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#### Interp and Violation: The affirmative must only defend that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust and may only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of the resolution – the violations is preemptive – if they just derive offense from the consequences of their advocacy and use their method to do impact calc, this shell goes away – if they derive offense from their discourse or method, they violate

#### Private entity is defined by

Cornell Law n.d. “private entity” <https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&height=800&iframe=true&def_id=6-USC-625312480-168358316&term_occur=999&term_src=title:6:chapter:6:subchapter:I:section:1501> TG

1. In general Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

#### Article 2 of the Outer Space Treaty defines outer space and appropriation

OST 66 “2222 (XXI). Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies.” UN Office for Outer Space Affairs, 1499th plenary meeting, Dec 19, 1966, <https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/outerspacetreaty.html> TG

ARTICLE II. Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.

#### Vote neg:

#### The resolution defines the division of ground --- it was announced in advance, providing both sides with a reasonable opportunity to *prepare to engage* one another’s arguments --- this doesn’t require any particular style, type of evidence, or role of the judge --- AND only a textual reading provides a predictable basis for research.

#### Fairness – post facto topic adjustment structurally favors the aff by manipulating the balance of prep. They can specialize in 1 area of literature for 4 years which gives them a huge edge over people switching topics every 2 months and locks us into a predictable null set of monolithic criticisms that are susceptible to the perm. Fairness is an impact - a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity which they’ve ceded validity to by participating, b] probability – individual ballots can’t alter subjectivity even if long term clash over a season can, but they can rectify skews which means the only immediate impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins, c] it internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education

#### Clash – argumentative testing along a stable tether and SSD are good – they force debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives through nuanced 3rd and 4th level testing that only occurs alongside a stasis point for preparation. Non-T affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to ideological dogmatism – our argument is that the process of defending and answering proposals against a well-researched opponent is a benefit of engaging the topic regardless of the truth value of those proposals.

#### Topic education---the process of detail-driven research over space is essential to rupture ignorance surrounding space---NewSpace thrives on lack of awareness which preordains unparalleled inequality and imperialism

--Space has potential to be radically equal – mining resources and giving to the global south, new career opportunities, etc, but only if we fight for that equality

--Clash is key – identifying ways to make space equal and to challenge NewSpace cannot involve clinging to convictions

Weeks, 12 – PhD, Webster University Adjunct Professor of International Relations

Edythe Weeks, “Outer Space Development, International Relations and Space Law: A Method for Elucidating Seeds,” Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 2012

The global knowledge community is made up of individuals, each with their own perspective and their own actual or potential areas of research. Individuals may become so attached to their research that they become oblivious to the connections between their work and the work of others. Realizing the opportunities that exist to construct bridges between our and others’ ideas through shared research can enable humankind to grow beyond the sum of our own personal research goals, agendas, and outcomes. We should work towards a global community by focusing on ways to connect ever more people, ideas, and fields of research.

Understanding international relations, the meaning of global citizenship, and the application of the social and behavioral sciences has led to a technological-scientific revolution, creating not only a new perspective on education, but an undeniable force that now functions in parallel to it. Education is a dynamic process and is not limited to one specific science. We as human beings have the intellect to consider, understand, and create our own choices in any aspect of our lives. However, if we limit ourselves to any domain of any science we thereby limit the infinite possibilities of thought.

Due to survival strategies and the urge to be the best in our fields, we, as human beings, tend to neglect and discount the valuable contributions that our competitors could make to our own work, thereby foreclosing the possibility of a true dialog of the intellects—a dialog which children need even without knowing that they need it. Children from the ages of 4 to 16 are taught not to use the entirety of their brain, just as if society as a whole were conditioned according to the divisions the child encounters between school, family, the workplace, athletics, etc.—these being just a few examples of activities that are used to socialize people into typical patterns of behavior.

Exposure to many different domains of knowledge—such as space medicine for medical students and physicians, for example—allows individuals, especially younger students, unrestricted scope to expand their aspirations. As technology advances so do the technological pathways that allow us to communicate. Any education project which is directed towards such an end promotes global communication. If we as a global community do not share our resources, we are closing crucial portals through which the insights of the future may make themselves available to us. On the other hand, if we do succeed so to share, we may come to constitute a true global community of human beings, which may be valued as the truest success with which our endeavors could be met.

It is the eve of outer space development, but few people are aware of this. In the absence of awareness, people cannot prepare for the opportunities that will arise; and so the vast wealth likely to flow to Earth from outer space will cause ever-greater inequality and instability in our already unequal and unstable world.

This book is a call to educators to factor equality and diversity into the process of outer space development by creating a widespread movement to teach outer space development studies to all students, especially those who study social and behavioral sciences. In calling for this, I am also putting out a call to visionary thinkers to increase public awareness that outer space is already in the process of being developed. My objective is to provide a pedagogical approach aimed at mending the knowledge gap. If we fail in this objective, we are more likely than ever before to witness ever-widening gaps of social and financial inequality.

The first question that will arise as we embark on this process, of course, will be: Why Outer Space Development?

People often ask where the money will come from to develop outer space. Platinum-group metals such as iridium and osmium, and various other valuable untapped natural resources, have been discovered in abundant quantities and are likely to be mined by companies. The discovery of natural resources has sparked development projects in the past. These historical patterns of human behavior are occurring again today, as companies speed up the process of private spaceship development.

A myriad of space laws and policies are already in place to support space commercialization. Recently, the 2010 NASA Authorization Act and various other laws and policies initiated by the U.S. government have placed on the agenda plans to build advanced space transportation systems; to privatize spacecraft development; to create commercial space habitats, space stations, and space settlements; to initiate commercial space mining; to investigate spacecraft trajectory optimization for landing on near-Earth asteroids; to engage in commercial spaceport construction and interstellar-interplanetary-international telecommunications; and to launch space exploration missions to near-Earth asteroids, the Moon, Mars, and Mars’s moons. U.S. initiatives have in the past been mirrored by the international community, and we can expect to see similar patterns arising on a global scale—indeed, as this book will demonstrate, they already are.

