## OFF

### T---1NC

#### Interpretation: Topical affirmatives must instrumentally defend an expansion of the scope of the United States core antitrust laws to substantially increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices.

#### Resolved means a policy

Louisiana House 5

(<http://house.louisiana.gov/house-glossary.htm>)

Resolution A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4)

#### Federal government is the legislative, executive and judicial

US Legal No Date (United States Federal Government Law and Legal Definition https://definitions.uslegal.com/u/united-states-federal-government/)

The United States Federal Government is established by the US Constitution. The Federal Government shares sovereignty over the United Sates with the individual governments of the States of US. The Federal government has three branches: i) the legislature, which is the US Congress, ii) Executive, comprised of the President and Vice president of the US and iii) Judiciary. The US Constitution prescribes a system of separation of powers and ‘checks and balances’ for the smooth functioning of all the three branches of the Federal Government. The US Constitution limits the powers of the Federal Government to the powers assigned to it; all powers not expressly assigned to the Federal Government are reserved to the States or to the people.

#### Should requires action

AHD 2k

(American Heritage Dictionary 2000 (Dictionary.com))

should. The will to do something or have something take place: I shall go out if I feel like it.

#### ‘Its’ means cooperation must be governmental

US District Court 7 (United States District Court for the District of the Virgin Islands, Division of St. Thomas and St. John, “AGF Marine Aviation & Transp. v. Cassin,” *2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 90808*, Lexis)

The Court inadvertently used the word "his" when the Court intended to use the word "its." The possessive pronoun was intended to refer to the party preceding its use--AGF. Indeed, that reference is consistent with the undisputed facts in this case, which indicate that Cassin completed an application for the insurance policy and submitted it to his agent, Theodore Tunick & Company ("Tunick"). Tunick, in turn, submitted the application to AGF's underwriting agent, TL Dallas. (See Pl.'s Mem. of Law in Supp. of Mot. for Summ. J. 5.)

#### The “core” antitrust statutes are the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and FTC Act

Lisa Kimmel 20, Senior Counsel at Crowell & Moring, LLP in Washington, D.C., twenty years of experience as an antitrust lawyer and holds a Ph.D. in economics from the University of California at Berkeley; and Eric Fanchiang, associate in Crowell & Moring’s Irvine, CA office and a member of the firm’s antitrust and commercial litigation groups, 2020, “Antitrust and Intellectual Property Licensing,” in 2020 Licensing Update, Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory U.S., https://www.crowell.com/files/20200401-Licensing-Update-Chapter-13.pdf

U.S. antitrust law is defined by federal and state statutes, as interpreted by the courts. The core federal statutes are the Sherman Act,1 passed by Congress in 1890, and the Federal Trade Commission2 and Clayton Acts,3 both passed in 1914. The United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”) and the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC” or “Commission”) (together the “agencies”) share enforcement of most areas of federal antitrust law but with some differences in the scope of their authority. The FTC has sole authority to enforce Section 5 of FTC Act, which prohibits (1) unfair methods of competition and (2) unfair or deceptive acts or practices. The FTC almost always pursues claims for anticompetitive conduct as unfair methods of competition and reserves charges of unfair or deceptive acts or practices for consumer protection violations. Though the FTC's authority to challenge unfair methods of competition goes beyond conduct prohibited by the Sherman and Clayton Acts, in practice the FTC brings most unfair methods of competition cases under the same standards that courts apply to Sherman Act claims. The most prominent exception is the invitation to collude offense, which falls outside the scope of the Sherman Act (if the invitation is not accepted, there is no agreement). The FTC challenges invitations to collude as so-called “standalone” violations of Section 5.4 The DOJ has sole authority to pursue criminal violations of the antitrust laws. Most states have their own state antitrust and unfair competition statutes. State law follows federal law to some extent, though as discussed below, may differ from federal law in meaningful ways that vary state to state. State attorneys general and private parties can also typically file suit to enforce both federal and state antitrust law.

#### They violate each of the above words’ requirements of government action.

#### Two impacts:

#### Fairness — debate requires effective competition between the aff and the neg---the only way for any benefit to be produced from debate is if the judge can make a decision between two sides who have had a relatively equal chance to prepare for a common point of debate.

#### Clash, debate is unique because of the iteration of limited arguments over the course of a season that forces debaters to improve their arguments and reconsider their positions. Their topic is unilaterally declared and imprecise, which prevents iteration through shallow debates, unpredictable advocacies, and lack of testing. Turns case.

#### Clash outweighs – a predictable point of disagreement allows for in depth preparation that results in iterative improvement of our arguments and superior education – abdication of a predictable stasis point flips incentives and prevents contradiction. Turns the case – rigorous testing is key to avoid false positives, polarization, and prove anything they said is true.

Poscher, 16—director at the Institute for Staatswissenschaft and Philosophy of Law at the University of Freiburg (Ralf, “Why We Argue About the Law: An Agonistic Account of Legal Disagreement”, *Metaphilosophy of Law*, Tomasz Gizbert-Studnicki/Adam Dyrda/Pawel Banas (eds.), Hart Publishing, forthcoming, dml)

Hegel’s dialectical thinking powerfully exploits the idea of negation. It is a central feature of spirit and consciousness that they have the power to negate. The spirit “is this power only by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it. This […] is the magical power that converts it into being.”102 The tarrying with the negative is part of what Hegel calls the “labour of the negative”103. In a loose reference to this Hegelian notion Gerald Postema points to yet another feature of disagreements as a necessary ingredient of the process of practical reasoning. Only if our reasoning is exposed to contrary arguments can we test its merits. We must go through the “labor of the negative” to have trust in our deliberative processes.104 This also holds where we seem to be in agreement. Agreement without exposure to disagreement can be deceptive in various ways. The first phenomenon Postema draws attention to is the group polarization effect. When a group of like‐minded people deliberates an issue, informational and reputational cascades produce more extreme views in the process of their deliberations.105 The polarization and biases that are well documented for such groups106 can be countered at least in some settings by the inclusion of dissenting voices. In these scenarios, disagreement can be a cure for dysfunctional deliberative polarization and biases.107 A second deliberative dysfunction mitigated by disagreement is superficial agreement, which can even be manipulatively used in the sense of a “presumptuous ‘We’”108. Disagreement can help to police such distortions of deliberative processes by challenging superficial agreements. Disagreements may thus signal that a deliberative process is not contaminated with dysfunctional agreements stemming from polarization or superficiality. Protecting our discourse against such contaminations is valuable even if we do not come to terms. Each of the opposing positions will profit from the catharsis it received “by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it”. These advantages of disagreement in collective deliberations are mirrored on the individual level. Even if the probability of reaching a consensus with our opponents is very low from the beginning, as might be the case in deeply entrenched conflicts, entering into an exchange of arguments can still serve to test and improve our position. We have to do the “labor of the negative” for ourselves. Even if we cannot come up with a line of argument that coheres well with everybody else’s beliefs, attitudes and dispositions, we can still come up with a line of argument that achieves this goal for our own personal beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. To provide ourselves with the most coherent system of our own beliefs, attitudes and dispositions is – at least in important issues – an aspect of personal integrity – to borrow one of Dworkin’s favorite expressions for a less aspirational idea. In hard cases we must – in some way – lay out the argument for ourselves to figure out what we believe to be the right answer. We might not know what we believe ourselves in questions of abortion, the death penalty, torture, and stem cell research, until we have developed a line of argument against the background of our subjective beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. In these cases it might be rational to discuss the issue with someone unlikely to share some of our more fundamental convictions or who opposes the view towards which we lean. This might even be the most helpful way of corroborating a view, because we know that our adversary is much more motivated to find a potential flaw in our argument than someone with whom we know we are in agreement. It might be more helpful to discuss a liberal position with Scalia than with Breyer if we want to make sure that we have not overlooked some counter‐argument to our case. It would be too narrow an understanding of our practice of legal disagreement and argumentation if we restricted its purpose to persuading an adversary in the case at hand and inferred from this narrow understanding the irrationality of argumentation in hard cases, in which we know beforehand that we will not be able to persuade. Rational argumentation is a much more complex practice in a more complex social framework. Argumentation with an adversary can have purposes beyond persuading him: to test one’s own convictions, to engage our opponent in inferential commitments and to persuade third parties are only some of these; to rally our troops or express our convictions might be others. To make our peace with Kant we could say that “there must be a hope of coming to terms” with someone though not necessarily with our opponent, but maybe only a third party or even just ourselves and not necessarily only on the issue at hand, but maybe through inferential commitments in a different arena. f) The Advantage Over Non‐Argumentative Alternatives It goes without saying that in real world legal disagreements, all of the reasons listed above usually play in concert and will typically hold true to different degrees relative to different participants in the debate: There will be some participants for whom our hope of coming to terms might still be justified and others for whom only some of the other reasons hold and some for whom it is a mixture of all of the reasons in shifting degrees as our disagreements evolve. It is also apparent that, with the exception of the first reason, the rationality of our disagreements is of a secondary nature. The rational does not lie in the discovery of a single right answer to the topic of debate, since in hard cases there are no single right answers. Instead, our disagreements are instrumental to rationales which lie beyond the topic at hand, like the exploration of our communalities or of our inferential commitments. Since these reasons are of this secondary nature, they must stand up to alternative ways of settling irreconcilable disagreements that have other secondary reasons in their favor – like swiftness of decision making or using fewer resources. Why does our legal practice require lengthy arguments and discursive efforts even in appellate or supreme court cases of irreconcilable legal disagreements? The closure has to come by some non‐argumentative mean and courts have always relied on them. For the medieval courts of the Germanic tradition it is bequeathed that judges had to fight it out literally if they disagreed on a question of law – though the king allowed them to pick surrogate fighters.109 It is understandable that the process of civilization has led us to non‐violent non‐ argumentative means to determine the law. But what was wrong with District Judge Currin of Umatilla County in Oregon, who – in his late days – decided inconclusive traffic violations by publicly flipping a coin?110 If we are counting heads at the end of our lengthy argumentative proceedings anyway, why not decide hard cases by gut voting at the outset and spare everybody the cost of developing elaborate arguments on questions, where there is not fact of the matter to be discovered? One reason lies in the mixed nature of our reasons in actual legal disagreements. The different second order reasons can be held apart analytically, but not in real life cases. The hope of coming to terms will often play a role at least for some time relative to some participants in the debate. A second reason is that the objectives listed above could not be achieved by a non‐argumentative procedure. Flipping a coin, throwing dice or taking a gut vote would not help us to explore our communalities or our inferential commitments nor help to scrutinize the positions in play. A third reason is the overall rational aspiration of the law that Dworkin relates to in his integrity account111. In a justificatory sense112 the law aspires to give a coherent account of itself – even if it is not the only right one – required by equal respect under conditions of normative disagreement.113 Combining legal argumentation with the non‐argumentative decision‐ making procedure of counting reasoned opinions serves the coherence aspiration of the law in at least two ways: First, the labor of the negative reduces the chances that constructions of the law that have major flaws or inconsistencies built into the arguments supporting them will prevail. Second, since every position must be a reasoned one within the given framework of the law, it must be one that somehow fits into the overall structure of the law along coherent lines. It thus protects against incoherent “checkerboard” treatments114 of hard cases. It is the combination of reasoned disagreement and the non‐rational decision‐making mechanism of counting reasoned opinions that provides for both in hard cases: a decision and one – of multiple possible – coherent constructions of the law. Pure non‐rational procedures – like flipping a coin – would only provide for the decision part. Pure argumentative procedures – which are not geared towards a decision procedure – would undercut the incentive structure of our agonistic disagreements.115 In the face of unresolvable disagreements endless debates would seem an idle enterprise. That the debates are about winning or losing helps to keep the participants engaged. That the decision depends on counting reasoned opinions guarantees that the engagement focuses on rational argumentation. No plain non‐argumentative procedure would achieve this result. If the judges were to flip a coin at the end of the trial in hard cases, there would be little incentive to engage in an exchange of arguments. It is specifically the count of reasoned opinions which provides for rational scrutiny in our legal disagreements and thus contributes to the rationales discussed above. 2. THE SEMANTICS OF AGONISTIC DISAGREEMENTS The agonistic account does not presuppose a fact of the matter, it is not accompanied by an ontological commitment, and the question of how the fact of the matter could be known to us is not even raised. Thus the agonistic account of legal disagreement is not confronted with the metaphysical or epistemological questions that plague one‐right‐answer theories in particular. However, it must still come up with a semantics that explains in what sense we disagree about the same issue and are not just talking at cross purposes. In a series of articles David Plunkett and Tim Sundell have reconstructed legal disagreements in semantic terms as metalinguistic negotiations on the usage of a term that at the center of a hard case like “cruel and unusual punishment” in a death‐penalty case.116 Even though the different sides in the debate define the term differently, they are not talking past each other, since they are engaged in a metalinguistic negotiation on the use of the same term. The metalinguistic negotiation on the use of the term serves as a semantic anchor for a disagreement on the substantive issues connected with the term because of its functional role in the law. The “cruel and unusual punishment”‐clause thus serves to argue about the permissibility of the death penalty. This account, however only provides a very superficial semantic commonality. But the commonality between the participants of a legal disagreement go deeper than a discussion whether the term “bank” should in future only to be used for financial institutions, which fulfills every criteria for semantic negotiations that Plunkett and Sundell propose. Unlike in mere semantic negotiations, like the on the disambiguation of the term “bank”, there is also some kind of identity of the substantive issues at stake in legal disagreements. A promising route to capture this aspect of legal disagreements might be offered by recent semantic approaches that try to accommodate the externalist challenges of realist semantics,117 which inspire one‐right‐answer theorists like Moore or David Brink. Neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics provide for the theoretical or interpretive element of realist semantics without having to commit to the ontological positions of traditional externalism. In a sense they offer externalist semantics with no ontological strings attached. The less controversial aspect of the externalist picture of meaning developed in neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics can be found in the deferential structure that our meaning‐providing intentions often encompass.118 In the case of natural kinds, speakers defer to the expertise of chemists when they employ natural kind terms like gold or water. If a speaker orders someone to buy $ 10,000 worth of gold as a safe investment, he might not know the exact atomic structure of the chemical element 79. In cases of doubt, though, he would insist that he meant to buy only stuff that chemical experts – or the markets for that matter – qualify as gold. The deferential element in the speaker’s intentions provides for the specific externalist element of the semantics. In the case of the law, the meaning‐providing intentions connected to the provisions of the law can be understood to defer in a similar manner to the best overall theory or interpretation of the legal materials. Against the background of such a semantic framework the conceptual unity of a linguistic practice is not ratified by the existence of a single best answer, but by the unity of the interpretive effort that extends to legal materials and legal practices that have sufficient overlap119 – be it only in a historical perspective120. The fulcrum of disagreement that Dworkin sees in the existence of a single right answer121 does not lie in its existence, but in the communality of the effort – if only on the basis of an overlapping common ground of legal materials, accepted practices, experiences and dispositions. As two athletes are engaged in the same contest when they follow the same rules, share the same concept of winning and losing and act in the same context, but follow very different styles of e.g. wrestling, boxing, swimming etc. They are in the same contest, even if there is no single best style in which to wrestle, box or swim. Each, however, is engaged in developing the best style to win against their opponent, just as two lawyers try to develop the best argument to convince a bench of judges.122 Within such a semantic framework even people with radically opposing views about the application of an expression can still share a concept, in that they are engaged in the same process of theorizing over roughly the same legal materials and practices. Semantic frameworks along these lines allow for adamant disagreements without abandoning the idea that people are talking about the same concept. An agonistic account of legal disagreement can build on such a semantic framework, which can explain in what sense lawyers, judges and scholars engaged in agonistic disagreements are not talking past each other. They are engaged in developing the best interpretation of roughly the same legal materials, albeit against the background of diverging beliefs, attitudes and dispositions that lead them to divergent conclusions in hard cases. Despite the divergent conclusions, semantic unity is provided by the largely overlapping legal materials that form the basis for their disagreement. Such a semantic collapses only when we lack a sufficient overlap in the materials. To use an example of Michael Moore’s: If we wanted to debate whether a certain work of art was “just”, we share neither paradigms nor a tradition of applying the concept of justice to art such as to engage in an intelligible controversy.s

