# 1AC R2

#### “It’s been now almost half a century since humans were last on the moon. That’s too long, we need to get back there and have a permanent base on the moon — again, like a big permanently occupied base on the moon. And then build a city on Mars to become a spacefaring civilization, a multi-planet species.” – Elon Musk[[1]](#footnote-1)

#### Fantasies of space colonization and the private appropriation of outer space rest upon techno-managerial logics grounded upon colonial and patriarchal ideals. The embrace of rational and scientific solutions to space exploration only cements liberalism and biopolitical control in space.

Schmedes ‘21 [Hannah Schmedes; finishing her Master’s in European Media Sciences at the University of Potsdam, received her Bachelor’s degree in Cultural Sciences and Philosophy from the Leuphana University of Lüneburg; 2021; “A Laboratory for Living Off-World: Re-Narrating Biosphere 2”; in “Earth and Beyond in Tumultuous Times: A Critical Atlas of the Anthropocene”, edited by Réka Patrícia Gál and Petra Löffler; pp. 163-165; https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/50006/9783957961891.pdf?sequence=1; Accessed 01-27-2022] AK

As biologist Danielle Lee states, the vocabulary used to describe the dream of colonizing Mars is based on imagery of imperial colonialism (2015a; 2015b). Beyond that, it is depicting the heroicness of male colonizers who conquered and organized the chaotic, unknown, dangerous and wild continents, often drawing parallels of the fertility of the land with that of Indigenous women (Blunt & Rose 1994, 8–14). The distinction between chaotic nature and orderly (space) technology runs along intersecting colonial and patriarchal lines (Mies 1998, 77). Gerard Kitchen O’Neill, a physicist and name giver of the space settlement concept the “O’Neill cylinder”, based his visions on the frontier myth that came with the first European settlements on the American continent and whose “function is to provide a historical account and an ideological justification of national development, and a repertoire of exemplary fables … that explain and justify the development of American nationality as the product of this perennial advance into the wilderness, or the ‘virgin land’” (Slotkin 2015, 1). This frontier myth also appealed to John Allen, leading figure in the story of Synergia Ranch and Biosphere 2, who “considered himself a son of the Western frontier” (Reider 2009, 18). In the 1975 Fall issue of The CoEvolution Quarterly, another editorship of Stewart Brand that grew out of the Supplement to the Whole Earth Catalog, O’Neill writes: “The human race stands now on the threshold of a new frontier, whose richness surpasses a thousand fold that of the new western world of five hundred years ago” (O’Neill 1978, 209). At this time, O’Neill worked on designing space habitats with his students at Princeton University and his well-known book The High Frontier: Human Colonies in Space, in which he envisioned space colonies as suburban, middle-class, liberal communities much like a new “America in the skies” (Kilgore 2003, 156–168; Turner 2006, 126).

According to Anker, “space colonies came to represent rational, orderly, and wise management, in contrast to the irrational, disorderly, and ill-managed Earth. Some of them built Biosphere 2 in Arizona to prepare for colonization of Mars and to create a model for how life on Earth should be organized” (2005, 240). In this context, Biosphere 2 figures as a topos illustrating the relation between ecosystem science, counterculture, space flight, and colonial expansion. It contains not only the beliefs and cultural motifs of a time in which the Cold War nuclear arms race and environmental activism culminated in apocalyptic imaginings of a near future. The case of Biosphere 2 additionally displays the “Western” modern desire to create a technologically enhanced and controlled second nature that is fundamentally and materially linked with colonial exploitation, ultimately unfolding how “Western” utopias are unconceivable without the history of colonialism and misogyny.3

#### Outer space was never meant to be controlled or understood with Western science – the resolution’s insistence on the cosmotechnical control of nature creates a psychic disorientation that traps us in a new era of techno-capitalism, which subsumes the Earth as billionaires try to escape finitude.

Dunker & Hui ‘20 [Anders Dunker; Norwegian writer and journalist; Yuk Hui; Ph.D. thesis at Goldsmiths College in London, postdoctoral studies in France, and Habilitation thesis in Germany, teaches at the Leuphana University and Bauhaus University; 06-09-2020; “On Technodiversity: A Conversation with Yuk Hui”; Los Angeles Review of Books; https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/on-technodiversity-a-conversation-with-yuk-hui/; Accessed 01-27-2022] AK

And what is cosmotechnics, exactly?

For the Greeks, “cosmos” means an ordered world. At the same time, the concept points to what lies beyond the Earth. Morality is first and foremost something that concerns the human realm. Cosmotechnics, as I understand it, is the unification of the moral order and cosmic order through technical activities. If we compare Greece and China in ancient times, we discover that they have very different understandings of the cosmos, and very different conceptions of morality as well. The arbitration between them also takes place in different ways, with different technologies. A cosmotechnics of the tianxia type is no longer possible in a time that no longer has a conception of “Heaven,” as people did in the past. Like other big nations, China has satellites orbiting the Earth. The heavens have become a secular place, utilized by humans, and can no longer play a role as a morally legitimizing power.

In Recursivity and Contingency, you speak about the need to “recosmicize the world.” You borrow this term from Augustin Berque, who pointed out that the modern world no longer has a cosmos, understood as a moral and meaningful order, and that colonization by the West has robbed other cultures of their distinctive conceptions of the cosmos. He says that the universe, as it is described in science, has nothing to do with the classical cosmos, since scientific explanation has no moral significance whatsoever. Does this mean that we are faced with the task of recosmicizing not only our world, but the universe itself? Is the universe, discovered by astronomy, still waiting to be given a proper moral significance?