The global community is experiencing economic recession, natural disasters, lack of opportunity, employment anxiety, failing K-12 programs, widening inequality gaps, uprisings, revolutions, revolts, unmet educational goals, and a general failure to uplift, inspire, and provide meaningful opportunities for significant portions of our population. In the United States of America, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan failed to jumpstart the economy; the Dow Jones failed; Wall Street failed; millions of working people lost their houses to foreclosure; tent communities and homeless populations are on the increase; many people are experiencing depression, anxiety, career anxiety; we see alarming rates of people dropping out of high school and college; and there is a general lack of opportunities, along with high rates of job loss. People need something that will allow them to focus anew their talents, energies, abilities, and gifts, and use this bleak climate as an opportunity for positive change. Outer space development is emerging as an answer to this state of crisis. The question is: To whom will the benefits accrue?

Many strategic decisions have already been taken regarding space development of which the global general public is unaware. Once legal rights to space resources are granted, only those with the capital to take advantage of new laws and policies will be in a position to profit from the new space industries. Only those who are in a position to “know” about outer space development will be in position to take advantage of the opportunities. It is important to remember that the global general public has for several decades being paying the start-up costs for space exploration research, science, and technology. It’s not too late to factor in equality before an infrastructure of inequality is forever with us as we venture to establish the final frontier.

I struggled for many years to find a framework for explaining what I observed was happening with respect to outer space development. Antonio Gramsci’s insights from his many writings provided a suitable all-overthe-place/messy analysis that was able to accommodate the myriad activities occurring within the working parts of the outer space development regime. Now that the battle between Communism and Capitalism is over, perhaps it’s safe to pick out select insights from Gramsci. It is not my intent here to promote either Communism or Capitalism. Rather, I aim to promote equality as outer space is developed.

The methodological framework used in this book relies on theories and concepts of international relations, with added insights from critical analytical theory. My research addresses the need to increase public awareness regarding outer space development. It also serves as a reminder that embedded inequality, feelings of subjugation, oppression, and of being left out of important development projects tend to produce discontent, and are eventually likely to produce international conflict. Equal opportunities tend to bring peace. We must design a model suitable for peace as we develop the final frontier.

The first step toward accomplishing this goal is to expose students, teachers, administrators, civic leaders, and public officials to cutting-edge research which highlights emerging industries in the field of outer space development. Exposing students to this type of cutting-edge knowledge while it is being created is likely to have a markedly positive impact on their future careers. Preparing them now to lead in newly emerging industries at a time when outer space settlements are being constructed can serve as a powerful motivating force to enable them to want to excel in school. Budding abilities, gifts, and talents can be recruited, nourished, and developed. Space has long been known to engage and interest students, and it is time to take these possibilities to a place beyond mere fascination. It is time to take students to a new level—to actual meaningful participation in outer space development resulting in tangible career opportunities.

Imagine outer space development themes being used to motivate and reinspire high school students who have lost their interest in school. Imagine outer space studies being added to the K-12 curriculum across the globe. Imagine universities providing students the opportunity to prepare themselves to lead as newly emerging industries take flight. Imagine outer space development sparking creativity and innovation. Imagine realizable opportunities made known to people from all walks of life within each nation so that we can all get ready to meet the challenges as humankind ascends into outer space. Imagine people being retrained for new job opportunities. This vision enables us to view outer space development as a means for solving the inequality gap problem that many scholars, activists, and academics have complained about. Outer space development can serve as an incentive for world peace and equality.

During a television interview in May 2002, Channel 2 News correspondent Joe Dana asked me if it bothered me that my research might not be relevant for 200 years; in fact my research became relevant approximately two years later, in December of 2004, when the Commercial Space Launch Amendments Act was passed. This new law provided a legal framework for the newly emerging private spaceship industry.

There has been a pattern of articulation in my life. I’ve articulated phenomena that I suspected would happen, and I’ve watched as predicted phenomena occurred. People often have asked me how I knew that space tourism, space mining, private spaceships, and commercial space settlements would become newly emerging industries. This book represents my attempt to recount all of this “knowing” in the form of a methodology to assist students and scholars along their path towards understanding and explaining emerging phenomena.

Acting on intuition, I began researching space law and outer space development and imagined it becoming an emerging phenomenon. Imagine knowing or suspecting that something was going to happen, but not knowing how to prove it, or how to discuss it in meaningful ways. This need to know, prove, and discuss outer space development prompted me to pursue the Ph.D. path. On that journey, I learned how to develop a methodology for explaining and understanding social and behavioral phenomena. This was necessary, because without it I wasn’t able to talk about the topic without getting funny looks and weird reactions. It was common to think that because I had no experience in science, technology, engineering, math, or space science, that I had no right to think or speak about outer space development. However, the seeds of proof and expertise were scattered all around: I just needed to learn how to locate, compile, analyze, understand, explain, and so discuss the relevant data.

From 1998 to 2006 I read books, articles, news reports, films, documentaries, videos, podcasts, hearing transcripts, policy statements, dissertations, websites, speeches, documents, databanks, policies, laws, and international treaties. I also attended various space-related conferences and listened to relevant presentations and discussions. I observed social and behavioral phenomena, analyzed written and printed materials distributed during the conferences, and presented papers to the congresses of the International Astronautical Federation and International Institute of Space Law. Inadvertently, I became part of the outer space development process, and around 2004 I was able to observe as outer space development began to accelerate. Ideology and discourse related to outer space had always made it seem as part of a fantasy world to most people; but now a new global vision of outer space as the answer to many of the world’s problems is emerging. Commercial spaceports are being conceptualized and constructed, new types of spaceships are being designed and tested, and space colonies are being planned, designed, and discussed. In this real life scenario, the actors are drawn from a multitude of nations which are planning, testing, and evaluating mankind’s prolonged presence in outer space. I found myself right in the middle of all of this.

#### TVA --- defend that private sectors are unjust because they’ll export Islamophobia to space --- 1AC Yaqeen proves

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative
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#### The reliance upon the politics of personal identity ignores the *material bases of oppression* --- in order to change the existing political order, our critique must preface class.

Moufawad-Paul 13. Josh Moufawad-Paul, 4/23/13, Professor of Philosophy @ York University, Toronto. “10 Theses on Identity Politics,” Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Reflections, http://moufawad-paul.blogspot.com/2013/04/10-theses-on-identity-politics.html.

