### 1

#### Interpretation – 1AC must use personal knowledge, organic intellectuals, and academic intellectuals, to garner offense.

Reid-Brinkley, Shanara (2008),” The Harsh Realities Of “Acting Black”: How African-American Policy Debaters Negotiate Representation Through Racial Performance and Style” Retrieved from <https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/reid-brinkley_shanara_r_200805_phd.pdf> Taja1h

The process of signifyin’ engaged in by the Louisville debaters is not simply designed to critique the use of traditional evidence. As Green argues, their goal is to “challenge the relationship between social power and knowledge.”57 In other words, those with social power within the debate community are able to produce and determine “legitimate” knowledge. These legitimating practices usually function to maintain the dominance of normative knowledgemaking practices, while crowding out or directly excluding alternative knowledge-making practices. The Louisville “framework looks to the people who are oppressed by current constructions of power.”58 Jones and Green offer an alternative framework for drawing claims in debate speeches, they refer to it as a three-tier process: A way in which you can validate our claims, is through the three-tier process. And we talk about personal experience, organic intellectuals, and academic intellectuals. Let me give you an analogy. If you place an elephant in the room and send in three blind folded people into the room, and each of them are touching a different part of the elephant. And they come back outside and you ask each different person they gone have a different idea about what they was talking about. But, if you let those people converse and bring those three different people together then you can achieve a greater truth.59

#### Violation – [Extempt]

#### Prefer

#### 1] Pornotroping: The 1AC narrates forms of violence for ballots commodifying experience and degrading them to high school debate rounds and detaching ourselves from the violence. This turns the aff because none of your impacts are achieved only recreating cruel optimism.

#### 2] Embodiment – Without embodiment the aff does nothing. Their method illusory so voting aff doesn’t do the benefits it discusses. It only matters if you have a connection with the advocacy, means vote neg on presumption. Also turns their method since it filters out whiteness.

**Campbell 97** [Fiona, [members.tripod.com/FionaCampbell/speech\_acts\_on\_problematising\_empowerment.htm](http://members.tripod.com/FionaCampbell/speech_acts_on_problematising_empowerment.htm), 12-04-07] Brackets in original

So who am I to speak, to be listened to? And why is it important to identify my speaking position? The word‘ in spoken or written form (sometimes referred to as Discourse), is the site that both power and knowledge meet. Which is why speech acts can be inherently dangerous**. Furthermore a personin a Privileged speaking position, such as myself, has a political/ethical responsibility to interrogate his/her relationship” to subordinated and disadvantaged peoples** and declare their „interest‟. On this point, La Trobe University, Professor Margaret Thornton states ―assumed objectivity of **knowledge itself camouflage not only the fact that it always has a standpoint, but that it also serves an ideological purpose**‖ (Thornton 1989: 125**). Refusing to declare one‟s speaking position, I argue constitutes not only a flagrant denial of the privileging effect of speech, but must be considered as an act of complicity to systematically mislead**. I speak tonight from what I would term, a privileged speaking position. As someone who has been exposed to tertiary education, had an opportunity to read and reflect on many books and ideas, with a job and more particularly, as a teacher. Indeed, for some I act as a mentor - the one who ‗knows something about knowledge‘. On the other hand, I am deeply ambivalent about my ‗expertise‘ to engage in the act of public speech talk. For am from the margins, the client, patient, the ‗riff raff‘, flotsam and jetsam of society and might say - somewhat ‗deviant‘. It is important to come clean about my speaking position, my knowledge standpoint and declare my interests: I speak for myself as a woman who has experienced youth homelessness, childhood violence and later ‗disability‘. **Before I speak I am required to undertake a process of self-examination, to scrutinise my representational politics, to immerse myself in a self-reflexive interrogation and discern “what [my] representational politics authorises and who it erases** … ―(Howe 1994: 217). Do I speak for myself or others? Am I making gross generalisations about groups in the community? Does my speech contain unacknowledged assumptions and values? More specifically, within this process of reflection, **I am required to examine the context and location from which I speak, in order to ascertain whether it is ―allied with structures of oppression … [or] … allied with resistance to oppression.**

#### 3] Accessibility – models of debate that don’t meet the three tiered process are uniquely inaccessible for oppressed bodies because they’re forced to invest in a system that is terminally juxtaposed in opposition to their very identity.

#### TVA – defend the plan while incorporating organic intellectuals and identify how you have personally related to their topic

### 2

#### Cosmobiopolitics constitutes the governance of Outer Space as a shared resource mean to be used to further Human Progress. The Aff’s managerial at “saving” space merely sustains space as a common good for “joint usage” to further exploitation.

