### K

#### 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.”

#### Knowing Nukes- The affirmative’s appeals to survival, like 1ac acton and 1ac framing nuclear war as an existential threat are not neutral but rather naturalize status quo concepts of universal humanity and a return to order – the discourse of the aff makes their impacts inevitable and only the alt solves.

Chaloupka, PhD, 92

(William, PoliSci@UniversityOfHawaii, AssocProfPoliSci@UMontana, Knowing Nukes, University of Minnesota Press)

In this chapter, I begin to map that intersection by examining a key universalism contained in most of the politics that engage issues of nuclearism. Survival is a coded position that privileges certain questions and marginalizes others. In this chapter, I want to make aspects of that privilege more explicit, more accessible to controversy. Assigning "survival" the status of summary and goal implies a relatively settled "humanity" that is, one hopes, to survive. One would hardly need to hope that people not survive to bring that code into question (although some radically misanthropic environmentalists playfully take just such a position). Savvy about codes and symbols, the nuclear critic might begin by highlighting what our most universalistic survival codes assume. Survival Perhaps the central political metaphor of antinuclearists involves the appeal to survival of the human species as a principle that can guide social and political response. But after Jonathan SchelPs Fate of the Earth presented that case, the narrowness of this appeal began to draw criticism. As Robert Jay Lifton has noted, the emergence of neo-Nazi survivalists is not without consequence for nuclear opponents who have used the survival language so extensively themselves.3 Schell broadened his metaphors in The Abolition,4 and nuclear opponents in general have tried to define survival in a way that is not individualist. Nonetheless, recent essays by political theorist George Kateb bring even that modified project into question, finding within the "survival" position an indefensible replacement totality.5 Kateb's critique focuses on the political metaphysics implied by the survival position. To turn "existence" into a principle that could inform action is to ignore many other philosophical commitments made in this century. The metaphysical privileging of existence as key to a great and total meaning (that might motivate political action in a classically liberal framework) is unavailable "in an age when the death of God has been announced with adequate plausibility." 6 Existence does not have systemic attributes amenable to univocal judgments. At least some of us cannot accept the validity of revelation, or play on ourselves the Kantian trick of regarding existence as if it were the designed work of a personal God, or presume to call it good, and bless it as if it were the existence we would have created if we had the power, and think that it therefore deserves to exist and is justifiable just as it is. No: these argumentative moves are bad moves; they are transparent tricks.7 Kateb wants to articulate a defensible "attachment to existence" without relying on "any kind of totality." Existence cannot be justified by any "internal" or human standard developed independently of a supposed divine authentication. That is to say, attachment cannot be cultivated by way of a theology . . . or by way of a believable reconciliation to the facts of wickedness, suffering, waste, cruelty, obscenity, and death. The universe . . . is without sponsorship; and existence on earth fails every test that is strenuously pressed. . . . What is needed is precisely a mode that is content not to make the world —human and natural existence on earth —into a story, a picture, an order or a pattern . . . that is, into a self-adequate totality or into a necessary part of a transcendent totality.8 The puzzle we retain, after Nietzsche, is to find a way to establish human value without the aid of an external totality (whether religious, scientific, or merely commonsensical).9 Kateb's strategy is to shift attention to the institutional and philosophical contexts within which this discussion of survival proceeds. Such a broadening of the question could confront the excessive individualism that otherwise makes "survival" a suspect theme. If the extreme individualism of this century cannot be absorbed into metaphysics, Kateb claims, it is still the case that individualism and the institutions of democracy are not easily dismissed: "Individualism in some of its developments after the seventeenth century contains . . . saving thoughts and feelings. The great work of Emerson, Thoreau, and Whitman comprises the main development, and the phrase 'democratic individuality' perhaps best names their idealism."10 To broaden these saving possibilities within individualism, Kateb (in a surprising move, for him) suggests that we take heart from the "antidemocratic individualist doctrines of Nietzsche and Heidegger," both writers who influence contemporary language approaches. "The best defensive idealism is individualism," but "the self-surpassing of both rightsbased individualism and existentialist individualism is the unique source of a selfless and saving attachment."1! In short, without adopting the categories I am attaching to this position, Kateb poses the possibility of a historical, yet ambivalent and even poststructuralist, individualism —a political form of nuclear criticism —as a response to the broad crisis of meaning in the late modern era.12 Kateb distinguishes himself from Foucault and Derrida when he stresses continuities, arguing that the dilemma for democratic individualism was highlighted by the nuclear age, but was visible previously. Several features of democratic society have long been at tension with the democratic idealism he sees as that society's best protector. Not only this puzzle, but also its resolution, precede nukes. Citing Whitman, Kateb argues that a conventional, democratic individualism could be founded on practice. Being " 'both in and out of the game and watching and wondering at it' ... is far better than being rooted in what is superstitiously regarded as reality. To watch the action as one acts is to play; to play is never to lose sight of others."13 This amounts to a proposal for an individualism defined relatively, justified by social and aesthetic judgments, and implemented on the model of play. Even after the metaphysics of existence has become impossible, politics and thought continue, because "democratic individuality radically changes both action and contemplation."14 Whether or not Kateb specifically intends it as such, this is a poststructuralist reading of democratic individuality —pragmatic, aesthetic, and interpretive. The individual acquires the critical distance necessary to judge his or her existence by acknowledging that the external vantage point previously provided by theology is now absent. On the basis of that understanding, the epistemological standpoint of individual thought and action can shift. Sources of meaning dislodge from supposedly essential, natural "facts" of existence, and instead situate themselves in the interplay of contemplation and action. Thus, "the hidden source of modern democracy may always have been the death of God." But the (nuke-induced) "precariousness of existence now deepens this sense," moving us toward a preferable democratic possibility. "Individualism in its contradictory variety is the best defensive