1) By basing a definition of oppression on sites of identity wrenched from a materialist basis, there emerges a concept of oppression that lacks any revolutionary praxis. There can be no solidarity in a theory that divides along multiple moments of identity and elevates these molecularities above the molar basis that actually divides a given mode of production into ruling and ruled classes. While it may be unfashionable in certain academic circles to make this claim, the only basis of revolutionary unity is still the basis of social class since a given mode of production, as well as the momentum of history, is determined, in the last instance, by class struggle. 2) While it is correct to reject the class essentialism of a crude marxism that in itself produces its own form of identity politics (where the proletariat is automatically and erroneously overcoded according to a white, male, hetero, able-bodied, and cis-gendered identity), it is incorrect to substitute a post-modern politics of difference––which concretely means identity politics––in its place. To argue that the proletariat’s composition is defined by these sites of oppression is not the same as clinging to a politics that speaks only of these sites, wrenched from the material basis of social class and treated in an abstract and intersecting manner, rather than the material fact of class division. Class might be determined by these moments of oppression, but it also and simultaneously determines these moments of oppression. Again: in the final instance we have to recognize social/economic class as the basis of revolutionary struggle. 3) The theory of intersectionality, a term flouted about by those committed to an identitarian approach, is ultimately banal. While it is indeed a fact that class, race, sex, gender, nationality, etc. intersect, recognizing this fact is about as useful as recognizing that the clouds are grey when it is close to raining. No theory of intersectionality proposed by proponents of post-modern and identitarian approaches has done anything more significant than inform us of the obvious fact that oppression intersects and overlaps; they generally fail to explain why and how they overlap, and more importantly they fail to provide a praxis of revolutionary unity. Here the statements of intersectionality mean only the recognition of disparate trajectories that happen to intersect, just because they do, rather than provide a precise epistemology of intersection. 4) Revolutionary communists have known, for a long time, that disparate oppressions intersect in the moment of class which is the final instance rather than a separate identitarian trajectory. By pretending that social class is something that is only a moment of intersection, rather than the material basis that makes sense of intersection, identity politics cannot challenge capitalism in a scientific manner. Instead, all it can do is offer moralizations. 5) Those who champion the enshrined practices of identity politics––anti-oppression training, “safe spaces”, rarified theories of privilege, abstract movementism––are generally petty-bourgeois academics. The irony is that while many of these people possess a significant level of intellectual privilege (and note that the post-modern theories behind this politics are currently accessible mainly to students and intellectuals) they do not grasp the privilege generated by their social class as the primary moment of privilege, or even recognize that they are economically privileged, when they speak of privilege, oppression, intersectionality, etc. Hence the failure to produce a material analysis of oppression: under capitalism those who possess the most “privilege” are those who possess the most economic autonomy, i.e. the bourgeosie, and those who possess the intellectual autonomy to flourish in the spaces opened by identity politics also possess, in some very significant ways and regardless of their specific identities (oppressed or otherwise), the very privilege they imagine they lack. None of this is to say that these practices were not at one point of time necessary, or at least the logical result of the class essentialism of a crude marxism, but just that they can be nothing more than a petty-bourgeois activism that produces neo-reformism. 6) Although there have been numerous marxist attempts to reject identity politics without falling back into class essentialism, most have ended up reifying the content of identity politics. (Hence the recent bad faith appropriation of proletarian feminism where the same identitarian notion of “privilege” is presupposed and revolutionary theorists such as Anuradha Gandhy are poached by bourgeois feminists who replace exploitation with an idealist concept of oppression.) Generally speaking, in our attempt to supersede a class essentialism while learning from the politics of identity, some of us tend to err more on the side of the latter in an attempt to overcome the problems of the former. This error makes sense in light of the history of crude marxism and yet is still an error… for if we claim we are marxists, then we need to offer something more and beyond the simplest and idealist rejections of a marxism that belongs in the dustbin of history.

#### Capitalism causes war, violence, environmental destruction, [racism], and extinction.

Robinson 14 (William I., Prof. of Sociology, Global and International Studies, and Latin American Studies, @ UC-Santa Barbara, “Global Capitalism: Crisis of Humanity and the Specter of 21st Century Fascism” The World Financial Review)

