**“Extinction first” independent voter**

“Extinction first” logic models genocidal thinking in the real world.

A) Extinction is treated as an ethical “trump card” that conditionally justifies any atrocity short of extinction as a means to prevent extinction. **Don’t let them shift out of this: their claim is “extinction *first.”* Hold them accountable to the plain meaning of their rhetoric.**

B) Threat calculations are purely subjective evaluations of probabilities — just as in debate, both sides can always generate extinction scenarios — so any policymaker can use “extinction first” ideology to justify any policy at any time.

C) The threat evaluations are couched in professional terms by self-identified experts and presented as authoritative judgments. There is no system to check these judgments. Systems of checks and balances are deontic protections of democracy which by definition are eliminated in “states of emergency” – so the power to commit atrocities in the name of security is uncheckable by definition.

The threats themselves (nuclear war, environmental devastation) are generated by the same policymakers who use those threats to justify further atrocities.

D) While their extinction story is completely artificial, the impact of securitization is absolutely real: (1) countries ignore poverty and hunger while spending trillions on the military; (2) militaries routinely justify systemic torture, genocide, and other atrocities as necessary to protect “the people.”

E) That means that this is what *really* “comes first” because we can’t let debate as an activity become a training ground for a next generation of leaders who will continue to impose this mindset on the world.

**LINK**

The link is their claim that “extinction comes first” in impact calc.

Extinction rhetoric is used to trump all ethical concerns. Prospective “future generations” are held hostage to the genocidal mindset of the state. **Neocleous 18:**

