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#### Security is a psychological construct- the aff’s scenarios for conflict are products of paranoia that project our violent impulses onto the other. Claims of war and conflict create a false dichotomy between the good us and the evil them, ignoring our role in provoking the aggression.

Mack, MD @ Harvard, 91

(John, former Professor of Psychology at Harvard and Pulitzer Prize Winner, <http://johnemackinstitute.org/1988/08/the-enemy-system-short-version/>) BW

The threat of nuclear annihilation has stimulated us to try to understand what it is about mankind that has led to such self-destroying behavior. Central to this inquiry is an exploration of the adversarial relationships between ethnic or national groups. It is out of such enmities that war, including nuclear war should it occur, has always arisen. Enmity between groups of people stems from the interaction of psychological, economic, and cultural elements. These include fear and hostility (which are often closely related), competition over perceived scarce resources,[3] the need for individuals to identify with a large group or cause,[4] a tendency to disclaim and assign elsewhere responsibility for unwelcome impulses and intentions, and a peculiar susceptibility to emotional manipulation by leaders who play upon our more savage inclinations in the name of national security or the national interest. A full understanding of the “enemy system”[3] requires insights from many specialities, including psychology, anthropology, history, political science, and the humanities. In their statement on violence[5] twenty social and behavioral scientists, who met in Seville, Spain, to examine the roots of war, declared that there was no scientific basis for regarding man as an innately aggressive animal, inevitably committed to war. The Seville statement implies that we have real choices. It also points to a hopeful paradox of the nuclear age: threat of nuclear war may have provoked our capacity for fear-driven polarization but at the same time it has inspired unprecedented efforts towards cooperation and settlement of differences without violence. The Real and the Created Enemy Attempts to explore the psychological roots of enmity are frequently met with responses on the following lines: “I can accept psychological explanations of things, but my enemy is real. The Russians [or Germans, Arabs, Israelis, Americans] are armed, threaten us, and intend us harm. Furthermore, there are real differences between us and our national interests, such as competition over oil, land, or other scarce resources, and genuine conflicts of values between our two nations. It is essential that we be strong and maintain a balance or superiority of military and political power, lest the other side take advantage of our weakness”. This argument does not address the distinction between the enemy threat and one’s own contribution to that threat-by distortions of perception, provocative words, and actions. In short, the enemy is real, but we have not learned to understand how we have created that enemy, or how the threatening image we hold of the enemy relates to its actual intentions. “We never see our enemy’s motives and we never labor to assess his will, with anything approaching objectivity”.[6] Individuals may have little to do with the choice of national enemies. Most Americans, for example, know only what has been reported in the mass media about the Soviet Union. We are largely unaware of the forces that operate within our institutions, affecting the thinking of our leaders and ourselves, and which determine how the Soviet Union will be represented to us. Ill-will and a desire for revenge are transmitted from one generation to another, and we are not taught to think critically about how our assigned enemies are selected for us. In the relations between potential adversarial nations there will have been, inevitably, real grievances that are grounds for enmity. But the attitude of one people towards another is usually determined by leaders who manipulate the minds of citizens for domestic political reasons which are generally unknown to the public. As Israeli sociologist Alouph Haveran has said, in times of conflict between nations historical accuracy is the first victim.[8] The Image of the Enemy and How We Sustain It Vietnam veteran William Broyles wrote: “War begins in the mind, with the idea of the enemy.”[9] But to sustain that idea in war and peacetime a nation’s leaders must maintain public support for the massive expenditures that are required. Studies of enmity have revealed susceptibilities, though not necessarily recognized as such by the governing elites that provide raw material upon which the leaders may draw to sustain the image of an enemy.[7,10] Freud[11] in his examination of mass psychology identified the proclivity of individuals to surrender personal responsibility to the leaders of large groups. This surrender takes place in both totalitarian and democratic societies, and without coercion. Leaders can therefore designate outside enemies and take actions against them with little opposition. Much further research is needed to understand the psychological mechanisms that impel individuals to kill or allow killing in their name, often with little questioning of the morality or consequences of such actions. Philosopher and psychologist Sam Keen asks why it is that in virtually every war “The enemy is seen as less than human? He’s faceless. He’s an animal”.” Keen tries to answer his question: “The image of the enemy is not only the soldier’s most powerful weapon; it is society’s most powerful weapon. It enables people en masse to participate in acts of violence they would never consider doing as individuals”.[12] National leaders become skilled in presenting the adversary in dehumanized images. The mass media, taking their cues from the leadership, contribute powerfully to the process. The image of the enemy as less than human may be hard to dislodge. For example, a teacher in the Boston area reported that during a high school class on the Soviet Union a student protested: “You’re trying to get us to see them as people”. Stephen Cohen and other Soviet experts have noted how difficult it is to change the American perception of the Soviet Union, despite the vast amount of new information contradicting old stereotypes.” Bernard Shaw in his preface to Heartbreak House, written at the end of World War I, observed ironically: “Truth telling is not compatible with the defense of the realm”. Nations are usually created out of the violent defeat of the former inhabitants of a piece of land or of outside enemies, and national leaders become adept at keeping their people’s attention focused on the threat of an outside enemy.[14] Leaders also provide what psychiatrist Vamik Volkan called “suitable targets of externalization”[10] – i.e., outside enemies upon whom both leaders and citizens can relieve their burdens of private defeat, personal hurt, and humiliation.[15] All-embracing ideas, such as political ideologies and fixed religious beliefs act as psychological or cultural amplifiers. Such ideologies can embrace whole economic systems, such as socialism or capitalism, or draw on beliefs that imply that a collectivity owes its existence to some higher power in the universe. It was not Stalin as an individual whom Nadezhda Mandelstam blamed for the political murder of her poet husband Osip and millions of other citizens but the “craving for an all-embracing idea which would explain everything in the world and bring about universal harmony at one go”.[16] Every nation, no matter how bloody and cruel its beginnings, sees its origins in a glorious era of heroes who vanquished less worthy foes. One’s own race, people, country, or political system is felt to be superior to the adversary’s, blessed by a less worthy god. The nuclear age has spawned a new kind of myth. This is best exemplified by the United States’ strategic defense initiative. This celestial fantasy offers protection from attack by nuclear warheads, faith here being invested not in a god but in an anti-nuclear technology of lasers, satellites, mirrors, and so on in the heavens.

#### Threats are constructed – their security discourse creates a self fulfilling prophecy that makes true understanding of structural causes behind “threats” impossible. Mack 91

Dr. Mack, professor at Harvard Medical School, 1991, (John E., “The Psychodynamics of International Relationships” Vol 1 p. 58-59)

Attempts to explore the psychological roots of enmity are frequently met with an argument that, reduced to its essentials , goes something like this: “It’s very well to psychologize but my enemy is real. The Russians (or Germans, Arabs, Israelis, Americans) are armed, threaten us, and intend us harm. Furthermore, there are real struggles between us and them and differing national interests: competition over oil, land or scarce resources and genuine conflicts of values between our two nations (or political systems) It is essential that we be strong and maintain a balance of superiority of (military and political) power, lest the other side take advantage of our weakness.” This argument is neither wrong nor right, but instead simply limited. It fails to grapple with a critical distinction that informs the entire subject. Is the threat really generated by the enemy as it appears to be at any given moment, or is it based on one’s own contribution to the threat, derived from distortion of perception by provocative words and actions in a cycle of enmity and externalization of responsibility? In sum, the enemy IS real, but we have not learned to identify our own role in creating that enemy or in elaborating the threatening image we hold of the other group or country and its actual intentions or purposes. “we never see our enemy’s motives and we never labor to asses his will with anything approaching objectivity.”