When we think of astrophysics, we see the universe as a thermodynamic system that inexorably moves toward destruction and heat-death, where stars are nothing but basic elements in nuclear reactions and where their twinkling has nothing to do with us. In this sense, it seems absurd to recosmicize the Earth and the universe; it can’t lead to anything but superficial mysticism and naïveté. Astrophysics only informs us of certain facts about the universe. It has no ambitions of telling us how to live. What kind of life should we imagine in light of recent astrophysical discoveries? Physics has no ambition to answer these questions.

“Recosmicizing” doesn’t mean giving some mystique back to the stars and cosmos, or giving technology a mystical meaning, but rather understanding that we must develop ways of life that solve the conflict between modern science and tradition, between technology and mysticism — whether we choose to talk about the Chinese Dao or Heidegger’s Sein. We must give the non-rational a place in a culture that is otherwise rational — the way, for example, that poetry gives the unknown a place in communication through an unconventional and paradoxical use of language. Art and philosophy can’t choose science as their point of departure. If they do, they become footnotes to positivism. They should not abandon science either, but rather tend to it and show the way to other modes of understanding the world. To paraphrase Georges Canguilhem, we must return technology to life.

What about people who want to develop new technologies in order to establish a new life in outer space? Does this also represent a cosmotechnics? For instance, the rocket billionaires, Bezos and Musk, who dream of colonies in space and a colonization of Mars?

There is a great passage in Nietzsche’s The Gay Science (1882), where he talks about “the horizon of the infinite.” It describes the moderns who have abandoned land for the pursuit of the infinite, yet, when they are in the middle of the ocean, there is nothing more fearful than the infinite — there is no more home to return to. The desire of the moderns, described by Nietzsche, continues to produce an effect of disorientation, while the sentiment that there is no longer any home to return to provides a huge market for psychotherapy and spiritual salvation. The longing for the infinite transports us toward the inhuman.

For Jean-François Lyotard, there are both positive and negative infinities, which are connected to different forms of rationality. Positive inhumanity captures us in rigid technological systems, like we see in China with the social credit system. The positive inhuman is one that is “more interior in myself than me” — for example, God for St. Augustine. We humans carry something inhuman in us, which is irreducible to the human and which maintains the highest intimacy with us. At the outset of his book L’Inhumain (1998), Lyotard asks if the ultimate goal for science is not that of preparing for the death of the sun, which, granted, lies unimaginably in the future, but which also entails the destruction of all living beings on Earth.

Rocket billionaires, who are all transhumanists, want to overcome finitude: the finitude of human life and of life as such. This longing for the infinite also implies no limit to capital accumulation. Overcoming human limitations — the search for eternal life — also implies an infinite market. In a way, the same happens in space exploration: investors want to profit from the Earth losing its meaning, as if leaving the planet were a matter of leaving one spaceship to enter another. I don’t think it is wrong to explore, or to try to understand the universe, but the conquest we see today seems to me to be merely a preparation for tomorrow’s consumerism. Transhumanists impose on us a false choice because they connect the question of the future of human existence with the question of immortality and describe Earth as a mere spacecraft.

In your last book, there is a passage about the secularization of space in which you mention that Elon Musk has launched his Tesla roadster into orbit around the sun. You see this as the first step in the commercialization of the cosmos and the next step as mining on other planets, effectively reducing them to mere natural resources, raw material.

#### The privatization of space locks in totalitarianism as space billionaires clear the path for infinite growth capitalism, bolstering surveillance. Only a rupture of space privatization can break capitalism’s cycle of consumption by achieving true satisfaction.

McGowan ‘16 [Todd McGowan; professor of film studies at the University of Vermont; 2016; “Capitalism and Desire: The Psychic Cost of Free Markets; Columbia University Press; pp. 66-69] AK

But as Hannah Arendt makes clear in her famous study of Nazism and Stalinism, these systems did not develop out of an embrace of universalized public space but rather out of a profound commitment to privacy. This is a point in Origins of Totalitarianism that few subsequent thinkers have noticed, but it fits within Arendt’s critique of privacy developed in other works. For this reason, it is perhaps the key insight of her analysis. As Arendt describes how totalitarian rule emerges, she claims, “Nothing proved easier to destroy than the privacy and private morality of people who thought of nothing but safeguarding their private lives.” It is precisely the attempt to cling to one’s private world and avoid the public that nourishes the totalitarian impulse that wipes out all privacy. A commitment to the public world itself sustains the private world as the product of the former.

In this sense, totalitarianism is not the reverse side of liberalism’s insistence on sustaining the private world at all costs, but instead the ultimate end point of this insistence. The more one seeks to safeguard privacy and clear the path for capitalist relations of production, the more one also leaves space for the rise of totalitarianism. The totalitarian leader might eliminate privacy but is able to do so because a commitment to privacy predominates. One cannot imagine the rise of totalitarianism without capitalism’s destruction of the public world.

Still, concern about capitalism’s destruction of the public world seems misplaced in the context of contemporary events. The greatest threat today seems to be the elimination of privacy, not the destruction of the public world. There may be whistle-blowers who come forward to expose secret assaults on the public, but they are in prison or exile for bringing the evisceration of privacy to light. Our privacy appears imperiled in the face of assaults from both the state and from the corporate world. It has become increasingly difficult to exist off the capitalist grid, to find a private place in which one might challenge the dominance of the capitalist system.

We live today in a surveillance society in which there is increasingly less space where subjects can act without being observed. If capitalism ushers subjects into a private world, it is also developing a system of surveillance that appears to eliminate the possibility of privacy. Though we can be reasonably sure that no one surreptitiously opens our letters and reseals them, we can be also be reasonably certain that some system is actually monitoring our e-mail and cell phone communications as well as observing us for much of the day. Surveillance has become the norm in contemporary capitalism.

