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#### Heidegger was a terrible person.

Fried, Professor of Philosophy at Suffolk University, ‘14

(Gregory, “What Heidegger Was Hiding,” 93 Foreign Aff. 159)

FOLLOWING PROTOCOL

As Trawny's title suggests, both Hitler's and Heidegger's view of the Jews grew out of a particular form of German anti-Semitism that was rampant after World War I. This strain of thinking, which saw Jews as part of a monolithic, transnational conspiracy, was crystallized in "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion," a forged document that first appeared in Russia in 1903 and made its way to Germany in 1920. Originally published by Russian monarchists to scapegoat the Jews for the tsar's military defeats and the subsequent upheaval, the protocols purported to be minutes from a series of meetings held by Jewish leaders bent on world domination. According to the alleged transcript, the plotters sought to manipulate international finance, culture, and media; promote extreme ideas and radical political movements; and foment war to destabilize existing powers. Hitler devoured the tract, which he swiftly employed as Nazi propaganda. It hit a nerve in Germany, still traumatized by World War I, beset by economic chaos, and subject to extreme political instability-all of which could now be attributed to the Jews.

Trawny does not argue that Heidegger read the protocols or agreed with all their contentions. Rather, he suggests that like so many other Germans, Heidegger accepted their basic premise, which Hitler hammered home in his speeches and in Nazi propaganda. As evidence, Trawny cites the German philosopher and Heidegger colleague Karl Jaspers, who recalled in his memoir a conversation he had with Heidegger in 1933. When Jaspers brought up "the vicious nonsense about the Elders of Zion," Heidegger reportedly expressed his genuine concern: "But there is a dangerous international alliance of the Jews," he replied.

Yet Hitler and Heidegger embraced anti-Semitic conspiracy theories for different reasons. Whereas the former argued that the Jews posed a racial threat (a fear for which the protocols offered evidence), the latter saw them as a philosophical one. The Jews, as uprooted nomads serving a transcendent God-albeit sometimes through their secular activities-embodied the very tradition that Heidegger wanted to overturn. Moreover, as Trawny points out, Heidegger found race deeply problematic. He did not dismiss the concept altogether; if understood as a biological feature of a particular people, race might well inform that people's historical trajectory. But he rejected using race as the primary determinant of identity. For Heidegger, racism was itself a function of misguided metaphysical thinking, because it presumed a biological, rather than historical, interpretation of what it meant to be human. By "fastening" people into "equally divided arrangement," he wrote in the notebooks, racism went "hand in hand with a self-alienation of peoples-the loss of history." Instead of obsessing over racial distinctions, Germans needed to confront their identity as an ongoing philosophical question. Heidegger overtly criticized the Nazis for their fixation on biological identity, but he also lambasted the Jews for the same sin. "The Jews," he wrote in the notebooks, "have already been 'living' for the longest time according to the principle of race."

Heidegger's anti-Semitism differed from that of the typical Nazi in other important ways. To many of Hitler's supporters, for example, the protocols reinforced the view that the Jews were essentially un-German, incapable of properly integrating with Germany's way of life or even understanding its spirit. But Heidegger took this notion further, arguing that the Jews belonged truly nowhere. "For a Slavic people, the nature of our German space would definitely be revealed differently from the way it is revealed to us," Heidegger told his students in a 1934 seminar. "To Semitic nomads, it will perhaps never be revealed at all." Moreover, Heidegger said, history had shown that "nomads have also often left wastelands behind them where they found fruitful and cultivated land." By this logic, the Jews were rootless; lacking a proper home, all they had was allegiance to one another.

Another anxiety reflected in the protocols and in Hitler's propaganda concerned the perceived power of this stateless, conspiratorial Jewry-be it in banking, finance, or academia. But for Heidegger, the success of Europe's Jews was a symptom of a broader philosophical problem. Playing on the tired clich6 of Jews as clever with abstractions and calculation, the notebooks make a more general critique of modern society: The temporary increase in the power of Jewry has its basis in the fact that the metaphysics of the West, especially in its modern development, served as the hub for the spread of an otherwise empty rationality and calculative skill, which in this way lodged itself in the "spirit."

In forgetting what it meant to be finite and historical, in other words, the West had become obsessed with mastering and controlling beings-a tendency Heidegger called "machination," or the will to dominate nature in all its forms, ranging from raw materials to human beings themselves. And with their "calculative skill," the Jews had thrived in this distorted "spirit" of the modern age.

At the same time, the Jews were not, in Heidegger's view, merely passive beneficiaries of Western society's "empty rationality" and liberal ideology; they were active proponents of them. "The role of world Jewry," Heidegger wrote in the notebooks, was a "metaphysical question about the kind of humanity that, without any restraints, can take over the uprooting of all beings from Being as its world-historical 'task."' Even if the Jews could not be blamed for the introduction of Platonism or for its hold over Western society, they were the chief carriers of its "task." By asserting liberal rights to demand inclusion in such nations as Germany, the Jews were estranging those countries' citizens from their humanity-the shared historical identity that made them distinct from other peoples. This reasoning formed the basis for a truly poisonous hostility toward the Jews, and it was perhaps Heidegger's most damning judgment of them. Now that the notebooks have come into the light, however, such passages constitute the most damning evidence against the philosopher himself.

So what did Heidegger think should be done about the Jews? Did he agree with the Nazi policies? The notebooks give readers little to go on; Heidegger seems to have had no taste for detailed policy discussions. Nevertheless, the philosopher spoke through his silence. Despite his criticism of the Nazis and their crude biological racism, he wrote nothing against Hitler's laws targeting the Jews. Although Heidegger resigned as rector of Freiburg before Hitler passed the Nuremberg Laws, which classified German citizens according to race, he had assumed the role in 1933, just after the Nazis enacted their first anti-Jewish codes, which excluded Jews from civil service and university posts (and which Heidegger helped implement). During a lecture in the winter of 1933-34, he warned a hall full of students that "the enemy can have attached itself to the innermost roots" of the people and that they, the German students, must be prepared to attack such an enemy "with the goal of total annihilation." Heidegger did not specify "the enemy," but for the Nazis, they included Germany's communists; its Roma, or Gypsies; and, above all, its Jews. This chilling prefiguration of Hitler's Final Solution is unmistakable, and Heidegger never explained, let alone apologized for, such horrendous statements.

