**1NC**

**T**

**1NC – Framework**

**Interpretation – the affirmative must only garner offense from a defense of the resolution.**

**The appropriation of outer space means permanently taking property**

**Gorove, LLM, 69** [Stephen Gorove, LLM & PhD Philsophy@Yale. "Interpreting Article II of the Outer Space Treaty." Fordham L. Rev. Vol. 37, Issue 3, pp. 349, published 1969, https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1966&amp;context=flr] HWIC

With respect to the concept of appropriation the basic question is what constitutes "appropriation," as used in the Treaty, especially in contradistinction to casual or temporary use. The term "appropriation" is used most frequently to denote the taking of property for one's own or **exclusive use with a sense of permanence**. Under such interpretation the establishment of a permanent settlement or the carrying out of commercial activities by nationals of a country on a celestial body may constitute national appropriation if the activities take place under the supreme authority (sovereignty) of the state. Short of this, if the state wields no exclusive authority or jurisdiction in relation to the area in question, the answer would seem to be in the negative, unless, the nationals also use their individual appropriations as cover-ups for their state's activities.5 In this connection, it should be emphasized that the word "appropriation" indicates a taking which involves something more than just a casual use. Thus a temporary occupation of a landing site or other area, just like the temporary or nonexclusive use of property, would not constitute appropriation. By the same token, any use involving consumption or taking with intention of keeping for one's own exclusive use would amount to appropriation.

**A private entity is**

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&height=800&iframe=true&def_id=6-USC-625312480-168358316&term_occur=999&term_src=title:6:chapter:6:subchapter:I:section:1501>

(A) In general Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

**"To be" is a linking verb of description**

**GU no date** [Gallaudet University. "ACTION VERBS AND LINKING VERBS," https://www.gallaudet.edu/tutorial-and-instructional-programs/english-center/grammar-and-vocabulary/verbs/action-verbs-and-linking-verbs/] HWIC

A linking verb is a verb that links (connects) the subject of the sentence to **information about that subject**. Linking verbs **do not describe action**. When using linking verbs, the sentence structure will be : SUBJECT--->LINKING VERB---> INFORMATION ABOUT THE SUBJECT (noun)(verb)(adjective, noun, or complement)

Some verbs are ALWAYS linking verbs because they never describe an action. Other verbs can be linking verbs in some sentences and action verbs in other sentences.

The following three verbs are ALWAYS linking verbs:

to be (is, am, are, was, were, has been, have been, had been, is being, are being, was being, will have been, etc.) to become (become, becomes, became, has become, have become, had become, will become, will have become, etc.) to seem (seemed, seeming, seems, has seemed, have seemed, had seemed, is seeming, are seeming, was seeming, were seeming, will seem) Here are some examples of linking verbs that are ALWAYS linking verbs in sentences: “The ball is red.” 'Is' is a linking verb that connects the subject, ball, to information about that subject (that it is red). “The children are smart.” 'Are' is a linking verb that connects the subject, children, to information about that subject (that they are smart). “The child will be tall five years from now.” 'Will be' is the linking verb connecting 'child' to the fact that he will be 'tall five years from now.'“The cat seems fine.”'Seems' links the subject, cat, with information about the cat (that it is fine). “The dog became thin after his surgery.” 'Became' links the subject, the dog, with information about him (that he became thin).

**Unjust means unfair or immoral**

**OED no date** ["unjust, adj. and n." Oxford English Dictionary, https://www-oed-com.proxy.hw.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/214856] HWIC

A. adj.

1. Not fair or equitable.

Thesaurus »

a. That does not observe the principles of justice or fair dealing; not acting justly, fairly, or impartially, esp. in administering justice; not behaving in an equitable manner with regard to a person or thing.

c1384—2011(Show quotations)

Thesaurus »

b. That is not in accordance with justice or fairness; inequitable, unfair; characterized by unfairness; esp. (of a punishment, reward, etc.) not merited; undeserved.

c1384—2010(Show quotations)