## CASE

### 1NC---Presumption

#### Vote negative on presumption

#### 1: Inherency: Their arguments already exist with academia writ large voting aff in this round does nothing to further- every other round proves it should have changed debate already

#### 2: Scope: Individual affirmations of cognitive strikes resolves judges guilt- but saps energy away from material activisms.

#### 3: Debate: The idea reading this argument in debate is radical is flawed they read the aff to debate T in almost every round which proves the aff is commodified by and for competition.

#### The aff’s anti-normativity is exactly what oppressive structures want---the university will assimilate the aff while finding new ways to discipline and exclude scholarship that meaningfully resists power structures.

Roderick A. Ferguson 12, He is professor of race and critical theory at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. He is author of Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique (Minnesota, 2003) and coeditor, with Grace Hong, of Strange Affinities: The Gender and Sexual Politics of Comparative Racialization, *The Reorder of Things: The University and Its Pedagogies of Minority Difference*, pp. 11-14//KU-MS

In the context of the post–World War II United States, the American academy can be read as a record of the shifts and contradictions of political economy. Indeed, with the admission of women and people of color into predominantly white academic settings, the eco-nomic character of the American academy did not simply vanish. The academy would begin to put, keep in reserve, and save minoritized subjects and knowledges in an archival fashion, that is, by devising ways to make those subjects and knowledges respect power and its “laws.” Put differently, the ethnic and women’s studies movements applied pressures on the archival conventions of the academy in an effort to stretch those conventions so that previously excluded subjects might enjoy membership. But it also meant that those subjects would fall under new and revised laws. As a distinct archival economy, the American academy would help inform the archival agendas of state and capital—how best to institute new peoples, new knowledges, and cultures and at the same time discipline and exclude those subjects according to a new order.

This was the moment in which power would hone its own archival economy, producing formulas for the incorporation rather than the absolute repudiation of difference, all the while refining and perfecting its practices of exclusion and regulation. This is the time when power would restyle its archival propensities by dreaming up ways to affirm difference and keep it in hand. Ethnic studies and women’s studies movements were the proto ­ typical resources of incorporative and archival systems of power that reinvented themselves because of civil rights and liberation movements of the fifties, sixties, and seventies. Part of the signature achievements of these affirmative modes of power was to make the pursuit of recognition and legitimacy into formidable horizons of pleasure, insinuating themselves into radical politics, trying to convince insurgents that “your dreams are also mine.”

By excavating the social movements, we may be able to chart the emergence of this new kind of archival economy that transformed academic, political, economic, and social life from the late sixties and beyond. Moreover, focusing on the social movements and the denominations of interdisciplinary forms that emerged from them might allow us to produce a counterarchive detailing the ways in which power worked through the “recognition” of minoritized histories, cultures, and experiences and how power used that “recognition” to resecure its status. The histories of interdisciplinary engagements with forms of difference represent a conflicted and contradictory negotiation with this horizon of power. Seen this way, we must entrust the interdisciplines with a new charge, that of assessing power’s archival techniques and maneuvers. As Self-Portrait 2000 suggests, the involution of marginal differences and the development of the interdisciplines, broadly conceived, denoted the elaboration of power rather than the confirmation that our “liberty” had been secured. We must make it our business to critically deploy those modes of difference that have become part of power’s trick and devise ways to use them otherwise.

The influence that the student movements had on institutional life within the United States points to a need to assess the streams of the academy within political economy. If state and particularly capital needed the academy to reorient their sensibilities toward the affirmation of difference— that is, to complete the constitutional project of the United States and begin to resolve the contradictions of social exclusion—then it also meant that the academy became the laboratory for the revalorization of modes of difference.

This changing set of representations, the institutions that organized themselves around that set, and the modes of power that were compelled by and productive of those transformations are what we are calling the interdisciplines. The interdisciplines were an ensemble of institutions and techniques that offered positivities to populations and constituencies that had been denied institutional claims to agency. Hence, the interdisciplines connoted a new form of biopower organized around the affirmation, recognition, and legitimacy of minoritized life. To offset their possibility for future ruptures, power made legitimacy and recognition into grand enticements. In doing so, they would become power’s newest techniques for the taking of difference. What the students often offered as radical critiques of institutional belonging would be turned into various institutions’ confirmation.

#### Their discursive resistance is part and parcel with neoliberalism---critique without collective action provides a façade of resistance but leaves power structures unchallenged and drains energy for real political action.

Abraham Iqbal Khan 16, Assistant Professor of African American Studies at Pennsylvania State University, *A rant good for business: Communicative capitalism and the capture of anti-racist resistance*, Popular Communication, 14:1, 39-48, DOI: 10.1080/15405702.2015.1084629//KU-MS

The problem with neoliberalism is not that it asks us to be anti-racist as such, but that it demonizes collective action, occludes class consciousness, and forestalls the formation of plausible solidarities. The critical move that connects anti-racism to anti-capitalism is to account for the mechanisms that help anti-racism depoliticize the marketplace. Opposing neoliberalism requires attention to what Jodi Dean calls communicative capitalism, an enticement to play politics without doing it, to delight in political speech without the work involved in organizing and forming coalitions. As Dean (2009) puts it, communicative capitalism is defined by “the materialization of ideals of inclusion and participation in information, entertainment, and communication technologies in ways that capture resistance and intensify global capitalism” (p. 2). Marxist critics like Adolph Reed (2013) worry that the hunt for institutional racism works to “graft more complex social dynamics onto a simplistic and frequently psychologically inflected racism/anti-racism political ontology” (p. 12). Reed’s concern is that anti-racism centers oppositional politics around the wrong antagonism by promoting the racial diversification of capital. At the same time, anti-racist critics of neoliberalism notice the ways in which those very same complex social dynamics are deeply racialized. The idea of communicative capitalism resolves this impasse in oppositional politics by recognizing that legitimation and obfuscation are opposite sides of the same coin. By promising universal access and unfettered mobility, communication technologies deliver participation to previously excluded social groups and then register the fact of participation as politics itself. Anti-racist grievances are easily heard, but also quickly evaporate. Participation validates market wisdom and effaces the market’s racial effects.

This point addresses the gap between racism as it was diagnosed and racism as it was practiced in the aftermath of Sherman’s postgame rant. A handful of hateful tweets offered the sports media the opportunity to exhibit their anti-racist credentials in torrents of self-referential speech. The sheer amount of media attention paid to Sherman after his postgame interview was itself the subject of media attention, a kind of meta-attention expressed in the suggestion that Sherman had “broken the internet.” 1 Dean (2009) observes that on the internet, “media circulate and extend information about an issue or event, amplifying its affect and seemingly its significance. This amplification draws in more media, more commentary, and more opinion, more parody and comic relief, more attachment to communicative capitalism’s information and entertainment networks such that the knot of feedback and enjoyment itself operates as (and in place of) the political issue or event” (p. 32). Sports media illustrated this dynamic relative to the way audiences were invited to interpret Sherman’s rant. As Tommy Tomlinson (2014) admitted in Forbes, “raw emotion—whatever form it takes—is exactly what I hope for.” ThinkProgress’s Travis Waldron (2014) agreed that “it might be a little unfair to expect anything else than raw, honest emotion right after that game is finished.” Beyond simply circulating a burst of anti-racist indignation, this commentary distilled Sherman’s display into pure affect. Dean (2009) contends that communicative capitalism “reformats” political energy “to speaking and saying and exposing and explaining, a reduction key to a democracy conceived of in terms of discussion and deliberation” (p. 32). This kind of discourse produces the illusion that something political is going on, while “reinforcing the hold of neoliberalism’s technological infrastructure” (Dean, 2009, p. 32). This is not to say that racist epithets are undeserving of rebuttal, but that the disproportionate response performs neoliberalism’s injunction to reduce politics to “dialogue” and “awareness.”

### 1NC---Defense

#### Cybernetic enslavement is not inevitable.

Markland, 21—Teaching Fellow in Politics and International Relations at Aston University (Alistair, “Epistemic Transformation at the Margins: Resistance to Digitalisation and Datafication within Global Human Rights Advocacy,” Global Society, February 3, 2021, dml)

As established in the first section of this article, proponents of what I have heuristically defined as the “transformation thesis” have emphasised the revolutionary ruptures wrought by digital connectivity and datafication. Some of these proponents illustrate these changes using field specific case studies, as with Duffield’s (2018) suggestion that the transition to a “cybernetic episteme” is reflected in humanitarian practice. Other authors have taken a more abstract view, including Chandler’s (2018) discussion of new modes of governance in the digital era, or the post-humanist drive to reconceptualise “humanity” under conditions of technological entwinement (Cudworth and Hobden 2013). These assertions of macro-level transformation are also supported by network sociology, led principally by Manuel Castells (2010) analysis of how revolutions in information technology, economic globalisation and an emergent “space of flows” interact to produce a new kind of “network society”. This linkage of societal transformation to economic forces is also characteristic of more critical anti-capitalist perspectives, as with the Marxist critique of “cognitive capitalism” (Moulier-Boutang 2012; Zukerfeld 2017). Although these approaches differ in their conceptual frameworks, they are united in their ambition to highlight universal epistemic transformations brought about by technological change.

One of the pitfalls of these totalising perspectives is the neglect of the particular in favour of the universal. For instance, networked thinking encourages assumptions about lateral transformation across socio-political fields that are connected to the digital universe. But not all spheres of social or political activity move at the same pace when they are exposed to technological innovation. Datafication and digitalisation are processes that have uneven impacts on different social and political fields. For example, the testimony of Facebook’s CEO Mark Zuckerberg to the Senate Judiciary and Commerce Committees in April 2018, where US lawmakers appeared confused by the social media giant’s basic business model, is a stark illustration of the gap that still exists between the world of Big Tech and the operating logics of mainstream democratic politics (Stewart 2018). Bigo and Bonelli (2019, 115) have found that even in the field of transnational intelligence, a sphere that could have much to gain from algorithmic techniques, technological expertise tends to be contracted out to third parties while traditional, human-sourced intelligence approaches remain dominant. Therefore, grasping for totalising processes risks ignoring the empirical specificity of divergent social microcosms.