#### Heidegger’s theories are inseparable from nazi-ism – his theory of non-instrumental being was closed off to Jews and their k of calculative logic is based on the Elders of Zion conspiracy

Richard Brody, Why Does It Matter If Heidegger Was Anti-Semitic? March 27, 2014, www.newyorker.com/culture/richard-brody/why-does-it-matter-if-heidegger-was-anti-semitic

According to Thomas Assheuer, writing in Die Zeit, “The Jew-hatred in ‘Black Notebooks’ is no afterthought; it forms the foundation of the philosophical diagnosis.” In other words, these newly published writings show that, for Heidegger, anti-Semitism was more than just a personal prejudice. In the Guardian, Philip Oltermann offers some choice passages:

“World Judaism,” Heidegger writes in the notebooks, “is ungraspable everywhere and doesn’t need to get involved in military action while continuing to unfurl its influence, whereas we are left to sacrifice the best blood of the best of our people.”

In another passage, the philosopher writes that the Jewish people, with their “talent for calculation,” were so vehemently opposed to the Nazi’s racial theories because “they themselves have lived according to the race principle for longest.”

The French philosopher Emmanuel Faye picks up on one notably insidious term in the new publications:

We know that [Heidegger] speaks in his “Black Notebooks” of the “worldlessness” of Judaism…. Jews aren’t just considered to lack a homeland, they are said definitively to be worldless. It’s worth recalling that worldlessness is an expression that Heidegger doesn’t even use for animals, which, in a 1929 lecture, he calls “world-poor.” In this complete dehumanization of Judaism, the Jews no longer have a place in the world, or, rather, they never had one. We also discover…that the Heideggerian idea of “being-in-the-world” which is central to “Being and Time” can take on the meaning of a discriminatory term with an anti-Semitic intent.

Oltermann adds that Heidegger also “argues that like fascism and ‘world judaism,’ Soviet communism and British parliamentarianism should be seen as part of the imperious dehumanising drive of western modernity.” Yet, in the magazine Prospect, the philosopher Jonathan Rée attempts to defend Heidegger by minimizing the significance of this idea: “One of his arguments is that Judaism, like Bolshevism and Fascism, participates in the corrosive calculative culture of modernity, even though it goes back thousands of years.” This makes me wonder about Rée as well: Isn’t it a priori anti-Semitic to consider Judaism “corrosive”? And wouldn’t that idea, as Oltermann suggests, place anti-Semitism at the core of Heidegger’s philosophical conception of history?

So the discussion has begun. But the underlying question is: Why the ongoing fascination with deconstructionism and with the work of the philosopher whose radical works inspired it? Why does this philosophical strain seem strangely central to the conception of modern criticism, even as it recedes in influence? And why do these thinkers’ personal lives and ideological compromises seem unusually relevant to their work, beyond the usual scandal-sheet Schadenfreude?

It may have something to do with their distinctive views regarding the relevance (or, rather, irrelevance) of character and personality to the objects of their study. Menand offers a crucial insight in his Critic at Large piece on de Man, explaining that deconstructionism offered a sort of nuclear physics of literature:

It generated intellectual power by bracketing off most of what might be called (with due acknowledgment of the constructed nature of the concept) the real-life aspects of literature—that literature is written by people, that it affects people, that it is a report on experience. But it was exciting to get inside the atom.

The crucial difference is that, when a physicist splits atoms, they’re not the atoms of the chair that he’s sitting on or of the equipment that he’s splitting them with. Deconstruction pulls the chair out from under the reader, compels the reader to undermine his own habits of reading. By dissolving the overt categories of reading—plot, story, style, character, moral—deconstruction wrenched literature away from the amateurs and delivered it to the sole care of academics, who alone had the tools with which to approach it. Thus, it transformed the academic study of literature from a marginal scholarly apparatus of footnotes to the only game in town, thereby turning traditional readers into spectators.

Deconstruction is a reflexive philosophy: it makes the very notion of literary analysis a self-revealing, self-questioning, quasi-poetic creation, undoing the traditional hierarchy by which the literary critic is the handmaiden of the creative writer. This philosophy doesn’t merely study the art of writing, it fuses with the art; instead of depersonalizing literary criticism into a quasi-scientific activity, it turns the literary critic into a self-defined peer of the novelist and the poet. (Similarly, Roland Barthes’s famous “death of the author” was actually the birth of a new author; namely, the critic who proclaimed that death.)

Heidegger happens to have been—a blessing and a curse—a brilliant writer, whose serpentine, spellbinding prose was both an argument against the traditional authority of logical reasoning and a performative undermining of that authority. (De Man, by contrast, is a rather dully mechanical writer; when I read his books in college, I found it strange that his influence should have survived his prose.)

But, even without particular regard to Jews and Nazis, Heidegger’s brilliance was intrinsically political. For Heidegger, the project of rescuing language from the ostensible truth of logic and restoring it to iridescent incantation implied kicking out the intellectual struts from under the claims to progress on the part of technological society. By undermining logic and science, Heidegger also undermined the Enlightenment—and the individualism, the freedoms, the claim to rights that are made in the name of reason and progress. Even apart from his specific ideological pronouncements, Heidegger was, philosophically, an anti-humanist rightist.