idealism in the nuclear situation."15 Whether or not this is indeed an "idealism" is an issue nuclear criticism would pose to Kateb. In any case, it is an unlikely "idealism" —lacking ideals or a positively structured given practice in which to situate them. Kateb's analysis may be most useful for nuclear criticism's deconstruction of "survival" as a cornerstone of this debate. Still, others interested in the relationships between language and politics will be dubious about Kateb's defense of "idealism," with its implication that a strong role still exists for the intellectual as a speaker of that ideal, a judge of its cases, and an articulator of what "existence" and "survival" might be. Ironically, Michel Foucault's treatment of this possibility also includes this approach's first insights on nuclearism: Some years have now passed since the intellectual was called upon to play this role. A new mode of the 'connection between theory and practice' has been established. Intellectuals have got used to working, not in the modality of the 'universal', the 'exemplary', the 'just-and-truefor- alP, but within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own conditions of life or work situate them (housing, the hospital, the asylum, the laboratory, the university, family and sexual relations).16 This passage should remind us of the roles played by intellectuals in the nuclear opposition. Humanists have learned the physics of power plants in order to object at siting hearings near their cities. Physicists, simultaneously, have learned the language of political opposition, organizing colleagues against Star Wars in their universities and institutes. In the example I will consider in a later chapter, the intellectual contribution was a phrase (the nuclear freeze) and a strategic political approach —not a manifesto of values and ideals. In the interview quoted above, Foucault goes on to make his bestknown comments on nuclear politics. His claim is that the intellectual par excellence is no longer the writer, who brings that "idealism" to concrete form, but the university activist, the "technician, magistrate, teacher." Global significance is not lost in this transformation. Such actors "have become able to participate, both within their own fields and through mutual exchange and support, in a global process of politicisation of intel lectuals."17 Foucault's example of an intellectual who operates in the realm of the specific is a central nuclearist: This figure of the 'specific' intellectual has emerged since the Second World War. Perhaps it was the atomic scientist (in a word, or rather a name: Oppenheimer) who acted as the point of transition between the universal and the specific intellectual. It's because he had a direct and localised relation to scientific knowledge and institutions that the atomic scientist could make his intervention; but, since the nuclear threat affected the whole human race and the fate of the world, his discourse could at the same time be the discourse of the universal.18 Focusing on the discontinuity entailed by nuclear technology (rather than on the search for continuities, as Kateb does), Foucault reconciled the role of the intellectual with the epistemological break required for "survival" to make sense as a political position. In a genealogy of nukes, the displacement of survival as key concept may be the crucial move toward oppositional politics. At least, that displacement marks the seriousness of the break with previous stances. Without that break, "survival" represents, at best, an appeal to a philosophically precarious doctrine of existence. At worst, it could be a selfish preference, little more than a narrowly narcissistic concern for physical health. Survivalists of every political stripe would respond that there is a general issue at stake, whether we like that issue, or whether the philosophical or psychological dimensions of that issue are felicitous or not. In other words, they are appealing to a brute condition, a stark threat that we cannot choose to ignore. The nuke —in league with the antinuke — does make it plain that we have common "species" interests, as the survivalists argue. But the issue is still not that simple. On one hand, this claim of species interest must confront the possibility that it is a vain or opportunistic claim. That is to say, it is not a self-evident condition. The concept of a self-aware species is a political act, inextricably bound to the possibility of political response —the possibility that all survivalist politics requires. On the other hand, such a position also must confront the fact that this species constitutes itself by identifying interests and solutions; there really is no "ordinary life" to return to after we settle survival issues. That political struggle already will have conditioned whatever life one would then resume. In other words, the species may have interests, but it is also the case that such a species is constituted, not found or remembered. In short, the call to survival not only addresses "real" lives (whatever those might be), but also constitutes those lives. What does it matter that this constituting activity has happened? Crucially, this constituted species sees itself as natural (what else could a species be?), but that perception is at odds with its situation. The context is far from "natural" (in the sense that no strong coherence underlies it); a better case can be made that it is contrived, contradictory, rule-bound, and, finally, absurd. Foucault's accomplishment, then, was not only to have joined with existentialists, Dadaists, and others who have so effectively "denaturalized" human history in this century. In addition, Foucault advanced these efforts by showing possibilities for freeing activity available only after history is denatured. For the species to act on the goal of survival embroils us in a simplistic, if still powerful, circle. The species must have always had some motivation to survive as a species, but its commitment to certain practices (especially rationality and science) is both unquestionable and the source of the threat amidst which the species finds itself lodged. Thus, the species must have mutated to produce such a result, and a mutated species might not be able to act on behalf of its survival. The absolutization of humanity proposes to lead us away from the twists, perversities, and gaps that continually preside over the nuclear age. Absurdity and contradiction have become elemental terms in our era. They are "hardened positions," to borrow a term, even if the notion of a hardened irony might be familiar only to Baudrillard. The species survival position cannot be comfortable in emphasizing those absurdities. But unless it does so, the survival position can scarcely discuss the nuclear age at all. From the approach I am taking, then, we might even call this diagnosis of unspeakability a rhetorically determined stance; antinuclearists have been forced to describe the age as unspeakable in order to continue to draw upon and defend an absolutized, natural humanity. As a consequence, the species survival position may not notice the broad effects of the age's distinctively spoken (speakable) character. Nuclear criticism could offer a better political response if it could expose the specific operations of power that enable some politics of opposition. Before considering that possibility, however, we must be more precise about this "unspeakability" that continually haunts talk of nukes.