#### State-centric security frames ensure that the aff’s benign attempt to resist insecurity reproduces the biopolitical imperative that compels liberal regimes to make catastrophic war on difference – the impact is extinction. Evans 16

Brad Evans is a senior lecturer in international relations at the School of Sociology, Politics & International Studies (SPAIS), University of Bristol, UK, “Liberal Violence: From the Benjaminian Divine to the Angels of History,” Theory & Event > Volume 19, Issue 1, 2016

Liberal War as Divine Violence Despite universal claims to peaceful co-habitation, liberal regimes have been compelled to make war on whatever threatens it40 . This is why the liberal account of freedom has depended upon a lethal principle, which discursively wrapped in the language of rights, security and justice, inaugurated planetary state of warfare and siege. It has promoted an account of freedom that, in the process of taking hold of the problem of the planetary life of political subjects, linked human potentiality to the possibility of its ruination. If liberal violence has then produced a necessary lethal corollary in its mission to foster the peace and prosperity of the species in order to alleviate unnecessary suffering; so it has also needed to foster a belief in the necessity of violence in the name of that suffering and vulnerability to which it continually stakes a claim. The Liberal wars of the past two decades in particular have revealed a number of defining principles41 . Aside from relying upon technological supremacy and universal claims to truth, they have been overwhelmingly driven by a bio-political imperative, which has displaced concerns with Sovereign integrities with forms of violence carried out in the name of an endangered humanity. In this regard, they have destroyed the Westphalia pretence, seeing the catastrophes of our global age in fact as a condition of possibility to further the liberal will to rule. Since incorporation in this setting has proceed on the basis that all life should necessarily be included within its strategic orbit, the veritable evisceration of any sense of “the outside” (as conceived in terms of its political imaginary) has led to the blurring of all conventional demarcations between friends/enemies, citizens/soldiers, times of war/times of peace. What is more, as life itself became increasingly central to questions of security, issues of development as broadly conceived would no longer be regarded as peripheral to the war effort. It would in fact become a central motif as most notably articulated in the strategic mantras “War by Other means” and “War for Hearts and Minds”. Not only would this point to new forms of de-politicisation which, less about Schmittean exceptionalism, were more explicable in terms of the fundamental political and social transformation of societies. It would also lead to the production of violent subjects, as the recourse to violence became sure testament to a conception of humanity realised through the wars fought in its name. Liberal violence, in other words, proved to be unbounded, unlimited and without conventional Sovereign warrant – namely revealing of the fundamental principles of what Benjamin once elected to term “the divine”. Diagnosing the liberal wars of the past two decades as a form of divine violence offers a more disturbing reading of the violence of the liberal encounter. If the violence of political realism, at least in theory, appreciated the value of limits and boundaries, what seems to define the lethality of liberal freedom has been a commitment to war without boundaries, hence limitless. As Dillon and Julian Reid acutely observed: [L]iberal peacemaking is lethal. Its violence a necessary corollary of the aporetic character of its mission to foster the peace and prosperity of the species ... There is, then, a martial face to liberal peace. The liberal way of rule is contoured by the liberal way of war ... Liberalism is therefore obliged to exercise a strategic calculus of necessary killing, in the course of which calculus ought to be able to say how much killing is enough... [However] it has no better way of saying how much killing is enough, once it starts killing to make life live, than does the geopolitical strategic calculus of necessary killing’42 . This brings us to Steven Pinker’s Better Angels of Our Nature43 . Reworking the well-rehearsed liberal peace thesis, for Pinker, the reason we have become less warlike today can be account for in terms of our liberal maturity. Leaving aside the evident theological undertones to Pinker’s work, along with the numerous empirical flaws in his thesis, his not so original thesis at least accredits its all too Euro-centric sources of inspiration on matters of civility: ‘The reason so many violent institutions succumbed within so short a span of time was that the arguments that slew them belong to a coherent philosophy that emerged during the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment. The ideas of thinkers like Hobbes, Spinoza, Descartes, Locke, David Hume, Mary Astell, Kant, Beccaria, Smith, Mary Wollstonecraft, Madison, Jefferson, Hamilton and John Stuart Mill coalesced into a worldview that we can call Enlightenment humanism’. John Gray has been rightly suspicious of the entire project and claims being made here: The idea that a new world can be constructed through the rational application of force is peculiarly modern, animating ideas of revolutionary war and pedagogic terror that feature in an influential tradition of radical Enlightenment thinking. Downplaying this tradition is extremely important for Pinker. Along with liberal humanists everywhere, he regards the core of the Enlightenment as a commitment to rationality. The fact that prominent Enlightenment figures have favoured violence as an instrument of social transformation is—to put it mildly—inconvenient... No doubt we have become less violent in some ways. But it is easy for liberal humanists to pass over the respects in which civilisation has retreated. Pinker is no exception. Just as he writes off mass killing in developing countries as evidence of backwardness without enquiring whether it might be linked in some way to peace in the developed world, he celebrates “re-civilisation”... without much concern for those who pay the price of the re-civilising process44 . Gray showed his evident concerns here with the promissory nature of liberal violence. Indeed, what he elsewhere terms the violence of the liberal missionary, reposes Nietzsche’s further instance that ‘god is dead and man has killed him’ with a devastating humanistic critique45 . Such violence, in the end, however has proved to be politically, ethically and economically narcissistic. Just as liberal advocates in the zones of crises now increasingly find themselves operating within fortified protectorates as part of a great separation from the world46 , this has been matched, albeit it ways that initially appear disconnected, by new forms of violence which also takes place almost exclusively at a distance. Indeed, as liberal actors increasingly give up on the idea that the world may be transformed for the better, new modalities of violence are emerging which seem to be more logically in fitting with the new politics of catastrophe that increasingly defines our terrifyingly normal times. As the promise of violence and catastrophe now appears inescapable, insecurity is becoming normalised, dystopian realism becoming the prevailing imaginaries for political rule, and once cited claims to emancipation, unending progress and lasting security for peoples all but abandoned47 . The politics of catastrophe and its relationship to “end of times” narratives adds another layer to our theological enquiry. As Jacob Taubes once noted48 , there is perhaps something theologically different at work here between the pre-modern apocalyptic movements and the catastrophic reasoning now defining the contemporary moment. For all their nihilism and monotheistic servitude, at least the apocalyptic movements of yesteryear could imagine a better world than already existed. There is therefore a vast difference between the subjects which names its disaster ‘apocalypse’ to that which reads disaster in terms of ‘catastrophe.’49 Unlike apocalypse, there is no beyond the catastrophic. Its mediation on the “end of times” is already fated. Catastrophe denies political transformation. It demands instead a forced partaking in a world that is deemed to be insecure unto the end. The upshot being, as all things become the source of endangerment, the human becomes the source of our veritable undoing. Angels of History Every war produces its casualties. Some of these stand out in terms of the sheer body count. The horror of mass warfare reduced to the most banal forms of inhuman quantification. Others, no less important, are its political and philosophical losses. What is increasingly clear is that the past two decades of liberal warfare, punctured but not initially determined by the tragedy of the events of September 11th 2001, ultimately put the very concept of war into question. The reluctance to officially declare war, even when our involvement in the politically motivated violence appears to be all too evident, now demands a move beyond the dominant frames which have shaped discussions for the past two decades. There is an important caveat to address here. What happened during last decade of the Global Wars on Terror cannot simply be inserted into a post 9/11 frames for analysis. Much of what passed for post 9/11 justice or military excessiveness was slowly maturing in the global borderlands for some considerable time. If there is a departure it needs to be accounted for against this broader post-Cold War humanitarian sensibility through which liberalism absorbed local crises into its political fabric to further condition its violent interventions. It has been all too easy for political and social theorists to put the blame for the violence and atrocities of the Global Wars on Terror onto the shoulders of George Bush and Dick Cheney. This has allowed liberals to appropriate Schmitt as one of their own, hence reducing the entire war effort to the reductionist measures of “US hegemony/exceptionalism”. Such retreats back into state centric models have not only proved unhelpful in terms of questioning the normalization of violence, they have failed to grasp the complexity of war – especially how questions of universality, economy, power and the formation of political subjectivities can be rethought through violent encounters. What is more, the limits of these analyses have been further evidenced by the complete lack of engagement with political theology, failing to recognize the violence of universal ambitions, along with the need to put the contemporary legacy of Kant on trial. Let us not forget Tony Blair and Barack Obama have embodied the liberal Kantian idea of political leadership better than any others throughout the history of liberalism. Any change in liberal fortunes must be understood in this context. We have witnessed in recent times profound changes in the violent cartography of what is a post-Iraq liberal influence. Instead of actively and one-sidedly engaging the world, humanely, violently or otherwise, what we are now encountering are new political arrangements shaped by forms of distancing and technological realignment. Just as liberal agents in the dangerous borderland areas increasingly find themselves operating within fortified protectorates as part of a great separation from the world, this is matched, albeit it ways that initially appear disconnected, by new forms of violence that also take place at a distance. The political and philosophical significance of this should not be underestimated. The technological and strategic confluence between the remote management of populations (notably surveillance) and new forms of violence are indicative of the narcissism of a liberal project that reeks of the worst excesses of technological determinism. Instead of looking with confidence towards a post-liberal commitment to transforming the living conditions of the world of peoples, what has taken its place is an intellectually barren landscape offering no alternative other than to live out our catastrophically fated existence. This is instructive regarding how we might envisage “the end of liberal times” as marked out and defined by this incommensurable sense of planetary siege. It also demands new thinking about the relationship between violence, technology and theology in these uncertain times. The liberal wars of the past decade have been premised on two notable claims to superiority. The first was premised on the logic of technology where it was assumed that high-tech sophistry could replace the need to suffer casualties. The second was premised upon a more humanitarian ethos, which demanded local knowledge and engagement with dangerous populations. The narcissistic violence of the Global War on Terror has put this secondary vision into lasting crises as the violence of liberal encounter has fatefully exposed any universal commitment to rights and justice. Not only did we appear to be the principle authors of violence, thereby challenging the notion that underdevelopment was the true cause of planetary endangerment, populations within liberal societies have lost faith in worldly responsibilities. Metaphysical hubris displaced by a catastrophic reasoning that quite literally places us at the point of extinction. Violence as such has assumed non-locatable forms as liberalism is coming to terms with the limits to its territorial will to rule. Physically separated from a world it no longer understands, it is now left to the digital and technological recoupment of distance to shape worldly relations with little concern for human relations. Drone violence is particularly revealing of this shift in the liberal worldview. While the first recorded drone strike was authorised by President George Bush in Pakistan on 18th June 2004, it has been during the Presidency of Obama that the use of the technology has become the more favoured method for dealing with recalcitrant elements in the global borderlands. Indeed, it seems, whilst the Bush administration favoured extraordinary rendition, detention and torture, the Obama policy for preventing the growth of inmates in camps such as Guantanamo has been their execution. Hence inhumane torture and barbarity replaced by the more dignified and considerate method of targeted assassination! While debates on drone violence tend to centre on questions its legality, especially whether it fits within established rules of war, little attention is given to the wider political moment and how the violence points to the changing nature of liberal power and its veritable retreat from the world of people. Whereas Bush and Blair launched a one-sided territorial assault on Iraq and Afghanistan in order to promote ‘civilisation’, Obama has waged his war in the deregulated atmospheric shadows where technological supremacy allows for the continuation of uninhibited forms of violence, while addressing the fact that the previous interventions failed by any given measure. Hence, this time, out of respect for public sensibilities a ‘precise’ or ‘surgical’ form of violence is delivered remotely to its distant adversaries. We should not forget however that the technologies, infrastructures and aesthetics essential for remote warfare are essentially the same as those that support the economy and consumer society. Targeted drone-strikes and the advertising that maintains the consumer hothouse essentially rely on the same computer-based technologies and algorithmic sense-making tools. Put another way, how Amazon mechanically predicts your next book purchase is not fundamentally different from how adversarial behavioural patterns are isolated in authoring a signature-kill. Drone technologies are not simply a new tool of warfare that allow for legal or strategic reassessment. They are paradigmatic to the contemporary stages of liberal rule. As technological advance compensates for the “soldiers on the ground” militaristic retreat, they further radicalise the very idea of the territorial front line such that any Schmittean notion of inside/outside appears like some arcane remnant of an out-dated past. What takes its place is an atmospheric gaze that further eviscerates the human. From the perspective of violence, displacing the primacy of human agency from the act of killing represents more than the realisation of the military’s dream of zero casualties. It reveals more fully the dominance of dystopian realism as the defining rationality shaping the political landscape in the here and now, and beyond50 . Demanding then of a new conceptual vocabulary that allows us to critique what happens when violence is neither orderly nor progressive, but is simply tasked to mitigate the demise liberal power and ambition in an uncertain world seems more pressing than ever.

