## 1NC – Case on War

#### The 1AC is a direct negation of the sacred— they embrace the profane realm of life, wherein accumulation, untouchable taboos, and fruitless life are the nexus of their praxis. Their self-propagated commandment of “Thou shalt not Kill” is reminiscent of the dictation of a self-declared messenger of god, whereby their tabooing of far off wars and violence ironically only allows for it unlimited release—the taboo exists to be transgressed, and as such, it must be violated

**Bataille 62**(Georges Bataille, Normal Librarian, “Erotism: Death & Sensuality” pgs. 62-70, City Lights Books)*jrd*

\*\*We don’t endorse gendered language

The transgression does not deny the taboo but transcends it and completes it. It is not only the great variety of their subjects but also a certain illogicality that makes it difficult to discuss taboos. Two diametrically opposed views are always possible on any subject. There exists no prohibition that cannot be transgressed. Often the transgression is permitted, often it is even prescribed. **We feel like laughing when we consider the solemn commandment "Thou shalt not kill" followed by a blessing on armies** and the Te Deum of the apotheosis. No beating about the bush: murder is connived at immediately after being banned! The violence of war certainly betrays the God of the New Testament, but it does not oppose the God of Armies of the Old Testament in the same way. If the prohibition were a reasonable one it would mean that wars would be forbidden and we should be confronted with a choice: to ban war and to do everything possible to abolish military assassination; or else to fight and to accept the law as hypocritical. But the taboos on which the world of reason is founded are not rational for all that. To begin with, a calm opposite to violence would not suffice to draw a clear line between the two worlds. If the opposition did not itself draw upon violence in some way, if some violent negative emotion did not make violence horrible for everyone, reason alone could not define those shifting limits authoritatively enough. Only unreasoning dread and terror could survive in the teeth of the forces let loose. This is the nature of the taboo which makes a world of calm reason possible but is itself basically a shudder appealing not to reason but to feeling, just as violence is. (Human violence is the result not of a cold calculation but of emotional states: anger, fear or desire.) We have to take into consideration the irrational nature of taboos if we want to understand the indifference to logic they constantly display. In the sphere of irrational behaviour we are reviewing we have to say: "Sometimes an intangible taboo is violated, but that does not mean to say that it has ceased to be intangible." We can even go as far as the absurd proposition: "**The taboo is there in order to be violated**." This proposition is not the wager it looks like at first but an accurate statement of an inevitable connection between conflicting emotions. When a negative emotion has the upper hand we must obey the taboo. When a positive emotion is in the ascendent we violate it. Such a violation will not deny or suppress the contrary emotion, but justify it and arouse it. We should not be frightened of violence in the same way if we did not know or at least obscurely sense that it could lead us to worse things. The statement: "The taboo is there to be violated" ought to make sense of the fact that the taboo on murder, universal though it may be, nowhere opposes war. I am even convinced that **without the prohibition, war would be impossible and inconceivable** ! Animals, recognising no taboos, have never progressed from the fights they take part in to the organised undertaking of war. War in a way boils down to the collective organisation of aggressive urges. Like work it is organised by the community; like work it has a purpose, it is the answer to the considered intention of those who wage it. We cannot say therefore that war and violence are in conflict. But war is organised violence. The transgression of the taboo is not animal violence. It is violence still, used by a creature 'capable of reason (putting his knowledge to the service of violence for the time being). At the very least the taboo is ' the threshold beyond which murder is possible; and for the community war comes about when the threshold is crossed. If transgression proper, as opposed to ignorance of the taboo, did not have this limited character it would be a return %, to violence, to animal violence. But nothing of the kind is so. Organised transgression together with the taboo make social life what it is. The frequency-and the regularity--of transgressions do not affect the intangible stability of the prohibition since they are its expected complement-just as the diastolic movement completes a systolic one, or just as explosion follows upon