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### 1AC: Clone Wars

#### Contention 1 is the Clone Wars!

#### The Separatist Army is using Battle Droids to fuel their desire to succeed from the Galactic Republic – that escalates and draws-in hundreds of other worlds

Wookiepedia 18 5-28-2018 “The Clone Wars” <https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Clone_Wars#cite_note-Dark_Disciple-13> (Wookieepedia: The Star Wars Wiki is an online encyclopedia for information on the Star Wars universe—including information on all the films, as well as Clone Wars, The Clone Wars and its introductory film, Rebels, the Star Wars expanded universe, and any upcoming Star Wars material.)//Elmer

As **the Clone Wars engulfed world after world across the galaxy**, the Jedi were forced to relinquish their traditional roles as peacekeepers[50] in favor of military commands within the Grand Army of the Republic. Knights and Masters accepted the new rank of Jedi General. Even Padawans contributed to the Republic's war effort, with some serving as battlefield commanders. Among the newly promoted Jedi Generals was Anakin Skywalker, whom the Jedi High Council elevated to Knighthood.[15] Unbeknownst to his colleagues, Skywalker had secretly married Padmé Amidala following the Battle of Geonosis,[12] a relationship that would have repercussions for the entire war.[7] To satisfy the Republic's increased demand for troops, Kamino continued its production and training of clone troopers. In turn, the Republic Navy blockaded Kamino,[51] and the Grand Army established a network of listening posts to monitor Separatist activity in the vicinity.[52] Due to the death of Jango Fett, the Kaminoan scientists stretched the preexisting samples of his DNA in order to decant more clones. The Jedi High Council selected one of its members, Master Shaak Ti, to oversee the training of clone cadets in Kamino's Tipoca City, assisted by contracted mercenaries such as Bric and El-Les to help supervise the clones' combat instruction.[51] The Republic attracted both internal and external criticism for its use of clone troopers, whom some viewed as slaves to the Jedi.[13][53] One trooper deserted from the Grand Army after the Confederacy annihilated his unit; he fled to the planet Saleucami, where he took the name Cut Lawquane with a family.[54] On the other hand, the Separatist citizenry took pride in the fact that officers in the Confederacy military were willing participants, while its **armed forces mainly sacrificed expendable battle droids for their cause**.[13] One Confederate officer, the husband of Separatist Senator Mina Bonteri, was slain while defending a new base on the planet Aargonar from Republic forces.[31] At the same time, the Confederate populace was insulated from reports of war crimes that were committed in its name. The primary cause of the carnage was General Grievous,[55] a cyborg warlord from Kalee **who oversaw the Droid Army**.[43] In addition to Grievous, Dooku recruited another agent as his lieutenant and emissary:[56] Asajj Ventress, a slave-turned-Jedi from Dathomir who fell to the dark side of the Force and became Dooku's apprentice.[21] Though Grievous and Ventress developed a long-standing rivalry,[20] both were motivated by a deep-seated hatred for the Jedi Order.[13][57] Grievous and Ventress made a habit of claiming as trophies the lightsabers of their fallen Jedi victims, and Dooku collected the pilfered weapons in his palace on Serenno. Ventress acquired one such lightsaber from Jedi Master Tholme, whom she bested in combat during a major campaign. She elected to slay Tholme rather than accept his surrender.[13] The outbreak of the **Clone Wars shifted the balance of power on numerous worlds**. Since the Separatist Crisis, a schism had fractured the Gotal population of Antar 4, with the Confederacy backing terrorist groups **to combat the moon's Republic loyalists**. The loyalists remained in power until shortly after the Battle of Geonosis, when the Confederacy conquered Antar 4, and the moon briefly served as a headquarters for Dooku. While millions of Gotal refugees fled to their colony world of Atzerri, an influx of Koorivar, Gossams, and other Confederate-allied species immigrated to Antar 4. The resulting political crisis on the moon gave rise to one of the Republic's first resistance cells. Gotal and Koorivar loyalists executed numerous acts of sabotage against the Separatist regime, with the Republic covertly sponsoring their guerrilla campaign. Despite their efforts, the Confederacy retained control of Antar 4 throughout the war.[1] Early in the Clone Wars,[58] the Confederacy seized the Outer Rim world of Lola Sayu,[43] the site of the infamous Republic prison known as the Citadel. The Citadel had been constructed five centuries earlier to hold Jedi who turned against the Republic. The Separatists converted the facility into a prisoner-of-war camp, using it to house Republic captives.[58] The Separatists also invaded Millius Prime, one of the thousand moons of the remote planet Iego, and drove away its inhabitants, the peaceful Angels. The Separatists established military sites on both Iego and Millius Prime, but later withdrew from the system. Before departing, they seeded Iego's asteroid field with a security grid of laser emitters that trapped its residents on the surface.[59] Other planets swept up in the Clone Wars included Akiva, where a **Confederate droid factory turned the planet into a battlefield** between the Jedi and the Separatists;[60] and Sedratis, which hosted the Battle of Sedratis. During the latter campaign, Jedi ace pilots Skywalker and Huulik proved instrumental in securing a Republic victory over the Confederacy's droid starfighter forces.[61] During the war, a number of manufacturers converted freighters and transports into combat vessels. New vehicles loaded with weapons were also made.[43] At one point, a battle was fought in the Crombach Nebula, during which Jedi Master Wom-Nii Gnaden's NTB-630 naval bomber collided with a Munificent-class star frigate.[62] Under the command of General Darrus Jeht, the Maelstrom-class battle cruiser named the Maelstrom served with distinction at the Battle of Kromus and later the Battle of Cularin.[63] During the conflict, because repair facilities were often heavily damaged during battles, Nomad starships would arrive in star systems after the fleets had departed and the fighting was over. The Nomads would help the local population with repairs to compensate for the damaged facilities.[64]

#### Battle Droids are soulless death machines that are autonomous and highly lethal

Harper 17 Thomas Harper 10-7-2017 "Roger Roger: Star Wars Autonomous Weapons & The Law" <http://thelegalgeeks.com/2017/10/07/roger-roger-star-wars-autonomous-weapons-the-law/> (Thomas is a Major in the U.S. Army serving as a Judge Advocate General (JAG) officer. During his time in the JAG Corps, he has served in a variety of positions, including as an Operational Law attorney advising on the law of war and rules of engagement in Afghanistan. After completing more than 7 years on active duty, he now serves in the Army Reserves as a military defense counsel, representing accused soldiers at courts-martial and other proceedings. While he loves all things geek, he is a massive Star Wars fan, collector, and trivia fiend.)//Elmer

KILLER ROBOTS. The very mention of those **soulless death machines** conjures nightmares of Skynet becoming self-aware, Cylons on the warpath, or renegade Roy Batty. From Terminator to Battlestar Galactica, murderous automatons have woven their way into the public psyche, as has our fear that robots will take over the world and convert us all to batteries Matrix-style. Star Wars admittedly lacks any single iconic killer robot (sorry, Darth Vader—you’re only part machine). Nevertheless, from battle droids to IG-88 or probe droids, the galaxy far far away is filled to the brim **with autonomous weapon systems**. Despite their futuristic depiction in movies, automated weapon systems are nothing new in real world militaries. The U.S. military does not employ any fully autonomous weapon systems, but they’ve been using weapons with varying levels of autonomy for decades. For example, the Army’s Patriot missile system and the Navy’s close in weapon system (CIWS or “Sea-Whiz”), two semi-autonomous “man on the loop” weapon systems, have been in service for years. The legality of autonomous weapon systems has become an increasingly important and controversial topic as technology has rapidly advanced. In 2015, Tesla founder Elon Musk and renowned scientist Stephen Hawking organized a coalition of 1,000 robotics experts who called for a ban on automated smart weapons. As the U.S. military’s arsenal continues to evolve, the lawfulness of increasingly automated weapons will remain a major issue on the international stage. While the Galactic Empire has its fair share of automated weapons, we’ll keep our focus on the prequel era and the Separatist army’s droid legions. Before we tackle the legality of all those battle and destroyer droids, let’s take a step back and get some framework on the issue. First, let’s figure out what the term “autonomous weapon system” means. There is no agreed upon international definition for the term, but the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) defines automated weapon systems as those that, when activated, are capable of selecting and engaging targets without further human intervention. In other words, although a human operator might have the ability to take control of the system, the system is capable of operating without any human involvement. The Separatist Army’s legions of battle droids and other mechanical terrors clearly **qualify as autonomous weapon systems**. Take the mainstay of their forces, the trusty B-1 battle droid. While battle droids became slightly more advanced as the Clone Wars dragged on, they were always built to be capable **of operating without further human** (or Neimoidian if we’re going to be all technical about it) **intervention**. Even in The Phantom Menace, when a single Trade Federation ship controlled the entire droid army, the droids themselves operated without any involvement from federation personnel. While the battle droids may have acted based on programming and Trade Federation orders, they were never directly controlled. Droids can be seen doing all sorts of independent tasks from guarding prisoners in the Theed Palace hangar to mounting a full assault on the Gungan army. The more advanced models, like the Commando Droids or Super Tactical Droids seen in The Clone Wars animated series, performed even more complicated tasks with total independence. Even though Separatist commanders retained the ability to shut down or override the droids, they still qualify as autonomous weapon systems. While the international community can’t agree on a definition for autonomous weapon systems, there is universal agreement that the law of armed conflict (LOAC) applies to them. To figure out whether a particular weapon is legal, we have to turn to the creatively named area of LOAC known as weapons law. Weapons law focuses on the overall legality of the weapon, without regard to how it’s used. As an example, a poison like the Blue Shadow Virus in The Clone Wars, is deemed per se unlawful under LOAC, no matter what the intended use. Even if the Separatists wanted to use the virus against a lawful target, such as a group of clone troopers on patrol, it would still be illegal to use. Whether autonomous or not, the legality of all weapons are determined by the same three distinct rules: (1) The weapon cannot cause unnecessary suffering or superfluous injury by nature; (2) The weapon cannot cause uncontrollable effects; (3) The weapon must not be indiscriminate by nature. As humanity became increasingly good at creating horrible weapons, the outcry for rules that would reign in the suffering grew. The ban on weapons that cause unnecessary suffering was one of the earliest prohibitions codified in international law, first appearing in the 1899 Hague Convention. The rule, which is now woven into international law, is intended to ban weapons that, by their nature, aggravate a combatant’s wounds. A prime real world example is projectiles filled with glass, which cause major additional wounding. The glass fragments are then very difficult to remove because they cannot be seen on x-ray, which only compounds the suffering. In Star Wars Rebels, the Empire’s dreaded T-7 ion disruptor rifles are a gruesome example of the sort of weapon that would be banned by this rule. T-7s were long rifles that would disintegrate organic beings atom by atom, leading to an excruciating death. While Boba Fett might fully approve of those effects, the T-7 disruptor is exactly the sort of weapon that would be banned in the real world. Coincidentally, the Galactic senate ultimately banned disruptors due to their terrible effects. In contrast, the bulk of the Separatist Army would not violate this rule. Battle droids function like normal soldiers, armed with blasters and standard programming **to engage and destroy the enemy**. Even though those droids could theoretically be programmed or ordered to cause unnecessary suffering, they aren’t designed cause those effects. That distinction is critical because the rule focuses on the weapon system’s effect on a targeted individual, not the manner in which it is used. Any weapon system can be used in an illegal manner, but that doesn’t mean that the weapon itself is automatically illegal. Second, weapons law prohibits the use of weapons that have uncontrollable effects, regardless of how accurately they can strike targets. Unfortunately for the Separatists, their prized Blue Shadow Virus gets the axe under this rule. While the virus might only be used against a lawful target like clone troopers, there’s no way to control its spread. Those same clones could easily infect civilians and other innocents, triggering an uncontrollable spread of the virus. However, Separatist automated droid forces don’t cause the same spiraling uncontrollable effects. Although swarms of droids were wielded to inflict devastating damage, their blasters, rocket launchers, and other conventional weaponry cause predictable damage with controllable effects. The droids’ automation doesn’t change that conclusion. Finally, LOAC prohibits weapons that are indiscriminate by their very nature. Under Additional Protocol I of the Geneva Conventions, any means of combat that cannot be directed against a specific military objective is unlawful. In other words, if the weapon cannot be aimed at a lawful military target, it’s probably not legal. Though not autonomous, the Death Star, everyone’s favorite orbital war crime, is a perfect example of an illegal weapon that is indiscriminate in nature. The battle station was designed to destroy entire planets, which is probably the most black and white example of indiscriminate targeting ever (just ask the poor Alderaanians). Separatist droid forces don’t run afoul of this rule. Battle droids were often made to **kill indiscriminately throughout the Clone Wars,** as we saw with **their killing of Naboo civilians** in The Phantom Menace. But just because they can be used in that manner doesn’t mean they are indiscriminate by their very nature. The droid forces aren’t pre-programmed to kill anyone they come into contact with. Similarly, they have the ability to aim their weapons (even if they happen to make Stormtroopers look like crack shots) and select their targets. Given their programming, the lack of individual control over the droids doesn’t render them indiscriminate weapon systems. Just as with any conventional weapon, the legality of new autonomous weaponry must go through a legal review process. Under Article 36 of Additional Protocol I, High Contracting Parties such as the U.S. are required to determine whether the Geneva Conventions or international law would prohibit the new piece of weaponry. In practice, the U.S. conducts a complex and thorough weapons review process. The process starts early in the weapon’s development process and continues through production to ensure the weapon is legal. As we’ve seen, the fact that a weapon system is automated doesn’t control the analysis, but instead is merely one factor.

#### The Clone Wars kills billions

Golden 15 Christie Golden 7-7-2015 "Dark Disciple" Ask me and I’ll give you the PDF, it’s a good read. (Absolute Star Wars Expert)//Elmer

For years, the galaxy-wide conflict known as the Clone Wars has raged. The struggle between the rightful government of the Galactic Republic and the Confederacy of Independent Systems **has claimed the lives of untold billions**. The Force-wielding Jedi, for millennia the guardians of peace in the galaxy, have been thwarted at nearly **every turn by the Separatists** and their leader, the Sith Lord Count Dooku. With the war showing no signs of ending, and the **casualties mounting each day**, the Jedi must consider every possible means of defeating their cunning foe. Whether some means are too unthinkable—and some allies too untrustworthy—has yet to be revealed… Ashu-Nyamal, Firstborn of Ashu, child of the planet Mahranee, huddled with her family in the hold of a Republic frigate. Nya and the other refugees of Mahranee braced themselves against the repercussions from the battle raging outside. Sharp, tufted Mahran ears caught the sounds of orders, uttered and answered by clones, the same voice issuing from different throats; keen noses scented faint whiffs of fear from the speakers. The frigate rocked from yet another blast. Some of the pups whimpered, but the adults projected calm. Rakshu cradled Nya’s two younger siblings. Their little ears were flat against their skulls, and they shivered in terror against their mother’s warm, lithe body, but their blue muzzles were tightly closed. No whimpers for them; a proud line, was Ashu. It had given the Mahran many fine warriors and wise statesmen. Nya’s sister Teegu, Secondborn of Ashu, had a gift for soothing any squabble, and Kamu, the youngest, was on his way to becoming a great artist. Or had been, until the Separatists had blasted Mahranee’s capital city to rubble. The Jedi had come, in answer to the distress call, as the Mahran knew they would. But they had come too late. Angry at the Mahranee government’s refusal to cooperate, **the Separatists had decided that genocide**, or as close a facsimile as possible, would solve the problem of obtaining a world so rich in resources. Nya clenched her fists. If only she had a blaster! She was an excellent shot. If any of the enemy attempted to board the ship, she could be of use to the brave clones now risking their lives to protect the refugees. Better yet, Nya wished she could stab one of the Separatist scum with her stinger, even though it would— Another blast, this one worse. The lights flickered off, replaced almost instantly by the blood-red hue of the backup lighting. The dark-gray metal of the bulkheads seemed to close in ominously. Something snapped inside Nya. Before she really knew what she was doing, she had leapt to her feet and bounded across the hold to the rectangular door. “Nya!” Rakshu’s voice was strained. “We were told to stay here!” Nya whirled, her eyes flashing. “I am walking the warrior path, Mother! I can’t just sit here doing nothing. I have to try to help!” “You will only be in the…” Rakshu’s voice trailed off as Nya held her gaze. Tears slipped silently down Rakshu’s muzzle, glittering in the crimson light. The Mahran were no telepaths, but even so, Nya knew her mother could read her thoughts. I can do no harm. We are lost already. Rakshu knew it, too. She nodded, then said, her voice swelling with pride in her eldest, “Stab well.” Nya swallowed hard at the blunt blessing. The stinger was the birthright of the Mahran—and, if used, their death warrant. The venom that would drop a foe in his tracks would also travel to his slayer’s heart. The two enemies always died together. The words were said to one who was not expected to return alive. “Good-bye, Mama,” Nya whispered, too softly for her mother to hear. She slammed a palm against the button and the door opened. Without pausing she raced down the corridor, her path outlined by a strip of emergency lighting; she skidded to a halt when the hallway branched into two separate directions, picked one, and ran headlong into one of the clones. “Whoa, there!” he said, not unkindly. “You’re not supposed to be here, little one.” “I will not die huddled in fear!” Nya snapped. “You’re not going to,” the clone said, attempting to be reassuring. “We’ve outrun puddle-jumpers like these before. Just get back to the holding area and stay out of our way. We’ve got this in hand.” Nya smelled the change in his sweat. He was lying. For a moment, she spared compassion for him. What had his life been like when he was a youngling? There had been no one to give him hugs or tell stories, no loving parental hands to soothe childhood’s nightmares. Only brothers, identical in every way, who had been raised as clinically as he. Brothers, and duty, and death. Feeling strangely older than the clone, and grateful for her own unique life that was about to end, Nya smiled, shook her head, and darted past him. He did not give chase. The corridor ended in a door. Nya punched the button. The door slid open onto the cockpit. And she gasped. She had never been in space before, so she was unprepared for the sight the five-section viewport presented. Bright flashes and streaks of laserfire dueled against an incongruously peaceful-looking starfield. Nya wasn’t sufficiently knowledgeable to be able to distinguish one ship from another—except for her own planet’s vessels, looking old and small and desperate as they tried to flee with their precious cargo of families just like her own. A clone and the Jedi general, the squat, reptilian Aleena who had led the mission to rescue Nya’s people, occupied the cockpit’s two chairs. With no warning, another blast rocked the ship. Nya went sprawling into the back of the clone’s chair, causing him to lurch forward. He turned to her, his eyes dark with anger, and snapped, “Get off this—” “General Chubor,” came a smooth voice. Nya’s fur lifted. She whirled, snarling silently. Oh, she knew that voice. The Mahran had heard it uttering all sorts of pretty lies and promises that were never intended to be kept. She wondered if there was anyone left in the galaxy who didn’t recognize the silky tones of Count Dooku. He appeared on a small screen near the top of the main viewport. A satisfied, cruel smirk twisted Dooku’s patrician features. “I’m surprised you contacted me,” his image continued. “As I recall, Jedi prefer to be regarded as the strong, silent type.” The clone lifted a finger to his lips, but the warning was unnecessary. Nya’s sharp teeth were clenched, her fur bristled, and her entire being was focused on the count’s loathed face, but she knew better than to speak. General Chubor, sitting beside the clone in the pilot’s chair, so short that his feet did not reach the floor, likewise was not baited. “You’ve got your victory, Dooku.” His slightly nasal, high-pitched voice was heavy with sorrow. “The planet is yours…let us have the people. We have entire families aboard, many of whom are injured. They’re innocents!” Dooku chuckled, as if Chubor had said something dreadfully amusing over a nice hot cup of tea. “My dear General Chubor. You should know by now that in a war, there is no such thing as an innocent.” “Count, I repeat, our passengers are civilian families,” General Chubor continued with a calmness at which Nya could only marvel. “Half of the refugees are younglings. Permit them, at least, to—” “Younglings whose parents, unwisely, chose to ally with the Republic.” Gone was Dooku’s civilized purr. His gaze settled on Nya. She didn’t flinch from his scrutiny, but she couldn’t stifle a soft growl. He looked her up and down, then dismissed her as of no further interest. “I’ve been monitoring your transmissions, General, and I know that this little chat is being sent to the Jedi Council. So let me make one thing perfectly clear.” Dooku’s voice was now hard and flat, as cold and pitiless as the ice of Mahranee’s polar caps. “**As long as the Republic resists me, ‘innocents’ will continue to die**. Every death in this war lies firmly at the feet of the Jedi. And now…it is time for you and your passengers to join the ranks of the fallen.” One of the largest Mahranee ships bloomed silently into a flower of yellow and red that disintegrated into pieces of rubble. Nya didn’t know she had screamed until she realized her throat was raw. Chubor whirled in his chair. His large-eyed gaze locked with hers. The last thing Ashu-Nyamal, Firstborn of Ashu, would ever see was the shattered expression of despair in the Jedi’s eyes. — The bleakest part about being a Jedi, thought Master Obi-Wan Kenobi, is when we fail. He had borne witness to scenes like the one unfolding before the Jedi Council far too many times to count, and yet the pain didn’t lessen. He hoped it never would. The terrified final moments of thousands of lives played out before them, then the grim holographic recording flickered and vanished. For a moment, there was a heavy silence. The Jedi cultivated a practice of nonattachment, which had always served them well. Few understood, though, that while specific, individual bonds such as romantic love or family were forbidden, the Jedi were not ashamed of compassion. All lives were precious, and when so many were lost in such a way, the Jedi felt the pain of it in the Force as well as in their own hearts. At last, Master Yoda, the diminutive but extraordinarily powerful head of the Jedi Council, sighed deeply. “Grieved are we all, to see so many suffer,” he said. “Courage, the youngling had, at the end. Forgotten, she and her people will not be.” “I hope her bravery brought her comfort,” Kenobi said. “The Mahran prize it. She and the others are one with the Force now. But I have no more earnest wish than that this tragedy be the last the war demands.” “As do all of us, Master Kenobi,” said Master Mace Windu. “But I don’t think that wish is coming true anytime soon.” “Did any ships make it out with their passengers?” Anakin Skywalker asked. Kenobi had asked the younger man, still only a Jedi Knight, to accompany him to this gathering, and Anakin stood behind Kenobi’s chair. “Reported in, no one has,” Yoda said quietly. “But hope, always, there is.” “With respect, Master Yoda,” Anakin said, “the Mahran needed more than our hope. They needed our help, and what we were able to give them wasn’t enough.” “And unfortunately, they are not the only ones we’ve been forced to give short shrift,” Windu said. “For almost three standard years, this war has raged,” said Plo Koon, the Kel Dor member of the Council. His voice was muffled due to the mask he wore over his mouth and nose, a requirement for his species in this atmosphere. “**We can barely even count the numbers of the fallen**. But this—” He shook his head.

#### The Separatist Movement commits hundreds of War Crimes

* Changed for Ableist Language

Amidala et Al 20 Padme Amidala, Bail Organa, Mon Mothma 1-12-2020 "Series 1: Separatist War Crimes - The Clone Wars: Revisited" https://www.reddit.com/r/TheCloneWars/comments/e9h9gl/series\_1\_separatist\_war\_crimes\_the\_clone\_wars/ (Senators in the Galactic Republic Senate from naboo, Alderaan, and Chandrilla)

Fellow delegates; members of the Senate; Chancellor Palpatine: The Confederacy of Independent Systems stands accused of the following crimes in violation of the laws of war, as dictated by the Galactic Republic under Senatorial guidance. This document, submitted to the Galactic Senate for approval, is not meant to be a comprehensive list of crimes committed by the CIS. Rather, let it serve as an exemplary of the Confederacy's **Targeting a Hospital**: Under the command of General Grievous, Supreme Leader of the droid armies, the Separatist warship Malevolence attempted to carry out an attack on a Grand Army of the Republic medical facility. The facility was host to thousands of critically injured and recovering clone soldiers, as well as a crew of additional non-combatant Republic personnel. Had it not been for the efforts of Jedi Generals Anakin Skywalker and Plo Koon, the facility would have been destroyed by the Malevolence, **leading to the deaths of thousands of defenseless beings**. For this and other crimes against the galaxy, General Grievous must be held accountable. Upon his eventual surrender or capture, he will be tried accordingly in the Republic Courts. Biological Warfare: Following the detection of the CIS droid army on Naboo, it was discovered that the Confederacy had installed a covert installation for the purpose of **developing biological weapons**. The long discredited Doctor Nuvo Vindi had been recruited by the CIS to engineer airborne umba-hyacinthius\*, a previously eradicated strain known commonly as the "Blue Shadow Virus". Vindi was aiding the Separatists in assembling the means to release the virus into Republic territory, **in an effort to [weaken]** ~~cripple~~ **Republic worlds for eventual Separatist invasion**.\* The use of biological weapons in any form is condemned by the Republic Laws of War. However, the Separatist plot to release the virus indiscriminately across inhabited worlds constitutes a gross lack of morality among the ranks of Separatist leadership. Doctor Vindi has been held in captivity on Coruscant since his capture following the incident on Naboo, and is awaited prosecution in the Republic Courts. Torture of Prisoners: Having fallen under the capture of the Droid Armies in the course of military actions, Jedi Master Even Piell and the clone officers under his command were interred as prisoners at Separatist Detention Facility Citadel Station on Lola Sayu. Under the direction of Grand Warden Osi Sobeck, Master Piell and his command team **were submitted to cruel interrogation methods**, which rose to the level of torture as dictated by Republic Laws of War. Sobeck's methods were witnessed directly by Master Piell's recovery team, some of whom were briefly subjected to similar methods of torture in the course of the mission. Warden Sobeck was subdued by the Jedi strike team during the recovery. Regrettably, Master Piell was also lost in the course of the rescue. Casualties included dozens of clone soldiers KIA, as well as one MIA. With Warden Sobeck unavailable to be held accountable for the atrocities committed at Citadel Station, it is the recommendation of this committee that Count Dooku, Leader of the Separatist Movement, be held to account in his stead.