Thesaurus »

Categories »

2. Lacking integrity or moral rectitude; characterized by this; not acting in accordance with what is morally right or just; wicked, sinful; dishonourable. Also: unfaithful or untrue to (†of) a promise, obligation, etc. (cf. just adj. 11b). Now rare.

c1400—1976(Show quotations)

Thesaurus »

3. Not proper or appropriate; not justified or warranted.

c1443—1996(Show quotations)

Thesaurus »

Categories »

4. Not accurate; incorrect; inexact, imprecise; (formerly also) †irregular (obsolete). Now rare.

In later use frequently with implication of unfairness or injustice.

1554—1986(Show quotations)

**Violation: they garner offense from a non-topical plantext**

**B] Standards –**

**They destroy engagement – predictable stasis ensures research accessibility and negative ground. Even if public policy isn’t the best focus for activism, it’s crucial for dialogue because it’s grounded in consistent reporting and academic work.**

**1] Changing the topic post facto structurally favors the aff by manipulating balance of prep and obliterating limits – vote neg because debate is a competitive game that’s meaningless without substantive constraints.**

**2] Exclusionary rule: They transform debate into a monologue which means their arguments are presumptively false because they haven’t been subjected to well researched scrutiny. Switch-side debate is good for portable skills and solves critical engagement on both sides**

**3] Their model creates a structural disincentive to substantial research. Failure to defend the actor and mechanism of the resolution allows them to shift their advocacy to the terms most favorable to them – causes dogmatism and forces the neg into generics at the margins of the literature – destroys good scholarship.**

**4] Moral hazard – they allow truisms like "racism bad" which are impossible to negate ethically – that makes debate unsafe**

**C**] **Drop the debater on T – the round is already skewed from the beginning because their advocacy excluded my ability to generate NC offense – letting them sever doesn’t solve**. **Debate is a game- forced winner/loser, speech times etc prove. Other impacts like activism or education can also be pursued in other forums, you can only win competitive debates at a debate tournament. Game recognition makes fairness the most important impact – both teams should have equal access to the ballot.**

**D] Use competing interpretations – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom where debaters will exploit a judge’s tolerance for questionable argumentation.**

**K**

**1NC – Cap**

**Radical politics that focus on questions of identity, individualism, etc, and increase economic inequality reify neoliberalism**

**Smulevich-Tucker & Thompson 15** (Gregory Smulevich-Tucker & Michael Thompson, September 2015, Radical Intellectuals and the Subversion of Progressive Politics: The Betrayal of Politics, kindle edition, page number at end of card Thompson is a Political Scientist @ William Patterson University, Smulevich-Tucker is a philosophy professor @ Baruch)

