger society is effectively sanctioned as a routine aspect of the landscape of punishment behind prison walls.”46 In this way, the widespread sexual abuse of people in prison, and particularly women, queer people, and transgender people of color, emerges not as exceptional, but rather as indicative and productive of a larger regime of gratuitous force that marks bodies as surplus through the use of violence and imprisonment. Sexualized violence against those in lockdown should thus not be understood as “cruel and unusual” spectacles aberrant to the political order, but rather as foundational to it, and as central to the production of civil society as well as its outsides.47 This is a move difficult to understand if we do not pay attention to how feelings are mobilized to garner legitimacy for the prison project. The construction of those in lockdown as “murderers, rapists, and robbers” and the pervasiveness of sexual violence in prisons thus should not be seen as coincidental, but rather as indicative of the powerful imbrications of desire, fear, and safety in the production and disposal of those who are “resistant or surplus to the new world order.” Just as we have argued that promises of belonging, value, recognition, and worth are issued to certain marginalized subjects, it is always on the ground of other (non)subjects. Heeding the same logics of expendability, once again a promise for safety and happiness can only be issued as a simultaneous call for murder and human demolition. This is but one of the central affective economies that produces the prison industrial complex as a seductive facet of our collective common sense. Through the mystifying narratives of “ ‘crime and punishment”’ and “ ‘law and order,”’ the prison is offered as an end to pain and as a catch-all solution to violence of all kinds. The prison promises citizens and subjects a future filled with freedom, security, and safety. Individualizing pain and harm such that they might be reduced to “crime” and “perpetrators,” the prison promises safety, order, and redress severed from the persistence of structural murder and the exploitation fundamental to the capitalist democracy itself. Importantly, the futures that global lockdown promises its docile disciples can only be imagined through the unending creation and preservation of outsiders, nonsubjects, nonfutures, and nonhumans. In effect, the citizen-subject cannot be free or perhaps even alive without the captivity and (social, corporeal, and civic) death of the noncitizen, nonsubject, and those cordoned off to the realm of human surplus or, as Davis calls it, “detritus.”48 We understand the promise project playing out through global lockdown in a variety of ways, from ongoing prison expansion efforts to soothe the crisis of prison overcrowding and fatal prison conditions, to the proliferation of citizen-led reformist measures in the name of rehabilitation and redemption, to our daily reliance on police as the primary way we might feel safe. To return to the site of (recognizable) queer politics, penalty-enhancing hate crimes legislation is proposed and supported as a solution to systemic transphobic and homophobic violence. In these campaigns, the prison offers the seductive promise of security if we might authorize and support the ongoing roundup and lockdown of subjects marked as threatening. As the HRC advertisement demonstrated, safety can only be called into being through a hypernationalism that requires the cordoning off and disposal of those deemed criminal, enemy, and surplus. It is specifically through the sexualized violence inherent in being “brought to justice” that enables the end of pain offered by global lockdown. Very clearly, then, the neoliberal empire has quite effectively commandeered our affective yearnings for safety, security, redress, and peace and collapsed them with carnage, punishment, and confinement such that they might appear synonymous. It should come as no surprise, then, that so many of the gains made by formerly marginal subjects over the past many decades have been simultaneous with intensified forms of violence and abjection against surplus populations. It is precisely through these forms of aggression that those gains have been made possible.49 Global lockdown thus functions as one of the looming underbellies and conditions of possibility of the (un)freedoms and (non)futures being promised by neoliberal empire. Consigning the collective traumas of slavery and colonization to a remote and irrelevant past while drawing on their logics to instantiate its rule, global lockdown shows itself to be neither cruel and unusual nor exceptional, but rather as foundational. Importantly, these (un)freedoms and (non)futures carry very different promises and pleasures depending on our relationship to the human surplus motoring the global political economy. Global lockdown, then, is not simply the newest outside, but quite literally the material redefining off what life can even mean in the wake of so much “necessary” death.

#### Understanding the relationship between racial formations and carcerality is a prerequisite to weighing the consequences of policy. Racial formations created and naturalized in the US spurs a global hardening of borders and expands US terror in away that creates more refugee crises abroad. Only abolition linked to the racialized logic of deterrence and deportation in a refusal of a politics of innocence can counter Global Apartheid.

**Loyd’15** (Jenna M. Loyd is an assistant professor in the Department of Geography at University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her first book Health Rights Are Civil Rights: Peace and Justice Activism in Los Angeles, 1963-1978 (2014, University of Minnesota Press) investigateseveryday understandings of health and violence and people’s grassroots mobilizations for health and social justice. She is the co-editor, with Matt Mitchelson and Andrew Burridge, of Beyond Walls and Cages: Prisons, Borders, and Global Crisis (2012, University of Georgia Press), which won the Past Presidents’ Award from the Association of Borderlands Studies. She and Alison Mountz have a forthcoming book (University of California Press, 2018) on the late- and post-Cold War history of United States migration detention and border deterrence policy entitled Boats, Borders, and Bases: Race, the Cold War, and the Rise of Migration Detention in the United States. “Carceral Citizenship in an Age of Global Apartheid” pgs.13-15. 2015)//NAE

Teasing out the geographies of global apartheid entails a multi-sited and multi-scalar genealogy that is attentive to specific regional racial formations and geopolitical moments. Remembering this Caribbean history of imprisonment and deterrence is important because it speaks to the fundamental, if widely forgotten, dimension of anti-Blackness within US border and immigration policy. Regional racial formations and conservative political forces in the Southwest built on a different, if interrelated, set of racial antagonisms than in Florida to shape deterrence as a national policy. This Caribbean history also speaks to the capacity of regional racial projects to become part of national and international policy in apparently race-neutral terms. Guy GoodwinGill, a prominent international law professor, called President Reagan’s Executive Order 12324, on the “Interdiction of Illegal Aliens,” “the model, perhaps, for all that has followed.” At the time, Goodwin-Gill was working for the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, and he recalls being “struck by the incongruity, the inconsistency, between this measure and the resolute stand taken by the United States on the protection of Indochinese refugees in South East Asia, for whom first asylum, non-discrimination and at least temporary admission were considered the essential minimum.”75 Following Rodríguez’s genealogical approach suggests not only delineating the interconnection between the prison regime and global apartheid but also tracing the sites where the prison and border erupt to contain the effects of US imperial activity. The reliance on imprisonment explicitly to deter Haitian asylum seekers built on the existing national racial formation and chain of associations linking Blackness, poverty, and criminality to a carceral solution. This has become all the more important with the material expansion of the immigration detention system (to the capacity to deport over 400,000 people annually) and discursive tightening between criminality and illegality. Detention’s roots in empire are also important to recall: detention as a tool of deterrence built on the “humane deterrence” policy that Thailand implemented in 1981 to constrain refugee movements from Laos.76 (This policy amounted to sending asylum seekers to “austerity” camps that did not provide a path to resettlement in a third country.) Thus, even as the United States extended refugee status to some survivors of its war in Southeast Asia, it also used detention within a different regional geopolitical context to deter the arrival of unwanted refugees from Haiti and Cuba. Yển Lê Espiritu writes that the refugee status of Vietnamese refugees has “continued to serve as a stage for the (re)production of American identities and for the shoring up of militarism” in ways that “naturalize and buttress the self-appointed US role as rescuer.”77 This imperial ideology of rescue promises the “gift of freedom” to Vietnamese subjects who are determined as needing care.78 Bush and Clinton deployed this rhetoric of care and rescue to refugees at sea in the Caribbean in ways that similarly erased violent US military and geoeconomic policies. Yet what differed is that this rhetoric of rescue rubbed up against the constant disavowal of Haitians as rescuable (that is to say, assimilable in terms of patriarchal subjection) and against a discursive shift from depicting Cuban refugees as freedom fighters to depicting them as unwanted, unruly, criminal subjects. Refugee rights advocate Bill Frelick has noted that, even as the United States was pursuing its interdiction policy in the Caribbean, Italy and Hong Kong were also forcibly repatriating asylum seekers attempting to arrive by sea. “These developments on the international front might have occurred with or without the United States precedent,” Frelick concludes; however, the “United States is now in no moral position to protest the treatment of refugees and asylum seekers by other governments, even when the United States thinks it is wrong.”79 Since then, Italy and other European nations have systematically patrolled the seas to prevent unauthorized arrivals from Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, and in 2001, Australia deployed its Pacific Solution to prevent boat arrivals with refugees largely from Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. Given that US wars and drone attacks in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan are at least partly responsible for refugee movements, we might also register Australian and European border control efforts as at least partially entwined with US imperial maneuvers.80 The blurring of the categories of criminal and noncitizen complicates how we might think about undoing sites and practices of global apartheid. This essay on the production of carceral citizenship and its global expanse has traced an alternative history of contemporary US immigration prisons and highlights the imperative of understanding immigration policy in terms of multiple regional racial formations. In a globally carceral era, one of the most important tools for ending how prisons and deportation separate families and communities is to link together what many regard as separate issues. Both anti-prison and immigrant justice organizers have identified the diaspora that is created by imprisonment and deportation. This mutually informed thinking suggests that, for anti-prison advocates, the question of the kinds of policies and practices that support reentry from prison needs to be reframed to expansively include stopping deportations and supporting legislation that allows people who have been deported to return to their loved ones and communities. As for the immigrant justice and antidetention movements, organizers are in a position to challenge anti-Black terms of criminalization, and the detention system itself, by refusing to invoke terms of innocence. This is not easy, given the insistent effort undertaken by the state to reproduce its sites and objects of war (drugs, crime, terror, etc.). Nor is it impossible, as the testimony by B.P. illustrates when he concluded that systemic anti-Blackness in the United States colluded with antidemocratic forces in Haiti. The entwining of domestic and foreign policy and space is most evident in the spaces of local jails confining asylum seekers and government boats patrolling the seas. The eighteenth-century figure of the British slave ship Brookes, which continues to inform contemporary abolitionist analyses, might be extended to include the US Coast Guard Cutters, Australian navy ships, and Frontex and European vessels patrolling their territorial waters. Indeed, Edwidge Danticat, Kamau Brathwaite, and other writers have drawn such a connection between the Middle Passage and Coast Guard patrols now blocking passage across the Caribbean.81 Direct-action blockades of deportation buses and flights and grassroots campaigns to prevent deportations are the latest iteration of this long abolitionist history.