To remedy this blind side in transformationalist thinking, I assert the utility of applying Pierre Bourdieu’s field theory when conceptualising how certain spheres of social or political activity—including the field of global human rights advocacy discussed in the previous section—mediate pressures for epistemic transformation and potentially isolate technological changes and agents to the margins. Employing field theory, Ole Jacob Sending (2015, 11) sees global governance as divided into separate fields, where “actors compete with each other to be recognised as authorities on what is to be governed, how, and why”. Examples of such fields include international development, security, peacebuilding, humanitarianism, and human rights advocacy. However, each field varies in terms of its specific “rules of the game” (Bourdieu and Waquant 1992, 99). Fields are bounded, game-like social structures that are constituted by a unique constellation of actors. These actors struggle for authority according to the field’s principles of legitimation (Bourdieu 1989, 17). These principles of legitimation, which define a field’s cultural capital, are durable to the extent that dominant actors remain invested in their reproduction. Actors’ prolonged immersion in these fields subsequently shapes their own practical sensibilities, so that the field’s logics are internalised as common sense within the habitus (Bourdieu 1990, 53). It is the embedment of the field’s doxa (common sense) within the habitus of invested actors that makes fields durable and resistant to radical transformations. As seen in the previous section, the rules governing the human rights field are associated with its logic of political influence, persuasion, and moral authority.

Critics of Bourdieusian field theory have argued that it is overly structuralist, reproductive, and cannot grasp “the ever-shifting constellations of actors, institutions, data and forms of expression that make up the expertise” (Waever and Leander 2018, 2). However, alternative approaches such as actor-network theory or assemblage-based theories fail to centralise the importance of social and political struggles between agents which are key in defining the trajectory of digitalisation and datafication. As Ruppert, Isin, and Bigo (2017, 3), “[d]ata does not happen through unstructured social practices but through structured and structuring fields in and through which various agents and their interests generate forms of expertise, interpretation, concepts, and methods that collectively function as fields of power and knowledge”. Similarly, “data is not an already given artefact that exists (which then needs to be mined, analysed, brokered) but an object of investment (in the broadest sense) that is produced by the competitive struggles of professionals who claim stakes in its meaning and functioning” (Bigo, Isin, and Ruppert 2019, 11). Technological change can influence the trajectory of different global political fields by enabling the entry of new types of actors (such as data consultants in the case of human rights advocacy), as well as by producing emergent sources of cultural capital and associated epistemic practices (such as expertise in geospatial imaging).

As Bigo and Bonelli (2019, 120) have observed in the case of the transnational intelligence field, technological change can be accompanied by the growing influence of private companies who “have played a substantial role in the recruitment of IT specialists, network engineers, data analysts, integration platform software designers, language and coding specialists, cryptologists, and mathematicians tasked with creating or combining algorithms”. Such entryism can have a revolutionary effect if those new actors are able redefine a field’s organising logic, cultural capital, and principles of legitimation. For example, looking at the case of Sudan in the 1990s as an antecedent to the transformation of humanitarianism, Duffield (2018, 85) traces how donor governments asserted greater control over NGOs, who subsequently “seamlessly morphed into the ‘implementing partners’ of donor governments”. Alongside growing private sector partnerships, these developments stimulated the neoliberal re-alignment of the humanitarian field away from Third World solidarity and the progressive support for autonomous change and towards the governance of precarity. This exposed the field to an epistemic transformation that privileged datafication based on a “surveillance logic of command and control” (ibid., 168).

However, not all global political fields are so structurally conducive to this kind of radical transformation. The example of the human rights advocacy field illustrates how a strong autonomous organising logic—a logic of persuasion—generates entrenched forms of field-specific cultural capital—qualitative and humanistic accounts of raw suffering that establish clear legal responsibilities. Actors can mobilise digital or data infrastructures to diversify the range of tools and media at their disposal, as illustrated by the (limited) use of geospatial technology, data visualisations in human rights reporting, and a growing reliance on social media platforms to engage audiences. However, they do not necessarily threaten the epistemic practices that are at the centre of human rights advocacy. This is because the transformative potential of new technologies and methods depends on their epistemic, political, social, or moral value in the eyes of the fields’ dominant actors. The integration of data-based approaches has been one of slow adaptation, not revolution, and technological specialists—often employed as third-party consultants rather than as full-time human rights professionals—remain at the margins. The Bourdieusian concept of habitus is also helpful in illuminating how fields with strong professional structures and specific educational and career trajectories can endow members with enduring dispositions that favour both the reproduction of existing epistemic practices and resistance to new ones. The habitus of human rights professionals is still primarily defined by legal, journalistic, and liberal-cosmopolitan moral/political dispositions, rather than technological expertise. So long as processes of doxic reproduction remain stable, the potential for epistemic transformation through datafication remains limited.

Conclusion

This article has cautioned against the analytical trend towards treating datafication as a general process acting to radically transform the epistemic and governance practices across global political fields. Because different social and political fields are unique social microcosms that contain divergent organising principles, readers should be wary of post-humanist analyses making totalising claims about alleged transformations in the human condition. The polemical teleology of transformationalism, an approach that is in vogue among Silicon Valley hype merchants like Elon Musk, public intellectuals, and a growing number of social scientists, is certainly attention grabbing, but it does not measure up against the actual way in which technological and methodological innovations are instituted within different fields of practice. International relations and global governance scholars working on the interstitial cross-roads between technology and various political or social lifeworlds need to be attentive to how digital and data transformations are mediated at the meso level of global politics. This article has demonstrated how epistemic transformation can be resisted at the meso level through observing changes and continuities among elite human rights organisations. Bourdieusian field theory, with its emphasis on legitimacy, social reproduction, and the durability of practical dispositions, offers a suitable framework for conceptualising the absence of epistemic rupture within the field of human rights advocacy. However, because digitalisation and datafication processes are mediated through the specific logics of a given field, more work needs to be done on examining how different organising principles shape the potentialities for epistemic transformation. Thus, in the future, more comparative empirical research will be needed to observe technological changes across different areas of global governance.

**There’s zero chance of a slide into dystopia**

**Dupont 16** – Benoît Dupont, Holder of the Canada Research Chair in Cybersecurity, Professor of Criminology at the Université de Montréal and the Scientific Director of the Smart Cybersecurity Network, “Hacking the Panopticon: Distributed Online Surveillance and Resistance”, Security and Privacy, Volume 3, Ed. Savirimuthu

I offer an additional interpretation inspired by Gary Marx's (2007) techno-fallacies article and the heuristics’ theory of Tversky and Kahneman (1982). Just like technophiles often succumb to the false belief that there is a technological fix for every security problem, surveillance scholars (as an epistemic community, not as individuals) are not immune to **biases** that lead them to assume that the monitoring technologies embedded in virtually every aspect of our lives are a clear indicator of our **inexorable fall into a 1984 reality**. Three biases are particularly salient in this belief system. The first bias is the **initiative bias**, which leads people to attribute less initiative and less imagination to others than to themselves (Kahneman & Tversky, 1993, p. 3), especially if they belong to a lower socio-economic group. While surveillance scholars are able to offer **elaborate narratives of the hidden power** of the electronic panopticon and its significance, they frequently **discount** the interpretive capacities and agency of surveillance subjects and the resistance strategies that ensue. The **loss aversion** bias refers to the asymmetrical evaluation of positive and negative outcomes, where losses are systematically overestimated and gains are underestimated. This bias seems particularly pronounced “when the reference point is the status quo, and when retention of the status quo is an option” (Kahneman & Tversky, 1993, p. 14). This bias corresponds in surveillance studies to the reticence manifested toward the study of positive developments (Haggerty, 2006, p. 35) such as the **accountability** produced by **meta-surveillance applications** or the independence afforded to elderly patients by monitoring systems that let them stay at home. The tendency to predict **widespread erosions** of freedom has also been a **prominent feature** of surveillance studies, **despite the lack of empirical and historical data**

to support this claim. **Democracies have not crumbled** since advanced monitoring technologies have invaded our lives, and the lack of sophisticated surveillance tools has **never prevented** authoritarian states to enroll thousands of informers to control internal dissent (Pfaff, 2001). Finally, the third heuristic is the **probability bias** whereby a confusion is made between what is possible and what is probable (Ohm, 2007). This bias is very closely connected with the previous one, because on contentious subjects such as surveillance and privacy, people tend to **focus on disastrous outcomes** and neglect the role played by randomness (Taleb, 2004), complexity, and contested rationalities (Espeland, 1998) among supervisors. Surveillance scholars frequently present what may happen as what will happen, obscuring the **mechanisms** that so often **derail the best plans**. Perhaps, the fact that Bentham's panopticon was **actually never built** and that the British government preferred instead to deport its prisoners to Australia, an open-air prison where convict supervision was deliberately kept at a minimum (Kerr, 1989; Jackson, 1998), should serve as a reminder that **dystopias are about as likely to materialize as utopias**.

#### Transhumanism won’t work---BUT, at best, takes hundreds of years.

Fish 9 (Greg, computer science grad student and science blogger whose work appears on BusinessWeek, Discovery News and The Panda’s Thumb, and featured on Bad Astronomy, SEED, and io9. please, leave your brain where it is http://worldofweirdthings.com/2009/05/11/please-leave-your-brain-where-it-is/ [accessed 9/25/10])

A while ago, I took a look into an idea of the Technological Singularity that looks towards a future in which the human mind will reside as pure information within a complex network of computers. Since the first post on the subject, I’ve been getting a slow but steady stream of feedback from proponents who say that with enough time, we can’t discount something like this from happening or that I haven’t given a valid reason why a future technology for transferring human minds to machines won’t work. According to them, if you have a perfect, one to one transfer of the information from the brain to a computer, the human and his consciousness should all be there in an electronic format like a huge collection of files. All you’d need are the right tools for the job… The concept of machine aided immortality is one of those ideas that’s just too good to let go. I may be tempted to believe it myself as an avid reader of science fiction since childhood. But it just so happens that technology is my area of expertise and I’ve worked with computers too long not to hear alarm bells ringing when I picture mad scientists trying to replicate a brain in machine form. When Ray Kurzweil talks about melding minds with microchips, he focuses on the idea that our minds have electrical impulses like computers and our thoughts can be read with proper equipment. However, the issue is a lot more nuanced than that. Just because we can design a probe that can read electrical activity in our nervous systems and activate preprogrammed functions, doesn’t mean that we took a step towards replacing neurons with silicon. Let’s say you wanted to truly download a human mind into a mechanical vessel of some sort. To make it work, your machine would have to work the same exact way as a human brain. That’s not going to happen with just a few futuristic updates. You’d need to rethink how it works from the bottom up, starting with memory and how it uses electrical activity for its basic functions. Electrical pulses in digital equipment like computers come from transistors switched on and off as electricity from a power supply flows to them. Data generated by myriads of these pulses is then recorded to a disk in a computer’s hard drive and can be retrieved when needed with the use an index which keeps track of where on the disk the data is actually recorded. So if you needed to find a file on your computer, the device finds all the places on the hard disk where the file’s data lives and presents it in the correct form via an operating system. A human brain is very different. In the brain, those pulses come from chemical reactions between sodium and potassium. There’s no hard disk where data is stored. Instead, clusters of neurons store the data temporarily and the more you reuse the information, the stronger those connections get and the better you remember it. Another major difference is that computers have limited amounts of data storage because hard disks can fit only so much. But the brain doesn’t have a limit on the amount of information it can store. Forgetting seems to be more of a function of not using the information or being unable to effectively retain it rather than our limit on potential knowledge. Estimates of what capacity the brain has are completely meaningless because they try to apply a the constraints of an electronic system designed to have X amount of storage to a biological network that evolved over millions of years and records memories in much more sophisticated and dynamic ways. So if the Singularity proponents can overlook so basic and so important, what are we to make of the idea that human brains can actually be downloaded or merge with machinery? Well, again, there’s a lot of excitement over the fact that our nervous system generate electrical activity and carry information with pulses of ions. In a computer network, you can get the same pulses to get you the same data on a different machine. But keep in mind that there’s no hard disk to which the data gets recorded in the brain and the electrical activity is used to fire neurotransmitters rather than record files. The brain is the storage, the RAM and the operating system so trying to transfer over the signals neurons send to each other into a computer isn’t going to give you any of the information stored in the person’s mind, not to mention that all you’d be doing in interrupting pulses which will start again as soon as your futile effort is over. The neurons in our brains aren’t just transistors that send ions to each other. They’re what make us who and what we are. Human minds are a product of chemistry and organic connections, swayed by neurotransmitters and hormones, prone to emotions that were passed on from our earliest ancestors as survival mechanisms. When someone like Ray Kurzweil talks about abandoning our bodies, he’s taking his very circumstantial and drastically incomplete knowledge of both computers and human brains, and applies a hefty dose of what can only be described as a technological New Ageism. His idea is based on a typical religious model which sees our bodies as nothing more than vessels for our souls. It’s that soul, that concept of the transcendent human essence, Kurzweil wants to extract and put into a microprocessor to gain a sort of immortality. And in this case, he thinks he found the human soul in the everyday electrical activity of the brain.

#### Black liberation theology can’t overcome western biases

Hlulani M. Mdingi, 20. Faculty of Humanities, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa. "The black church as the timeless witness to change and paradigm shifts posed by the Fourth Industrial Revolution." HTS Theological Studies 76, no. 2 (2020): 1-9.

The current technological and scientific developments of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) signal great leaps in human intellect and creativity. At the crossroad of great steps into the future, a future that will be determined by science and innovation, the smeared bond between theology and science recoils upon theological consideration of human intellect. Black liberation theology has stressed a change in paradigm, which takes oppression, class and intellect seriously. This research seeks to elaborate that a general acceptance of human intellect and science tends to ignore that modern-day science is part of Western civilisation. The Western world view remains dominant in the world. It will be argued that while the 4IR is important, the intellect, politics, economics and need for a 4IR, however, remain synonymous with the need of the West to 'civilise' the world. Institutions such as the World Economic Forum are Western institutions and still represent the goals of Western civilisation. This article argues that great leaps in science must be measured by the Christian church's commitment to eschatology and a building of an egalitarian society on earth. The article seeks to explore if the notion of a black church can be instrumental in the 4IR for focusing on the human condition and humanity of the oppressed in Africa and Latin America. The article argues that the church's role is to witness great change in society and it must be prepared to actively respond to great societal change posed by the 4IR.