#### The management of space debris is rooted in a militarized approach to the future that culminates in the full-spectrum dominance of the globe.

Reno, Associate Prof. Anthropology @ Binghamton, 20

(Joshua Ozias, PhD from the University of Michigan: “The Wrong Stuff”, chapter 4 of Military Waste: The Unexpected Consequences of Permanent War Readiness Univ of California Press, Feb 4, 2020 Pg. 127-130)DR 19

**Space debris** can be dangerous to orbiting vessels and, as such, it represents an ever-growing hazard to human uses of Earth space. But these objects are hard to track and easy to mistake for something else, even for people who spend all of their time looking up at the night sky. Like space exploration itself, this is a difficult problem to solve, so it is not surprising that **only the most powerful and prominent space agencies imagine they are capable of finding space debris**, let alone clearing it from orbital environments. A core dimension of that power and prominence, moreover, is about having military ambitions that extend beyond the surface of the planet. And, **from the very beginnings**, doing so has meant enrolling amateur or civilian scientists in DoD plans for outer-space. Historically, **solving space-related challenges has meant getting funds and resources from wealthy and powerful nations**. **With the growth of** a permanent war economy, **such expenditure** is very often **tied** **to** imagined or real military applications. Consequently, the history of space exploration has been and continues to be shaped by tensions and networks between **civilian and military** scientific objectives. But these seemingly opposed **groups** also align and become indistinguishable, especially insofar as they embrace a fascination with developing the latest technology and an unrelenting faith in its ability to solve all problems. This is also known as techno-solutionism. Evgeny Morozov (2013) developed this idea related to utopian appraisals of the internet. His account draws heavily on **Hannah Arendt’s** *On Violence* (1970), a book which openly criticizes **US administrations** that thought they could solve global problems through technically ingenuous forms of death and destruction. Broadly defined, techno-solutionism is faith that technical fixes can solve any problem…even when they are targeting a realm like **outer space**, one that is already saturated with the leftovers of generations of technological problem-solving. According to Gökçe Günel (2019, 129), any technical adjustment is not only about “functionality, effectiveness, or use, but rather the ways in which its materially and conceptually indeterminate existence mobilizes potential towards a technically adjusted future.” In this sense, **technical fixes for space debris are more about extending the possibility of future technical intervention in orbital environments**, rather than, for instance, **encouraging ethical reflection** on whether people should create debris at all. Space debris is not just any problem, it is **one that originated** **with** and threatens **space science** and, as such, shows the limits of technical solution-making in general. If it is problematic to see space debris as a technical glitch, as noise in an otherwise perfectly rendered human design, that is because such a view can **mislead us** into thinking that all it takes is a little more ingenuity, a bit more mastery, to solve the problem entirely. But, following Virilio (2007), every new technical innovation and improvement brings a new disaster, an unprecedented act of contamination. If **space debris represents inevitable traces** that human artifacts and projects leave behind in the space beyond Earth, then, whatever the future may hold, this problem is unavoidable. If people want to continue to escape their earthly confines, space debris will have to be reckoned with. Space debris is a possibility that haunts all uses of space *tout court*, rather than an incidental by-product of space exploration and travel. A focus on technical mastery links the cause of space debris with its proposed cure. As a counterpoint, I discuss how amateur astronomers and ham radio operators have engaged with space debris in a different manner and with altogether different goals. Specifically, they tend to look for ways to become attuned with and enliven debris that has been abandoned. Militarizing Civilian Science The possibility of a semiautonomous civilian space agency had defined space exploration from the start, but by the 1970s and ‘80s, funding had dropped precipitously from the heyday of the Apollo missions. By that time, NASA had come under widespread criticism as the country entered recession and other big programs (such as the CIA) and national initiatives (the War on poverty, Civil Rights Legislation, the Vietnam War) were attacked by political representatives and activists across the political spectrum. The prominent images that NASA members used to promote the organization during the 1960s was that of pragmatism, that space efforts would yield scientific benefits. This failed to improve the prestige of the organization within the government, until the Reagan era, when there was a resurgence of nationalist and romanticist rhetoric from earlier in NASA’s history. With the Reagan administration there was an effort, first, to block international efforts to ban weapons use in outer space and, second, to invest new symbolic importance and new financial resources in the militarization of space. Since that time, **solving space debris has become a common pursuit** of space agencies all over the world, both the more militarized and the more civilian among them. By the early 1980s, **satellites were central infrastructure**, particularly for the United States. The militarization of space had already occurred, in other words, and **without extravagant laser weapons**. Consequently, among the most central issues of the time was the testing and development of antisatellite weaponry (ASAT). The use of experimental ASAT has been partly responsible for reorienting international attention to space debris, since ASAT is a spectacular technology, the goal of which is to transform working satellites into unusable waste. Since satellites were so vulnerable to attack, and space treaties did not allow for the defense of particular regions of space as sovereign territory, satellites could be destroyed simply by sending “space mines” to collide with them. This constitutes one clear reason why DARPA and the Air Force are so intent on tracking space debris—they want to know whether satellites colliding with unidentified objects represent coincidental hazards or deliberate attacks. Being able to tell the difference between space debris and an actively launched space mine would be like knowing whether an ocean vessel sank because of an iceberg or a submarine. Even if one cannot capture space debris, being able to detect and identify it might be **necessary to predict or avoid war**. The ambiguities of witnessing discussed in the previous section, not knowing what one is seeing, therefore take on perilous consequences. While Reagan’s “Star Wars” and Trump’s “Space Force” have been heavily discussed and derided, other administrations have had similar designs. Perhaps most enduring has been the Clinton-era concept of *full-spectrum dominance*, first outlined in the United States Space Command “Vision for 2020” released in 1997. This relationship between outer space and defense and security has been so central to US policy that prominent advocates for science, notably Neil deGrasse Tyson, have authored reports suggesting that **NASA could be restored to its former glory by becoming more like DARPA**, that is, the militaristic organization it was partly created ***not to become***. In many ways the DoD’s Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (**DARPA) is the epitome of techno-solutionist practice**. Though the term *defense* was only added to the acronym later (it was termed ARPA until 1972), **the agency was always closely linked to military interests and problem-solving**. In management studies, the concept of problems that are “DARPA-hard” has become widespread, with websites baiting visitors to see whether their company’s challenges would come close to qualifying. According to Leifer and Steinert (2011, 159), there are four criteria for the agency to consider something DARPA-hard: 1. Technically challenging (beyond current limits); 2. Actionable (proof of concept or prototype); 3. Multidisciplinary (complex); and 4. Far-reaching (advances on a grand scale, radical). At the turn of the century, **DARPA** clearly **determined that solving orbital space debris met these criteria**. Space debris fragments **exceeded the capabilities of the Air Force’s Space Surveillance Network** (SSN), it would take work with specialists from various fields, and the achievement of a solution would be legitimately global in impact. The only thing missing was proof of concept. Their first attempt at a solution was to work with MIT aeronautics labs to develop a specialized telescope to detect faint objects. In 2011, DARPA unveiled a massive new telescope, the Space Surveillance Telescope (SST), specially developed with MIT labs to identify space debris. In contrast with what DARPA spokespersons described as the “soda straw approach” of existing telescopes, the SST would allow wide-angle shots of the night sky, made possible by a much larger aperture and an advanced visual processing system. **In at least one report** provided to NBC, moreover, cleaning up space debris was linked directly with military objectives.

#### Catastrophe scenarios program us affectively to accept violence and dehumanization

Evans And Reid, PhD’s, 14

(Brad, International Studies @ Bristol, Julian, International Politics @ Lapland, Resilient Life: The art of Living Dangerously)