compression. The compression is not subservient to the explosion, far from it; it gives it increased force. This looks like a new idea though it is founded on immemorial experience. But it runs counter to the world of speech from which science is derived and that is why it is found stated only recently. Marcel Mauss, perhaps the most remarkable interpreter of the history of religion, was conscious of it and formulated it in his oral teaching, but his printed work brings it out only in a small number of significant sentences. Only Roger Caillois, following Mauss's teaching and advice, has fully examined this aspect of transgression in his "Theory of Celebrations". Transgression without limits Often the transgression of a taboo is no less subject to rules than the taboo itself. No liberty here. "At such and such a time and up to a certain point this is permissible"- that is what the transgression concedes. But once a limited licence has been allowed, unlimited urges towards violence may break forth. The barriers are not merely raised, for it may even be necessary at the moment of transgression to assert their solidity. Concern over a rule is sometimes at its most acute when that rule is being broken, for it is harder to limit a disturbance already begun. However, in exceptional cases unlimited transgression is conceivable. Let me give you a noteworthy instance. It can happen that violence over-reaches the bounds of the taboo in some way. It seems-it may seem-that once the law has become powerless there is nothing to keep violence firmly within bounds in the future. Basically death contravenes the taboo against the violence which is supposedly its cause. Most frequently the subsequent sense of rupture brings in its wake a minor disturbance which funeral rites and festivities with their ordered ritual, setting bounds to disorderly urges, are able to absorb. **But if death prevails over a sovereign whose exalted position might seem to be a guarantee against it, that sense of rupture gets the upper hand and disorder knows no bounds.** Caillois has described the behaviour of certain oceanic peoples. "When social and natural life" he says "are summed up in the sacred person of a king, the hour of his death determines the critical instant and looses ritual licence. This licence corresponds closely with the importance of the catastrophe. The sacrilege has a social nature. It is committed ar the expense of the kingship, the heirarchy and the established powers. No hint of resistance is ever offered to the frenzy of the people. This is considered as necessary as obedience to the dead man was. In the Sandwich Islands the people on learning of the king's death commit all the acts looked on as criminal in ordinary times: they set buildings on fire, they loot and they murder, while women are expected to prostitute themselves publically . . . In the Fiji Islands the consequences are even more clearly defined. The death of the chief gives the signal for pillage, subject tribes invade the capital and indulge in every form of brigandage and depredation. "Yet these transgressions still constitute a sacrilege. They break the rules that were in force yesterday and which will be restored tomorrow, sacred and inviolable. They appear in fact as major acts of sacrilege." It is noteworthy that the disorder takes place during "the critical period of decay and degradation represented by death", during "the time when its active and contagious virulence is in full swing". It "ends when all the rotting flesh has finally disappeared from the royal corpse, when nothing is left of the remains but a hard, clean, incorruptible skeleton. The mechanism of transgression is manifest when violence is let loose in this way. Man intended to curb nature when he set up taboos in opposition and indeed he thought he had succeeded. When he confined the violent, urges of his own nature within bounds he thought he had done the same for the violence in the world outside himself. But when he saw how ineffectual was the barrier he had sought to set up against violence, the rules he had meant to observe himself lost their significance. His suppressed urges were unleashed, thenceforth he killed without hesitation, ceased to control his sexual exuberance and feared no longer to perform publically and unrestrainedly acts which hitherto he had only performed in private. As long as the king's body was given over to an active decomposition the whole of society was under the sway of violence. The barrier that had not saved the king from the ravages of death could not withstand the excesses that constantly endanger the social order. No well-defined rules order these "major acts of sacrilege" given free rein by the death of the king, but when nothing remains of the dead man but the clean bones this chaotic reign of licence comes to an end. Even in this extreme case transgression has nothing to do with the primal liberty of ' animal life. 