#### Thus the Plan – States ought to ban Battle Droids.

To clarify – we will defend Battle Droids that help the Confederacy of Independent Systems win including B1 and B2 Battle Droids, Commando Battle Droids, Magna Guards, Tactical Battle Droids, and Droidekas. Enforcement will be done via an inter-system treaty within the Confederacy of Independent Systems.

#### The Plan solves:

#### a] Eliminating Battle Droids decimates the Separatist Movements ending the Clone Wars

Britt 19 Ryan Britt 12-3-2019 "THE MOST IMPORTANT STAR WARS CHARACTER OF ALL TIME IS WAT TAMBOR, LEADER OF THE TECHNO UNION ARMY" <https://www.syfy.com/syfywire/the-most-important-star-wars-character-of-all-time-is-wat-tambor-leader-of-the-techno-union> (Absolute Star Wars beast)//Elmer

Wat Tambor's first of two appearances in live-action Star Wars films is in Attack of the Clones ... and in that story, he changes everything. In some ways, the plot of Attack of the Clones can be boiled down this: Here are the very specific nitty-gritty details of how a complicated sci-fi war was waged, in which both sides began the war without having a standing army. Of course, we know from the title of the movie that the Republic eventually gets an army of clones who attack, but the "bad guys" — the Separatists — **employ an army of battle droids.** Now, we had met armies of battle droids in the previous film, Star Wars: Episode I – The Phantom Menace, but what Attack of the Clones makes clear is that **new, more intense battle droids are brought into the Separatist war effort to make sure the droids are formidable to rumble with the Jedi.** Enter Wat Tambor. As Obi-Wan listens in, we hear (though don't entirely see) Wat Tambor utter one of his two galaxy-shaking lines in his hilarious faux-robot voice: "**With these new battle droids we've built for you, you'll have the finest army in the galaxy."** What battle droids does he refer to, pray tell? These would be the "super" battle droids who cause the Jedi such trouble in the arena fight at the end of the film, and, if you've been watching The Mandalorian, these are the same variety of battle droids hassling young Mando and his family in those flashbacks. So, you see, already, how influential Wat Tambor is? His super **battle droids took out a bunch of Jedi on Geonosis** and, seemingly, orphaned young Pedro Pascal, causing him to become The Mandalorian in the first place. Had Wat Tambor not created the new battle droids for Count Dooku and **the Separatists, the Clone Wars would have never happened** because the Republic would never have been cajoled into accepting the clone army they didn't actually want. And this also means Mando would have possibly never become an orphan. And if Mando had never become an orphan, who would have rescued Baby Yoda???

#### b] Removes a key rallying cry for Separatist non-droid troops

Golden 15 Christie Golden 7-7-2015 "Dark Disciple" Ask me and I’ll give you the PDF, it’s a good read. (Absolute Star Wars Expert)//Elmer

And Count Dooku, clad in full military regalia, stepped onto the balcony. The crowd went wild, applauding and cheering, hooting and making all manner of other sounds of excitement. Dooku, looking every bit the benevolent patrician leader, waved and smiled warmly. Down in the square, symbolically “among the people,” his three-meter-high hologram did the same thing. Vos thought about Master Tholme. How Ventress had told him he’d died, sliced into two pieces by Dooku’s crimson lightsaber. Once, Vos would have banished the hot rush of emotion, but now he embraced it, let it flow through him, settling in his center like a coiled snake ready to strike. Dooku was not alone. General Grievous, the cyborg commander of the count’s vast droid army, stood a few steps behind his lord. With his four arms, skull-like mask, and clawed feet, Grievous was like something one would expect to see in spice-induced nightmares, rather than in reality. He was more machine than living creature, but there was a terrible malice in the slitted eyes that peered through the white mask. “Looks like Dooku brought his sidekick,” Vos murmured. Still smiling, Dooku raised his hands in a gesture for silence, then began to speak. “It is an honor to stand here before you, for you represent the freedom and the future of our galaxy. The once-great Republic and Jedi Order have become victims of their own ambitions, and the Supreme Chancellor is no more than a pawn of corporate monopolies.” Vos folded his arms, listening. Ventress appeared to be doing the same, but out of the corner of his eye, Vos observed her unobtrusively watching the crowd. “As a people you called out for change, you called out for leadership, and I humbly answered that call,” Dooku continued. His voice, as always, was sonorous and strong. “Together we challenged the system. We asked for equality. And how were we met? With war! The Jedi secret army of clones was revealed, and their treachery was far greater than we could have imagined!” Angry muttering, shaking fists, and low booing rippled through the crowd. Dooku looked to be filled with righteous fury as he continued. “Countless living beings—these clones the Jedi created—have been sent to their deaths, **while we sacrifice mainly droids**.” Vos grimaced slightly and said to Ventress, “He makes a good point.” She gave him a sidelong look that conveyed exactly how unimpressed she was. “Our soldiers of flesh and blood **are willing participants**! They are your fathers and sons, mothers and daughters, who fight not because they were grown and designed to do so, **but because they know in their hearts that they are fighting for a just and noble cause**!” More cheering. Vos glanced around at the faces, alight with excitement and adoration. It was unnerving to realize how beloved Count Dooku, monster and murderer, was among these people. Ventress’s gaze was not focused on Dooku, and though she did a good job of keeping her expression composed, Vos knew her well enough to see through the act to the loathing that simmered just beneath the surface. She squeezed his arm and inclined her head to the colonnades to their right. They began threading their way through the square while Dooku finished his speech. “It is not a simple thing to be your leader during this unfortunate war, but I shall receive this humanitarian honor, and take it as a sign that my leadership has met with your approval.

### 1AC: Heuristic

#### Contention 2 is our Heuristic

#### Our reading of the Clone Wars challenges the ontological certainty of politics surrounding Lethal Autonomous Weapons. Countries who seek Killer Robots under the ruse of humanitarianism and “safe war” use the logic of the Separatist Movement that kills billions in the name of freedom. As Dave Filoni once said, “It is a galaxy far, far away, but it feels relatively close and it can feel very familiar. It’s that familiarity that you connect with.”

* Cole Horton 3-21-2014 "FROM WORLD WAR TO STAR WARS: THE CLONE WARS" <https://www.starwars.com/news/from-world-war-to-star-wars-the-clone-wars> (Star Wars Fanatic)//Elmer

#### That enables agency - the status quo results in the collapse of all political action - only a reinvigoration of science fiction stories can create new paradigms and possibilities

McCalmont 12 Jonathan McCalmont 10-3-2012 “Laziness and Irony: How Science Fiction Lost the Future” ruthlessculture.com/2012/10/03/cowardice-laziness-and-irony-how-science-fiction-lost-the-future/ (Film Critic and Author)//Re-cut by Elmer

While many of these books are excellent examples of their styles of writing, I cannot help but yearn for books that plunge us into the world rather **than aid our flight** from it. The thing that unites humanity is not the trappings of popular culture, but the realities of a world that needs to be both **confronted and understood** if it is ever to change. It is now almost a cliché to say that we are living in a science fictional world but it is genuinely astonishing to think about how much science fiction writers have got right over the years: Every morning, I sit at my desk and fire up a Twitter client that allows me to communicate with people around the globe in real time. Both a sounding board and a source of information, Twitter has me bouncing my ideas off Australian graduate students and Indian journalists while other people retweet links to their latest blog posts for the people living in different time zones. Cory Doctorow’s Eastern Standard Tribe (2004) predicted much of what it meant to have one’s community exist in entirely different places and yet hardly any contemporary science fiction novels acknowledge the existence of social media let alone engage with the social and psychological changes heralded by such a radically different types of community. Having grown afraid of the political repercussions of putting soldiers in harm’s way, American political elites have increasingly come to rely on the use of remote controlled planes as a means of imposing American political hegemony on remote parts of the globe. Increasingly sophisticated at the level of both software and hardware, these drones are beginning to resemble the drones that appeared in Iain M. Banks’ Culture novels but while Banks’ predictions of a hard robotic hand inside a velvety human glove come to pass, Banks himself seems more interested in reimagining the Culture as a fantastical backdrop similar to that of Vernor Vinge’s Zones of Thought series. I used the examples of Doctorow and Banks as both are writers whose careers have played out against a background of ironic detachment. Indeed, between Doctorow’s fondness for Disney’s Magic Kingdom and Banks’ increasing fondness for epic quest narratives, both Doctorow and Banks demonstrate how even the most detached of writers can sometimes connect directly to the world around them. Indeed, the point of this essay was never to make monolithic statements about the true nature of science fiction but rather to draw attention to a broad narrative of detachment that has transformed the mainstream of science fiction into an airless postmodern vacuum. Science fiction never completely stopped commenting on the world… it’s just that the works that do comment on the world do not get as much attention as those that pointedly ignore it. Similarly, few writers have completely abandoned writing about either the future or science, it is just that these ideas now lurk on the periphery rather than in the foreground of the text. I am not calling for a complete re-think of the science fictional enterprise, rather I would like to see the genre seize this historic opportunity and rediscover its heritage of engagement and prediction. Part of what makes this moment so special is the fact that we have seen cracks appear in the façade of neoliberalism. Francis Fukuyama once wrote of the end of history having been achieved but the economic, social and political turbulence engulfing the world make it clear that history is very much alive and kicking. The challenge facing contemporary science fiction is to widen the cracks and to peer through the fractured veneer of neoliberalism in an effort to see what could one day come to pass. These futures, though speculative, must always remain anchored in the present moment as the real challenge facing science fiction is not merely to create a possible future, but to create the type of possible future that is **currently deemed unthinkable**. As Mark fisher puts it: The long dark night of the end of history has to be grasped as an enormous opportunity. The very oppressive pervasiveness of capitalist realism means that even glimmers of alternative political and economic possibilities can have a disproportionately great effect. The tiniest event can tear a hole in the grey curtain of reaction which has marked the **horizons of possibility under capitalist realism**. From **a situation in which nothing can happen, suddenly anything is possible again**. My greatest source of optimism for the future of science fiction lays in the fact that science fiction has handled precisely this type of situation before. Back in the 1950s, the British science fiction author John Wyndham wrote a series of novels attempting to make sense of the end of the British Empire. Snarkily dubbed ‘Cosy Catastrophes’ by Brian Aldiss, these works painted a memorable image of middle-class folk struggling to cling to their old lifestyles as the world fell apart around them. In The Day of the Triffids (1951) Wyndham describes middle-class people being shackled to the sick and blind in a misguided effort to create a more equal society. Confronted by this nightmare of post-Imperial socialist egalitarianism, Wyndham’s characters retreat to the Isle of Wight where they begin to draw up plans to re-impose their middle-class values on the world. A similar terror of unchecked social change pervades Wyndham’s The Midwich Cuckoos (1957) as a group of villagers realise that their brilliantly gifted children are in fact a group of inhuman monsters that must be destroyed lest their difference taint the entire planet. Looking back on Wyndham’s work, it is easy to laugh at the astonishing narrow-mindedness of his concerns. Less than a decade after the publication of The Midwich Cuckoos, Stan Lee and Jack Kirby would take the idea of a generation of radically Other children and turned it into a franchise that sold millions of comics and inspired the creation of a series of vastly successful blockbuster movies. We laugh at Wyndham’s social conservatism and cheer the X-men’s celebration of difference in part because Wyndham did his job as a science fiction writer. By using genre techniques to isolate social trends and force them out into the open where they can be discussed and analysed in a fictional context, Wyndham was helping an entire generation process and come to terms with a period of intense social unrest, a period very similar to our own. We are living through a period of instability. As government and businesses teeter on the brink of collapse and individuals acquire fortunes so vast that they beggar belief, our cosy Western reality is beginning to fall apart. For the first time in decades, the next generation of Westerners will be less well off than their parents as jobs, housing and opportunity decline across the board. Devoid of ideas and clearly terrified by the responsibility of having to keep a decaying system together, Western leaders tear up a century of political reform and strip the state back to its feudal origins: Armies to fight foreigners and a police force to fight everyone else. Faced with such terrifying instability and the shadow of a hideous future being born, Western culture has responded by dutifully ignoring the warning signs and encouraging us to buy more stuff. Don’t worry about your job… picture yourself as a Victorian airship captain! Don’t think too much about what the government is doing with your taxes… read a series of novels about bloggers fighting zombies! Don’t pay attention to real world inequalities… moan about how oppressed and mistreated you are for wanting to watch a cartoon about magical ponies and friendship! Never has the term ‘cosy catastrophe’ seemed more fitting than it does today. Just as Joe Haldeman once used science fictional tropes to process the experience of returning from Vietnam to find America completely changed in The Forever War (1976) and Joanna Russ’s The Female Man (1975) addressed the changing nature of female identity, contemporary science fiction must find a way to confront, process and make sense of the world as it is today. We are living in a science fictional world and this means that science fiction is in a unique position to help us **to make sense of a dangerously unstable world**. By rediscovering its ties to reality and using old tropes to explore new problems, science fiction can provide humanity with its first draft of future history.

#### Objective reality is inconclusive – the future is based off of different perceptions of the world, so our reading is best.

MIT Technology Review ’19 (Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page; Covers latest ideas from blog post about arXiv; 03/12/2019; “Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page”; <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/03/12/136684/a-quantum-experiment-suggests-theres-no-such-thing-as-objective-reality/>; *MIT Technology Review*; accessed: 11/19/2020; MohulA)

Back in 1961, the Nobel Prize–winning physicist Eugene Wigner outlined a thought experiment that demonstrated one of the lesser-known paradoxes of quantum mechanics. The experiment shows how the strange nature of the universe allows two observers—say, Wigner and Wigner’s friend—to experience different realities. Since then, physicists have used the “Wigner’s Friend” thought experiment to explore the nature of measurement and to argue over whether objective facts can exist. That’s important because scientists carry out experiments to establish objective facts. But if they experience different realities, the argument goes, how can they agree on what these facts might be? That’s provided some entertaining fodder for after-dinner conversation, but Wigner’s thought experiment has never been more than that—just a thought experiment. Last year, however, physicists noticed that recent advances in quantum technologies have made it possible to reproduce the Wigner’s Friend test in a real experiment. In other words, it ought to be possible to create different realities and compare them in the lab to find out whether they can be reconciled. And today, Massimiliano Proietti at Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh and a few colleagues say they have performed this experiment for the first time: they have created different realities and compared them. Their conclusion is that Wigner was correct—these realities can be made irreconcilable so that it is impossible to agree on objective facts about an experiment. Wigner’s original thought experiment is straightforward in principle. It begins with a single polarized photon that, when measured, can have either a horizontal polarization or a vertical polarization. But before the measurement, according to the laws of quantum mechanics, the photon exists in both polarization states at the same time—a so-called superposition. Wigner imagined a friend in a different lab measuring the state of this photon and storing the result, while Wigner observed from afar. Wigner has no information about his friend’s measurement and so is forced to assume that the photon and the measurement of it are in a superposition of all possible outcomes of the experiment. Wigner can even perform an experiment to determine whether this superposition exists or not. This is a kind of interference experiment showing that the photon and the measurement are indeed in a superposition. From Wigner’s point of view, this is a “fact”—the superposition exists. And this fact suggests that a measurement cannot have taken place. But this is in stark contrast to the point of view of the friend, who has indeed measured the photon’s polarization and recorded it. The friend can even call Wigner and say the measurement has been done (provided the outcome is not revealed). So the two realities are at odds with each other. “This calls into question the objective status of the facts established by the two observers,” say Proietti and co. That’s the theory, but last year Caslav Brukner, at the University of Vienna in Austria, came up with a way to re-create the Wigner’s Friend experiment in the lab by means of techniques involving the entanglement of many particles at the same time. The breakthrough that Proietti and co have made is to carry this out. “In a state-of-the-art 6-photon experiment, we realize this extended Wigner’s friend scenario,” they say. They use these six entangled photons to create two alternate realities—one representing Wigner and one representing Wigner’s friend. Wigner’s friend measures the polarization of a photon and stores the result. Wigner then performs an interference measurement to determine if the measurement and the photon are in a superposition. The experiment produces an unambiguous result. It turns out that both realities can coexist even though they produce irreconcilable outcomes, just as Wigner predicted. That raises some fascinating questions that are forcing physicists to reconsider the nature of reality. The idea that observers can ultimately reconcile their measurements of some kind of fundamental reality is based on several assumptions. The first is that universal facts actually exist and that observers can agree on them. But there are other assumptions too. One is that observers have the freedom to make whatever observations they want. And another is that the choices one observer makes do not influence the choices other observers make—an assumption that physicists call locality. If there is an objective reality that everyone can agree on, then these assumptions all hold. But Proietti and co’s result suggests that objective reality does not exist. In other words, the experiment suggests that one or more of the assumptions—the idea that there is a reality we can agree on, the idea that we have freedom of choice, or the idea of locality—must be wrong. Of course, there is another way out for those hanging on to the conventional view of reality. This is that there is some other loophole that the experimenters have overlooked. Indeed, physicists have tried to close loopholes in similar experiments for years, although they concede that it may never be possible to close them all. Nevertheless, the work has important implications for the work of scientists. “The scientific method relies on facts, established through repeated measurements and agreed upon universally, independently of who observed them,” say Proietti and co. And yet in the same paper, they undermine this idea, perhaps fatally. The next step is to go further: to construct experiments creating increasingly bizarre alternate realities that cannot be reconciled. Where this will take us is anybody’s guess. But Wigner, and his friend, would surely not be surprised.

#### Destroying the hyperreal fictions of the media-militarist society requires us to tell stories that are impossibly false—science fiction is a gift that the system can only receive by destroying itself

Bogard 3, Bill. "Hyperfacticity and Fatal Strategies." Science Fiction Studies (2003): 178-179. //Re-cut by Elmer

A social science fiction is not some **Utopia or dystopia**. It is not some future state to which we can compare the reality of the present, or some imaginary state of affairs that might or might not materialize in the ways it is projected. A social science fiction is the reality of the present, the fiction of real politics and technology, right now, in your face. What is more fictional than the events of 9/11, or 24-hour news, or John Poindexter's plan for "Total Information Awareness"? What is more unreal than cloning, or "smart bombs," or an Internet chat room? There is a certain truth in what J.G. Ballard says: we **have to learn how to make the reality of events more fictional than fiction**. Real fiction is tame by comparison to the fiction of the real. The modern world is **more than just a bad science fiction novel (although it is that**, too). At least I can stop reading the latter. The fiction of the real has none of the charm of a grade “B” thriller, none of its loose ends and incoherencies. No, I'm with Baudrillard on this. Everything today is **obscenely visible and immaculately packaged**, totally coherent, controlled in advance by models and codes and simulations that disguise the absence of anything remotely or nakedly real anymore. The sheer bizarreness and excessiveness of twenty-first-century technological civilization far outstrips what even the worst science fiction writer is capable of depicting on a bad day. Baudrillard says that what you have today is the order of the "truer-than-true." Hyperfacticity, that's the word. Information overload, endless polls, universal testing (am I beautiful enough, am I smart enough, am I pure and perfect enough?). To all that you must oppose the "falser-than-false," which he likens to evil outbidding evil. Fiction, of course, has always been aligned with the false and against the true. But when truth has been murdered and its death masked by the truer-than-true, you require **something more dangerous than fiction**, something worse, as a kind of antidote to the oppressive climate of facticity that envelops us today (It's a fact! I saw it on CNN!). Of course, it's that very obsession with not just facts but with facticity **that is so fictional** about our current condition. And none of this is contradictory; it's all perfectly and stupidly consistent. The truer-than-true is just bad fiction. So what do we do? How do we get to the more fictional than fiction, the falser-than-false? In the end, you have to give the world a gift to which it cannot respond **except by its own death**. What can destroy the fiction of the hyperfactual truer-than-true information-soaked bestiality of the postmodern world other than the gift of an even more monstrous and bestial fiction, which even it cannot outdo. This, of course, was Ballard's insight, and the insight of all the great science fiction writers who, taking **matters to their extreme** (Crash!), present to a world already at the extremity, at the limits of ugliness and perversity and terror, an irresistible image of its own desire. Fatal strategy.

#### All politics is fictional – imagination is a central component of representation – our affirmative merely exposes this truth

Freedman 13, Carl. Critical theory and science fiction. Wesleyan University Press, 2013. Pg 20-22 (Associate Professor of English at Louisiana State University)

It is a priori likely that most texts display the activity of numerous different genres, and that few or no texts can be adequately described in terms of one genre alone. Genre in this sense is analogous to the Marxist concept of the mode of production as the latter has gained new explanatory force by being contrasted, in the Althusserian vocabulary, with the category of social formation – a term that is preferred to the more familiar notion of society, because the latter connotes a relatively homogeneous unity, whereas the former is meant to suggest an overdetermined combination of *different* modes of production at work in the same place and during the same time. Though it is thus impossible simply to equate a given social formation with a given mode of production, it is nonetheless legitimate to affirm that (for instance) the United States "is" capitalist, so long as we understand that the copulative signifies not true equation or identity but rather conveys that, of the various and relatively autonomous modes of production active within the U.S. social formation, capitalism enjoys a position of *dominance.* In the same way, the dialectical rethinking of genre does not in the least preclude generic discrimination. We may validly describe a particular text as science fiction if we understand the formulation to mean that cognitive estrangement is the dominant generic tendency within the overdetermined textual whole. Accordingly, there is probably no text that is a perfect and pure embodiment of science fiction (no text, that is to say, in which science fiction is the *only* generic tendency operative) **but also no text in which the science fiction tendency is altogether absent.** Indeed**, it might be argued that this tendency is the precondition for the constitution of fictionality** – and even of representation – itself. For the construction of an alternative world is the very definition of fiction: owing to the character of representation as a nontransparent process that necessarily involves not only similarity but *difference* between representation and the "referent" of the latter, an irreducible degree of alterity and estrangement is bound to obtain even in the case of the most "**realistic" fiction** imaginable. The appearance of transparency in that paradigmatic realist Balzac has been famously exposed as an illusion;2 ' nonetheless, it is important to understand the operation of alterity in realism not as the failure of the latter, but as the sign of the estranging tendency of science fiction that supplies (if secretly) some of the power of great realistic fiction 25 Furthermore, just as some degree of alterity and hence estrangement is fundamental to all fiction, finally including realism itself, so the same is true (but here the limit case is fantasy) of that other dialectical half of the science-fiction tendency: cognition. The latter is after all an unavoidable operation of the human mind (however precritical, and even if clinically schizophrenic) and must exercise a determinant presence for literary production to take place at all. Even in *The Lord of the Rings*-to consider again what is perhaps the most thoroughgoing fantasy we possess, by an author who stands to fantasy rather as Balzac stands to realism – cognition is quite strongly and overtly operative on at least one level: namely that of the moral and theological values that the text is concerned to enforce. 2 It is, then, in this very special sense that the apparently wild assertions that **fiction is science fiction and even that the latter is a wider term than the former may be justified**: cognition and estrangement, which together constitute the generic tendency of science fiction, are not only actually present in all fiction, but are structurally crucial to the possibility of fiction and even of representation in the first place. Yet in more routine usage, the term of science fiction ought, as I have maintained above, to be reserved for those texts in which cognitive estrangement is not only present but dominant. And it is with this dialectical understanding of genre that we may not reconsider the apparently difficult cases of Brecht, on the one hand, and *Star Wars* on the other.

#### Creative engagement with political decisionmaking is critical to human survival

Stannard 6 Matt Stannard 4-18-2006 “Deliberation, Democracy and Debate” <http://theunderview.blogspot.com/2006/04/deliberation-democracy-and-debate.html> (Department of Communication and Journalism at the University of Wyoming)//Re-cut by Elmer

The complexity and interdependence of human society, combined with the control of political decisionmaking—and political conversation itself—in the hands of fewer and fewer technological "experts," the gradual exhaustion of material resources and the organized circumvention of newer and more innovative resource development, places humanity, and perhaps all life on earth, in a precarious position. **Where we need creativity and openness**, **we find rigid and closed non-solutions**. Where we need masses of people to make concerned investments in their future, we find (understandable) alienation and even open hostility to political processes. The dominant classes manipulate ontology to their advantage: When humanity seeks meaning, the powerful offer up metaphysical hierarchies; when concerned masses come close to exposing the structural roots of systemic oppression, the powerful switch gears and promote localized, relativistic micronarratives that discourage different groups from finding common, perhaps "universal" interests. Apocalyptic scenarios are themselves rhetorical tools, but that doesn’t mean they are bereft of material justification. The "flash-boom" of apocalyptic rhetoric isn’t out of the question, but it is also no less threatening merely as a metaphor for the slow death of humanity (and all living beings) through environmental degradation, the irradiation of the planet, or the descent into political and ethical barbarism. Indeed, these slow, deliberate scenarios ring more true than the flashpoint of quick Armageddon, but in the end the "fire or ice" question is moot, because the answers to those looming threats **are still the same**: The complexities of threats to our collective well-being require **unifying perspectives based on diverse viewpoints,** in the same way that the survival of ecosystems is dependent upon biological diversity. In Habermas’s language, we must fight the colonization of the lifeworld in order to survive at all, let alone to survive in a life with meaning. While certainly not the only way, **the willingness to facilitate organized democratic deliberation, including encouraging participants to articulate views with which they may personally disagree**, is one way to resist this colonization.