#### The alternative is Worldism. The refusal of international relations and specialization as dictated by racial capitalism in favor of epistemological interventions into the exercise of Space as a carceral apparatus.

Agathangelou and Ling ‘09. Anna M. Agathangelou is an Associate Professor in the Departments of Political Science and Women’s Studies at York University, Canada and co-director of the Global Change Institute, Nicosia, Cyprus, L.H.M. Ling is an Associate Professor in the Graduate Program in Inter- national Affairs at The New School, New York, USA., Transforming World Politics: From empire to multiple worlds, The New International Relations Series, 2009. //NAE

MAIN ASPECTS Worldism presents world politics as a site of multiple worlds. These refer to the various and contending ways of being, knowing, and relating that have been passed onto us from previous generations. Histories, languages, myths, and memories institutionalize and embody multiple worlds through simple daily acts like cooking and eating, singing and dancing, joking and playing but also through larger events like trade, development, conflict, and war. Worldism registers not only the “difference” that comes from multiple worlds (see Inayatullah and Blaney 2004) but also their entwinements. Selves and others reverberate,2 producing multi- and trans-subjectivities that leave us legacies of reinforcement and conflict, reconstruction and critique, reconciliation and resistance. Such syncretic engagements belie seeming oppositions and contradictions among multiple worlds to reveal their underlying connections despite hegemony’s violent erasures. On this basis, communities have opportunities to heal and recuperate so they can build for another day, for another generation. Worldism as everyday life enacts self–other reverberations and syncretic engagements, especially by communities at the margins. Worldism as an analytical framework theorizes about them. Both types of worldist activity expose the problematic of empire in practice and logics. Building on the postcolonial notion that all parties make history, albeit with unequal access to power, worldism leads to an undeniable conclusion: our mutual embeddedness makes us mutually accountable. One cannot escape from the other. Mutual accountability brings with it duties and responsibilities, to be sure, but also possibilities: that is, (a) an internal dialectic of constant questioning to check and problematize hegemony, so that (b) we can expand our visions, strategies, and approaches beyond the narrow, hegemonic confines of realism/liberal internationalism, in order to (c) arrive at a more inclusive, conciliatory, and democratic world politics. In brief, worldism consists of two simultaneous processes: descriptive and analytical. Worldism-as-description features the following: (a) multi- and trans-subjectivities that institutionalize the social and structural reverberations between selves and others; (b) the agency of all parties, despite inequities and injustices, to create, build, and articulate multiple worlds; (c) syncretic engagements that consolidate the entwinements of multiple worlds into concrete strategies for change, adjustment, adaptation, refor- mulation, and transformation; and (d) community-building that integrates and accretes these syncretic engagements despite denials of such efforts from hegemonic elites and their ideologies. Worldism-as-analysis draws on the struggles and learning undertaken in worldist daily life to emphasize: (a) accountability as a hallmark of worldist inquiry that ensures (b) an internal criticality to question, contest, and challenge hegemony, so that we may (c) arrive at emancipatory construction even as we critique and resist. The critical reader may interject: Couldn’t “agency” and “accountabil- ity” in worldism be taken as a fancy way of blaming the victim? Are Jews, for example, responsible for the Holocaust; slaves for their enslavement; or any oppressed people for their oppression? Worldism as a politics of multiple relations subsumes this liberal, individualist understanding of responsibility. Multiple relations produce a web of effects and consequences to any kind of decisions and/or set of practices. Accountability in worldism asks: Who’s involved, under what conditions, and through which processes can we redress or transform the violence? What kinds of understanding are generated to account for these relations and/or to make them invisible? Without the painful concession that all of us, “abusers,” “victims,” and “innocent bystanders” alike, contribute to the production of hegemonic violence, whether it results in domestic abuse (see Adler and Ling 1995) or state violence (see Ling 1994), we may never realize how violence is conceived, generated, and sustained. By extension, we will never understand ways to end it. Instead, in our injuries and (self ) alienation, we may reproduce time and again the same conditions of violence or hegemony that afflicted us in the past and which seems the only option for the present. Suspended political ideals, in this case, could also block us from action and change. Worldist agency and accountability compel us to face the complicities (including our own) that sustain violence in the making of history, so that we may, as Marx exhorted, change it. Where do these ideas come from?, our reader may ask. Let us delineate the intellectual precedents to worldism. INTELLECTUAL PRECEDENTS Worldism draws on constructivism and postmodernism but also differs from them. Worldism shares with constructivism its emphasis on intersubject- ivity, and with postmodernism its insights on asymmetrical difference: that is, the norms, institutions, practices, and behaviors that set up certain subjects and subjectivities as more privileged and protected than others. Power, then, cannot be reduced to an objectified, reified condition of who’s “on top” or who “has more” but instead results from agents contributing to macro-political structures like ideology, organization, and capitalist relations. Power redefined in these terms stems from an intersubjective consensus within a context of material conditions and relations. The crux here lies in the framing. Since narration as a process is never complete, the story can always change.3 However, worldism departs from constructivism by asking: What kinds of intersubjectivity are constructed, by whom, and for what purpose, and how do theories of subjectivity restructure the world “otherwise”? And is this how we want the world to be? Not probing into the social relations of intersubjectivity, according to worldism, effectively erases the power politics of meaning, including the political economy behind such constructions. And unlike postmodernism, worldism distinguishes power from the resistance it induces. Contra Foucault (1994), we differentiate between the colonizer and colonized in their experiences of colonial power (see Stoler 2002) and the entwinements that follow, both reinforcing and conflicting complicity (see Ling 2002b). Not doing so implicitly reinforces the imperialist assertion that “this is the way the world is”: that is, it is not open to alternative concepts, discourses, strategies, or ways of being. These gaps in constructivism and postmodernism return us to the conventional treatment of power as domination, pure and simple. Ronen Palan (2000), for instance, finds a strain of conservative realism in Alexander Wendt’s “naturalist” version of constructivism, primarily because he claims to offer a method only, and not an interpretation, of politics. Wendt (2005) himself admits as much. For similar reasons, Samir Amin (2004) calls postmodernism an “ideological accessory” to elite, bourgeois interests just as Aijaz Ahmad (1992) considers post-structuralist theories serve as alibis for imperialism. Both post- modernism and poststructuralism value critique and deconstruction over political action, thereby keeping de facto power intact. We note that although critical theories like postmodernism and con- structivism open up spaces to think about shifting power politics, they fall short of transforming the very asymmetries they critique. Inattention to structural, material interest and lack of integrating the Other analytically – that is, as a substantive maker of the world – undermines their claims of emancipatory social theory. Ultimately, the Other becomes a repository of raw materials for hegemonic actors and sites in the North to process. Worldism acknowledges a deep intellectual debt to postcolonial studies. Here, race, gender, sexuality, class, and nationality serve as analytics and substance in examinations of power relations. Postcolonial studies demystify empire’s boast, like Kipling’s “White Man’s Burden,” that the imperial Self makes the world for all Others. And that world is unidimensional (top- down state power), unilateral (center dominates periphery), and unilinear (past–present–future). Postcolonial studies record a more nuanced and multiple history by problematizing the ways colonial power is imposed on the colonized. That is, colonization involves more than a unilateral and mechanical domination of the subjugated by colonizers and their states. As documented by postcolonial studies, tensions and contradictions emerge from these relations (Said 1979; Spivak 1999), leading to adaptations and integrations between hegemonic selves and subaltern others. From this inter- action, “colonizers” and “colonized” produced something together over the course of time that neither anticipated nor perhaps desired but which all learned to live with, and eventually called their own. Divides along lines of property, race, class, language, religion, and ideology did not disappear. They fused, rather, into hybrid, creole, or mélange cultures that, nonethe- less, contested these categories constantly (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 1995; Lewis and Mills 2003). In recognizing that colonizer and colonized mutually construct their sub- jectivities, postcolonial studies attribute to both the legacies of power that we face today. Note, for example, Britain’s principal instrument of colonial and imperial power: the East India Company. Sudipta Sen (1998) shows that, contrary to claims that the British brought capitalism to India, the East India Company had to adjust to pre-existing market structures and political relations to gain access to the thriving trade already in place in northern India.4 Only through this kind of entry could the East India Company later redirect the trade to its favor. L.H.M. Ling (2002b) traces how institutional elites in East Asia learned syncretically and “interstitially” between two world orders – the agrarian-based, cosmo-moral universe of Confucian governance and the Westphalian inter-state system of commerce and trade – to cumulate into what we know as Asian capitalism today. Walter Mignolo (2000) highlights the “gnosis” of thought and action, Self and Other, that comes from centuries of transgressing and reformulating the colonial boundaries that comprise Latin America. Of course, those subjected to hegemony must accommodate others more than those who perpetrate it. Yet hegemony’s very asymmetry highlights the resilience and creativity of the marginalized. Ordinary people can journey across subjectivities to engage syncretically with others, even under conditions of poverty and inequality, to rebuild, reconstruct, and reorganize communities. Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldua (1983) characterize their straddling of multiple worlds as life on the “borderlands.” Typically, they point out, women of color from the South must bear the biggest burden of negotiating the multiple worlds of language, culture, class, and gender to survive white- majority society in the North despite systemic discrimination and obstacles. Still, they are able to exercise internal reserves of freedom, thought, and action to sort through hegemony, not simply surrender to it.