Cyclical, Structural, and Systemic Crises Most commentators on the contemporary crisis refer to the “Great Recession” of 2008 and its aftermath. Yet the causal origins of global crisis are to be found in over-accumulation and also in contradictions of state power, or in what Marxists call the internal contradictions of the capitalist system. Moreover, because the system is now global, crisis in any one place tends to represent crisis for the system as a whole. The system cannot expand because the marginalisation of a significant portion of humanity from direct productive participation, the downward pressure on wages and popular consumption worldwide, and the polarisation of income, has reduced the ability of the world market to absorb world output. At the same time, given the particular configuration of social and class forces and the correlation of these forces worldwide, national states are hard-pressed to regulate transnational circuits of accumulation and offset the explosive contradictions built into the system. Is this crisis cyclical, structural, or systemic? Cyclical crises are recurrent to capitalism about once every 10 years and involve recessions that act as self-correcting mechanisms without any major restructuring of the system. The recessions of the early 1980s, the early 1990s, and of 2001 were cyclical crises. In contrast, the 2008 crisis signaled the slide into a structural crisis*. Structural crises* reflect deeper contra- dictions that can only be resolved by a major restructuring of the system. The structural crisis of the 1970s was resolved through capitalist globalisation. Prior to that, the structural crisis of the 1930s was resolved through the creation of a new model of redistributive capitalism, and prior to that the struc- tural crisis of the 1870s resulted in the development of corpo- rate capitalism. A systemic crisis involves the replacement of a system by an entirely new system or by an outright collapse. A structural crisis opens up the possibility for a systemic crisis. But if it actually snowballs into a systemic crisis – in this case, if it gives way either to capitalism being superseded or to a breakdown of global civilisation – is not predetermined and depends entirely on the response of social and political forces to the crisis and on historical contingencies that are not easy to forecast. This is an historic moment of extreme uncertainty, in which collective responses from distinct social and class forces to the crisis are in great flux. Hence my concept of global crisis is broader than financial. There are multiple and mutually constitutive dimensions – economic, social, political, cultural, ideological and ecological, not to mention the existential crisis of our consciousness, values and very being. There is a crisis of social polarisation, that is, of *social reproduction.* The system cannot meet the needs or assure the survival of millions of people, perhaps a majority of humanity. There are crises of state legitimacy and political authority, or of *hegemony* and *domination.* National states face spiraling crises of legitimacy as they fail to meet the social grievances of local working and popular classes experiencing downward mobility, unemployment, heightened insecurity and greater hardships. The legitimacy of the system has increasingly been called into question by millions, perhaps even billions, of people around the world, and is facing expanded counter-hegemonic challenges. Global elites have been unable counter this erosion of the system’s authority in the face of worldwide pressures for a global moral economy. And a canopy that envelops all these dimensions is a crisis of sustainability rooted in an ecological holocaust that has already begun, expressed in climate change and the impending collapse of centralised agricultural systems in several regions of the world, among other indicators. By a crisis of humanityI mean a crisis that is approaching systemic proportions, threatening the ability of billions of people to survive, and raising the specter of a collapse of world civilisation and degeneration into a new “Dark Ages.”2 This crisis of humanity shares a number of aspects with earlier structural crises but there are also several features unique to the present: 1. The system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. Global capitalism now couples human and natural history in such a way as to threaten to bring about what would be the sixth mass extinction in the known history of life on earth.3 This mass extinction would be caused not by a natural catastrophe such as a meteor impact or by evolutionary changes such as the end of an ice age but by purposive human activity. According to leading environmental scientists there are nine “planetary boundaries” crucial to maintaining an earth system environment in which humans can exist, four of which are experiencing at this time the onset of irreversible environmental degradation and three of which (climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss) are at “tipping points,” meaning that these processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries. 2. The magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as is the concentration of the means of global communication and symbolic production and circulation in the hands of a very few powerful groups. Computerised wars, drones, bunker-buster bombs, star wars, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare. Warfare has become normalised and sanitised for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. At the same time we have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication, images and symbolic production. The world of Edward Snowden is the world of George Orwell; *1984 has arrived;* 3. Capitalism is reaching apparent limits to its extensive expansion. There are no longer any new territories of significance that can be integrated into world capitalism, de-ruralisation is now well advanced, and the commodification of the countryside and of pre- and non-capitalist spaces has intensified, that is, converted in hot-house fashion into spaces of capital, so that *intensive* expansion is reaching depths never before seen. Capitalism must continually expand or collapse. How or where will it now expand? 4. There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums,”4 alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins, and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and to destruction - to a mortal cycle of dispossession-exploitation-exclusion. This includes prison-industrial and immigrant-detention complexes, omnipresent policing, militarised gentrification, and so on; 5. There is a disjuncture between a globalising economy and a nation-state based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to play the role of what social scientists refer to as a “hegemon,” or a leading nation-state that has enough power and authority to organise and stabilise the system. The spread of weapons of mass destruction and the unprecedented militarisation of social life and conflict across the globe makes it hard to imagine that the system can come under any stable political authority that assures its reproduction. Global Police State How have social and political forces worldwide responded to crisis? The crisis has resulted in a rapid political polarisation in global society. Both right and left-wing forces are ascendant. Three responses seem to be in dispute. One is what we could call “reformism from above.” This elite reformism is aimed at stabilising the system, at saving the system from itself and from more radical re- sponses from below. Nonetheless, in the years following the 2008 collapse of the global financial system it seems these reformers are unable (or unwilling) to prevail over the power of transnational financial capital. A second response is popular, grassroots and leftist resistance from below. As social and political conflict escalates around the world there appears to be a mounting global revolt. While such resistance appears insurgent in the wake of 2008 it is spread very unevenly across countries and regions and facing many problems and challenges. Yet another response is that I term *21st century fascism*.5 The ultra-right is an insurgent force in many countries. In broad strokes, this project seeks to fuse reactionary political power with transnational capital and to organise a mass base among historically privileged sectors of the global working class – such as white workers in the North and middle layers in the South – that are now experiencing heightened insecurity and the specter of downward mobility. It involves militarism, extreme masculinisation, homophobia, racism and racist mobilisations, including the search for scapegoats, such as immigrant workers and, in the West, Muslims. Twenty-first century fascism evokes mystifying ideologies, often involving race/culture supremacy and xenophobia, embracing an idealised and mythical past. Neo-fascist culture normalises and glamorises warfare and social violence, indeed, generates a fascination with domination that is portrayed even as heroic.

#### The role of the ballot should endorse the best political tactics for organizing against material oppressio and the alternative is to theorize through communism --- the best method is the one that most effectively catalyzes political organization against capitalism.

Walker 14 (Gavin, Assistant Professor of History and East Asian Studies at McGill University, “The Reinvention of Communism: Politics, History, Globality,” The South Atlantic Quarterly 113:4, Fall 2014)