Radical politics in contemporary Western democracies finds itself in a state of crisis. When viewed from the vantage point of social change, a progressive transformation of the social order, political radicalism is found wanting. This would seem to go against the grain of perceived wisdom. As an academic enterprise, radical theory has blossomed. Figures such as Slavoj Žižek openly discuss Marxism in popular documentaries, new journals have emerged touting a radical “anti-capitalism,” and whole conferences and subfields are dominated by questions posed by obscure theoretical texts. Despite this, there is a profound lack in substantive, meaningful political, social, and cultural criticism of the kind that once made progressive and rational left political discourse relevant to the machinations of real politics and the broader culture. Today, leftist political theory in the academy has fallen under the spell of ideas so far removed from actual political issues that the question can be posed whether the traditions of left critique that gave intellectual support to the great movements of modernity— from the workers’ movement to the civil rights movement— possess a critical mass to sustain future struggles. Quite to the contrary, social movements have lost political momentum; they are generally focused on questions of culture and shallow discussions of class and obsessed with issues of identity— racial, sexual, and so on— rather than on the great “social question” of unequal economic power, which once served as the driving impulse for political, social, and cultural transformation. As these new radical mandarins spill ink on futile debates over “desire,” “identity,” and illusory visions of anarchic democracy, economic inequality has ballooned into oligarchic proportions, working people have been increasingly marginalized, and ethnic minority groups turned into a coolie labor force. This has been the result, we contend, of a lack of concern with real politics in contemporary radical theory. Further, we believe that this is the result of a transformation of ideas, that contemporary political theory on the Left has witnessed a decisive shift in focus in recent decades— a shift that has produced nothing less than the incoherence of the tradition of progressive politics in our age. At a time when the Left is struggling to redefine itself and respond to current political and economic crises, a series of trends in contemporary theory has reshaped the ways that politics is understood and practiced. Older thinkers such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, and Jacques Derrida, and newer voices like Alain Badiou, Jacques Rancière, David Graeber, and Judith Butler, among others, have risen to the status of academic and cultural icons while their ideas have become embedded in the “logics” of new social movements. As some aspects of the recent Occupy Wall Street demonstrations have shown, political discourse has become increasingly dominated by the impulses of neo-anarchism, identity politics, postcolonialism, and other intellectual fads. This new radicalism has made itself so irrelevant with respect to real politics that it ends up serving as a kind of cathartic space for the justifiable anxieties wrought by late capitalism, further stabilizing its systemic and integrative power rather than disrupting it. These trends are the products as well as unwitting allies of that which they oppose. The transformation of radical and progressive politics throughout the latter half of the twentieth and the early decades of the twenty-first centuries is characterized by both a sociological shift as well as an intellectual one. A core thesis has been that the shift from industrial to postindustrial society has led to the weakening of class politics. But this is unsatisfying. There is no reason why class cannot be seen in the divisions of mental and service labor as it was with an industrial proletariat. There is no reason why political power rooted in unequal property and control over resources, in the capacity for some to command and to control the labor of others as well as the consumption of others ought not to be a basic political imperative. To this end, what we would call a rational radical politics should seek not the utopian end of a “post-statist” politics, but rather to enrich common goods, erode the great divisions of wealth and class, democratize all aspects of society and economy, and seek to orient the powers of individuals and the community toward common ends. Indeed, only by widening the struggles of labor and rethinking the ends of the labor movement— connecting the struggles of labor to issues beyond the workplace, to education, the environment, public life, issues of racial and gender equality, culture, and the nature of the social order more broadly— can we envision a revitalization of a workers’ movement, one that would have no need of the alienated theory of the new radicals. (2015-09-10). Radical Intellectuals and the Subversion of Progressive Politics: The Betrayal of Politics (Political Philosophy and Public Purpose) (Kindle Locations 113-117). Palgrave Macmillan. Kindle Edition.

**Neoliberal norms annihilate sense of self and turns case by reducing resistance**

**Verhaeghe, PhD, 14**

(Paul, 9-29 <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/sep/29/neoliberalism-economic-system-ethics-personality-psychopathicsthic>) JJN from File