But widespread surveillance doesn’t have the effect of eliminating our investment in privacy and our private worlds. Instead, surveillance—and knowledge about that surveillance—has the effect of heightening our commitment to privacy. When surveillance threatens the private world, we respond by identifying entirely as private beings, which is precisely the response the surveillance aims to trigger. The ideological function of surveillance is not the elimination of privacy but the creation of subjects who see themselves only in terms of privacy. Surveillance leads one to think of oneself as an essentially private being whose private life threatens to become visible.

Whether one responds to surveillance with outrage or acquiescence, the fact of thinking about oneself as a being subjected to surveillance already indicates a turn away from the public and toward the private. In this sense, surveillance ipso facto privatizes us. This is clearest in those who see increasing surveillance as an existential threat that they must defend themselves against. They retreat into enclaves of privacy and erect more and more barriers to any public contact in order to preserve their private worlds. But by doing so, they play right into the hands of the structure they believe they are opposing. They accept that they have a private world and a private being to treasure. But one cannot defeat the privatization of the world by retreating into privacy.

Those who simply accept surveillance often do not escape its ideological hold either, though their investment in privacy is not as easy to see. Surveillance ensconces subjects in a self-relation built around privacy, and going about one’s daily existence under surveillance tends to focus one’s attention on one’s private interests. This is evident in many consumer interactions with companies on the Internet. On the Internet, surveillance is even more thoroughgoing than it is in London, the city with the most surveillance cameras in the world.

As everyone who has ever made an online purchase knows, companies track the electronic behavior of individuals in order to know how best to market to them. They keep records on the websites individuals visit, the products they purchase, and contacts they make on social networks. Most individuals tacitly appreciate this tracking because it facilitates the act of consumption. Amazon.com knows which coupon to send to one customer, and Nike knows which shoe to advertise to another. Everyone comes out ahead. Surveillance facilitates the consumption process by eliminating barriers to the object of desire. It is easier to find what one wants on Amazon.com because the company has tracked previous purchases and browsing activity. When one accepts this easy access to the object, one has adopted the attitude toward desire that capitalist society constantly encourages in its subjects.

Other acts of surveillance, however, have no direct bearing on subjects accessing their objects of desire. Surveillance of private phone calls in the United States by the National Security Agency or the millions of surveillance cameras placed throughout Great Britain observing the minutiae of individual activity do not make it easier for me to accumulate. But these apparatuses do function as evidence for the essentially private nature of existence. They constantly remind us that we have something to hide, something that belongs to us alone.

The premise that animates the surveillance society is that the subject is an essentially private being. In public interactions the subject dissimulates and obfuscates its true desire, but in private that desire becomes evident. When I’m in public, I alter my actions according to the expectations of the Other, but when I’m in private, no such barrier exists. I’m free to be myself, which is why the system of surveillance focuses on the private sphere and increasing our investment in it.

In the face of an almost ubiquitous surveillance perpetuated by both state and corporate forces, it seems ludicrous to lament the decline of the public world. And yet, our satisfaction depends on this public world and the obstacle to desire it erects. Threats to privacy are not threats to the subject’s mode of satisfaction. Privacy itself is the threat. Surveillance is only a danger insofar as it convinces us that we have an essentially private being that might be subjected to surveillance. The subject’s essence is always outside of itself and readily visible to the public. For the subject that recognizes the necessity of the obstacle, there is nothing for the surveillance camera to see. The subject necessarily exposes itself in the form of its subjectivity.

In the public world, the subject is a citoyen, someone engaged in affairs that concern everyone. But one comes to be a citoyen only through recognizing that one’s status as homme depends on the obstacles of the public world. In this sense, Rousseau’s distinction breaks down when we analyze how the homme satisfies itself. This is also the problem with all the critiques of the emergence of the homme and the disappearance of the citoyen that populate contemporary political thought. The retreat into privacy that increasingly marks capitalist society cannot be overcome with moral calls for engagement with the commons. The most effective counter to privacy lies in showing that the retreat into privacy is actually a retreat from the subject’s own satisfaction, which depends on the public world that the private subject tries to flee. As long as we remain committed to obtaining the object (whatever that object is), the private world will seem like the only site for satisfaction. But there is no satisfaction for the subject without the act of engaging the public. When we recognize the necessity of the public trauma, we accede to our status as citoyens.

#### Private control in outer space is grounded in cosmobiopolitics, operating through informatic control. By constructing a security apparatus around the globe, tech in outer space domesticates the universe, imprinting the human onto a living milieu to govern life itself.

Damjanov ‘15 [Katarina Damjanov; PhD, a Senior Lecturer and the Discipline Lead in Media and Communication at the University of Western Australia; 2015; “The matter of media in outer space: Technologies of cosmobiopolitics”; Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 2015, Vol. 33(5) 889–906; Accessed 02-02-2022] AK