Anybody who has experienced immunization will appreciate the violence of the encounter. The whole process begins with the awareness of some vaguely looming threat which promises in the worst case an extremely violent ending. To pre-empt this happening, the subject is physically penetrated by the alien body with a controlled level of the lethal substance which, although producing violent sickness, is a fate less than death. Such violence unto oneself offers to counter violence with violence such that life may carry on living in spite of the dangers we are incapable of securing ourselves against. It is to give over to a form of self-harm albeit in a way that is actively desired and positively conceived. How else may we live otherwise? Resilience follows a similar logic. It encourages that we partake in the violence of the world to keep death at bay. For in the process of learning to live through the insecurity of the times, the subject is asked to incorporate the catastrophic intellectually, viscerally and affectively, thereby providing certain immunization against a more endangering fate. Indeed, since the ultimate litmus test is to bring to question the worst case scenario, the future cannot appear to us as anything other than completely monstrous. What, however, is actually slain as the future is wagered by the violence of the present may only become revealed with the passage of time. None of this operates outside of the realm of power politics. We only have to consider here (a) the moral judgements and political stakes associated with HIV as a pandemic that is more than simply biological, and (b) the development of viral analogies to explain more generally the problems ‘infecting’ societies from terror to criminality to evidence the point. Immunization is precisely about exposing oneself to something that is potentially lethal, thereby raising the threshold level for existence such that violence is normalized on account of our vulnerabilities to that which may be tempered but remains undefeatable. We are drawn here to Stellan Rye's (1913) silent horror movie The Student from Prague (Der Student von Prag) which has inspired a number of compelling literary and cinematic classics. In this tragic tale of poverty and violence, the impoverished student, Balduin, makes a bargain with the Devil as he exchanges the reﬂection of image for more immediate compensations. Upon eventually seeing himself, however, the student is avenged by an angry double that begins to wreak havoc as it seeks out revenge in light of its betrayal. Following an eventual violent confrontation the student has with his double, Balduin shatters the mirror that is central to the plot, and invariably destroys the fantasy of endangerment which also became the source of his afflicted curse. Inevitably, however, since the double was an essential element of this Faustian agreement, in killing the violent double, so the student kills himself. Otto Rank famously related this to the narcissistic self whose very sense of loneliness and alienation is caused by an anguish of a fear of death; even though it is precisely the violence of the pact which pushes the subject further towards the precipice. Whilst it is tempting to read this in familiar dialectical terms, there is a more sophisticated double move at work here, as the violence is already encoded within the initial act of demonic violation before the tragic encounter. For the double merely highlights the self-propelling tendency, from the fantasy of endangerment to the reality of the catastrophic. There is also a semantic interchange at work in Rye's Doppelganger as it stakes out the choice between a violated/violent life and eventual death. Since reason or logic prove utterly incapable of explaining the condition of Balduin's existence, let alone offering any promise of salvation from the oppressive situation to which he is fatefully bound, the double serves as an important metaphor for the narcissism of the times, as the subject wilfully accepts a violation and all the violence this entails in exchange for an illusion or fantasy of security which proves in the end to have been imbued with the catastrophic from the outset. Our understanding of the fundamental tenets of violence is invariably transformed such that we are forced to think about forms of violation/ intervention prior to any sense of dialectical enmity. Premetic Violence René Girard's thesis Violence and the Sacred offers a theory of violence that is exclusively bound to the desire to ‘overcome’ tragedy. To develop this theory, Girard speciﬁcally relates to the classic Greek play by Sophocles, Oedipus Rex, which he uses to illustrate the relationship between tragic dispossession and violence. It is through the tale of Oedipus and his return to reclaim the realm from which he was abandoned that we uncover a genesis of sacriﬁcial violence that is linked to some ‘past tragedy’.3\_9 Oedipus thus epitomizes the motif of the lost prince whose modes of contestation can be understood through competing claims to the ‘same object of desire: The story follows that when two uncompromising entities vie over the same object of desire, violence necessarily erupts. Through Girard's decoding of the Oedipus myth, what we therefore ﬁnd is any attempt to re-possess the object of desire necessarily requires the guilt of those currently in possession - a sacriﬁcial victim. Thus, to overcome tragedy one must come from the ‘outside’ - a violently destined return that can only be justiﬁed by making a claim to the original sin, or what Girard terms a return to the ‘original scene: However, as Sophocles tells it, such violence is more than simply a reclamation of that which has been taken. The violence of the already dispossessed desires to re-establish the authentic order which has been falsely appropriated - the paradise lost. Importantly, for Girard, such violence is not a relation of difference but is more deﬁned by the logic of mimesis: ‘At ﬁrst, each of the protagonists believes that he can quell the violence; at the end each succumbs to it. All are drawn unwittingly into a violent reciprocity - which they always think they are outside of, because they all initially came from outside and mistake this positional and temporary advantage for a permanent and fundamental superiority.40 Plunging into an opposition which ‘reduces the protagonists into a uniform condition of violence’, all claims to ‘difference’ are effectively ‘eclipsed’ by ‘a resurgence of reciprocity.41 It has been common to read Rye's doubling as a clear example of mimetic behaviour. This has found clear applications from Hegelian-inspired revolutionary accounts of dialectical reasoning, to Frantz Fanon's theory of (post)colonial brutality, onto the exceptional violence of Schmitt's sovereign decisionism. While accepting how this logic has played a structural role in the demar- cation of certain regimes of violence which came to hallmark distinct marks of separation, we need to depart from this logic if we are to make sense of the violence of the catastrophic imaginary. What, in other words, becomes of violence once we reconceptualize the idea of the original scene and its logics of exposure such that violence itself becomes virtually ordained? That is to say, what becomes of violence once it begins to precede any dialectical arrangement? Mimetic violence, we have noted, is obj ectiﬁable. Based upon establishing various forms of mystical foundations, it has a distinct materiality to it that permits clear lines of demarcation and embodiment. These work both spatially and temporally. The object for violence is locatable, while the time of its occurrence offers clear (if sometimes contested) conceptions as to its beginning and ending. It beneﬁts, then, from the guarantees of identiﬁcation and the ability to represent that which must be vanquished at a given moment ‘in timei The virtual nature of the violence endured by the resilient subject offers no such guarantees. Collapsing the space-time continuum of mimetic rivalry, it is merely projected into the future without the prospect of bounce-back. Internalized, however, into the very living conditions of the subject now permanently under siege, the violence is no less real. As any author of horror ﬁction will tell, the mind can be a terrifying place to inhabit. Once the source of endangerment becomes unknowable by deﬁnition, everything becomes the potential source of a violent encounter. Resilience challenges the logic of mimetic violence, therefore, in two fundamental ways. Firstly, it shows us that our only way of dealing with endangerment is to absorb its lethal tendencies. That which has the potential to destroy must become part ofsociety's make-up and its epistemic fabric. We too, in the process, become more lethally endowed as a result. Invariably, the more lethal we become, the more we end up embracing the biophysical conditions of our potential undoing as a principle form of human