#### Surveillance is not a unified, totalizing system of juridical violence

Currah 14 – Paisley Currah, Professor of Political Science and Women’s & Gender Studies at Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, M.A and Ph.D. in Government from Cornell University, “The State”, TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly, Volume 1, Numbers 1-2, May

For the Left, however, the liberal state and the principles of political equality it celebrates conceal the maldistribution of equality. A certain domesticated form of selfhood is reproduced when individuals petition the government for recognition of their particular selves and, in turn, recognize themselves when they are hailed by various state apparatuses — interpolation is the term of art used to describe this relationship. From this more radical perspective, then, the transgender rights movement is merely insisting that the hailing be more accurate. A transgender man will now have an M on his driver's license, and the police officer who stops him on the street may call him “sir” rather than “ma'am.” But the power of the state to surveil individuals and to regulate gender remains intact. While the political approach of many trans legal advocates requires them to naturalize gender identity, the more radical trans Left recognizes that “sex” cannot be made to fit into a rigid presocial biological schema of male and female. On the question of sex classification, the goal should not be to install the “right” definition of sex in the regulatory architecture to make the legal recognition of transition possible but to get the state out of the business of defining sex in the first place.

Both the classical liberal theory of the state and the Left's critical rejoinder, however, lack the capacity or perhaps the flexibility to account for contradictions in policies for sex reclassification. Perhaps what underlies the inability to account for contradictions in sex classification is the belief that the state actions should manifest an underlying coherence. In fact, the hope — or fear — that we are governed by a single, rational legal structure is belied by the existence of a virtually uncountable number of state institutions, processes, offices, and political jurisdictions. In the United States, for example, when some individuals cross borders, walk into a government office to apply for benefits, get a driver's license, go to jail or prison, sign up for selective service, try to get married, or have any interaction with any state actor, the sex classification of some people can and often does switch. Even within a single jurisdiction, almost every particular state agency — from federal to municipal — has the authority to decide its own rules for sex classification. To complicate matters even more, both state and federal judges have found that one's sex classification for one social function may not hold for others. These include legislatures, courts, departments, agencies, elected officials, political appointees, public servants, constitutions, laws, regulations, administrative rules, and informal norms and practices. These intertwined and sprawling apparatuses all rest, sometimes uneasily, on diachronous layers of sedimented yet still active historical state formations. Given this disarray, it is not surprising that different state entities might sometimes advance different, even incommensurate, projects. Indeed, how could they not?

According to Gilles Deleuze, a concept “should express an event rather than an essence” (1995: 14). Molar, large-scale accounts of sex and the state have assumed a sameness to sex and a singular rationality to state actors, decisions, and projects. If the state is not unitary, coordinated, and hierarchically organized in an ultimately rational way — if, as Michel Foucault suggests, “the state is only a composite reality and a mythicized abstraction whose importance is much less than we think” (1991: 103) — then it should come as no surprise that state definitions of sex are also plural. A contradiction is something that does not make sense, a position that is logically inconsistent. To begin by letting go of the assumption that there is any “there there,” any whatness, to (legal) sex apart from what an agency says it is, the contradiction evaporates. The official sex designation — or, more precisely, the M or the F — stamped on documents or coded in records becomes the starting point. Then an analysis can focus not on what sex is, or what it should be, but on what it does, what it accomplishes, what it produces. Indeed, if the only thing we know for sure about sex is what any of these many state actors say it is in any particular instance, sex will turn out to be as messy and diffuse a concept as the state. Entering into the analysis without a firm sense of what sex is or what the state is — as a priori facts, as edifices — makes the processes through which they come into being more visible. It might be better to defer attempts to resolve — theoretically or politically — the messiness in order to understand what a particular system of sex designation does for a particular state project such as recognition or redistribution (Currah, forthcoming).

Of course, states should not only or always be imagined as messy, scattered nodes of local and arbitrary power arrangements. The Leviathan state's terrible concentrated authority to impose sanctions (death, imprisonment, fines) has been the subject of theories of sovereignty for centuries. For this purpose, the most apt definition of the state begins with the simple description from Max Weber: “A human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate physical violence within a particular given territory” (1991: 78). To create a truly compelling account of sovereign violence and the paradox of sovereignty, one must take Weber's definition, put question marks around “legitimate,” and add the observation made by scholars such as Walter Benjamin, Carl Schmitt, Hannah Arendt, Jacques Derrida, and Giorgio Agamben that the force that creates the law and makes it legitimate cannot be justified by a law that does not yet exist. Still, much of what states do — regulating the health, safety, and public welfare through myriad regulations, rules, decisions, practices — does not reach the threshold of juridical violence, even if those actions are ultimately undergirded by its threat. Fetishizing a generalized idea of the state and its terrifying or redemptive power (depending on one's perspective) can obscure what is actually happening in the local, micro, particular sites where most public authority is exercised. While it is crucial to theorize the singular finality of state violence, neglecting to examine the messiness of actually existing and potentially incommensurate policies, practices, rules, and norms risks substituting the conceptual for the concrete and gets in the way of understanding what might actually be going on (Latour 1995: 48).

#### Prosaic material incentives explain contemporary anti-blackness far better than ontology

**Harari 15** [Yuval Noah Harari, Israeli historian and a tenured professor in the Department of History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, specializing in World History, Doctorate in Philosophy from Oxford University, and an acclaimed author whose first book, Sapiens, was an international bestseller that received lavish praise by figures ranging from Barack Obama to Bill Gates, *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind,* tr. by Yuval Harari with help from John Purcell and Haim Watzman, HarperCollins: Broadway, NY, 2015, p. 133-144]

UNDERSTANDING HUMAN HISTORY IN THE millennia following the Agricultural Revolution boils down to a single question: how did humans organise themselves in mass-cooperation networks, when they lacked the biological instincts necessary to sustain such networks? The short answer is that humans created imagined orders and devised scripts. These two inventions filled the gaps left by our biological inheritance.

However, the appearance of these networks was, for many, a dubious blessing. The imagined orders sustaining these networks were neither neutral nor fair. They divided people into make-believe groups, arranged in a hierarchy. The upper levels enjoyed privileges and power, while the lower ones suffered from discrimination and oppression. Hammurabi’s Code, for example, established a pecking order of superiors, commoners and slaves. Superiors got all the good things in life. Commoners got what was left. Slaves got a beating if they complained.

Despite its proclamation of the equality of all men, the imagined order established by the Americans in 1776 also established a hierarchy. It created a hierarchy between men, who benefited from it, and women, whom it left disempowered. It created a hierarchy between whites, who enjoyed liberty, and blacks and American Indians, who were considered humans of a lesser type and therefore did not share in the equal rights of men. Many of those who signed the Declaration of Independence were slaveholders. They did not release their slaves upon signing the Declaration, nor did they consider themselves hypocrites. In their view, the rights of men had little to do with Negroes.

The American order also consecrated the hierarchy between rich and poor. Most Americans at that time had little problem with the inequality caused by wealthy parents passing their money and businesses on to their children. In their view, equality meant simply that the same laws applied to rich and poor. It had nothing to do with unemployment benefits, integrated education or health insurance.

Liberty, too, carried very different connotations than it does today. In 1776, it did not mean that the disempowered (certainly not blacks or Indians or, God forbid, women) could gain and exercise power. It meant simply that the state could not, except in unusual circumstances, confiscate a citizen’s private property or tell him what to do with it. The American order thereby upheld the hierarchy of wealth, which some thought was mandated by God and others viewed as representing the immutable laws of nature. Nature, it was claimed, rewarded merit with wealth while penalising indolence.

All the above-mentioned distinctions – between free persons and slaves, between whites and blacks, between rich and poor – are rooted in fictions. (The hierarchy of men and women will be discussed later.) Yet it is an iron rule of history that every imagined hierarchy disavows its fictional origins and claims to be natural and inevitable. For instance, many people who have viewed the hierarchy of free persons and slaves as natural and correct have argued that slavery is not a human invention. Hammurabi saw it as ordained by the gods. Aristotle argued that slaves have a ‘slavish nature’ whereas free people have a ‘free nature’. Their status in society is merely a reflection of their innate nature.

Ask white supremacists about the racial hierarchy, and you are in for a pseudoscientific lecture concerning the biological differences between the races. You are likely to be told that there is something in Caucasian blood or genes that makes whites naturally more intelligent, moral and hardworking. Ask a diehard capitalist about the hierarchy of wealth, and you are likely to hear that it is the inevitable outcome of objective differences in abilities. The rich have more money, in this view, because they are more capable and diligent. No one should be bothered, then, if the wealthy get better health care, better education and better nutrition. The rich richly deserve every perk they enjoy.

People with lighter skin colour are typically more in danger of sunburn than people with darker skin. Yet there was no biological logic behind the division of South African beaches. Beaches reserved for people with lighter skin were not characterised by lower levels of ultraviolet radiation.

Hindus who adhere to the caste system believe that cosmic forces have made one caste superior to another. According to a famous Hindu creation myth, the gods fashioned the world out of the body of a primeval being, the Purusa. The sun was created from the Purusa’s eye, the moon from the Purusa’s brain, the Brahmins (priests) from its mouth, the Kshatriyas (warriors) from its arms, the Vaishyas (peasants and merchants) from its thighs, and the Shudras (servants) from its legs. Accept this explanation and the sociopolitical differences between Brahmins and Shudras are as natural and eternal as the differences between the sun and the moon.1 The ancient Chinese believed that when the goddess Nü Wa created humans from earth, she kneaded aristocrats from fine yellow soil, whereas commoners were formed from brown mud.2

Yet, to the best of our understanding, these hierarchies are all the product of human imagination. Brahmins and Shudras were not really created by the gods from different body parts of a primeval being. Instead, the distinction between the two castes was created by laws and norms invented by humans in northern India about 3,000 years ago. Contrary to Aristotle, there is no known biological difference between slaves and free people. Human laws and norms have turned some people into slaves and others into masters. Between blacks and whites there are some objective biological differences, such as skin colour and hair type, but there is no evidence that the differences extend to intelligence or morality.

Most people claim that their social hierarchy is natural and just, while those of other societies are based on false and ridiculous criteria. Modern Westerners are taught to scoff at the idea of racial hierarchy. They are shocked by laws prohibiting blacks to live in white neighbourhoods, or to study in white schools, or to be treated in white hospitals. But the hierarchy of rich and poor – which mandates that rich people live in separate and more luxurious neighbourhoods, study in separate and more prestigious schools, and receive medical treatment in separate and better-equipped facilities – seems perfectly sensible to many Americans and Europeans. Yet it’s a proven fact that most rich people are rich for the simple reason that they were born into a rich family, while most poor people will remain poor throughout their lives simply because they were born into a poor family.

Unfortunately, complex human societies seem to require imagined hierarchies and unjust discrimination. Of course not all hierarchies are morally identical, and some societies suffered from more extreme types of discrimination than others, yet scholars know of no large society that has been able to dispense with discrimination altogether. Time and again people have created order in their societies by classifying the population into imagined categories, such as superiors, commoners and slaves; whites and blacks; patricians and plebeians; Brahmins and Shudras; or rich and poor. These categories have regulated relations between millions of humans by making some people legally, politically or socially superior to others.

Hierarchies serve an important function. They enable complete strangers to know how to treat one another without wasting the time and energy needed to become personally acquainted. In George Bernard Shaw’s Pygmalion, Henry Higgins doesn’t need to establish an intimate acquaintance with Eliza Doolittle in order to understand how he should relate to her. Just hearing her talk tells him that she is a member of the underclass with whom he can do as he wishes – for example, using her as a pawn in his bet to pass off a jower girl as a duchess. A modern Eliza working at a jorist’s needs to know how much effort to put into selling roses and gladioli to the dozens of people who enter the shop each day. She can’t make a detailed enquiry into the tastes and wallets of each individual.

Instead, she uses social cues – the way the person is dressed, his or her age, and if she’s not politically correct his skin colour. That is how she immediately distinguishes between the accounting-firm partner who’s likely to place a large order for expensive roses, and a messenger boy who can only afford a bunch of daisies.

Of course, differences in natural abilities also play a role in the formation of social distinctions. But such diversities of aptitudes and character are usually mediated through imagined hierarchies. This happens in two important ways. First and foremost, most abilities have to be nurtured and developed. Even if somebody is born with a particular talent, that talent will usually remain latent if it is not fostered, honed and exercised. Not all people get the same chance to cultivate and refine their abilities. Whether or not they have such an opportunity will usually depend on their place within their society’s imagined hierarchy. Harry Potter is a good example. Removed from his distinguished wizard family and brought up by ignorant muggles, he arrives at Hogwarts without any experience in magic. It takes him seven books to gain a firm command of his powers and knowledge of his unique abilities.

Second, even if people belonging to different classes develop exactly the same abilities, they are unlikely to enjoy equal success because they will have to play the game by different rules. If, in British-ruled India, an Untouchable, a Brahmin, a Catholic Irishman and a Protestant Englishman had somehow developed exactly the same business acumen, they still would not have had the same chance of becoming rich. The economic game was rigged by legal restrictions and unoɽcial glass ceilings.