Damjanov 15, Katarina. "The matter of media in outer space: Technologies of cosmobiopolitics." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 33.5 (2015): 889-906. (Faculty of Arts, University of Western Australia)//Elmer

Long before the beginning of the Space Age, humans used the regions above the globe to facilitate mediation practices; electromagnetic waves, for example, were emitted across airspace and into the atmosphere to enable radio communication decades before the first artificial satellite confirmed its arrival in the planet’s orbit on 4 October 1957. With its possible roots in early societies’ use of the celestial bodies visible from the earth’s surface for temporal and spatial orientation, the ‘media history’ of the human use of outer space reaches a watershed moment with the launch of Sputnik. This basketball-sized metal sphere, equipped with radio transmitter and four external antennas, was the first solid object, the first functional media artefact that humans had placed outside their own world. This is not to say that Sputnik marks the event in which human mediation practices begun to materially impact outer space, erasing its original, ‘natural’ state – the radio signals that penetrated the layers of the troposphere and ionosphere, although intangible, left their own material traces, environmental alterations comparable with the material results of atmospheric pollution triggered by industrial progress. These early uses of space have entangled it in a gamut of processes of techno-mediation, initiating the extraterrestrial unfolding of a historical trajectory which Jussi Parikka (2011: 3) terms ‘medianature’ – they have extended this ‘continuum between mediatic apparatuses and their material contexts in the exploitation of nature’ into outer space. However, Sputnik’s orbital presence does represent a steppingstone in the extraterrestrial progression of human medianature: it indicates the species’ acquired ability to purposefully introduce an object of technical media into outer space. As such, Sputnik epitomises a shift in the use of non-terrestrial spaces; no longer were they incidental and remote to human media exploits, they were instead made central and essential. What the first signal that Sputnik sent to its ground control announced was that humanity’s techno-logic aspirations to transform the material world and advance its productive capacity through the logic of acquisition, investment and destruction – an intrinsic human impulse described by Karl Marx (1964) as our essence of species-being – are no longer earth-bound. Sputnik and all media devices that followed it have been gradually converting outer space into a living milieu, reinforcing it as a material–social setting of human circumstances and relations. The concept of ‘milieu’ is important for understanding the complexities involved in the cosmobiopolitical transformation of outer space. In Foucault’s work and in other influential texts such as those of his mentor Georges Canguilhem (2008) and Simondon (1980) and Stiegler (1998), although employed in different contexts, the term ‘milieu’ essentially designates a site which simultaneously conditions and is itself conditioned by the productive forces of human life – whether biological, social or technical. Courses of medianature in outer space sharpen such perspectives on mutually transforming relations between humans and their milieu, providing biopolitical focus to Simondon’s and Stiegler’s perspectives on technology as fundamental in constituting human life. Stiegler’s view of progress as human technological evolution frames technical objects as a prosthesis in whose creation humans embed their ‘interiors’ and through which they further exteriorise and mould their living milieu, a process which has been changing the idea of what it is to be human (Stiegler, 1998: 17). In the Stieglerian sense, the human ‘exteriorisation’ in technical media that are sent into space not only imbues the earth’s exterior with a reflection of the human, but itself reconstitutes the human and reconfigures human ways of life. These technologies thus radically enhance the capacity for species-being, becoming a vital part of our biopolitical capital: while altering our apparently otherwise lifeless planetary exterior into a malleable and thus governable locus of life, their mediatic operations assist humans to overcome their biological and geographical limitations and proceed as a collective towards becoming more-than-human. Our medianature has been continuously adjusting to its extraterrestrial conditions and the acceleration of our technological ‘exteriorisation’ in space has necessitated the development of an attendant governmental framework. The landmark attempt to arrange the increasing multiplicity of human relationships with outer space was to define them through the rule of law – a juridical prefiguration which, as Foucault and Giorgio Agamben (1998) suggest, is a prerequisite for governing life. In 1967, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (United Nations, 2002), or, The Outer Space Treaty (OST) entered into force. In lieu of the pending human landing on the Moon, this international legal agreement established outer space as the shared domain of a global commons, which is to be explored and used by all nation-states, but which itself is to stay outside the vagaries of territorial claims and property rights. A pre-emptive gesture aimed at securing politico-economic codification of the extraterrestrial milieu before human arrival, the OST did not specify where the administrative borders of outer space are – the border between terrestrial and extraterrestrial space has been unofficially assigned to the Ka´rma´n line, a region about 100 km above the planetary surface, where objects sent into space do not fall back but remain in orbit. Nevertheless, the Treaty designates its inhuman expanses as the precinct of human governance, and behind such legal coding stood the same politico-economic rationalities which Foucault identified as pivotal for the institution of the doctrine of the ‘Freedom of the Seas’ as a foundation of international maritime law in the seventeenth century. This legal principle that identified the ocean’s strategic importance as a jointly used resource and set it free from territorial claims, symptomatically announced two interrelated entrances onto the world stage – the rise of global capitalism and the birth of biopolitics, while its replication in the OST marked the next phase in their development. In one of his lectures at the Colle`ge de France, Foucault (2008: 51–73) provided a brief account of how the history of international law echoed the emergence of modern approaches to governance, where the primary emphasis upon territory becomes augmented with the objective to secure the vitality of the shared market. He described how the Treaty of Westphalia’s reinforcement of borders around sovereign states in 1598, which strengthened their inner autonomy yet limited their external reach, instituted each of them as a part of a collective of states gathered around the common interest of progress. This territorial reform aimed to end devastating wars between the states and ensure their political and economic stability, but it imposed the need for new domains of competition in which each of them could independently acquire and prosper, and all them could together be in a ‘state of permanent collective enrichment’ (Foucault, 2008: 55). These spaces, Foucault suggested, were inaugurated with the ‘Freedom of the Seas’ in 1609, which opened the ocean as a space which all states could use to advance through economic competition rather than rivalry over territory. While specifically related to the agenda of European colonial expansions, the establishment of the seas as shared commons was indicative of the awareness that the unlimited accumulation of wealth requires the infinitely free space of the global market. Freedom of the seas was, as Foucault (2008: 56) described, born out of this ‘new form of global rationality... a new calculation on the scale of the world’ and it marked the start of economic