#### Reject the k – nazism implicates all of Heidegger’s politics – the alt reinscribes fascism

Joshua Rothman, The New Yorker, 4/28/14, "Is Heidegger Contaminated by Nazism?," [www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/is-heidegger-contaminated-by-nazism](http://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/is-heidegger-contaminated-by-nazism)

When I read Heidegger’s books, I “knew”—but didn’t particularly care—that he had been a Nazi. (He joined the party in 1933, the year after giving the lectures behind “The Essence of Truth.”) I was so fascinated by his philosophy that his Nazism stayed “hidden”; though his ideas felt vivid and present, his biography belonged to the past. But, over the past few months, not caring has become **more difficult.** That’s largely because of a philosophy professor named Peter Trawny, who has begun publishing some of Heidegger’s anti-Semitic writings. Trawny is the director of the Martin Heidegger Institute at the University of Wuppertal, in Germany, and the editor of Heidegger’s “black notebooks,” some of which were published for the first time this spring. (Heidegger wrote in the small, black-covered notebooks for nearly forty years—publishing them all could take decades.)

It’s always been safe to assume that Heidegger, being a Nazi, was also an anti-Semite (though not necessarily a “virulent” one, whatever that term might mean). But, as my colleague Richard Brody wrote a few weeks ago, **the passages reveal a** particularly unsettling **kind of anti-Semitism**—**one which hasn’t been fully visible before.** They show that, even as Heidegger held the most banal and ignorant anti-Semitic beliefs (he wrote about a worldwide conspiracy of “calculating” Jews “unfurl[ing] its influence”), **he also tried to formulate a special, philosophical, and even Heideggerian kind of anti-Semitism.** (Jews, he writes, are “uprooted from Being-in-the World”—that is, incapable of authentically caring and knowing.) The passages, some of which were written during the Second World War, account for only a few pages out of more than a thousand. But **they have alarmed and disgusted Heideggerians because they show that Heidegger himself had no trouble using his own philosophy for anti-Semitic ends.** Philosophy has a math-like quality: it’s not just a vocabulary, but a system. A failure in one part of the system can suggest a failure everywhere. And so, earlier this year, in a book called “Heidegger and the Myth of Jewish World Conspiracy,” Trawny asked the inevitable question: could Heidegger’s philosophy as a whole be “contaminated” by Nazism?

When Trawny came to New York, during the second week of April, for a panel on Heidegger and Nazism hosted by the Goethe Institute, in the East Village, all sorts of Heideggerians, from the casual to the committed, came to hear him speak. The general rule seemed to be that the more time you’d spent thinking about Heidegger, the more unnerved you were by the controversy. Relaxed, curious undergrads gathered near the sunlit windows at the back of the audience. (One couple had their arms around each other, apparently on a date.) Further up, the grad students, in their too-old or too-young outfits, looked alert and inquisitive: for them, this was an issue of professional interest. A few rows on, an explosion of gray marked where the older professors huddled together. And at the front sat the panelists: Trawny, along with two American professors of philosophy, Roger Berkowitz and Babette Babich, from Bard and Fordham, respectively. Outside, it was spring. Inside, it was dim, airless, and funereal.

### 2

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being.

#### 1] Phenomenal introspection – it’s the most epistemically reliable- historical and moral disagreement over internal conceptions of morality such as questions of race, gender, class, religion, etc. prove the fallibility of non-observational based ethics. Introspection means that we value happiness because we can determine that we each value it – just as I can observe a lemon’s yellowness, we can make those judgements about happiness.

#### 2] Actor specificity – A] Aggregation – every policy benefit some and harms others, which also means that side constraints freeze action, B] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – governments actively decide not to act so there is no omission, C] States lack wills or intentions since policies are inherently collective actions. Actor specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings.

#### 3] Only consequentialism can explain degrees of wrongness – If I break a promise to meet up for lunch that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only by evaluating the consequences of each scenario can we explain why the second one is much worse than the first.

#### 4] Extinction first under any other framework – A] It precludes the possibility of any kind of moral value – we can’t confer value onto anything if we’re not alive, B] Future generations mean infinite magnitude – we must look towards future lives as well.

#### 5] Reductionism – empirics prove.

**Parfit 84** [Derek Parfit, cool hair. “Reasons and Persons” 1984. Brackets for gender]

Some recent medical cases provide striking evidence in favour of the Reductionist View. Human beings have a lower brain and two upper hemispheres, which are connected by a bundle of fibres. In treating a few people with severe epilepsy, surgeons have cut these fibres. The aim was to reduce the severity of epileptic fits, by confining their causes to a single hemisphere. This aim was achieved. But the operations had another unintended consequence. The effect, in the words of one surgeon, was the creation of ‘two separate spheres of consciousness.’ This effect was revealed by various psychological tests. These made use of two facts. We control our right arms with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. And what is in the right halves of our visual fields we see with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. When someone’s hemispheres have been disconnected, psychologists can thus present to this person two different written questions in the two halves of [their] ~~his~~ visual field, and can receive two different answers written by this person’s two hands.

#### 6] No intent-foresight distinction— If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen.

#### 7] Calc indicts fail – A) they prove util is hard not impossible B) empirically denied policymakers use util all the time and every round on the west coast is larp, which proves its possible to reliably resolve offense under the framework.

#### 8] Theory - ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate. Any standard is an interpretation of the word ought-thus framework is functionally a topicality argument about how to define the terms of the resolution. Prefer my interp –

#### A] Ground: Both debaters are guaranteed access to ground to engage under util – ie Aff gets plans and advantages, while Neg gets disads and counterplans. Additionally, anything can function as a util impact as long as an external benefit is articulated, so all your offense applies. Other frameworks deny 1 side the ability to engage the other on both the impact level and the link level.