#### **The role of the judge is to embrace productive science fiction - empirics based thinking leads us facing backwards into an increasingly technocratic time period**

Hollinger 10, Veronica. "A History of the Future: Notes for an Archive." Science Fiction Studies 37.1 (2010): 23-33. (Professor of Cultural Studies at Trent University in Peterborough, Ontario, co-editor of the journal Science Fiction Studies, past chair of the Cultural Studies Program and past Director of Trent's MA Program in Theory, Culture and Politics)

I take it for granted that a history of sfs futures would be a cultural history—much like Roger's Science Fiction and De Witt's Astrofuturism. That there is complex and ongoing feedback between present and future is a very familiar idea—representations of the future in science fiction, whatever else they are. **are significant responses to the political, social, and cultural conditions of their production**; to borrow a phrase from Elizabeth Grosz, sfs futures are "readable pictures of the present that produced them" ("Histories of a Feminist Future" 1017). At the same time, "**visions of the future**, especially in technologically advanced eras, **can dramatically affect present developments**," as N. Katherine Hayles has noted of the dialectical interplay—movements of reflexivity and feedback—between present and imagined futures ("Computing the Human" 131). Jacques Derrida has addressed this in his thinking about the supplement; some sf writers have addressed this in their attempts to imagine futures of significant difference.2 For many people—at least in the technologically driven west—the future feels much closer than it used to. In a review of Gibson's Pattern Recognition (2003), an sf novel set in the present, John Clute memorably writes: "Sf is no longer about the future as such, because 'we have no future' that we can do thought experiments about, only futures, which bleed all over the page, soaking the present" ("The Case of the World, Two" 403). This in turn suggests to me the continued usefulness of the overused but usefully multivalent phrase "future-present."3 It's inside the framework of the "future-present" of postmodernity that I see my history of the future taking shape. Science Fiction as the Future Not all of [sf], to be sure, is or need be set in the future.... But without that possibility as a formal resource, and without an audience disposed to look ahead rather than to the past, science fiction could never have achieved anything like its full powers.—Paul K. Alkon, Science Fiction Before 1900 (20) Science fiction is conventionally understood to be a future-oriented genre; in David Harvey's terms, it is a modern literature of becoming (359). Harvey quotes approvingly from Renato Poggioli's Theory of the Avant-Garde: "for the moderns, the present is valid **only by virtue of the potentialities of the future**, as the matrix of the future, insofar as it is the forge of history **in continued metamorphosis**" (qtd Harvey 359). Most historians associate the emergence of science fiction with the emergence of a sense of history, past and future, that gradually developed during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In his Origins of Futuristic Fiction, Alkon points out that "It was extrapolation to a geological and evolutionary past envisioned as ever more remote from the present that by the nineteenth century had widened temporal perspectives in a way favoring tales of the future no less than historical novels" (46).4 Fredric Jameson has referred to science fiction "as a symptom of a mutation in our relationship to historical time" ("Progress Versus Utopia" 149). In his 2006 acceptance of the SFRA's Pilgrim Award, Jameson noted that "SF marks the moment in which a society realizes that it has a future, and that it is itself in its very nature and structure becoming, a vast being in perpetual continual change and transformation" (15).5 But writing about the future has its risks. If we take H.G. Wells at his word, sf has always struggled with the future, even though that struggle might seem more critical in our own present of radical technocultural metamorphosis. In 1938, as if he were preparing to write a version of Gibson's "The Gcrnsback Continuum" (1981), Wells noted the sheer impossibility of trying to tell stories about the future: Maybe no literature is perfect and enduring, but there is something specially and incurably topical about all these prophetic books; **the more you go ahead, the more you seem to get entangled with the burning questions of your own time**. And all the while events are overtaking you. ("Fiction about the Future" 246) "And all the while events are overtaking you." In 2001 sf writer Judith Berman diagnosed a kind of exhaustion with the future in some recent short sf. The title of Wells's 1938 essay is "Fiction about the Future"; the title of Berman's 2001 essay is "Science Fiction without the Future." In it, Berman discusses her survey of some recent American sf stories published around the turn of the millennium.6 "As a group," she concludes, "the stories are full of nostalgia, regret, fear of aging and death, fear of the future in general, and the experience of change as disorienting and bad" (Berman). Her article raises a host of questions about generic exhaustion, generational fatigue, technoscientific acceleration, sf s "proper" relationship to the future—and so on. "Science Fiction without the Future" won the SFRA's Pioneer Award for best critical essay of 2001. "The Future Is Always History" The future is always history.—Darren Tofts and Annamarie Jonson, "Futuropolis: Postmillennial Speculations" (210) My epigraph for this section is taken from the editorial introduction to a group of essays on "Postmillennial Speculations" in a very large and valuable collection titled Prefiguring Cyberculture: An Intellectual History (2002). The editors remind readers that 'The future is always history" because speculations about the future can only ever be evaluated once the future has arrived (as with key "future" moments such as 1984 and 2001—"when the present caught up with and became the image or relic of a projected future" 1210]). In addition, they note Marshall McLuhan's aphorism: "**We look at the present through a rear-view mirror**. We march backwards into the future." The future is inevitably imagined within the framework of past experience, so that it is literally implicated in history even as it is also the product of imaginative anticipation. "The future is always history" might also recall Jameson's unhappy conclusion from the early 1980s that science fiction, especially contemporary science fiction, is incapable of imagining futures of authentic (Utopian) difference: what is indeed authentic about [sf] ... is not at all its capacity to keep the future alive, even in imagination. On the contrary, its deepest vocation is over and over again to demonstrate and to dramatize our incapacity to imagine the future, to body forth ... the atrophy in our time of what Marcuse has called the Utopian imagination, the imagination of otherness and radical difference.... ("Progress Versus Utopia" 153) Not surprisingly, given their own particular commitments to futurity, feminist sf writers and critics have tended to take exception to this position. Jenny Wolmark has recently argued that "it is the dynamic relationship between Utopian longings and critical memory lhat enables both past and future to remain open to feminist intervention" (162). She writes approvingly of feminist sf that "accept[s] the risks that are entailed in moving forward into a future that is open because it is not shaped by the needs of the past" (169).7 This is a vision of imagined futures that is free of at least some of the political and imaginative contraints that, in Jameson's view, trap us inside our own histories. And it gives added resonance to the title of one of the foundational studies of women's science fiction— Marleen Barr's 1981 Future Females: A Critical Anthology. "The future is [also] always history" when it plays a role in an sf story-world; it becomes part of **an imagined past-tense narration** even as it tells of events still to come. Frank Kermode has called history "the imposition of a plot on time," and we might consider how sf stories are impositions of imaginative plots on time future.8 It is this imposition of plot, of narrative structure, that transforms **nonsignificant future time into meaningful future history**, into a future of and for human beings. In itself, time future is nothing; but "the future" in science fiction is an element of story and the story is always, no matter how alien, a story about us. Arguably, it is the fact of our absence on the terminal beach of the far future that makes the final vision in The Time Machine at once so poignant and so chilling—the anachronistic presence of the Time Traveller only serves to **emphasize that crucial absence**. That same absence **gives tragic impact to the far-future vision of tireless machines carrying on long after the last human has disappeared** in John W. Campbell's 1934 story, "Twilight": "When Earth is cold, and the Sun has died out, those machines will go on. When Earth begins to crack and break, those perfect, ceaseless machines will try to repair her—" (45).

## 1AC v2

### 1AC: Clone Wars

#### Contention 1 is the Clone Wars!

#### The Separatist Army is using Battle Droids to fuel their desire to succeed from the Galactic Republic – that escalates and draws-in hundreds of other worlds

Wookiepedia 18 5-28-2018 “The Clone Wars” <https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Clone_Wars#cite_note-Dark_Disciple-13> (Wookieepedia: The Star Wars Wiki is an online encyclopedia for information on the Star Wars universe—including information on all the films, as well as Clone Wars, The Clone Wars and its introductory film, Rebels, the Star Wars expanded universe, and any upcoming Star Wars material.)//Elmer

As **the Clone Wars engulfed world after world across the galaxy**, the Jedi were forced to relinquish their traditional roles as peacekeepers[50] in favor of military commands within the Grand Army of the Republic. Knights and Masters accepted the new rank of Jedi General. Even Padawans contributed to the Republic's war effort, with some serving as battlefield commanders. Among the newly promoted Jedi Generals was Anakin Skywalker, whom the Jedi High Council elevated to Knighthood.[15] Unbeknownst to his colleagues, Skywalker had secretly married Padmé Amidala following the Battle of Geonosis,[12] a relationship that would have repercussions for the entire war.[7] To satisfy the Republic's increased demand for troops, Kamino continued its production and training of clone troopers. In turn, the Republic Navy blockaded Kamino,[51] and the Grand Army established a network of listening posts to monitor Separatist activity in the vicinity.[52] Due to the death of Jango Fett, the Kaminoan scientists stretched the preexisting samples of his DNA in order to decant more clones. The Jedi High Council selected one of its members, Master Shaak Ti, to oversee the training of clone cadets in Kamino's Tipoca City, assisted by contracted mercenaries such as Bric and El-Les to help supervise the clones' combat instruction.[51] The Republic attracted both internal and external criticism for its use of clone troopers, whom some viewed as slaves to the Jedi.[13][53] One trooper deserted from the Grand Army after the Confederacy annihilated his unit; he fled to the planet Saleucami, where he took the name Cut Lawquane with a family.[54] On the other hand, the Separatist citizenry took pride in the fact that officers in the Confederacy military were willing participants, while its **armed forces mainly sacrificed expendable battle droids for their cause**.[13] One Confederate officer, the husband of Separatist Senator Mina Bonteri, was slain while defending a new base on the planet Aargonar from Republic forces.[31] At the same time, the Confederate populace was insulated from reports of war crimes that were committed in its name. The primary cause of the carnage was General Grievous,[55] a cyborg warlord from Kalee **who oversaw the Droid Army**.[43] In addition to Grievous, Dooku recruited another agent as his lieutenant and emissary:[56] Asajj Ventress, a slave-turned-Jedi from Dathomir who fell to the dark side of the Force and became Dooku's apprentice.[21] Though Grievous and Ventress developed a long-standing rivalry,[20] both were motivated by a deep-seated hatred for the Jedi Order.[13][57] Grievous and Ventress made a habit of claiming as trophies the lightsabers of their fallen Jedi victims, and Dooku collected the pilfered weapons in his palace on Serenno. Ventress acquired one such lightsaber from Jedi Master Tholme, whom she bested in combat during a major campaign. She elected to slay Tholme rather than accept his surrender.[13] The outbreak of the **Clone Wars shifted the balance of power on numerous worlds**. Since the Separatist Crisis, a schism had fractured the Gotal population of Antar 4, with the Confederacy backing terrorist groups **to combat the moon's Republic loyalists**. The loyalists remained in power until shortly after the Battle of Geonosis, when the Confederacy conquered Antar 4, and the moon briefly served as a headquarters for Dooku. While millions of Gotal refugees fled to their colony world of Atzerri, an influx of Koorivar, Gossams, and other Confederate-allied species immigrated to Antar 4. The resulting political crisis on the moon gave rise to one of the Republic's first resistance cells. Gotal and Koorivar loyalists executed numerous acts of sabotage against the Separatist regime, with the Republic covertly sponsoring their guerrilla campaign. Despite their efforts, the Confederacy retained control of Antar 4 throughout the war.[1] Early in the Clone Wars,[58] the Confederacy seized the Outer Rim world of Lola Sayu,[43] the site of the infamous Republic prison known as the Citadel. The Citadel had been constructed five centuries earlier to hold Jedi who turned against the Republic. The Separatists converted the facility into a prisoner-of-war camp, using it to house Republic captives.[58] The Separatists also invaded Millius Prime, one of the thousand moons of the remote planet Iego, and drove away its inhabitants, the peaceful Angels. The Separatists established military sites on both Iego and Millius Prime, but later withdrew from the system. Before departing, they seeded Iego's asteroid field with a security grid of laser emitters that trapped its residents on the surface.[59] Other planets swept up in the Clone Wars included Akiva, where a **Confederate droid factory turned the planet into a battlefield** between the Jedi and the Separatists;[60] and Sedratis, which hosted the Battle of Sedratis. During the latter campaign, Jedi ace pilots Skywalker and Huulik proved instrumental in securing a Republic victory over the Confederacy's droid starfighter forces.[61] During the war, a number of manufacturers converted freighters and transports into combat vessels. New vehicles loaded with weapons were also made.[43] At one point, a battle was fought in the Crombach Nebula, during which Jedi Master Wom-Nii Gnaden's NTB-630 naval bomber collided with a Munificent-class star frigate.[62] Under the command of General Darrus Jeht, the Maelstrom-class battle cruiser named the Maelstrom served with distinction at the Battle of Kromus and later the Battle of Cularin.[63] During the conflict, because repair facilities were often heavily damaged during battles, Nomad starships would arrive in star systems after the fleets had departed and the fighting was over. The Nomads would help the local population with repairs to compensate for the damaged facilities.[64]

#### Battle Droids are soulless death machines that are autonomous and highly lethal

Harper 17 Thomas Harper 10-7-2017 "Roger Roger: Star Wars Autonomous Weapons & The Law" <http://thelegalgeeks.com/2017/10/07/roger-roger-star-wars-autonomous-weapons-the-law/> (Thomas is a Major in the U.S. Army serving as a Judge Advocate General (JAG) officer. During his time in the JAG Corps, he has served in a variety of positions, including as an Operational Law attorney advising on the law of war and rules of engagement in Afghanistan. After completing more than 7 years on active duty, he now serves in the Army Reserves as a military defense counsel, representing accused soldiers at courts-martial and other proceedings. While he loves all things geek, he is a massive Star Wars fan, collector, and trivia fiend.)//Elmer

KILLER ROBOTS. The very mention of those **soulless death machines** conjures nightmares of Skynet becoming self-aware, Cylons on the warpath, or renegade Roy Batty. From Terminator to Battlestar Galactica, murderous automatons have woven their way into the public psyche, as has our fear that robots will take over the world and convert us all to batteries Matrix-style. Star Wars admittedly lacks any single iconic killer robot (sorry, Darth Vader—you’re only part machine). Nevertheless, from battle droids to IG-88 or probe droids, the galaxy far far away is filled to the brim **with autonomous weapon systems**. Despite their futuristic depiction in movies, automated weapon systems are nothing new in real world militaries. The U.S. military does not employ any fully autonomous weapon systems, but they’ve been using weapons with varying levels of autonomy for decades. For example, the Army’s Patriot missile system and the Navy’s close in weapon system (CIWS or “Sea-Whiz”), two semi-autonomous “man on the loop” weapon systems, have been in service for years. The legality of autonomous weapon systems has become an increasingly important and controversial topic as technology has rapidly advanced. In 2015, Tesla founder Elon Musk and renowned scientist Stephen Hawking organized a coalition of 1,000 robotics experts who called for a ban on automated smart weapons. As the U.S. military’s arsenal continues to evolve, the lawfulness of increasingly automated weapons will remain a major issue on the international stage. While the Galactic Empire has its fair share of automated weapons, we’ll keep our focus on the prequel era and the Separatist army’s droid legions. Before we tackle the legality of all those battle and destroyer droids, let’s take a step back and get some framework on the issue. First, let’s figure out what the term “autonomous weapon system” means. There is no agreed upon international definition for the term, but the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) defines automated weapon systems as those that, when activated, are capable of selecting and engaging targets without further human intervention. In other words, although a human operator might have the ability to take control of the system, the system is capable of operating without any human involvement. The Separatist Army’s legions of battle droids and other mechanical terrors clearly **qualify as autonomous weapon systems**. Take the mainstay of their forces, the trusty B-1 battle droid. While battle droids became slightly more advanced as the Clone Wars dragged on, they were always built to be capable **of operating without further human** (or Neimoidian if we’re going to be all technical about it) **intervention**. Even in The Phantom Menace, when a single Trade Federation ship controlled the entire droid army, the droids themselves operated without any involvement from federation personnel. While the battle droids may have acted based on programming and Trade Federation orders, they were never directly controlled. Droids can be seen doing all sorts of independent tasks from guarding prisoners in the Theed Palace hangar to mounting a full assault on the Gungan army. The more advanced models, like the Commando Droids or Super Tactical Droids seen in The Clone Wars animated series, performed even more complicated tasks with total independence. Even though Separatist commanders retained the ability to shut down or override the droids, they still qualify as autonomous weapon systems. While the international community can’t agree on a definition for autonomous weapon systems, there is universal agreement that the law of armed conflict (LOAC) applies to them. To figure out whether a particular weapon is legal, we have to turn to the creatively named area of LOAC known as weapons law. Weapons law focuses on the overall legality of the weapon, without regard to how it’s used. As an example, a poison like the Blue Shadow Virus in The Clone Wars, is deemed per se unlawful under LOAC, no matter what the intended use. Even if the Separatists wanted to use the virus against a lawful target, such as a group of clone troopers on patrol, it would still be illegal to use. Whether autonomous or not, the legality of all weapons are determined by the same three distinct rules: (1) The weapon cannot cause unnecessary suffering or superfluous injury by nature; (2) The weapon cannot cause uncontrollable effects; (3) The weapon must not be indiscriminate by nature. As humanity became increasingly good at creating horrible weapons, the outcry for rules that would reign in the suffering grew. The ban on weapons that cause unnecessary suffering was one of the earliest prohibitions codified in international law, first appearing in the 1899 Hague Convention. The rule, which is now woven into international law, is intended to ban weapons that, by their nature, aggravate a combatant’s wounds. A prime real world example is projectiles filled with glass, which cause major additional wounding. The glass fragments are then very difficult to remove because they cannot be seen on x-ray, which only compounds the suffering. In Star Wars Rebels, the Empire’s dreaded T-7 ion disruptor rifles are a gruesome example of the sort of weapon that would be banned by this rule. T-7s were long rifles that would disintegrate organic beings atom by atom, leading to an excruciating death. While Boba Fett might fully approve of those effects, the T-7 disruptor is exactly the sort of weapon that would be banned in the real world. Coincidentally, the Galactic senate ultimately banned disruptors due to their terrible effects. In contrast, the bulk of the Separatist Army would not violate this rule. Battle droids function like normal soldiers, armed with blasters and standard programming **to engage and destroy the enemy**. Even though those droids could theoretically be programmed or ordered to cause unnecessary suffering, they aren’t designed cause those effects. That distinction is critical because the rule focuses on the weapon system’s effect on a targeted individual, not the manner in which it is used. Any weapon system can be used in an illegal manner, but that doesn’t mean that the weapon itself is automatically illegal. Second, weapons law prohibits the use of weapons that have uncontrollable effects, regardless of how accurately they can strike targets. Unfortunately for the Separatists, their prized Blue Shadow Virus gets the axe under this rule. While the virus might only be used against a lawful target like clone troopers, there’s no way to control its spread. Those same clones could easily infect civilians and other innocents, triggering an uncontrollable spread of the virus. However, Separatist automated droid forces don’t cause the same spiraling uncontrollable effects. Although swarms of droids were wielded to inflict devastating damage, their blasters, rocket launchers, and other conventional weaponry cause predictable damage with controllable effects. The droids’ automation doesn’t change that conclusion. Finally, LOAC prohibits weapons that are indiscriminate by their very nature. Under Additional Protocol I of the Geneva Conventions, any means of combat that cannot be directed against a specific military objective is unlawful. In other words, if the weapon cannot be aimed at a lawful military target, it’s probably not legal. Though not autonomous, the Death Star, everyone’s favorite orbital war crime, is a perfect example of an illegal weapon that is indiscriminate in nature. The battle station was designed to destroy entire planets, which is probably the most black and white example of indiscriminate targeting ever (just ask the poor Alderaanians). Separatist droid forces don’t run afoul of this rule. Battle droids were often made to **kill indiscriminately throughout the Clone Wars,** as we saw with **their killing of Naboo civilians** in The Phantom Menace. But just because they can be used in that manner doesn’t mean they are indiscriminate by their very nature. The droid forces aren’t pre-programmed to kill anyone they come into contact with. Similarly, they have the ability to aim their weapons (even if they happen to make Stormtroopers look like crack shots) and select their targets. Given their programming, the lack of individual control over the droids doesn’t render them indiscriminate weapon systems. Just as with any conventional weapon, the legality of new autonomous weaponry must go through a legal review process. Under Article 36 of Additional Protocol I, High Contracting Parties such as the U.S. are required to determine whether the Geneva Conventions or international law would prohibit the new piece of weaponry. In practice, the U.S. conducts a complex and thorough weapons review process. The process starts early in the weapon’s development process and continues through production to ensure the weapon is legal. As we’ve seen, the fact that a weapon system is automated doesn’t control the analysis, but instead is merely one factor.

#### The Clone Wars kills billions

Golden 15 Christie Golden 7-7-2015 "Dark Disciple" Ask me and I’ll give you the PDF, it’s a good read. (Absolute Star Wars Expert)//Elmer

For years, the galaxy-wide conflict known as the Clone Wars has raged. The struggle between the rightful government of the Galactic Republic and the Confederacy of Independent Systems **has claimed the lives of untold billions**. The Force-wielding Jedi, for millennia the guardians of peace in the galaxy, have been thwarted at nearly **every turn by the Separatists** and their leader, the Sith Lord Count Dooku. With the war showing no signs of ending, and the **casualties mounting each day**, the Jedi must consider every possible means of defeating their cunning foe. Whether some means are too unthinkable—and some allies too untrustworthy—has yet to be revealed… Ashu-Nyamal, Firstborn of Ashu, child of the planet Mahranee, huddled with her family in the hold of a Republic frigate. Nya and the other refugees of Mahranee braced themselves against the repercussions from the battle raging outside. Sharp, tufted Mahran ears caught the sounds of orders, uttered and answered by clones, the same voice issuing from different throats; keen noses scented faint whiffs of fear from the speakers. The frigate rocked from yet another blast. Some of the pups whimpered, but the adults projected calm. Rakshu cradled Nya’s two younger siblings. Their little ears were flat against their skulls, and they shivered in terror against their mother’s warm, lithe body, but their blue muzzles were tightly closed. No whimpers for them; a proud line, was Ashu. It had given the Mahran many fine warriors and wise statesmen. Nya’s sister Teegu, Secondborn of Ashu, had a gift for soothing any squabble, and Kamu, the youngest, was on his way to becoming a great artist. Or had been, until the Separatists had blasted Mahranee’s capital city to rubble. The Jedi had come, in answer to the distress call, as the Mahran knew they would. But they had come too late. Angry at the Mahranee government’s refusal to cooperate, **the Separatists had decided that genocide**, or as close a facsimile as possible, would solve the problem of obtaining a world so rich in resources. Nya clenched her fists. If only she had a blaster! She was an excellent shot. If any of the enemy attempted to board the ship, she could be of use to the brave clones now risking their lives to protect the refugees. Better yet, Nya wished she could stab one of the Separatist scum with her stinger, even though it would— Another blast, this one worse. The lights flickered off, replaced almost instantly by the blood-red hue of the backup lighting. The dark-gray metal of the bulkheads seemed to close in ominously. Something snapped inside Nya. Before she really knew what she was doing, she had leapt to her feet and bounded across the hold to the rectangular door. “Nya!” Rakshu’s voice was strained. “We were told to stay here!” Nya whirled, her eyes flashing. “I am walking the warrior path, Mother! I can’t just sit here doing nothing. I have to try to help!” “You will only be in the…” Rakshu’s voice trailed off as Nya held her gaze. Tears slipped silently down Rakshu’s muzzle, glittering in the crimson light. The Mahran were no telepaths, but even so, Nya knew her mother could read her thoughts. I can do no harm. We are lost already. Rakshu knew it, too. She nodded, then said, her voice swelling with pride in her eldest, “Stab well.” Nya swallowed hard at the blunt blessing. The stinger was the birthright of the Mahran—and, if used, their death warrant. The venom that would drop a foe in his tracks would also travel to his slayer’s heart. The two enemies always died together. The words were said to one who was not expected to return alive. “Good-bye, Mama,” Nya whispered, too softly for her mother to hear. She slammed a palm against the button and the door opened. Without pausing she raced down the corridor, her path outlined by a strip of emergency lighting; she skidded to a halt when the hallway branched into two separate directions, picked one, and ran headlong into one of the clones. “Whoa, there!” he said, not unkindly. “You’re not supposed to be here, little one.” “I will not die huddled in fear!” Nya snapped. “You’re not going to,” the clone said, attempting to be reassuring. “We’ve outrun puddle-jumpers like these before. Just get back to the holding area and stay out of our way. We’ve got this in hand.” Nya smelled the change in his sweat. He was lying. For a moment, she spared compassion for him. What had his life been like when he was a youngling? There had been no one to give him hugs or tell stories, no loving parental hands to soothe childhood’s nightmares. Only brothers, identical in every way, who had been raised as clinically as he. Brothers, and duty, and death. Feeling strangely older than the clone, and grateful for her own unique life that was about to end, Nya smiled, shook her head, and darted past him. He did not give chase. The corridor ended in a door. Nya punched the button. The door slid open onto the cockpit. And she gasped. She had never been in space before, so she was unprepared for the sight the five-section viewport presented. Bright flashes and streaks of laserfire dueled against an incongruously peaceful-looking starfield. Nya wasn’t sufficiently knowledgeable to be able to distinguish one ship from another—except for her own planet’s vessels, looking old and small and desperate as they tried to flee with their precious cargo of families just like her own. A clone and the Jedi general, the squat, reptilian Aleena who had led the mission to rescue Nya’s people, occupied the cockpit’s two chairs. With no warning, another blast rocked the ship. Nya went sprawling into the back of the clone’s chair, causing him to lurch forward. He turned to her, his eyes dark with anger, and snapped, “Get off this—” “General Chubor,” came a smooth voice. Nya’s fur lifted. She whirled, snarling silently. Oh, she knew that voice. The Mahran had heard it uttering all sorts of pretty lies and promises that were never intended to be kept. She wondered if there was anyone left in the galaxy who didn’t recognize the silky tones of Count Dooku. He appeared on a small screen near the top of the main viewport. A satisfied, cruel smirk twisted Dooku’s patrician features. “I’m surprised you contacted me,” his image continued. “As I recall, Jedi prefer to be regarded as the strong, silent type.” The clone lifted a finger to his lips, but the warning was unnecessary. Nya’s sharp teeth were clenched, her fur bristled, and her entire being was focused on the count’s loathed face, but she knew better than to speak. General Chubor, sitting beside the clone in the pilot’s chair, so short that his feet did not reach the floor, likewise was not baited. “You’ve got your victory, Dooku.” His slightly nasal, high-pitched voice was heavy with sorrow. “The planet is yours…let us have the people. We have entire families aboard, many of whom are injured. They’re innocents!” Dooku chuckled, as if Chubor had said something dreadfully amusing over a nice hot cup of tea. “My dear General Chubor. You should know by now that in a war, there is no such thing as an innocent.” “Count, I repeat, our passengers are civilian families,” General Chubor continued with a calmness at which Nya could only marvel. “Half of the refugees are younglings. Permit them, at least, to—” “Younglings whose parents, unwisely, chose to ally with the Republic.” Gone was Dooku’s civilized purr. His gaze settled on Nya. She didn’t flinch from his scrutiny, but she couldn’t stifle a soft growl. He looked her up and down, then dismissed her as of no further interest. “I’ve been monitoring your transmissions, General, and I know that this little chat is being sent to the Jedi Council. So let me make one thing perfectly clear.” Dooku’s voice was now hard and flat, as cold and pitiless as the ice of Mahranee’s polar caps. “**As long as the Republic resists me, ‘innocents’ will continue to die**. Every death in this war lies firmly at the feet of the Jedi. And now…it is time for you and your passengers to join the ranks of the fallen.” One of the largest Mahranee ships bloomed silently into a flower of yellow and red that disintegrated into pieces of rubble. Nya didn’t know she had screamed until she realized her throat was raw. Chubor whirled in his chair. His large-eyed gaze locked with hers. The last thing Ashu-Nyamal, Firstborn of Ashu, would ever see was the shattered expression of despair in the Jedi’s eyes. — The bleakest part about being a Jedi, thought Master Obi-Wan Kenobi, is when we fail. He had borne witness to scenes like the one unfolding before the Jedi Council far too many times to count, and yet the pain didn’t lessen. He hoped it never would. The terrified final moments of thousands of lives played out before them, then the grim holographic recording flickered and vanished. For a moment, there was a heavy silence. The Jedi cultivated a practice of nonattachment, which had always served them well. Few understood, though, that while specific, individual bonds such as romantic love or family were forbidden, the Jedi were not ashamed of compassion. All lives were precious, and when so many were lost in such a way, the Jedi felt the pain of it in the Force as well as in their own hearts. At last, Master Yoda, the diminutive but extraordinarily powerful head of the Jedi Council, sighed deeply. “Grieved are we all, to see so many suffer,” he said. “Courage, the youngling had, at the end. Forgotten, she and her people will not be.” “I hope her bravery brought her comfort,” Kenobi said. “The Mahran prize it. She and the others are one with the Force now. But I have no more earnest wish than that this tragedy be the last the war demands.” “As do all of us, Master Kenobi,” said Master Mace Windu. “But I don’t think that wish is coming true anytime soon.” “Did any ships make it out with their passengers?” Anakin Skywalker asked. Kenobi had asked the younger man, still only a Jedi Knight, to accompany him to this gathering, and Anakin stood behind Kenobi’s chair. “Reported in, no one has,” Yoda said quietly. “But hope, always, there is.” “With respect, Master Yoda,” Anakin said, “the Mahran needed more than our hope. They needed our help, and what we were able to give them wasn’t enough.” “And unfortunately, they are not the only ones we’ve been forced to give short shrift,” Windu said. “For almost three standard years, this war has raged,” said Plo Koon, the Kel Dor member of the Council. His voice was muffled due to the mask he wore over his mouth and nose, a requirement for his species in this atmosphere. “**We can barely even count the numbers of the fallen**. But this—” He shook his head.