globalisation. The interplay between the finite room of territories and infinite possibilities for circulation and accumulation of capital was sustained indefinitely by asserting the global freedom, the commonality of the seas. Through the commons of the seas, capitalism assumed its global latitudes; while the historical enclosure of wastelands that were shared as ‘commons’ enabled the initial, ‘primitive’ accumulation of capital, the creation of the ocean’s commons enabled capitalism to articulate its processes at a global scale. This legal manoeuvre to defend territory by rethinking the spaces of the market institutes the idea of shared commonality as an Archimedean point for the governance of human societies, preparing the terrain for a biopolitical system of governance based upon its abstraction into a method of subsuming ‘life itself’ to the massifying logic of averages and estimates. The institution of the OST and its associated Agreements and Conventions2 from the mid-twentieth century was an outcome of yet another spatial crisis; it was an attempt to negotiate the many tensions that the arrival of the Space Age stirred within global affairs. It was at the time of Cold War and states’ political polarisation, in a world where rapid industrialisation and massive population increases were coupled with anxieties about limits to economic growth, that outer space was identified as a potential site of military conflicts, competing claims of sovereignty and a rapacious race for resources. The looming possibility of still deeper crisis necessitated another repositioning of states and markets around their vital assets, and a restoring of the global equilibrium of powers. Here the OST drew upon the juridical principle of a ‘common heritage’ of humankind – a concept previously employed in the Antarctic Treaty in 1959 for comparable arrangements of international regimes of governance – and took the idea of the commons outside the globe. The treaty expanded the conceptual borders of ‘the scale of the world’ into extraterrestrial space, prescribing that its exploration ‘shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries’ and that it ‘shall be the province of all mankind’ (OST, article 1). Once again, international law established a space of commons whose exploration and exploitation would proceed as a joint enterprise through which all states could freely advance and prosper both individually and as a part of collective. Just as the ‘Freedom of the Seas’ opened routes for ships sailing in the name of nations, the OST unlocked flightpaths for spaceships and other technologies, stimulating states’ techno-scientific interests and competition and ensuring that the emerging mode of ‘high-tech’ capitalism had from its beginnings an extra-planetary, infinite prospect. This trans-national legal netting codified an idea of global commonality and framed the inhuman regions of outer space as the ‘province of all mankind’, drawing them into its global system of governance. The OST thus provided the juridical platform from which to articulate a cosmobiopolitical order; it offered a governmental framework for enacting a vision of the human race as a species-power, which will, through the techno-mediated exploration of space, direct its own cosmic progress. Almost a half century after the OST, media technologies remain crucial to the transformation of outer space into a human province. The voracious neoliberal drive of the state-industry nexus that conditions global biopolitics is so dependent upon them, that they become a target of the same systems of governance they catalyse. Their construction, launches and distribution are the subject of careful calculation, meticulous planning and complex logistics, their condition and movements are continuously being monitored, assessed and managed, and this transfer of governmental rationalities from living humans to inanimate objects changes the biopolitical approach to human species-being. If biopower emerged as concerned with bodies of human individuals and populations, and pressing environmental concerns about the ‘global body of the Earth’ augmented its application ‘from human to planetary bodies’ (Bryld and Lykee, 2000: 92–94), then space-based media technologies mark a subsequent phase in the development of its architecture. They trigger the transposition of life management onto the bodies and populations of media technologies and it is this shift which inaugurates the object-centred coordinates of the cosmobiopolitical: the governance of the human without actual humans. The legal basis of cosmobiopolitics, the OST respectively preserves the status of outer space as a globally shared domain and permits its occupation by technical media that are the legal province of particular terrestrial entities, thus accommodating the contradictory tenets of their governance. However, these governmental rationalities are defined by codes of law and ‘the law’ as Foucault (2007: 47) notes ‘works at the level of the imaginary’, and it can only imagine things which can and cannot be done; like the 0s and 1s of digital code, it only prescribes a state of presence or absence of things. It is the very presence of media technologies in outer space (and the absence of humans) which contradictorily makes possible and disturbs the cosmobiopolitical imaginary. Their remote position situates them beyond the reach of juridical rule and the policing-power of states, literally placing them outside of the ‘global grid’ of governance. While they are used as apparatus through which to enable human terrestrial enterprises, these objects themselves carry the essence of terra and of the absent presence of the human beyond the globe. The media technologies in outer space do not only reduce the incompatibility between the human and the extraterrestrial, but also introduce frictions within their exchanges. This disturbance suggests that their material realities disrupt the imaginaries implied by law and instead assert their own force, reinforcing these objects somewhat absurdly as the non-governable markers of extraterritoriality in the commons, as the non-human emissaries of humanity, and as a non-living population of objects which are managed as if they were alive. In outer space, the matter of media itself becomes code through which to define what can be propertied and what remains commons, what can be governed and what poses itself as ungovernable, where the human ends and the non-human begins, where the boundaries that distinguish governance of the living from the non-living lie and when biopolitics transmutes into a cosmobiopolitics. The media apparatus that support the metamorphosis of biopolitics in outer space are varied, and the milieus in which they function require a range of different performances. The following sections of this paper consider a number of the varying ways specific media technologies perform this extra-planetary extension of the impulse to govern life by focusing on satellites and their debris, and on the prospects of an interplanetary Internet. None of these specimens provides a complete picture of the ways in which media technologies inspire the advent of a cosmobiopolitics. Rather, each offers a different angle from which to consider the shifts in material and social arrangements that are demanded by forays beyond the earth, signs that herald a radical shift in the way humanity conceives of life and articulates its governance. What follows is a series of initial steps, the first paces in a far larger survey that aims to chart the natality of the emergent cosmic traits of biopolitics. I offer here a series of sketches, an outline of tentative trajectories suggested by contemporary mediatic excursions into outer space. By exploring how we manage an over-population of functional and defunct media objects in orbital space and imagine the utilities of interplanetary Internet networks, I suggest that human extraterrestrial medianatures necessitates a profound alteration in our relationship with the technologies, and the reframing of governmental obsessions with discourses of territory, security, and population.