#### The management of space debris, like 1ac runnels necessitating debris removal, 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.

#### Debris is our ally against empire! Their rhetoric, like in 1ac acton and 1ac hattenbach, securitizes the threat and ensures Active Debris Removal

Reno, Associate Prof. Anthropology @ Binghamton, 18

(Joshua Ozias, PhD from the University of Michigan: “Making Time with Amateur Astronomers and Orbital Space Debris: Attunement and the Matter of Temporality” in Journal of Contemporary Archaeology 5.1 (2018) 4–18)DR 19

For one thing, space debris is potentially dangerous to spacecraft. Space debris is partly assessed by treating returning spacecraft in a way they were never intended for: as a “hypervelocity impact capture medium”, as they are dented more by artificial objects than natural meteorites (Bernhard et al. 1997). The impetus for tracking and modeling space debris thus comes from the temporal possibilities they threaten. Alice Gorman (2015) describes space debris as an emergent assemblage that takes on new spatio-temporal properties, even when compared with other objects orbiting the Earth. This is most clearly represented in the idea of the Kessler Syndrome (Kessler and Cour-Palais 1978). This theory predicts a “cascade of random collisions that create so much debris the Earth is enveloped and cut off from space” (Gorman 2015, 42). This includes **a feedback process whereby objects continually collide and spread out**, **converting Earth orbits**, especially in LEO, **into** **a hazardous environment filled with tiny fragments**. Space debris would circle eternally overhead like a cloud of bullets awaiting a target, trapping us in fear on the surface. Gorman points out that it is unclear that such a dire situation has emerged or necessarily will. Whether it is likely to take hold or not, the Kessler Syndrome actually reflects anxiety about the unexpected and emergent spacetime of materials orbiting the Earth. The time they threaten is increasingly incorporated into fantasies of space travel. For example, this provided an element of horror in the recent and very successful science-fiction film Gravity (2013), where space debris was depicted as a monstrous threat – like a swarm of abiotic locusts – that cycled the Earth with an alien regularity: without warning they descend and annihilate spacecraft or slaughter hapless astronauts. It may be that these risks are being somewhat amplified by filmmakers and space agencies; yet, the threat of damage from orbital space debris is at least somewhat real. The ISS had to perform approximately eight evasive maneuvers during its first decade of operation in order to avoid collisions with debris. Calculations are normally performed at least three times a day to determine risks of collision over the subsequent 72 hours; if the chance of collision with a large enough object is determined to be greater than one in ten thousand, then maneuvers are planned and executed (see Johnson and Klinkrad 2009). Here is an account of a recent incident, written by representatives from the ESA and NASA assigned to space debris: The last collision avoidance maneuver by ISS occurred on 27 August 2008 when a fragment from the Kosmos 2421 spacecraft was projected to pose a collision risk of 1 in 72, i.e., 0.014 […]. This piece of debris was one of more than 500 cataloged debris released from Kosmos 2421 during three major fragmentation events from March to June 2008. At the time of these fragmentations, Kosmos 2421 was only about 60 km above the orbit of the ISS. As these debris decayed down through the ISS orbit, the number of potentially threatening conjunctions each month increased by a factor of three. (Johnson and Klinkrad 2009, 5) Occasionally, these objects also fall from the sky, as occurred in December of 2016 when a large object came seemingly out of nowhere and smashed a man’s van in Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Lemoine 2016). Wisconsin is also where a fragment of Sputnik 4 crashed down from the sky in 1962. The occasion is still celebrated in one town as “Sputnikfest”, including a pageant to determine the annual “Miss Space Debris” (David 2013). According to Dickens and Ormrod (2007, 153), space debris **is arguably even more meaningful as both** barrier **and bridge to desirable futures**. **These hoped-for futures involve**, for instance, further **exploration and exploitation beyond LEO** and **into the very valuable and legally contested domain of geostationary orbit**, **where satellites can more easily analyze** from and transmit data to the entire planet (Collis 2009). This also includes NewSpace initiatives that seek to extend capitalism and empire beyond the limits of the Earth, whether to mine asteroids or colonize Mars (Dickens and Ormrod 2007; Dickens 2009). **These initiatives** provide a clear motivation to clean up the polluted and risk-filled environment in the vicinity of Earth. From this admittedly interested perspective, the presence of space debris