### Fw

#### FW Interp: Evaluate the 1AC as a scholarly artifact – this means that the aff has to defend its epistemic and rhetorical investments prior to weighing the hypothetical consequences of the 1AC

#### 1] Framing Issue – If we win our reps are good and that our ethical orientations come apriori, that means that we just have to win a risk of a link to prove that the plan is unethical.

#### 3] Outer space has become a new frontier for capital accumulation and imperial expansion, the role of the judge is to dispel the cosmic view that perpetuates the false dualism of US exceptionalism and globalization.

Winter 15 [Jermone Dale, Lecturer in the Writing Program @ UC-Riverside and editor of speculative fiction for the Los Angeles Review of Books, Nostalgia for infinity: New Space Opera and Neoliberal Globalism, pp. 69-79//ak47]

“[John F. Kennedy’s] men had become convinced that the Cold War was going to be won or lost in the so-called Third World, and that cultural factors would influence the loyalties of wavering nations as much as economics did. In this respect, Apollo was performance, pure and simple. JFK wanted to something to capture the global imagination…and the fantasy was already there…all those space novels and sci-fi movies and articles in Collier’s and Space Cadet sat at the top of a pyramid of human dreaming that stretched back thousands of years.” - Andrew Smith, Moondust (2005) In his cultural history of the Apollo moon landings, No Requiem for the Space Age (2014), Matthew Tribbe notes with bemusement the grasping analogy that legions of pundits frequently made linking the Eagle lander of the Apollo 11 touching ground on the lunar Sea of Tranquility and Christopher Columbus’s first footfall on San Salvador in 1492. Tribbe notes the tragic ineptitude of this glib analogy between “Columbus’s blind voyage to a lush new terrestrial terrain and the astronauts’ technologized, preprogrammed flight of already surveyed, dead world where they would almost immediately die outside their spacesuits” (Tribbe 29). For Tribbe, this inarticulacy is telling, though, since the reference to the overdetermined legacy of colonialism suggested the world-historical immensity of this staggering achievement that seemed to imply “to many Americans the ultimate proof that the United States had somehow mastered the universe, with its combination of can-do attitude and advanced science and technology” (Tribbe 4). Moreover, we might add that the perceived triumph of this largely symbolic global event of the moon landing was most successful at bridging a dated frontier mythos of American exceptionalism, tied inexorably to the expansionist ambitions of hyper-advanced global capitalism, with cutting-edge developments in rocketry, spaceflight, bureaucratic management, and computer-electronic technology. The contention of this chapter is that the voluminous repository of space-opera fiction had already primed the pump of technocultural energies that the moon landing would later exploit in its media coverage and political maneuvering. The buoyant optimism of this space opera, as well as the space culture it shaped and transfigured, is the imagined infinity for which the New Space Opera that began to proliferate in the 1980s remains forever nostalgic. By the time Neil Armstrong parroted Werner Von Braun’s rhetoric that the moon had been conquered “for all mankind”, let alone Buckminster Fuller had stressed that the lunar missions offered a vision of the fragile interconnectedness of this Spaceship Earth, traditional American space opera had percolated into mainstream thinking and feeling a mode of economic-political rationality that promised as well to master the much more urgent geopolitical problems facing American hegemony in the wake of the end of empire, such as the persisting postcolonial dilemmas of Cold-War rivalry, global inequality, the expansion of transnational corporations, and neocolonial warfare. Support for the massive government spending and technocratic Keynesianism of the U.S. manned space program quickly imploded as it inevitably failed to live up to the grandiose optimism of its overblown promise; moreover — unlike the more rarefied, literary, and more purely neoliberal space opera of the period that tapped into the widespread enthusiasm for Gerard O’ Niell-esque space colony fantasies that championed “small-scale, do-it-yourself enterprises” (Weber 8) — funding for the NASA manned spaceflight programs fell apart under the general hostility to big government and extraneous tax burdens held by the populace at large. And unlike traditional space opera discussed in this chapter, sophisticated postmodern response to American space ambitions would be more suspicious of the moon landings as complicit in the “hourglass of failed colonialism” and the fall into “the rocket state of multinational capitalism (Atwill 21). The global dimensions of the space race, and its globalization of political economy in the postwar period of decolonization, must be understood as a prime motivating factor in the development of the American space program and the role that space politics plays in the contemporary global cultural imaginary. Documents of the Kennedy administration reveal that the moon landing was conceived to bolster confidence in the prospects of American capitalism for the benefit of skeptical, nonaligned nations in the global South. Vice President Lyndon Johnson, for instance, advised Kennedy that “other nations will tend to align themselves with the country they believe will be the world leader — the winner in the long run”; and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara argued that the United States must commit to “make a positive decision to pursue space projects aimed at enhancing national prestige” (qtd. McCurdy 97). Hence a major scientific discourse integrally bound up with what this chapter discusses as the recent global phenomena of American-derived neoliberal biopolitics is the rise of global space culture. Under-analyzed in the current literature on the subject is the extent to which the ideologically charged launch-pad of this space culture was constructed in the pulp-era space opera of the 1940s and 1950s. In his important tracing of the byzantine politics of the space race to the bourgeoning of a global technocratic class, Walter MacDougal argues that the effect of the space race on the so-called “Third World” (a term invented in this period) was decidedly mixed: “some Third World leaders realized that space technology was irrelevant to their needs, and other indulged in exaggerated expectations of what the United States and space could do for them” (MacDougall 360). Nonetheless, prior to Kennedy’s 1962 “We Choose to Go to the Moon” speech, his second State of the Union address initially justified the eventual exorbitant expenditure of the moon landing — at its height, U.S. tax-payers footed thousands of millions of dollars every year, or over two percent of their per-capita taxes on NASA alone — by way of a propaganda campaign designed to influence the decolonizing states. Kennedy made the moon appeal by claiming that the U.S. needed to “capture” the favors of the coming tide, “the great battlefield for the defense and expansion of freedom today is the whole southern half of the globe— Asian Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East— the land of the rising people” (qtd. McDougall 302). By reference to the recent corporate sponsoring of space programs and the suborbital tourism ventures bankrolled by Elon Musk of SpaceX and Richard Branson of Virgin Galactic, Martin Parker echoes the titular theme of this dissertation by contending that the existing literature on the “Marxist sociology of space” as essentially arguing that “the desire to go into space is ‘cosmic narcissism’, a sort of projection of capitalist individualism onto the universe”, or, as Peter Dickens contends, “outer space represents resources for capitalism to continue ad infinitum, especially if unfettered by state intervention” (Dickens 73). Alternately, in a dialectical fashion, this dissertation also concurs with viewing New Space Opera as complex political allegory, coupling the collective imagination of manned space exploration with socialist-utopian energies. As such, I agree with Stephen Shukaitis who tracks the rhetorical deployment of outer space as “myth territory and space of composition…involved in forms of semiotic warfare and conflict” (Shukaitis 106) To this end, I would like to supplement a discussion of spaceopera fiction onto Shukaitis’s contention and its drawing of a compelling genealogy from Wobbly labor-organizer Joe Hill’s playful suggestion that he would catalyze Martian canal workers into a revolution following his execution, to Argentinean Trotskyist Juan Posadas and his absurd call for an intergalactic Fourth International, to the proliferation of Afro-futurist discourse from the Sun Ra Arkestra to Samuel R. Delany and Nalo Hopkinson. Likewise, Roger Launius contends that an understanding of the technocultural system of NASA — “not just the spacecraft but the organizations, people, communications, manufacturing components, and even political structure” (Launius 294) — must needs negotiate the paradox of the planting of the American flag on the moon “for all mankind”, or the Christmas greeting cards sent of what came to be known as the “blue marble” images from Apollo 8 that influenced generations to see the fragile interconnections of all the people of the world as rooted in the grandiose statement of the moon landing, ultimately stemming