Since the turn of the twenty-first century, the term communism has returned to the theoretical and historical agenda with a striking force and a surprising novelty. 1 In a wide range of fields of knowledge, the questions of the actuality and the history of the world communist movement, the theoretical tendencies of communist thought, and the current political possibilities of new developments of communism have been revisited and addressed anew. In the social movements that have sprung up in nations around the world—from Spain to Greece to Quebec, throughout Latin America, Asia, Africa, and beyond—-the word communism has again acquired a critical force, not a force of nostalgia or simple retrospection, but a new and creative force. We can only be struck by the degree to which it now seems that communism, far from the dead end of the twentieth century it was long assumed to be, may be something profoundly of the twenty-first century, an idea and field of concepts whose time has come. When Antonio Negri emphasizes that the communists today are “alone and potent,” he alerts us to a crucial point that I want to highlight, from two divergent directions, in the following essay. Rather than see the contemporary communist moment simply as a “return,” implying a transposition of the same forces, forms, and contents, this moment indicates instead an open field for the reinvention of communism. The earlier modality of twentieth-century communism, linked above all to the existence and continuity established by the Soviet Union, no longer exists. No longer is there a national form or federated space that would serve as a “bulwark” of the communist project. In this sense, the communists today are alone. Yet Negri insists that the communists are alone and potent. This potency is derived, not as in the previous arrangement, from a site of institutional force that could be treated as a model of explanation, but from this fact of being alone, untethered, unguaranteed, not beholden to a specific historical telos. In this sense, the communists today are potent because they are alone. What does this new political solitude mean for the concepts and contents of communism in our contemporary moment? Two distinct trends emerge in this development of communism in our global present. One is the great historic movement that has transferred the center of gravity of a reinvented communist politics to the exterior of the West, taken in the broadest sense. This globality of communism is in essence a fulfillment of a promise rather than a historical accident, the fulfillment of a politics that from the outset sought a new theoretical and political destiny beyond the horizon of the national and local. The second is the striking link between this return—and reinvention—of communism and its site of return, one of which is without doubt the field of “critical theory.” What makes this site peculiar is that it too, like the political potential of communism itself, has been in a long retreat since the 1980s in the fields of knowledge production around the world. Theory’s originary impulse toward the politicization of knowledge, the immanent critique of the university, and its globality, the fact that theory has long provided a common language beyond the regime of national language, has been the target of an intense revanchist attack by institutional neoliberalism, conservative politics, and positivist knowledge work. But new experiences have emerged in recent years to produce a situation in which these two developments—one linked to the practical social movements and reinventions of political organization and the other linked to the crystallization of a new trend in theory—are experiencing complex and volatile articulations and points of contact. What we are seeing today is perhaps the first emergence of a new direction and politicization of theory itself, the first stirrings of a communist critical theory. P o litics: P e rs is te n c e a n d S cissio n One distinguishing feature of the current discussions of the “communist hypothesis” (Badiou), the “actuality of communism” (Bosteels), and “the communist horizon” (Dean) is a renewal of an insistence on the primacy of politics over the mere presupposition of a politics derived from the structural analysis of global capitalism’s current tendencies, level of technical composition, and scale of development of the productive forces. These thinkers maintain a conception of politics that upholds its rarity, its intermittent or hazardous quality. Rather than accept the given character of politics, in which it would become a figure of ubiquity or immanence (the banal argument that “everything is political”), the rethinking of the question of communism has also insisted on a divergent genealogy of what is and what is not political. Rather than a constantly presupposed undercurrent, this figure of politics would instead be, for instance, in Alain Badiou (2001), the rare event that grounds a political sequence and convokes a subject through a fidelity, or in Jacques Ranciere’s (1999) terms, the egalitarian proposal that suspends the representations possible in the dominant order (“the police”).2 This concept of politics is, above all, linked to new attempts to think the place of the subject of politics, and it is this point that provides an entry into the critical dimensions of this “communist hypothesis” within the theoretical field. The rethinking of communism today has distinguished itself as a trend in insisting on antagonism, contradiction, the subject, politics, and organization; it refuses gestures of diffusion, multiplicity as such, focusing on the dialectical conditions of the possible rather than the immanent conditions of the impossible. There is here a reaction to the monopoly held by a very specific register—the Derridean register of defeat and withdrawal, the Deleuzian register of immanence and multiplicity—within the broadly left trends of thought and knowledge production. Metapolitically speaking, we can observe within the works associated with this “communist hypothesis” a rebirth of simple, seemingly “obvious” concepts: truth, justice, fidelity, struggle, honor, courage, and so forth, concepts largely derided in the postdeconstruction trends of thought and relegated to the realm of the “popular,” avoided as vulgarities too “earnest” for the field of so-called theory. Instead, detachment, irony, withdrawal, defeat, finitude, the impossibility of presence, the impossibility of naming, the impossibility of an affirmative creation, and the impossibility of an interventionist politics proper often constitute the typical terms of theoretical work. There is thus in the recent communist current a refusal to accept this by-now rigid division of labor, one that has decisive consequences for both politics and critical theory itself. What lies behind this new vocabulary and new set of gestures? Above all, it is the insistence on a link between the internal dynamics of theory and the external situation, in particular, on the question of organization. Let us consider a few short texts that might be taken as a “pre-history” of this notion, a polemical period of Badiou’s work that expresses the essence of the overall problem: how to develop and conceptualize a theory of politics that is not simply a reflection or proof of a structural or given feature of the situation in which we find ourselves, a theory of politics that is not beholden to concepts of historical necessity. Behind this thesis lies a resistance to the notion that politics is involved in a flattening of phenomena, a fear of antagonism, the preference for holism over division, the emphasis on consensus, on “friendship,” against contestation. In 1977 Badiou launched a frontal attack against Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s work for its implied political pitfalls. This attack on their “fascism of the potato” is excessive, dogmatic, beyond the demands of the political conjuncture (going so far as to identify them as “prefascist ideologues”). But it also contains an extremely important point for the paradox of organization within politics, perhaps the key kernel of the new trend inaugurated in theoretical work by the hypothesis of communism. In this text, Badiou (2012:199-200) reacts against Deleuze and Guattari’s celebration of multiplicity, appeals to escape, to flight, to becoming-multiple, becomingschizophrenic, becoming-minor, and so forth,3 by intersecting this theoretical work with the concrete terms of the political situation: We have seen this in May ’68: If you have the mass revolt, but not the proletarian antagonism, you obtain the victory of the bourgeois antagonism (of bourgeois politics). If you have ideas that are just, but not Marxism, you obtain the return to power of the bourgeois reformists of the Parti Socialiste. If you have the objective forces, but neither the programme nor the party, you obtain the revenge of Pompidou’s parliamentarianism, you obtain the return to the scene of the PCF and the unions. Badiou argues that Deleuze and Guattari fail to carry through the very ideas that found their major theoretical concepts. They support the mass revolt, but lack the antagonism between “friends” and “enemies” of the people; they have “just ideas”—freedom, the overturning of injustice, the defense of the workers, the poor, the targets of a vicious imperialism in and out of the metropole—but no structural features link the situation of domination with an affirmative politics of inversion; they include the objective forces of the masses in social motion, but lack direction, a concrete framework within which the mass movement can orient itself. Badiou argues that these elements finally invert into their opposites: the victory of bourgeois politics, reformism, parliamentarism, and so forth. But what is behind this charge, this accusation? Two elements subtend this polemic whose compositional elements are returning today to the theoretical scene through the return to the communist hypothesis, namely, persistence and scission. Badiou charges Deleuze and Guattari with the production of a theoretical system that is itself in a constant process of diverting, redirecting, and moving sideways to avoid “capture.” Such a politics cannot sustain the forces it unleashes; it can initiate moments of dissensus within the dominant order, but it cannot persist in a full overturning of their foundations or proceed from this moment of dissensus to a new hegemony over the situation. Such a mode of thought poses questions, identifies structural injustices, and marks points of rupture, but it nevertheless chooses, at the final moment, to refuse to uphold a strong division, a strong break, an insistence on one side over another, one line over another. Badiou (2012:199-200) puts this point in a dense and powerful formulation: “To think the multiple outside the two, outside scission, amounts to practicing in exteriority the dictatorship of the One.” If you think the multiple, you can expose the One to its internal disunity, the false impression of substantiality. But merely pointing to the multiple character of a social and political situation is not in itself a bridge to a politics. Remarking on the multivocal character of what appears as a unity is in no way a critique, much less an intervention, within this situation. Instead, the multivocal reality of the unitary image can always be recuperated precisely in the service of the One. In a circumstance of social struggle, it is never enough to point to the heterogeneous composition of all positions—“the police are also drawn from the lower stratum of society,” “their pensions are also being cut back by the state,” “within the ranks of the workers are some with terrible ideas,” “the activists are not as upstanding as they say they are,” and so on—and thereby to end in the original abstentionist position: “It’s all so complicated, it’s not just one thing and another.” This type of analysis, which always underscores the hybridity and mutual complicity of political scenarios, itself participates in the naive fantasy of imagining that exposing this multiplicity allows one out of the practice of partisanship. In such an optic, you can go on multiplying the options, always finding yet another option, always finding a “third way,” always insisting on escape from the binary, escape from the pressure of limited choices, always demanding an evacuation of responsibility, of having to uphold the consequences of a choice. To force a cut in the situation is to assert that the One is forever split, that there is a two-line struggle in every social and political scenario, that politics proper consists in this scission itself: the formation of an antagonism where previously there was only a semblance of unity. This is why Badiou emphasizes the Two—when you choose to say, “I don’t want either side, they’re all bad, we don’t have to make a choice, we don’t have to have just one thing,” what is installed in theory and in practice is not a splitting or splintering of the One into its infinitely heterogeneous elements (the thesis of multiplicity) but a withdrawal that allows the One to remain intact. This is precisely what Badiou calls, in the above formulation, “practicing in exteriority the dictatorship of the One.” By choosing flight or escape, the status quo (i.e., the One) reasserts itself, this time stronger than before, bolstered by the experience of finding in its own image of multiplicity a renewed unity. What remains a true politics is the courage to choose, to insist on the Two, to not fear division, separation, scission. To accept the responsibility of the choice, to accept that there is no way to opt out—that the act of a supposed withdrawal is in fact a refusal to countenance real movement, real overturning of the situation, a break that has to be sustained—is to accept the responsibility to uphold the choice despite the fact that there is no going back. What does this argument contain for the current rethinking of communism? Above all, it holds that politics is contained not in overturning the system of social binaries, or in finding a “third way,” or in escapism, defeatism, or abstention. A common thread today, in all the thinkers reinventing the term communism, is a long and arduous struggle for hegemony in the world of thought, a world devoted to concepts of the “death of the subject,” the refusal of binaries, the emphasis on incessant multiplicity, and so forth. This struggle for a new politics recognizes the dead end of these “philosophies of defeat,” in Bruno Bosteels’s terms. It recognizes that a new communist development will come, not from the endless work of withdrawal and negation as such, but from the affirmative and interventionist declaration that politics is possible and the status quo can be permanently fractured. And this fracture produces the need for a persistence, the ability to carry through the full consequences of the initial break.
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Narratives PIC