limits the utilization of LEO, MEO and GEO, **creating risks for** any state and/or capital investment. Insofar as space debris influences assessments concerning the utilization of outer space for various ends, it directly mediates the futures that space agencies and industries imagine **possible** and **desirable**. To manage these risks requires attunement. Space agencies must first be able to find the objects and predict their strange movements. As with contract archaeologists, experts are called upon to manage those materials that might otherwise interfere with the success of productive enterprises of extraction, construction and consumption. The primary difference is that, where contract archaeology, and cultural resource management generally, endeavor to protect the objects they curate from destruction by human industry, in astronomical CRM the risks are reversed: it is those voyaging into space who potentially have something to fear from leftover remains, and not the other way around. As Gorman makes clear, the primary difficulty with an archaeological analysis of space debris is the issue of distance and a lack of “direct field experience” (Gorman 2015, 33). Remote sensing can only provide fragmentary glimpses of objects large enough to capture. In short, the objects are too small and space is too big. In this regard, archaeology becomes much like astronomy. Amateur astronomers could be seen as ideally positioned to aid in such research, in fact, as they can cover more of the spacescape than even a very large centralized government telescope (Marshall et al. 2015). Beginning after the launch of Sputnik 1, amateur citizen scientists known as “Moonwatchers” (named after Operation Moonwatch, a Smithsonian project), helped form a global network of satellite trackers who provided crucial information to space agencies and governments throughout the Cold War (see McCray 2008). Given the secrecy that has surrounded a great many satellites, furthermore, such efforts arguably also help to democratize scientific knowledge. A more recent example is the crowd-sourced effort to scan space in search of the elusive and acclaimed Planet 9. And, perhaps more importantly, amateur astronomers have developed the patience to undertake this, having had to routinely undergo attunement to multiple temporal constraints in order to follow their passion. It therefore is not surprising that in 2012, DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the US Department of Defense’s projects agency created after Sputnik 1 launched) proposed to enroll amateur astronomers in their hunt for space debris. The goal, they claimed, was to supplement the DoD’s Space Surveillance Network with a new program called SpaceView. Astronomers would help DARPA track the debris so that they could launch a satellite recycling robot, called the Phoenix; initially, it was hoped that this would be ready by 2017, although it is still in development. The Phoenix would find the debris identified by astronomers and use the parts to support new space missions. The European Space Agency and NASA have announced a similar goal, without any mention of the use of amateur astronomers. The appeal of recycling space debris is that it turns the threat into a resource that can make up for the enormous terrestrial funds and resources that are needed to launch objects into Earth’s orbit and beyond. With the help of amateur astronomers, space debris would not only be a form of cultural resource to manage – as it is typically imagined within the archaeology of outer space – **but a material foundation for new and emergent futures.** Precisely because amateur astronomers are used to undergoing attunement to terrestrial and cosmic temporalities, however, they may not answer the call. Those astronomers that I have met are skeptical of DARPA’s plans (which, like many proposals to capture and clean up the orbital environments of Earth, have yet to materialize). Amateur astronomers are too aware of the trials undergone to peer through the media of sky and space, the time it would take to find something small and unexpected. Perhaps more importantly, this is free labor that they would rather use for more satisfactory ends. Space debris, after all, is usually thought of as noise that disrupts their careful efforts at observation. Conclusion There is a sense in which both astronomical and archaeological practice share a peculiar temporal multiplicity or polychronicity. They are both material practices directed at traces in the present, about things in the past, for the sake of the future. That is, no matter what form they take, their true object is not the actual rays of light or fragments of material they have access to in the present, but the past reality these stand for and enable us to better imagine (whether distant celestial objects or human societies as they once were). And no matter whether the goal of what they do is preserving a memory or engaging in positive social change, they are striving toward a hoped-for future where the