“Witness, for example, the phenomenon that has been described as neoliberalism. Much can and has been made of the ways in which neoliberalism involves a transformation of the individual: ‘economics are the method; the object is to change the heart and soul’, as Margaret Thatcher (Sunday Times, 1981) once put it. Taking such a claim seriously means reading neoliberalism not simply in terms of its destructive power, for example in destroying certain kinds of rights and institutions, but also in terms of its productive power: in its ability to create new kinds of social relations, new ways of living and new political subjects. The literature on the new neoliberal subject recognizes more than anything that what is being produced is an entrepreneurial self and a productive subject: a monetized, atomized and calculating subject that is required and expected to endlessly perform as a neoliberal subject in the social realm as well as in the marketplace (Dardot and Laval, 2013). This production of new subjectivities, however, is also very much an orientation of the subject around security: new political subjects forged through security, operating for security and organized around security. In other words, security- conscious neoliberal subjects. The connection between security and capital is thus integral to the neoliberal revolution and part of neoliberalism’s productive power and disciplinary core. (As with so many aspects of neoliberalism, what is of most interest is its disciplinary moment, and at the heart of this disciplinary moment lies the logic of security.) The explosion and expansion of security in the last two decades, while conventionally connected to the problem of terrorism (the ‘war on terror’), might just as properly be connected to the attempt to engrain neoliberalism into the hearts and minds of political subjects. Moreover, because the neoliberal subject is expected to be an active subject, this activity is also expected to respond to the demands of security as well as the demands of capital. As is well known, under neoliberalism it is no longer enough for us to simply work, earn our money, go home and spend it. Now we must believe in the work we are doing and actively show that we believe in it, identifying with the organization and signing up to the company’s mission, vision and values. The neoliberal workplace has become a ‘community of desire’, as Frédéric Lordon puts it, and yet this poses a problem for capital, which constantly questions the worker’s desire. In Lordon’s example: the employee- subject swears that they have no other passion than the manufacture of yoghurt, our company’s business, but can we really believe them? (Lordon, 2015, p. 84). The answer has to be no, and so the expected desire must be constantly expressed, measured and assessed, since it is always in danger of fading. A similar point might be made about the neoliberal polity, and likewise about the neoliberal security state: the citizen- subject swears that they have no other interest than the security of the social order, but can we really believe them? The answer must again be no,2 and so the expected desire must also be constantly expressed, measured and assessed, since it is always in danger of fading. Herein lies the basis for all the actions we are now being trained to undertake as security- conscious neoliberal subjects, such as being trained in ‘resilience’, being taught to be constantly ‘prepared for emergency’, and being encouraged to report any friends, family, lovers, neighbours and colleagues who we suspect might be doing something ‘suspicious’ (Neocleous, 2013, 2016, 2017). Part of the novelty of neoliberalism lies precisely in the idea that this active subject is not expected to remain content with the simple exchange of security for obedience, but, rather, is to be actively mobilized around the logic of security. **Security has become a neoliberal mobilization regime:** the people mobilized in the name of security as well as capital. Such **mobilization is** yet **a**nother **way** of incorporating the people into security and another way in which **security expresses its desire to exist without reply**, just like capital and the state. Part of **the illusion of security is that we are expected to bow down before it without** even **asking what it is** or how it came to begranted such a status**.** To exist without reply, **security seeks to nullify all dissent** and suppress any rebellion **even before** suchdissent **[it has]** and rebellion have **begun. Any objections** or resistance **to** any of **the policies** – not least the economic policies – being carried out by the powers **which claim to exercise security on our behalf are met either with [coercive]** security **measures** of the most coercive kind **or with the expectation that reason must abase itself before it –** all **our critical faculties set aside as security** and its leading **defenders tell us to shut up, listen and obey.** Those arguing against austerity, for example, are treated first and foremost as a threat to national security. Thus, far from security being emancipation, as some people working in the academic sector of the security industry like to claim and which is the very belief that security wants us to hold, the articulation of security as an overarching principle of politics – the idea, in other words, that security is the absolute foundation of all politics, or that security has to be the starting point for any political thought, or that security is the grounds on which we must accept the protection of the state, or that what all of us would most like for Christmas is security – is nothing less than the articulation of a demand for obedience. Security is in this sense central to the containment of social change, nothing less than the principle and process of pacification, if by ‘pacification’ we understand not simply the military crushing of resistance but, rather, the fabrication of social order (Neocleous, 2011, 2017; Neocleous, Rigakos and Wall, 2013). What does this obedience in the name of security produce? The answer is not difficult: obedience itself. Obedience produces obedience, as Foucault once commented (2014, p. 270) about what he called ‘pastoral power’. It reproduces itself as a system of obedience. That is, one accepts the principle of security in order to become obedient and one reproduces this state of obedience in a striving for the mythical state of security. Hence one is expected to manage oneself in the way that a security operative would have us be managed. This is the very point to which Hobbes alludes in the final paragraph of Leviathan; it is the very same point understood by all contemporary politicians when they speak the language of security; and it is the point implicit in much of the discourse and policies surrounding terrorism, which is why so much anti- terror legislation concerns itself with the obedience of the population. Obedience thereby becomes a permanent way of being, and we are encouraged and expected to believe that obedience is essential to the security of the subject. Obedience becomes fundamental to the principle of raison d’état, demanded by the state for security reasons, and our training in obedience a training of and for political order. And, given the security–commodity nexus, what we are being made obedient for is nothing other than the domination of our lives by capital. Security, then, demands that we bow down to security. It demands that we feel secure in our insecurity as bourgeois subjects but also insecure in our security as bourgeois subjects. It demands that we commit ourselves not to making history but, rather, to the eternal recurrence of the same: to securing capital and the state rather than anything against it or opposed to them. Like capital, security wants us to believe that it is our fate. Opening his book Politics and Fate, Andrew Gamble asks: ‘If politics were at an end, if this was our fate, what would this mean for us?’ (2000, p. 1). One answer: it would mean nothing less than being stuck in an endless security experience. ‘How was your security experience today?’, the questionnaire at Heathrow airport demands, after making us undergo a series of security rituals. An endless security experience, then, but one in which we are constantly asked to assess, measure and confirm our happiness in being able to participate in the rituals and thus in the process to confirm the extent to which security dominates our lives. A second answer to Gamble’s question: it would mean being subjected to one security innovation after another, including those innovations sold to us as being somehow ‘socially responsible’.**”**

Neocleous, Mark. “The bleak rituals of progress; or, if somebody offers you a socially responsible innovation in security, just say no,” in J. Peter Burgess, *Socially Responsible Innovation in Security,* pp. 133-6, 2018.