The Vicious Circle

All societies are based on imagined hierarchies, but not necessarily on the same hierarchies. What accounts for the differences? Why did traditional Indian society classify people according to caste, Ottoman society according to religion, and American society according to race? In most cases the hierarchy originated as the result of a set of accidental historical circumstances and was then perpetuated and refined over many generations as different groups developed vested interests in it.

For instance, many scholars surmise that the Hindu caste system took shape when Indo-Aryan people invaded the Indian subcontinent about 3,000 years ago, subjugating the local population. The invaders established a stratified society, in which they – of course – occupied the leading positions (priests and warriors), leaving the natives to live as servants and slaves. The invaders, who were few in number, feared losing their privileged status and unique identity. To forestall this danger, they divided the population into castes, each of which was required to pursue a specific occupation or perform a specific role in society. Each had different legal status, privileges and duties. Mixing of castes – social interaction, marriage, even the sharing of meals – was prohibited. And the distinctions were not just legal – they became an inherent part of religious mythology and practice.

The rulers argued that the caste system rejected an eternal cosmic reality rather than a chance historical development. Concepts of purity and impurity were essential elements in Hindu religion, and they were harnessed to buttress the social pyramid. Pious Hindus were taught that contact with members of a different caste could pollute not only them personally, but society as a whole, and should therefore be abhorred. Such ideas are hardly unique to Hindus. Throughout history, and in almost all societies, concepts of pollution and purity have played a leading role in enforcing social and political divisions and have been exploited by numerous ruling classes to maintain their privileges. The fear of pollution is not a complete fabrication of priests and princes, however. It probably has its roots in biological survival mechanisms that make humans feel an instinctive revulsion towards potential disease carriers, such as sick persons and dead bodies. If you want to keep any human group isolated – women, Jews, Roma, gays, blacks – the best way to do it is convince everyone that these people are a source of pollution.

The Hindu caste system and its attendant laws of purity became deeply embedded in Indian culture. Long after the Indo-Aryan invasion was forgotten, Indians continued to believe in the caste system and to abhor the pollution caused by caste mixing. Castes were not immune to change. In fact, as time went by, large castes were divided into sub-castes. Eventually the original four castes turned into 3,000 different groupings called jati (literally ‘birth’). But this proliferation of castes did not change the basic principle of the system, according to which every person is born into a particular rank, and any infringement of its rules pollutes the person and society as a whole. A persons jati determines her profession, the food she can eat, her place of residence and her eligible marriage partners. Usually a person can marry only within his or her caste, and the resulting children inherit that status.

Whenever a new profession developed or a new group of people appeared on the scene, they had to be recognised as a caste in order to receive a legitimate place within Hindu society. Groups that failed to win recognition as a caste were, literally, outcasts – in this stratified society, they did not even occupy the lowest rung. They became known as Untouchables. They had to live apart from all other people and scrape together a living in humiliating and disgusting ways, such as sifting through garbage dumps for scrap material. Even members of the lowest caste avoided mingling with them, eating with them, touching them and certainly marrying them. In modern India, matters of marriage and work are still heavily influenced by the caste system, despite all attempts by the democratic government of India to break down such distinctions and convince Hindus that there is nothing polluting in caste mixing.3

Purity in America

A similar vicious circle perpetuated the racial hierarchy in modern America. From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, the European conquerors imported millions of African slaves to work the mines and plantations of America. They chose to import slaves from Africa rather than from Europe or East Asia due to three circumstantial factors. Firstly, Africa was closer, so it was cheaper to import slaves from Senegal than from Vietnam.

Secondly, in Africa there already existed a well-developed slave trade (exporting slaves mainly to the Middle East), whereas in Europe slavery was very rare. It was obviously far easier to buy slaves in an existing market than to create a new one from scratch.

Thirdly, and most importantly, American plantations in places such as Virginia, Haiti and Brazil were plagued by malaria and yellow fever, which had originated in Africa. Africans had acquired over the generations a partial genetic immunity to these diseases, whereas Europeans were totally defenceless and died in droves.

It was consequently wiser for a plantation owner to invest his money in an African slave than in a European slave or indentured labourer. Paradoxically, genetic superiority (in terms of immunity) translated into social inferiority: precisely because Africans were fitter in tropical climates than Europeans, they ended up as the slaves of European masters! Due to these circumstantial factors, the burgeoning new societies of America were to be divided into a ruling caste of white Europeans and a subjugated caste of black Africans.

But people don’t like to say that they keep slaves of a certain race or origin simply because it’s economically expedient. Like the Aryan conquerors of India, white Europeans in the Americas wanted to be seen not only as economically successful but also as pious, just and objective. Religious and scientific myths were pressed into service to justify this division. Theologians argued that Africans descend from Ham, son of Noah, saddled by his father with a curse that his offspring would be slaves. Biologists argued that blacks are less intelligent than whites and their moral sense less developed. Doctors alleged that blacks live in filth and spread diseases – in other words, they are a source of pollution.

These myths struck a chord in American culture, and in Western culture generally. They continued to exert their influence long after the conditions that created slavery had disappeared. In the early nineteenth century imperial Britain outlawed slavery and stopped the Atlantic slave trade, and in the decades that followed slavery was gradually outlawed throughout the American continent.

Notably, this was the first and only time in history that slaveholding societies voluntarily abolished slavery. But, even though the slaves were freed, the racist myths that justified slavery persisted. Separation of the races was maintained by racist legislation and social custom.

The result was a self-reinforcing cycle of cause and effect, a vicious circle.

Consider, for example, the southern United States immediately after the Civil War. In 1865 the Thirteenth Amendment to the US Constitution outlawed slavery and the Fourteenth Amendment mandated that citizenship and the equal protection of the law could not be denied on the basis of race. However, two centuries of slavery meant that most black families were far poorer and far less educated than most white families. A black person born in Alabama in 1865 thus had much less chance of getting a good education and a well-paid job than did his white neighbours. His children, born in the 1880S and 1890s, started life with the same disadvantage – they, too, were born to an uneducated, poor family.

But economic disadvantage was not the whole story. Alabama was also home to many poor whites who lacked the opportunities available to their better-off racial brothers and sisters. In addition, the Industrial Revolution and the waves of immigration made the United States an extremely fluid society, where rags could quickly turn into riches. If money was all that mattered, the sharp divide between the races should soon have blurred, not least through intermarriage.

But that did not happen. By 1865 whites, as well as many blacks, took it to be a simple matter of fact that blacks were less intelligent, more violent and sexually dissolute, lazier and less concerned about personal cleanliness than whites. They were thus the agents of violence, theft, rape and disease – in other words, pollution. If a black Alabaman in 1895 miraculously managed to get a good education and then applied for a respectable job such as a bank teller, his odds of being accepted were far worse than those of an equally qualified white candidate. The stigma that labelled blacks as, by nature, unreliable, lazy and less intelligent conspired against him.

You might think that people would gradually understand that these stigmas were myth rather than fact and that blacks would be able, over time, to prove themselves just as competent, law-abiding and clean as whites. In fact, the opposite happened – these prejudices became more and more entrenched as time went by. Since all the best jobs were held by whites, it became easier to believe that blacks really are inferior. ‘Look,’ said the average white citizen, ‘blacks have been free for generations, yet there are almost no black professors, lawyers, doctors or even bank tellers. Isn’t that proof that blacks are simply less intelligent and hard-working?’ Trapped in this vicious circle, blacks were not hired for whitecollar jobs because they were deemed unintelligent, and the proof of their inferiority was the paucity of blacks in white-collar jobs.

The vicious circle did not stop there. As anti-black stigmas grew stronger, they were translated into a system of ‘Jim Crow’ laws and norms that were meant to safeguard the racial order. Blacks were forbidden to vote in elections, to study in white schools, to buy in white stores, to eat in white restaurants, to sleep in white hotels. The justification for all of this was that blacks were foul, slothful and vicious, so whites had to be protected from them. Whites did not want to sleep in the same hotel as blacks or to eat in the same restaurant, for fear of diseases. They did not want their children learning in the same school as black children, for fear of brutality and bad influences. They did not want blacks voting in elections, since blacks were ignorant and immoral. These fears were substantiated by scientific studies that ‘proved’ that blacks were indeed less educated, that various diseases were more common among them, and that their crime rate was far higher (the studies ignored the fact that these ‘facts’ resulted from discrimination against blacks).

By the mid-twentieth century, segregation in the former Confederate states was probably worse than in the late nineteenth century. Clennon King, a black student who applied to the University of Mississippi in 1958, was forcefully committed to a mental asylum. The presiding judge ruled that a black person must surely be insane to think that he could be admitted to the University of Mississippi.

The vicious circle: a chance historical situation is translated into a rigid social system.

Nothing was as revolting to American southerners (and many northerners) as sexual relations and marriage between black men and white women. Sex between the races became the greatest taboo and any violation, or suspected violation, was viewed as deserving immediate and summary punishment in the form of lynching. The Ku Klux Klan, a white supremacist secret society, perpetrated many such killings. They could have taught the Hindu Brahmins a thing or two about purity laws.

With time, the racism spread to more and more cultural arenas. American aesthetic culture was built around white standards of beauty. The physical attributes of the white race – for example light skin, fair and straight hair, a small upturned nose – came to be identified as beautiful. Typical black features – dark skin, dark and bushy hair, a flattened nose – were deemed ugly. These preconceptions ingrained the imagined hierarchy at an even deeper level of human consciousness.

Such vicious circles can go on for centuries and even millennia, perpetuating an imagined hierarchy that sprang from a chance historical occurrence. Unjust discrimination often gets worse, not better, with time. Money comes to money, and poverty to poverty. Education comes to education, and ignorance to ignorance. Those once victimised by history are likely to be victimised yet again. And those whom history has privileged are more likely to be privileged again.

Most sociopolitical hierarchies lack a logical or biological basis – they are nothing but the perpetuation of chance events supported by myths. That is one good reason to study history. If the division into blacks and whites or Brahmins and Shudras was grounded in biological realities – that is, if Brahmins really had better brains than Shudras – biology would be sufficient for understanding human society. Since the biological distinctions between different groups of Homo sapiens are, in fact, negligible, biology can’t explain the intricacies of Indian society or American racial dynamics. We can only understand those phenomena by studying the events, circumstances, and power relations that transformed figments of imagination into cruel – and very real – social structures.

#### humanism is good --- context is always key and narratives of humanity are contingent

**Lester 12** – (January 2012, Alan, Director of Interdisciplinary Research, Professor of Historical Geography, and Co-Director of the Colonial and Postcolonial Studies Network, University of Sussex, “Humanism, race and the colonial frontier,” Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, Volume 37, Issue 1, pages 132–148)

Anderson argues that it is not an issue of extending humanity to … negatively racialised people, but of putting into question that from which such people have been excluded – that which, for liberal discourse, remains unproblematised. (2007, 199) I fear, however, that if we direct attention away from histories of humanism’s failure to deal with difference and to render that difference compatible with its fundamental universalism, and if we overlook its proponents’ failed attempts to combat dispossession, murder and oppression; if our history of race is instead understood through a critique of humanity’s conceptual separation from nature, we dilute the political potency of universalism. Historically, it was not humanism that gave rise to racial innatism, it was the specifically anti-humanist politics of settlers forging new social assemblages through relations of violence on colonial frontiers. Settler communities became established social assemblages in their own right specifically through the rejection of humanist interventions. Perhaps, as Edward Said suggested, we can learn from the implementation of humanist universalism in practice, and insist on its potential to combat racism, and perhaps we can insist on the contemporary conceptual hybridisation of human–non-human entities too, without necessarily abandoning all the precepts of humanism (Said 2004; Todorov 2002). We do not necessarily need to accord a specific value to the human, separate from and above nature, in order to make a moral and political case for a fundamental human universalism that can be wielded strategically against racial violence. Nineteenth century humanitarians’ universalism was fundamentally conditioned by their belief that British culture stood at the apex of a hierarchical order of civilisations. From the mid-nineteenth century through to the mid-twentieth century, this ethnocentrism produced what Lyotard describes as ‘the flattening of differences, or the demand for a norm (“human nature”)’, that ‘carries with it its own forms of terror’ (cited Braun 2004, 1352). The intervention of Aboriginal Protection demonstrates that humanist universalism has the potential to inflict such terror (it was the Protectorate of Aborigines Office reincarnated that was responsible, later in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, for Aboriginal Australia’s Stolen Generation, and it was the assimilationist vision of the Protectors’ equivalents in Canada that led to the abuses of the Residential Schools system). But we must not forget that humanism’s alternatives, founded upon principles of difference rather than commonality, have the potential to do the same and even worse. In the nineteenth century, Caribbean planters and then emigrant British settlers emphasised the multiplicity of the human species, the absence of any universal ‘human nature’, the incorrigibility of difference, in their upholding of biological determinism. Their assault on any notion of a fundamental commonality among human beings has disconcerting points of intersection with the radical critique of humanism today. The scientific argument of the nineteenth century that came closest to post-humanism’s insistence on the hybridity of humanity, promising to ‘close the ontological gap between human and non-human animals’ (Day 2008, 49), was the evolutionary theory of biological descent associated with Darwin, and yet this theory was adopted in Aotearoa New Zealand and other colonial sites precisely to legitimate the potential extinction of other, ‘weaker’ races in the face of British colonisation on the grounds of the natural law of a struggle for survival (Stenhouse 1999). Both the upholding and the rejection of human–nature binaries can thus result in racially oppressive actions, depending on the contingent politics of specific social assemblages. Nineteenth century colonial humanitarians, inspired as they were by an irredeemably ethnocentric and religiously exclusive form of universalism, at least combatted exterminatory settler discourses and practices at multiple sites of empire, and provided spaces on mission and protectorate stations in which indigenous peoples could be shielded to a very limited extent from dispossession and murder. They also, unintentionally, reproduced discourses of a civilising mission and of a universal humanity that could be deployed by anticolonial nationalists in other sites of empire that were never invaded to the same extent by settlers, in independence struggles from the mid-twentieth century. Finally, as Whatmore’s (2002) analysis of the Select Committee on Aborigines reveals, they provided juridical narratives that are part of the arsenal of weapons that indigenous peoples can wield in attempts to claim redress and recompense in a postcolonial world. The politics of humanism in practice, then, was riddled with contradiction, fraught with particularity and latent with varying possibilities. It could be relatively progressive and liberatory; it could be dispossessive and culturally genocidal. Within its repertoire lay potential to combat environmental and biological determinism and innatism, however, and this should not be forgotten in a rush to condemn humanism’s universalism as well as its anthropocentrism. It is in the tensions within universalism that the ongoing potential of an always provisional, self-conscious, flexible and strategic humanism – one that now recognises the continuity between the human and the non-human as well as the power-laden particularities of the male, middle class, Western human subject – resides.