memory lasts and/or people are better off (cf. McGuire 2008). I have argued that amateur astronomy in general, and the observation of space debris in particular, demonstrate how materials can do more than stand for time’s passing, but also produce a temporality all their own, with which one can become more or less attuned. This raises the question of whether such time is uniform or multiple. Adam (1995, 1998) and Connolly (2013) both argue that the universe consists of multiple, nested and semi-autonomous temporalities. Similarly, the heirs of Einsteinian relativity in contemporary astronomy have developed not one master clock but a “family of time scales” which include Universal Time, International Atomic Time, Coordinate Universal Time and “apparent time”, among others (Seidelmann and Seago 2011). By contrast, Ingold and Hallam (2007) and Ingold (2012, 2014) usefully direct our attention to the role of the nonhuman as productive of temporality. However, according to Georgina Born, they rely on a “monotemporality of becoming” that fails to acknowledge “the plural temporalities in operation both in human and nonhuman life and in cultural production” (Born 2015, 365). Based on the experiences of amateur astronomers and the phenomenon of orbital space debris, one could argue not only that materials are time, but that these times are multiple, nested and emergent. The tendency in the growing archaeology of outer space has been to look at documented evidence from the vantage point of the ground – but, unlike amateur astronomers, not through telescopes. This does not make the evidence they have gathered less important, but it does mean that the material practices involved, of observing and becoming attuned, is different. The archaeological curation of objects in outer space not only consists of a new form of cultural resource management or heritage research, although it is that as well (see Barclay and Brooks 2009; Idziak 2013). Rather than helping us merely to record the past, it may, as Gorman (2014, 2015) argues, help us understand the emergence of new temporalities. In particular, she associates observation of outer space with the Anthropocene, which “cannot be understood without reference to space. **The Sun**, **Moon**, and **electromagnetic environment shape and drive the climate of the Earth**” (Gorman 2014, 90). To reckon with such unsettling temporal possibilities, one need only turn to astronomical practice, which has long facilitated new ways of imagining the universe’s ultimate beginnings and endings… from the Big Bang and Big Crunch, to the Milky Way’s eventual collision with the Andromeda Galaxy, and the inevitable incineration of the Earth as it is engulfed by our aging Sun, which itself will eventually die. If anything, **astronomers must be open to many futures**, **many endings**. The difference between these disastrous, imagined futures **and** those associated with space debris is that, by limiting the exploitation of orbital regions and the exploration of the universe, space debris serves as a temporal blockage of sorts – one that not only frustrates us in the present but delays or eliminates possibilities, including the possibility of future escape from the climatic and climactic disasters that await a humanity that may be prevented from ever safely leaving Earth behind. Perhaps space debris can never be mastered and will only multiply. If so, it would have to be attuned to as yet another constraining nonhuman force, mediating access to desired and hoped-for views of, and futures in, space. One might assume that the main limitation confronting the archaeology of outer-space exploration is the lack of access to the remains floating in orbit or crashing into the earth. Archaeologists of outer space have developed novel ways to study what they rarely can grasp and handle, measure and collect, but amateur astronomers have far more experience, being passionate about things to which they have no direct access. I have no reason to endorse DARPA’s view, that amateur astronomers are interested or able to provide new data, per se. What I think they represent, instead, is an alternative sensibility, one cultivated over many generations, **whereby knowledge practices are undergone rather than mastered.** This is true not only of amateurs, those I have focused on, but of professionals as well. Exoplanet astronomers, for instance, are tasked with imagining worlds from the slightest glimpse of planets many light-years away (Messeri 2016). Not only do archeologists of space debris have a closer target, in space and in time: they also know much more about the world from which these metal pests emerged. If they became more familiar with an astronomical sensibility, one **premised on distance and attunement**, restraint and constraint, they might discover a set of practices that has grown in the absence of such relative mastery, subject to processes of formation and deformation not unlike what conventional archaeologists encounter amid the Earth’s beguiling surface.