#### Counterplan text: we endorse the entirety of the aff minus their use of narratives. To clarify, using personal narratives is bad.

#### We endorse the content of thehir message but we rejec ttheir uses of narratives as a means to express it.

#### Narratives are violent – they force the judge to compare between different people’s experiences and stories, which requires the judge to quantify lived experiences and suffering which causes oppression olympics and violence when osmeone is told that their narratives are not good enough
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Radical Loss CP

#### CP Text: Vote negative to inject the affirmative advocacy with a radical loss.

**Genosko 16** - Gary Genosko, University of Ontario, Lo Sguardo, 8/29/16 “How to Lose to a Chess Playing Computer According to Jean Baudrillard” [<http://www.losguardo.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/2017-23-Genosko.pdf>] Accessed 9/14/20 SAO

Readers of Baudrillard know that he thought about competition in sport and games in terms of failure and frailty. In For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign, exchange value and symbolic ambivalence are mutually exclusive domains; in the latter, desire is not satisfied through phantasmic completion, and this entails that desire may ride failure to an ignominious counter-victory. Baudrillard found in the failure to react positively to an inducement like winning a race – captured in that bizarre American football phrase appropriated as a handle by Ronald Reagan, «Win One for the Gipper!» – the principle of a radical counter-economy of needs. Losers come in all shades. But radical losers stand apart from the crowd in the virulence of their capacity to radiate loss that they throw down as a challenge. There are those whso are irresistibly drawn to blowing it, and others who can taste failure and steal it from the jaws of victory. From the Beatles to Beck, the figure of the loser has fascinated lyricists and theorists alike as not merely sympathetic but as a foundation for a deliberate weakness in the face of overwhelming odds and the false pretenses of victory. Here I revisit Jean Baudrillard’s speculations about computer chess programs, specifically IBM’s Deep and Deeper Blue, and how best to play against them. Drawing on Baudrillard’s theory of loss in sports as an act of contempt for the fruits of victory, institutional accommodation, and the cheap inducements of prestige and glory, I examine how chess masters like Garry Kasparov have met the challenge of the brute force programs – some of which were congealed models of his own play – with appeals to a kind of unforced play and even ‘non-thought’. Considering the malevolent and fictional computer system HAL, as well as Deep Blue and subsequent programs, right up to IBM’s Jeopardy-playing computer ‘Watson’, this paper looks at ways to defeat programming power by critically regaining the counter-technical and (dys)functional skills of the loser.