#### Even if transhumanism is successful, the aff does not achieve black transhumanism---it does not change cultural or societal perspectives in or outside of debate

#### OR Transhumanism won’t work---BUT, at best, takes hundreds of years.

Fish 9 (Greg, computer science grad student and science blogger whose work appears on BusinessWeek, Discovery News and The Panda’s Thumb, and featured on Bad Astronomy, SEED, and io9. please, leave your brain where it is http://worldofweirdthings.com/2009/05/11/please-leave-your-brain-where-it-is/ [accessed 9/25/10])

A while ago, I took a look into an idea of the Technological Singularity that looks towards a future in which the human mind will reside as pure information within a complex network of computers. Since the first post on the subject, I’ve been getting a slow but steady stream of feedback from proponents who say that with enough time, we can’t discount something like this from happening or that I haven’t given a valid reason why a future technology for transferring human minds to machines won’t work. According to them, if you have a perfect, one to one transfer of the information from the brain to a computer, the human and his consciousness should all be there in an electronic format like a huge collection of files. All you’d need are the right tools for the job… The concept of machine aided immortality is one of those ideas that’s just too good to let go. I may be tempted to believe it myself as an avid reader of science fiction since childhood. But it just so happens that technology is my area of expertise and I’ve worked with computers too long not to hear alarm bells ringing when I picture mad scientists trying to replicate a brain in machine form. When Ray Kurzweil talks about melding minds with microchips, he focuses on the idea that our minds have electrical impulses like computers and our thoughts can be read with proper equipment. However, the issue is a lot more nuanced than that. Just because we can design a probe that can read electrical activity in our nervous systems and activate preprogrammed functions, doesn’t mean that we took a step towards replacing neurons with silicon. Let’s say you wanted to truly download a human mind into a mechanical vessel of some sort. To make it work, your machine would have to work the same exact way as a human brain. That’s not going to happen with just a few futuristic updates. You’d need to rethink how it works from the bottom up, starting with memory and how it uses electrical activity for its basic functions. Electrical pulses in digital equipment like computers come from transistors switched on and off as electricity from a power supply flows to them. Data generated by myriads of these pulses is then recorded to a disk in a computer’s hard drive and can be retrieved when needed with the use an index which keeps track of where on the disk the data is actually recorded. So if you needed to find a file on your computer, the device finds all the places on the hard disk where the file’s data lives and presents it in the correct form via an operating system. A human brain is very different. In the brain, those pulses come from chemical reactions between sodium and potassium. There’s no hard disk where data is stored. Instead, clusters of neurons store the data temporarily and the more you reuse the information, the stronger those connections get and the better you remember it. Another major difference is that computers have limited amounts of data storage because hard disks can fit only so much. But the brain doesn’t have a limit on the amount of information it can store. Forgetting seems to be more of a function of not using the information or being unable to effectively retain it rather than our limit on potential knowledge. Estimates of what capacity the brain has are completely meaningless because they try to apply a the constraints of an electronic system designed to have X amount of storage to a biological network that evolved over millions of years and records memories in much more sophisticated and dynamic ways. So if the Singularity proponents can overlook so basic and so important, what are we to make of the idea that human brains can actually be downloaded or merge with machinery? Well, again, there’s a lot of excitement over the fact that our nervous system generate electrical activity and carry information with pulses of ions. In a computer network, you can get the same pulses to get you the same data on a different machine. But keep in mind that there’s no hard disk to which the data gets recorded in the brain and the electrical activity is used to fire neurotransmitters rather than record files. The brain is the storage, the RAM and the operating system so trying to transfer over the signals neurons send to each other into a computer isn’t going to give you any of the information stored in the person’s mind, not to mention that all you’d be doing in interrupting pulses which will start again as soon as your futile effort is over. The neurons in our brains aren’t just transistors that send ions to each other. They’re what make us who and what we are. Human minds are a product of chemistry and organic connections, swayed by neurotransmitters and hormones, prone to emotions that were passed on from our earliest ancestors as survival mechanisms. When someone like Ray Kurzweil talks about abandoning our bodies, he’s taking his very circumstantial and drastically incomplete knowledge of both computers and human brains, and applies a hefty dose of what can only be described as a technological New Ageism. His idea is based on a typical religious model which sees our bodies as nothing more than vessels for our souls. It’s that soul, that concept of the transcendent human essence, Kurzweil wants to extract and put into a microprocessor to gain a sort of immortality. And in this case, he thinks he found the human soul in the everyday electrical activity of the brain.

#### You cannot “escape” pre-existing modes of relationality---attempts to do so re-create neoliberalism.

Love 15 – Associate Professor at the University of Pennsylvania [Heather, ““Doing Being Deviant: Deviance Studies, Description, and the Queer Ordinary,” *differences* Vol. 26, No. 1, p. 89-91]

Today, queer studies – prestigious but unevenly institutionalized – still signals absolute refusal or criticality – all anti- and no normativity. In their influential 2004 essay, “The University and the Undercommons” (and in the 2013 book that followed from it), Fred Moten and Stefano Harney rely on such an understanding of queer (as well as concepts borrowed from black studies, feminism, ethnic studies, and anticolonial thought). They call for betrayal, refusal, theft, and marronage as modes of resisting the iron grip of the academy, pointing to an uncharted, underground, and collective space they call the undercommons. “To enter this space,” they write, “is to inhabit the ruptural and enraptured disclosure of the commons that fugitive enlightenment enacts, the criminal, matricidal, queer, in the cistern, on the stroll of the stolen life, the life stolen by enlightenment and stolen back, where the commons give refuge, where the refuge gives commons” (103). Moten and Harney speculate whether the “thought of the outside” (105) is possible inside the university and suggest that if there is an outside, it is along the margins and at the bottom. Yet their imagination of that outside is indebted to the inside, in particular to the conception of deviance produced within sociology. Their account of the undercommons reads like a rap sheet, a list of the traditional topics of deviance studies: theft, homosexuality, prostitution, incarceration.

Moten and Harney do not describe the undercommons, but rather ask their readers to join it, to participate in active revolt against profes- sional and disciplinary protocols. To o er an objective account of the social position of radical academics would be to further business as usual in the academy; dwelling in the undercommons requires giving up on the usual protocols of description. Moten and Harney argue against the traditional role of the “critical academic” (105), which they see as just another turn of the professional screw, since work that opposes the academy does not challenge its basic structure or everyday operations. They argue that “to be a critical academic in the university is to be against the university, and to be against the university is always to recognize it and to be recognized by it, and to institute the negligence of the internal outside, that unassimilated underground, a negligence of it that is precisely, we must insist, the basis of the professions” (105). In contrast to the figure of the critical academic, they forward the image of the “subversive intellectual” who is “in but not of” the academy (101). Without dismissing the galvanizing effect of such a call to the undercommons, it is important to consider the limits of the refusal of objectification as a strategy. To be unlocatable, to be nowhere, to be in permanent revolt: Moten and Harney describe the path that queer inquiry laid out for itself. Objectification – recognition, description, critique – can be a way to reinforce the status quo, but it is also a way of acknowledging one’s institutional position and the real differences between inside and outside. Even the most subversive intellectuals in the academy are “on the stroll” in a metaphorical but not a material sense. The fate of those who came “under false pretenses, with bad documents, out of love” (101), if they survive, is to become “superordinates” in Becker’s sense.

Whose side are we on? Can we hold onto the critical and polemical energy of queer studies as well as its radical experiments in style and thought while acknowledging our implication in systems of power, management, and control? Will a more explicit avowal of disciplinary affiliations and methods snuff out the utopian energies of a field that sees itself as a radical outsider in the university? To date, both the political and the methodological antinormativity of queer studies have made it difficult to address our implication in the violence of knowledge production, pedagogy, and social inequality. Such violence is inevitable, and critical histories of the disciplines – and the production of knowledge about social deviance – are essential. Undertaking such work, however, will not allow escape into a radically different relation to our objects because we are (as Moten and Harney also argue) part of that history – we are its contemporary instantiation. To imagine a social world in which those relations are transformed – in what Moten and Harney refer to as the “prophetic organization” (102) – may be crucial for the achievement of social justice, but to deny our own implication in existing structures is also a form of violence.

#### The affirmative reinforces ableist notions of humanity centered on capabilities---turns the case.

Dalibert 14 (Lucie, Dissertation to obtain the degree of doctor at the University of Twente, “Posthumanism and Somatechnologies Exploring the Intimate Relations between Humans and Technologies,” 2014, Chapter Two: Human Enhancement as Normation?, <https://ris.utwente.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/6057325/thesis_L_Dalibert.pdf>, DOA: 9-19-2019) //Snowball

Furthermore, as enhancement technologies become available, what constitutes ‘species typical/normal functioning’ is likely to be reconfigured and abilities are likely to be not only differently desirable but also hierarchically valued. In fact, human enhancement and enhancement technologies might reinforce the tension between average and ideal that informs what is considered to be normal. In Linda Hogle’s words,

as a norm comes to stand for something to strive for, rather than a centered, neutral, or positive condition, the average comes to be seen as the deficient (Hogle 2005: 699).

Certain (enhanced) abilities can be expected to become the norm, and humans will become evaluated – they will count as more or less human, their life will be regarded as more or less worth living – on basis of the possession or the lack of these (enhanced) abilities (Haker 2008: 196).

Humanness – who and what counts as (putatively properly) human – is at stake within human enhancement. This becomes particularly clear when attention is drawn to the ways in which human enhancement, or rather human enhancement as it is framed by some of its proponents (be they transhumanist or not), is underpinned by and operates a devaluation of disabilities. With the intertwinement of the norm and the normal in the concept of ‘typical species functioning’ and the correlate consecration of the normate – or its technologically enhanced version the posthuMan – at the expense of putatively differently abled bodies, who tend to be regarded as always already disabled, human enhancement – as it is delineated in discussions about it – tends to become a system of normation. In fact, as it partakes in and reinstates the (ableist) ideology of disability, human enhancement becomes a highly exclusionary phenomenon. Another element contributes to this state of affairs: human enhancement is rarely, if ever, apprehended as a configuration of human-technology relations. Rather, with the normate as both baseline and horizon of human enhancement, the latter is construed as a steady improvement (see also chapter one). Dualisms pervade while the figure of the huMan/posthuMan reigns.

### 1NC---Turn

#### Reject sweeping pessimism about algorithms---it is good:

#### 1. Accurate predictions---the AFF causes confirmation bias

Michael D. Ward 13, Professor of Political Science at Duke University, Niles W. Metternich, University of College London, Cassy L. Dorff, Max Gallop, Florian M. Hollenbach, Anna Schultz, and Simon Weschle, "Learning from the Past and Stepping into the Future: Toward a New Generation of Conflict Prediction", International Studies Review (2013) 15, 473-490

Political events are frequently framed as unpredictable. Who could have predicted the Arab Spring, 9/11, or the end of the cold war? This skepticism about prediction reflects an underlying desire to forecast. Predicting political events is difficult because they result from complex social processes. However, in recent years, our capacity to collect information on social behavior and our ability to process large data have increased to degrees only foreseen in science fiction. This new ability to analyze and predict behavior confronts a demand for better political forecasts that may serve to inform and even help to structure effective policies in a world in which prediction in everyday life has become commonplace. Only a decade ago, scholars interested in civil wars undertook their research with constrained resources, limited data, and statistical estimation capabilities that seem underdeveloped by current standards. Still, major advances did result from these efforts. Consider “Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War” by Fearon and Laitin (2003), one of the most venerated and cited articles about the onset of civil wars. Published in 2003, it has over 3,000 citations in scholar.google.com and almost 900 citations in the Web of Science (as of April 2013). It has been cited prominently in virtually every social science discipline in journals ranging from Acta Sociologica to World Politics; and it is the most downloaded article from the American Political Science Review.2 ¶ This article is rightly regarded as an important, foundational piece of scholarship. However, in the summer of 2012, it was used by Jacqueline Stevens in a New York Times Op-Ed as evidence that political scientists are bad forecasters. That claim was wildly off the mark in that Fearon and Laitin do not focus on forecasting, and Stevens ignored other, actual forecasting efforts in political science. Stevens’ point—which was taken up by the US Congress—was that government funding on quantitative approaches was being wasted on efforts that did not provide accurate policy advice. In contrast to Stevens, we argue that conflict research in political science can be substantially improved by more, not less, attention to predictions through quantitative approaches.¶ We argue that the increasing availability of disaggregated data and advanced estimation techniques are making forecasts of conflict more accurate and precise, thereby helping to evaluate the utility of different models and winnow the good from the bad. Forecasting also helps to prevent overfitting and reduces confirmation bias. As such, forecasting efforts can be used to help validate models, to gain greater confidence in the resulting estimates, and to ultimately present robust models that may allow us to improve the interaction with decision makers seeking greater clarity about the implications of potential actions.