**Thus, the ROB is to vote for the debater who better deconstructs securitization**

**Prefer additionally**

**Securitization is the root cause of all violence, it’s what justifies predictive policing, police brutality, and genocide.**

**Securitization warps our epistemology since we’re conditioned to believe that we’re always in danger of something. We need to first resolve that epistemic skew to engage in the debate.**

**IMPACTS**

The logic of “extinction first” is a political tool designed to facilitate political atrocities. **Moller:**

**“**Rather, **securitization** research in their sense requires an identification within a body of discourse of statements and claims which conform to the intrinsic logic or “grammar” of securitisation, which entails **claim[s]**ing **the issue to be of “existential” importance** and extremely urgent. **Unless solved without delay such a problem may allegedly destroy all other values, which warrants assigning absolute first priority** to it **and justifies** a resort to **extraordinary measures.** What should count as extraordinary will depend on context. For instance, whereas violating international obligations or using torture may be “business as usual” for some states, for others such measures will constitute very dramatic departure from common practice. Certain words would often be used in such securitisation attempts, e.g. “genocide” (often in the vague sense of “the most heinous of all crimes”) or “emergency” as in “state of emergency,” which is often the legal framework used for extraordinary measures—which may explain the otherwise rather bizarre interest taken by securitisation theorists in the works of Carl Schmitt (1888-1985), the classical theorist of states of emergency, according to whom “Not every extraordinary measure, not every police emergency measure or emergency decree, is necessarily an exception. **What characterizes an exception is principally unlimited authority, which means the suspension of the entire existing order.”**

Moller, Bjorn. “Securitisation and genocide: two chapters from work in progress.” No year. https://cric.ku.dk/publications/cric-papers/Securitisation\_and\_Genocide.pdf

Treating existential threats as states of exception perverts the purpose of democratic societies to suborn ethical requirements and justify collective violence. **El-Affendi:**

**“The ‘state of exception’** currently overshadowing liberal polities cannot thus be deemed their ‘essence’ (otherwise it would be meaningless to discuss ‘exception’) but as **[is] a mark of liberal democracy’s vulnerability to narratives of insecurity.** We may not know when the ‘State of Exception’ will ever end, but ‘we all know when it began.’ ‘We can no longer quite ‘remember’ that moment, for the images have long since been refitted into a present-day fable of innocence and apocalypse: the perfect blue of that late summer sky stained by acrid black smoke … Since that day ten years ago we have lived in a subtly different country.’ [Ellipsis in original] The significance of this imperceptible migration to a ‘different country’ stems from the remarkable transparency of the process of wholesale securitization (Macrosecuritization, as Buzan and Waever put it) that brought it about. Nevertheless, the camps at Guantanamo Bay and Baghram are not (yet) Auschwitz, and their significance is seriously eroded by such comparisons. The argument has often been made, sometimes by towering intellectual figures, that **genocidal excess reflects the ‘dark side of Enlightenment’** (Adorno and Horkheimer), or the ‘dark side of modernity’ (Hinton, Zygmunt, Bauman) or the ‘dark side of democracy’ (Michael Mann). The reflections in question present important and deep insights into **the** unintended or **unforeseen consequences** and by-products **of intellectual and social trends:** the arrogance of **self-validating** reason preached by the Enlightenment, utopian grand **schemes to control nature and humanity’s future;** the foregrounding of instrumental reason; ***the evolution of*** modern **armies** and bureaucracies **as** formidable (and **self-perpetuating) instruments of control [and]**; **the** fragmentation and **dilution of individual ethical responsibility;** the rise of new ideologies and exclusivist national mythologies; imperialist hubris; etc**.”**

El-Affendi, Abdelwahab. *Genocidal Nightmares: Narratives of Insecurity and the Logic of Mass Atrocities.* Bloomsbury; 2016.