conditioning. The body accepts the lethality on account of preparedness. Secondly, there is an outward projection against that which could potentially threaten our existence. But this projection doesn't connect to any mimetic rival. We have no clear sense of what it is that so endangers in its particular guise, only a generalizable indication that something which is part of the integral whole will eventually bring about our ﬁnal demise. Deprived, then, of the potential to ‘at last stand’ upon a terrain whose forms of endangerment were known in advance, we continue to walk through a veritable mineﬁeld of potential disasters of a multi-dimensional nature, not knowing when the explosion will happen, with little comfort provided by the intellectual comforts of the past, and with no fence on the horizon beyond which relative security may be achieved and freedom from endangerment realized. The only solution, we are told, remains to expose oneself to all its disastrous permutations so that we may be better prepared against those already charged and yet to detonate, along with those yet to even be inserted into this catastrophic topography. But what does it mean to say that violence is now beyond representation? And what type of reality are we producing if we are calling into question the depths of ﬁeld that once gave qualitative and quantitative meaning to our relations to violence? For Paul Virilio, whose work we may connect to the premetic, this inaugurates ‘the futurism of the instant’ whose kairos shatters all metaphysical meaning: This spells disorientation in knowledge acquired over the course of millennia regarding the spatial environment and the cycle of seasons; an integral accident in knowledge of history as well as of the usual concrete geography that goes with it, the unity of place and time of a secular history. No doubt this is the fatal novelty of the historic tragedy befalling humanity and a progress that will no longer be exclusively technologistical and extra-planetary, but merely human, ‘all too human’. Masochism vis-a-vis an abhorred past that no longer passes muster is now symmetrically doubled with a masochism in relation to a future where, for want of fear, we will, this time, have space, all the space of a miniscule planet reduced to nothing, or as good as, by the progress of our discoveries.2 Nihilism Unbound Writing in the nineteenth century, Nietzsche argued that nothing was more deeply characteristic of the modern world than the power of nihilism.E Nietzsche's intervention here allowed us to move beyond the well-rehearsed attack upon Platonic reason or Christian faith, to focus instead upon ‘the radical repudiation of value, meaning and desirabilityiﬁ Nihilism, thus understood, referred to the triumph of reactive thinking. It was all about the negation of life as it appeared to be incapable of afﬁrming that which is properly and creatively different to human existence. Hence, for Nietzsche, nihilism was not simply reducible to some historical event in time, i.e. an exceptional moment in history which could be shamefully written into annals of human suffering. Nihilism was the recurring motor of history as the operation of power leads to a will to nothingness that strips life of any purposeful meaning. Crucially, as Nietzsche understood, this repudiation of the afﬁrmative realm of experience is something we create for ourselveaﬁ Nihilism, in other words, is to be understood through a sophisticated manipulation of desires such that the individual subject depreciates itself to such an extent that it actively participates in a custom of political self- annihilation. Central to Nietzsche's thinking on the perpetuation of nihilism is the notion of ressentiment. In his On the Genealogy of Morality, Nietzsche explains this in terms of the slave mentality. This produces a feeling of impotence which not only translates into vengefulness, but more problematic still, teaches the slave that the only way it can become free is to give over to the prevailing reason mastery has set in place. Sloterdijk equates this ressentiment with rage, the basis of all great theisms.4i Such a condition, as Nietzsche understood, was ‘paralysing’ insomuch as it annuls the possibility of thinking and acting otherwise, and it was ‘exhausting’ insomuch as life was forced to compromise with the very lethality that put its condition originally into question. Through a ‘spirit of revenge’ what is lacking is therefore produced in a double movement, for lack is not some original gesture, it derives out of the ressentiment to deny us the opportunity to bring something different into the world. This raises a number of pressing questions: Could it be that not only have we become slaves to our biological existence, but in claiming false mastery of the earth we have given to ourselves an illusionary sovereignty? For how can we have mastery if that which we claim to be able to dominate as the principle force makes us increasingly vulnerable with each passing moment? Have we not, then, become slaves to ourselves and slaves to the earth, and resentful of them as a result? Nihilism has never been alien to liberal biopolitics. It is arguably its most potent expression. Its early development can be traced to Kant's Copernican revolution of the mind. Placing life at the centre of its universe, Kant forced us to look for meaning beyond the realms of theological destiny. Whilst this moved us beyond the suffering and lament of the Christian subject which so irked Nietzsche, Kant's universal substitute proved to be no substitute at all. The universal was actually denied to us due to the limits of our reason and our imperfections as ﬁnite beings - imperfections that signiﬁcantly proved incapable of moving us beyond the reductionism of metaphysical idealism and its crude representations, towards a more afﬁrmative form of meta- physics that worked in practice. As Drucilla Cornell writes, ‘Martin Heidegger famously wrote that Kant takes us to the limit of the very notion of critique and ultimately raises, but does not fully address, the question of ‘who’ is this ﬁnite being that must think through the transcendental imaginationfﬂ In a remarkably potent yet tragic stroke, Kant wrote the death of the omnipotent God and the types of docile subjects it produced who were rendered immobile due to its vengeance and fury, while putting in its place a fallen subject that was fated to be forever incomplete because of the burdens of its own actions. While Kant's thinking paved the way for new eschatological forms of power to emerge that took leave of traditional sovereign moorings, the fallen subject was compelled to become resentful of its biological existence. Bios were to remain forever imperfect by design and fated to be judged accordingly. With life fated to live a biologically endowed existence, it is stripped of its capacity to have a meaningful existence beyond the limits of its bodily formations, while political strategies operate by governing through the problem of ﬁnitude, even though the ﬁnite inevitably became a philosophical problem too difﬁcult to comprehend. As a result, forced to endure a growing resentment of its unfolding drama, liberalism slowly became morally equipped to continually intervene upon the souls of the living simply by offering to prolong the subject's existence better than any other political rationality. Such was the realization of our ﬁnite entrapment in the bodily form that the ability to philosophically transgress the injunction between life and death became increasingly impossible. Indeed, as we shall point out later, while liberal societies have a particular relationship to the question of dying as our existence is continually put into question, such that with each passing second we learn to survive until we become truly meaningless in the end, the idea of death remains incommensurable to the liberal subject. No longer does the resilient subject solely project its resentfulness onto the souls of ‘Others’. It resents the living world, for it too is radically endangering. It is here that catastrophic imaginaries begin to truly thrive. The resilient subject is shaped and anxiously mobilized by the prospect of the coming catastrophe. It fears the transformation of the subject, just as it fears the transformation of the ecosystem that gives sustenance to life. Our rage as such, to borrow from Sloterdijk, has become truly limitless. As everything becomes the source of our endangerment, we internalize the ressentiment and proliferate our impotence with unrivalled intensity and absolute necessity. Hence this produces a form of nihilism which is ‘unbounded: For no longer do we simply resent the teleological unfolding of history as we phase shift from masters to slaves to masters; there is no mastery to speak of and as a result all our lament ﬁlters into a politics of ressentiment as we are left to simply govern through our continually unfolding state of unending emergency. (111-17)