#### 2. Peacekeeping---algorithmic governance enables effective responses to global atrocities

John Karlsrud 14, Senior Research Fellow and Manager of the Training for Peace programme at NUPI, Peacekeeping 4.0: Harnessing the Potential of Big Data, Social Media, and Cyber Technologies, in “Cyberspace and International Relations: Theory, Prospects and Challenges,” https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hakan\_Mehmetcik/publication/285282612\_A\_New\_Way\_of\_Conducting\_War\_Cyberwar\_Is\_That\_Real/links/5c63f67d45851582c3e47db7/A-New-Way-of-Conducting-War-Cyberwar-Is-That-Real.pdf

Brought together, the data can enable international organizations to follow and possibly prevent evolving situations and crises. This potential has been recognized; and, following the financial crisis, the UN Secretary-General created UN Global Pulse to explore opportunities for using real-time data to gain a more accurate understanding of population wellbeing, especially related to the impacts of global crises. The availability of real-time data holds great promise for helping us detect the early signs of stress on vulnerable populations. It represents an unprecedented opportunity to track the human impacts of crises as they unfold, and to get real-time feedback on how well policy responses are working (UN Global Pulse 2012b). As such, research undertaken by UN Global Pulse, notably though its networks of country-level “Pulse Labs,” may give the UN a better ability to follow, respond to and mitigate the impact of natural disasters and complex crises. However, more than 90 % of the information will be unstructured, potentially rich in useful information. Turning structured and unstructured information into actionable data requires efficient ways of structuring and analyzing the information in real time in a data ecosystem (WEF 2010, p. 4). This process is often called “reality mining” (UN Global Pulse 2012a, p. 18; Eagle and Pentland 2006) or “data mining”—discovering patterns in large data sets (Cheshire 2011; Helbing and Balietti 2012). So, how can the UN and other multilateral actors make use of this data? Cooperation has been initiated with Google and other large corporations that are at the forefront in harvesting actionable data from the “data deluge” (The Economist 2010b). Concurrently with this development, the digital divide is closing at an increasing speed. According to the World Bank, 44.9 out of every 100 people in subSaharan Africa had a mobile subscription in 2010 (World Bank 2012a), and by 2016 this figure will reach 91.3 (Portio Research 2012), although the high number may mask persons have more than one subscription. The percentage of population with access to internet is also increasing (World Bank 2012b). This means that the amount of both structured and unstructured data that can be analyzed and can inform multilateral efforts for conflict prevention and international security is increasing rapidly and can give a more even and realistic picture of the situation in question. However, there is a need to be realistic. There is great variance in the access to data between countries such as Syria and the Democratic Republic of Congo, and many have more than one mobile subscription to strengthen their resilience against patchy networks. Other co-influencing factors are the rapid spread of 3G networks in developing countries and affordable smart phones at prices down to $50 or less (Jidenma 2011). There is also a current global mega-trend of access to the internet through mobile devices: “in a world where there are 6.3 bn mobile users and 2.3 bn internet users, the default access mode to broadband services is mobile” (Ulf Ewaldsson, Ericsson, quoted in ITU 2012a). According to the International Telecommunication Union, “the ubiquitous mobile phone provides an important foundation for the uptake of mobilebased Internet [in the developing world]. With the majority of countries worldwide having launched 3G mobile-broadband services, the prospects are promising” (ITU 2012b, p. 39, Evans 2012). In the areas of conflict prevention, humanitarian action, and development, the UN has made some initial steps. But what then is the situation in the areas of peacekeeping and peacebuilding? Unfortunately, little progress has been made so far. Notwithstanding the inclusion of surveillance drones in one peacekeeping mission, the development of Joint Mission Analysis Cells and Joint Operations Centres (which I will return to in the next section), the use of mobile phones in community alert networks in eastern Congo, and the heightened focus on the strategic planning and coordination capacity of peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations, much work remains before peacekeeping operations can be said to be tapping the potential of big data, social media, and cyber-technology effectively, entering the age of “Peacekeeping 4.0.” The good part of this story is that much work already has been undertaken in the similar and parallel fields of conflict prevention, humanitarian action and development. Many lessons from these fields could easily be imported, while other innovative approaches can be accessed through increased cooperation and coordination. Accomplishing this will require overcoming various bureaucratic hurdles and turfism, driven by support from engaged member states and the Secretary-General. Finally, the uptake of digital information in the planning of UN peace operations may also have implications for how the interaction between the UN, member states and civil society is theorized. IR theorists have increasingly underscored the importance of civil society actors as potential norm entrepreneurs (Keck and Sikkink 1998), and more recent research looking at the relationship between media and international organizations emphasize the potential role civil society and new technology can play in democratizing the access to information, but also the potential for groups spreading disinformation and incite hatred. This chapter will seek to explore what chances the availability of Big Data and new technologies offer for peacekeeping and as well as inherent challenges. The chapter proceeds as follows: First, I narrow in on some key initiatives in the areas of conflict prevention, humanitarian action, and development that can be relevant to peacekeeping. The following section provides a short background on peacekeeping and its evolution from the end of the Cold War until present, noting some of the steps taken to date. Thirdly, I discuss some of the challenges and opportunities facing policymakers, and relate these to the area of peacekeeping in particular. Finally, the chapter sums up and offers some recommendations for policymakers among member states, in the UN, and among civil society, as well as pointing out areas in need of further research, to enable the UN to enter the era of fourth generation peacekeeping—“Peacekeeping 4.0.” 2 Cyberization of Conflict Prevention, Humanitarian Action, and Development The age of Big Data and social media has dawned on the fields of humanitarian activity, social activism, and development. Here the application of big data and social media has advanced a great deal further than in the areas of peacekeeping and peacebuilding, particularly among civil society organizations (CSOs) and other independent actors. One of these initiatives is Ushahidi. Ushahidi is a “web based reporting system that utilizes crowdsourced data to formulate visual map information of a crisis on a real-time basis” (Ushahidi 2012a). Ushahidi, which means “testimony” in Swahili, was originally a website established after the election violence in Kenya in 2008 to map incidents of violence (Ushahidi 2012b). Using crowdsourcing as a method means that everyone with access to common digital communication channels can contribute data.1 The data can be provided via text messages, email, twitter and web-forms. One recent example is Syria Tracker—a website set up to monitor violent incidents involving civilians in Syria: “Syria Tracker is a crowdsourced effort developed by individuals concerned about the harm inflicted upon civilians in Syria” (Syria Tracker 2012). Ushahidi and Syria Tracker are part of a tendency of “how non-state actors are increasingly collaborating online to tackle issues traditionally managed by governments” (Leson 2012). Also in the area of monitoring and evaluation, internet platforms are being established to ease the sharing and coordination of information. One example is the ActivityInfo website established by UNICEF, OCHA, and bedatadriven; it “that helps humanitarian organizations to collect, manage, map and analyze indicators…and allow for real time monitoring of the humanitarian situation in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of Congo” (ActivityInfo 2012). Analyzing the use of Google searches or Twitter messages can give strong indications of evolving situations, or whether an epidemic is spreading. Paul and Dredze (2011) found a very strong correlation coefficient (0.958) between tweets and official flu statistics, where the tweets were in real time and the statistics available only afterwards. Analyzing trending topics in Google searches or Facebook and blog posts can also yield significant data (Ginsberg et al. 2009). Google Dengue Trends uses aggregated Google search data to estimate dengue activity (Google 2012a); there is a similar service for influenza (Google 2012b). Following the earthquake in Port-au-Prince, Haiti, researchers from Sweden’s Karolinska Institutet and Columbia University in New York used mobile phone data, tracking 1.9 million SIM cards (Bengtsson et al. 2011, p. 2). They were able to follow the population flows and destinations of 648,717 people who had been displaced (ibid.:3). Later that year, the same team followed population movement after a cholera outbreak (Bengtsson et al. 2010, p. 2). Multilateral actors have started to catch on. The UN Secretary-General has created UN Global Pulse; the World Bank has begun discussing how big data can be used for development (World Bank 2012c), and has established “Mapping for Results” to visualize and track its programs and projects on the ground (World Bank 2012d). However, much remains to be done. In 2009, the UN Global Pulse Initiative launched the Rapid Impact and Vulnerability Analysis Fund (RIVAF). However, a recent report published by the initiative reveals a focus on the use of traditional indicators, and a lack of focus on conflict and post-conflict countries, even though many of the UN agencies, funds, and programs involved in the RIVAF initiative operate in precisely such locations (UN Global Pulse 2011). Further work is necessary in this area, also to focus the energies of developmentoriented organizations to conflict and post-conflict countries and utilize the potential offered by big data, social media, and cyber-technology. The UN has engaged with the Crisis Mappers community since 2010 (UN 2012a, p. 4, Crisis Mappers 2012); among other things, the Standby Task Force has supported OCHA crowdsourcing data for South Sudan, collecting “a total of 1,767 unique rows of data and 15,271 unique pieces of information records” in a mere 3 days (Standby Task Force 2012). At a recent meeting in New York to discuss the status of implementation of the UN’s Crisis Information Strategy, it was agreed that there is a need for Crisis Information Managers, and that the efforts towards convergence in crisis information management could support the “endeavours of ‘One UN’ and better coordination within the UN and the international community in general” (Swiss Mission to the United Nations 2012). A Crisis Management Training Course has since been established, with the first course being given in February 2013 at the International Peace Support Training Centre (IPSTC) in Nairobi, Kenya. The course will train civilians, military and police “working in multidimensional peace and humanitarian operations … to integrate new information technology into an information management system [and] demonstrate the opportunities and challenges of new ICTs [Information and Communication Technology] and social media tools…” (ICT4Peace 2012a). The challenge now will be to get the UN onboard and send staff to these courses, providing the organization with staff trained personnel that can enable it to make use of Big Data, ICTs and social media in its operations. The UN in Sudan has taken one step in this direction. With support of the United Kingdom, UNDP has run a Crisis Recovery and Mapping Analysis project since 2007 (UNDP 2012a), aimed at supporting both the UN country team (UNCT) and national authorities in making their activities more evidence-based and conflict-responsive (see also Bott and Young 2012).2 In Georgia, the Caucasus Research Resource Centers and Saferworld have joined forces with developers to produce Elva, combining “the data-rich mapping of Ushahidi with the meticulous requirements of human-rights researchers” (Sifry 2012). The platform is used to create a community safety network where a community representative, using SMS, can report violent or security incidents on a weekly basis. A similar initiative was developed by Columbia University in connection with the Voix des Kivus program in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) to “overcome the problems associated with the collection of conflict data” (van der Wind and Humphreys 2012). It involved distributing prepaid cellphones, solar chargers, and code sheets to community representatives in 18 villages in Eastern Congo (ibid.). For both projects, protecting the identity of those reporting against possible reprisals became an important concern (ibid., p. 24; see also Puig 2012). Together with the crisis mapping community, OCHA is experimenting with developing twitter dashboards for humanitarian crises. These use “Machine Learning (ML) techniques and social computing methods… to extract relevant information from twitter and aggregate this information according to Cluster for analytical purposes” (Meier 2012). A similar dashboard for peacekeeping operations “that looks across social media content and perhaps uses corporate data” could be envisaged (Interview with Meier 2012).