#### Threat imagery impoverishes scholarship and policy making- their claims can't be evaluated outside of the project of security that created them. Self Fulfilling prophecy outweighs aff predictions offense

Gregory D Foster, J. Carolton Ward Distinguished Prof. National Defense University, West Point Grad 69, PhD from GWU, Interrogating the Future: The Question of Long-Term Threats, Alternatives 19 1995

Where, then, does this leave us—in an elevated state of awakening or in a depressed state of confusion and resentment? It is, admittedly, burdensome and intimidating to face a deluge of questions without being afforded the intellectual crutch of an authoritative answer or two. That is the price we pay, though, for having allowed our minds to be crippled by Cold War dogma. Possessed of truth, we ignored, we denied, we disdained anyone or anything that contradicted our certainty. We did not question, we did not seek answers other than the ones we already had. To do so would have been superfluous, and clearly suspect. Now we must undergo corrective surgery. Whatever answers might emerge from the questions posed here, three fundamental issues deserve our attention. The first concerns the very language—the terminology—we use in public discourse. In his rather well-known 1946 essay, "Politics and the English Language," George Orwell drew the link between the debasement of language and the decline of civilization. He was convinced that both conditions were taking place in tandem at the time he wrote. By the same token, he believed the problem could be reversed. By ridding oneself of the many bad habits of English usage we have adopted, one can think more clearly, he said, and thereby take the first step toward political regeneration.74 The use of the word "threat" certainly seems to fit here. Although it is not a new word, the Cold War gave it heightened visibility, broadened and obscured its meaning, and made it part of the lingua franca of contemporary international politics. What should be all too obvious is the adversarial image the term conveys and the Manichean world view it engenders. Threattalk becomes threatthink. The resultant paranoia and intolerance invariably blind us to emerging developments and conditions that truly threaten our well-being but fall outside the bounds of our distorted perception. This brings us to a second fundamental issue: the effect our image of threat has on reality. The late Kenneth Boulding made the astute observation that there is a reciprocal, escalatory dynamic associated with threat imagery. For example, Country A, feeling itself threatened (however and for whatever reasons) by Country B, increases its armaments to reduce its insecurity. This makes B feel threatened, and so B increases its armaments to bolster its security. This makes A feel even more threatened, so A again increases its armaments. This growing threat "forces" B to further increase its armaments. And so on until either war breaks out or some other change (such as internal economic collapse) reverses the process.75 This is how threatthink becomes threat. If there is a single, documentable truth to be derived from an assessment of threat-based thinking, it is that the perception of threat— at least where that threat has a human component—almost invariably becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. For this reason alone—the fact that we have shown ourselves perversely capable of creating unwanted inevitability—we must face up to a third fundamental issue: the more general failure of our overall approach to envisioning the future. Most of us justifiably consider ourselves unqualified to divine the future. We therefore typically defer to experts and authorities—futurists and assorted government technocrats presumably possessed of special powers or information the rest of us do not have—who end up thereby dictating not only our future but our present as well. These are the individuals who tell us not only that there are threats, but what they are and how we must deal with them. What we refuse to recognize is that the future these purported visionaries are able to see is invariably nothing more imaginative than a simple projection of what already is happening. It also is an assured way for them to solidify and perpetuate their own power over us. The future they see, because the rest of us accept it on authority as all but inevitable, closes out any perceived need to pursue other potentially fruitful possibilities; it provides an excuse for ignoring present needs that, if fulfilled, might well produce a markedly different future; it