#### B] Resolvability – only util can compare and choose between two different types of impacts – anything else forces judge intervention which takes the debate out of the debaters hands

### 3

#### Private sector innovation in the commercial space industry is high now.

**Smith 18** [Matthew Smith, 6-11-2018, "Commercialized Space and You," Science in the News, https://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/commercialized-space-and-you/]//DDPT

Step aside, NASA. The 20th century model of space exploration is running out of fuel, and private companies are now leading the race for human expansion across the galaxy. Elon Musk, Richard Branson, and Jeff Bezos are three of the billionaires leading this extraterrestrial adventure with their respective companies, SpaceX, Virgin Galactic, and Blue Origin. Bezos, the founder of Amazon and currently the wealthiest person in the world, has a vision of sending autonomous rovers to the Moon and helping to eventually create a Moon Village. He has explained that collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and other government agencies are encouraged and appreciated, but are no longer essential to achieve his goal. [Musk](https://www.geekwire.com/2018/jeff-bezos-blue-origin-space-venture-go-moon-settlements/), who co-founded Tesla, has already launched nine rockets within the first five months of 2018, one of which was the most powerful private spacecraft [ever sent into orbit](http://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/spacex-launches-falcon-heavy-rocket-successfully/). Looking forward, SpaceX aims to complete its first manned mission to Mars in 2024, almost a decade earlier than NASA’s projections. Even the current US president is encouraging this shift to private companies driving [innovation in space](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2018/02/11/the-trump-administration-wants-to-turn-the-international-space-station-into-a-commercially-run-venture/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d2c1eccab4ca). With almost [$1 billion](https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexknapp/2018/04/10/nearly-1-billion-was-invested-in-space-startups-in-1q2018-new-report-says/#5fdd019b285c) invested in space-focused startups in the first quarter of 2018, the commercialized space industry shows no sign of slowing down.

#### Private space appropriation is uniquely key to ensuring ongoing innovation towards space exploration and colonization.

**Cheng 20** [Dean Cheng, 09-16-2020, "Outer Space and Private Property," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/space-policy/commentary/outer-space-and-private-property]//DDPT

Fully 53 years after the Outer Space Treaty, however, this has begun to change. The success of SpaceX, Blue Origin, Virgin Galactic, and other private companies has led to what has been termed Space 2.0.

The Obama administration’s decision to rely on commercial space-launch services to resupply the International Space Station opened the door to expanding private enterprise’s role in space.

The innovation exhibited in the various Falcon launches, including the ability to reuse the booster rockets, has seen a significant drop in the cost of placing payloads into orbit. As a result, a real opportunity exists for companies to begin thinking about how to use space not simply to improve terrestrial operations, but to make money from space and its physical resources.

The uncertainty associated with private property rights, however, has had a constraining effect on the ability to exploit space more extensively. Companies are unlikely to be willing to risk capital and assets if they are not sure that they will be able to profit from their investments.

#### The private sector is the key internal link to space exploration and colonization.

**Sharma 9/7** [Maanas Sharma, 9-7-2021, "The Space Review: The privatized frontier: the ethical implications and role of private companies in space exploration," The Space Review, https://www.thespacereview.com/article/4238/1]//DDPT

In recent years, private companies have taken on a larger role in the space exploration system. With lower costs and faster production times, they have displaced some functions of government space agencies. Though many have levied criticism against privatized space exploration, it also allows room for more altruistic actions by government space agencies and the benefits from increased space exploration as a whole. Thus, we should encourage this development, as the process is net ethical in the end. Especially if performed in conjunction with adequate government action on the topic, private space exploration can overcome possible shortcomings in its risky and capitalistic nature and ensure a positive contribution to the general public on Earth.

The implications of commercial space exploration have been thrust into the limelight with the successes and failures of billionaire Elon Musk’s company SpaceX. While private companies are not new to space exploration, their prominence in American space exploration efforts has increased rapidly in recent years, fueled by technological innovations, reductions in cost, and readily available funding from government and private sources.[1] In May 2020, SpaceX brought American astronauts to space from American soil for the first time in almost 10 years.[2] Recognizing the greatly reduced costs of space exploration in private companies, NASA’s budget has shifted to significantly relying on private companies.[3] However, private space companies are unique from government space agencies in the way they experience unique sets of market pressures that influence their decision-making process. Hence, the expansion of private control in the space sector turns into a multifaceted contestation of its ethicality.

The most obvious ethical concern is the loss of human life. Critics contend that companies must answer to their shareholders and justify their profits. This contributes to a larger overall psyche that prioritizes cost and speed above all else, resulting in significantly increased risks.[4] However, the possible increase in mishaps is largely overstated. Companies recognize the need for safety aboard their expeditions themselves.[5] After all, the potential backlash from a mishap could destroy the company’s reputation and significantly harm their prospects. According to Dr. Nayef Al-Rodhan, Head of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy’s Geopolitics and Global Futures Programme, “because there were no alternatives to government space programs, accidents were seen to some degree as par for the course… By comparison, private companies actually have a far more difficult set of issues to face in the case of a mishap. In a worst case scenario, a private company could make an easy scapegoat.” [6]

Another large ethical concern is the prominence capitalism may have in the future of private space exploration and the impacts thereof. The growth of private space companies in recent years has been closely intertwined with capitalism. Companies have largely focused on the most profitable projects, such as space travel and the business of space.[7] Many companies are funded by individual billionaires, such as dearMoon, SpaceX’s upcoming mission to the Moon.[8] Congress has also passed multiple acts for the purpose of reducing regulations on private space companies and securing private access to space. From this, many immediately jump to the conclusion that capitalism in space will recreate the same conditions in outer space that plague Earth today, especially with the increasing push to create a “space-for-space” economy, such as space tourism and new technologies to mine the Moon and asteroids. Critics, such as Jordan Pearson of VICE, believe that promises of “virtually unlimited resources” are only for the rich, and will perpetuate the growing wealth inequality that plagues the world today.[9]

However, others contend that just because private space exploration has some capitalist elements, it is by no means an embodiment of unrestricted capitalism. A healthy balance of restricted capitalism—for example, private space companies working through contracts with government agencies or independently under monitoring and regulation by national and international agreements—will avoid the pitfalls that capitalist colonialism faced down here on Earth. Even those who are generally against excessive government regulation should see the benefits of them in space. Lacking any consensus on definitions and rights in space will create undue competition between corporations as well as governments that will harm everyone rather than helping anyone. To create a conducive environment for new space-for-space exploration, one without confrontation but with protection for corporate astronauts, infrastructure, and other interests, governments must create key policies such as a framework for property rights on asteroids, the Moon, and Mars.[7,10]