#### The Separatist Movement commits hundreds of War Crimes

* Changed for Ableist Language

Amidala et Al 20 Padme Amidala, Bail Organa, Mon Mothma 1-12-2020 "Series 1: Separatist War Crimes - The Clone Wars: Revisited" https://www.reddit.com/r/TheCloneWars/comments/e9h9gl/series\_1\_separatist\_war\_crimes\_the\_clone\_wars/ (Senators in the Galactic Republic Senate from naboo, Alderaan, and Chandrilla)

Fellow delegates; members of the Senate; Chancellor Palpatine: The Confederacy of Independent Systems stands accused of the following crimes in violation of the laws of war, as dictated by the Galactic Republic under Senatorial guidance. This document, submitted to the Galactic Senate for approval, is not meant to be a comprehensive list of crimes committed by the CIS. Rather, let it serve as an exemplary of the Confederacy's **Targeting a Hospital**: Under the command of General Grievous, Supreme Leader of the droid armies, the Separatist warship Malevolence attempted to carry out an attack on a Grand Army of the Republic medical facility. The facility was host to thousands of critically injured and recovering clone soldiers, as well as a crew of additional non-combatant Republic personnel. Had it not been for the efforts of Jedi Generals Anakin Skywalker and Plo Koon, the facility would have been destroyed by the Malevolence, **leading to the deaths of thousands of defenseless beings**. For this and other crimes against the galaxy, General Grievous must be held accountable. Upon his eventual surrender or capture, he will be tried accordingly in the Republic Courts. Biological Warfare: Following the detection of the CIS droid army on Naboo, it was discovered that the Confederacy had installed a covert installation for the purpose of **developing biological weapons**. The long discredited Doctor Nuvo Vindi had been recruited by the CIS to engineer airborne umba-hyacinthius\*, a previously eradicated strain known commonly as the "Blue Shadow Virus". Vindi was aiding the Separatists in assembling the means to release the virus into Republic territory, **in an effort to [weaken]** ~~cripple~~ **Republic worlds for eventual Separatist invasion**.\* The use of biological weapons in any form is condemned by the Republic Laws of War. However, the Separatist plot to release the virus indiscriminately across inhabited worlds constitutes a gross lack of morality among the ranks of Separatist leadership. Doctor Vindi has been held in captivity on Coruscant since his capture following the incident on Naboo, and is awaited prosecution in the Republic Courts. Torture of Prisoners: Having fallen under the capture of the Droid Armies in the course of military actions, Jedi Master Even Piell and the clone officers under his command were interred as prisoners at Separatist Detention Facility Citadel Station on Lola Sayu. Under the direction of Grand Warden Osi Sobeck, Master Piell and his command team **were submitted to cruel interrogation methods**, which rose to the level of torture as dictated by Republic Laws of War. Sobeck's methods were witnessed directly by Master Piell's recovery team, some of whom were briefly subjected to similar methods of torture in the course of the mission. Warden Sobeck was subdued by the Jedi strike team during the recovery. Regrettably, Master Piell was also lost in the course of the rescue. Casualties included dozens of clone soldiers KIA, as well as one MIA. With Warden Sobeck unavailable to be held accountable for the atrocities committed at Citadel Station, it is the recommendation of this committee that Count Dooku, Leader of the Separatist Movement, be held to account in his stead.

#### The Clone Wars laid the foundation for the rise of the Empire – only we control Offense

Saavedra 20 John Saavedra 5-4-2020 "Star Wars: Who Started the Clone Wars?" <https://www.denofgeek.com/tv/star-wars-who-started-clone-wars/> (John Saavedra is the Managing Editor of Den of Geek.)//Elmer

When it comes to the Clone Wars, one of Star Wars‘ most famous conflicts, there are two questions that come up often but aren’t so easy to answer. Here’s the first: Who won the war? From a certain point of view, the Republic won. From another, **the Empire was the true winner.** The answer we came up with suggests even blurrier lines. The point is that Darth Sidious’ web of deceit makes it difficult to declare one faction the winner over the other. After all, he controlled the Republic as Supreme Chancellor Palpatine but also led the Separatists as the Dark Lord of the Sith who instructed Count Dooku and General Grievous. By the end of the bloody war, the only thing that was clear is that **the Sith had defeated the Jedi**. Things are just as confusing when it comes to the second question: who started the Clone Wars? On the surface, it was the Separatists. After the Separatists commit an act of terrorism and attempt to assassinate a senator on Coruscant, the Jedi are sent to investigate the faction that’s threatening to secede from the Republic. This is how Obi-Wan Kenobi ends up first on Kamino, where he finds Jango Fett, the bounty hunter responsible for the Separatist attacks on Coruscant, and then on Geonosis, where the Jedi comes face to face with Count Dooku, the group’s true leader. In Attack of the Clones, we see as Dooku captures Obi-Wan — and later, Padme Amidala and Anakin Skywalker — and condemns them to death by execution in a Geonosian coliseum. But the rest of the Jedi Order arrives on the planet just in time to help the trio, and the Grand Army of the Republic, which consists of clones engineered for war on Kamino, follows close behind. Thus begins the battle of Geonosis, the opening shot of the Clone Wars Stream your Star Wars favorites on Disney+ with a FREE TRIAL, on us! So, the Separatists started the war, right? Yes, but behind the scenes, there was something darker afoot. After all, it’s a Jedi, a master named Sifo-Dyas, who set in motion the creation of a massive army of clones, to begin with. But when Sifo-Dyas met his untimely death in an “accident” (actually the work of the Sith) around the time of The Phantom Menace (the character never appears in any of the movies), Darth Sidious takes over the clone project under the Jedi Master’s name and begins fueling the war to come. At the same time, Sidious also recruited the former Jedi Count Dooku to his side. Dooku had left the Jedi after becoming disillusioned with both the corruption in the Republic and the ways of the Jedi Order, so he was the perfect person to organize a Separatist movement with the goal of breaking away from the galactic government. Together, Sidious and Dooku built up both sides of the war, overseeing the creation of the Clone Army and the Separatist Droid Army. By Attack of the Clones, Sidious had already started instigating the war through Dooku and the rest of the Separatist leaders, while responding to those same threats as Supreme Chancellor Palpatine, the head of state of the Republic. In this way, Sidious escalated the conflict until the first battle broke out on Geonosis. Ultimately, the Sith lord started a war with himself that would completely break the systems of democracy, destroy the galaxy’s greatest protectors, and bring about the rise of the Galactic Empire. In the end, it’s truly Darth Sidious who started the Clone Wars, even if on the surface it seems like the Separatists started it. As Revenge of the Sith showed us on Mustafar, both sides were manipulated into fighting the war. When they stopped being useful to his plan, Sidious simply sent Darth Vader to slaughter what remained of the Separatist leadership while declaring himself the Emperor and reorganizing **the Republic as the Empire** on the Galactic Senate floor. It was the perfect plan.

#### Thus the Plan – States ought to ban Battle Droids.

To clarify – we will defend Battle Droids that help the Confederacy of Independent Systems win including B1 and B2 Battle Droids, Commando Battle Droids, Magna Guards, Tactical Battle Droids, and Droidekas. Enforcement will be done via an inter-system treaty within the Confederacy of Independent Systems.

#### The plan ends the Clone Wars

Britt 19 Ryan Britt 12-3-2019 "THE MOST IMPORTANT STAR WARS CHARACTER OF ALL TIME IS WAT TAMBOR, LEADER OF THE TECHNO UNION ARMY" <https://www.syfy.com/syfywire/the-most-important-star-wars-character-of-all-time-is-wat-tambor-leader-of-the-techno-union> (Absolute Star Wars beast)//Elmer

Wat Tambor's first of two appearances in live-action Star Wars films is in Attack of the Clones ... and in that story, he changes everything. In some ways, the plot of Attack of the Clones can be boiled down this: Here are the very specific nitty-gritty details of how a complicated sci-fi war was waged, in which both sides began the war without having a standing army. Of course, we know from the title of the movie that the Republic eventually gets an army of clones who attack, but the "bad guys" — the Separatists — **employ an army of battle droids.** Now, we had met armies of battle droids in the previous film, Star Wars: Episode I – The Phantom Menace, but what Attack of the Clones makes clear is that **new, more intense battle droids are brought into the Separatist war effort to make sure the droids are formidable to rumble with the Jedi.** Enter Wat Tambor. As Obi-Wan listens in, we hear (though don't entirely see) Wat Tambor utter one of his two galaxy-shaking lines in his hilarious faux-robot voice: "**With these new battle droids we've built for you, you'll have the finest army in the galaxy."** What battle droids does he refer to, pray tell? These would be the "super" battle droids who cause the Jedi such trouble in the arena fight at the end of the film, and, if you've been watching The Mandalorian, these are the same variety of battle droids hassling young Mando and his family in those flashbacks. So, you see, already, how influential Wat Tambor is? His super **battle droids took out a bunch of Jedi on Geonosis** and, seemingly, orphaned young Pedro Pascal, causing him to become The Mandalorian in the first place. Had Wat Tambor not created the new battle droids for Count Dooku and **the Separatists, the Clone Wars would have never happened** because the Republic would never have been cajoled into accepting the clone army they didn't actually want. And this also means Mando would have possibly never become an orphan. And if Mando had never become an orphan, who would have rescued Baby Yoda???

### 1AC: Heuristic

#### Contention 2 is our Heuristic

#### Our reading of the Clone Wars challenges the ontological certainty of politics surrounding Lethal Autonomous Weapons. Countries who seek Killer Robots under the ruse of humanitarianism and “safe war” use the logic of the Separatist Movement that kills billions in the name of freedom. As Dave Filoni once said, “It is a galaxy far, far away, but it feels relatively close and it can feel very familiar. It’s that familiarity that you connect with.”

* Cole Horton 3-21-2014 "FROM WORLD WAR TO STAR WARS: THE CLONE WARS" <https://www.starwars.com/news/from-world-war-to-star-wars-the-clone-wars> (Star Wars Fanatic)//Elmer

#### Reading the Clone Wars as political pedagogy is valuable.

Sweet 1, Derek R. Star Wars in the public square: The Clone Wars as political dialogue. Vol. 50. McFarland, 2015. (an associate professor of communication studies at Luther College and writes, primarily, about the intersection of rhetoric, popular culture, and politics.)//Elmer

Since the debut of Star Wars: A New Hope in 1977, numerous scholars have explored the way the voices of the Star Wars cinematic universe **speak to audiences**. Indeed, Star Wars has been well examined from a number of critical perspectives. From a mythical perspective, a perspective that illuminates the archetypal narratives contributing to a culture's social institutions and norms, Star Wars is a traditional quest narrative woven together from the diverse threads of Saturday afternoon serials, Arthurian legend, Samurai tales, and modern war epics. Interpreted as cultural myth, the Star Wars films reinforce the familiar U.S. American cultural tropes of rugged individualism, good versus evil, and the potential for redemption. The rise and fall of Anakin Skywalker, and his ultimate redemption via the efforts of his son, cautions audiences to heed the words of Master Yoda: "Anger, fear, aggression. The dark side are they." Examined through the lens of cultural studies, a critical approach "that seeks to analyze how cultural phenomena intersect with social formations such as economics, technology, race, and gender," Star Wars scholars interrogate the way the six films reify and subvert hegemonic cultural ideals.Z The various critical perspectives aside, scholars who scrutinize the Stars Wars films and associated cultural phenomena are, in some sense, acknowledging Filoni's observation concerning the power of the mediated text to **incite thought and discussion among viewers**. Inspired by Filoni's comments, this book adds my voice to the body of work focused on the Star Wars universe. Rather than exploring the six films, however, I turn my attention to the text with which Dave Filoni is involved directly: Star Wars: The Clone Wars. And while The Clone Wars displays many of the mythic and cultural elements so frequently associated with the Star Wars universe, my critical perspective stresses the **political elements of the series**. There is no question mythic narratives and cultural phenomena are major influences in the realm of the political. Such widely understood myths as the American Dream, the Wild West, American exceptionalism, myths deeply ingrained in the collective imagination of U.S. American society, shape the way people think about national identity, party affiliation, individual opportunity, and justice. Likewise, realizations of race, gender, and class reveal the underlying ideologies contributing to the creation, reinforcement, and transformation of institutionalized cultural hierarchies and conceptions of power. The definitive focus of this project, however, is not on the mythic narratives embedded within Star Wars; similarly, this project does not attempt to reveal how the science fantasy epic reinforces or challenges institutionalized patterns of cultural subjugation and debasement. Rather, my exploration of politics in the Star Wars universe engages The Clone Wars as an **important voice** in ongoing deliberations over matters of **common interest and public consequence**. Put simply, this project is more concerned with the debate surrounding specific political issues than with broader conceptions of belief, party, ideology, or power. To be fair, politicos, reporters, and scholars have always considered the Star Wars franchise a politically-charged science fiction text. Two months prior to the release of Return of the Jedi, Senator Edward Kennedy referred to President Reagan's advocacy for the Strategic Defense Initiative—a military research program tasked with developing a space based missile defense system—as nothing more than "misleading Red Scare tactics and reckless Star Wars schemes Kennedy's comparison between the Strategic Defense Initiative and a piece of culturally resonant science fiction was obviously intended as an indictment of the unrealistic technological expectations associated with such a complex system. The Reagan administration, however, "readily accepted the critics' language, welcoming an association with the romanticism and the lure of technological advancement found in the films."2 Congress and the press were not the only ones who read the original Star Wars trilogy as a politically-relevant text. As early as 1978, one year after the release of the original Star Wars film, Dan Rubey touched on the political content of the film. Rubey's essay—a critical review exploring the tensions resulting from the mediated convergence of technology, metaphysics, and humanity—addresses the **mythic and cultural implications of the film** but also interrogates several political points. The intense visual experience of special effects—laden science fiction spectacle, he argues, positions viewers in a way that dehumanizes the experience of warfare. As he points out, the explosions of Alderaan and the Death Star resulted in billions of deaths that—"Obi-Wan Kenobi's brief attack of heartburn" aside—went largely unacknowledged by the characters in the film and probably weren't given much thought by viewers observing the destruction from the safety of their theater seats..13. This kind of cinematic experience echoes a form of sterilized, technological warfare emerging from World War II; with the aid of increasingly sophisticated weaponry and war machines, pilots, sailors, and soldiers frequently engaged enemy targets beyond their line of sight. Released just a few years after the conclusion of the Vietnam War, Rubey suggests the science fiction spectacle of deep space warfare imitates the firebombing of Dresden or the long-range jet fighter skirmishes of the 1960s and 1970s in that those who drop bombs, fire missiles, and even unleash the planet-annihilating weaponry of the Death Star rarely see the face of the enemy or the innocents caught in the crossfire. 1i Like Rubey, Ryan and Kellner argue the original trilogy—A New Hope, The Empire Strikes Back, and Return of the Jedi—emphasizes several political dialectics present during the post-Vietnam 1970s: governmental control versus individual freedom, individual success versus communal responsibility, and "faith and feeling against science and rationality Embracing the traditional hero's journey—the person of humble beginnings embarks on a quest that ultimately leads to the salvation of the broader community—the films celebrate the ability of the free individual to resist, and ultimately overthrow, the oppressive tyranny of sprawling government. Such ideals, argue Ryan and Kellner, reflect the emergence of the conservative political movement associated with the Reagan revolution. If the Empire is understood as an analogy for government's intrusion into matters of private life and the "curtailment of individual self-control and freedom:' then the Rebel Alliance represents conservative political reform and the fight to resist the stifling practices of liberal leaning government. While some critiques engage the ideological underpinnings of the Star Wars films, Stephen McVeigh interrogates what he refers to as "the central trope, the engine that drives the narrative the trilogies: war."H Reinforcing the work of earlier Star Wars scholars, McVeigh construes the original trilogy as a post-Vietnam critique of military superiority whereby a technological superpower is defeated by smaller, more humanized forces. The films, he argues, present a dual reading of U.S. military might, a reading that helps rehabilitate the damaged U.S. psyche concerning morally just war. In one sense, the Empire reflects the massive technological advantage displayed by the U.S. military machine and even conjures haunting memories of the moral ambiguities associated with Vietnam. Rather than fully embrace those moral ambiguities, however, Lucas offers a multilayered representation of the galactic conflict harkening back to World War II (the Empire's penchant for Nazi-style uniforms) and even the American Revolution (the Rebels as resisting an oppressive regime). Thus, the original trilogy presents a dual image of U.S. military might: one portraying the United States as a morally bankrupt oppressor and another encouraging viewers to rethink U.S. interests and actions as just. If the original trilogy offers an assessment of post-Vietnam America, the prequel trilogy addressed "the fears and concerns over the demands, shapes, and nature of future wars." The prequel films, suggests McVeigh, reflect an institutional change in both the nature of war and the way in which wars are fought. Produced in the decade following the end of the Cold War, the prequel trilogies reflect a geopolitical anxiety concerning future wars: fifty years of superpower-fueled mutually assured nuclear destruction, stalemated conventional armies, and small conflicts by proxy gave way to an era of indeterminate enemies, counterinsurgency tactics, and global police operations. The post-Cold War era marked "a moment when the American military recognized that the nature of war had changed and sought to embrace new technology in the theater of war, to bring about a change in military practice"16 Just as the Persian Gulf War, the War on Terror, and the Iraq War featured innovations in military technology—namely the increased use of cruise missiles, smart bombs, and drones—the conflict of the prequels relied on weaponized droids and genetically-manipulated clones rather than conventional soldiers. In either case, Persian Gulf or prequel, McVeigh observes that the respective military strategies involve rapid troop deployment and a reduced involvement of human soldiers.L7 In a passage particularly relevant for this project, McVeigh shows how the content of President George W. Bush's post-9/11 speech to a joint session of Congress—a speech detailing the blueprint for the War on Terror—engages the plot of Attack of the Clones in a kind of cultural dialogue. Drawing these kinds of connections between political deliberations and popular culture content is the focal point of my argument. Nowhere is this dialogue between ongoing cultural debate and Star Wars more apparent than in the work of Anne Lancashire. Lancashire's early Star Wars scholarship breaks down the narrative complexity of Return of the Jedi in relation to the two previous installments of the original trilogy and illustrates how the growth of Luke Skywalker brings a central theme to life: "maturity as the victory of self-knowledge and cooperative love ... over hatred, violence, and fear:'.°. Lancashire's work examining the intertextuality of The Phantom Menace and the films of the original trilogy, however, moves the discussion of Star Wars and political affairs toward the critique of pertinent public issues. Interspersed with the familiar narrative structure, mythic archetypes, and visual spectacle of the Star Wars universe is a film grounded not in the epic themes of intergalactic tyranny and rebellion but in more 19 prosaic conflicts concerning "trade, taxation, and political power." — The political skirmishes of The Phantom Menace provide the foundation for the explicitly political war that breaks out in Attack of the Clones: "the economic and political greed and ambition—the dark-side unrestrained appetite—of the political and business classes ... is leading towards the death of democracy (the Republic) and the rise of political dictatorship (the Empire)?' Contending that the film is "first and foremost a political —and politically critical—film," Lancashire posits that the Attack of the Clones invites a rereading of the entire Star Wars narrative from a political perspective.2 Depicting a Republic affected by corporate interests, oversized political egos, and a complacent constituency, Attack of the Clones details the pivotal moment when a well-meaning democracy starts the descent toward political dictatorship. Parallels with the Enron banking scandal, the erosion of individual freedoms in the name of the War on Terror (e.g., the Patriot Act), and the questionable decision to invade Iraq establish Attack of the Clones as a kind of mediated allusion for the challenges facing the people of the United States. Although several scholars provide insights into the political nature of Star Wars, some of the most poignant analysis appears in the journalistic assessments of Revenge of the Sith. At the time of the film's release (May 19, 2005), the United States military was deployed—in the name of national security and the broader war on terror—in Iraq and Afghanistan and the Bush administration, an administration that enjoyed broad support post-9/11, faced increasing criticism from an American public tired of prolonged conflict and the policies associated with that conflict (e.g., the Patriot Act, various war spending bills). Given this context, the Wall Street Journal commented on how the film's "anti-Bush, anti-Iraq War message" served as an "indictment of the Bush Administration for allegedly abusing power in order to wage war and persuade the American people to abandon central tenets of democracy."22 Other news sources also detected a link between Sith and real-world politics. As David Germain wrote in a May 16, 2005, piece appearing in the Los Angeles Times, the Cannes Film Festival premier of Revenge of the Sith resulted in several comparisons "between the final chapter of the sci-fi saga and our own troubled times." The most notable similarity, reported Germain, appeared in the form of Anakin Skywalker's line "If you're not with me, then you're my enemy" with President Bush's post-9/11 warning to the nations of the world: "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists In his May 16, 2005, review for the New York Times A. 0. Scott made nearly the same observation: Mr. Lucas is clearly jabbing his lightsaber in the direction of some real-world political leaders. At one point, Darth Vader, already deep in the thrall of the dark side and echoing the words of George W. Bush, hisses at Obi-Wan, "If you're not with me, you're my enemy." Obi-Wan's response is likely to surface as a bumper sticker during the next election campaign: "Only a Sith thinks in absolutes You may applaud this editorializing, or you may find it overwrought, but give Mr. Lucas his due. For decades he has been blamed (unjustly) for helping to lead American movies away from their early-70's engagement with political matters, and he deserves credit for trying to bring them back. In fact, the political commentary of Revenge of the Sith became political reality when Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.) stood on the Senate Floor, pointed to an image of Chancellor Palpatine, and said, "In a far-off universe, in this film, the leader of the Senate breaks the rules to give himself and his supporters more power. I sincerely hope that it doesn't mirror actions being contemplated in the Senate of the United States." Of note here is the way newspaper writers, movie reviewers, and even a senator acknowledged the politically-relevant themes resonating throughout the third film of the prequel trilogy. The political dialogue between Star Wars and contemporary politics did not end of with the release of Revenge of the Sith. As I suggested in the opening paragraph of this introduction, The Clone Wars animated series continues to implicate the Star Wars universe as politically-relevant science fiction. At the conclusion of season four, Scott Thill commented: Hitting its stride, The Clone Wars has become increasingly philosophical and powerful. It's the scariest cartoon on television for any age. Its also perhaps our most relevant animated series, especially for a nation so shocked and awed by perpetual war that its willing to hand off constitutional rights like due process and habeas corpus for a patriotic song and dance. Keeping this political resonance in mind, the series emerges as an unexpected voice in public deliberations encouraging viewers to **consider, analyze, and judge** a wide variety of **controversial issues and policy debates**. More specifically, my engagement of The Clone Wars explores the way in which the series enters into what Hauser and Benoit-Barne describe as "the ongoing conversation about how **we shall act and interact**—our political relations" and how those conversations encourage "political choice based on a sense of the common good:'.2. Viewed as a participating voice in a multivocal public dialogue The Clone Wars calls on viewers to consider such varied questions as what constitutes a good citizen, what social beliefs, values, and attitudes should be sanctioned or rejected, or what governmental policies or actions should be deemed just or unjust.26 Encounters with mediated texts like The Clone Wars mark what Mikhal Bakhtin would describe as a dialogic moment of communicative interplay whereby "viewpoints, world views, and trends cross, converge, and diverge."21 With Bakhtin's notion of popular dialogue in mind, the remainder of this book examines Star Wars: The Clone Wars as a form of political discourse concerning matters of public consequence. My purpose in introducing Bakhtinian dialogics to the rhetoric of science fiction is threefold. First, I hope to add my voice to a growing number of scholars who recognize Bakhtin's dialogics as one way to recast rhetoric as a collaborative, rather than monologic, enterprise. Bakhtin argues the traditional conception of rhetoric advances a communicative exchange whereby an individual attempts to advocate her or his worldview with little regard for the worldview of others. With an emphasis on persuading individuals to accept or reject a particular proposition, traditional rhetorical practice positions listeners as passive recipients rather than active participants and champions "power in the form of individual advancement or personal gain."28 A rhetoric grounded in dialogics, on the other hand, recognizes all participants of a communicative exchange, speakers and listeners alike, as active rhetorical agents responsible for collaborative meaning-making. As Hatch explains, a Bakhtinian rhetoric posits deliberative interactions "in which distinct cultural voices and generic forms come together in new and complex ways that are transformative (and suasive) toward fuller truths."29 Each rhetorical encounter, a communicative exchange Bakhtin identifies as an "utterance," is always part of a broader ongoing conversation comprised of a multitude of previous utterances. Historical and contemporary perspectives, ideas, and ideologies continue to clash in perpetuity; ever unresolved and ultimately unfinalized, fleeting dialogic encounters draw on previous and present understandings to generate any number of potentialities. Second, and closely related to the first, is my desire to recast consumers of popular culture as active, rather than passive, participants. Many contemporary characterizations of media consumption depict audiences as unthinking couch potatoes who zone out the moment they enter a theater or turn on the television. These uncritical viewers fill their leisure time with vacuous mediated entertainments and, as a result, possess less time for pursuits that would help them participate in discussions relevant to the welfare of the community. Fixated on updating a Facebook status, catching up on Sookie's latest vampire tryst, or marveling at the summer spectacle of The Avengers or The Dark Knight Rises, audiences tune into their popular culture pleasures and tune out from matters of public importance. Or do they? As other popular culture scholars have noted, the engagement of these seemingly guilty pleasures are more active than not. Participating in a kind of indirect communal viewing, individuals might watch a particular television series and then share their excitements, disappointments, and conjectures with friends, classmates, or work colleagues. More active still is the practice of second screen viewing whereby an individual simultaneously watches a television show and interacts with fellow fans via Twitter, Facebook, message board, or text message. Many consumers of popular culture do not turn off when tuning in but assume the role of an active, critical consumer prepared to discuss a text at some level or another. My argument, then, takes this active consumption to another level as I contend some, if not most, forms of popular culture invite viewers to engage politically-salient dialogues. At a time when the U.S. public is accused of political apathy, I want to assert that perhaps the public is just as politically active as ever. Third, just as Bakhtin championed the nineteenth-century novel as the potential site of complex, multi-voiced cultural discourses that transcend the monologic voice of the author, I want to cast my lot with mediated texts of popular culture. Like Bakhtin, I do not view all mediated texts as multi-voiced and dialogic; there are those moments when an author's voice and artistic vision mutes the sound of other cultural voices leaving a text stilted, contrived, and lifeless. There are, however, those popular culture texts that capture the complex, contradictory nature of human life in all its dialogic vividness. As Bakhtin asserts, the represented world of a fictional text is clearly distinct from the real world of human life; at the same time, however, the "real and represented world" are "indissolubly tied up with each other ... in mutual interaction."30 Science fiction, with its emphasis on speculation, juxtaposition, and political tension, is a genre particularly rife with Bakhtinian dialogism. Nowhere is the interrelatedness of the "real and the represented world" more obvious than in the narrative of an alien race relegated to an internment camp (e.g., District 9), an invasion which positions the United States as an occupied nation (e.g., War of the Worlds, Battle: Los Angeles, Falling Skies), or an exploration of the human condition through the eyes of an artificial intelligence or clone (e.g., Battlestar Galactica, Blade Runner, A.I., Moon). Informed by the culture in which it is created, such an artistic creation challenges viewers to consider their own perceptions of the broader world. In his piece regarding the political rhetoric of the rebooted Battlestar Galactica, Brian Ott articulates a similar understanding of science fiction: "I believe that it stages contemporary social and political concerns in a manner that allows for critical self-reflection better than any other television genre."31 The moment when a character's response to a moral quandary makes a viewer cheer or cringe, particularly when the choice coincides or conflicts with the viewer's own moral sense, is a glimpse into collaborative meaning-making writ large. With all this in mind, the remainder of this book advances The Clone Wars as a text illustrating my argument for reading popular culture artifacts as meaningful utterances within continuing cultural conversations. Chapter One delves into the prospect of a dialogic rhetoric in relation to film, television, and related media forms. To begin, the chapter reviews previous scholarship centered on rhetoric and science fiction by tracing the popular film and television as equipment for living perspective from Kenneth Burke's original essay to the more contemporary conceptualization of mediated texts as a tool for negotiating postmodern Cartesian anxieties. Building on this body of work, the chapter then turns to the collected writings of Bahktin and the task of parsing out the possibility of a dialogic rhetoric rooted in the ideas of intersubjectivity, addressivity, and unfinalizability. Rethinking rhetoric dialogically offers the possibility of a contentious public square populated by multiple voices, perspectives, interpretations, and potential outcomes. More specifically, I argue the politically ambiguous positions represented by The Clone Wars elicit a creative perception calling viewers to not only render judgment but to act.