Media technologies occupy the earth’s exterior as extraterrestrial footprints of global capitalism and its contemporary ‘high-tech’ grasp over vital material and social processes. Their presence in space is at once a result and a resource of the technological evolution of politico-economic regimes grounded in exploitative control of the productive and reproductive ambits of life – what Michel Foucault introduced in contemporary intellectual thought as the order of biopolitics. Foucault’s (1990, 2004, 2007, 2008) work on the genealogy of power over life traced the advancement of its conceptual and operative framework from the principle of sovereign rule over a territory and subjects into a complex governmental platform of biopower whose twofold agenda strives to harness the conduct of human individuals and the life-processes of human populations. While the former, discipline, prescribes and enforces behavioural standards for maximising individual productivities, the latter, biopolitics, regulates the biological and social registers of life to strategically increase the overall productive potential of human living space by seizing, as Foucault (2004: 245) summarised it, ‘control over relations between the human race. . . and their environment, the milieu in which they live’. The unfolding of the biopolitical episteme in the era of techno- centred capitalism subsumed the bounty of ‘life itself’ under the calculative procedures of informatics, logistics and strategic management – and media, communication and information technologies have come to play a fundamental role in its current practices. As works which extended Foucault’s thesis to contemporary techno-logic culture such as Gilles Deleuze’s (1992) ‘Postscript on the Societies of Control’ and Alexander Galloway’s (2004) Protocol have demonstrated, these technologies now determine the conditions in which any human action can occur. Media devices that reside in outer space are necessarily bound up with the question of biopolitics in its ‘high-tech’ era – what commenced with Sputnik as a military contest to secure states’ territorial and geopolitical interests now extends to an extra-territorial edifice of technical media mobilised to fortify global biopolitical regimes. From satellites sent to orbit the earth and collect and relay data to global communication networks, spatial positioning and navigation systems, weather and climate monitoring centres and surveillance grids, to spacecraft dispatched to measure, evaluate and report on other celestial environments and events, these technologies have become a decisive constituent of the security apparatus that underpins contemporary biopolitics.

Today, when space-based media lie at the crux of global mechanisms of control, their extraterrestrial position requires us to reconsider the scale at which the currents of biopolitics assume their evolutionary course. The ever-increasing obsessions with advancing mediatic devices with which to inspect and direct the routes of life, from its molecular minutiae to the complex ecologies of the living, facilitate a continuous rescaling of the spectrum of the biopolitical: to govern ‘life itself’ involves, as Eugene Thacker (2009) suggests, encountering and overcoming a multiplicity of scalar restraints. With the possibility of media technologies in outer space, aspirations to strategically interfere with, and capitalise upon, life and the living are presented with a distinct window of opportunity: terrestrial constraints can be circumvented. While providing the essential means for sustaining biopolitical regimes, extraterrestrially situated media apparatus expedites both the micro and macro-scale of their implementation, permitting both their intensive, ubiquitous, terrestrially oriented assertion, and their potentially unlimited spatial expansion outwards. The extraterrestrial presence of media technologies thus impose the need to uncover global topologies of power and governance not only at their planetary level, but also to ‘un-earth’ them within the scale of their cosmic prospects. I describe this extra-planetary capacity of biopolitical progress conveyed by human media advances in space as a nascent order of what I call ‘cosmobiopolitcs’. I use the term in an attempt to both affirm its continuity with a research trajectory established by Foucault, but also to emphasise the radical transformations engendered by the extraterrestrial. I approach media technologies in outer space as a symptomatic register of this cosmobiopolitical leap, suggesting that they not only enable biopolitical gestures to be replicated off-world, but themselves have a decisive impact upon ways in which ‘life itself’ is conceptualised and subjected to techno- logic forms of control. Increasingly inflecting the human drive to be more and have more, they have become critical to the unfolding of biopolitical regimes.

Media technologies that reside in outer space demand site-specific analysis – unlike terrestrially bound devices, they inhabit what is external to earth. Both as a physical and as a discursive site, the location of outer space conditions their mediatic capacity to sculpt human societies. In 1967, the international law declared that outer space was a domain of global commons, placing it outside territorial and property rights and under international regimes of governance. Yet, while this legal provision framed outer space as a ‘common heritage’ of humanity, it remained essentially an inhuman environment; all our encounters with it are always mediated – from the astronaut suit that keeps the human body alive to the Hubble Telescope images of faraway galaxies that once existed before the dawn of our time. Positioned in outer space to overcome its fundamental incompatibility with humans, these devices perform their primary function of technical media, acting as ‘mediators between man and nature’ (Simondon, 1980: 1) and domesticating the unforgiving expanses of the extraterrestrial as a ‘living milieu’ onto which the human and its vital processes could be imprinted and subsequently governed. However, except for a few astronauts currently on roster in the International Space Station, outer space is generally empty of humans, and this absence brings our biopolitical bonds with media technologies into sharp relief: claiming and retaining outer space as a part of the human milieu entirely relies upon our ability to create, manage and control these objects. The biological imperatives of securing the desired modes of relationship between humans and their milieu necessarily involve governance of objects (Thacker, 2009), in particular those of a technical kind, which are, as Gilbert Simondon (1980) and Bernard Stiegler (1998) invite us to consider, historically inseparable from human life. But in the inhuman milieu of outer space, technologies are no longer only a means, or a side concern of governance, but its primary and central objects. Supported by an earth- bound pyramid of elite scientific labour and sophisticated equipment, the human relationship with these remotely positioned technologies is indicative of the readjustment of the scope of the biopolitical. It necessitates shifting the governmental focus from living humans towards inanimate objects and their own life in space, and acknowledging the complexities produced in this interweaving of the human and the technological.

#### Power in a control society is exercised not through repression but instant communication and continuous control. The private appropriation of outer space is the latest tactic of control society to modulate the enunciation of behavior and subjectivity through fascist mechanisms.