Another key matter to note is restricted capitalism in space “could also be our salvation.”[11] Private space exploration could reap increased access to resources and other benefits that can be used to solve the very problems on Earth that critics of capitalism identify. Since governments offset some of their projects to private companies, government agencies can focus on altruistic projects that otherwise would not fit in the budget before and do not have the immediate commercial use that private companies look for. Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor of aeronautics and astronautics at Stanford University, discusses how “this strategy allows the space agency to continue ‘exploring the fringe where there really is no business case’” but still has important impacts on people down on Earth.[12]

Indeed, this idea is a particularly powerful one when considering the ideal future of private companies in space exploration. Though there is no one set way governments will interact with companies, the consensus is that they must radically reimagine their main purpose as the role of private space exploration continues to grow. As governments utilize services from private space companies, “[i]nstead of being bogged down by the routine application of old research, NASA can prioritize their limited budget to work more on research of other unknowns and development of new long-term space travel technologies.”[13] According to the Council on Foreign Relations, such technologies have far-reaching benefits on Earth as well. Past developments obviously include communications satellites, by themselves a massive benefit to society, but also “refinements in artificial hearts; improved mammograms; and laser eye surgery… thermoelectric coolers for microchips; high-temperature lubricants; and a means for mass-producing carbon nanotubes, a material with significant engineering potential; [and h]ousehold products.”[2] Agencies like NASA are the only actors able to pursue the next game-changing missions, “where the profit motive is not as evident and where the barriers to entry are still too high for the private sector to really make a compelling business case.”[8] These technologies have revolutionized millions, if not billions, of lives, demonstrating the remarkable benefits of space exploration. It follows then that it is net ethical to prioritize these benefits.

This report concludes that the private sector, indeed, has a prominent role to play in the future of space exploration. Further, though private space exploration does bring the potential of increased danger and the colonization of space, these concerns can be effectively mitigated. Namely, strong government frameworks—particularly international ones—will minimize possible sources of ethical violations and ensure an optimal private sector role in space. This also allows government agencies to complete significantly more difficult, innovative projects which have transformative benefits for life on Earth.

#### Space exploration solves extinction and endless resource wars.

Collins 10 [Patrick Collins, professor of economics at Azabu University in Japan, and a Collaborating Researcher with the Institute for Space & Astronautical Science, as well as adviser to a number of companies, Adriano V. Autino is President of the Space Renaissance International; Manager, CEO/CTO, Systems Engineering Consultant / Trainer at Andromeda Systems Engineering LLC; and Supplier of methodological tools and consultancy at Intermarine S.p.A, Acta Astronautica, Volume 66, Issues 11–12, June–July 2010, “What the growth of a space tourism industry could contribute to employment, economic growth, environmental protection, education, culture and world peace”, Pages 1553–1562]

7. World peace and preservation of human civilisation

The major source of social friction, including international friction, has surely always been unequal access to resources. People fight to control the valuable resources on and under the land, and in and under the sea. The natural resources of Earth are limited in quantity, and economically accessible resources even more so. As the population grows, and demand grows for a higher material standard of living, industrial activity grows exponentially. The threat of resources becoming scarce has led to the concept of “Resource Wars”. Having begun long ago with wars to control the gold and diamonds of Africa and South America, and oil in the Middle East, the current phase is at centre stage of world events today [37]. A particular danger of “resource wars” is that, if the general public can be persuaded to support them, they may become impossible to stop as resources become increasingly scarce. Many commentators have noted the similarity of the language of US and UK government advocates of “war on terror” to the language of the novel “1984” which describes a dystopian future of endless, fraudulent war in which citizens are reduced to slaves.

7.1. Expansion into near-Earth space is the only alternative to endless “resource wars”

As an alternative to the “resource wars” already devastating many countries today, opening access to the unlimited resources of near-Earth space could clearly facilitate world peace and security. The US National Security Space Office, at the start of its report on the potential of space-based solar power (SSP) published in early 2007, stated: “Expanding human populations and declining natural resources are potential sources of local and strategic conflict in the 21st Century, and many see energy as the foremost threat to national security” [38]. The report ended by encouraging urgent research on the feasibility of SSP: “Considering the timescales that are involved, and the exponential growth of population and resource pressures within that same strategic period, it is imperative that this work for “drilling up” vs. drilling down for energy security begins immediately” [38].

Although the use of extra-terrestrial resources on a substantial scale may still be some decades away, it is important to recognise that simply acknowledging its feasibility using known technology is the surest way of ending the threat of resource wars. That is, if it is assumed that the resources available for human use are limited to those on Earth, then it can be argued that resource wars are inescapable [22] and [37]. If, by contrast, it is assumed that the resources of space are economically accessible, this not only eliminates the need for resource wars, it can also preserve the benefits of civilisation which are being eroded today by “resource war-mongers”, most notably the governments of the “Anglo-Saxon” countries and their “neo-con” advisers. It is also worth noting that the $1 trillion that these have already committed to wars in the Middle-East in the 21st century is orders of magnitude more than the public investment needed to aid companies sufficiently to start the commercial use of space resources.

Industrial and financial groups which profit from monopolistic control of terrestrial supplies of various natural resources, like those which profit from wars, have an economic interest in protecting their profitable situation. However, these groups’ continuing profits are justified neither by capitalism nor by democracy: they could be preserved only by maintaining the pretence that use of space resources is not feasible, and by preventing the development of low-cost space travel. Once the feasibility of low-cost space travel is understood, “resource wars” are clearly foolish as well as tragic. A visiting extra-terrestrial would be pityingly amused at the foolish antics of homo sapiens using long-range rockets to fight each other over dwindling terrestrial resources—rather than using the same rockets to travel in space and have the use of all the resources they need!