in part from complex Cold War cultural politics and such historical realities as the launching of Sputnik, the Bay of Pigs invasion, and the Vietnam War. The space opera of the period taps into the cultural politics of space race not simply as a function of the binary between Cold War ideologues or “One World” activists, but in the capacity of the triumphal, techno-capitalist management of labor evoked by the space race. And the New Space Opera that dominates subsequent chapters of this dissertation endeavors to rekindle the halcyon days of this earlier space fiction, epitomized perhaps by the warring poles of the lugubrious work of Jack Vance or the gung-ho juveniles of Robert Heinlein discussed below, in ways that that register, anticipate, and even contest the bourgeoning military-industrial-space-complex of postwar global dynamics. The cutting edge of global New Space Opera both contests and channels the techno-nostalgic return to the dyad of the neoliberal imperative, the continual tug-of-war between an unmooring sense of infinite expansion and the narrow re-containment of such disruptive, cosmopolitical impulses into the hegemonic, marketdriven discourses of development, nation, and race. In the overarching thesis of this dissertation, I concur with Hoagland and Sarwal in SF, Imperialism, and the Third World that science fiction is too often marked by a “nostalgic attachment to the here and now that parades as an ersatz futurity” (13). In The Birth of Biopolitics, based on lectures given at Collège de France from 1978 through 1979, Michel Foucault provides a context for what he styles the American neoliberalism of what would eventually become the Chicago School as stemming from “a criticism of the New Deal and what we broadly call the Keynesian policy developed from 1933-34” (Foucault 216). Foucault, though, hastens to add that the global ideology of neoliberalism cannot be grasped as a specific policy platform of the leftwing or rightwing of any bipartisan national political system given that the discourse channels both a conservative antipathy to “anything sounding socialist” and a leftist “state phobia” (Foucault 218). Rather than a political history, Foucault is primarily interested in the cultural work— “a general style of thought, analysis, and imagination” (Foucault 219) that colonizes previously non-economic aspects of the technosubject — that neoliberalism performs in everyday life as a function of a utopian desire caught up in “the problem of freedom” (Foucault 218) in globally Northern, capitalism-driven democracies. According to Foucault, neoliberalism counters the abstraction of labor as a passive investment strategy in classical liberalism through the positing of human beings as efficient machines of rational choice and decision theory, a new version of the homo economicus or the self-entrepreneur as form of biocapital. (Foucault 226) Eschewing an unambiguous enthusiasm for technocratic progress, neoliberalism, then, does indeed pursue technological innovation but tempers such faith with the motive of expanding profit margins (Foucault 232) in the context of an efficient laissez-faire law of supply and demand, risky, profit-oriented cost-benefit calculus, and competitive specializations, or the “framework of a multiplicity of diverse enterprises” (Foucault 241). This conclusion leads Foucault to argue that in neoliberal regimes even families engage in a mercenary and predatory quasi-Darwinian calculus to maximize the capital output of offspring via entrepreneurial potential. Neoliberal freedom, the ethos of the endlessly competitive fighting spirit in the free market, is the seductive chimerical delusion fabricated by the most recent cultural mythology of global capitalism. One consequence of the origins of neoliberalism that Foucault does not enumerate, though — despite his acknowledged, if divergent debt to Karl Marx in his analysis of neoliberalism — is its erosion of the possibility of revolutionary class struggle given the compromise of mainstream political interests in foreclosing such utopian change. This is a significant addendum to Foucault’s discussions since as labor historian Sharon Smith writes in Subterranean Fire (2006) the neoliberal curtailment of class struggle was forged in the 1950s predawn of neoliberal politics, the infinite future for which New Space Opera remains nostalgic: “The era of the American Dream set the stage for the employers’ offensive…[and] the lasting impact of McCarthyism left the rank and file with few existing structures to challenge corrupt and moribund union leaders, much less to launch an aggressive defense of workers’ rights” (Smith 223). But a signal consequence of neoliberal biocapital for postcolonial theory that Foucault does indeed briefly suggest is it forces us to “rethink the problem of the failure of Third World economies to get going, not in terms of the blockage of economic mechanisms, but in terms .of insufficient investment·in human capital” (Foucault 232). Hence postcolonial and cosmopolitical critics such as Peng Cheah revisit Foucault’s analysis to show how the inhuman disciplinary and regulatory apparatus of “governmentality” or the “heterogenous assemblage of institutions, technologies, calculations, and tactics” (Cheah 201) shape the neoliberal biopolitics of the global South given that “welfare policies can shape the population by affecting birthrates, health, and distribution of the population” (Cheah 201). Critics of one of the most nostalgically lionized science-fiction grandmasters of the twentieth-century, Robert Heinlein, have not failed to notice the author’s consistent proliferation of characters and plots celebrating the superior, omni-competent individual, the superheroic “Man Who Knows How” (Knight 83), in connection with his libertarian devotion to an entrepreneurial vision of global capitalism, noting especially the eternal recurrence of the “Social Darwinistic theme of human progress through free enterprise” (Smith 151) in Heinlein’s prototypical work. Although there is some ambiguity over his attempt at fashioning anti-sexist, anti-racist, and even queer politics prior to the civilrights, women’s liberation, and gay-rights movements, it is hard to contest that the writer was extremely rightwing even for his conservative midcentury postwar climate, offering up an avid fanbase thinly veiled propaganda for the xenophobic glorification of proxy war in the global South that had found itself locked in the heated standoff of Cold-War rivalries. Heinlein’s defenders aver that the writer advocated a modernized defiant individualism characteristic of deep tradition of American culture in which the government is best that governs least and marked by “intense Jeffersonian Americanism combined with ‘social justice’” adamantly opposed to Marxists and leftists (Patterson 509). In Starship Troopers, for instance, Heinlein sets out fruitlessly to “demolish the Marxian theory of value” and childishly castigates Das Kapital as infantile (Heinlein 114-18). H. Bruce Franklin is not so charitable in his assessment that Heinlein’s work represents not only a moment “when America’s powers seemed invulnerable and its future boundless as space… [but also the fear] that the combined force of the Soviet Union and the anti-imperialist revolutionary movements in Asia, African, and Latin America threatened the very existence for a society based on worldwide economic and military hegemony” (Franklin 66). The expansion of the lone solipsistic individual into the cosmos indirectly reflects the annexation of decolonizing countries into client states and the interplanetary aggression and loathing of alien civilizations depicted in Heinlein’s fiction becomes a logical extension of international neo-imperialism and American exceptionalism. The hysterically anticommunist alien-invasion novel The Puppet Masters, for instance, famously concludes with this pathological war cry of preemptive strike to the body-snatching hive-mind spreading over the globe: “the free men are coming to kill you! Death and destruction!” (416) In the same novel, Heinlein’s neoliberal avatar of a character, the secret-service agent Sam, argues that “the price of freedom is the willingness to do sudden battle, anywhere, any time, and with utter recklessness" (Heinlein 99). Yet critics have yet to discuss the ways that Heinlein’s primal gestation of traditional gung-ho American space opera responds to the first inklings of its neoliberal moment in the context of the anti-New Deal backlash of the 1950s. New Space Opera’s later problematizes this boosterism of radical freedom, as often expressed in Heinlein through the dynamic adventures of right-libertarian supermen. New Space Opera therefore owes as much to the nexus of concerns Foucault relates to the broader spectrum of neoliberalism than only the narrow (and incoherent) Republican platform of militaristic, free-market liberalism per se. With irreverent nods to Heinlein’s foundational work, New Space Opera re-envisions the interworking of technocratic innovation, especially cutting-edge advances in biological and physical scientific knowledge and particularly in the context of the bourgeoning space race, the climate of economic rational-choice theory and market fundamentalism, and the championing of a ferocious entrepreneurial spirit. These concerns were forged in the neoimperial furnace of a hyper-capitalist 1950s American culture that fervidly imagined an idealized rich, white, male future to which both contemporary neoliberal culture and New Space Opera today are inextricably linked.