#### 3. There’s no risk of errors---even if AI isn’t perfect, it’s great at admitting what it doesn’t know---human error is orders of magnitude worse

Patrick Tucker 20 {Patrick Tucker is technology editor for Defense One. 4-29-2020. “Artificial Intelligence Outperforms Human Intel Analysts In a Key Area.” https://www.defenseone.com/technology/2020/04/artificial-intelligence-outperforms-human-intel-analysts-one-key-area/165022/}//JM

In the 1983 movie WarGames, the world is brought to the edge of nuclear destruction when a military computer using artificial intelligence interprets false data as an imminent Soviet missile strike. Its human overseers in the Defense Department, unsure whether the data is real, can’t convince the AI that it may be wrong. A recent finding from the Defense Intelligence Agency, or DIA, suggests that in a real situation where humans and AI were looking at enemy activity, those positions would be reversed. Artificial intelligence can actually be more cautious than humans about its conclusions in situations when data is limited. While the results are preliminary, they offer an important glimpse into how humans and AI will complement one another in critical national security fields. DIA analyzes activity from militaries around the globe. Terry Busch, the technical director for the agency’s Machine-Assisted Analytic Rapid-Repository System, or MARS, on Monday joined a Defense One viewcast to discuss the agency’s efforts to incorporate AI into analysis and decision-making. Earlier this year, Busch's team set up a test between a human and AI. The first part was simple enough: use available data to determine whether a particular ship was in U.S. waters. “Four analysts came up with four methodologies; and the machine came up with two different methodologies and that was cool. They all agreed that this particular ship was in the United States,” he said. So far, so good. Humans and machines using available data can reach similar conclusions. The second phase of the experiment tested something different: conviction. Would humans and machines be equally certain in their conclusions if less data were available? The experimenters severed the connection to the Automatic Identification System, or AIS, which tracks ships worldwide. “It’s pretty easy to find something if you have the AIS feed, because that’s going to tell you exactly where a ship is located in the world. If we took that away, how does that change confidence and do the machine and the humans get to the same end state?” In theory, with less data, the human analyst should be less certain in their conclusions, like the characters in WarGames. After all, humans understand nuance and can conceptualize a wide variety of outcomes. The researchers found the opposite. “Once we began to take away sources, everyone was left with the same source material — which was numerous reports, generally social media, open source kinds of things, or references to the ship being in the United States — so everyone had access to the same data. The difference was that the machine, and those responsible for doing the machine learning, took far less risk — in confidence — than the humans did,” he said. “The machine actually does a better job of lowering its confidence than the humans do….There’s a little bit of humor in that because the machine still thinks they’re pretty right.” The experiment provides a snapshot of how humans and AI will team for important analytical tasks. But it also reveals how human judgement has limits when pride is involved. Humans, particularly experts in specific fields, have a tendency to overestimate their ability to correctly infer outcomes when given limited data. Nobel-prize winning economist and psychologist Daniel Kahneman has written on the subject extensively. Kahneman describes this tendency as the “inside view.” He cites the experience of a group of Israeli educators assigned to write a new textbook for the Ministry of Education. They anticipated that it would take them a fraction of the amount of time they knew it would take another similar team. They couldn’t explain why they were overconfident; they just were. Overconfidence is human and a particular trait among highly functioning expert humans, one that machines don’t necessarily share.
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#### More evidence---their method can’t meaningfully resist surveillance.

Lee 14 – Ashlin Lee, PhD in Sociology from University of Tasmania, Honorary Lecturer in Sociology at the Australia National University, Associate Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Tasmania, “A Question of Momentum: Critical Reflections on Individual Options for Surveillance Resistance,” Revista Teknokultura, Volume 11, Number 2, p. 430-433

Resistance Options

This is not to suggest that surveillance is a deterministic social phenomena. Surveillance processes are always a consequence of "the context and comportment" (Marx, 2013, p. 5) of any given social situation, with the outcomes of this situation never predetermined. As Gilliom (2005) notes even the most marginalised and disadvantaged members of society can offer forms of resistance to surveillance, challenging the status quo. But the question is: do these actions actually change the balance of power and the circumstances of surveillance for individuals? Marx (2003, 2009, p. 297) suggests twelve possible "surveillance neutralisation" techniques for individuals to resist surveillance: However, in suggesting these surveillance neutralisation devices, Marx (2009) also notes the potential for methods of resistance to be overcome or nullified through appropriate counter- measures taken by the surveillance system or authority. These countermeasures are a function of the momentum of the surveillance system, as momentum dictates the available resources a system has towards its interests. It is for this reason that any individual act of resistance is likely to be easily countered by global surveillance systems – individuals simply lack the ability to confront and neutralise this momentum. Now consider Marx’s typology in this light. His first method of resistance, discovering and raising awareness, is irrelevant as the details of such surveillance systems are already available, and public awareness is at an all time high. These programs still continue. Methods such as refusing surveillance, explaining and con- testing surveillance, and co-operating with surveillance do not actively seek to change the circumstances or vulnerabilities of the individual to data collection and are not of interest here. This leaves a set of neutralisation techniques that focus on making changes to the individual's circumstances, including avoiding or breaking surveillance devices, blocking access to personal data, distorting data capture, switching the captured data, and piggy backing onto accepted or unwatched objects or measures. These behaviours represent confrontational forms of resistance in that they directly challenge the socio-material forms of order that allow surveil- lance to occur. All of these methods are possible for individuals. Personal data may be encrypted to prevent access, and the Internet may be accessed through secure private net- works, or routed through services such as TOR that disrupt monitoring (See TOR 2014). This achieves forms of blocking or masking. An individual may choose to enter false data voluntarily, acting as a means of distorting. A user might access the Internet on someone else's computer or use a friend’s phone, switching the data collected. Individuals are therefore not without options.

But these options are easily countered by global surveillance systems. The technological momentum, and therefore prior investment and development in global surveillance, means that many of the measures suggested have already been countered by those conducting surveil- lance. For example, many standard encryption measures, network equipments, and digital devices have vulnerabilities which state authorities are often aware of and exploit at will (Menn, 2013; Riley, 2014; Der Spiegel, 2013). When these approaches do not suffice, state authorities have designed and constructed network infrastructure and hardware to allow direct access to the fibre optic or copper lines themselves (Aron, 2013). Privacy services like TOR have been penetrated by state security services and their encryption protocols broken (Goodin, 2013). Distortion and switching as a form of resistance are also misleading, as they ignore how services like PRISM rely on databases of previously entered information in addition to real time data collection. Entire datasets of personal information are already in the possession of governments and private corporations already (Lyon, 2001). A sudden change in behaviour or shift in the data collected in real time doesn't change prior knowledge, and the analytical and comparative potential of these datasets persists. Data collected and circulated within these databases is notoriously difficult to remove, and is often outside the awareness and means of individuals themselves (Lyon, 2002). Finally in many cases those conducting surveillance have enormous ranges of extra techniques for collecting personal information. Security organisations in the service of nation states and private companies have a range of covert and exotic measures for data collection (Der Spiegel, 2013), and consumer level surveillance is often built into the many digital infrastructure, networks, and standards that consumers use (Prid- more, 2012). Companies and authorities have also been extraordinarily successful in "seducing" users away from resistance to complicity (Lyon, 2007, p. 102). What this suggests is that for individuals confrontational measures of resistance are limited, and that any meaningful shift in the material realities of data collection is difficult.

#### Rather, we should attempt to reclaim humanism---look before you leap – a radical departure from the legacy of humanism risks an eager embrace of totalitarian violence.

Condit 15 ― Celeste Condit, Distinguished Research Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Georgia, National Communication Association Distinguished Scholar, Ph.D. from the University of Iowa, 2015. (“Multi-Layered Trajectories for Academic Contributions to Social Change”, *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Vol. 101, No. 1, February 4th, 2015, Available Online at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00335630.2015.995436?needAccess=true> Accessed 9-8-17)

The Insufficiencies of Twentieth-Century Critical Theories of Social Change The theories of social change that dominated American Communication Studies at the close of the twentieth century echoed those of the Western humanities. These theories spurred extensive thought about the performances of individual identity and the relationship of identity to mass media and culture, and they probably had some laudable influence on the broader culture. They are, however, inadequate to the evolving contexts I have described. One can sum up the most widely circulating theories of social change among “critical social theorists” of the twentieth century in the following, admittedly simplified, statement: There is an (evil) Totality (fill in the blank with one or more: patriarchy, whites, the West, the U.S., neo-liberalism, global capitalism) that must be overturned by a Radical Revolution. We don’t know the shape of what will come after the Revolution, but The Evil is a construction of the Totality, so anything that comes after will be better. All you need is … (fill in the blank: Love, Courage, Violence, etc.). For an example, read Slavoj Žižek’s attack on the evil Totality (“capitalism,” 5 pp. 41/ 49), which requires the “excess” of violence named as “courage” 6 (pp. 75, 78, 79), via “a leap” 7 (p. 81), to eliminate “democracy” for a yet-to-be-imagined “new collectivity” (p. 85).8 The resilience of this social theory identifies it as a rhetorical attractor; a predispositional symbolic set that readily transmits emotive potency. To appropriate Kenneth Burke’s terms, the bio-symbolics of human political relationships readily create a “grammar” and “rhetoric” in the form of a unified enemy that can be imagined as defeated in a singular battle, after which, things in “our” tribe may be harmonious. To identify this fantasy theme in this way is to suggest that it may not merely be the product of “Western” or “capitalist” imaginations, but rather that it arises from an intersection of the structural characteristics of language systems and the nature of human biologies (which readily adopt both tribal social cooperation and inter-tribal competition). Because neither biology nor symbolics are deterministic systems, this fantasy theme is avoidable, even if it is powerfully attractive. Because both biology and symbolics are material, however, specific kinds of work are necessary in order to avoid the lure of that predisposition. This point is crucial, because it invalidates the twentieth century (idealist) approaches to social change, which envisioned a single (violent) leap away from the social as sufficient to create and maintain better worlds. Thus, when Žižek and others urge us to “Act” with violence to destroy the current Reality, without a vision of an alternative, on the grounds that the links between actions and consequences are never certain, we can call ~~his~~ [their] appeal both a failure of imagination and a failure of reality. As for reality, we have dozens of revolutions as models, and the historical record indicates quite clearly that they generally lead not to harmonious cooperation (what I call “AnarchoNiceness” to gently mock the romanticism of Hardt and Negri) but instead to the production of totalitarian states and/or violent factional strife. A materialist constructivist epistemology accounts for this by predicting that it is not possible for symbol-using animals to exist in a symbolic void. All symbolic movement has a trajectory, and if you have not imagined a potentially realizable alternative for that trajectory to take, then what people will leap into is biological predispositions— the first iteration of which is the rule of the strongest primate. Indeed, this is what experience with revolutions has shown to be the most probable outcome of a revolution that is merely against an Evil. The failure of imagination in such rhetorics thereby reveals itself to be critical, so it is worth pondering sources of that failure. The rhetoric of “the kill” in social theory in the past half century has repeatedly reduced to the leap into a void because the symbolized alternative that the context of the twentieth century otherwise predispositionally offers is to the binary opposite of capitalism, i.e., communism. That rhetorical option, however, has been foreclosed by the historical discrediting of the readily imagined forms of communism (e.g., Žižek9 ). The hard work to invent better alternatives is not as dramatically enticing as the story of the kill: such labor is piecemeal, intellectually difficult, requires multi-disciplinary understandings, and perhaps requires more creativity than the typical academic theorist can muster. In the absence of a viable alternative, the appeals to Radical Revolution seem to have been sustained by the emotional zing of the kill, in many cases amped up by the appeal of autonomy and manliness (Žižek uses the former term and deploys the ethos of the latter). But if one does not provide a viable vision that offers a reasonable chance of leaving most people better off than they are now, then Fox News has a better offering (you’ll be free and you’ll get rich!). A revolution posited as a void cannot succeed as a horizon of history, other than as constant local scale violent actions, perhaps connected by shifting networks we call “terrorists.”

#### Their author definitely advocates for technological human enhancement.

Butler, 19 – Philip Butler, Assistant Professor of Theology and Black Posthuman and Artificial Intelligence Systems at the Iliff School of Theology; 2019(“Black Transhuman Liberation Theology,” Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 137-139, bam)

The scholarship of Black spiritualities and Black (Christian) liberation theology has yet to offer meaningful reflection on the role of technology in the lives of Black people. A deep reflection on the role and potential of technology in the lives of Black folks in the North American context may demonstrate technology’s potential to be the perfect partner for spirituality. In saying this, it means that technology helps to create and cultivate a sustained internal disposition primed for liberating the self toward a collective and physically manifested version of liberation. This project is a theological juxtaposition based on the liberation genre/theme forged through the combination of transhumanism and spirituality. This theology starts from the premise that theological anthropology is the foundation for understanding spirituality’s role in the work of liberation. My goal is to bring attention to current and emergent technological advances in order to imagine what it means to begin utilizing technology’s personally augmenting capabilities to enhance human spiritual experiences. I hope that this exercise will provide a physical foundation for realizing the implications of what it means to spiritually struggle against oppression, concretely. The tangible implications of Black transhuman liberation theology manifest as it melds technology and spirituality in a manner that helps individuals create an internal disposition that points toward liberation, keeping the mind clear and focused in the pursuit of the ultimate liberative goal.

I chose this project for several reasons: (1) to begin the discussion of integrating neurophysiology into the study of Black spirituality in the US context; (2) to reflect on potential practices that combine the power of technology and Black spirituality; (3) to bring to the forefront the thought that participation in the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) fields by Black folks is crucial to achieving the fullness of that compilation—as a means to direct its potential; and (4) I see the combination of these two realms as key to the materialization of liberation that Black folks seek.

With the current rate of technological expansion, it may sometimes appear that technology’s reach has no end. Technology has seeped into nearly every facet of everyday life, even into the way in which governments function. As prosthetic creatures, human beings, or human animals, have and continue to coevolve alongside the technologies we create.1 In that effect, humans have always been transhuman. Very basically, transhumanism is a cultural and philosophical movement. It asserts that any use of technology to augment human intellectual, physical, or psychological capability makes one transhuman.2 This can be seen in the example of the cave dweller, who utilized rocks and sticks to aid her in hunting, cooking, art, and the creation of fire. It can also be seen in the basic biotechnology inherent within the body itself: the brain, neurons, cells, transmitters, etc. So, from this acknowledgment two questions arise: (1) Have we ever been just human? (2) Are we even human—if we’ve always been transhuman? Because if we are not human, then the guidelines for the way we engage others, the world, and ourselves change dramatically. These questions are important to Black folks because as we move into the future, the complex relationship between governing authorities, ourselves, and technology will have a large impact on the way we are then allowed to—or allow ourselves to—live in the world, which is essentially the way we are free.