7.2. High return in safety from extra-terrestrial settlement

Investment in low-cost orbital access and other space infrastructure will facilitate the establishment of settlements on the Moon, Mars, asteroids and in man[/woman]-made space structures. In the first phase, development of new regulatory infrastructure in various Earth orbits, including property/usufruct rights, real estate, mortgage financing and insurance, traffic management, pilotage, policing and other services will enable the population living in Earth orbits to grow very large. Such activities aimed at making near-Earth space habitable are the logical extension of humans’ historical spread over the surface of the Earth. As trade spreads through near-Earth space, settlements are likely to follow, of which the inhabitants will add to the wealth of different cultures which humans have created in the many different environments in which they live.

Success of such extra-terrestrial settlements will have the additional benefit of reducing the danger of human extinction due to planet-wide or cosmic accidents [27]. These horrors include both man-made disasters such as nuclear war, plagues or growing pollution, and natural disasters such as super-volcanoes or asteroid impact. It is hard to think of any objective that is more important than preserving peace. Weapons developed in recent decades are so destructive, and have such horrific, long-term side-effects that their use should be discouraged as strongly as possible by the international community. Hence, reducing the incentive to use these weapons by rapidly developing the ability to use space-based resources on a large scale is surely equally important [11] and [16]. The achievement of this depends on low space travel costs which, at the present time, appear to be achievable only through the development of a vigorous space tourism industry.

## Case

### Overview

#### We will impact turn every basis for the 1NC’s critique of scientific rationalism.

#### Basing the international order on scientific cosmology is essential to check climate change and public health crises

Bentley B. Allan 18, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, “Scientific Cosmology and International Orders,” DOI: 10.1017/9781108241540

However, if international order could be reconstructed on the basis of a shared scientific cosmology, then common purposes and institutions acceptable to both the United States and China could be produced.

This is one pathway to peaceful change: the system can remain stable if the American hegemon can use scientific cosmology as a basis for order maintenance. The question then becomes, can the United States harness cosmology or help push a new cosmological shift to maintain and reinvigorate the primary and secondary institutions underlying international order? If the United States and China are able to forge a peaceful revision of the existing international order, it is likely that cooperation will begin with economic, environmental, and other technical problems in which the issues are structured by a common understanding of the world underwritten by transnational scientific discourses. This is not because, as the functionalists supposed, it is easier to cooperate on technical as opposed to political issues. This presumption is based on the idea that scientific and technological modes of knowledge and practice are not already political and that there is some extra-political domain in which disputes can be settled.33 Instead, the construction and spread of scientific knowledge and technological innovations is a political process of building alliances, diffusing ideas through institution building and maintenance, and other hard-won political tasks. If the United States and China do find it easier to cooperate on issues like climate change and global health it will be because both share similar cosmological discourses that constitute compatible purposes and goals.

#### Scientific cosmology produces new methods for political life and justice. Turns the case. They demonize and turn this as a basis for political formation.

Bentley B. Allan 18, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, “Scientific Cosmology and International Orders,” DOI: 10.1017/9781108241540

By contrast, I demonstrate that scientific ideas have done more than serve as instrumental means; they have laid the groundwork for the transformation of state purpose. Scientific ideas allowed individuals and groups to reimagine their relationships to the cosmos. In so doing, they inspired new ways of thinking about what political life could and should be about. Scientific ideas were thereby transformed from means to ends. Far from draining the world of meaning, scientific discourses have been used to naturalize a number of ends and purposes since the sixteenth century. Indeed, Weber himself presupposes that science has operated as a negative cosmological force that reduced the meaning of life and death to moments in the organic life cycle. Moreover, he doubts that progress itself can have “an intrinsically meaningful end.”85 However, the inability of science to provide meanings that are logically deduced from scientific principles has nothing to do with the fact that scientific ideas have nonetheless been used to define humanity’s place in the universe. Another aspect of the problem is that IR scholars are used to characterizing the political orders of non-Western societies as drawing on cosmological beliefs, but less likely to think of Western political orders in those terms.86 This is part of a broader orientalist tendency to see Western political orders as rational and progressive while viewing non-Western societies as backward.87 As we shall see in Chapter 4, this tendency was built into the social sciences by colonial anthropology.88 Weberian ideas about rationalization are also bound up in this discourse. Weber argues that “traditional” societies rest on “the sanctity of orders and powers of rule which have existed since time immemorial.”89 For Weber, the process of rationalization in the West eroded magical thinking and disrupted the ritualistic basis of traditional rule. As a result, Western political orders came to be based on the impartial administration of fixed, rational rules.90 We might seek to avoid thinking in these orientalist terms by discarding the cosmological analysis of political orders altogether. However, this would leave us unable to understand and explain shifts in political purpose in the West. Instead, we can push back on the cosmological–rational dichotomy itself by retelling Western history in cosmological terms. Thus, in contrast to the instrumental and Weberian views of science, I conceptualize the Western scientific tradition as carrying and expressing cosmological elements that have been used to infuse the world with meaning. As John Meyer and his colleagues in the World Polity School argue, “science operates as the secular equivalent of a ‘sacred canopy’ for the modern order, generating a modern, rational interpretation of world order and offering this logic as a secular interpretive grid for natural and social life.”91 In short, science describes both nature and society as knowable, calculable, law-governed domains. In so doing, it provides ontological and cosmological support to legitimate the modern idea that actors (individuals, states, and organizations) can rationally harness knowledge to their ends. The role of science in world order further bolsters ends of justice (equality) and progress (economic growth).92 On one hand, this argument usefully extends and modifies Weber’s rationalization thesis. For the World Polity School, rationalization has not drained the world of meaning but has simply replaced older cultural frames with modern scientific ones.93 On the other hand, the argument reproduces the weakest aspect of Weber’s schema: the idea that science and technology exhibit a singular, rational logic that produces the same effects everywhere throughout the world. The result is that the varied political effects of scientific ideas are folded into monolithic, abstract processes like modernization, rationalization, and commodification.94 This universalistic conception of science is at odds with the plural and historical conception of science that has emerged from the last forty years of historical and sociological studies of science. Indeed, the singular conception of science in the World Polity School was designed to explain isomorphism and is poorly suited to explain change in international discourses.95 To be adapted to the historical analysis of science in international politics, the World Polity School’s narrow, universalistic conception of science must be replaced with the plural and historical view. In light of the fact that the meanings and methods of the scientific enterprise change over time, it does not make sense to refer analytically to “science” as a single enterprise with uniform effects on international politics over the course of 450 years. Instead, I trace the effects of specific scientific movements on the history of the present international order. So, rather than produce a general theory of how science has shaped political institutions, my approach seeks to demonstrate the effects of three specific cosmological shifts on the discourses of state purpose underlying international order. This approach decomposes a macrohistorical process, the emergence of scientific ideas in politics, into a series of contested moments of institutionalization.