#### The Affirmative critique is assimilated to justify the moral superstructure they criticize. It’s try or die for the CP under their role of the ballot.

**Robinson 12** - Andrew Robinson, Ceasefire, August 24th, 2012 “An A to Z of Theory | Jean Baudrillard: From Revolution to Implosion” [<https://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-baudrillard-10/>] Accessed 3/9/20 SAO

Baudrillard and resistance Last week, this column explored Baudrillard’s account of the collapse or implosion of capitalism. What does all of this mean for political resistance? For one thing, it means that the dominant system must continue to be opposed. For Baudrillard, there is always something missing from the code. It is always incomplete, leaving a radical remainder. The system is based on a split. The code is differentiated from reality. It has to be, to avoid symbolic exchange. It cannot achieve the complete inclusion which comes about with generalised reversibility. Yet the code tends to take over all of social space. Its “other” disappears or becomes invisible. It tries to be a complete system, a total reality. It largely succeeds in sucking intensity from social life. Yet it also remains vulnerable, because of the exclusion on which it is based. Baudrillard theorises resistance in terms of the irruption of the symbolic in the realms controlled by the code. It is something like what Hakim Bey terms the ‘return of the primitive’. We really need the dimension of the ‘secret’. Its forced revelation is destructive and impossible. The return of the symbolic is discussed in various ways in different texts. Resistance arises when subjects come to see their own programmed death in the accumulation, production and conservation of their subjectivity. They become fiercely opposed to their reduction to the regime of work-buy-consume-die. Resistance becomes increasingly nihilistic, in response to the programming of the universe. It becomes resistance to the code as meaning, and at the same time as lack of intensity. In seeking to restore intensity, it resorts to the modalities of symbolic exchange. The impossibility of “revolution” It is important to differentiate Baudrillard’s view from standard accounts of revolution. To be sure, this is the position from which Baudrillard emerges. In the early work, The Political Economy of the Sign, Baudrillard argued that the regime of the code could only be destroyed by a total revolution. ‘Even signs must burn’. Baudrillard’s early work can be read as a call for a Situationist-style overthrow of capitalism through a revolution in the everyday, which breaks the power of the code and of signs. In more recent works, Baudrillard rethinks this view. He claims that revolution is now impossible. Baudrillard makes this claim because of the end of production. Revolution was historically seen as the liberation of the productive energy of humanity from the confines of capitalism. But if production no longer exists, this kind of vision has no hold. Labour has become another sign. There is no tendency for it to liberate itself by moving beyond capitalism. Baudrillard is deeply critical of standard leftist responses to neoliberalism. He criticises revolutionaries of his day for seeking a return to the “real”. He sees this as nostalgia for the previous, Fordist period of capitalism. People seek to get rid of the code, and go back to the earlier kind of simulation. Or they seek to identify something which is not yet signified in the system and which ought to be – for instance, excluded groups who should be included. This actually ties people to the prior forms of the dominant system. For Baudrillard, the weapons of the previous period are already neutralised in the order of the code. Revolution is a casualty of the end of the period of system-expansion. Explosions and revolutions are effects of an expanding order. This expanding order is an effect of the regime of production. But simulation is instead an inward-looking order. It is ‘saturated’ – it cannot expand any further. As a result, explosion will never again happen. It has been replaced by the ‘cold’ energy of the simulacrum. Instead, there is constant implosion. The world is saturated. The system has reached its limits. It is socially constructed as dense and irreversible, as beyond the ‘liberating explosion’. Baudrillard believes that we are past a point of no return: the system can’t be slowed down or redirected to a new end. We are in a ‘pure event’, beyond causality and without consequence, and every effort to exorcise hyperreality simply reinforces it. These are little fractal events and gradual processes of collapse which no longer create massive collapses, but exist horizontally. Events no longer resonate across spheres. It is as if the forces carrying the meaning of an event beyond itself have slowed to a standstill. The London ‘riots’ or the student fees protests, for example, do not turn into generalised rebellions in Britain as perhaps they still might in Egypt or Greece. We are in an era of ‘anomalies without consequences’. But the system will nevertheless come to an end, by other means. Even if people can’t revolt, a reaction is certain. Explosive violence is replaced by implosive violence, arising from a saturated, retracting, involuting system. The system has lost its triumphal imaginary because of its saturation. It is now in a phase of mourning, passing towards catastrophe. Things don’t get transcended anymore, but they expand to excess. Baudrillard sees this as the culmination of a kind of negative evolution. Systems pass through stages: a loose state produces liberty or personal responsibility; a denser state produces security; an even denser state produces terror, generalised responsibility, and saturation. Beyond saturation there is only implosion. Anti-consumerism is another target of critique. Criticising consumer society for doing what it claims to do – for supplanting ‘higher’ virtues with everyday pleasures – is a false critique which reinforces the core myth of consumerism. Consumer society functions as it does, precisely because it does not provide everyday pleasures. Rather, it simulates them through the code. Baudrillard also criticises moral critique and scandal, such as Watergate. He argues that the system requires a moral superstructure to operate, and the revival of such a superstructure sustains the system. What is really scandalous is that capital is fundamentally immoral or amoral. Moral panics serve to avoid awareness of this repressed fact. Similarly, critiques of ideology risk reaffirming the system’s maintenance of the illusion of truth. This helps cover up the fact that truth no longer exists in the world of the code. Since there is no reality beneath the simulacrum, such analyses are flawed. It is now the left (or the Third Way) that tries to re-inject moral order and justice into a failing system, thereby protecting it from its own collapse. Baudrillard implicitly criticises theories such as Laclau’s, which seek to re-inject meaning and intensity into politics. For Baudrillard, this task is both impossible and reactionary. Baudrillard sees the system as creating the illusion of its continued power by drawing on or simulating antagonisms and critique. There is thus a danger that critique actually sustains the system, by giving it a power it doesn’t have. Trying to confront and destroy the system thus inadvertently revives it, giving it back a little bit of symbolic power. He also sees conspiracy theories and current forms of Marxism as attempts to stave off awareness of the reality of a systematic code. In any case, the energy of the social is simply a distorted, impoverished version of the energy of “diabolical” forces (i.e. of symbolic exchange). Baudrillard thinks that societies actually come into being, not for the management of interests, but coalesce around rituals of expenditure, luxury and sacrifice. Politics itself was a pure game until the modern period, when it was called upon to represent the social. Now politics is dead, because it no longer has a referent in reality. This is because it lacks symbolic exchange. The absence of symbolic exchange leads also to an absence of possibility of redistribution, either North to South or elite to masses. Fascism also resists the death of the real, in a similar way. It tries to restore in an excessive way the phenomena of death, intensity and definite references, in order to ward off the collapse of the real. Fascist and authoritarian tendencies revive what Baudrillard terms ‘the violence necessary to life’ – they keep up some kind of symbolic power. (Baudrillard’s Lacanian heritage is clearly shown in this idea of a necessary violence). Baudrillard has a certain sympathy for the desire to escape hyperreality in this way, but also sees it as futile. People doing this – both left and right – are trying to resuscitate causes and consequences, realities and referents, and recreate an imaginary. But the system deters such efforts from succeeding. Le Pen for instance is ultimately absorbed, as the mainstream integrates and repeats his racist ideas. This analysis could also be applied to various “fundamentalisms” and ethno-nationalist movements today. This kind of resistance is ultimately reactionary, seeking to restore the declining regime of signs. But it can only be understood if its basis in energies of resistance to simulation is recognised. It is because it channels such resistance that it is able to mobilise affective forces. Baudrillard’s analysis is here similar to Agamben’s view that the sovereign gesture is now exercised everywhere because of the rise of indistinction and indeterminacy. The paradox is that the performance of fundamentalism often leads back towards the world of simulation and deterrence. Such movements map symbolic exchange onto the state, restoring some of its reality, but ultimately contributing to the persistence of simulation. Resistance from inside the regime of power is impossible because of deterrence. Baudrillard suggests that it’s now impossible to imagine a power exercised inside the enclosure created by deterrence – except for an implosive power which abolishes the energies preventing other possibilities emerging. He also suggests that the loss of the real is irreversible. Only the total collapse of the terrain of simulation will end it, not a test of reality. A truly effective revolution would have to abolish all the separations – including the separation from death. It cannot involve equality in what is separated – in survival, in social status and so on. The strategy for change is now exacberation, towards a catastrophic end of the system. Baudrillard believes that the resultant death of the social will paradoxically bring about socialism.
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Sufism PIC