#### The Affirmative obfuscates the intricate connection between the “Public” sector and “Militarism” – the Aff is merely a smokescreen to hide military development of outer space in new forms.

Sheehan 7, Michael. The international politics of space. Routledge, 2007. (Nancy and Peter Meinig Family Investigator in the Life Sciences, Assistant Professor)//Elmer

The 1958 Space Act declared that the United States was keen to explore space for ‘peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind’, and allowed for ‘cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations’.30 This declaration had a dual purpose. The first statement was designed to deflect attention away from the military dimension of US space research and reduce foreign concerns that the United States was seeking to militarize outer space. The second statement’s purpose was to promote the image of the United States as a scientific leader that was willing to share the development of space with other nations, and which therefore clearly had no hidden agenda beyond space exploration for the general benefit of humanity. In this regard, it fitted in with other US policy initiatives designed to promote the image of the United States as a country eager to cooperate internationally in an open and transparent manner. The Marshall Plan, Atoms-for-Peace and the Peace Corps were all part of this general image-building approach, though all had other motivations as well, as did the space policy. The apparent separation of civilian and military activities allowed the United States considerable flexibility. By having a largely transparent civilian-dominated programme, American public insecurity was alleviated, yet at the same time the US was able to continue its military programmes away from the glare of national and international scrutiny, and often successfully camouflaged behind actual or fictitious civilian space projects. In fact, unknown to the American public, there were three, not two space programmes, white, blue and black. The white programme was the high profile civilian programme led by NASA. The blue programme was the classified military programme run by the Department of Defense. In addition, there was the ‘black programme’, the reconnaissance programme run by the intelligence agencies. The apparent separation of the elements of the US space programme made it easier for the vast majority of the American political establishment to rally behind a substantial and energetic space programme. Liberals could support it as an alternative form of competition with the Soviet Union in an era when the dangers of nuclear war were very real, while conservatives saw the programme as developing military hardware and providing capabilities that would in the long run enhance the effectiveness of US armed forces.31

#### The desire to manage Debris to protect Satellites is a form of cosmo-biopolitical control which determines the productive capacity of objects and people in terms of risk analysis.

Damjanov 15, Katarina. "The matter of media in outer space: Technologies of cosmobiopolitics." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 33.5 (2015): 889-906. (Faculty of Arts, University of Western Australia)//Elmer