### Framework

#### Ontological thinking as epistemic based critique is nothing more than a resilience project that empowers neoliberalism. Turns the case.

**Evans and Reid 14** [Brad Evans, professor of international relations at the University of Lapland, Finland and Julian Reid, senior lecturer in international relations at the University of Bristol, *Resilient Life*, 2014, p. 102-4]

The significance of linking self-worth and achievement to the ‘social norm’ cannot be underestimated as it allows us to illustrate the differences between the learning processes of resilience as compared to a properly critical pedagogy which would encourage children to question the fundamental tenets of power and inequality in the world. **Strategies of** resilience when applied to children take the form of training exercises which enable them to deal with the localized effects of their vulnerability and the forms of attachments and dependencies they have created which amplify the problems. The examples of youths falling into membership of inner-city gangs become a prime example of a vulnerable child that has fallen through the cracks. Countering this is the idea of ‘educational resilience**’**, defined as the ‘heightened likelihood of success in school and other life accomplishments despite environmental adversities brought about by early traits, conditions, and experiences’.20 But how exactly do we measure success? Is the educationally resilient the vulnerable subject who goes on to fulfill their neoliberal potential, or is it the subject who goes to war with the system that seeks to render them resilient as such? Resilience, as we have learned, is more a code for social compliance than a political ambition to transform the very sources of inequality and injustices experienced by marginalized populations. We find this in early educational theories where resilience is again conflated with strategies of resistance such that the resilient child, individualistically conceived, pathologically outlives its conditions of impoverishment to exhibit social achievement in ways that are altogether in tune with the normal functioning of society.21 Indeed, more than simply learning to cope in conditions of impoverishment and vulnerability, as Steven Condly succinctly puts it in an approving review of the prevailing mainstream educational approaches, the doctrine of resilience offers new ways to assess qualities, competences and capabilities, as ‘resilient children tend to possess an above average intelligence and have a temperament that endears them to others and that also does not allow them to succumb to self-pity’.22 What of course qualifies as ‘self-pity’ in another setting could easily be read as a conscious attempt to challenge that which is beyond the control or individual responsibility of the particular subject. Sheila Martineau is attuned to this and writes of the political dangers of resilience in education with considerable foresight: ‘Though resilience conveyed anomalous childhood behaviour in the context of traumatic events in the 1970s, it has become detached from the traumatic context … dangerously, resilience has become constructed as a social norm modelled on the behavioural norms and expectations of the dominant society’.23 Resilience, in other words, becomes a normalized standard for mapping out (ab)normal behaviours such that the very terms of success are loaded with moral claims to a specific maturity, wherein the maturity itself is qualified through one’s ability to connect to the liberal order of things and partake in the world such that to resist means, without contraction, that one successfully learns to conform. Or to put it in more critical terms, since the ‘solution’ is to teach children to overcome ‘obstacles’ to personal development without ultimately challenging wider relations of power, the resilient child (which, although said to include all children, overwhelmingly concentrates on those from poorer, culturally and racially distinct backgrounds) encounters policies which, instead of ‘treating the individual’, end up by virtue of its logic ‘blaming the victim’.24 Disadvantage as such becomes once again the means to author new forms of discrimination that plays the vulnerable card to remove any political claims that things could be otherwise. Today we can situate these earlier demands for resilience within the strategic context of what Henry Giroux calls the ‘war on youth’. Indicative of **the neoliberal** assault on the education **system** more generally, Giroux maintains that youth has become a privileged object for power in a way that seeks to strip away any sense of critical awareness and political agency at the earliest possible stages of intellectual development. As he wr**it**es, since ‘neoliberalism is also a pedagogical project designed to create particular subjects, desires, and values defined largely by market considerations’, questions of ‘destiny’ become ‘linked to a market-driven logic in which freedom is stripped down to freedom from government regulation, freedom to consume, and freedom to say anything one wants, regardless of how racist or toxic the consequences might be’.25 This has a profound bearing upon education policy as ‘Critical thought and human agency are rendered impotent as neoliberal rationality substitutes emotional and personal vocabularies for political ones in formulating solutions to political problems’**.**26 Hence, within this ‘depoliticized discourse, youths are told that there is no dream of the collective, no viable social bonds, only the actions of autonomous individuals who can count only on their own resources and who bear sole responsibility for the effects of larger systemic political and economic problems’. Whilst education therefore should have a pedagogical commitment to the globally oppressed, what takes its place is a substitution for education that produces vulnerable consumers whose very training renders the political impossible**.**

At: sheehan –

1. Not emp based
2. Pain and pleasure hijack

### AT: ROB

#### The ROB is to vote for the better debater – anything else is arbitrary, self-serving, and necessarily excludes certain arguments which kills fairness and education.