'It opens the door into what lies beyond the limits usually observed, but it maintains these limits just the same. Transgression is complementary to the profane world, exceeding its limits but not destroying it. Human society is not only a world of work. Simultaneously—or successively—It is made up of the profane and the sacred, its two complementary forms. **The profane world is the world of taboos. The sacred world depends on limited acts of transgression. It is the world of celebrations, sovereign rulers and God. This approach is a difficult one, in that sacred simultaneously has two contradictory meanings. Whatever is the subject of a prohibition is basically sacred. The taboo gives a negative definition of the sacred object and inspires us with awe on the religious plane.** Carried to extremes that feeling becomes one of devotion and adoration. The gods who incarnate this sacred essence put fear into the hearts of those who reverence them, yet men do reverence them I none the less. Men are swayed by two simultaneous emotions: they are driven away by terror and drawn by an awed fascination. Taboo and transgression reflect these two contradictory urges. The taboo would forbid the transgression but the fascination compels it. Taboos and the divine are opposed to each other in one sense only, for the sacred aspect of the taboo is what draws men towards it and transfigures the original interdiction. The often inter- / twined themes of mythology spring from these factors. The only clear and comprehensible distinction between these two aspects of the taboo is an economic one. Taboos are there to make work possible; work is productive; during the profane period allotted to work consumption is reduced to the minimum consistent with continued production. Sacred days though are feast days. Then things which usually are forbidden are permitted or even required, though the upheaval is not necessarily as total as that following the death of a king. The values of the workaday world are inverted, as Caillois has pointed out.' From an economic standpoint the reserves accumulated during periods of work are squandered extravagantly at feast times. Here is a clearcut distinction. We are not perhaps justified in asserting that religion is based on breaking the rules rather than on the rules themselves but feast days depend on a readiness to make great inroads upon savings and feast days are the crown of religious activity. Getting and spending are the two phases of this activity. Seen in this light religion is like a dance where a novement backwards is followed by a spring forward. Man must combat his natural impulses to violence. This signifies an acceptance of violence at the deepest level, not an abrupt break with it; the feeling responsible for the rejection of violence is kept going in the background by this acceptance. Moreover the urge to reject violence is so persistent that the swing of accepted violence always has a dizzying effect. Man is seized first with nausea, then as it passes by a heady vertigo-phases of the paradoxical dance ordained by religious attitudes. By and large, then, in spite of the complexity of the impulses concerned the meaning is plaiil enough: religion is the moving force behind the breaking of taboos. Now, religion is founded on feelings of terror and awe, indeed it can hardly be thought of without them, and their existence causes some confusion. The recoil that inevitably follows the forward movement is constantly being presented as the essence of religion. This interpretation is obviously incomplete and the misunderstanding could easily be cleared up but for a misleading inner swing of feeling based on a deep inversion in harmony with the rational or practical world. In universal religions like Christianity or Buddhism terror and nausea are a prelude to bursts of burning spiritual activity. Founded as it is on a reaffirmation of the primary taboos, this spiritual life yet implies a celebration, that is, the transgression, not the observation, of the law. In Christianity and Buddhism ecstasy begins where horror is sloughed off. A sense of union with the irresistible powers that bear all thngs before them is frequently more acute in those religio~s where the pangs of terror and nausea are felt most deeply. More than any other state of mind consciousness of the void about us throws us into exaltation. This does not mean that we feel an emptiness in ourselves, far from it; but we pass beyond that into an awareness of the act of transgression. In order to define the nature and implications of transgression, rather than less complex cases I shall describe the peaks reached by overwhelming religious experience, Christian or Buddhist, where acts of transgression are accomplished. First, however, I must turn to less complex forms of transgression. I shall speak of war and sacrifice and then of physical eroticism.