#### 4] Equality – framing is not neutral – reject team on Imperial politics into events

Mignolo 7, Walter D. "The de-colonial option and the meaning of identity in politics." (2007). (Professor at Duke)//Elmer

The rhetoric of modernity (from the Christian mission since the sixteenth century, to the secular Civilizing mission, to development and modernization after WWII) occluded—under its triumphant rhetoric of salvation and the good life for all—**the perpetuation of** the logic of **coloniality**, that is, of massive appropriation of land (and today of natural resources), massive exploitation of labor (from open slavery from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, to disguised slavery, up to the twenty first century), and the **dispensability of human lives** from the massive killing of people in the Inca and Aztec domains to the twenty million plus people from Saint Petersburg to the Ukraine during WWII killed in the so called Eastern Front.4 Unfortunately, not all the massive killings have been recorded with the **same value and the same visibility**. The unspoken criteria for the value of human lives is an obvious sign (from a de-colonial interpretation) of the hidden imperial identity politics: that is, the value of human lives to which the life of the enunciator belongs becomes the **measuring stick** to evaluate other human lives who do not have the intellectual option and institutional power to tell the story and to classify events according to a ranking of human lives; that is, according to a racist classification.5

#### 5] Smoke Screen DA – Every time the 1AR and 2AR say they get to weigh the fiated impacts against the K is a new link and a settler move to innocence – that allows for them to not be held accountable for violence. If they said the N word – in a model of plan focus they can still win the debate because the aff is a good idea. This OW their offense because it creates a violent and inaccessible model of debate premised on exclusion – try or die for my interp.

#### 6] Resolvability – Voting aff cannot magically pass the affirmative – but rather your ballot can have an impact on the type of scholarship circulated within debate. Empirically proven within debate – the success of the Louisville project forced debate to shift away from making args like K’s are cheating, Mcdougnough winning the TOC resulted in a proliferation of alternative approaches to fiat. Competitive incentives flip negative because if a team keeps losing – it forces them to go back to the drawing board and read something different.

#### 7] Survivalism DA

Juárez 15 Nicolas Juárez is a Native American studies scholar with a focus on the political ontology of Amerindians within the Western hemisphere, the settlerist politics of love, and the connections between racialization and psychopathology. My current research is focused on Lacanian psychoanalysis and Indigenous cosmology. [“To Kill an Indian to Save a (Hu)Man:Native Life through the Lens of Genocide”]//Mberhe

I am inclined to agree with Wilderson that the Leninist question of “what is to be done” is in the wrong direction. The question itself fails to grasp the severity of the problem we face. To ask “what is to be done” is to first understand the problem one faces and secondly presumes that the problem one faces can be articulated, that one is deprived of something that can be named rather than deprived of being able to lose. To address this, what is needed is a radical shift in orientation in our scholarship and ethics that focuses on the question of understanding and ending the structures that make our, Red and Black, existence impossible rather than asking what is to be done within the epistemologies and ethics of those structures. When Subcomandante Marcos asks Presidente Salinas why do we need to be pardoned, when he asks what are we to be pardoned for, and when he asks who should ask for pardon, and who can grant it, he is not merely exposing the gratuitous violence of the Settler upon Red bodies, he is revealing the impossibility of an answer. If this paper is forced to offer a solution, however meager, it is for Red bodies to relinquish their desire to be structurally adjusted into the Human fold, a fold which will never solve or relieve our problems because our problems are the condition of possibility for that fold’s existence. In realizing how our desire is structured not only as a fear of Slaveness, but of Savageness, we can better come to form survival strategies for our communities and, as Fanon suggests, set to work.