We tend to perceive our identities as stable and largely separate from outside forces. But over decades of research and therapeutic practice, I have become convinced that economic change is having a profound effect not only on our values but also on our personalities. Thirty years of neoliberalism, free-market forces and privatisation have taken their toll, as relentless pressure to achieve has become normative. If you’re reading this sceptically, I put this simple statement to you: meritocratic neoliberalism favours certain personality traits and penalises others. There are certain ideal characteristics needed to make a career today. The first is articulateness, the aim being to win over as many people as possible. Contact can be superficial, but since this applies to most human interaction nowadays, this won’t really be noticed. It’s important to be able to talk up your own capacities as much as you can – you know a lot of people, you’ve got plenty of experience under your belt and you recently completed a major project. Later, people will find out that this was mostly hot air, but the fact that they were initially fooled is down to another personality trait: you can lie convincingly and feel little guilt. That’s why you never take responsibility for your own behaviour. On top of all this, you are flexible and impulsive, always on the lookout for new stimuli and challenges. In practice, this leads to risky behaviour, but never mind, it won’t be you who has to pick up the pieces. The source of inspiration for this list? The psychopathy checklist by Robert Hare, the best-known specialist on psychopathy today. This description is, of course, a caricature taken to extremes. Nevertheless, the financial crisis illustrated at a macro-social level (for example, in the conflicts between eurozone countries) what a neoliberal meritocracy does to people. Solidarity becomes an expensive luxury and makes way for temporary alliances, the main preoccupation always being to extract more profit from the situation than your competition. Social ties with colleagues weaken, as does emotional commitment to the enterprise or organisation. Bullying used to be confined to schools; now it is a common feature of the workplace. This is a typical symptom of the impotent venting their frustration on the weak – in psychology it’s known as displaced aggression. There is a buried sense of fear, ranging from performance anxiety to a broader social fear of the threatening other. Constant evaluations at work cause a decline in autonomy and a growing dependence on external, often shifting, norms. This results in what the sociologist Richard Sennett has aptly described as the “infantilisation of the workers”. Adults display childish outbursts of temper and are jealous about trivialities (“She got a new office chair and I didn’t”), tell white lies, resort to deceit, delight in the downfall of others and cherish petty feelings of revenge. This is the consequence of a system that prevents people from thinking independently and that fails to treat employees as adults. More important, though, is the serious damage to people’s self-respect. Self-respect largely depends on the recognition that we receive from the other, as thinkers from Hegel to Lacan have shown. Sennett comes to a similar conclusion when he sees the main question for employees these days as being “Who needs me?” For a growing group of people, the answer is: no one. Our society constantly proclaims that anyone can make it if they just try hard enough, all the while reinforcing privilege and putting increasing pressure on its overstretched and exhausted citizens. An increasing number of people fail, feeling humiliated, guilty and ashamed. We are forever told that we are freer to choose the course of our lives than ever before, but the freedom to choose outside the success narrative is limited. Furthermore, those who fail are deemed to be losers or scroungers, taking advantage of our social security system. A neoliberal meritocracy would have us believe that success depends on individual effort and talents, meaning responsibility lies entirely with the individual and authorities should give people as much freedom as possible to achieve this goal. For those who believe in the fairytale of unrestricted choice, self-government and self-management are the pre-eminent political messages, especially if they appear to promise freedom. Along with the idea of the perfectible individual, the freedom we perceive ourselves as having in the west is the greatest untruth of this day and age. The sociologist Zygmunt Bauman neatly summarised the paradox of our era as: “Never have we been so free. Never have we felt so powerless.” We are indeed freer than before, in the sense that we can criticise religion, take advantage of the new laissez-faire attitude to sex and support any political movement we like. We can do all these things because they no longer have any significance – freedom of this kind is prompted by indifference. Yet, on the other hand, our daily lives have become a constant battle against a bureaucracy that would make Kafka weak at the knees. There are regulations about everything, from the salt content of bread to urban poultry-keeping. Our presumed freedom is tied to one central condition: we must be successful – that is, “make” something of ourselves. You don’t need to look far for examples. A highly skilled individual who puts parenting before their career comes in for criticism. A person with a good job who turns down a promotion to invest more time in other things is seen as crazy – unless those other things ensure success. A young woman who wants to become a primary school teacher is told by her parents that she should start off by getting a master’s degree in economics – a primary school teacher, whatever can she be thinking of? There are constant laments about the so-called loss of norms and values in our culture. Yet our norms and values make up an integral and essential part of our identity. So they cannot be lost, only changed. And that is precisely what has happened: a changed economy reflects changed ethics and brings about changed identity. The current economic system is bringing out the worst in us.