#### Particularly true about Debates on LAWs.

Sweet 2, Derek R. Star Wars in the public square: The Clone Wars as political dialogue. Vol. 50. McFarland, 2015. (an associate professor of communication studies at Luther College and writes, primarily, about the intersection of rhetoric, popular culture, and politics.)//Elmer

Despite the affective personhood evinced by R2-D2 and D-Squad, The Clone Wars also articulates a contradictory concern regarding the dispassion arising from automated weapons systems. A war fought largely by manufactured units, whether constructed in a weapons factory or grown in a cloning facility, The Clone Wars depicts a conflict where the public bears little burden in relation to direct combat. The public, on both sides of the conflict, remains largely removed from direct combat fatalities; droids and clone troopers do the heavy lifting in that regard. When massive casualties put the war effort at risk, the Confederacy of Independent Systems manufactures more droids or the Galactic Republic grows more clones. Representations of the two capital cities, Raxus and Coruscant, suggest that the average citizen is able to go about her or his day-to-day business without much concern for the ongoing conflict. In the episode "Heroes on Both Sides," when Padme Amidala and Ahsoka Tano visit the Separatist capital for covert peace negotiations, they stroll through beautiful gardens and enjoy casual drinks with old friends. And while Padme treats with Separatist Senator Mira Bontera and discusses the possibility of peace, the actual conflict remains far removed from everyday life.SS In fact, the civilian populations on both sides of the war appear **largely apathetic** until an episode late in season five where, after a terrorist attack on the Jedi Temple, a handful of Coruscant citizens protest the war. Similar to the dispassion expressed in relation to the proliferation of drone warfare, and the potential widespread use of autonomous weapons systems in international problem solving, the deployment of battle droids illuminates the **consequences of the right weapon falling into the wrong hands**. Given their representation in The Clone Wars, there is no doubt Count Dooku, Separatist political leader and secret apprentice to Darth Sidious, and General Grievous, the field leader and military tactician for the Separatist droid army, parallel the abusive leaders mentioned in the various humanitarian reports. Utilizing the droid armies with an amoral ruthlessness, the leaders' obvious disregard for civilian populations is readily apparent. Lok Durd, a Separatist military general, attempts to test a new weapon "designed to destroy all organic matter while leaving mechanicals unharmed" on a peaceful civilian village.-57 The attack fails, the Jedi and clone troopers intervene, but the Separatist indifference toward civilian life remains. On the planet Ryloth the occupying droid army hopes to stave off an impending Republic assault by surrounding proton canon emplacements with Twi'lek civilians.58 The most brutal portrayal of apathy toward civilians involves a secret Separatist plot to derail peace negotiations. Count Dooku works against the wishes of his own people—the Separatist legislative body votes to open peace talks with the Republic—and sends demolition droids to strike at the Galactic Republic's capital. Demolition droids disguised as cleaning droids infiltrate a power station, gun down civilian utility workers, link together to form an explosive device, and destroy a power reactor. The terrorist attack plunges the Republic Senate into turmoil, derails the peace talk vote entirely, and precipitates an increase in military funding. Most disturbing about this plot point is the brutal depiction on screen. The image pans around the power station control room showing, with perfect clarity, the cold-blooded murder of several workers. Viewers watch as blaster bolts strike the workers, mowing them down with little or no resistance. All three of these examples illustrate a blatant disregard for civilian populations; if the death, or potential death, of noncombatants advances an objective, lives are forfeit. Similar to a U.S. drone attack targeting a high level militant leader attending a tribal meeting, or militants using a civilian population as a human shield, or a terrorist attack on a public target, Separatist leaders position human life as expendable, as a justifiable wartime cost. The dispassion associated with the automated weapons systems deployed by the Separatists leads to familiar territory: **the widespread disruption of civilian lives**. Beyond the civilian lives lost the series illustrates, sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly, the widespread pain and suffering experienced by noncombatants. In some storylines the direct consequences to noncombatants takes center stage, compelling the main characters to try and remedy the situation. While food shortages on Rodia play a central role in "Bombad Jedi" and leads to a dangerous confrontation between Senator Amidala and Nute Gunray, a Trade Federation blockade of Pantora prompts Ahsoka Tano to help Senator Riyo Chuchi free her homeworld. From financial institutions to the Mandalorian black market, the economic impact of the war results in fiscal hardships for citizens of Separatist, Republic, and neutral systems alike. The occupation of several other planets and systems, as well as the widespread devastation that accompanies warfare, precipitates a refugee conference to try and resolve the 1 complications resulting from so many displaced civilians.

#### Objective reality is inconclusive – the future is based off of different perceptions of the world, so our reading is best.

MIT Technology Review ’19 (Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page; Covers latest ideas from blog post about arXiv; 03/12/2019; “Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page”; <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/03/12/136684/a-quantum-experiment-suggests-theres-no-such-thing-as-objective-reality/>; *MIT Technology Review*; accessed: 11/19/2020; MohulA)

Back in 1961, the Nobel Prize–winning physicist Eugene Wigner outlined a thought experiment that demonstrated one of the lesser-known paradoxes of quantum mechanics. The experiment shows how the strange nature of the universe allows two observers—say, Wigner and Wigner’s friend—to experience different realities. Since then, physicists have used the “Wigner’s Friend” thought experiment to explore the nature of measurement and to argue over whether objective facts can exist. That’s important because scientists carry out experiments to establish objective facts. But if they experience different realities, the argument goes, how can they agree on what these facts might be? That’s provided some entertaining fodder for after-dinner conversation, but Wigner’s thought experiment has never been more than that—just a thought experiment. Last year, however, physicists noticed that recent advances in quantum technologies have made it possible to reproduce the Wigner’s Friend test in a real experiment. In other words, it ought to be possible to create different realities and compare them in the lab to find out whether they can be reconciled. And today, Massimiliano Proietti at Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh and a few colleagues say they have performed this experiment for the first time: they have created different realities and compared them. Their conclusion is that Wigner was correct—these realities can be made irreconcilable so that it is impossible to agree on objective facts about an experiment. Wigner’s original thought experiment is straightforward in principle. It begins with a single polarized photon that, when measured, can have either a horizontal polarization or a vertical polarization. But before the measurement, according to the laws of quantum mechanics, the photon exists in both polarization states at the same time—a so-called superposition. Wigner imagined a friend in a different lab measuring the state of this photon and storing the result, while Wigner observed from afar. Wigner has no information about his friend’s measurement and so is forced to assume that the photon and the measurement of it are in a superposition of all possible outcomes of the experiment. Wigner can even perform an experiment to determine whether this superposition exists or not. This is a kind of interference experiment showing that the photon and the measurement are indeed in a superposition. From Wigner’s point of view, this is a “fact”—the superposition exists. And this fact suggests that a measurement cannot have taken place. But this is in stark contrast to the point of view of the friend, who has indeed measured the photon’s polarization and recorded it. The friend can even call Wigner and say the measurement has been done (provided the outcome is not revealed). So the two realities are at odds with each other. “This calls into question the objective status of the facts established by the two observers,” say Proietti and co. That’s the theory, but last year Caslav Brukner, at the University of Vienna in Austria, came up with a way to re-create the Wigner’s Friend experiment in the lab by means of techniques involving the entanglement of many particles at the same time. The breakthrough that Proietti and co have made is to carry this out. “In a state-of-the-art 6-photon experiment, we realize this extended Wigner’s friend scenario,” they say. They use these six entangled photons to create two alternate realities—one representing Wigner and one representing Wigner’s friend. Wigner’s friend measures the polarization of a photon and stores the result. Wigner then performs an interference measurement to determine if the measurement and the photon are in a superposition. The experiment produces an unambiguous result. It turns out that both realities can coexist even though they produce irreconcilable outcomes, just as Wigner predicted. That raises some fascinating questions that are forcing physicists to reconsider the nature of reality. The idea that observers can ultimately reconcile their measurements of some kind of fundamental reality is based on several assumptions. The first is that universal facts actually exist and that observers can agree on them. But there are other assumptions too. One is that observers have the freedom to make whatever observations they want. And another is that the choices one observer makes do not influence the choices other observers make—an assumption that physicists call locality. If there is an objective reality that everyone can agree on, then these assumptions all hold. But Proietti and co’s result suggests that objective reality does not exist. In other words, the experiment suggests that one or more of the assumptions—the idea that there is a reality we can agree on, the idea that we have freedom of choice, or the idea of locality—must be wrong. Of course, there is another way out for those hanging on to the conventional view of reality. This is that there is some other loophole that the experimenters have overlooked. Indeed, physicists have tried to close loopholes in similar experiments for years, although they concede that it may never be possible to close them all. Nevertheless, the work has important implications for the work of scientists. “The scientific method relies on facts, established through repeated measurements and agreed upon universally, independently of who observed them,” say Proietti and co. And yet in the same paper, they undermine this idea, perhaps fatally. The next step is to go further: to construct experiments creating increasingly bizarre alternate realities that cannot be reconciled. Where this will take us is anybody’s guess. But Wigner, and his friend, would surely not be surprised.

#### Interpretation – the Negative must concede the Affirmative’s Universe as the basis of debate – 1] Imaginative Pedagogy – key to testing in unique worlds which is necessary to create different conditions for how we interact and engage within the world – Aff choice key to nuanced pre-round research which is key to Education AND ensures we don’t just randomly pick some random world which is key to self-reflexive skills, 2] Aff Strat Skew – Universe Specification is inevitable – it’s just a question of if it happens in the 1AC or 1NC – functional limits checks Aff predictability since we have to pick a universe that has a large enough scenario to beat back presumption BUT infinite 1NC universe spec means we only have 4 min to beat back a 7 min dump which forces us to re-start.

#### **The role of the judge is to embrace productive science fiction - empirics based thinking leads us facing backwards into an increasingly technocratic time period**

Hollinger 10, Veronica. "A History of the Future: Notes for an Archive." Science Fiction Studies 37.1 (2010): 23-33. (Professor of Cultural Studies at Trent University in Peterborough, Ontario, co-editor of the journal Science Fiction Studies, past chair of the Cultural Studies Program and past Director of Trent's MA Program in Theory, Culture and Politics)

I take it for granted that a history of sfs futures would be a cultural history—much like Roger's Science Fiction and De Witt's Astrofuturism. That there is complex and ongoing feedback between present and future is a very familiar idea—representations of the future in science fiction, whatever else they are. **are significant responses to the political, social, and cultural conditions of their production**; to borrow a phrase from Elizabeth Grosz, sfs futures are "readable pictures of the present that produced them" ("Histories of a Feminist Future" 1017). At the same time, "**visions of the future**, especially in technologically advanced eras, **can dramatically affect present developments**," as N. Katherine Hayles has noted of the dialectical interplay—movements of reflexivity and feedback—between present and imagined futures ("Computing the Human" 131). Jacques Derrida has addressed this in his thinking about the supplement; some sf writers have addressed this in their attempts to imagine futures of significant difference.2 For many people—at least in the technologically driven west—the future feels much closer than it used to. In a review of Gibson's Pattern Recognition (2003), an sf novel set in the present, John Clute memorably writes: "Sf is no longer about the future as such, because 'we have no future' that we can do thought experiments about, only futures, which bleed all over the page, soaking the present" ("The Case of the World, Two" 403). This in turn suggests to me the continued usefulness of the overused but usefully multivalent phrase "future-present."3 It's inside the framework of the "future-present" of postmodernity that I see my history of the future taking shape. Science Fiction as the Future Not all of [sf], to be sure, is or need be set in the future.... But without that possibility as a formal resource, and without an audience disposed to look ahead rather than to the past, science fiction could never have achieved anything like its full powers.—Paul K. Alkon, Science Fiction Before 1900 (20) Science fiction is conventionally understood to be a future-oriented genre; in David Harvey's terms, it is a modern literature of becoming (359). Harvey quotes approvingly from Renato Poggioli's Theory of the Avant-Garde: "for the moderns, the present is valid **only by virtue of the potentialities of the future**, as the matrix of the future, insofar as it is the forge of history **in continued metamorphosis**" (qtd Harvey 359). Most historians associate the emergence of science fiction with the emergence of a sense of history, past and future, that gradually developed during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In his Origins of Futuristic Fiction, Alkon points out that "It was extrapolation to a geological and evolutionary past envisioned as ever more remote from the present that by the nineteenth century had widened temporal perspectives in a way favoring tales of the future no less than historical novels" (46).4 Fredric Jameson has referred to science fiction "as a symptom of a mutation in our relationship to historical time" ("Progress Versus Utopia" 149). In his 2006 acceptance of the SFRA's Pilgrim Award, Jameson noted that "SF marks the moment in which a society realizes that it has a future, and that it is itself in its very nature and structure becoming, a vast being in perpetual continual change and transformation" (15).5 But writing about the future has its risks. If we take H.G. Wells at his word, sf has always struggled with the future, even though that struggle might seem more critical in our own present of radical technocultural metamorphosis. In 1938, as if he were preparing to write a version of Gibson's "The Gcrnsback Continuum" (1981), Wells noted the sheer impossibility of trying to tell stories about the future: Maybe no literature is perfect and enduring, but there is something specially and incurably topical about all these prophetic books; **the more you go ahead, the more you seem to get entangled with the burning questions of your own time**. And all the while events are overtaking you. ("Fiction about the Future" 246) "And all the while events are overtaking you." In 2001 sf writer Judith Berman diagnosed a kind of exhaustion with the future in some recent short sf. The title of Wells's 1938 essay is "Fiction about the Future"; the title of Berman's 2001 essay is "Science Fiction without the Future." In it, Berman discusses her survey of some recent American sf stories published around the turn of the millennium.6 "As a group," she concludes, "the stories are full of nostalgia, regret, fear of aging and death, fear of the future in general, and the experience of change as disorienting and bad" (Berman). Her article raises a host of questions about generic exhaustion, generational fatigue, technoscientific acceleration, sf s "proper" relationship to the future—and so on. "Science Fiction without the Future" won the SFRA's Pioneer Award for best critical essay of 2001. "The Future Is Always History" The future is always history.—Darren Tofts and Annamarie Jonson, "Futuropolis: Postmillennial Speculations" (210) My epigraph for this section is taken from the editorial introduction to a group of essays on "Postmillennial Speculations" in a very large and valuable collection titled Prefiguring Cyberculture: An Intellectual History (2002). The editors remind readers that 'The future is always history" because speculations about the future can only ever be evaluated once the future has arrived (as with key "future" moments such as 1984 and 2001—"when the present caught up with and became the image or relic of a projected future" 1210]). In addition, they note Marshall McLuhan's aphorism: "**We look at the present through a rear-view mirror**. We march backwards into the future." The future is inevitably imagined within the framework of past experience, so that it is literally implicated in history even as it is also the product of imaginative anticipation. "The future is always history" might also recall Jameson's unhappy conclusion from the early 1980s that science fiction, especially contemporary science fiction, is incapable of imagining futures of authentic (Utopian) difference: what is indeed authentic about [sf] ... is not at all its capacity to keep the future alive, even in imagination. On the contrary, its deepest vocation is over and over again to demonstrate and to dramatize our incapacity to imagine the future, to body forth ... the atrophy in our time of what Marcuse has called the Utopian imagination, the imagination of otherness and radical difference.... ("Progress Versus Utopia" 153) Not surprisingly, given their own particular commitments to futurity, feminist sf writers and critics have tended to take exception to this position. Jenny Wolmark has recently argued that "it is the dynamic relationship between Utopian longings and critical memory lhat enables both past and future to remain open to feminist intervention" (162). She writes approvingly of feminist sf that "accept[s] the risks that are entailed in moving forward into a future that is open because it is not shaped by the needs of the past" (169).7 This is a vision of imagined futures that is free of at least some of the political and imaginative contraints that, in Jameson's view, trap us inside our own histories. And it gives added resonance to the title of one of the foundational studies of women's science fiction— Marleen Barr's 1981 Future Females: A Critical Anthology. "The future is [also] always history" when it plays a role in an sf story-world; it becomes part of **an imagined past-tense narration** even as it tells of events still to come. Frank Kermode has called history "the imposition of a plot on time," and we might consider how sf stories are impositions of imaginative plots on time future.8 It is this imposition of plot, of narrative structure, that transforms **nonsignificant future time into meaningful future history**, into a future of and for human beings. In itself, time future is nothing; but "the future" in science fiction is an element of story and the story is always, no matter how alien, a story about us. Arguably, it is the fact of our absence on the terminal beach of the far future that makes the final vision in The Time Machine at once so poignant and so chilling—the anachronistic presence of the Time Traveller only serves to **emphasize that crucial absence**. That same absence **gives tragic impact to the far-future vision of tireless machines carrying on long after the last human has disappeared** in John W. Campbell's 1934 story, "Twilight": "When Earth is cold, and the Sun has died out, those machines will go on. When Earth begins to crack and break, those perfect, ceaseless machines will try to repair her—" (45).