Deleuze and Negri’90 |Gilles Deleuze and Antonio Negri, “Gilles Deleuze in conversation with Antonio Negri,” <http://www.generation-online.org/p/fpdeleuze3.htm>|KZaidi

Negri: In your book on Foucault, and then again in your TV interview at INA,6 you suggest we should look in more detail at three kinds of power: sovereign power, disciplinary power, and above all the control of "communication " that's on the way to becoming hegemonic. On the one hand this third scenario relates to the most perfect form of domination, extending even to speech and imagination, but on the other hand any man, any minority, any singularity, is more than ever before potentially able to speak out and thereby recover a greater degree of freedom. In the Marxist Utopia of the Grundrisse, communism takes precise­ly the form of a transversal organization of free individuals built on a tech­nology that makes it possible. Is communism still a viable option? Maybe in a communication society it's less Utopian than it used to be? Deleuze: We're definitely moving toward "control" societies that are no longer exactly disciplinary. Foucault's often taken as the theorist of discipli­nary societies and of their principal technology, confinement (not just in hospitals and prisons, but in schools, factories, and barracks). But he was actually one of the first to say that we're moving away from dis­ciplinary societies, we've already left them behind. We're moving toward control societies that no longer operate by confining people but through continuous control and instant communication. Bur­roughs was the first to address this. People are of course constantly talking about prisons, schools, hospitals: the institutions are breaking down. But they're breaking down because they're fighting a losing battle. New kinds of punishment, education, health care are being stealth­ily introduced. Open hospitals and teams providing home care have been around for some time. One can envisage education becoming less and less a closed site differentiated from the workspace as anoth­er closed site, but both disappearing and giving way to frightful con­tinual training, to continual monitoring7 of worker-schoolkids or bureaucrat-students. They try to present this as a reform of the school system, but it's really its dismantling. In a control-based system noth­ing's left alone for long. You yourself long ago suggested how work in Italy was being transformed by forms of part-time work done at home, which have spread since you wrote (and by new forms of circulation and distribution of products). One can of course see how each kind of society corresponds to a particular kind of machine—with simple mechanical machines corresponding to sovereign societies, thermo-dynamic machines to disciplinary societies, cybernetic machines and computers to control societies. But the machines don't explain any­thing, you have to analyze the collective arrangements of which the machines are just one component. Compared with the approaching forms of ceaseless control in open sites, we may come to see the harsh­est confinement as part of a wonderful happy past. The quest for "universals of communication" ought to make us shudder. It's true that, even before control societies are fully in place, forms of delinquency or resistance (two different things) are also appearing. Computer pira­cy and viruses, for example, will replace strikes and what the nine­teenth century called "sabotage" ("clogging" the machinery) .8 You ask whether control or communication societies will lead to forms of resis­tance that might reopen the way for a communism understood as the "transversal organization of free individuals." Maybe, I don't know. But it would be nothing to do with minorities speaking out. Maybe speech and communication have been corrupted. They're thoroughly per­meated by money—and not by accident but by their very nature. We've got to hijack speech. Creating has always been something dif­ferent from communicating. The key thing may be to create vacuoles of noncommunication, circuit breakers, so we can elude control.

#### Thus, in response to the unjust appropriation of outer space by private entities, I affirm the hacking of technologies of control in outer space.

#### The aff is a form of cyberguerilla warfare that targets and exploits system vulnerabilities in private space companies. By using new mediums of communication to break down cybernetic power structures, the aff’s guerilla tactics spell the death of western power structures.

Interior Ministry'18 |The Interior Ministry comprises of an anonymous group of guerilla militants and semioticians. “Guerilla Semiotix,” from *ALIENIST Magazine #4* (December 2018): RAGE AGAINST THE ALGORITHM. Page 84-88. <https://alienistmanifesto.files.wordpress.com/2018/12/Alienist_Magazine-4_December_2018-1.pdf>|KZaidi