Satellite control is guided by the perspective of Space Situational Awareness (SSA), which, although central to orbital logistics, is thus far without an official definition (Kaiser, 2014). In essence, SSA is concerned not only with observation and surveillance of satellites as a way of knowing details of their orbital position, but also with collecting, aggregating and analysing a wide range of types of data about all objects and events in orbital space as a reference point from which to estimate the best courses in their management. One of the many descriptions of the SSA postulates it as the pursuit of ‘a comprehensive knowledge of the population of space objects, of the space environment, and of the existing risks and threats’ (European Security and Defence Assembly, 2009). While suggestive of the biopolitical agenda of securing human activities in the orbital milieu, this formulation symptomatically reveals a turn towards object-oriented governance: SSA focuses upon the ‘population of space objects’. On one hand, the term ‘space object’ is a legal classification of all human-made items placed in outer space, a nomenclature introduced by the OST and elaborated in the Liability Convention from 1972, which gives their legal owners exclusive rights to control and interfere with them. On the other, the phrase ‘population of space objects’ – an expression which is customarily used in expert vocabulary surrounding SSA5 – signposts a repositioning of the human-centred en masse purview of biopolitics to incorporate a population of technologies. The biopolitical use of the term ‘population’ originally specifies a mass of living humans; however, with its application to the assemblage of human-made satellites, biopolitics in outer space becomes central to attempts to manage a population whose bodies are neither human, not animate, but that of technology. This twofold satellite logistics which focuses upon both singular ‘space objects’ and a collective ‘space population’ to assess multiple variables that determine their productive capacity and manage risks associated with their occupation of orbital space, reinforces regimes of satellite management which operate parallel to that of humans. At both its administrative and executive levels, the governance of satellites regulates their material presence in space, managing their distribution, traffic, operations and decommission. Satellite launches require technical and procedural compliance with national and international protocols. Information about each satellite is stored in the United Nations Register of Space Objects Launched into Outer Space that functions as an inventory of their births and deaths, and while apparently excluding undisclosed missions,6 acts as an (always incomplete) global census on satellite population. Activities of satellites are continuously examined, evaluated and upheld via a multifaceted management system termed Tracking, Telemetry and Control (TT&C). TT&C enables ground control centres to monitor satellites via sensors and on-board computers with which they are equipped, telemetrically measure their ‘health’ by determining the ‘condition and performance of various subsystems such as fuel status, attitude and output of solar panels’, and adjust their trajectories, configurations and functions (U.S. Army Space Division, n.d.). Within satellite logistics, authority over each satellite is restricted to its owners and allows for its individual proprietary control, but the overall population of satellites is seen as a shared matter of global security, which necessitates cooperative collection and exchange of data between space agencies, commercial and space experts and enthusiasts. There is a range of satellite tracking software and databases, some with restricted access such as the US Space Surveillance Network that only provides data to subscribed governmental and commercial parties, and others which are freely available online such as the UCS Satellite Database or the website Heaven Above that enable the public to monitor the movement of satellites. Taken together, these examples of logistical inscription and calculated management suggest attempts to institute a global system of networked satellite control which corresponds with the twin-poled organisation of power over life. It simultaneously centres on an individual satellite (aiming to diagnose and restore its health and discipline its conduct in order to maximise its productivity) and their entire population (overseeing its demographic distribution and circulation and seeking to uphold its ‘public health’).7 However, like the volatile lives of humans, the orbital life of satellites to some extent eludes its logistical control; as Foucault (1990: 143) reminds us, ‘it is not that life has been totally integrated into techniques that govern and administer it; it constantly escapes them’. Aside from the stealth or spy satellites constructed to avoid detection by any party external to their missions and the general techno-scientific limitations of satellite control, a satellite’s life in orbit could take many unexpected turns which rupture the effective performance of its control grids. For example, the Eutelsat W2M unexpectedly fell from its orbital pathway (Selding, 2009), the unforeseen collision between US Iridium 33 and the inactive Russian Kosmos 2251 satellite demolished them both (Iannotta and Malik, 2009), and an Indonesian satellite was damaged ‘by urine and faecal matter’ left in orbit by manned space missions (China Daily, 2006). Due to human error or factors beyond human control, a satellite occasionally crashes with another object in orbit, sometimes it falls back to Earth, its body suffers material damage and its vital functions fail, the service that it provides is terminated and its ‘death’ takes the hands-on approach of satellite logistics out of hand. Orbital debris or space waste (Figure 1) presents a particular encumbrance for the efficiency of satellite logistics: millions of pieces of obsolete satellites silently swirl around the planet at ultra-high velocities and are to stay in orbit for years, centuries and even millennia, posing a constant collision hazard for active spacecraft and constraining their future launches. Space waste is subject to the same logistic networks of surveillance and database governance as the active satellites, but while its ‘Tracking’ is possible to a very limited extent,8 its management does not involve ‘Telemetry’ and certainly not ‘Control’. The unruly blanket of satellite debris participates in satellite circulation as a bad element, ‘a living dead’ formation that is impossible to command – material evidence of the effective loss of authority and control in orbital space. The fragmented bodies of defunct satellites introduce a disorder into satellite logistics, and they are literary ‘non-governable’ objects which, as Ned Rossiter describes in his discussion of the management of electronic waste, ‘hold a range of implications for biopolitical technologies of control’ (Rossiter, 2009: 37). They suggest, in this instance, that cosmobiopolitical modes of governance also need to incorporate the risk produced by the afterlife of space objects as a way of compensating for deterioration of its aptitude to enforce sovereignty rights and property management over their ‘unruly’ conduct. The proliferation of spent satellite hardware destabilises the security of the global circulation of information and knowledge. The movement of each satellite entails a constant risk from damage that would transform it into uncontrollable ‘living dead’ matter with the potential to subsequently contaminate others and corrupt their signal transmissions. Foucault’s research into ways in which historical approaches to epidemics reflect the methodological shifts in exercising power over life, evolving from the sovereignty model of the exclusion of the contagious, via disciplinary prescription of normative procedures surrounding the diseased, to biopolitical strategies of prevention and prediction of outbreaks. In contemporary culture, metaphors of epidemics and contagion have been extended from their originally biological context to the circulation of ‘immaterial’ digital content such as computer worms, viruses and spam (Parikka, 2005, 2007a, 2007b; Sampson, 2011; Thacker, 2005a). With space debris, such metaphors extend to the technological hardware which sustains information networks and ultimately global systems of biopolitical control. The application of information technologies to evaluate the ‘public health’ of satellites mirrors the practice of biosurveillance that monitors the risks of epidemics among living biota and in this sense, their logistics can be seen as a strategy of preventive biodefense. The official guidelines that cover the construction, management and disposal of satellites provide instructions about developing them from materials that would enable greater control over their bodies, even when they cease to operate (United Nations, 2010; US Government, 1997). Here endeavours to command the matter and ways of life through the application of advanced technologies are imposed upon the bodies and population of satellites. The efforts to improve the vitality of satellites’ physiques and breed them into a healthy, resistant population, transfer the risk-combating strategies of satellite logistics from discipline and surveillance to deep ecologies of bioengineering. The materiality of satellites triggers a biopolitical response, a human attempt to mitigate the contagion risk by attempting to govern these inanimate objects as if they were living. The mass of functional and defunct satellites that swarm around the globe has become an inseparable part of its environs, which reconfigures the circumstances of human medianatures. Each of their atoms is now a constituent element of orbital space and as such they themselves become a common that is shared by all. This is a common created by humans at the level of species – material evidence that the impact of human technoindustrial activities which have pushed the planet into a new geological period, the Anthropocene, is already overspilling the globe. Satellite populations facilitate new paths for the biopolitical production of the commons, revealing the material aspect of information and communication technologies as vital to the creation of human collectivities. Thacker (2005b) suggests that, in the age in which informatics becomes central for securing life and its processes, ‘perhaps we can rephrase Foucault’s formulation of biopolitics, and suggest that biopolitics is the condition in which population, information, and security become intertwined in a set of practices, responses, and preparations’. In the context of the satellites that inhabit the orbital commons, this rephrasing should also include the impact that the matter of technology has upon the global focus and practices of biopolitics. In this sense, the human relationship with satellites signposts a possible transformation of biopower as power concerned only with the mere survival of the human element of ‘bare life’ (Agamben, 1998) towards a more technical and perhaps networked definition of life, which encompasses both humans and objects involved in mediation practices and whose governance incorporates their living and living-like populations.