#### Representations must precede policy discussion. Thus, the role of the ballot should be to assume the position of a critical intellectual- debate is primarily an academic activity. The signal sent intellectually outweighs any specific policy proposal

Neta Crawford ,PhD MA MIT, BA Brown, Prof. of poli sci at boston univ. Argument and Change in World Politics, 2002 p. 19-21

Coherent arguments are unlikely to take place unless and until actors, at least on some level, agree on what they are arguing about. The at least temporary resolution of meta-arguments- regarding the nature of the good (the content of prescriptive norms); what is out there, the way we know the world, how we decide between competing beliefs (ontology and epistemology); and the nature of the situation at hand( the proper frame or representation)- must occur before specific arguments that could lead to decision and action may take place. Meta-arguments over epistemology and ontology, relatively rare, occur in instances where there is a fundamental clash between belief systems and not simply a debate within a belief system. Such arguments over the nature of the world and how we come to know it are particularly rare in politics though they are more frequent in religion and science. Meta-arguments over the “good” are contests over what it is good and right to do, and even how we know the good and the right. They are about the nature of the good, specifically, defining the qualities of “good” so that we know good when we see it and do it. Ethical arguments are about how to do good in a particular situation. More common are meta-arguments over representations or frames- about how we out to understand a particular situation. Sometimes actors agree on how they see a situation. More often there are different possible interpretations. Thomas Homer-Dixon and Roger karapin suggest, “Argument and debate occur when people try to gain acceptance for their interpretation of the world”. For example, “is the war defensive or aggressive?”. Defining and controlling representations and images, or the frame, affects whether one thinks there is an issue at stake and whether a particular argument applies to the case. An actor fighting a defensive war is within international law; an aggressor may legitimately be subject to sanctions. Framing and reframing involve mimesis or putting forward representations of what is going on. In mimetic meta-arguments, actors who are struggling to characterize or frame the situation accomplish their ends by drawing vivid pictures of the “reality” through exaggeration, analogy, or differentiation. Representations of a situation do not re-produce accurately so much as they creatively re-present situations in a way that makes sense. “mimesis is a metaphoric or ‘iconic argumentation of the real.’ Imitating not the effectivity of events but their logical structure and meaning.” Certain features are emphasized and others de-emphasized or completely ignored as their situation is recharacterized or reframed. Representation thus becomes a “constraint on reasoning in that it limits understanding to a specific organization of conceptual knowledge.” The dominant representation delimits which arguments will be considered legitimate, framing how actors see possibities. As Roxanne Doty argues, “the possibility of practices presupposes the ability of an agent to imagine certain courses of action. Certain background meanings, kinds of social actors and relationships, must already be in place.” If, as Donald Sylvan and Stuart Thorson argue, “politics involves the selective privileging of representations, “it may not matter whether one representation or another is true or not. Emphasizing whether frames articulate accurate or inaccurate perceptions misses the rhetorical import of representation- how frames affect what is seen or not seen, and subsequent choices. Meta-arguments over representation are thus crucial elements of political argument because an actor’s arguments about what to do will be more persuasive if their characterization or framing of the situation holds sway. But, as Rodger Payne suggests, “No frame is an omnipotent persuasive tool that can be decisively wielded by norm entrepreneurs without serious political wrangling.” Hence framing is a meta-argument.

#### The alternative is to reject the AFF’s security representations as a critical intellectual labor that makes imagination of a more peaceful future possible. Neocleous 08

(Neocleous 8 — Prof of Government @ Brunel University; London (Mark, Critique of Security, pg. 184-5)

Anyone well versed in history or with experience of university life will know about the shameful ways in which large numbers of academics have elevated venality into the cardinal academic virtue, complying with the demands of those in power and the wishes of those with money: witness the political scientists, historians, anthropologists, geographers, cartographers, sociologists, linguists and many others who reworked their disciplines according to the principles and myths, and the principle myths, of fascism.' 'Academic life under fascism', notes Christopher Hutton, 'is a dismal ... episode in an unedifying story of relations between the modem academic and the state, and between academics and power both within and outside the university. But this part of the history of fascism is merely the worst moment in the wider and equally unedifying story of relations between academics and the state more generally, merely one way m which intellectuals have kowtowed to the principles and myths, and the principle myths, concerning security and the state. Spouting the jargon of security and enthralled by the trappings of power, their intellectual labour consists of nothing less than attempts to write hand-books for the princes of the new security state. The death of countless numbers in a more 'efficient' bombing of a city, the stationing of troops halfway around the World in order to bring to an end any attempt at collective self-determination, the use of military machines against civilians, the training of police forces in counter-insurgency practices, but more than anything the key concepts and categories used to explain and justify these things - all defended, supported and even ‘improved” by security intellectuals for whom, ultimately, intelIecua1 labour boils down to little more than the question of the most efficient manner. In which to achieve the security demanded by the state and bourgeois order. In rationalizing the political and corporate logic of security, the security intellectual conceals the utter irrationality of the system as a whole. The security intellectual then is nothing less than the security ideologue, peddling the fetish of our time. The only way out of such a dilemma, to escape the fetish, is perhaps to eschew the logic of security altogether - to reject it as so ideologically loaded in favour of the state that any real political thought other than the authoritarian and reactionary should be pressed to give it up, That is clearly something that can not be achieved within the limits of bourgeois thought and thus could never even begin to be imagined by the security intellectual. It is also something that the constant iteration of the refrain ‘this is an insecure world’ and reiteration of one fear, anxiety and insecurity after another will also make it hard to do, but it is something that the critique of security suggests we may have to consider if we want a political way out of the impasse of security. This impasse exists because security has now become so all-encompassing that it marginalizes all else, most notably the constructive conflicts, debates and discussions that animate political life. The constant prioritizing of a mythical security as a political end - as the political end - constitutes a rejection of politics in any meaningful sense of the term. That is, as a mode of action in which differences can be articulated, in which the conflicts and struggles that arise from such differences can be fought for and negotiated, in which people might come to believe that another world is possible - that they might transform the world and in turn be transformed. Security politics simply removes this; worse, it removes it while purportedly addressing it. In so doing it suppresses all issues of power and turns political questions into debates about the most efficient way to achieve ‘security’, despite the fact that we are never quite told - never could be told – what might count as having achieved it. Security politics is, in this sense, an anti-politics,” dominating political discourse in much the same manner as the security state tries to dominate human beings, reinforcing security fetishism and the monopolistic character of security on the political imagination. We therefore need to get beyond security politics, not add yet more ‘sectors to it in a way that simply expands the scope of the state, and legitimizes state intervention in yet more and more areas of our lives. Simon Dalby reports a personal communication with Michael Williams, co-editor of the important text Critical Security Studies, in which the latter asks: if you take away security, what do you put in the hole that’s left behind? But I’m inclined to agree with Dalby: maybe there is no hole. The mistake has been to think that there is a hole and that this hole needs to be filled with a new vision or revision of security in which it is re-mapped or civilised or gendered or humanised or expanded or whatever. All of these ultimately remain within the statist political imaginary, and consequently end up re-affirming the state as the terrain of modem politics, the grounds of security. The real task is not to fill the supposed hole with yet another vision of security, but to fight for an alternative political language which takes us beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois security and which therefore does not constantly throw us into the arms of the state. That’s the point of critical politics: to develop a new political language more adequate to the kind of society we want. Thus while much of what I have said here has been of a negative order, part of the tradition of critical theory is that the negative may be as significant as the positive in setting thought on new paths. For if security really is the supreme concept of bourgeois society and the fundamental thematic of liberalism, then to keep harping on about insecurity and to keep demanding ‘more security’ (while meekly hoping that this increased security doesn’t damage our liberty) is to blind ourselves to the possibility of building real alternatives to the authoritarian tendencies in contemporary politics. To situate ourselves against security politics would allow us to circumvent the debilitating effect achieved through the constant securitizing of social and political issues, debilitating in the sense that ‘security’ helps consolidate the power of the existing forms of social domination and justifies the short-circuiting of even the most democratic forms. It would also allow us to forge another kind of politics centered on a different conception of the good. We need a new way of thinking and talking about social being and politics that moves us beyond security. This would perhaps be emancipatory in the true sense of the word. What this might mean, precisely, must be open to debate. But it certainly requires recognizing that security is an illusion that has forgotten it is an illusion; it requires recognising that security is not the same as solidarity; it requires accepting that insecurity is part of the human condition, and thus giving up the search for the certainty of security and instead learning to tolerate the uncertainties, ambiguities and ‘insecurities’ that come with being human; it requires accepting that securitizing an issue does not mean dealing with it politically, but bracketing it out and handing it to the state; it requires us to be brave enough to return the gift.