#### 8] Calculability –Antiblackness is unable to be calculated on a consequentialist metric – it is both a spiritual and cultural genocide that leads to a psychological and emotional genocide that can’t be accounted for by body count or measure of violence vs another groups.

#### 9] Psychiatric Colonialism – “Other” Bodies are scientifically considered to have “dampened pain and pain signaling” meaning their pain is considered and evaluated differently to justify colonial actions that “won’t hurt as much” – means their starting point is violent.

## Case

#### Commercial mining solves extinction from scarcity, climate, terror, war, and disease.

Pelton 17—(Director Emeritus of the Space and Advanced Communications Research Institute at George Washington University, PHD in IR from Georgetown).. Pelton, Joseph N. 2017. The New Gold Rush: The Riches of Space Beckon! Springer. Accessed 8/30/19.

Are We Humans Doomed to Extinction? What will we do when Earth’s resources are used up by humanity? The world is now hugely over populated, with billions and billions crammed into our overcrowded cities. By 2050, we may be 9 billion strong, and by 2100 well over 11 billion people on Planet Earth. Some at the United Nations say we might even be an amazing 12 billion crawling around this small globe. And over 80 % of us will be living in congested cities. These cities will be ever more vulnerable to terrorist attack, natural disaster, and other plights that come with overcrowding and a dearth of jobs that will be fueled by rapid automation and the rise of artifi cial intelligence across the global economy. We are already rapidly running out of water and minerals. Climate change is threatening our very existence. Political leaders and even the Pope have cautioned us against inaction. Perhaps the naysayers are right. All humanity is at tremendous risk. Is there no hope for the future? This book is about hope. We think that there is literally heavenly hope for humanity. But we are not talking here about divine intervention. We are envisioning a new space economy that recognizes that there is more water in the skies that all our oceans. Th ere is a new wealth of natural resources and clean energy in the reaches of outer space—more than most of us could ever dream possible. There are those that say why waste money on outer space when we have severe problems here at home? Going into space is not a waste of money. It is our future. It is our hope for new jobs and resources. The great challenge of our times is to reverse public thinking to see space not as a resource drain but as the doorway to opportunity. The new space frontier can literally open up a “gold rush in the skies.” In brief, we think there is new hope for humanity. We see a new a pathway to the future via new ventures in space. For too long, space programs have been seen as a money pit. In the process, we have overlooked the great abundance available to us in the skies above. It is important to recognize there is already the beginning of a new gold rush in space—a pathway to astral abundance. “New Space” is a term increasingly used to describe radical new commercial space initiatives—many of which have come from Silicon Valley and often with backing from the group of entrepreneurs known popularly as the “space billionaires.” New space is revolutionizing the space industry with lower cost space transportation and space systems that represent significant cost savings and new technological breakthroughs. “New Commercial Space” and the “New Space Economy” represent more than a new way of looking at outer space. These new pathways to the stars could prove vital to human survival. If one does not believe in spending money to probe the mysteries of the universe then perhaps we can try what might be called “calibrated greed” on for size. One only needs to go to a cubesat workshop, or to Silicon Valley or one of many conferences like the “Disrupt Space” event in Bremen, Germany, held in April 2016 to recognize that entrepreneurial New Space initiatives are changing everything [ 1 ]. In fact, the very nature and dimensions of what outer space activities are today have changed forever. It is no longer your grandfather’s concept of outer space that was once dominated by the big national space agencies. The entrepreneurs are taking over. The hopeful statements in this book and the hard economic and technical data that backs them up are more than a minority opinion. It is a topic of growing interest at the World Economic Forum, where business and political heavyweights meet in Davos, Switzerland, to discuss how to stimulate new patterns of global economic growth. It is even the growing view of a group that call themselves “space ethicists.” Here is how Christopher J. Newman, at the University of Sunderland in the United Kingdom has put it: Space ethicists have offered the view that space exploration is not only desirable; it is a duty that we, as a species, must undertake in order to secure the survival of humanity over the longer term. Expanding both the resource base and, eventually, the habitats available for humanity means that any expenditure on space exploration, far from being viewed as frivolous, can legitimately be rationalized as an ethical investment choice. (Newman) On the other hand there are space ethicists and space exobiologists who argue that humans have created ecological ruin on the planet—and now space debris is starting to pollute space. Th ese countervailing thoughts by the “no growth” camp of space ethicists say we have no right to colonize other planets or to mine the Moon and asteroids—or at least no right to do so until we can prove we can sustain life here on Earth for the longer term. However, for most who are planning for the new space economy the opinion of space philosophers doesn’t really fl oat their boat. Legislators, bankers, and aspiring space entrepreneurs are far more interested in the views of the super-rich capitalists called the space billionaires. A number of these billionaires and space executives have already put some very serious money into enterprises intent on creating a new pathway to the stars. No less than five billionaires with established space ventures—Elon Musk, Paul Allen, Jeff Bezos, Sir Richard Branson, and Robert Bigelow—have invested millions if not billions of dollars into commercializing space. They are developing new technologies and establishing space enterprises that can bring the wealth of outer space down to Earth. This is not a pipe dream, but will increasingly be the economic reality of the 2020s. These wealthy space entrepreneurs see major new economic opportunities. To them space represents the last great frontier for enterprising pioneers. Th us they see an ever-expanding space frontier that offers opportunities in low-cost space transportation, satellite solar power satellites to produce clean energy 24h a day, space mining, space manufacturing and production, and eventually space habitats and colonies as a trajectory to a better human future. Some even more visionary thinkers envision the possibility of terraforming Mars, or creating new structures in space to protect our planet from cosmic hazards and even raising Earth’s orbit to escape the rising heat levels of the Sun in millennia to come. Some, of course, will say this is sci-fi hogwash. It can’t be done. We say that this is what people would have said in 1900 about airplanes, rocket ships, cell phones and nuclear devices. The skeptics laughed at Columbus and his plan to sail across the oceans to discover new worlds. When Thomas Jefferson bought the Louisiana Purchase from France or Seward bought Alaska, there were plenty of naysayers that said such investment in the unknown was an extravagant waste of money. A healthy skepticism is useful and can play a role in economic and business success. Before one dismisses the idea of an impending major new space economy and a new gold rush, it might useful to see what has already transpired in space development in just the past five decades. The world’s first geosynchronous communications satellite had a throughput capability of about 500 kb / s. In contrast, today’s state of the art Viasat 2 —a half century later— has an impressive throughput of some 140 Gb/s. Th is means that the relative throughput is nearly 300,000 greater, while its lifetime is some ten times longer (Figs. 1.1 and 1.2 ). Each new generation of communications satellite has had more power, better antenna systems, improved pointing and stabilization, and an extended lifetime. And the capabilities represented by remote sensing satellites , meteorological satellites , and navigation and timing satellites have also expanded their capabilities and performance in an impressive manner. When satellite applications first started, the market was measured in millions of dollars. Today commercial satellite services exceed a quarter of a billion dollars. Vital services such as the Internet, aircraft traffi c control and management, international banking, search and rescue and much, much more depend on application satellites. Th ose that would doubt the importance of satellites to the global economy might wish to view on You Tube the video “If Th ere Were a Day Without Satellites?” [ 2 ]. Let’s check in on what some of those very rich and smart guys think about the new space economy and its potential. (We are sorry to say that so far there are no female space billionaires, but surely this, too, will come someday soon.) Of course this twenty-fi rst century breakthrough that we call the New Space economy will not come just from new space commerce. It will also come from the amazing new technologies here on Earth. Vital new terrestrial technologies will accompany this cosmic journey into tomorrow. Information technology, robotics, artificial intelligence and commercial space travel systems have now set us on a course to allow us humans to harvest the amazing riches in the skies—new natural resources, new energy, and even totally new ways of looking at the purpose of human existence. If we pursue this course steadfastly, it can be the beginning of a New Space renaissance. But if we don’t seek to realize our ultimate destiny in space, Homo sapiens can end up in the dustbin of history—just like literally millions of already failed species. In each and every one of the five mass extinction events that have occurred over the last 1.5 billion years on Earth, some 50–80 % of all species have gone the way of the T. Rex, the woolly mammoth, and the Dodo bird along with extinct ferns, grasses and cacti. On the other hand, the best days of the human race could be just beginning. If we are smart about how we go about discovering and using these riches in the skies and applying the best of our new technologies, it could be the start of a new beginning for humanity. Konstantin Tsiokovsky, the Russian astronautics pioneer, who fi rst conceived of practical designs for spaceships, famously said: “A planet is the cradle of mankind, but one cannot live in a cradle forever.” Well before Tsiokovsky another genius, Leonardo da Vinci, said, quite poetically: “Once you have tasted flight, you will forever walk the earth with your eyes turned skyward, for there you have been, and there you will always long to return.” The founder of the X-Prize and of Planetary Resources, Inc., Dr. Peter Diamandis, has much more brashly said much the same thing in quite diff erent words when he said: “The meek shall inherit the Earth. The rest of us will go to Mars.” The New Space Billionaires Peter Diamandis is not alone in his thinking. From the list of “visionaries” quoted earlier, Elon Musk, the founder of SpaceX; Sir Richard Branson, the founder of Virgin Galactic; and Paul Allen, the co-founder of Microsoft and the man who financed SpaceShipOne, the world’s first successful spaceplane have all said the future will include a vibrant new space economy. Th ey, and others, have said that we can, we should and we soon shall go into space and realize the bounty that it can offer to us. Th e New Space enterprise is today indeed being led by those so-called space billionaires , who have an exciting vision of the future. They and others in the commercial space economy believe that the exploitation of outer space may open up a new golden age of astral abundance. They see outer space as a new frontier that can be a great source of new materials, energy and various forms of new wealth that might even save us from excesses of the past. Th is gold rush in the skies represents a new beginning. We are not talking about expensive new space ventures funded by NASA or other space agencies in Europe, Japan, China or India. No, these eff orts which we and others call New Space are today being forged by imaginative and resourceful commercial entrepreneurs. Th ese twenty-fi rst century visionaries have the fortitude and zeal to look to the abundance above. New breakthroughs in technology and New Space enterprises may be able to create an “astral life raft” for humanity. Just as Columbus and the Vikings had the imaginative drive that led them to discover the riches of a new world, we now have a cadre of space billionaires that are now leading us into this New Space era of tomorrow. These bold leaders, such as Paul Allen and Sir Richard Branson, plus other space entrepreneurs including Jeff Bezos of Amazon and Blue Origin, and Robert Bigelow, Chairman of Budget Suites and Bigelow Aerospace, not only dream of their future in the space industry but also have billions of dollars in assets. These are the bright stars of an entirely new industry that are leading us into the age of New Space commerce. These space billionaires, each in their own way, are proponents of a new age of astral abundance. Each of them is launching new commercial space industries. They are literally transforming our vision of tomorrow. These new types of entrepreneurial aerospace companies—the New Space enterprises—give new hope and new promise of transforming our world as we know it today. The New Space Frontier What happens in space in the next few decades, plus corresponding new information technologies and advanced robotics, will change our world forever. These changes will redefi ne wealth, change our views of work and employment and upend almost everything we think we know about economics, wealth, jobs, and politics. Th ese changes are about truly disruptive technologies of the most fundamental kinds. If you thought the Internet, smart phones, and spandex were disruptive technologies, just hang on. You have not seen anything yet. In short, if you want to understand a transition more fundamental than the changes brought to the twentieth century world by computers, communications and the Internet, then read this book. There are truly riches in the skies. Near-Earth asteroids largely composed of platinum and rare earth metals have an incredible value. Helium-3 isotopes accessible in outer space could provide clean and abundant energy. There is far more water in outer space than is in our oceans. In the pages that follow we will explain the potential for a cosmic shift in our global economy, our ecology, and our commercial and legal systems. These can take place by the end of this century. And if these changes do not take place we will be in trouble. Our conventional petro-chemical energy systems will fail us economically and eventually blanket us with a hydrocarbon haze of smog that will threaten our health and our very survival. Our rare precious metals that we need for modern electronic appliances will skyrocket in price, and the struggle between “haves” and “have nots” will grow increasingly ugly. A lack of affordable and readily available water, natural resources, food, health care and medical supplies, plus systematic threats to urban security and systemic warfare are the alternatives to astral abundance. The choices between astral abundance and a downward spiral in global standards of living are stark. Within the next few decades these problems will be increasingly real. By then the world may almost be begging for new, out of- the-box thinking. International peace and security will be an indispensable prerequisite for exploitation of astral abundance, as will good government for all. No one nation can be rich and secure when everyone else is poor and insecure. In short, global space security and strategic space defense, mediated by global space agreements, are part of this new pathway to the future.