#### The Impact is unending war and environmental catastrophe.

Craven 19 [Matt Craven (Professor of International Law, SOAS University of London, United Kingdom). “‘Other Spaces’: Constructing the Legal Architecture of a Cold War Commons and the Scientific-Technical Imaginary of Outer Space”. European Journal of International Law, Volume 30, Issue 2, May 2019, Pages 547–572, Accessed 1/12/22. <https://academic.oup.com/ejil/article/30/2/547/5536739> //Xu]

Even in the aftermath of the pronounced ‘closure’ of the Cold War, the residue of the formation that was brought into play in space remains very much with us today. On the one hand, outer space has been progressively enveloped within the technological infrastructure of warfare and policing actions – the first Gulf War of 1990 ushering in a new era of ‘smart’ weaponry and GPS-configured surgical violence139 – anticipating, in the process, the ‘remote’ operations of the drone and cyber warfare of the contemporary era. The blurring of the demarcation between the (outer space) technologies of war and peace finds its contemporary parallels in the collapse of a range of other operative distinctions – between the virtual and the real, the combatant and the civilian, the battlefield and the battle space, the interstate and the intra-state. The juridical formations on which these depend, furthermore, have themselves become enveloped within the same strategic operations – ‘lawfare’ becoming the adjunct to a new form of totalized warfare stripped of any spatial determinacy. On the other side, outer space has increasingly become the terrain of speculative capitalism, which, following the growth of space tourism (pioneered by the Russian space administration in the 1990s140), has seen the active development of a range of commercial projects from the construction of sub-orbital ‘space planes’ to asteroid and lunar mining undertaken by both public and private agencies. The imaginative resources for such projects have come from various directions, but a common theme is that impending resource depletion on earth will soon bring such resources within commercial and technological reach, and that outer space will therefore provide a ‘spatial fix’ for a system of global capitalism that might otherwise run into the ground.141 There is, as Katarina Damjanov has noted,142 a deep parallelism here between the juridical opening of the seas (mare liberum), which served to stabilize the system of sovereignty within Europe in the 17th century by extroverting the site of conflict and competition,143 and the opening of outer space three centuries later as another prophylactic measure, even if, in this case, that which was to be guarded against was a planetary-wide, environmental catastrophe. Perhaps the deepest irony, here, is that the mode of salvation on offer is precisely the same as that which is the extant cause of crisis, which one may take to be a remorseless instrumentalization of nature.