## Case

#### NU – space is already a global commons

#### Plan fails –

#### Global commons still allow for private appropriation

#### China inevitably undermines solvency

#### Too many private actors ensure conflict

#### Turn – limitations on commons access such as private entity restrictions lead to backlash

Stang 13

Gerald Stang (associate fellow at the EUISS) , 2013, "Global Commons: between cooperation and competition" European Institute for security studies, https://www.iss.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EUISSFiles/Brief\_17.pdf, // HW AW

Rapid economic development and increasing international trade are leading to a more crowded international stage and raising new challenges in the ‘global commons’ – those domains that are not under the control or jurisdiction of any state but are **open for use by countries, companies and individuals from around the world**. Their management involves increasingly complex processes to accommodate and integrate the interests and responsibilities of states, international organisations and a host of non-state actors. Shared rules regarding the usage of - and access to - the global commons encourage their peaceful and cooperative use. Over the last seven decades, the US has led in the creation of a liberal international order which has attempted to define these rules in such a way as to make it easier and more beneficial to join the order and follow the rules than it does to operate outside of (or undermine) it. With the rise of nonWestern, less liberal powers - particularly **China - questions must be asked regarding the durability of the existing processes for managing the global commons,** along with the potential for developing effective new processes that can address new threats and challenges. The EU is uniquely positioned to play an important role in giving value to existing multilateral frameworks and in developing new ones for international cooperation in these domains. But with a multitude of competing interests among stakeholders, much work remains to be done. What exactly are the global commons? Security analysts generally identify **four domains as global commons: high seas, airspace, outer space** and, now, cyberspace. From a security perspective, the primary concern is safeguarding ‘access’ to these domains for commercial and military reasons. It is important to highlight that this language differs from the discourse on commons developed by environmental analysts: their arguments focus on damage to the ‘condition’ of the commons from overuse by actors who do not have to pay direct costs. They worry about the depletion of shared resources such as ocean fish stocks, or the damage to shared domains such as Antarctica or the atmosphere. A third strand of analysis looks not at the need for ‘access’ to or preservation of the ‘condition’ of the commons, but at the capacity of the commons to provide ‘global public goods’. As there is no accepted definition of a global public good (a functioning trading system, peace, clean water, electricity, the internet, and many other things are often included), it may be wiser to focus on the four global commons relevant to security analysts mentioned above. While there are major differences between the ‘access’ views of security analysts and the ‘condition’ views of environmentalists, both are concerned about how the Global commons: Between cooperation and competition by Gerald Stang Photo by NASA / Rex Features (1568628a) European Union Institute for Security Studies April 2013 2 rules for use of the commons are set and enforced. In today’s interconnected world, **any limitations on access to the commons would be highly disruptive**. Militaries rely on access to the commons to pursue security goals in domains outside their sovereign control. Economic actors rely on the commons to trade and conduct business. **Changes to the condition of the commons can therefore disrupt commerce and security, not to mention the status of the global environment.** Each of the four commons discussed below possesses unique attributes and poses unique challenges for international cooperation and governance. Sea As the primary avenue for international commerce since ancient times, norms for access to and passage on the seas have developed and evolved over many years. Only in recent decades, however, have there been agreed regulatory frameworks and institutions to manage them. The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), first initiated in 1956 though not legally in force until 1994, is the primary international treaty regarding the sea, laying out rules for territorial boundaries (22km from shore), resource management and the rights of states within their exclusive economic zones (370km from shore). The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS), created by UNCLOS, has the power to resolve disputes by States Parties. Except for the US, most countries and all global powers - including the EU-27 - have signed and ratified UNCLOS. The UN International Migratory Organization (IMO), created in 1948, regulates international shipping and rulings on safety, environmental and technical cooperation issues (the EU has observer status). As the world’s only global sea power, the United States has historically seen itself as the protector of free movement on the seas. With 11 carrier groups (Russia has one, rarely used) and hundreds of naval bases and allied ports throughout the globe, the US has a naval footprint that dwarfs all its allies and competitors. While countries such as Iran and China may be uncomfortable with US capacity to deny others access to the sea, US support for the creation and respect of transparent international regulations for use of the sea (which they adhere to themselves despite not having ratified UNCLOS), has allowed for the stable management of access to the seas. Except for the disruptive (but still rare) threat of piracy, access to the seas is generally a smooth and well-regulated process. The massive and relatively effective, if ad hoc, global response to the localised piracy problem off the coast of Somalia (for which the EU launched Atalanta, its own anti-piracy mission under the CSDP) highlighted the world’s impressive capacity to handle disruptions of this type. Territorial disputes exist in places like the South China Sea, but relate to historical boundary disagreements rather than conflict over rules of sea access. Normally, no state has an interest in disrupting sea trade. Even in times of crisis, while individual states may wish to deny their opponents access to certain regions, they are unlikely to harm their own interests by disrupting traffic on the world’s oceans. Environmental ‘condition’ issues in the sea commons are disconnected from ‘access’ issues. No single international treaty or body addresses pollution, overfishing or the various challenges in the melting Arctic. A confusing patchwork of sea basin cooperation groupings, regional fisheries management organisations and pollution monitoring agreements is in place. The integrated marine policy of the EU recognizes the need to improve governance of the seas while avoiding treaty congestion. While no unifying treaty or body to manage maritime issues is likely to appear, years of patient discussion in a variety of venues (of the type that the EU excels at) may lead to greater coherence and cooperation in managing environmental threats. Air International air travel requires the use of national airspace for continuous transit and involves detailed agreements that define transit rights. The UN International Civil Aviation Organisation, established in 1947, is the leading institution for regulating air travel. All EU countries are members, while the EU has observer status. As with piracy at sea, any potential disruption of access to the air commons is likely to come from non-state actors. While terrorist events can disrupt air traffic, however, intergovernmental cooperation between national police and security agencies is well established. Any systemic threat to the air commons appears so unlikely that some security analysts do not even include air as a one of the commons. Also like the sea commons, issues of management of environmental ‘condition’ are disconnected from ‘access’ issues. The accumulation of greenhouse gases is a form of pollution of the atmosphere, but the alarm stems from their effects on the biosphere rather than from the risk that the atmosphere may become unbreathable or inaccessible. The EU is a global leader on climate change, with the world’s most comprehensive emissions trading scheme and intense efforts to regulate and limit emissions. The Union has set the tone at the international level but has been unable to win agreement for an internal carbon tax or stronger emissions targets from external partners. European Union Institute for Security Studies April 2013 3 Space More than a thousand orbiting satellites facilitate communications in both the military and the civilian spheres, regulated by a mix of UN guidelines, bilater- al Cold War agreements and industry standards. The UN International Telecommunications Union (ITU) allocates radio spectrum and satellite orbits and develops international technical standards. Established in 1869, the ITU has almost universal membership among existing states, including all EU countries - though not the EU itself. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty, signed by all spacefaring nations, provides the minimal framework for activities in space, banning weapons of mass destruction and preventing states from claims to celestial bodies. The Treaty does not establish infrastructure for coordination, and consultation among party states is ad hoc. Following China’s destruction of one of its own satellites in 2007, there has been increasing concern about protection of satellites from attack. During the later stages of the Cold War, the US and the USSR tacitly agreed to a moratorium on testing anti-satellite weapons (ASAT) - but there are no binding rules in place. The satellite’s destruction also created a debris cloud which could have damaged other satellites or spacecraft. Unlike the sea and air domains, the problem of debris management in space indicates an overlap between ‘access’ and ‘condition’ issues. While access to space has previously been limited to a small number of states, **the increasing role of new actors (including from the private sector) suggests that the creation of comprehensive and binding regulations for the space commons may become more difficult.** The EU has pushed to become a key actor in space matters, working with the European Space Agency (ESA) - an intergovernmental body - on Galileo, Europe’s civilian satellite navigation system. In an effort to get ahead of the curve and manage uncertainty, the European Council approved a voluntary Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities in late 2008 (revised in 2010) to address both space operations and space debris. It has only limited operational requirements but develops important cooperation, consultation, and notification mechanisms. To make it more palatable to the US and other states, it is not binding and has no enforcement mechanism. As with many efforts in multilateral regulation of the global commons, the US has been hesitant to agree to the Code for fear of diminishing its own freedom of manoeuvre. It may be an important step, however, in setting the groundwork for future space cooperation if the EU can follow up on the Code’s development with diplomatic action by bringing other space-faring countries on board. Cyberspace Cyberspace differs from the other commons because it is not a physical domain and because of the preponderant role of the private sector in both the infrastructure and the management of the domain. All of the physical nodes of the internet also exist within states and are subject to national law, rather than existing physically outside of national control as for the other commons. The American and security-related roots of the internet are reflected in how technical internet standards are managed. The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), a private non-profit entity under contract with the US government, has ensured the coordination of internet addresses and registries since 1998. While ICANN operations have been stable - and their inclusive governance style has won imitators for handling technical issues - many countries prefer a formal international body to manage technical internet issues. The ITU has been suggested as a neutral management body, but this idea has been resisted by most Western states. Interestingly, non-Western states are pushing for international management of the internet within a framework that provides individual countries with rights and roles, rather than leaving it to the nonprofit sector to decide how the internet works. All EU-27 countries are members of the ITU and, following a European Parliament deliberation, voted as a bloc against the measures granting more power to the ITU, concerned over states wishing to regulate, control, and limit internet use. The UN Internet Governance Forum (IGF) has become the leading multi-stakeholder platform for states and other actors to debate internet governance. Regardless of the ICANN/ITU issue, states can filter and censor within their territories, and for the time being, efforts to protect against cyber attacks remain within the national sphere. Cyberspace allows for the spread of information, creating pressures for transparency in both democratic and non-democratic states. Discussions on the management of cyberspace, therefore, have become connected with those on the power of states to control information. Finally, although there is no environmental constitu- ency for cyberspace, there are constituencies of users and providers - private and public - who play a similar role in pushing for the protection of certain conditions in cyberspace. Unlike for sea and air domains, therefore, there is overlap between ‘access’ and ‘condition’ discussants. With worries about Cold War-style espionage and cyber conflict between states, cyber security problems European Union Institute for Security Studies April 2013 4 QN-AK-13-017-2A-N | ISSN 2315-1110 are expected to grow worse and are unlikely to be addressed through multilateral fora. Problems with hackers of various types make problems of attribution, response and coordination of policing very difficult. Cyber conflict involving states will ebb and flow along with the quality of the relationship between those states and competing states will continue to test each other’s cyber defences.