Their rhetoric models the genocidal mindset of securitization, which justifies any atrocity in the name of preventing even marginal risks of existential threats;

And “extinction first” rhetoric is a *self-fulfilling* - it causes the genocidal violence it claims to be concerned with. **Abrams:**

**“Building upon [the]** Horowitz’s **threat of extinction,** the creation of a security dilemma between competing ethnic groups **can** also **create a basis for violence.** Barry Posen frames the problem of ethnic groups emerging from post-colonial/post-imperial situations within the discourse of the realist concept of the security dilemma. For Posen, the dilemma arises in the anarchy created in the transition from colonial/imperial rule to independence. In this period of fluidity it is hard to distinguish between another group’s offensive and defensive intentions. The inherent instability of this period creates a fear that the other side might renege on peace agreements. Making this determination even more difficult is the similarity between offensive and defensive weaponry used in low-level conflict. The result is that **groups ‘invest in and prepare for violence, and thereby make actual violence possible.’** In the end, the security dilemma creates a fear of the other group’s offensive intentions and capabilities and therefore a fear for survival. Again the existence of an existential threat creates legitimacy for extreme and often preemptive offensive action which will ‘save’ the group. Therefore by **creating a sense of threat** by “the other” **against the** very **existence of the** ethnic **group**, group security” **[justifies] action** **by elites against other** ethnic **groups.** **The fear of extinction** felt by self-assessed backwards groups and the inherent security dilemma create in transitional period help **explain[s] the willingness of the masses to support extreme tactics perpetrated by** their **leaders.”**

Abrams, Brian Eric. “Strategy of domination: Zanu-PF’s use of ethnic conflict as a means of maintaining political control in Zimbabwe, 1982-2006.” Master of Arts in Law and Diplomacy Thesis, April 2006.

**ALTERNATIVE**

**REFUSE TO CONSENT TO SECURITIZATION - PUSHING BEYOND SECURITY REQUIRES FORMING A NEW ETHICAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE OTHER THAT REFUSES THE SECURITY OF THE SELF. Burke:**

**Burke 2002** [Anthony, Lecturer in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at Univ of New South Wales, “Aporias of Security,” Alternatives 27.1, jstor, GDI-ALG]

“It is perhaps easy to become despondent, but as countless struggles for freedom, justice and social transformation have proved, a sense of seriousness can be tempered with the knowledge that many of the tools are already available – and where they are not, the effort to create a productive new critical sensibility is well advanced. There is also a crucial political opening within the liberal problematic itself, in the sense that it assumes that **power is most effective when it is** absorbed as truth, **consented to and desired – which creates an important space for dissent, critique and refusal.** As Colin Gordon argues, Foucault thought that the very possibility of governing was conditional on it being credible to the governed as well as the governing.79 This throws weight onto the question of how security works as a technology of subjectivity. It is to take up Foucault's challenge, framed as a reversal of the liberal progressive movement of being we have seen in Hegel, not to discover who we are so much as to refuse what we are.80 **Just as security rules subjectivity as** both **a totalising** and individualising **blackmail** and promise**,** it is at these levels **we too can intervene.** **We can critique the machinic frameworks of** possibility represented by **law,[and] policy**, economic regulation and diplomacy, **while challenging the way these institutions deploy language to draw** individual subjects **into their consensual web.** This suggests, at least provisionally, a dual strategy. The first asserts the space for agency, both in challenging available possibilities for being and their larger socio-economic implications. **Pushing beyond security requires tactics that** can work at many levels: that **empower individuals to recognise the** larger social, cultural and economic implications of the everyday **forms of** desire, **subjection and discipline they encounter, to challenge and rewrite them,** and which in turn contribute to collective efforts to transform the larger structures of being, exchange and power that sustain (and have been sustained by) these forms. As Derrida suggests, this is **to open up** aporetic **possibilities that** transgress and **call into question the boundaries of** the **self, society and the international that security seeks to** imagine and **police.** The second seeks new ethical principles based on a critique of the rigid and repressive forms of identity security has heretofore offered. Thus writers such as Rosalyn Diprose, William Connolly and Moira Gatens have sought to **imagine a new ethical relationship**, which thinks difference not on the basis of the Same, but **on the basis of a dialogue with the Other that might allow space for the unknown and unfamiliar**, for what Gatens calls a 'debate and engagement with the other's law and the other's ethics' – an encounter which involves a transformation of the self rather than the other.81 (The potentials and limits of these models of ethics are explored in more detail in Chapter 3, where I critically analyse the political possibilities offered by the thought of Emmanuel Levinas, Martin Heidegger and Martin Buber.) In short, while **the** sweep and **power of security** must be acknowledged, it **must** also **be refused**: at the simultaneous levels of individual identity, social order and macroeconomic possibility, it would entail another kind of work on 'ourselves' – a political refusal of the One, the imagination of an Other that never returns to the Same. It is to imagine a world in which alternative possibilities of society, justice and existence are free to develop, independent of sovereign ontologies and their animating forms of geopolitical control, desire and violence. It is to ask if there can be a world or a security after security, and what its shimmering possibilities might be.”