CYBERGUERRILLA WARFARE KNOWS NO BOUNDARIES Cyberspace favours the attacker. The cyberguerrilla is able to mask their electronic identity in a cyberspace that changes constantly. New systems mean new vulnerabilities. Firewalls & intrusion prevention systems will thwart only so many attacks. Defenders must be right all the time; the attacker, only once. Negligence with portable drives, outdated virus protection, compromised passwords, wireless code insertion, physical breach, social engineering, & dozens of other exploits are commonplace & regularly open the door to an attack. Socalled realworld barriers have no counterparts in cyberspace. Neither electronic nor air-gapped barriers offer sanctuary. As long as a device contains a processor & some memory, it can be accessed, affected & controlled. Thus, it is important to understand that the defender’s main strategy often lies in their response after an attack has already occurred; or “active defence” (offensive action) in anticipation of attacks that have not yet occurred. Despite appearances, as in the “realworld” no cyberattack is immune to countermeasures, given adequate resources. (It must be assumed that such countermeasures won’t be restricted by jurisdiction: in any kind of guerrilla action no tactical value can be placed upon the supposed asymmetry of “legal process,” unless as a last resort.) Thus, as in “realworld” guerrilla warfare, every cyberattack must be prepared within a larger strategy of CONTINUOUS EVASION. CYBERGUERRILLA ACTIONS FORM A DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM What can be done once can usually be done again. By stealth & “elegance” of design & execution, cyberguerrilla actions can accumulate in such a way that their true character will remain unrecognised & uncommunicated, & may thus be perpetuated in a broad configuration. While every impression should be given that attacks are isolated & opportunistic incidents, ideally they should be coordinated in such a way as to be amplified in larger logistical & control systems: electrical grids, financial systems, air & rail transport, shipping, distribution centres, water & sewage systems, even GPS. The motivation for cyberguerrilla actions cannot be “spectacular.” Excepting material verification (blackouts, downed networks, etc.), it must be assumed that state & corporate defenders will veil even the fact of attack in secrecy, unless it is advantageous or unavoidable for them to do otherwise. “Outing” the enemy’s vulnerabilities is nevertheless of dubious tactical value & of short-lived effect: indeed, the actual frequency of such occurrences has had no other consequence than to routinise both the systems of defence & the public’s (i.e. market’s) response. The pursuit of spectacular actions has, in general, the consequence of negating an integrated strategy & diminishing the likelihood of success in executing actions of a more substantial, further-reaching nature. Spectacularism has been the most frequent downfall of guerrilla operations. For this reason, but not only for this reason, NO CYBERGUERRILLA ACTION SHOULD EVER BE PUBLICLY “CLAIMED.” THE CYBERGUERRILLA IS AN ATTACK ALGORITHM It is an often-repeated truism that cyberattacks are self-defeating, since they call into being the very means of overcoming them. Yet institutional & organisational inertia often mitigates against the effectiveness of such means. And just as with purely technical responses, the inter-governmental & corporate intelligence-sharing that frequently proceeds in a knee-jerk fashion following such attacks often PRODUCES NEW VULNERABILITIES. For this reason, the most effective responses to cyberguerrilla actions are often restricted to classic indications techniques rather than to Big Brother panopticism. While the tendency of the Corporate-State Apparatus is nevertheless to aggregate its responses into a “dynamic defence,” this can have the eff ect of amplifying the institutional inertia it is designed to overcome into broader systemic perturbations of which it is unaware. It remains an important tactical consideration of the cyberguerrilla, then, to determine how a limited action might be used to cause a system to more profoundly COMPROMISE ITSELF. THE CYBERGUERRILLA IS A CONTESTANT IN AN UNDISCLOSED STRUGGLE The consensus view is that the “threat of & opportunity for real damage from cyberspace is increasing,” yet this is only a measure of the ambitions of the Corporate-State Apparatus to fully integrate all aspects of everyday life into its control structures. This “threat,” therefore, represents the degree of in-built crisis on which the increasing degrees of that control are justified. “Cyberspace is a domain & a global commons whose reach is being constantly expanded by wired, wireless, & sneaker-netted connectors. Everything from home thermostats to the critical infrastructure that is vital to daily life (water, power, manufacturing) is within its reach. It is ‘shared by all’ & dominated by none” (RAND). But there is nothing at all neutral about the terrain of cyberspace. Nor are these “threats” in any way the existential risk a supposedly benevolent Corporate-State Apparatus pretends them to be, but rather a low-level attrition in what is otherwise an active battlespace. The task of the cyberguerrilla is to determine what is NOT being represented in this threat-assessment – which, far from describing a forced move, is in fact a calculation-in-advance in the larger struggle for CYBERSPACE DOMINATION. Thus the cyberguerrilla is not only tasked with exploiting the vulnerabilities of the cybernetic supply chain, but of the GENERAL SITUATION arising from the expanded hegemonic struggle that drives it. By such means does the true nature of the Corporate-State Apparatus come more clearly into view as the very architecture of that struggle itself. CYBERGUERRILLA ACTIONS HOLD A MIRROR UP TO POWER Invisibility is the prime consideration. Techniques of coordination & communication are key to the success of any cyberguerrilla action, & must be given equal consideration as to the action itself. Rapid communications evolutions favour small, agile groups able to quickly leverage technological advancements against the Corporate-State Apparatus’ advantage in material, financial & technological resources. Increasingly this advantage is restored through the analysis of newly conventionalised modes of communication, designated broadly as social media. “The growth of social media as an effective data source for understanding the information environment has made it more important than ever for the U.S. military to develop a robust capacity for social media analytics in support of information operations” (RAND). It must be appreciated that all public communication concerning cyberguerrilla actions – wherever there is a transmissible record or log of any kind – ultimately occurs in the domain of social media, thus providing intelligence about time-frames, demographics, organisational structure, areas of activity, network reach & psychological profi le. “Geotagged posts can supplement social media analysis, helping identify the geographic spread of ideas or areas of particularly strong or weak support for a cause, group, or idea. Network analysis provides additional potential benefits in planning efforts to promote or counter the spread of specific ideas or information. Analysing the data generated by social media posts against metadata & the demographics of users associated with the accounts can help identify influencers in a social network. Image classification algorithms can aggregate & describe the kinds of images shared on social media, which, when analysed alongside other data with geoinferencing & mapping software, can visualise changes in local populations preferences & attitudes” (RAND). Yet these means can also be used in the planning & execution of cyberguerrilla actions against elements of the Corporate-State Apparatus. THE CYBERGUERRILLA PRODUCES FALSE INDICATORS The semantics of cyberguerrilla action must remain indecipherable. Both the true nature of the action & its intent must remain opaque before, during & after. Wherever possible, all visible patterns of activity should be randomly distributed or concealed within a general background noise. Increasingly, social media data is representative of entire populations (cognitive, informational, physical) – with the consequence that conspicuous absence from media platforms can be as indicative as conspicuous presence. Where social media presence is employed e.g. for disinformation, it must therefore be conscientiously desynchronised from all cyberguerrilla activity while simultaneously presenting a false picture. In their most basic form, maps of individual user-relationships & interactions on social media platforms can be used to identify members of a cyberguerrilla cell. Researchers have been able to detect nuances in the dynamics of interpersonal networks by analysing the information posted by users on these platforms. Similar means, however, can be used to target security operations themselves by discovering human & infrastructural vulnerabilities via the unsecured circulation of sensitive online data & metadata (e.g. geotags automatically embedded in photos taken with mobile devices are visible in social media uploads, etc.). In this way the enemy’s “active defence” may be turned to advantage by combining counter-analysis & the construction of persuasive decoys. The use of such decoys need not be restricted to the task of evasion in the planning, execution or aftermath of cyberguerrilla actions, but can also be means of attack in & of themselves. THE CYBERGUERRILLA IS AUTOPOIETIC It is necessary to understand the security culture & logic of the enemy. Above all, it is necessary to understand how mitigation strategies & defence systems are segmented, & where automated & manual systems meet or overlap in the “cyber kill chain” (early warning, inbound-protect, activity detection, outbound-protect, etc.). It is also necessary to understand the history & logic of cyberwarfare itself. Nothing must be left to assumption. This means pursuing a close analysis of the prevailing financial, heuristic & effects-based models of cybersecurity in relation to critical infrastructure (RAND, Lockheed Martin, Goldman Sachs, GCHQ, NSA, the Australian Signals Directorate…) as well as identifying those technical limitations to be exploited. Such analysis is the task of every cyberguerrilla. Ultimately, this should be undertaken with a view to planning cyberguerrilla actions that, wherever possible, can be automated & made fully autonomous, on the model e.g. of a GAN (Generative Adversarial Network). The CYBERGUERRILLA CONCEPT aims to expand the asymmetrical domain of cyberguerrilla action by decoupling its operations from identifiable “realworld” actors – employing weapons capable of analysis & organisation, & of exercising initiative in offence, & which ideally leave no trace.