**Vote negative to endorse a class-based critique of the system—pedagogical spaces are the crucial staging ground for keeping socialism on the horizon**

McLaren, Distinguished Fellow – Critical Studies @ Chapman U and UCLA urban schooling prof, and Scatamburlo-D’Annibale, associate professor of Communication – U Windsor, ‘4

(Peter and Valerie, “Class Dismissed? Historical materialism and the politics of ‘difference’,” Educational Philosophy and Theory Vol. 36, Issue 2, p. 183-199)

For well over two decades we have witnessed the jubilant liberal and conservative pronouncements of the demise of socialism. Concomitantly, history's presumed failure to defang existing capitalist relations has been read by many self-identified ‘radicals’ as an advertisement for capitalism's inevitability. As a result, the chorus refrain ‘There Is No Alternative’, sung by liberals and conservatives, has been buttressed by the symphony of post-Marxist voices recommending that we give socialism a decent burial and move on. Within this context, to speak of the promise of Marx and socialism may appear anachronistic, even naïve, especially since the post-al intellectual vanguard has presumably demonstrated the folly of doing so. Yet we stubbornly believe that the chants of T.I.N.A. must be combated for they offer as a fait accompli, something which progressive Leftists should **refuse to accept**—namely **the triumph of capitalism** and its political bedfellow neo-liberalism, which have worked together to naturalize suffering, undermine collective struggle, and obliterate hope. We concur with Amin (1998), who claims that such chants must be defied and revealed as absurd and criminal, and who puts the challenge we face in no uncertain terms: humanity may let itself be led by capitalism's logic to a **fate of collective suicide** or it may pave the way for an alternative humanist project of global socialism. The grosteque conditions that inspired Marx to pen his original critique of capitalism are present and flourishing. The inequalities of wealth and the gross imbalances of power that exist today are leading to abuses that exceed those encountered in Marx's day (Greider, 1998, p. 39). Global capitalism has paved the way for the obscene concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands and created a world increasingly divided between those who enjoy opulent affluence and those who languish in dehumanizing conditions and economic misery. In every corner of the globe, we are witnessing social disintegration as revealed by a rise in abject poverty and inequality. At the current historical juncture, the combined assets of the 225 richest people is roughly equal to the annual income of the poorest 47 percent of the world's population, while the combined assets of the three richest people exceed the combined GDP of the 48 poorest nations (CCPA, 2002, p. 3). Approximately 2.8 billion people—almost half of the world's population—struggle in desperation to live on less than two dollars a day (McQuaig, 2001, p. 27). As many as 250 million children are wage slaves and there are over a billion workers who are either un- or under-employed. These are the concrete realities of our time—realities that **require a vigorous class analysis**, an **unrelenting critique** of capitalism and an oppositional politics capable of confronting what Ahmad (1998, p. 2) refers to as ‘capitalist universality.’ They are realities that require something more than that which is offered by the prophets of ‘difference’ and post-Marxists who would have us relegate socialism to the scrapheap of history and mummify Marxism along with Lenin's corpse. Never before has a Marxian analysis of capitalism and class rule been so desperately needed. That is not to say that everything Marx said or anticipated has come true, for that is clearly not the case. Many critiques of Marx focus on his strategy for moving toward socialism, and with ample justification; nonetheless Marx did provide us with **fundamental insights** into class society that have held true to this day. Marx's enduring relevance lies in his indictment of capitalism which continues to wreak havoc in the lives of most. While capitalism's cheerleaders have attempted to hide its sordid underbelly, Marx's description of capitalism as the sorcerer's dark power is even more apt in light of contemporary historical and economic conditions. Rather than jettisoning Marx, decentering the role of capitalism, and discrediting class analysis, radical educators must continue to engage Marx's oeuvre and extrapolate from it that which is useful **pedagogically, theoretically, and**, most importantly, **politically** in light of the challenges that confront us. The urgency which animates Amin's call for a collective socialist vision necessitates, as we have argued, moving beyond the particularism and liberal pluralism that informs the ‘politics of difference.’ It also **requires** challenging the **questionable assumptions** that have come to constitute the core of contemporary ‘radical’ theory, **pedagogy** and politics. In terms of effecting change, what is needed is a cogent **understanding** of the systemic nature of exploitation and oppression based on the precepts of a radical political economy approach (outlined above) and one that incorporates Marx's notion of ‘unity in difference’ in which people share widely common material interests. Such an understanding extends far beyond the realm of theory, for the manner in which we choose to interpret and explore the social world, the **concepts and frameworks** we use to express our sociopolitical understandings, are more than just abstract categories. They imply intentions, organizational practices, and political agendas. Identifying class analysis as the basis for our understandings and class struggle as the basis for political transformation implies something **quite different** than constructing a sense of political agency around issues of race, ethnicity, gender, etc. Contrary to ‘Shakespeare's assertion that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet,’ it should be clear that this is not the case in political matters. Rather, in politics ‘the essence of the flower lies in the name by which it is called’ (Bannerji, 2000, p. 41). The task for progressives today is to seize the moment and plant the seeds for a political agenda that is grounded in historical possibilities and informed by a vision committed to overcoming exploitative conditions. These seeds, we would argue, must be derived from the tree of radical political economy. For the vast majority of people today—people of all ‘racial classifications or identities, all genders and sexual orientations’—the common frame of reference arcing across ‘difference’, the ‘concerns and aspirations that are most widely shared are those that are rooted in the common experience of everyday life shaped and constrained by political economy’ (Reed, 2000, p. xxvii). While post-Marxist advocates of the politics of ‘difference’ suggest that such a stance is outdated, we would argue that the categories which they have employed to analyze ‘the social’ are now losing their usefulness, particularly in light of actual contemporary ‘social movements.’ All over the globe, there are large anti-capitalist movements afoot. In February 2002, chants of ‘Another World Is Possible’ became the theme of protests in Porto Allegre. It seems that those people struggling in the streets haven’t read about T.I.N.A., the end of grand narratives of emancipation, or the decentering of capitalism. It seems as though the struggle for basic survival and some semblance of human dignity in the mean streets of the dystopian metropoles doesn’t permit much time or opportunity to read the heady proclamations emanating from seminar rooms. As E. P. Thompson (1978, p. 11) once remarked, sometimes ‘experience walks in without knocking at the door, and announces deaths, crises of subsistence, trench warfare, unemployment, inflation, genocide.’ This, of course, does not mean that socialism will inevitably come about, yet a sense of its nascent promise animates current social movements. Indeed, noted historian Howard Zinn (2000, p. 20) recently pointed out that after years of single-issue organizing (i.e. the politics of difference), the WTO and other anti-corporate capitalist protests signaled a turning point in the ‘history of movements of recent decades,’ for it was the issue of ‘class’ that more than anything ‘bound everyone together.’ History, to paraphrase Thompson (1978, p. 25) doesn’t seem to be following Theory's script. Our vision is informed by Marx's historical materialism and his revolutionary socialist humanism, which must not be conflated with liberal humanism. For left politics and pedagogy, a socialist humanist vision remains crucial, whose fundamental features include the creative potential of people to challenge collectively the circumstances that they inherit. This variant of humanism seeks to give expression to the pain, sorrow and degradation of the oppressed, those who labor under the ominous and ghastly cloak of ‘globalized’ capital. It calls for the transformation of those conditions that have prevented the bulk of humankind from fulfilling its potential. It vests its hope for change in the development of critical consciousness and social agents who make history, although not always in conditions of their choosing. The political goal of socialist humanism is, however, ‘not a resting in difference’ but rather ‘the emancipation of difference at the level of human mutuality and reciprocity.’ This would be a step forward for the ‘discovery or creation of our real differences which can only in the end be explored in reciprocal ways’ (Eagleton, 1996, p. 120). Above all else, the enduring relevance of a radical socialist pedagogy and politics is the **centrality** it accords to the interrogation of capitalism. We can no longer afford to remain indifferent to the horror and savagery committed by capitalist's barbaric machinations. We need to recognize that capitalist democracy is unrescuably contradictory in its own self-constitution. Capitalism and democracy cannot be translated into one another without profound efforts at manufacturing empty idealism. Committed Leftists must unrelentingly cultivate a democratic socialist vision that refuses to forget the ‘wretched of the earth,’ the children of the damned and the victims of the culture of silence—a task which requires more than abstruse convolutions and striking ironic poses in the agnostic arena of signifying practices. Leftists must illuminate the little shops of horror that lurk beneath ‘globalization’s’ shiny façade; they must challenge the true ‘evils’ that are manifest in the tentacles of global capitalism's reach. And, more than this, Leftists must search for the cracks in the edifice of globalized capitalism and shine light on those fissures that **give birth to alternatives.** Socialism today, undoubtedly, runs against the grain of received wisdom, but its vision of a vastly improved and freer arrangement of social relations beckons on the horizon. Its unwritten text is nascent in the present even as it exists among the fragments of history and the shards of distant memories. Its potential remains untapped and its promise needs to be redeemed.