#### The alternative is *Worldism* – the refusal of international relations and specialization as dictated by militarism in favor of epistemological interventions into the exercise of Space as a carceral apparatus.

Agathangelou and Ling 09 Anna M. Agathangelou is an Associate Professor in the Departments of Political Science and Women’s Studies at York University, Canada and co-director of the Global Change Institute, Nicosia, Cyprus, L.H.M. Ling is an Associate Professor in the Graduate Program in Inter- national Affairs at The New School, New York, USA., Transforming World Politics: From empire to multiple worlds, The New International Relations Series, 2009.

MAIN ASPECTS Worldism presents world politics as a site of multiple worlds. These refer to the various and contending ways of being, knowing, and relating that have been passed onto us from previous generations. Histories, languages, myths, and memories institutionalize and embody multiple worlds through simple daily acts like cooking and eating, singing and dancing, joking and playing but also through larger events like trade, development, conflict, and war. Worldism registers not only the “difference” that comes from multiple worlds (see Inayatullah and Blaney 2004) but also their entwinements. Selves and others reverberate,2 producing multi- and trans-subjectivities that leave us legacies of reinforcement and conflict, reconstruction and critique, reconciliation and resistance. Such syncretic engagements belie seeming oppositions and contradictions among multiple worlds to reveal their underlying connections despite hegemony’s violent erasures. On this basis, communities have opportunities to heal and recuperate so they can build for another day, for another generation. Worldism as everyday life enacts self–other reverberations and syncretic engagements, especially by communities at the margins. Worldism as an analytical framework theorizes about them. Both types of worldist activity expose the problematic of empire in practice and logics. Building on the postcolonial notion that all parties make history, albeit with unequal access to power, worldism leads to an undeniable conclusion: our mutual embeddedness makes us mutually accountable. One cannot escape from the other. Mutual accountability brings with it duties and responsibilities, to be sure, but also possibilities: that is, (a) an internal dialectic of constant questioning to check and problematize hegemony, so that (b) we can expand our visions, strategies, and approaches beyond the narrow, hegemonic confines of realism/liberal internationalism, in order to (c) arrive at a more inclusive, conciliatory, and democratic world politics. In brief, worldism consists of two simultaneous processes: descriptive and analytical. Worldism-as-description features the following: (a) multi- and trans-subjectivities that institutionalize the social and structural reverberations between selves and others; (b) the agency of all parties, despite inequities and injustices, to create, build, and articulate multiple worlds; (c) syncretic engagements that consolidate the entwinements of multiple worlds into concrete strategies for change, adjustment, adaptation, refor- mulation, and transformation; and (d) community-building that integrates and accretes these syncretic engagements despite denials of such efforts from hegemonic elites and their ideologies. Worldism-as-analysis draws on the struggles and learning undertaken in worldist daily life to emphasize: (a) accountability as a hallmark of worldist inquiry that ensures (b) an internal criticality to question, contest, and challenge hegemony, so that we may (c) arrive at emancipatory construction even as we critique and resist. The critical reader may interject: Couldn’t “agency” and “accountabil- ity” in worldism be taken as a fancy way of blaming the victim? Are Jews, for example, responsible for the Holocaust; slaves for their enslavement; or any oppressed people for their oppression? Worldism as a politics of multiple relations subsumes this liberal, individualist understanding of responsibility. Multiple relations produce a web of effects and consequences to any kind of decisions and/or set of practices. Accountability in worldism asks: Who’s involved, under what conditions, and through which processes can we redress or transform the violence? What kinds of understanding are generated to account for these relations and/or to make them invisible? Without the painful concession that all of us, “abusers,” “victims,” and “innocent bystanders” alike, contribute to the production of hegemonic violence, whether it results in domestic abuse (see Adler and Ling 1995) or state violence (see Ling 1994), we may never realize how violence is conceived, generated, and sustained. By extension, we will never understand ways to end it. Instead, in our injuries and (self ) alienation, we may reproduce time and again the same conditions of violence or hegemony that afflicted us in the past and which seems the only option for the present. Suspended political ideals, in this case, could also block us from action and change. Worldist agency and accountability compel us to face the complicities (including our own) that sustain violence in the making of history, so that we may, as Marx exhorted, change it. Where do these ideas come from?, our reader may ask. Let us delineate the intellectual precedents to worldism. INTELLECTUAL PRECEDENTS Worldism draws on constructivism and postmodernism but also differs from them. Worldism shares with constructivism its emphasis on intersubject- ivity, and with postmodernism its insights on asymmetrical difference: that is, the norms, institutions, practices, and behaviors that set up certain subjects and subjectivities as more privileged and protected than others. Power, then, cannot be reduced to an objectified, reified condition of who’s “on top” or who “has more” but instead results from agents contributing to macro-political structures like ideology, organization, and capitalist relations. Power redefined in these terms stems from an intersubjective consensus