#### The term global commons leads to a false sense of security when in actuality makes whatever is supposedly being protected exploited

**Clancy 98** (The Tragedy of the Global Commons, Spring 1998, <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1136&context=ijgls> pecial Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of State, US Department of State, Indiana Journal of global legal studies)//HWLND

The inherent problem in this communal property is the idea put forth byGarrett Hardin in his 1968 article entitled The Tragedy of the Commons." Hardin theorized that in communal property systems, each individual enjoys the benefit of exploiting the resource to its maximum, while the cost of this increased utilization is spread out over all users. Consequently, there is incentive for individual over exploitation. Applying this theory to global expanses shows that "the disadvantage inherent in this doctrine is that nations are free to make maximum use of resources because no outside mechanism exists to force their acceptance of external costs, either the cost of resource degradation or the cost of resource depletion."'" Much like the herding commons depicted in Hardin's essay, global commons are susceptible to overuse. 19 This problem is indeed a serious one. Global commons become, in effect, a target for over exploitation. Moreover, critics have addressed the problems of free riders and the Prisoner's Dilemma in dealing with commons.2 " The end result is the same, however. These global commons fall victim to the predatory interest of individual exploiting nations.

#### Kessler syndrome is media hype – no risk

Von Fange 17

Daniel von Fange (systems engineer. Fond of charts), 5-21-2017, "Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped," braino, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/, // HW AW

Kessler Syndrome is overhyped. A chorus of online commenters greet any news of upcoming low earth orbit satellites with worry that humanity will to lose access to space. I now think they are wrong. What is Kessler Syndrome? Here’s the popular view on Kessler Syndrome. Every once in a while, a piece of junk in space hits a satellite. This single impact destroys the satellite, and breaks off several thousand additional pieces. These new pieces now fly around space looking for other satellites to hit, and so exponentially multiply themselves over time, like a nuclear reaction, until a sphere of man-made debris surrounds the earth, and humanity no longer has access to space nor the benefits of satellites. It is a dark picture. Is Kessler Syndrome likely to happen? I had to stop everything and spend an afternoon doing back-of-the-napkin math to know how big the threat is. To estimate, we need to know where the stuff in space is, how much mass is there, and how long it would take to deorbit. The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions. Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over. High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue. Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here. GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here. How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be? Let’s imagine a worst case scenario. **An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space? I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total.** For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, **its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000**. **So even in the worst case, we don’t lose access to space.** Now though you can travel through the debris, you couldn’t keep a satellite alive for long in this orbit of death. Kessler Syndrome at its worst just prevents us from putting satellites in certain orbits. In real life, there’s a lot of factors that make Kessler syndrome even less of a problem than our worst case though experiment. Debris would be spread over a volume of space, not a single orbital surface, making collisions orders of magnitudes less likely. Most impact debris will have a slower orbital velocity than either of its original pieces - this makes it deorbit much sooner. Any collision will create large and small objects. **Small objects are much more affected by atmospheric drag and deorbit faster**, even in a few months from high LEO. Larger objects can be tracked by earth based radar and avoided. The planned big new constellations are not in High LEO, but in Low LEO for faster communications with the earth. They aren’t an issue for Kessler. Most importantly, all new satellite launches since the 1990’s are required to include a plan to get rid of the satellite at the end of its useful life (usually by deorbiting) So the realistic worst case is that insurance premiums on satellites go up a bit. Given the current trend toward much smaller, cheaper micro satellites, this wouldn’t even have a huge effect. **I’m removing Kessler Syndrome from my list of things to worry about.**