## 1NC – Governmental Circumvention Def/DA

**Plan gets circumvented. It gets funneled through governmental partnerships with space agencies.**

**Davenport 20** (Christian Davenport covers NASA and the space industry for The Washington Post's Financial desk. He joined The Post in 2000 and has served as an editor on the Metro desk and as a reporter covering military affairs. He is the author of "The Space Barons: Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos and the Quest to Colonize the Cosmos". “A dollar can’t buy you a cup of coffee but that’s what NASA intends to pay for some moon rocks”. December 3, 2020.)

**NASA** **announced** Thursday **that several companies had won contracts to mine the moon** and turn over small samples to the space agency for a small fee. In one case, a company called Lunar Outpost bid $1 for the work, a price NASA jumped at after deciding the Colorado-based robotics firm had the technical ability to deliver. “You’d be surprised at what a dollar can buy you in space,” Mike Gold, NASA’s acting associate administrator for international and interagency relations, said in a call with reporters. But the modest financial incentives are not the driver of the program. Nor to a large extent is the actual lunar soil. NASA is asking for only small amounts — between 50 and 500 grams (or 1.8 ounces to about 18 ounces). While there would be scientific benefits to the mission, **it’s** really **a tech**nology **development program, allowing companies to practice extracting resources from the lunar surface** and then selling them. It would also establish a legal precedent that would pave the way for companies to mine celestial bodies in an effort blessed by the U.S. government to help build a sustainable presence on the moon and elsewhere. To do that, **NASA** says it **needs its astronauts**, like the western pioneers, to “live off the land,” **using the resources in space instead of hauling them from Earth**. The moon, for example, has plenty of water in the form of ice. **That’s not only key to sustaining human life, but** the hydrogen and oxygen in water **could also be used as rocket fuel, making the moon a potential gas station in space** that could help explorers reach farther into the solar system. **Asteroids also have significant resources, particularly precious metals that could be used for in-space manufacturing.** While the prospect of large mining and manufacturing facilities in orbit is still many years away, NASA wants to use the mining program as a small step toward that goal. NASA is now trying to return astronauts to the moon under its Artemis program for the first time since 1972. Unlike its predecessor, Apollo, where the astronauts visited the lunar surface for a short while before coming home, the Artemis program would create a permanent presence on and around the moon. “**The ability to extract and utilize space resources is the key to achieving this objective of sustainability**,” Gold said. “We must learn to generate our own water, air and even fuel. Living off the land will enable ambitious exploration activities that will result in awe-inspiring science and unprecedented discoveries.” In 2015, then-President Barack Obama signed a law that allowed private companies the right to own the resources they mined in space. Under the program announced Thursday, NASA said the materials would be transferred from the private companies to NASA. **The effort would not violate the 1967 Outer Space Treaty**, NASA officials have said, which prohibits nations from claiming sovereignty over a celestial body. NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine previously likened the policy to the rules governing the seas. “We do believe **we can extract and utilize the resources of the moon, just as we can extract and utilize tuna from the ocean**,” he said earlier this year. As part of its lunar exploration mission, NASA has been working to get countries around the world to adopt what it calls the Artemis Accords, a legal framework that would govern behavior in space and on celestial bodies such as the moon. The rules would allow private companies to extract lunar resources and create safety zones to prevent conflict and ensure that countries act transparently about their plans in space, while sharing their scientific discoveries. The mining announcement came during the same week that China landed a spacecraft on the moon, extracted resources and then lifted off from the lunar surface in an effort to return the sample to Earth. Instead of developing and sustaining a big government sample-return mission, **NASA is taking another approach by partnering with the private sector**. “If you step back and think about how really amazing it is that NASA can essentially piggyback on the private-sector space capabilities to perform this mission, it would not have been possible 10 years ago,” said Phil McAlister, the director of NASA’s commercial spaceflight division. **In addition to Lunar Outpost, the other companies chosen for NASA’s** program **are**: **ispace Japan and Europe**, which would each charge $5,000 for the material; **and Masten Space Systems of California**, would charge $15,000. All of the companies would already be on the moon, according to NASA, conducting other missions. McAlister said Lunar Outpost would be ferried to the moon by the lunar lander known as Blue Moon being developed by Jeff Bezos’s Blue Origin. (Bezos owns The Washington Post.) The company later clarified that it was looking at a number of landers to get it to the lunar surface, and not just Blue Origin’s. The ispace companies would fly on a Japanese lander, McAlister said, and Masten, already part of another NASA lunar contract, would use its own Masten XL-1 lander.

-bypasses OST so proves it’s legal

## 1NC – Privyet, Entities! Def/DA

#### **Private entities are business groups not government-affiliated nor publicly traded, but they can circumvent being a private entity by going public**

QTC, 2020 (Quest Trust Company, 9-28-2020, "What Are Private Entities?," https://www.questtrustcompany.com/2020/09/28/what-are-private-entities/)/kaichen

What is a Private Entity?

There are a few groups that can be considered **a**[**private entity**](https://www.questtrustcompany.com/2020/07/24/understanding-self-directed-employer-plans-and-which-one-is-right-for-my-business/)**in the business world. A partnership, corporation, individual, nonprofit organization, company, or any organized group that is not government-affiliated** can be considered a private entity.

Because private entities are not publicly traded companies**, they do not have public stock offerings** on Nasdaq, American Stock Exchange, or the New York Stock Exchange. They do offer private shares to investors who can trade among themselves.

This means that they do not need to meet the Securities and Exchange Commission’s (SEC) strict filing requirements that public companies do. That means their shares are less liquid, and their valuations are harder to determine.

Because private entities are not publicly traded companies, they do not have public stock offerings on Nasdaq, American Stock Exchange, or the New York Stock Exchange. They do offer private shares to investors who can trade among themselves.

This means that they do not need to meet the Securities and Exchange Commission’s (SEC) strict filing requirements that public companies do. That means their shares are less liquid, and their valuations are harder to determine.

How Do They Work?

A private entity relies on a small group of chosen investors in order to grow and fund their business. This could be employees, colleagues, friends, family, or even large institutional investors. Interested parties are able to support the private entity in order to help the company grow.

Once it reaches a certain size, a private company may eventually [decide to go public](https://www.sec.gov/smallbusiness/goingpublic). This means they are able to have an IPO or initial public offering of stock shares on a public exchange. However, many private companies prefer to remain private to maintain family ownership or avoid the high costs of an IPO.