#### 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.

#### Representations must precede policy discussion

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 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- this card is the bees knees

Richard Wyn Jones, Professor International Politics @ Aberystwyth University, ‘99 (Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, p. 155-163)

The **central political task of the intellectuals** is to aid in the construction of a counterhegemony and thus undermine the prevailing patterns of discourse and interaction that make up the currently dominant hegemony. This task is accomplished through **educational activity**, because, as Gramsci argues, “every relationship of ‘hegemony’ is necessarily a pedagogic relationship” (Gramsci 1971: 350). Discussing the relationship of the “philosophy of praxis” to political practice, Gramsci claims: It [the theory] does not tend to leave the “simple” in their primitive philosophy of common sense, but rather to lead them to a higher conception of life. If it affirms the need for contact between intellectuals and “simple” it is not in order to restrict scientific activity and preserve unity at the low level of the masses, but precisely in order to construct an intellectual-moral bloc which can make politically possible the intellectual progress of the mass and not only of small intellectual groups. (Gramsci 1971: 332-333). According to Gramsci, this attempt to construct an alternative “intellectual-moral bloc” should take place under the auspices of the Communist Party – a body he described as the “modern prince.” Just as Niccolo Machiavelli hoped to see a prince unite Italy, rid the country of foreign barbarians, and create a virtu-ous state, Gramsci believed that the modern price could lead the working class on its journey toward its revolutionary destiny of an emancipated society (Gramsci 1971: 125-205). Gramsci’s relative optimism about the possibility of progressive theorists playing a constructive role in emancipatory political practice was predicated on his belief in the existence of a universal class (a class whose emancipation would inevitably presage the emancipation of humanity itself) with revolutionary potential. It was a gradual loss of faith in this axiom that led Horkheimer and Adorno to their extremely pessimistic prognosis about the possibilities of progressive social change. But does a loss of faith in the revolutionary vocation of the proletariat necessarily lead to the kind of quietism ultimately embraced by the first generation of the Frankfurt School? The conflict that erupted in the 1960s between them and their more radical students suggests not. Indeed, contemporary critical theorists claim that the deprivileging of the role of the proletariat in the struggle for emancipation is actually a positive move. Class remains a very important axis of domination in society, but it is not the only such axis (Fraser 1995). Nor is it valid to reduce all other forms of domination – for example, in the case of gender – to class relations, as orthodox Marxists tend to do. To recognize these points is not only a first step toward the development of an analysis of forms of exploitation and exclusion within society that is more attuned to social reality; it is also a realization that there are other forms of emancipatory politics than those associated with class conflict.1 This in turn suggests new possibilities and problems for emancipatory theory. Furthermore, the abandonment of faith in revolutionary parties is also a positive development. The history of the European left during the twentieth century provides myriad examples of the ways in which the fetishization of party organizations has led to bureaucratic immobility and the confusion of means with ends (see, for example, Salvadori 1990). The failure of the Bolshevik experiment illustrates how disciplined, vanguard parties are an ideal vehicle for totalitarian domination (Serge 1984). Faith in the “infallible party” has obviously been the source of strength and comfort to many in this period and, as the experience of the southern Wales coalfield demonstrates, has inspired brave and progressive behavior (see, for example, the account of support for the Spanish Republic in Francis 1984). But such parties have so often been the enemies of emancipation that they should be treated with the utmost caution. Parties are necessary, but their fetishization is potentially disastrous. History furnishes examples of progressive developments that have been positively influenced by organic intellectuals operating outside the bounds of a particular party structure (G. Williams 1984). Some of these developments have occurred in the particularly intractable realm of security. These examples may be considered as “resources of hope” for critical security studies (R. Williams 1989). They illustrate that ideas are important or, more correctly, that change is the product of the dialectical interaction of ideas and material reality. One clear security-related example of the role of critical thinking and critical thinkers in aiding and abetting progressive social change is the experience of the peace movement of the 1980s. At that time the ideas of dissident defense intellectuals (the “alternative defense” school) encouraged and drew strength from peace activism. Together they had an effect **not only on short-term policy** but on the dominant discourses of strategy and security, a **far more important result in the long run**. The synergy between critical security intellectuals and critical social movements and the potential influence of both working in tandem can be witnessed particularly clearly in the fate of common security. As Thomas Risse-Kappen points out, the term “common security” originated in the contribution of peace researchers to the German security