#### CP Text: I endorse the entirety of the 1AC minus their use of the word Sufism.

Dehlvi 16 [Sadia Dehlvi in TOI Edit Page, Edit Page, India, TOI. “Islam Is Non-Violence: Unfortunately Sufis, Islam’s original mystics, are succumbing to sectarianism too.”April 21, 2016. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/blogs/toi-edit-page/islam-is-non-violence-unfortunately-sufis-islams-original-mystics-are-succumbing-to-sectarianism-too/]

Sufism is the modern word for Tasawwuf, Islam’s mystic path. Sufis never called themselves Sufis but faqirs, indicating their state of humility before God. Datta Ganj Baksh of Lahore wrote of Sufis in the 8th century saying, ‘Tasawwuf, once a reality without a name, is today a name without a reality’. The ‘ism’ remains problematic for it turns an internal spiritual quest into externalised religiosity and bubblegum spirituality. The ‘ism’ is commercialised, pickled and sold as Sufi Disco, Sufi Kathak, Sufi Nights at bar clubs, and as the ‘Antidote to Terror’. Historically, Sufis played key roles in providing educative, philosophical and spiritual nourishment, enabling openings of both mind and heart. Sufism gained strength in the 8th century as a reaction to the Islamic Caliphate’s obsession with conquests and wealth; forgetting the egalitarianism and simplicity of the Prophetic message. Early mystics raised voices against stifling religious freedoms, ensuring Islam not be confined to legalistic codes. Today, frequent Deoband fatwas and Sufi advisories constrict the inherent flexibility of Islam. Barring some mandatory rules, Quranic wisdom lies in its silence on trivial issues; offering layers of multiple interpretations. Sufis like Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti, Baba Farid and Hazrat Nizamuddin Auliya brought new dimensions to Islamic understanding; enabling it to blossom organically with the colours of the Indian soil; not requiring local citizenry to commit cultural apostasies. This provided nourishment to the synthesis of Muslim and Hindu mystics that produced the Bhakti movement, when people across faiths came together against religious orthodoxies and social divisions. At the World Sufi Forum in Delhi, as expected, enlightened Islamic narratives came from Sufis and scholars in Syria, Egypt, Indonesia, America, Africa, Europe, and Canada. Contemporary Muslim rhetoric in the subcontinent remains intellectually lethargic, failing to rejuvenate the pluralistic traditions of Islam. Perhaps the slogan ‘Islam is peace’ should change to, ‘Islam is non-violence and non-coercion’. Some individuals and states find peace through wars, suicide bombings, retribution, death penalties and other ways of blood letting. Peace in the Quran flowers from the absence of ‘khauf’, fear, and ‘huzn’, grief; achieved through denial of violence, coercion, sectarianism, oppression, injustice and poverty. Prophets were not sent to establish peace, but to alleviate suffering, establish law and preach the Oneness of God. Violence is an aberration of the human heart that naturally inclines towards calm. Muslims requiring fatwas against terrorism reveal the vulnerability, despair and defeat of Muslim communities. Until issues such as heresy, blasphemy, apostasy, exclusion and gender justice are addressed; the words ‘love, harmony and world peace’ remain candy floss. Be they Salafis, Sufis, Deobandis, Barielvys, Shias or other, Muslim thinkers must engage critically and creatively with canonised medieval laws; enabling Muslims to negotiate today’s realities. Otherwise, violence in the name of Islam will long continue.