It is also possible for a public company to go private if a large investor buys out the majority of the stock shares and removes them from public exchanges.

Prefer bc:

1. common usage—we’re talking in the context of business, which is the foundation for all economic and capitalist theories in debate, which gives most groun\

## 1NC – FW

#### Death, suffering, and extinction are inevitable. Humanity is a cosmic accident whose consciousness produces its own demise; We will inevitably disappear—but at least a value to life can we maximally enjoy whatever time we have left.

Ligotti ‘12 [Thomas Ligotti, contemporary American philosopher and horror author, THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE HUMAN RACE, p. 42—AD: 4/21/15]

Consciousness is an existential liability, as every pessimist agrees—a blunder of blind nature, according to Zapffe, that has taken humankind down a black hole of logic. To make it through this life, we must make believe that we are not what we are—contradictory beings whose continuance only worsens our plight as mutants who embody the contorted logic of a paradox. To correct this blunder, we should desist from procreating. What could be more judicious or more urgent, existentially speaking, than our selfadministered oblivion? At the very least, we might give some regard to this theory of the blunder as a “thoughtexperiment.” All civilizations become defunct. All species die out. There is even an expiration date on the universe itself. Human beings would certainly not be the first phenomenon to go belly up. But we could be the first to precipitate our own passing, abbreviating it before the bodies really started to stack up. Could we know to their most finegrained details the lives of all who came before us, would we bless them for the care they took to keep the race blundering along? Could we exhume them alive, would we shake their bony, undead hands and promise to pass on the favor of living to future generations? Surely that is what they would want to hear, or at least that is what we want to think they would want to hear. And just as surely that is what we would want to hear from our descendents living in far posterity, strangers though they would be as they shook our bony, undead hands. Nature proceeds by blunders; that is its way. It is also ours. So if we have blundered by regarding consciousness as a blunder, why make a fuss over it? Our selfremoval from this planet would still be a magnificent move, a feat so luminous it would bedim the sun. What do we have to lose? No evil would attend our departure from this world, and the many evils we have known would go extinct along with us. So why put off what would be the most laudable masterstroke of our existence, and the only one? Of course, phenomena other than consciousness have been thought to be blunders, beginning with life itself. For example, in a novel titled At the Mountains of Madness (1936), the American writer H. P. Lovecraft has one of his characters mention a “primal myth” about “Great Old Ones who filtered down from the stars and concocted earth life as a joke or mistake.” Schopenhauer, once he had drafted his own mythology that everything in the universe is energized by a Willtolive, shifted to a commonsense pessimism to represent life as a congeries of excruciations. [L]ife presents itself by no means as a gift for enjoyment, but as a task, a drudgery to be performed; and in accordance with this we see, in great and small, universal need, ceaseless cares, constant pressure, endless strife, compulsory activity, with extreme exertion of all the powers of body and mind. Many millions, united into nations, strive for the common good, each individual on account of his own; but many thousands fall as a sacrifice for it. Now senseless delusions, now intriguing politics, incite them to wars with each other; then the sweat and the blood of the great multitude must flow, to carry out the ideas of individuals, or to expiate their faults. In peace industry and trade are active, inventions work miracles, seas are navigated, delicacies are collected from all ends of the world, the waves engulf thousands. All push and drive, others acting; the tumult is indescribable. But the ultimate aim of it all, what is it? To sustain ephemeral and tormented individuals through a short span of time in the most fortunate case with endurable want and comparative freedom from pain, which, however, is at once attended with ennui; then the reproduction of this race and its striving. In this evident disproportion between the trouble and the reward, the will to live appears to us from this point of view, if taken objectively, as a fool, or subjectively, as a delusion, seized by which everything living works with the utmost exertion of its strength for some thing that is of no value. But when we consider it more closely, we shall find here also that it is rather a blind pressure, a tendency entirely without ground or motive. (The World as Will and Representation, trans. R. B. Haldane and J. Kemp) Schopenhauer is here straightforward in limning his awareness that, for human beings, existence is a state of demonic mania, with the Willtolive as the possessing spirit of “ephemeral and tormented individuals.” Elsewhere in his works, he denominates consciousness as “an accident of life.” A blunder. A mistake. Is there really anything behind our smiles and tears but an evolutionary slipup?

**Prefer bc—**

1. **prerequisite—all other frameworks are predicated in the sense that there is a value to life, meaning in death, but we arguably don’t have much**