#### a] Indo-Pak War – goes Nuclear

Klare 20 — Five College professor emeritus of peace and world security studies, and director of the Five College Program in Peace and World Security Studies (PAWSS), holds a B.A. and M.A. from Columbia University and a Ph.D. from the Graduate School of the Union Institute. (Michael; Published: 2020; "Climate Change, Water Scarcity, and the Potential for Interstate Conflict in South Asia"; Journal of Strategic Security 13, No. 4, Pages 109-122; https://doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.13.4.1826 Available at: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol13/iss4/8)//CYang

Interstate conflict over water might occur, the ICA indicated, when several states rely on a shared river system for much of their water supply and one or more of the riparian states sought to maximize the river’s flow for their own benefit at the expense of other states in the basin, amplifying any scarcities already present there. “We judge that as water shortages become more acute beyond the next ten years, water in shared basins will increasingly be used as leverage,” the ICA stated. An upstream state enjoying superior control over a river’s flow might exploit its advantage, say, to extract advantage in international negotiations or to attract international aid for infrastructure projects. As the ICA further noted, “…we assess that states will also use their inherent ability to construct and support major water projects to obtain regional influence or preserve their water interests.”16

The utilization of a state’s superior position in a shared river system to extract political or economic advantage can prove especially destabilizing, the ICA suggested, when weaker states in the system (typically the downstream countries) are especially vulnerable to water scarcity because of long-standing social, economic, and political conditions. Without identifying any particular states by name, the study suggested that this could occur when downstream states suffer from endemic corruption, poor water management practices, and systemic favoritism when it comes to the allocation of scarce water supplies. In such cases, any reduction in the flow of water by an upstream country could easily combine with internal factors in a downstream country to provoke widespread unrest and conflict. “Water shortages, and government failures to manage them, are likely to lead to social disruptions, pressure on national and local leaders, and potentially political instability,” the report noted.17

Although most discussion of the climate and water security nexus has continued to emphasize the risk of internal conflict arising from warming-related water scarcities, some analysts have pursued the line of inquiry introduced by the 2012 ICA, focusing on interstate tensions arising within shared river basins. This was a prominent theme, for example, of a 2013 study conducted by the National Research Council (NRC) on behalf of the IC. Entitled Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis, the 2013 NRC report sought to better identify the links between global warming, pre-existing social vulnerabilities, and the likelihood of conflict. While it echoed earlier studies by the CNA and NIC in identifying internal factors like poverty, ethnic discord, and governmental ineptitude as likely pre-conditions for climate-related conflict, it also examined dangers arising from dependence on shared river systems, especially in cases where cooperation among the riparian powers in managing the system is limited and global warming is expected to reduce future water flows.18