**Case**

**Presumption**

**Vote neg on presumption –**

**1] Nothing spills over – there’s no connection between the ballot and changing people’s attitudes – no one stalks tabroom and the wiki to see which rounds were won on what and even if they did it wouldn't make them any more inclined towards the aff**

**2] No warrant for a ballot – the competitive nature of debate coopts any ethical value of advocating the aff – winning rounds only makes it look like they just want to win which proves framework and means advocating by losing is more effective.**

**Ballot paradox – either they don’t care about winning and you should vote negative, or they want to win which proves that debate is competitive, and fairness is an impact**

**3] Debate – none of their evidence is specific to it – sets a high threshold for solvency and ignores how communicative norms operate.**

**4] Voting aff doesn’t access social change, but voting neg resolves our procedural impacts.**

**Proper**

**1] Their “topical offense” isn’t offense at all – it’s a random author at forbes writing about a maybe-technology and the author concludes it’s good. Most importantly, being able to manufacture existing drugs more efficiently isn’t a “race towards the proliferation of the techno-body”, it just means impoverished people can get life-saving treatment more cheaply. There’s a reason they’re reading an article from forbes in a k aff -no kritikal authors are getting angry at people making drugs in space because it’s just good for everyone**

**2] It’s not unique to private entities – their howell card concedes the evil death lab of technopolitical destruction would be on the ISS – it’s literally called the US National Laboratory**

**3] This isn’t an extension of big pharma into space, they aren’t trying to put any more people into addiction cycles or exert the kind of biopolitical control Preciado is critiquing, they’re just trying to cure blindness and make medical procedures safer. The costs are so high that risk of widespread negative impact is 0. The only potential is for research**

**Howell 19**

(Elizabeth Howell, How Big Pharma Was Wooed To Space-Based 'Business Park, August 14 2019, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/elizabethhowell1/2019/08/14/how-big-pharma-was-wooed-to-space-based-business-park/?sh=e97d10632e17>) // recut HW AW

Such endeavors could one day help improve astronaut health and equip humanity for longer ventures into space, but their primary aim is to **develop or improve drugs for people on Earth**. That’s certainly the hope of Greco and his colleagues, who found out a few months after that December afternoon that, as they’d hypothesized, the proteins layered in space appeared to have more-orderly arrangements—an improvement that could benefit the artificial retina’s function. Studies such as these have yet to yield new blockbuster drugs or even significant improvements to existing ones. **Research in space is slow, and the costs are sky-high. All projects are subsidized through NASA, and many rely on additional financial support through federal grants,** spurring a new kind of space race—one aiming to prove that such projects are profitable enough for the private sector to fund on their own.