#### Science Fiction is good and outweighs:

#### 1] Agency - the status quo results in the collapse of all political action - only a reinvigoration of science fiction stories can create new paradigms and possibilities

McCalmont 12 Jonathan McCalmont 10-3-2012 “Laziness and Irony: How Science Fiction Lost the Future” ruthlessculture.com/2012/10/03/cowardice-laziness-and-irony-how-science-fiction-lost-the-future/ (Film Critic and Author)//Re-cut by Elmer

While many of these books are excellent examples of their styles of writing, I cannot help but yearn for books that plunge us into the world rather **than aid our flight** from it. The thing that unites humanity is not the trappings of popular culture, but the realities of a world that needs to be both **confronted and understood** if it is ever to change. It is now almost a cliché to say that we are living in a science fictional world but it is genuinely astonishing to think about how much science fiction writers have got right over the years: Every morning, I sit at my desk and fire up a Twitter client that allows me to communicate with people around the globe in real time. Both a sounding board and a source of information, Twitter has me bouncing my ideas off Australian graduate students and Indian journalists while other people retweet links to their latest blog posts for the people living in different time zones. Cory Doctorow’s Eastern Standard Tribe (2004) predicted much of what it meant to have one’s community exist in entirely different places and yet hardly any contemporary science fiction novels acknowledge the existence of social media let alone engage with the social and psychological changes heralded by such a radically different types of community. Having grown afraid of the political repercussions of putting soldiers in harm’s way, American political elites have increasingly come to rely on the use of remote controlled planes as a means of imposing American political hegemony on remote parts of the globe. Increasingly sophisticated at the level of both software and hardware, these drones are beginning to resemble the drones that appeared in Iain M. Banks’ Culture novels but while Banks’ predictions of a hard robotic hand inside a velvety human glove come to pass, Banks himself seems more interested in reimagining the Culture as a fantastical backdrop similar to that of Vernor Vinge’s Zones of Thought series. I used the examples of Doctorow and Banks as both are writers whose careers have played out against a background of ironic detachment. Indeed, between Doctorow’s fondness for Disney’s Magic Kingdom and Banks’ increasing fondness for epic quest narratives, both Doctorow and Banks demonstrate how even the most detached of writers can sometimes connect directly to the world around them. Indeed, the point of this essay was never to make monolithic statements about the true nature of science fiction but rather to draw attention to a broad narrative of detachment that has transformed the mainstream of science fiction into an airless postmodern vacuum. Science fiction never completely stopped commenting on the world… it’s just that the works that do comment on the world do not get as much attention as those that pointedly ignore it. Similarly, few writers have completely abandoned writing about either the future or science, it is just that these ideas now lurk on the periphery rather than in the foreground of the text. I am not calling for a complete re-think of the science fictional enterprise, rather I would like to see the genre seize this historic opportunity and rediscover its heritage of engagement and prediction. Part of what makes this moment so special is the fact that we have seen cracks appear in the façade of neoliberalism. Francis Fukuyama once wrote of the end of history having been achieved but the economic, social and political turbulence engulfing the world make it clear that history is very much alive and kicking. The challenge facing contemporary science fiction is to widen the cracks and to peer through the fractured veneer of neoliberalism in an effort to see what could one day come to pass. These futures, though speculative, must always remain anchored in the present moment as the real challenge facing science fiction is not merely to create a possible future, but to create the type of possible future that is **currently deemed unthinkable**. As Mark fisher puts it: The long dark night of the end of history has to be grasped as an enormous opportunity. The very oppressive pervasiveness of capitalist realism means that even glimmers of alternative political and economic possibilities can have a disproportionately great effect. The tiniest event can tear a hole in the grey curtain of reaction which has marked the **horizons of possibility under capitalist realism**. From **a situation in which nothing can happen, suddenly anything is possible again**. My greatest source of optimism for the future of science fiction lays in the fact that science fiction has handled precisely this type of situation before. Back in the 1950s, the British science fiction author John Wyndham wrote a series of novels attempting to make sense of the end of the British Empire. Snarkily dubbed ‘Cosy Catastrophes’ by Brian Aldiss, these works painted a memorable image of middle-class folk struggling to cling to their old lifestyles as the world fell apart around them. In The Day of the Triffids (1951) Wyndham describes middle-class people being shackled to the sick and blind in a misguided effort to create a more equal society. Confronted by this nightmare of post-Imperial socialist egalitarianism, Wyndham’s characters retreat to the Isle of Wight where they begin to draw up plans to re-impose their middle-class values on the world. A similar terror of unchecked social change pervades Wyndham’s The Midwich Cuckoos (1957) as a group of villagers realise that their brilliantly gifted children are in fact a group of inhuman monsters that must be destroyed lest their difference taint the entire planet. Looking back on Wyndham’s work, it is easy to laugh at the astonishing narrow-mindedness of his concerns. Less than a decade after the publication of The Midwich Cuckoos, Stan Lee and Jack Kirby would take the idea of a generation of radically Other children and turned it into a franchise that sold millions of comics and inspired the creation of a series of vastly successful blockbuster movies. We laugh at Wyndham’s social conservatism and cheer the X-men’s celebration of difference in part because Wyndham did his job as a science fiction writer. By using genre techniques to isolate social trends and force them out into the open where they can be discussed and analysed in a fictional context, Wyndham was helping an entire generation process and come to terms with a period of intense social unrest, a period very similar to our own. We are living through a period of instability. As government and businesses teeter on the brink of collapse and individuals acquire fortunes so vast that they beggar belief, our cosy Western reality is beginning to fall apart. For the first time in decades, the next generation of Westerners will be less well off than their parents as jobs, housing and opportunity decline across the board. Devoid of ideas and clearly terrified by the responsibility of having to keep a decaying system together, Western leaders tear up a century of political reform and strip the state back to its feudal origins: Armies to fight foreigners and a police force to fight everyone else. Faced with such terrifying instability and the shadow of a hideous future being born, Western culture has responded by dutifully ignoring the warning signs and encouraging us to buy more stuff. Don’t worry about your job… picture yourself as a Victorian airship captain! Don’t think too much about what the government is doing with your taxes… read a series of novels about bloggers fighting zombies! Don’t pay attention to real world inequalities… moan about how oppressed and mistreated you are for wanting to watch a cartoon about magical ponies and friendship! Never has the term ‘cosy catastrophe’ seemed more fitting than it does today. Just as Joe Haldeman once used science fictional tropes to process the experience of returning from Vietnam to find America completely changed in The Forever War (1976) and Joanna Russ’s The Female Man (1975) addressed the changing nature of female identity, contemporary science fiction must find a way to confront, process and make sense of the world as it is today. We are living in a science fictional world and this means that science fiction is in a unique position to help us **to make sense of a dangerously unstable world**. By rediscovering its ties to reality and using old tropes to explore new problems, science fiction can provide humanity with its first draft of future history.

#### 2] Critical Interrogation – Dialogue over Science Fiction creates more productive and educational communication models within public dialogue

Sweet 3, Derek R. Star Wars in the public square: The Clone Wars as political dialogue. Vol. 50. McFarland, 2015. (an associate professor of communication studies at Luther College and writes, primarily, about the intersection of rhetoric, popular culture, and politics.)//Elmer

Keeping this in mind, Bakhtin describes the traditional sender/receiver, speaker/ listener, or author/audience **communication models as deeply flawed** in that these conceptualizations appear to grant a great deal of agency to the **sender but little to the receiver**. Rejecting the passivity of the listener, Bakhtin highlights "an actively responsive understanding" that requires full collaborative attention and participation of all those involved in a discursive exchange.31 While a person might initiate a line of thought in a particular context, she does not expect her interlocutor(s) to sit idly and accept whatever ideas, worldviews, and opinions are articulated. The initiator anticipates, and expects, a response. When a listener encounters an utterance, she or he engages it, mulls it over, analyzes it, and "either agrees or disagrees with it (completely or partially), augments it, applies it, prepares for its execution, and so on."-32 The active scrutiny of an utterance, as well as the formulation and deployment of an immediate, or even delayed response, is the hallmark of responsive understanding: Of course, an utterance is not always followed immediately by an articulated response. An actively responsive understanding of what is heard (a command, for example) can be directly realized in action (the execution of an order or command that has been understood and accepted for execution), or it can remain, for the time being, a silent responsive understanding (certain speech genres are intended exclusively for this kind of responsive understanding, for example, lyrical genres), but this is, so to speak, responsive understanding with a delayed reaction. Sooner or later what is heard and actively understood will find its response in the subsequent speech or behavior of the listener. Bakhtin's insistence that a listener will respond transforms that individual from one toward whom an utterance is directed to one who directs an utterance toward others. Put simply, "the listener becomes the speaker." Thus, in the coordinated give and take of human communication the boundary between sender/receiver, author/audience, creator/viewer becomes blurred; every author is an audience member and every audience member is an author. Understanding, for Bakhtin, manifests in the ongoing call and response integral to every dialogic encounter. Having detoured into a general discussion of dialogics, I want to refocus attention on Bakhtin's treatment of popular culture. Although he modeled his conception of discursive dialogics on the routine face-to-face exchanges of everyday life—interactions in the workplace, discussions in the classroom, conversations in the home—Bakhtin was interested, primarily, with the dialogism of artistic discourse. While Bakhtin identifies the novel as the artistic form most capable of capturing the complex, dialogic contentiousness of social heteroglossia, an assertion Kay Halasek attributes to the pervasive cultural, historical, and political influences at work within the fledgling Soviet Union, contemporary scholars apply his conceptions to a wide array of popular culture texts.3S In the early twenty-first century, the narrated realities present in Bakhtin's novel materialize in such wide ranging popular culture texts as film, television, music, public art installations, and social media. Contemporary popular culture, suggests Hirschkop, is awash with narrative "templates **for a life worth living**," templates that encourage individuals to "savour and enjoy their lives 'aesthetically." Had Bakhtin written in the early part of the twenty-first century, I would like to think he would see dialogism at work in an almost limitless number of popular culture texts. Just as the novel calls readers to participate in the constitution of their social world, contemporary forms of popular culture invite individuals "to engage with other aspects of social experience and other members of the interpretive community, generating a network of 'creative perception' and dialogic participation.„7 The author, argues Bakhtin, stands in a position unique among writers, speakers, and creators as he or she simultaneously resides within a particular historical and cultural context and yet also stands as "omnipresent witness” to the ideologies, social mores, and worldviews intimated within a narrative.38 When inhabiting an authorial role, an individual is both part of, and apart from, his parent culture. Likewise, he is part of the work he creates yet oddly apart from that same work; the author cannot inhabit the world that springs forth from his own imagination. The author constructs a represented world populated by multiple characters who display a rich polyvocality resonant with the social world at large. Although the author facilitates an ongoing dialogue between the broader culture and the novel's represented culture, his own voice "remains outside the world he has represented in his work:' Despite the inability to inhabit the worlds and voices springing forth from her imagination, the author's **creative efforts do impact the social world in which she lives**. Conversely, the social world surrounds the author and cannot help but seep into the contours of a creative work. As Bakhtin remarks, The work and the world represented in it enter the real world and enrich it, and the real world enters the work and its world as part of the process of its creation, as well as part of its subsequent life, in a continual renewing of the work through the creative perception of listeners and readers. The dialogic give and take between represented world and real world, between author and listener, underscores the polysemy at work within **inter-oriented discourse** and illustrates how a particular text takes on multiple meanings and, through the responsivity of audiences, weaves its way into broader cultural conversations. A nineteenth-century novel, for example, takes on new meanings as the text is encountered by twenty-first-century readers immersed in their particular moment of historical, cultural, and personal understanding. The same holds true for contemporary popular culture texts. While one person might interpret the original Star Wars film as both culturally and politically conservative, connecting the film's black and white morality to the "renewed American conservatism" of the early 1980s, another might perceive the underdog story of ragtag rebels standing against the immense might of a military superpower as ideologically liberal.il Others, like several authors in Douglas Brode and Leah Deyneka's edited collection exploring the cultural resonance of the Star Wars franchise, associate the films with such diverse genres as science fiction, the Western, and fairy tales. Depending on one's interpretation, the represented world of Star Wars enters the responsive understanding of viewers and makes its way into discussions of politics, fundamental cultural values, and the life lessons of children. As Martin Flanagan points out in his exploration of dialogism and film, whether one is reading a book, listening to music, or watching a movie "we commune with various speaking agents behind the textual utterance:743 Also important to note is how the discursive inter-orientation insinuates a creative, dialogic relationship between artistic texts; previous texts "enrich" the real world and, as a result, contribute to the creative emergence of new texts. Building on Bakhtin's work, Julia Kristeva highlights this point when she writes, "Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another."4 An example of this intertextuality, and one most relevant for this current project, is Anne Lancashire's examination of The Phantom Menace as part of a broader "narrative, mythological, and metaphoric whole." In her piece, Lancashire calls attention to the fact that the first film of the Star Wars prequel trilogy is intended to be understood as part of a six film narrative arc. Pointing out numerous parallels in terms of narrative structure, characterizations, and visual symbols, she argues the film calls on viewers to recognize "intertextual patternings" between The Phantom Menace and the films of the original trilogy. 46 In doing so, Lancashire makes explicit the intersubjective dialogue occurring between texts as well as between viewers of the texts. Recognizing the responsive understanding at work, she argues, results in a more meaningful filmic experience. Brooker makes a similar argument regarding the mediated constitution of Batman. Giving Bakhtin's dialogism a direct nod, Brooker suggests texts in conversation with other texts are an important, and often overlooked, element of responsive understanding. Batman's meaning and cultural significance does not spring forth from a single text but emerges from a mediated melange. From Batman's first appearance in 1939 to Christopher Nolan's theatrical trilogy the cultural understanding of the Dark Knight arises from the intersection of tens of thousands of texts. Batman is accomplished "between author and reader" and "in the relationship between the text and other texts." Jeffrey Bussolin's observations regarding the constitutive intertextuality of numerous Joss Whedon projects parallel those of Lanchashire and Brooker. Describing constitutive intertextuality as structural, visual, and linguistic dialogue occurring between mediated texts, Bussolini illustrates how Buffy the Vampire Slayer, Angel, and Firefly made significant contributions to the creation, production, and interpretation of such diverse television programs as Deadwood, Eureka, and Torchwood. These conversations between texts, coupled with the interactions between author/ creator, text, and audience, suggest an underlying intertextuality permeating every moment of responsive understanding. Bakhtin describes this space where interlocutors, texts, and culture come together in responsive understanding as the public square. Patterned after the medieval public square, a space that served numerous public functions (e.g., marketplace, festival grounds, political assembly), Bakhtin's public square is a heteroglossic discursive space where the official and vernacular ideologies, viewpoints, lifestyles, and politics of a stratified society mix and mingle, collide and divide, converge and diverge. Unlike Habermas' conception of the public sphere, Bakhtin's public square makes no pretense toward the idealization of rational deliberation. The public square is a messy place, populated by individuals and groups from various cultural segments who employ a variety of official and vernacular communicative forms—face-to-face conversations, public speeches, social media, television, film, radio, novels, newspapers, magazines—to engage matters of communal importance and consequence. To be certain, the dialogic public square is not a space of equal participation and formalized debate where interlocutors square off with the intention of achieving victory or even consensus. As Hirschkop contends, "It's not that the conversation of the public square, now idolised, isn't composed of dialogues, it's just that it is valued not for the equal rights embodied within it, but for its quasi-Nietzschean 'liveliness, it's earthiness and vulgarity, its imbrication with interests and struggles Already echoing with the official discourse of political speeches, congressional debates, media pundits, and corporate spokespersons, the public square is the discursive space where the vernacular voices of authors, artists and fans participate in creating a "connection between the interlocking plots of a nation-state, a class, a family, and an individual life."50 Such a connection brings the Bakhtinian public square into a direct dialogue with rhetoric. Rhetoric and the Dialogic Public Square My turn to Bakhtin in an effort to reconceptualize the rhetoricalness of popular culture may, at first glance, seem like an odd choice. As I suggested in the introduction, Bakhtin decries rhetoric as a monologic affair consisting of individual players who wish to impart their particular truths on members of an audience. Monologism, suggests Bakhtin, "pretends to possess a ready-made truth, and it is also counterposed to the naive self-confidence of those people who think they know something, that is, who think they possess certain truths. Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual nercnn it is horn hotweon nent)lp rnllectivelv cearchina fnr truth in the process of their dialogic interaction: This emphasis on imparting one particular truth or another and the resulting clashes between the unyielding advocates of these truths implicates a communicative exchange wherein one person is declared a victor and all others are losers. He states, "In rhetoric there is the unconditionally innocent and the unconditionally guilty; there is complete victory and destruction of the opponent.”2 To further his indictment of rhetoric, Bakhtin also characterizes rhetorical practice as displaying an insidious, faux dialogue: it appears dialogic when it is not. In other words, rhetors frequently make use of the language of others—quoting another person, summarizing a particular policy position, or articulating a shared concern—in the course of their utterances. This proves problematic, maintains Bakhtin, when such double voicedness (rearticulating another's position) is employed by an individual pursuing a singular goal. A rhetor might incorporate the voices of other participants in a particular exchange (e.g., a debate over the legality of human reproductive cloning) but, in the final analysis, the political and cultural complexity of these voices is muted in service to the rhetor's every whim. Uprooted and transplanted from the salient discursive context, pseudo dialogue "is not fertilized by a deep-rooted connection with the forces of historical becoming that serve to stratify language, and therefore rhetorical genres are at best merely a distanced echo of this becoming, narrowed down to an individual polemic."53 Polemic, adversarial, and focused on the personal whims of a rhetor, the rhetoric described in Bakhtin's writings is more about championing individual interests than deliberating the public good. To some extent, Bakhtin's articulation of rhetoric is a fair assessment. Rhetoric, not unlike the power of the Force, can be used for nefarious or honorable ends. Murphy makes this clear in his assessment of Bakhtin's dislike for the communicative art: "Rhetoric is scary" 54 Bakhtin's apprehension regarding rhetoric is well founded: "Rhetoric crafts languages and voices; rhetoric demands answers; rhetoric noisely intervenes in human affairs."55 An individual utilizing the art of rhetoric for personal gain may indeed articulate static, reified truths designed to persuade audiences to see the world in particular ways. In making his forceful assertions regarding rhetoric's tendency to manifest monologically, however, Bakhtin runs afoul of his own writings. As Kay Halasek writes, Bakhtin's insistence on depicting rhetoric as a communicative exchange focused on "creating a combative and confrontational relationship between itself and other discourses" illustrates a contradiction within his own works. While Bakhtin criticizes rhetoric for its monologic orientation he also argues that no communicative exchange occurs without an interlocutor who participates in the dialogic formation of responsive understanding. And while I concede there are a great many rhetorical interactions where a self-absorbed individual crafts a text with little or no apparent regard for other voices, Bakhtin's work insinuates that a self-centered rhetor is still situated within the ebb and flow of historical, political, and cultural contexts. Attempting to draw parallels between the world of the face-to-face encounter and the artistic world of creative endeavors, Bakhtin makes clear that all utterances—a conversation, a novel, a television program—display a constitutive quality. Bakhtin centralizes the dialogic socialness of communicative exchanges when he describes discursive utterances as part of an ongoing language game located at the intersection of everything from formal linguistic structures to official/vernacular declarations to cultural norms, values, and expectations. He makes the collaborativeness of dialogism explicit when he states, "Discourse—in any of its forms, quotidian, rhetorical, scholarly —cannot fail to be oriented toward the 'already uttered, the 'already known, the `common opinion' and so forth. The dialogic orientation of discourse is a phenomenon that is, of course, a property of any discourse. It is the natural orientation of any living discourse What emerges from Bakhtin's work, then, is a conflicted account of rhetoric. On the one hand Bakhtin describes all communicative encounters, including rhetorical interactions, as dialogic. On the other hand, he denounces rhetoric as a monologic enterprise. In an attempt to sort through this apparent contradiction, I turn to James P. Zappen's working concerning Bakhtin, rhetoric, and dialogue. While some rhetorical scholars point out the apparent contradiction in Bakhtin's work, James P. Zappen's approach to rehabilitating the relationship between rhetoric and dialogue hinges on what he suggests is a misreading of Bakhtin's position. Rather than interpreting his work as antithetical to rhetoric, Zappen situates Bakhtin's criticisms as a call to reimagine rhetoric as a dialogic practice infused with a "multiplicity of voices" and oriented toward the "testing and contesting and creating of ideas."51 According to Zappen, Bakhtin's indictment of rhetorical practice is not directed as much toward rhetoric itself as it is toward the way both rhetors and rhetoricians (rhetorical critics) interpret the practice pragmatically and theoretically. Conceptualizing rhetoric as an isolated, instrumental means of moving an immediate audience dismisses the situatedness of all discourse and denies the collaborativeness that defines dialogism. Thomas B. Farrell makes a similar observation when he writes, "We misunderstand rhetoric if we assume that it begins and ends as merely directive or manipulative discourse Joining this chorus is the aforementioned Calvin Schrag who, like Zappen and Farrell, rejects a monologic understanding of rhetoric. Conversely, Schrag describes rhetoric as "a creative activity that displays discernment and insight" and characterizes rhetorical communication "as a collaborative and creative activity of deliberation and discourse against the backcloth of the common good of the polis." Linking Bakhtinian dialogics and rhetorical communication directly, Schrag offers an understanding of rhetoric grounded in the supposition that all human communication hinges on responsivity. When a rhetor engages in the act of invention, he references previously articulated meanings, understandings, and discernments; he collaborates with others, albeit indirectly, and incorporates those responsive understandings within the present rhetorical encounter. No matter the subject matter or rhetorical situation, a rhetor draws on previous utterances, anticipates future utterances, and orients his present utterance toward others. And these others, who cannot help but assume the position of rhetor themselves as they formulate a response (this response might be immediate or delayed), participate in these same dialogic acts. James Jasinski describes these responsive understandings as "the need to maintain discursive and deliberative 6 I space.„ — Put simply, the participants in a rhetorical performance work together "to make sense of the world inhabited by both.” In all the variations of rhetorical accomplishing, interlocutors direct their utterances toward one another and participate in the vigorous activity of self-constitution. As Schrag remarks, We converse and write in a variety of manners and modes. In the different involvements of our shared communal existence our words, spoken and written, lend themselves to elucidating, describing, explaining, contesting, critiquing, dissenting, agreeing, praising, consoling, admonishing—and a variety of combinations of each in colorful genres of mixed discourse. We script our lives in poetry and prose, in letters and electronic mail, in diaries and memoirs, in eulogies and orations, in sermons and scientific discourse. Building on Schrag's work, I would also add non-discourse forms of communication such as television, film, dance, music, and visual art. Schrag himself alludes to additional modes when he makes reference to "images" as part of the human communication repertoire. If one conceptualizes rhetoric as dialogic, a communicative practice simultaneously responding to previous utterances and anticipating future utterances, then even a political polemic is understood as part of an ongoing process of meaning-making. As self-serving as a particular utterance might be, the invention and declamation never occur within a vacuum; no matter how much a speaker, author, or filmmaker might wish it were so, a rhetorical utterance can never be disconnected from the surrounding historical, political, and cultural context. This shared sense of communal responsibility, which Schrag highlights in his reference to "the common good of the polls," distinguishes rhetoric from other communicative acts. Rhetorical communication is always about matters of public concern and, by definition, is directed toward "an understanding, accommodation, and modification of social practices." Whether rhetoric takes the form of a congressional hearing on the potential dangers of human cloning, a presidential speech concerning military action in a foreign land, or a television program representing torture as an effective tool for intelligence gathering the utterance solicits audiences to acknowledge their communal responsibility and participate in relevant public deliberations. What values should the scientific community consider when conducting biogenetic research? When and how should a government use military force in the name of justice? To what ends should an intelligence apparatus go to protect citizens? In a broader sense, the rhetorical dialogue surrounding these questions contributes to important discussions concerning such salient public issues as reproductive rights, civil liberties, and definitions of citizenship. In the spirit of Bakhtin's public square and dialogic rhetoric, the remainder of this project focuses on how science fiction texts (The Clone Wars, specifically) speak with a critical voice, and sometimes multiple voices, on such important political issues as human cloning, torture, and drone warfare. Often dismissed as melodramatic spectacle, the sometimes understated and sometimes forthright speculations, criticisms, and possibilities associated with the science fiction genre rarely engage matters of public interest directly. The thoughtful social commentary offered by a television program or film is not the same as offering testimony before a congressional sub-committee or "taking the floor on the House of Commons."66 That does not mean, however, that science fiction texts do not contribute thoughtful perspectives on important social and political issues. Chris Pak's examination of the discursive interplay between representations of genetic engineering and ongoing, real-world deliberations about biogenetics, for example, illustrates how science fiction texts provide "metaphorical 67 portals to ongoing debates.” — Films like Pacific Rim, with its subtle denunciation of U.S. immigration policy (e.g., the use of a wall to protect citizens from "aliens"), or Star Trek: Into the Darkness, with its direct criticism of a state's legal right to assassinate citizens deemed enemy combatants, are not meant to be engaged directly by policy proponents or opponents. The questions posed by both films, however, do call on audience members to make connections between the political arguments of a represented world and the broader conversations reverberating throughout the public square. Indirectly, then, the speculative viewpoints of science fiction enter the public imagination and become part of the broader political conversation. As Flanagan remarks, Consumption of a filmic text, under any set of viewing conditions, gains us entrance into an interpretive community based around that text. Our "take," or reading, on the text is projected outwards into a discourse sustained by other members of that community. There are many outlets for such opinions with varying degrees of "official" stamp—review in magazines and newspapers, polls on websites, academic seminars, fan clubs, informal discussion with friends and so on. Bakhtin would have it that once we have voiced our opinion on a text—once we have formulated our answer to it—that response becomes part of the discourse associated with the text, becomes on of many framing voices, contending, conflicting, clamouring to be heard..°. The important feature of this dialogic exchange is not whether a popular text contributes to an immediate resolution of a public controversy. Such resolutions rarely occur. Instead, the important feature of Bakhtin's dialogic public square is the continued existence of social and political tensions via the articulation of varying viewpoints. Filled with the simultaneously dissonant and harmonious sounds of contention, engagement, and deliberation, the public square resonates with a multitude of inter-oriented voices engrossed in responsive understanding. In the chapters that follow, I make explicit the inter-oriented voices of the dialogic public square and illustrate how the imagined worlds, characters, and plots of Star Wars: The Clone Wars implicate U.S. American post-9/11 realities. Rather than making broad generalizations about the way The Clone Wars enters the public imaginary, I make direct connections between real-world rhetorical texts—congressional hearings, news editorials, presidential discourse, pamphlets, and human rights reports—and the perspectives and positions offered by the television series. Concentrating on the emergent themes developed by the creators of The Clone Wars, I delve into five politically-salient issues: human cloning, torture, Just War Theory, peace, and drone warfare. By putting the series into direct dialogue with other rhetorical texts, I illustrate how The Clone Wars emerges as "a link in a very complexly organized chain of other utterances."69 Linked to ongoing discussions in the public square, the series presents a number of engaging questions for audience consideration. How do representations of clone troopers address some of the same public concerns articulated during congressional hearings on human cloning? Is Anakin Skywalker's propensity for violent interrogation analogous to Dick Cheney's warning that the U.S. might need to embrace the "dark side" of the war on terror? How might characters like Master Yoda offer a direct criticism of President Obama's justification of military action? Do Senator Padme Amidala and Duchess Satine Kryze, with their calls for nonviolence and peaceful negotiation, reverberate with the sounds of former congressional representative and peace activist Jeanette Rankin? Like Rankin's efforts in the early to mid-twentieth century, do these two secondary characters in The Clone Wars narrative attempt to give voice to frequently silenced arguments of the early twenty-first century? How might the ubiquity of droids throughout the Star Wars universe mirror, or challenge, various human rights concerns pertaining to the United States' increased dependence on drone warfare? In visiting this deeply developed segment of a galaxy far, far away and exploring these questions, I want to suggest that a rhetoric based in Bakhtin's dialogics might provide a new way of thinking about discourse, deliberation, and debate in the public square.