For the NRC, the river systems of greatest concern in this respect were those that originate in the Himalayan Mountains and depend, for a significant share of the annual flow, on meltwater from the Himalayan glaciers. These glaciers are an important source of meltwater for many of Asia’s major rivers, including the Indus, Ganges, Brahmaputra, and

Mekong Rivers. These rivers originate in China but travel through India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam—countries with a combined population of over 3.4 billion people, or approximately 44 percent of the world’s total population.19 A large share of the population in these countries depends on agriculture for its livelihood, so ensuring access to adequate supplies of water is a prime local and national priority. During the monsoon season, heavy rains provide these rivers with abundant water, but during dry seasons they are dependent on glacial meltwater—and, with the rise in global temperatures, the Himalayan glaciers are melting, jeopardizing future water availability in these river basins. Given a history of ethnic and social discord within many of these countries and long-standing tensions among them, analysts fear that such shortages could aggravate both internal and external tensions and ignite interstate as well as intrastate conflict.20

As was the case of previous IC-initiated studies, the authors of the 2013 NRC report were reluctant to identify specific countries in their findings, referring again to “countries of security concern” or other such euphemisms. However, they did select one of these countries in particular: Pakistan. They chose that country for special analysis, the report indicated, because “Pakistan presents a clear example of a country where social dynamics and susceptibility to harm from climate events combine to create a potentially unstable situation.”21 Pakistan was said to suffer from multiple risk factors: Its economy is largely dependent on agriculture; much of the water used for irrigation purposes comes from just one source, the Indus River; control over the allocation of irrigation waters is often exercised by privileged elites, leaving millions of Pakistanis vulnerable to water shortages; and much of the water flowing into the Indus comes from China or from tributaries originating in India, leaving Pakistan in an unfavorable (downstream) position in the system. These conditions have led, in the past, to internal squabbles over water rights and to tensions with India over control of the Indus; now, with the likelihood of diminished meltwater from the Himalayan glaciers, the risk of water scarcity triggering violent conflict of one sort or another becomes that much greater.22

Pakistan, the Indus, and U.S. Security

There is no doubt that Pakistan is considered by U.S. security analysts as a “state important to U.S. national security interests,” the term used by the Defense Intelligence Agency to describe countries of concern in the 2012 ICA on water. Not only is Pakistan a critical—if not always wholehearted—partner in the global war on terror, but it also possesses a substantial arsenal of nuclear weapons whose security is a matter of enormous concern to American leaders.23 Should those munitions wind up with rogue elements of the Pakistani military (some of whose members are believed to maintain clandestine links to radical Islamic organizations), or even worse, should Pakistan descend into civil war and the weapons fall into untrustworthy or hostile hands, the safety of India and other US allies—as well as of American forces deployed in the region—would be at grave risk.24 Ensuring Pakistan’s stability therefore, has long been a major U.S. security objective, prompting regular deliveries of American arms and other military aid. Yet, despite billions of dollars in American aid, Pakistan remains vulnerable to social and ethnic internal strife.25

As noted, farming is the principal economic activity in Pakistan, and ensuring access to water is an overarching public and government concern. This means, above all, managing the use of the Indus—the country’s main source of water for irrigation and its major source of power for electricity generation. Pakistan’s rising population and growing cities, with their rings of factories, are placing an immense strain on the Indus, leading to competition between farmers, industrialists, and urban consumers. With water and power shortages becoming an increasingly frequent aspect of daily life, public protests—sometimes turning violent—have erupted across the country. In one particularly intense bout of rioting, following a prolonged power outage in June 2012, protestors burned trains, blocked roads, looted shops, and damaged banks and gas stations.26

However bad things might be in Pakistan today, climate change is likely to make conditions far worse in the years ahead. Prolonged droughts, climate scientists believe, will occur with increasing regularity, posing a severe threat to the nation’s agricultural sector and further reducing the supply of hydroelectric power. At the same time, warming is expected to increase the intensity of monsoon downpours, resulting in massive flooding (as occurred in 2010) and the loss of valuable topsoil, further adding to Pakistan’s woes. As the Himalayan glaciers melt, moreover, water flow through the Indus will diminish.27 With the competition for land and water resources bound to increase and with Pakistan already divided along ethnic and religious lines, widespread civil strife will become ever more likely, possibly jeopardizing the survival of the state.

It is impossible to predict exactly how the United States might respond to a systemic breakdown of state governance in Pakistan. One thing is clear, however: At the earliest sign that the country’s nuclear weapons are at risk of falling into the hands of hostile parties, the American military would respond with decisive force. In fact, research conducted by the nonpartisan Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) has revealed that the Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) and specialized Army units have been training for such contingencies for some time and have deployed all the necessary gear to the region. In the event of a coup or crisis, the NTI revealed, “U.S. forces would rush into the country, crossing borders, rappelling down from helicopters, and parachuting out of airplanes, so they can secure known or suspected nuclear-storage sites.” Recognizing that any such actions by American forces could trigger widespread resistance by the Pakistani army and/or various jihadist groups, the U.S. Central Command, which has authority over all American forces in the region, has developed plans for backing up JSOC personnel with full-scale military support.28

Another scenario that has some analysts worried is the possibility that a time of sharply reduced water flow through the Indus will coincide with efforts by India to exploit its advantageous position as the upper riparian on three key tributaries of the Indus—the Ravi, the Beas, and the Sutlej—to divert water for its own use, thereby depriving downstream Pakistan of vital supplies and provoking a war between these two countries. India was granted control over the three tributaries under the Indus Water Treaty of 1960, and various Indian leaders have threatened at times to dam the rivers or otherwise reduce their flow into Pakistan as a reprisal for Pakistani attacks on Indian bases in the disputed territory of Kashmir (through which the tributaries flow); this, in turn, has provoked counter-threats from Pakistani leaders.29 What analysts fear most, in such a situation, is that India, possessing superior conventional forces, would overpower Pakistan’s equivalent armies, leading Pakistan’s leaders to order the use of nuclear weapons against India, igniting a regional nuclear war. Such a conflict, scientists have calculated, would result in 50 to 125 million fatalities, and produce a dust cloud covering much of the Earth, decimating global agriculture—an outcome with enormous implications for American national security.30

#### Earth mining kills the environment.

Williams 19 Matthew S Williams 8-1-2019 “Asteroid Mining: What Will It Involve and Is This the Future of Wealth?” <https://interestingengineering.com/asteroid-mining-what-will-it-involve-and-is-this-the-future-of-wealth> (writer at Universe Today)//Elmer

Of course, this raises the obvious question: wouldn't it be really expensive to do all this mining? Why not simply continue to rely on Earth for sources of precious metals and resources and simply learn to use them better? To put it simply, we are running out of resources. To be clear, learning to use our resources better and more sustainably is always a great idea. And while it is certainly true than Earth-based mining is far cheaper than going to space would be, that may not be the case indefinitely. Aside from the fact that off-world minerals and ices would be of considerable value to Earth's economy, there is also the way that growing consumption is leading our reserves to become slowly exhausted. In fact, according to some estimates, it is possible that our planet will run out of key elements that are needed for modern industry and food production within the next 50 to 60 years. This alone is a pretty good incentive to tap the virtually inexhaustible supply of elements located off-world. Plus, there are a lot of benefits to expanding humanity's resource base beyond Earth. Here on Earth, mining takes a considerable toll on the natural environment. In fact, depending on the methods used, it can result in erosion, sinkholes, habitat destruction, and the destruction of native animal and plant life. There's also the dangers of toxic runoff and the contamination of soil, groundwater, and surface water, which is a danger to humans, as well as to wildlife and the natural environment. As for smelting, machining, and manufacturing, the environmental damage that results is well-documented. Combined with power generation, these industrial processes are one of the leading contributors to air, water, and pollution. By shifting these burdens off-world, humanity could dramatically-reduce the impact it has on the natural environment.