**4] Preciado’s folk politics – their movement worsens conditions**

**Hester, 15**—Associate Professor of Media and Communication, University of West London (Helen, “Synthetic Genders and the Limits of Micropolitics,” …ment Issue 06 [the name of the journal is “…ment,” ellipses and all…], dml)

Of course, the alignment or conformity of certain ideas and practices with neoliberalism is **hardly an isolated phenomenon**, and **should not in itself be seen as sufficient** to render an activity **irredeemably problematic**. Moreover, we must be careful to ensure that the saturation of the city by capital is not simply assumed, and that accounts do not neglect the incipient potentials for resistance that these kinds of urban spaces can afford35. However, there are issues with the **framing of political agency** in Testo Junkie. Preciado, for all hir avowed cosmopolitanism, talks primarily in terms of **small-scale interventions** and **repurposings**, arguing that self-experimentation is ‘a **requirement** for the possibility of **any future micropolitical action**’36. This ‘micropolitics’ often seems to manifest itself **almost exclusively** at the level of the atomised subject, with **little imaginative space** being given to the ways in which diverse embodied appropriations might **interconnect**, or in which the project might be **expanded** or **scaled up**. As Preciado hirself admits, ‘romantic autoexperimentation **carries the risk of individualism** and **depoliticization**’37, and hir project **might all too easily coincide** with those currents of neoliberalism that **depress awareness of shaping structural influences** such as class. In this sense, one could argue that Preciado’s work – for all its embrace of biotech and transformative media – trenches on what has been pejoratively called the ‘**folk political**.’ It frequently **refuses to think beyond the microcommunity**, neglects to directly engage with the ‘rhizomatic connections among […] resistances and insubordinations’38, and deals **primarily** with small ‘interventions consisting of **non-scaleable tactics**’39. As such, it **risks remaining satisfied with isolated**, **temporary**, and **defensive gestures of experimentation**, **rather** than looking toward **socially transformative projects**. As Srnicek and Williams note, ‘to present an emancipatory process of constructive freedom which might **contend on a global scale with capitalism** in its myriad forms **depends** on shifting towards the **structural**, the **generalised**, and the **non-localised**’40, and this is something that Testo Junkie **rarely achieves**. While the main focus of the book is (quite self-consciously) micropolitical experimentation, there are moments at which Preciado hirself appears to express a desire for larger-scale social change, and it is at these points that the non-scalabilty of hir project demands critical consideration. In those instances, Preciado tends to **veer rather dramatically** from the micropolitical towards the other extreme. S/he jumps from toying with the hormonal metabolism of hir own discrete body to species-wide ‘endocrinal reprogramming’41, making the leap from an individualized micropolitics of embodiment to a wider-reaching political vision **no less radical** than ‘the **transformation of the species**’42. Again, there is an **obvious issue with scale** here – from **tinkering with individual bodies** to re**-engineering humanity**, with **little in between**. The sphere of the **mesopolitical** – a space we might associate with the advance of **pragmatic** and **actionable activist tactics** – is **entirely absent**. Of course, Preciado never claims that hir pharmaceutical and theoretical protocols should be read as a practical handbook for Promethean politics, and as such it would be somewhat unfair to censure hir for failing to engage in feasible counter-hegemonic strategizing. However, it **remains instructive** to consider how hir rhetoric (with all its intoxicating glimmers of sociopolitical opportunity) might ultimately ‘**cash out**,’ as well as to reflect upon **what we might actually do** with Testo Junkie. In Testo Junkie, the **perceived dangers of coalescing into a recognisable movement** – of **thinking beyond the individual** in order to **make collective demands** – **constrain the text’s horizons of possibility**. Preciado appears all too aware of the fact that the discourses of feminism can be (and have been) co-opted by the pharmacopornographic regime, just as the tools of said regime can be seen to lend themselves to co-option by hir technologically-minded transfeminism; after all, as s/he points out, this regime ‘exploited the revolutionary and emancipatory rhetoric of the feminist movement of the 1960s to pass off the chemical and contraceptive management of the female body as a step toward sexual liberation’43. It is perhaps for this reason that s/he decides hir proposed movement of gender self-experimentation will have ‘no single name that can be transformed into brand’44 – hence, no brand identity to be recuperated, appropriated or seized; but also **little explicit sense of cooperative**, **collective**, or **counter-hegemonic purpose**.

**5] The aff is inaccessible for people who dont have the means to engage financial support social context etc**

**6] ivermectin**