#### There’s a window for hackers to exploit vulnerabilities in private space companies now.

Akoto ‘20 [William Akoto; Postdoctoral Research Fellow, University of Denver; 02-12-2020; “Hackers could shut down satellites – or turn them into weapons”; The Conversation; https://theconversation.com/hackers-could-shut-down-satellites-or-turn-them-into-weapons-130932; Accessed 02-01-2022] AK

Last month, SpaceX became the operator of the world’s largest active satellite constellation. As of the end of January, the company had 242 satellites orbiting the planet with plans to launch 42,000 over the next decade. This is part of its ambitious project to provide internet access across the globe. The race to put satellites in space is on, with Amazon, U.K.-based OneWeb and other companies chomping at the bit to place thousands of satellites in orbit in the coming months.

These new satellites have the potential to revolutionize many aspects of everyday life – from bringing internet access to remote corners of the globe to monitoring the environment and improving global navigation systems. Amid all the fanfare, a critical danger has flown under the radar: the lack of cybersecurity standards and regulations for commercial satellites, in the U.S. and internationally. As a scholar who studies cyber conflict, I’m keenly aware that this, coupled with satellites’ complex supply chains and layers of stakeholders, leaves them highly vulnerable to cyberattacks.

If hackers were to take control of these satellites, the consequences could be dire. On the mundane end of scale, hackers could simply shut satellites down, denying access to their services. Hackers could also jam or spoof the signals from satellites, creating havoc for critical infrastructure. This includes electric grids, water networks and transportation systems.

#### Use a framework of cosmobiopolitics to theorize the techno-appropriation of outer space. This novel method reinterprets biopolitics to understand how post-planetary capitalism shapes motives of expansion and exploration to exert new techniques of control.

Damjanov ‘15 [Katarina Damjanov; PhD, a Senior Lecturer and the Discipline Lead in Media and Communication at the University of Western Australia; 2015; “The matter of media in outer space: Technologies of cosmobiopolitics”; Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 2015, Vol. 33(5) 889–906; Accessed 02-02-2022] AK

A distinct stage of our techno-scientific endeavour to exceed our ‘natural’, human and terrestrial limitations, mediatic exploration of space fuels the vectors of technology and currents of life beyond the globe, entangling them into relations which might appear uncannily familiar yet utterly alien to us now. Ongoing media advances in outer space are a major means for shaping what the 2014 symposium at Parsons New School of Design invoked as the contours of ‘Post-Planetary Capital’, heralding a host of intersecting trajectories surrounding ways of thinking at a scale beyond the planetary.1 A critical focus upon the central role of media technologies appears as a crucial contribution to the various arcs of speculative inquiry into ‘post-planetary capital’; this is not least because the operations of these technologies are at the core of all political, scientific, economic and environmental conceptions of human ways of life outside the planet. Media technologies not only underwrite the spatial progress of capitalism, its re-scaling of the commons and the transmutation of its biopolitical rationalities, these objects themselves exert their own material and social effects, providing directional impetus to the idea of planetary and extra-planetary ‘capital’. In this sense, they are not merely artefacts of techno-scientific capability or markers of the assertion of property, nor are they just the scaffolding which supports the evolution of media cultures. They act as a fulcrum upon which the productive agencies of the human and the technological can reposition themselves within the arena of life, demanding continuous reappraisal and redesign of the scope and techniques of its control. This paper brings these diverse technologies together under the analytic rubric of ‘media’ to situate them within the conceptual framework of cosmobiopolitics. In the following sections, I first historicise their role in the articulation of governmental strategies that sustain capitalist expansion and biopolitical control of human ‘living space’. I then consider our mediatic relations with the ‘extra-planetary’ through two case studies; the first on satellites and their debris in earth’s orbital space and the second on steps towards the establishment of interplanetary Internet networks, exploring their potential to sculpt the material and social horizon of our futures on and beyond the globe.