#### 3] Hyperreal Simulations - Destroying the hyperreal fictions of the media-militarist society requires us to tell stories that are impossibly false—science fiction is a gift that the system can only receive by destroying itself

Bogard 3, Bill. "Hyperfacticity and Fatal Strategies." Science Fiction Studies (2003): 178-179. //Re-cut by Elmer

A social science fiction is not some **Utopia or dystopia**. It is not some future state to which we can compare the reality of the present, or some imaginary state of affairs that might or might not materialize in the ways it is projected. A social science fiction is the reality of the present, the fiction of real politics and technology, right now, in your face. What is more fictional than the events of 9/11, or 24-hour news, or John Poindexter's plan for "Total Information Awareness"? What is more unreal than cloning, or "smart bombs," or an Internet chat room? There is a certain truth in what J.G. Ballard says: we **have to learn how to make the reality of events more fictional than fiction**. Real fiction is tame by comparison to the fiction of the real. The modern world is **more than just a bad science fiction novel (although it is that**, too). At least I can stop reading the latter. The fiction of the real has none of the charm of a grade “B” thriller, none of its loose ends and incoherencies. No, I'm with Baudrillard on this. Everything today is **obscenely visible and immaculately packaged**, totally coherent, controlled in advance by models and codes and simulations that disguise the absence of anything remotely or nakedly real anymore. The sheer bizarreness and excessiveness of twenty-first-century technological civilization far outstrips what even the worst science fiction writer is capable of depicting on a bad day. Baudrillard says that what you have today is the order of the "truer-than-true." Hyperfacticity, that's the word. Information overload, endless polls, universal testing (am I beautiful enough, am I smart enough, am I pure and perfect enough?). To all that you must oppose the "falser-than-false," which he likens to evil outbidding evil. Fiction, of course, has always been aligned with the false and against the true. But when truth has been murdered and its death masked by the truer-than-true, you require **something more dangerous than fiction**, something worse, as a kind of antidote to the oppressive climate of facticity that envelops us today (It's a fact! I saw it on CNN!). Of course, it's that very obsession with not just facts but with facticity **that is so fictional** about our current condition. And none of this is contradictory; it's all perfectly and stupidly consistent. The truer-than-true is just bad fiction. So what do we do? How do we get to the more fictional than fiction, the falser-than-false? In the end, you have to give the world a gift to which it cannot respond **except by its own death**. What can destroy the fiction of the hyperfactual truer-than-true information-soaked bestiality of the postmodern world other than the gift of an even more monstrous and bestial fiction, which even it cannot outdo. This, of course, was Ballard's insight, and the insight of all the great science fiction writers who, taking **matters to their extreme** (Crash!), present to a world already at the extremity, at the limits of ugliness and perversity and terror, an irresistible image of its own desire. Fatal strategy.

#### 4] All politics is fictional – imagination is a central component of representation – our affirmative merely exposes this truth

Freedman 13, Carl. Critical theory and science fiction. Wesleyan University Press, 2013. Pg 20-22 (Associate Professor of English at Louisiana State University)

It is a priori likely that most texts display the activity of numerous different genres, and that few or no texts can be adequately described in terms of one genre alone. Genre in this sense is analogous to the Marxist concept of the mode of production as the latter has gained new explanatory force by being contrasted, in the Althusserian vocabulary, with the category of social formation – a term that is preferred to the more familiar notion of society, because the latter connotes a relatively homogeneous unity, whereas the former is meant to suggest an overdetermined combination of *different* modes of production at work in the same place and during the same time. Though it is thus impossible simply to equate a given social formation with a given mode of production, it is nonetheless legitimate to affirm that (for instance) the United States "is" capitalist, so long as we understand that the copulative signifies not true equation or identity but rather conveys that, of the various and relatively autonomous modes of production active within the U.S. social formation, capitalism enjoys a position of *dominance.* In the same way, the dialectical rethinking of genre does not in the least preclude generic discrimination. We may validly describe a particular text as science fiction if we understand the formulation to mean that cognitive estrangement is the dominant generic tendency within the overdetermined textual whole. Accordingly, there is probably no text that is a perfect and pure embodiment of science fiction (no text, that is to say, in which science fiction is the *only* generic tendency operative) **but also no text in which the science fiction tendency is altogether absent.** Indeed**, it might be argued that this tendency is the precondition for the constitution of fictionality** – and even of representation – itself. For the construction of an alternative world is the very definition of fiction: owing to the character of representation as a nontransparent process that necessarily involves not only similarity but *difference* between representation and the "referent" of the latter, an irreducible degree of alterity and estrangement is bound to obtain even in the case of the most "**realistic" fiction** imaginable. The appearance of transparency in that paradigmatic realist Balzac has been famously exposed as an illusion;2 ' nonetheless, it is important to understand the operation of alterity in realism not as the failure of the latter, but as the sign of the estranging tendency of science fiction that supplies (if secretly) some of the power of great realistic fiction 25 Furthermore, just as some degree of alterity and hence estrangement is fundamental to all fiction, finally including realism itself, so the same is true (but here the limit case is fantasy) of that other dialectical half of the science-fiction tendency: cognition. The latter is after all an unavoidable operation of the human mind (however precritical, and even if clinically schizophrenic) and must exercise a determinant presence for literary production to take place at all. Even in *The Lord of the Rings*-to consider again what is perhaps the most thoroughgoing fantasy we possess, by an author who stands to fantasy rather as Balzac stands to realism – cognition is quite strongly and overtly operative on at least one level: namely that of the moral and theological values that the text is concerned to enforce. 2 It is, then, in this very special sense that the apparently wild assertions that **fiction is science fiction and even that the latter is a wider term than the former may be justified**: cognition and estrangement, which together constitute the generic tendency of science fiction, are not only actually present in all fiction, but are structurally crucial to the possibility of fiction and even of representation in the first place. Yet in more routine usage, the term of science fiction ought, as I have maintained above, to be reserved for those texts in which cognitive estrangement is not only present but dominant. And it is with this dialectical understanding of genre that we may not reconsider the apparently difficult cases of Brecht, on the one hand, and *Star Wars* on the other.

#### 5] Creative engagement with political decisionmaking is critical to human survival

Stannard 6 Matt Stannard 4-18-2006 “Deliberation, Democracy and Debate” <http://theunderview.blogspot.com/2006/04/deliberation-democracy-and-debate.html> (Department of Communication and Journalism at the University of Wyoming)//Re-cut by Elmer

The complexity and interdependence of human society, combined with the control of political decisionmaking—and political conversation itself—in the hands of fewer and fewer technological "experts," the gradual exhaustion of material resources and the organized circumvention of newer and more innovative resource development, places humanity, and perhaps all life on earth, in a precarious position. **Where we need creativity and openness**, **we find rigid and closed non-solutions**. Where we need masses of people to make concerned investments in their future, we find (understandable) alienation and even open hostility to political processes. The dominant classes manipulate ontology to their advantage: When humanity seeks meaning, the powerful offer up metaphysical hierarchies; when concerned masses come close to exposing the structural roots of systemic oppression, the powerful switch gears and promote localized, relativistic micronarratives that discourage different groups from finding common, perhaps "universal" interests. Apocalyptic scenarios are themselves rhetorical tools, but that doesn’t mean they are bereft of material justification. The "flash-boom" of apocalyptic rhetoric isn’t out of the question, but it is also no less threatening merely as a metaphor for the slow death of humanity (and all living beings) through environmental degradation, the irradiation of the planet, or the descent into political and ethical barbarism. Indeed, these slow, deliberate scenarios ring more true than the flashpoint of quick Armageddon, but in the end the "fire or ice" question is moot, because the answers to those looming threats **are still the same**: The complexities of threats to our collective well-being require **unifying perspectives based on diverse viewpoints,** in the same way that the survival of ecosystems is dependent upon biological diversity. In Habermas’s language, we must fight the colonization of the lifeworld in order to survive at all, let alone to survive in a life with meaning. While certainly not the only way, **the willingness to facilitate organized democratic deliberation, including encouraging participants to articulate views with which they may personally disagree**, is one way to resist this colonization.

# 1AR

## Case

### 1AR – O/V

#### Separatist droids sustain the Clone Wars which draws in thousands of planets and kills billions. Plan eliminates the sole source of Separatist Strength which allows the Galactic Republic to win preventing Imperial Takeover.

### 1AR – AT: Helps Palpatine

#### 1AC Saavedra Link Turns this – Palpatine used the Clone Wars to cement his power by forcing reliance on the state – no Clone Wars meant he has no means of taking over the senate

### 1AR – AT: Doesn’t ban Vulture Droids/Warships

#### Yes we do – 1AC Plan Spec wasn’t all-inclusive – we’ve defined battle droids as any Separatist droids capable of autonomously taking life which means we ban those too

### 1AR – AT: Doesn’t ban Grievous

#### Irrelevant – he can’t win the war by himself since he’s only one person

### 1AR – AT: Ending Clone Wars leads to Civil War

#### This is non-unique – there already is a Global Civil War – no comparative ev about why this other conflict would be worse – the plan solves since it would expose the Sith’s plan by preventing them from having a smokescreen

## Heuristic

### 1AR – Heuristic O/V

#### 2 Framing Issues for these turns -

#### 1] Everything in debate is fictional since even Fiat is imagination BUT their focus on one singular objective reality locks in Dogma and Deliberation – the impact is Extinction which 1AC Standard since complex world systems requires creative political engagement that only “fictional” commentary like the Clone Wars can access – that’s 1AC Sweet.

#### 2] Default to Method Specific Ev – their turns aren’t Star Wars specific – 1AC Sweet is Clone Wars specific as a unique way of engaging post-9/11 politics as commentary – this is an independent Topic Specific DA to their Model since it helps inform us about the potentialities of debates about LAWs.

#### You should artificially presume the 1AC takes place in the real world – this blurring of “objective reality” and science fiction is an offensive reason to prefer our Model of Debate since it broadens our imaginations to things that may seem out of our purview that allows for us to create new horizons of possibility – link turning all their materialism and pragmatism offense” – that is 1AC Freedman, Stannard, and McCalmont

### 1AR – Ext: MIT – Objective Reality Doesn’t Exist

#### Extend MIT – if we win this – 1] Flips U/Q for their Heuristic Turns and 2] Proves zero violation on T-FW – Quantum Mechanics proves that 2 competing worlds can co-exist since photons exist in simultaneous polarization states due to super-position.

### 1AR – AT: Science Fiction Racist

#### 1] Misreads SciFi – it says Science Fiction has historically been racist NOT that it intrinsically is

#### 2] Conceding the I/L story that we need to be held responsible for our broader Reps – you link harder since FW mandates the USFG which committed Genocide, Slavery, Jim Crow, and the Prison-Industrial-Complex

#### 3] L/T – we’re not Racist – that’s 1AC Sweet –

#### a] Star Wars is social commentary as interrogation NOT endorsement

#### b] Separatists are metaphors for White Ethno-Nationalist Supremacist Movements

### 1AR – AT: Star Wars Racist

#### 1] We don’t need to defend all of Star Wars but our contextual reading of it to Droids – anything else links back to them since they mandate the USFG that is complicit in Genocide and Anti-Black Violence

#### 2] Star Wars is a critical commentary that depicts cultural issues as an interrogation of them – that’s 1AC Sweet – L/T’s this since it forces dialogue abt those issues

#### 3] Our specific reading turns it – Separatists are allegories of White Supremacist movements since they act as ethno-nationalist towards other groups in the Outer Rim

### 1AR – AT: Science Fiction Commodified

#### Non-Unique – it’s already commodified in the status quo BUT our reading of it gets exported and subverts dominant readings of power by pushing past the politics of the possible

### 1AR – AT: Innovation DA

#### 1] We Link Turn Innovation – external offense to our DA’s on FW

Spitz and Zuin 20 Roger Spitz and Lidia Zuin 10-22-2020 “How Science Fiction Can Help Chart Your Company's Path Forward When reality flips upside down, SF can accelerate innovation.” (Roger Spitz is the founder of Techistential (Foresight Strategy) and Disruptive Futures Institute (Think Tank), based in San Francisco. He is an expert on artificial intelligence, and sits on a number of advisory boards for companies, VCs & academic institutions. He has spent two decades advising CEOs, founders, boards and shareholders of companies globally on M&A, strategic investments and future-proofing their business. Lidia Zuin is a Brazilian journalist, futurology researcher, professor, and speaker. She holds a MA in Semiotics and is currently a PhD candidate in Arts. She publishes a quarterly column about culture, technology and science fiction. Besides being a sci-fi writer, Lidia has also presented two TEDx talks in Brazil and teaches at Istituto Europeo di Design.)//Elmer

At the beginning of the quarantine, professor Bodhisattva Chattopadhyay from the University of Oslo published a video on Facebook in which he argued that science fiction fans are rarely surprised by anything, since they have already seen or experienced a scenario as a fictional narrative. It is true that science fiction, horror, and fantasy explore scenarios like the end of the world, alien invasions, and machine uprisings. But despite all the movies, games, and books about pandemics, were we really ready for Covid-19? The answer is both yes and no. While we have already seen such developments in fiction, watching a movie about an apocalypse certainly does not prepare you for one. Although we all long for technology that can upload kung fu into our brains like Neo in The Matrix, this is not possible?--?yet. In addition to being an artistic genre, science fiction is one of the methodologies proudly situated within futures studies. But unlike futurology or forecasting, science fiction does not require the same scientific foundations. In fact, science fiction is all **about speculation and creativity,** two qualities that could allow both companies and professionals to remain -- or become -- relevant in the face of **our rapidly changing world**. Prototyping "What If?" -- From Imagination to Market Despite their financial, strategic, or competitive advantages, it was not the incumbent automakers that pioneered the creation of intelligent, autonomous "operating systems," but rather **Uber, Waymo (Alphabet), Tesla, and Nvidia.** Likewise, it was **Beyond Meat and Impossible Foods** that reframed the meat industry through sustainable food tech, breaking the molds of industry leaders like Tyson or JBS. The same holds true for myriad other industries: It was **SpaceX** that partnered with NASA for commercial space flights, not industry giants like Airbus or Boeing?--?although the latter has sponsored science fiction creations in the past. In other words, it is the players who **challenge assumptions** and ask new questions that beat incumbents in innovation. Some companies are coming around to this idea. It's why Hershey's is 3-D-printing chocolate, why Visa uses experiential technology to explore the future of commerce and payments, and why Lowe's combines AR, VR, and spatial computing to enhance its customer experiences while partnering with Made in Space to imagine an additive manufacturing facility for extraterrestrial hardware stores. Truly innovative players look to longer time horizons, reframing perceptions to explore new products or technologies with few financial or technological barriers to hamper creativity. In "futurecasting," science fiction serves as a powerful catalyst **for suspending disbelief**. Conversely, incumbents, which often operate as if the world were linear, stable, and predictable, are more likely to use strategic analysis when planning their next steps. Similarly, their shareholders tend to be more prone to preferring measurable, quantifiable returns around predictable investment cycles?--?all strategies that undervalue imagination and under-prioritize innovation. Instead of taking an imaginative leap into the unknown, well-established players typically rely on countless strategic consultants and bottom-up analysis. But this sort of risk analysis has a limit. In our increasingly volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) world, extrapolating the future from the past can be terribly inaccurate. It is often more valuable to dedicate time to science fiction--speculating and creatively responding--than to regression algorithms. The former can imagine the unforeseeable while the latter would fail in, for example, a pandemic. In science fiction, it is possible to imagine and consider not only new perceptions, but also products, intellectual properties, and technologies. Through the creative process, science fiction authors provide a heightened level of systems thinking and recognition of next-order implications, such as: Visual prototypes of theoretical designs Cultural implications of technology The diverse impact of narrative and storytelling A platform for ethical debates Interestingly, professor Philipp Jordan from the University of Hawaii has found that the use of science fiction terms in academic papers has grown exponentially over the past 30 years. MIT has also studied how science fiction was used as a means to drive innovation. In a VUCA world, success comes less from quantifying than from forming an anticipatory, agile, and adaptive mindset, a mindset enhanced by science fiction. How does one combine the inspiration of this artistic genre with the brass tacks of strategic thinking? As a starting point, remember that neither science fiction nor futurology are designed to predict the future. In the words of Alvin Toffler: "No serious futurist deals in prediction. These are left for television oracles and newspaper astrologers." Similarly, science fiction does not describe precise scenarios that the world need follow step by step. Reality is about diversity, and as William Gibson once said, "The future is already here, but it is not evenly distributed." One effective strategy is design fiction, a combination of design thinking and science fiction. First proposed by sci-fi author Bruce Sterling, the method proposes the "deliberate use of diegetic prototypes to suspend disbelief about change." In other words, in this creative and strategic process, people are challenged to create prototypes (objects, artworks, narratives, illustrations, films, performances, you name it) that trigger conversation and suspend the audience's disbelief to the point of actually considering these speculative scenarios as real possibilities. Facilitators can also use already-known frameworks like the futures wheel or the Thing from the Future during their processes of design fiction. These strategies open up one's mind to the tangible possibilities that the future will be vastly different from the past. A number of well-respected labs are already combining the perspectives of speculative design and design fiction: SciFutures "accelerate[s] innovation with sci-fi prototyping." Imagination of Things "uses design, fiction, and technology to craft meaningful stories." UP Future Sight uses design fiction, strategic planning, and trend forecasting to help companies visualize and plan ahead. Rito hosts immersive experiences that blend fiction and reality to facilitate views about the future. Envisioning maps fictional technologies and connects them to their sci-fact counterparts. It also issues original science fiction stories and interactive narrative games on demand. M&A and VC Investments: Science Fiction to Science Fact The gap between science fiction and reality is shrinking everywhere, as even mergers and acquisitions or venture capital investments are themselves resembling what was once science fiction. Cybernetics brain-computer interface (BCI) is one such promising area, evidenced by Facebook's acquisition of CTRL-labs for between $500 million and $1 billion, and by two Israeli cybernetics companies that raised VC money in the past two years: Arctop, which uses A.I. to construct a multidimensional map of real-time brain activity, and CorrActions, which develops noninvasive software to anticipate human intentions. In addition, Mojo Vision (which has raised $100 million to date), is working on augmented reality contact lenses. In haptics, HaptX has raised $19 million to build a haptic telerobotic system to transmit touch feedback to an operator anywhere. With the convergence of connective technologies (A.I., 5G, IoT, sensors), immersive experiences (AR, VR, and MR), and human-machine interface (BCI, tech + wearables) you'll be able to see, hear, and feel, providing a realistic implementation of digital teleportation or space/time travel. According to physicist Michio Kaku, "Once confined to fantasy and science fiction, time travel is now simply an engineering problem." The same goes for recent developments in Elon Musk's Neuralink prototype: A simplification of the device and the promises it holds could make real what was once seen as impossible fiction. In Our VUCA World, Science Fiction Is a Mandatory Strategy Science fiction is not limited to business or venture investors: Governments and institutions could use futurecasting to imagine idealistically, especially as the world begins rebuilding in the wake of Covid-19. Starting in the future and then working backwards, we can scrutinize the results of these new narratives as we develop an inspiring action plan. Science fiction is also a powerful tool for individuals. It provides agency over our futures with a more proactive approach, suspending our disbelief as we broaden the horizons of our imaginations. It can help us develop aspirational, sustainable longer-term perspectives (instead of our current bias for short-term fixes). Science fiction harnesses curiosity, creativity, and diverse perspectives to go against the grain, creating new combinations in a world where patterns are increasingly difficult to interpret. Science fiction also helps you taste a broader set of human-machine interactions, experiences that could be tomorrow's reality. Imagine instilling empathy as part of our technological prototypes, in expectation of co-habitating with these intelligent, aware, and social machines. These metaskills will help our society thrive as we envision an alternative set of possible futures. Through science fiction, we can imagine our **preferred new experiences--**be they on Earth, virtual, or intergalactic, because today's impossible will be tomorrow's reality.

#### 2] Frame 1AC McCalmont as terminal defense AND flips U/Q – engagement is limited since we’re held back by what is perceived as “rational” or “reasonable” – only by pushing the bounds of the possible can lead to creative engagement w/ political and scientific realities

#### [Optional]

#### 3] No Link – there’s a clear distinction between Science Fiction and Fiction – Science Fiction pushes the bounds of reality, Fiction re-writes it altogether which means our Method and Science are not mutually exclusive

#### 4] Try-or-die for the Politics of the Possible – that’s 1AC McCalmont – we can no longer rely on what we’ve in the past since the world is always becoming more complex and changing

### 1AR – AT: Ballot doesn’t Solve

#### We agree – we are fiating the imagination of the Plan – not a question of Rhetoric or the Ballot BUT about imagining a hypothetical policy action in Star Wars

### 1AR – AT: Presumption

#### Non-sensical – this is a debate about the hypothetical implementation of the plan in Star Wars

## Topicality

### 1AR – AT: T-FW

#### 1] We meet – read the Plan – it says we ban Battle Droids which are LAWs – that’s 1AC Harper – prefer since only we have cards that attempt to include - plan text in a vacuum is the only predictable stasis point for violations – anything regress in an infinite manner to make universal preparation impossible

#### Not Extra-T – Heuristic isn’t an advantage to the Plan, only to our Model under a FW debate

#### [AT States List Violation] – W/M – CIS are States – outweighs on Predictability – millions of people have watched the Clone Wars and no one has heard of this random list of tiny states – also not meant to be completely inclusive which doesn’t prove a violation.

Wookiepedia 18 [Wookieepedia 2018, "Confederacy of Independent Systems," <https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Confederacy_of_Independent_Systems>, accessed 1-18-2021]//Raunak Dua

The Confederacy of Independent Systems ([24 BBY](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/24_BBY)–[19 BBY](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/19_BBY)), abbreviated to CIS, and also known as the Separatist Alliance or the **Separatist State**, was an unrecognized breakaway polity that fought against the [Galactic Republic](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Galactic_Republic) during the [Clone Wars](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Clone_Wars) formed by thousands of [star systems](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Star_system) from the [Mid Rim](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Mid_Rim) to the [Outer Rim](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Outer_Rim_Territories) that broke away from the Republic. The Confederacy was founded on the grounds of excessive taxation and corruption within the [Galactic Senate](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Galactic_Senate) and general feeling of dissatisfaction towards and neglect by the [Core Worlds](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Core_Worlds), which contained some of the wealthiest and most prestigious [planets](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Planet) in [the galaxy](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/The_galaxy). The Confederacy was led by the former [Jedi](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Jedi) [Count](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Count) [Dooku](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Dooku) of [Serenno](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Serenno" \t "_blank" \o "Serenno), who served as its [Head of State](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Head_of_State). In addition, the Confederacy was secretly supported by several corporations, including the [Trade Federation](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Trade_Federation), headed by [Viceroy](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Viceroy_of_the_Trade_Federation) [Nute Gunray](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Nute_Gunray" \t "_blank" \o "Nute Gunray); the [InterGalactic Banking Clan](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/InterGalactic_Banking_Clan" \t "_blank" \o "InterGalactic Banking Clan), headed by [Chairman](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Chairman) [San Hill](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/San_Hill); the [Techno Union](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Techno_Union), headed by [Foreman](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Foreman) [Wat Tambor](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Wat_Tambor); the [Commerce Guild](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Commerce_Guild), headed by [Presidente](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Presidente" \t "_blank" \o "Presidente) [Shu Mai](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Shu_Mai); the [Corporate Alliance](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Corporate_Alliance), headed by [Magistrate](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Magistrate) [Passel Argente](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Passel_Argente); and the [Retail Caucus](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Retail_Caucus)

#### 2] They have no definition of what world the aff must take place in – reject non-resolutional theory violations – they are infinitely regressive and turns their predictability offense – also reject sand-bagging T interps – causes late-breaking debates and crunches the 2AR to a 6 min dump

#### 3] C/A 1AC MIT – objective reality doesn’t exist – the resolution doesn’t mandate a specific reality - Quantum Mechanics proves that 2 competing worlds can co-exist since photons exist in simultaneous polarization states due to super-position – it’s just a question of which one you think through in debates

#### 4] Framing – their interp would be zero Aff ground – there is zero topic since all Affs have to fiat some new world since their model forces Affs to be in a world w/ zero inherency – outweighs Limits since we have some clash like Separatists Good BUT your model has 100% Neg Win Rate which hurts Fairness more

#### 5] Fairness isn’t yes/no but a sliding scale – 1NC hasn’t provided a case-list – 2NR is too-late which means only risk of Limits DA is one new aff

#### 6] Counter interp – topical affs fiat states banning LAWS in a reality outside of the constraints of empiricism

#### 7] Prefer – these are all reasons our Model is valuable AND why making our Aff topical is good -

#### a] Star Wars is pedagogically valuable – that’s 1AC Sweet – it’s a political interrogation that speaks to viewers by inciting thoughts about controversial and relevant issues – proven how Revenge of the Sith was commentary on post-9/11 US militarism in Iraq – specifically true about LAWs since it imagines potential futures such as the Separatists and Battle Droids – forces re-imagination over how the topic operates which is an independent Topic Education DA to their interp.