This refusal requires voting down the “extinction first” position - it’s the only method of rejection available in the debate space. A vote for the position is a vote to normalize genocidal reasoning.

**PRE-FIAT IMPACT**

The impact of “extinction first” is real: every war is justified as necessary to avoid destruction, and combatants routinely use torture, and genocide as “necessary” tools of war.

Treat this as a pre-fiat voter:

A) They make the debate space unsafe. Extinction first says that racism, sexism, transphobia, slavery, and genocide are all secondary considerations. Extinction framing implicitly tells me that my bodily agency doesn’t matter and can be subordinated based on any fractional probability of extinction. **Advocacies that conditionally justify genocidal ideation have to be rejected forcibly regardless of the flow.** Debaters have to be held accountable for the implications of their speech acts. **Vincent:**

**“**The question then becomes how does our discourse justify what we believe? For many debaters it is **the gaming aspect of debate** that **allows us to** assume that our speech can be **disconnect**ed **from the speech act.** The speech can be defined as the arguments that are placed on the flow, and is evaluated in the context of what [will] is the most logical and rational argument to win the round. The critical distinction is the speech act, which is the performance of that discourse. It’s not what you say, but what you justify. **Understanding the speech act requires** critically **assessing the ramifications of the debaters’ discourse.** Debate is in and of itself a performance. To claim that it is not is to be divorced from the reality of what we do. **We must evaluate what a debater’s performance does and justifies.** For white debaters it is easy to view the discourse as detached from the body. For **those with privilege in debate,** they **are never forced to have their performance attached to them** but instead their arguments are viewed as words on paper. **They are taught to separate themselves from** any **ideologies** and beliefs, **and feel that there is no consequence to what they say**. It becomes the way in which they justify what is deemed as ‘rational’ and ‘logical’ thought. The argument sounds like it will be competitive so it is read but it is deemed as just an argument. **Judges evaluate this as just a speech.** **This** becomeswhat I deem as a performance by the body, rather than a performance of the body. Performances by the body **allow[s] debaters to not be held accountable to the words they say. Words are** seen as **divorced from any meaning outside of the flow**, versus the performance of the body where the words are attached to the body itself. Debaters often insert the performance by the body, when they make arguments that they claim that they do not believe, but think it is the best strategy for the round. This is a false assumption, since for black debaters meaning is always connected to their bodies. The best strategy should never be one that at the same time justifies acts of racism**.”**

Vincent, Christopher. “Re-conceptualizing our performances: accountability in Lincoln Douglas debate.” *VBriefly,* October 26, 2013.

B) They didn’t have to argue “extinction first.” They could have argued that extinction risk has to be weighed based on probability against other kinds of impacts. “Extinction first” was a conscious choice they made. They need to lose the debate because they chose to defend genocidal thinking in order to make impact calc easier.

PRE-FIAT WEIGHING:

Take the pre-fiat implications of “extinction first” rhetoric seriously. Their argument will probably be that it’s just a game. But that is an expression of privilege: systemic violence is an everyday reality; its justification with imaginary threats poses real danger to real people. On average, the wealthier you are; the whiter you are; if you live in a stable democracy; if you are a CIS male: all of these give you the privilege of being protected from the violence from securitization. Disregarding the pre-fiat impact of this argument entrenches that privilege by saying that it doesn’t matter that relatively wealthy, secure American high school students actively promote this reasoning.