#### Insurrectionist movements are ongoing resistances that happen in our thoughts, actions, provocations, and explorations. Our model of debate seeks to allow for beautiful insurgencies from the ground up. This is work without a beginning, without an end, a constant planning as opposed to policy that we take with us wherever we go. Shukaitis and Graeber 7 Stevphen Shukaitis is Senior Lecturer at the University of Essex, Centre for Work and Organization, and a member of the Autonomedia editorial collective. David Rolfe Graeber is an American anthropologist and anarchist activist, perhaps best known for his 2011 volume Debt: The First 5000 Years. He is professor of anthropology at the London School of Economics. “Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations // Collective Theorization.” ISBN 978-1-904859-35-2.  Library of Congress Number: 2006924199 ©2007)

Thoughts. Provocations. Explorations. Forms of investigation and social research that expand possibilities for political action, proliferating tactics of resistance through the constituent power of the imagination. Walking, we ask questions, not from the perspective of the theorist removed and separate from organizing, but rather from within and as part of the multiple and overlapping cycles and circuits of struggle. For the removed theorist, movements themselves are mere abstractions, pieces of data to be categorized, analyzed, and fixed. **The work of militant investigation is multiple**, collectively extending forms of antagonism to new levels of understanding, composing flesh-made words from immanent processes of resistance. Far from vanguardist notions of intellectual practice that translate organizing strategies and concepts for populations who are believed to be too stupid or unable to move beyond trade union consciousness, it is a process of collective wondering and wandering that is not afraid to admit that the question of how to move forward is always uncertain, difficult, and never resolved in easy answers that are eternally correct. As an open process, **militant investigation discovers new possibilities within the present**, turning bottlenecks and seeming dead ends into new opportunities for joyful insurgency. A beautiful example of this is John Holloway’s book, *Change the World Without Taking Power*. Holloway, a soft-spoken Scottish political philosopher, was associated with the “Open Marxism” school developed at the University of Edinburgh where he taught in the 1970s and ’80s. In 1991, he moved to Mexico where he took a position with the Instituto de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales in the Universidad Autónoma de Puebla. After the Zapatista rebellion broke out in 1994, he quickly became one of its chief intellectual supporters. In 1998, he helped compile a book of essays on the Zapatistas called *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*; this was his attempt to think through the implications of this new revolutionary paradigm, one which rejected classic Marxist ideas of vanguardism and the very project of trying to seize state power for one of building autonomous com- munities rooted in new forms of direct democracy, using the categories of Marxist theory. The result was an extremely dense book. At certain points, it reads like a mixture of Marxist jargon and lyric poetry: In the beginning is the scream. We scream. When we write or when we read, it is easy to forget that the beginning is not the word, but the scream. Faced with the mutilation of human lives by capitalism, a scream of sadness, a scream of horror, a scream of anger, a scream of refusal: NO. The starting point of theoretical reflection is opposition, negativity, struggle. It is from rage that thought is born, not from the pose of reason, not from the reasoned-sitting-back-and-reflecting-on-the-mysteries-of-existence that is the conventional image of the thinker. We start from negation, from dissonance. The dissonance can take many shapes. An inarticulate mumble of discontent, tears of frustration, a scream of rage, a confident roar. An unease, a confusion, a longing, a critical vibration. More than anything else, it’s a book about knowledge. Holloway argues that reality is a matter of humans doing and making things together: what we perceive as fixed self-identical objects are really processes. **The only reason we insist on treating objects as anything else is because, if we saw them as they really are, as mutual projects, it would be impossible for anyone to claim ownership of them.** All liberatory struggle therefore is ultimately the struggle against identity. Forms of knowledge that simply arrange and classify reality from a distance—what Holloway refers to as “knowledge- about”—may be appropriate for a vanguard party that wants to claim the right to seize power and impose itself on the basis of some privileged “scientific” understanding, but ultimately it can only work to reinforce structures of domination. **True revolutionary knowledge would have to be different. It would have to be a pragmatic form of knowledge that lays bare all such pretensions;**

**a form of knowledge deeply embedded in the logic of transformational practice.** Furious debates ensued. Leninists and Trotskyites lambasted the book as utopian for adopting what they considered a naïve anarchist position—one that was completely ignorant of political realities. Anarchists were alternately inspired and annoyed, often noting that Holloway seemed to echo anarchist ideas without ever mentioning them, instead writing as if his positions emerged naturally from a correct reading of classic Marxist texts. Others objected to the way he read the texts. Supporters of Toni Negri’s Spinozist version of Marxism denounced the book as so much Hegelian claptrap; others suggested that Holloway’s argument that any belief in self-identical objects was a reflection of capitalist logic seemed to imply that capitalism had been around since the invention of language, which ultimately made it very difficult to imagine an alternative. In Latin America, where the battle was particularly intense, a lot of the arguments turned around very particular questions of revolutionary strategy. Who has the better model: the Zapatistas of Chiapas or Chavez’s Bolivarian Revolution in Venezuela? Were the Argentine radicals who over- threw four successive regimes in December of 2001 right to refuse seizing power, to reject the entire domain of formal politics and try to create their own autonomous institutions? Or had they allowed an opportunity for genuine revolutionary change to slip through their grasp? For many in the global justice movement in Europe and North America, the book provided the perfect counterpoint to Michael Hardt and Negri’s *Empire*, then being hailed in the media as the bible of the movement. Where Hardt and Negri were drawing on an Italian autonomist tradition that saw capital not as imposing itself on labor but as constantly having to adjust itself to the power of workers’ struggle, Holloway was arguing that this approach did not go nearly far enough. In fact, capital was labor and capitalism the system that makes it impossible for us to see this. Capitalism is something we make every day and the moment we stop making it, it will cease to exist. There were endless Internet debates. Seminars and reading groups were held comparing the two arguments in probably a dozen different languages.

1. [Michael Sheetz; space reporter @ CNBC; 4-23-2021; “Elon Musk wants SpaceX to reach Mars so humanity is not a ‘single-planet species’”; CNBC; https://www.cnbc.com/2021/04/23/elon-musk-aiming-for-mars-so-humanity-is-not-a-single-planet-species.html; Accessed 2-11-2022] AK [↑](#footnote-ref-1)