#### b] Agency – that’s 1AC McCalmont – the “real world” plunges us into social dogma that collapses creating new futures – Science Fiction pushes the politics of the possible by re-inventing the world around us – the impact is Extinction since complex worlds require complex policy-making and decision-making – outweighs since Debate’s purpose is portability.

#### c] Will to Truth DA – that’s 1AC Bogard – hyper-focus on the “real world” inscribes a violent will to truth that seeks to render the whole world “objective” and transparent – turning us into CNN vs Fox News – that ultimately leads to the War on Terror to exterminate difference – Science Fiction solves by revealing the blurredness of truth since it questions our core assumptions.

#### [AT Clash] – Turn – a] We’ve indicted Clash under your Model – technocratic policy-making under their Model locks in Dogma which hurts creative pedagogy, b] We solve – robust clash such as Separatists Good exists, c] SciFi Clash is Good and Outweighs – necessary for interrogations past the politics of the possible – invigorates critical pedagogy.

### 1AR – AT: T-Nebel

#### 1] C/I – We’ll defend the violation w/ the plank of disclosure 30 min before the round

#### 2] “LAWS” is existential and pragmatics outweigh

Cohen PhD et al 02 Ariel Cohen [Ph.D., Computational Linguistics, Carnegie Mellon University] Nomi Erteschik-Shir [PhD, Ben Gurion University of the Negev] “Topic, Focus, and the Interpretation of Bare Plurals” Natural Language Semantics, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer 2002), pp. 125-165 RE

\*for reference the sentence it is referring is “Boys are present.”\*

Sentence (46b) contains the predicate present, which is S-level. This predicate introduces a spatiotemporal variable, which may be a stage topic. In this case the subject may be a topic as before, but does not have to be. When the subject is a topic, it is interpreted generically; when it is in focus, it is interpreted existentially (we will return to existential interpretations in section 7 below). Hence, the sentence is ambiguous and both generic and existential readings are available (cf. Jäger 1999). In fact, it is hard to get the generic reading, and the existential reading is much preferred. The reason is that generics cannot express predication of a temporary property (Cohen 1999). If the property present is perceived to be such a temporary property, with a boy being present at some times and absent at others, the generic will be unacceptable. If, on the other hand, being present is perceived to be a property that is expected to hold well into the future, a generic reading is possible, as in (4)

#### 3] Specific instances prove generics which also means I meet

Cimpian et al 10 (PhDs – Andrei, Amanda C. Brandone, Susan A. Gelman, Generic statements require little evidence for acceptance but have powerful implications, Cogn Sci. 2010 Nov 1; 34(8): 1452–1482)

Generic statements (e.g., “Birds lay eggs”) express generalizations about categories. In this paper, we hypothesized that there is a paradoxical asymmetry at the core of generic meaning, such that these sentences have extremely strong implications but require little evidence to be judged true. Four experiments confirmed the hypothesized asymmetry: Participants interpreted novel generics such as “Lorches have purple feathers” as referring to nearly all lorches, but they judged the same novel generics to be true given a wide range of prevalence levels (e.g., even when only 10% or 30% of lorches had purple feathers). A second hypothesis, also confirmed by the results, was that novel generic sentences about dangerous or distinctive properties would be more acceptable than generic sentences that were similar but did not have these connotations. In addition to clarifying important aspects of generics’ meaning, these findings are applicable to a range of real-world processes such as stereotyping and political discourse. Keywords: generic language, concepts, truth conditions, prevalence implications, quantifiers, semantics Go to: 1. Introduction A statement is generic if it expresses a generalization about the members of a kind, as in “Mosquitoes carry the West Nile virus” or “Birds lay eggs” (e.g., Carlson, 1977; Carlson & Pelletier, 1995; Leslie, 2008). Such generalizations are commonplace in everyday conversation and child-directed speech (Gelman, Coley, Rosengren, Hartman, & Pappas, 1998; Gelman, Taylor, & Nguyen, 2004; Gelman, Goetz, Sarnecka, & Flukes, 2008), and are likely to foster the growth of children’s conceptual knowledge (Cimpian & Markman, 2009; Gelman, 2004, 2009). Here, however, we explore the semantics of generic sentences—and, in particular, the relationship between generic meaning and the statistical prevalence of the relevant properties (e.g., what proportion of birds lay eggs). Consider, first, generics’ truth conditions: Generic sentences are often judged true despite weak statistical evidence. Few people would dispute the truth of “Mosquitoes carry the West Nile virus”, yet only about 1% of mosquitoes are actually carriers (Cox, 2004). Similarly, only a minority of birds lays eggs (the healthy, mature females), but “Birds lay eggs” is uncontroversial. This loose, almost negligible relationship between the prevalence of a property within a category and the acceptance of the corresponding generic sentence has long puzzled linguists and philosophers, and has led to many attempts to describe the truth conditions of generic statements (for reviews, see Carlson, 1995; Leslie, 2008). Though generics’ truth conditions may be unrelated to property prevalence (cf. Prasada & Dillingham, 2006), the same cannot be said about the implications of generic statements. When provided with a novel generic sentence, one often has the impression that the property talked about is widespread. For example, if we were unfamiliar with the West Nile virus and were told (generically) that mosquitoes carry it, it would not be unreasonable to assume that all, or at least a majority of, mosquitoes are carriers (Gelman, Star, & Flukes, 2002). It is this paradoxical combination of flexible, almost prevalence-independent truth conditions, on the one hand, and widespread prevalence implications, on the other, that is the main focus of this article. We will attempt to demonstrate empirically that the prevalence level that is sufficient to judge a generic sentence as true is indeed significantly lower than the prevalence level implied by that very same sentence. If told that, say, “Lorches have purple feathers,” people might expect almost all lorches to have these feathers (illustrating generics’ high implied prevalence), but they may still agree that the sentence is true even if the actual prevalence of purple feathers among lorches turned out to be much lower (illustrating generics’ flexible truth conditions). Additionally, we propose that this asymmetry is peculiar to generic statements and does not extend to sentences with quantified noun phrases as subjects. That is, the prevalence implied by a sentence such as “Most lorches have purple feathers” may be more closely aligned with the prevalence that would be needed to judge it as true. Before describing our studies, we provide a brief overview of previous research on the truth conditions and the prevalence implications of generic statements. 1.1. Generics’ truth conditions Some of the first experimental evidence for the idea that the truth of a generic statement does not depend on the underlying statistics was provided by Gilson and Abelson (1965; Abelson & Kanouse, 1966) in their studies of “the psychology of audience reaction” to “persuasive communication” in the form of generic assertions (Abelson & Kanouse, 1966, p. 171). Participants were presented with novel items such as the following: Altogether there are three kinds of tribes—Southern, Northern, Central. Southern tribes have sports magazines. Northern tribes do not have sports magazines. Central tribes do not have sports magazines. Do tribes have sports magazines? All items had the same critical feature: only one third of the target category possessed the relevant property. Despite the low prevalence, participants answered “yes” approximately 70% of the time to “Do tribes have sports magazines?” and other generic questions similar to it. Thus, people’s acceptance of the generics did not seem contingent on strong statistical evidence, leaving the door open for persuasion, and perhaps manipulation, by ill-intentioned communicators. A similar conclusion about the relationship between statistical prevalence and generics’ truth conditions emerged from the linguistics literature on this topic (e.g., Carlson, 1977; Carlson & Pelletier, 1995; Dahl, 1975; Declerck, 1986, 1991; Lawler, 1973). For example, Carlson (1977) writes that “there are many cases where […] less than half of the individuals under consideration have some certain property, yet we still can truly predicate that property of the appropriate bare plural” (p. 67), as is the case with “Birds lay eggs” and “Mosquitoes carry the West Nile virus” but also with “Lions have manes” (only males do), “Cardinals are red” (only males are), and others. He points out, moreover, that there are many properties that, although present in a majority of a kind, nevertheless cannot be predicated truthfully of that kind (e.g., more than 50% of books are paperbacks but “Books are paperbacks” is false). Thus, acceptance of a generic sentence is doubly dissociated from the prevalence of the property it refers to—not only can true generics refer to low-prevalence properties, but high-prevalence properties are also not guaranteed to be true in generic form

#### 4] Topic Lit – No unified definition of a LAW means Specification is inevitable – Topic Ed outweighs since we only have 2 months to debate the topic

Wyatt 20 Austin Wyatt 6-8-2020 "So Just What Is a Killer Robot?: Detailing the Ongoing Debate around Defining Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems" <https://www.whs.mil/News/News-Display/Article/2210967/so-just-what-is-a-killer-robot-detailing-the-ongoing-debate-around-defining-let/> (Dr. Wyatt (PhD, Australian Catholic University) is a research associate in the Values in Defence and Security Technology group at The University of New South Wales at the Australian Defence Force Academy. His research concerns autonomous weapons with a particular emphasis on their disruptive effects in Southeast Asia.)//Elmer

Developing a definition for a complete lethal autonomous weapon system (LAWS) is arguably **one of the major stumbling blocks to developing an effective international response** to the emergence of increasingly autonomous military technology, whether regulation or a developmental ban. As a result of political and practical issues, the international group of experts convened by the United Nations has been unable to generate a definition of autonomous weapon systems that **would be universally agreed** or operate as the basis for a preemptive development ban. In this gap, various actors from states to arms companies to scholars have developed competing definitions for what they would consider LAWSs.

#### 5] Clash – better in depth debates and research skills – depth o/w – deters rehashes of the same debate every round which kills ed.

#### 6] Aff ground—No advantage applies to all states because each one has different geopolitical situations which incentivizes Negs to read infinite PICs

#### Pics are comparatively worse – 1] Reversibility – 1AR can’t recover since it moots 6 min of the 1AC and 2] Quantifiability – cause meaningful time skew, 3] they get generics against aff arguments which checks back limits but we cant get those in the 1ar, 4] pics can have shady internals but the burden for affs is so much higher

#### 7] Functional Limits do check - ridiculously non sensical affs will always be answered by common sense arguments or presumption, no one is going to read an Israel-China-US aff bc it doesn’t have an advantage area

#### 8] Reasonability – good is good enough, gets back to substance and avoids bad theory debates that create a race to the bottom for competition

### 1AR – AT: T-States

#### 1] W/M – the violation makes zero sense

#### a] They have a government – this card just says they’re made up of different groups.

#### b] They have territory – you misread I-Law, it’s just a question of if they have territory at all, it doesn’t have to be static.

Matignon 20 Louis de Gouyon Matignon 1-18-2020 "THE CONDITIONS FOR SPEAKING OF A STATE IN PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW" <https://www.spacelegalissues.com/the-conditions-for-speaking-of-a-state-in-public-international-law/> (PhD in space law)//Elmer

Territory, when speaking of a State in Public International Law, is defined by the fact that every State **has in principle a territory delimited by borders with other States**. A State has guarantees, like for example the “principle of territorial integrity” or “the principle of inviolability”. The State is protected by principles of Public International Law. State-territories **can evolve**. For example, **France regularly renegotiates its borders** for infrastructural reasons; this is particularly the case with the unfrozen Franco-German border located in the middle of the Rhine.

#### 2] The CIS are States

Wookiepedia 18 [Wookieepedia 2018, "Confederacy of Independent Systems," <https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Confederacy_of_Independent_Systems>, accessed 1-18-2021]//Raunak Dua

The Confederacy of Independent Systems ([24 BBY](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/24_BBY)–[19 BBY](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/19_BBY)), abbreviated to CIS, and also known as the Separatist Alliance or the **Separatist State**, was an unrecognized breakaway polity that fought against the [Galactic Republic](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Galactic_Republic) during the [Clone Wars](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Clone_Wars) formed by thousands of [star systems](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Star_system) from the [Mid Rim](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Mid_Rim) to the [Outer Rim](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Outer_Rim_Territories) that broke away from the Republic. The Confederacy was founded on the grounds of excessive taxation and corruption within the [Galactic Senate](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Galactic_Senate) and general feeling of dissatisfaction towards and neglect by the [Core Worlds](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Core_Worlds), which contained some of the wealthiest and most prestigious [planets](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Planet) in [the galaxy](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/The_galaxy). The Confederacy was led by the former [Jedi](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Jedi) [Count](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Count) [Dooku](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Dooku) of [Serenno](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Serenno" \t "_blank" \o "Serenno), who served as its [Head of State](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Head_of_State). In addition, the Confederacy was secretly supported by several corporations, including the [Trade Federation](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Trade_Federation), headed by [Viceroy](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Viceroy_of_the_Trade_Federation) [Nute Gunray](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Nute_Gunray" \t "_blank" \o "Nute Gunray); the [InterGalactic Banking Clan](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/InterGalactic_Banking_Clan" \t "_blank" \o "InterGalactic Banking Clan), headed by [Chairman](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Chairman) [San Hill](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/San_Hill); the [Techno Union](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Techno_Union), headed by [Foreman](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Foreman) [Wat Tambor](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Wat_Tambor); the [Commerce Guild](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Commerce_Guild), headed by [Presidente](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Presidente" \t "_blank" \o "Presidente) [Shu Mai](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Shu_Mai); the [Corporate Alliance](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Corporate_Alliance), headed by [Magistrate](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Magistrate) [Passel Argente](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Passel_Argente); and the [Retail Caucus](https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Retail_Caucus)

#### No I/L to Limits – CIS meets all of their interp requirements – they have not read a “real-world” or “Earth” bright-line so they can’t access that offene

#### Our interp is more predictable – everyone has watched Star Wars, less people know nuanced I-Law – means reading a Star Wars Aff is more predicable than Azerbaijan or Turkey – stronger I/L to Limits since it’s key to core stasis.

## 1AR Kritiks

### 1AR – AT: Cap Kritik

#### 1] Perm – Do Both – we L/T the K at the level of form and content – a] Form – Extend 1AC Sweet and 1AC McCalmont – Star Wars as political commentary interrogates neoliberal ideals such as materiality and objectivity in favor of pushing creative ways of engaging the world – our project is a subversive critique of the way post-9/11 militaristic politics operate, b] Content – extend 1AC Amidala et Al – Separatists are capitalist fascists who are dominated by evil corporations like the Trade Federation

#### [AT SciFi Commodified Link] – Framing – this is non-unique – Star Wars will always be owned by Disney BUT we can use it to show subversive thought to a broader audience by infiltrating larger corporations – this is EXACTLY what the Clone Wars does by critiquing Capitalist War Machines for exploiting the deaths of innocents

#### 2] Perm – Do the Alt - either the alt is strong enough to overcome the link args or the squo thumps aff solvency

#### 3] Our itnerp – is that the 1NC has to win links to the action of the plan – that’s the only predictable point of offense – there are infinite reps

#### 4] But if they get links to our reps – I can weigh the heuristic page as offense

#### 5] Framing issue is that they have entered into the debate space too – by choosing to play the game they can’t collapse it – proves that debate isn’t collapsing

#### 6] It’s a question of what we do with this space – proves case outweighs

#### 7] The alt links as well – the university’s inclusive gesture means that it weaponizes the alt as proof that it is self reflective and allows for its own critique which legitimizes all their offense.

## 1AR – Policy

### 1AR – AT: Kalani PIC

#### 1] Perm – Do the CP – Kalani is a battle droid not a tactical droid – your ev makes this distinction for us – default to 1AC Harper – battle droids are only meant to kill – intrinsicness is the only way to determine competition since even a chair can theoretically kill

1NC Wookieepedia, "Kalani," <https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Kalani> mvp

About two years before the Battle of Yavin, the Agamar base was visited by several members of the Phoenix Cell including the former Clone Captain Rex, the Jedi Kanan Jarrus, his apprentice Ezra Bridger, and the Lasat Garazeb Orrelios. Upon being discovered by B1-268, Kalani had him capture the rebels alive for a "war game" that would end on his terms. After learning about the end of the Clone Wars, Kalani was upset that the Separatist Droid Army lost. Based on his calculations, he had estimated that the Separatists' chance of defeat was only 23.6% had the "shut-down" order not been sent.[6] Rex, for that matter, also felt let down at how the war suddenly ended instead of the clone troopers finishing their mission on the battlefield like they were trained to do. Nonetheless, Rex and Kanan insisted that the war was over and refused to participate in Kalani's war game. When Zeb objected, Kalani agreed with the Lasat, since his species had not participated in the Clone Wars. Instead, he designated Zeb as the hostage that Rex and the Jedi would have to rescue. In the end, Rex and Kanan agreed to Kalani's terms at the insistence of Ezra; who convinced Kalani to free Zeb and to allow them to take the proton bombs if they won. Kalani accepted Ezra's terms and ordered his droids to prepare for battle.[6] Kalani's simulation involved the Jedi and Rex fighting their way through Separatist droid forces back to the command center in order to free Zeb. Kalani deployed battle droids, which the rebels quickly scattered since many of the droids were old and were in need of repair. The rebels then made their way into the hangar. However, Kalani had anticipated their moves after spending years studying past battles against the Jedi and Clone troopers. Kalani deployed droidekas against them but Ezra used the Force to collapse a catwalk on top of them. In addition, the rebels' astromech droid Chopper also sent a distress signal that was intercepted by Imperial Governor Arihnda Pryce, who dispatched Imperial forces to Agamar.[6] After defeating Kalani's droidekas, the rebels made their way into the super tactical droid's command center. When Rex argued that he had won, Kalani countered that he had won the "simulation" of which side would have truly won the Clone Wars had the shut-down order not gone out. Kalani added that the droid army "at the time" would not have malfunctioned. Ezra then intervened and pointed out that this was all irrelevant because both sides had lost; the Galactic Empire was the only true winner since Palpatine had played the two sides against each other. According to Ezra's reasoning, the shut-down order was always meant to go out, the droids were always meant to lose, and the Clone Troopers were never meant to beat the droids but their own Jedi commanders. Rex and Kalani were grieved by this but the droid general could not deny Ezra's logic.[6] Ezra asked Kalani why he fought in the war at all and the tactical droid stated that the Separatists were fighting against what they perceived as the tyranny of the Republic. Ezra pointed out that the Republic had become the Empire, which was now openly tyrannical, and that the rebels had always been fighting against tyranny. He could not deny the boy's logic and agreed that they now shared a common enemy. Their base was then assaulted by Imperial forces who had been dispatched by Governor Pryce. After B1-268 and several battle droids were disintegrated when they tried to greet the Imperials, Kalani and the remaining droids joined forces with the rebels to fight the Imperials and to escape in three Neimoidian escort shuttles, which had been repaired by Chopper.[6] He informed the rebels that because of his depleted forces and that they were fighting insurmountable odds, he was unsure of what to do. When informed of the rebels' plan to escape, he was worried that it would not work, but agreed to carry it out. He ordered his droids to roll the proton bombs towards the AT-AT walkers, while another group of droids fired at Ezra and Kanan to reflect their shots towards the bombs, one of which exploded and damaged an AT-AT walker. With the Imperials momentarily distracted, Kalani, the battle droids, and the rebels escaped in the Neimoidian escort shuttles. One of the shuttles carrying battle droids was shot down, but Kalani and his remaining droids along with the rebels managed to flee into space. Once in space, Ezra said that their escape was a victory. While Kalani initially disagreed, he accepted Rex's reasoning that the youth had "ended" the Clone Wars. He was later offered to join the nascent Rebellion, though he denied their offer, stating that from their escape, they had a 1% chance of overthrowing the Empire. He later departed with his remaining droids to an unknown location.[6]

#### 2] Aff solve the Empire – conceded 1AC Saavedra which says the Clone Wars were the foundation for smoke-screening Palpatine’s transition from the Republic to the Empire – ending the Clone Wars focuses the attention on blatant Republic Corruption which prevents the Empire – outweighs since we solve a structural issue regarding the Empire while your ev is about one singular instance

#### 3] Turn – Kalani is bad – your ev is out-of-context – Kalani didn’t know the war was over and he captured the rebels which caused them to waste the proton bombs against the Empire – if he wasn’t there – they wouldn’t have been AT RISK from the empire which proves the Aff solves - here’s your ev

1NC Wookieepedia, "Kalani," <https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Kalani> mvp

About two years before the Battle of Yavin, the Agamar base was visited by several members of the Phoenix Cell including the former Clone Captain Rex, the Jedi Kanan Jarrus, his apprentice Ezra Bridger, and the Lasat Garazeb Orrelios. Upon being discovered by B1-268, Kalani had him capture the rebels alive for a "war game" that would end on his terms. After learning about the end of the Clone Wars, Kalani was upset that the Separatist Droid Army lost. Based on his calculations, he had estimated that the Separatists' chance of defeat was only 23.6% had the "shut-down" order not been sent.[6] Rex, for that matter, also felt let down at how the war suddenly ended instead of the clone troopers finishing their mission on the battlefield like they were trained to do. Nonetheless, Rex and Kanan insisted that the war was over and refused to participate in Kalani's war game. When Zeb objected, Kalani agreed with the Lasat, since his species had not participated in the Clone Wars. Instead, he designated Zeb as the hostage that Rex and the Jedi would have to rescue. In the end, Rex and Kanan agreed to Kalani's terms at the insistence of Ezra; who convinced Kalani to free Zeb and to allow them to take the proton bombs if they won. Kalani accepted Ezra's terms and ordered his droids to prepare for battle.[6] Kalani's simulation involved the Jedi and Rex fighting their way through Separatist droid forces back to the command center in order to free Zeb. Kalani deployed battle droids, which the rebels quickly scattered since many of the droids were old and were in need of repair. The rebels then made their way into the hangar. However, Kalani had anticipated their moves after spending years studying past battles against the Jedi and Clone troopers. Kalani deployed droidekas against them but Ezra used the Force to collapse a catwalk on top of them. In addition, the rebels' astromech droid Chopper also sent a distress signal that was intercepted by Imperial Governor Arihnda Pryce, who dispatched Imperial forces to Agamar.[6] After defeating Kalani's droidekas, the rebels made their way into the super tactical droid's command center. When Rex argued that he had won, Kalani countered that he had won the "simulation" of which side would have truly won the Clone Wars had the shut-down order not gone out. Kalani added that the droid army "at the time" would not have malfunctioned. Ezra then intervened and pointed out that this was all irrelevant because both sides had lost; the Galactic Empire was the only true winner since Palpatine had played the two sides against each other. According to Ezra's reasoning, the shut-down order was always meant to go out, the droids were always meant to lose, and the Clone Troopers were never meant to beat the droids but their own Jedi commanders. Rex and Kalani were grieved by this but the droid general could not deny Ezra's logic.[6] Ezra asked Kalani why he fought in the war at all and the tactical droid stated that the Separatists were fighting against what they perceived as the tyranny of the Republic. Ezra pointed out that the Republic had become the Empire, which was now openly tyrannical, and that the rebels had always been fighting against tyranny. He could not deny the boy's logic and agreed that they now shared a common enemy. Their base was then assaulted by Imperial forces who had been dispatched by Governor Pryce. After B1-268 and several battle droids were disintegrated when they tried to greet the Imperials, Kalani and the remaining droids joined forces with the rebels to fight the Imperials and to escape in three Neimoidian escort shuttles, which had been repaired by Chopper.[6] He informed the rebels that because of his depleted forces and that they were fighting insurmountable odds, he was unsure of what to do. When informed of the rebels' plan to escape, he was worried that it would not work, but agreed to carry it out. He ordered his droids to roll the proton bombs towards the AT-AT walkers, while another group of droids fired at Ezra and Kanan to reflect their shots towards the bombs, one of which exploded and damaged an AT-AT walker. With the Imperials momentarily distracted, Kalani, the battle droids, and the rebels escaped in the Neimoidian escort shuttles. One of the shuttles carrying battle droids was shot down, but Kalani and his remaining droids along with the rebels managed to flee into space. Once in space, Ezra said that their escape was a victory. While Kalani initially disagreed, he accepted Rex's reasoning that the youth had "ended" the Clone Wars. He was later offered to join the nascent Rebellion, though he denied their offer, stating that from their escape, they had a 1% chance of overthrowing the Empire. He later departed with his remaining droids to an unknown location.[6]

#### 4] No I/L U/Q – Resistance gets Proton Bombs regardless

Wookiepedia "Proton Bomb" <https://starwars.fandom.com/wiki/Proton_bomb#cite_note-WynkahthuJob-10> //Elmer

Decades later, during their war with the First Order, the Resistance carried proton bombs into combat by MG-100 StarFortress SF-17 bombers. Proton bombs in Resistance Star Fortresses were often decorated with cartoons or defiant messages towards their enemies. They were used to bomb the Fulminatrix, a Mandator IV-class Siege Dreadnought during the evacuation of D'Qar. While the bombers suffered heavy losses - especially when three bombers were lost in an explosive chain reaction from a TIE fighter crashing into one of the bombers' bomb bays - a lone bomber crewed by one survivor, Paige Tico, managed to drop its entire payload on the dreadnought, destroying both itself and the dreadnought.[3]

#### 5] Zero reason Phoenix Cell is solely key to the Rebellion – your ev is atrocious – it says it was a part but nowhere does it say it’s necessary – they weren’t even part of Return of the Jedi or a New Hope – proves they’re useless.