within a context of material conditions and relations. The crux here lies in the framing. Since narration as a process is never complete, the story can always change.3 However, worldism departs from constructivism by asking: What kinds of intersubjectivity are constructed, by whom, and for what purpose, and how do theories of subjectivity restructure the world “otherwise”? And is this how we want the world to be? Not probing into the social relations of intersubjectivity, according to worldism, effectively erases the power politics of meaning, including the political economy behind such constructions. And unlike postmodernism, worldism distinguishes power from the resistance it induces. Contra Foucault (1994), we differentiate between the colonizer and colonized in their experiences of colonial power (see Stoler 2002) and the entwinements that follow, both reinforcing and conflicting complicity (see Ling 2002b). Not doing so implicitly reinforces the imperialist assertion that “this is the way the world is”: that is, it is not open to alternative concepts, discourses, strategies, or ways of being. These gaps in constructivism and postmodernism return us to the conventional treatment of power as domination, pure and simple. Ronen Palan (2000), for instance, finds a strain of conservative realism in Alexander Wendt’s “naturalist” version of constructivism, primarily because he claims to offer a method only, and not an interpretation, of politics. Wendt (2005) himself admits as much. For similar reasons, Samir Amin (2004) calls postmodernism an “ideological accessory” to elite, bourgeois interests just as Aijaz Ahmad (1992) considers post-structuralist theories serve as alibis for imperialism. Both post- modernism and poststructuralism value critique and deconstruction over political action, thereby keeping de facto power intact. We note that although critical theories like postmodernism and con- structivism open up spaces to think about shifting power politics, they fall short of transforming the very asymmetries they critique. Inattention to structural, material interest and lack of integrating the Other analytically – that is, as a substantive maker of the world – undermines their claims of emancipatory social theory. Ultimately, the Other becomes a repository of raw materials for hegemonic actors and sites in the North to process. Worldism acknowledges a deep intellectual debt to postcolonial studies. Here, race, gender, sexuality, class, and nationality serve as analytics and substance in examinations of power relations. Postcolonial studies demystify empire’s boast, like Kipling’s “White Man’s Burden,” that the imperial Self makes the world for all Others. And that world is unidimensional (top- down state power), unilateral (center dominates periphery), and unilinear (past–present–future). Postcolonial studies record a more nuanced and multiple history by problematizing the ways colonial power is imposed on the colonized. That is, colonization involves more than a unilateral and mechanical domination of the subjugated by colonizers and their states. As documented by postcolonial studies, tensions and contradictions emerge from these relations (Said 1979; Spivak 1999), leading to adaptations and integrations between hegemonic selves and subaltern others. From this inter- action, “colonizers” and “colonized” produced something together over the course of time that neither anticipated nor perhaps desired but which all learned to live with, and eventually called their own. Divides along lines of property, race, class, language, religion, and ideology did not disappear. They fused, rather, into hybrid, creole, or mélange cultures that, nonethe- less, contested these categories constantly (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 1995; Lewis and Mills 2003). In recognizing that colonizer and colonized mutually construct their sub- jectivities, postcolonial studies attribute to both the legacies of power that we face today. Note, for example, Britain’s principal instrument of colonial and imperial power: the East India Company. Sudipta Sen (1998) shows that, contrary to claims that the British brought capitalism to India, the East India Company had to adjust to pre-existing market structures and political relations to gain access to the thriving trade already in place in northern India.4 Only through this kind of entry could the East India Company later redirect the trade to its favor. L.H.M. Ling (2002b) traces how institutional elites in East Asia learned syncretically and “interstitially” between two world orders – the agrarian-based, cosmo-moral universe of Confucian governance and the Westphalian inter-state system of commerce and trade – to cumulate into what we know as Asian capitalism today. Walter Mignolo (2000) highlights the “gnosis” of thought and action, Self and Other, that comes from centuries of transgressing and reformulating the colonial boundaries that comprise Latin America. Of course, those subjected to hegemony must accommodate others more than those who perpetrate it. Yet hegemony’s very asymmetry highlights the resilience and creativity of the marginalized. Ordinary people can journey across subjectivities to engage syncretically with others, even under conditions of poverty and inequality, to rebuild, reconstruct, and reorganize communities. Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldua (1983) characterize their straddling of multiple worlds as life on the “borderlands.” Typically, they point out, women of color from the South must bear the biggest burden of negotiating the multiple worlds of language, culture, class, and gender to survive white- majority society in the North despite systemic discrimination and obstacles. Still, they are able to exercise internal reserves of freedom, thought, and action to sort through hegemony, not simply surrender to it. Similarly, the indigenous populations of the Americas, Australia, and New Zealand have entered into treaties with their white majorities to retain aspects of indigenous ontologies by formalizing them in Western institutions (Shilliam 2008).