#### Fairness above the K – 1] Fairness is a prior question to effective dialogue – If fairness is bad writ large vote neg regardless of the flow because it’s unfair, 2] If the judge doesn't enforce fairness, none of your scholarship would pass since it would give them the unfair jurisdiction to reject it and vote you down. Even if they don't, rejecting fairness is a practice that would justify a bad norm, which all your arguments are predicated on anyways, 3] We can’t compare or interact to find the best solution to oppression if the unfair nature of your arguments prevents me from strategizing. Fairness is an integral part of your solvency, 4] Unfair practices would make kids quit debate if they can’t check it which means less people to spread your message to so the shell is a prior question. Every reason fairness is a voter is a reason you can’t read substantive take-outs to the shell since it precludes your evaluation of them.

#### Ontological thinking and the opposition to the University throw out valuable tools and people as permanently flawed.

Angela **Davis and** Gayatri Chakravorty **Spivak** (Angela Yvonne Davis is an American political activist, philosopher, academic, and author. She is a professor emerita at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak is an Indian scholar, literary theorist, and feminist critic. She is a University Professor at Columbia University and a founding member of the establishment's Institute for Comparative Literature and Society. “Planetary Utopias”. June 24, 20**18**.)

Nikita Dhawan: Another extremely instructive lesson that we have learnt from you is to adopt a critical posture towards the tools, concepts, vocabularies and organising practices that characterise landscapes of struggle. There is this wonderful, possibly apocryphal, quote that ‘The last capitalist we hang shall be the one who sold us the rope.’ **What do we do with this double bind that the instruments we have to use to change unjust structures are inherited from these very structures**? Angela Davis: This is what we have and **we have no other choice than to use them and to simultaneously question them.** **And so the process of developing critical habits, habits of self-questioning, is a process that never ends.** And we are learning a great deal now especially, given the activism of transgender communities. We are learning a great deal about what it means to challenge categories that we have considered to be so normal that they aren’t even worth questioning. But they actually constitute the arena, the ground of our thinking. Thus when we look at movements around transgender issues, movements against the violence directed against transgender women of colour, we realize that they constitute the sector of the population that is the target of more forms of violence – state, personal, individual, etc. – and more consistent violence than any other group. So we are learning how to challenge the binary structure of gender even though there is often a telling awkwardness, especially in instances where you are asked to introduce yourself with your preferred pronouns. And that awkwardness is good and productive because it makes us question that which we haven’t previously known how to question. So I don’t think anything is immune from that process, **even the ways in which we are formulating this question about how to be critical** regarding that which we consider most normal, that which otherwise **is ideologically constructed.** And I guess **it’s about** education, about **the kind of education** that Gayatri was speaking about, as **opposed to the education that simply wants to produce skilled subjects who are able to participate well in the machinery of global capitalism.** The last thing I would say is that we have to really beware of these terms that are supposed to carry the entire weight of struggles for justice. Sara Ahmed was talking about the term diversity yesterday and I really hate that notion. I cannot stand the notion of diversity, because it means largely the effort to make the machine run more effectively with those who were previously excluded by the machine. Who wants to be assimilated into a racist institution, when the institution continues to maintain its racist structure? This is why **we always have to be hyperconscious of our vocabularies.** This is a practice that I want to carry to my grave. Gayatri Spivak: Yes, **it is legitimation by reversal**. Before they were all bad and now they are all good. This is why I find ‘Global South’ to be a reverse racist term. I mean there are some real self-constructed native informants selling themselves from these places. But **this issue of having only a tainted methodology with which to work, I find that to be completely ok. You work with what you can: an affirmative sabotage.** When Audre Lorde said that you can’t break down the master’s house with the master’s tools, she was extremely angry because of the treatment she had received at NYU. A thing like ‘The subaltern cannot speak’ – these are enraged declarations. Many take it as an excuse for avoiding homework. ‘No, no, we don’t have to read any of the master’s tools. No, the house will not be broken down.’ Lorde was not giving a formula for saving intellectual labour. In that context I would say that the masters had the leisure of the theory class. They had all the leisure on our backs – and some of us also collaborating with our tongues hanging out, so let’s not just do a finger-pointing – to develop these theories. And also, they had such a very long time in early capitalism that they could do this slowly, whereas many colonial places got the mode of exploitation without the mode of production, so they couldn’t do it from inside. **We should take** those **well-developed methods**, make our former masters our servants as it were, put them on tap rather than on top, inhabit them well, **turn them around**. Don’t accuse them, don’t excuse them, **use them for something which they were not made for.**

Ed doesn’t matter –

1. No spill over
2. In round fairness a prior question
3. University is not a monolith

### AT: Karamercan 21

#### No libidinal desire or ontology claim explains space exploration. Evaluate specificity.

**Mindell et al** **08** (David A. Mindell directs the Space, Policy, and Society Research Group at MIT. He is Dibner Professor of the History of Engineering and Manufacturing, Professor of Engineering Systems, and Director of the Program in Science, Technology, and Society at MIT. He has two decades of experience in technology development for deep ocean exploration. His most recent book is Digital Apollo: Human and Machine in Spaceflight. This paper was written in conjunction with several members of the MIT Space Engineering Dept. “The Future of Human Spaceflight”. December 2008.)

We reject these arguments about essential qualities of human nature. **No** historical **evidence**, no social science evidence, and no genetic evidence **prove that human beings have an innate, universal compulsion to explore. In fact**, **space exploration is radically different from the kinds of geographical expansion that have marked human history because of its high degree of technical difficulty**, the environments’ extreme hostility to human life, **and** the **total lack of encounters with other human cultures.** Furthermore, **if there were some grand universal compulsion to explore**, **we would find no compelling reason** for the United States or any other nation **to act now**, as we would eventually migrate to the stars, **regardless of our** potentially fallible **political decision making.** The exploration of space will continue if and only if governments or other large entities consider it within their interests and means to do so. **Only a fraction of nations** have ever found exploration valuable, and only a smaller fraction **are** now **space faring**.