debate of the 1970s (Risse-Kappen 1994: 186ff.); it was subsequently popularized by the Palme Commission report (Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues 1982). Initially, mainstream defense intellectuals dismissed the concept as hopelessly idealistic; it certainly had no place in their allegedly hardheaded and realist view of the world. However, notions of common security were taken up by a number of different intellectuals communities, including the liberal arms control community in the United States, Western European peace researchers, security specialists in the center-left political parties of Western Europe, and Soviet “institutchiks” – members of the influential policy institutes in the Soviet Union such as the United States of America and Canada Institute (Landau 1996: 52-54; Risse-Kappen 1994: 196-200; Kaldor 1995; Spencer 1995). These communities were subsequently able to take advantage of public pressure exerted through social movements in order to gain broader acceptance for common security. In Germany, for example, “in response to social movement pressure, German social organizations such as churches and trade unions quickly supported the ideas promoted by peace researchers and the SPD” (Risse-Kappen 1994: 207). Similar pressures even had an effect on the Reagan administration. As Risse-Kappen notes: When the Reagan administration brought hard-liners into power, the US arms control community was removed from policy influence. It was the American peace movement and what became known as the “freeze campaign” that revived the arms control process together with pressure from the European allies. (Risse-Kappen 1994: 205; also Cortright 1993: 90-110). Although it would be difficult to sustain a claim that the combination of critical movements and intellectuals persuaded the Reagan government to adopt the rhetoric and substance of common security in its entirety, it is clear that it did at least have a substantial impact on ameliorating U.S. behavior. The most dramatic and certainly the most unexpected impact of alternative defense ideas was felt in the Soviet Union. Through various East-West links, which included arms control institutions, Pugwash conferences, interparty contacts, and even direct personal links, a coterie of Soviet policy analysts and advisers were drawn toward common security and such attendant notions as “nonoffensive defense” (these links are detailed in Evangelista 1995; Kaldor 1995; Checkel 1993; Risse-Kappen 1994; Landau 1996 and Spencer 1995 concentrate on the role of the Pugwash conferences). This group, including Palme Commission member Georgii Arbatov, Pugwash attendee Andrei Kokoshin , and Sergei Karaganov, a senior adviser who was in regular contact with the Western peace researchers Anders Boserup and Lutz Unterseher (Risse-Kappen 1994: 203), then influenced Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. Gorbachev’s subsequent championing of common security may be attributed to several factors. It is clear, for example, that new Soviet leadership had a strong interest in alleviating tensions in East-West relations in order to facilitate much-needed domestic reforms (“the interaction of ideas and material reality”). But what is significant is that the Soviets’ commitment to common security led to significant changes in force sizes and postures. These in turn aided in the winding down of the Cold War, the end of Soviet domination over Eastern Europe, and even the collapse of Russian control over much of the territory of the former Soviet Union. At the present time, in marked contrast to the situation in the early 1980s, common security is part of the common sense of security discourse. As MccGwire points out, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (a common defense pact) is using the rhetoric of common security in order to justify its expansion into Eastern Europe (MccGwire 1997). This points to an interesting and potentially important aspect of the impact of ideas on politics. As concepts such as common security, and collective security before it (Claude 1984: 223-260), are adopted by governments and military services, they inevitably **become somewhat debased**. The hope is that **enough of the residual meaning can survive** to shift the parameters of the debate in a potentially progressive direction. Moreover, the adoption of the concept of common security by official circles provides critics with a useful tool for (immanently) critiquing aspects of security policy (as MccGwire 1997 demonsrates in relation to NATO expansion). The example of common security is highly instructive. First, it indicates that critical intellectuals can be politically engaged and play a role – a significant one at that – in making the world a better and safer place. Second, it points to potential future addressees for critical international theory in general, and critical security studies in particular. Third, it also underlines the role of ideas in the evolution in society. CRITICAL SECURITY STUDIES AND THE THEORY-PRACTICE NEXUS Although most proponents of critical security studies reject aspects of Gramsci’s theory of organic intellectuals, in particular his exclusive concentration on class and his emphasis on the guiding role of the party, the desire for engagement and relevance must remain at the heart of their project. The example of the peace movement suggests that critical theorists can still play the role of organic intellectuals and that this organic relationship need not confine itself to a single class; it can involve alignment with different coalitions of social movements that campaign on an issue or a series of issues pertinent to the struggle for emancipation (Shaw 1994b; R. Walker 1994). Edward Said captures this broader orientation when he suggests that critical intellectuals “are always tied to and ought to remain an organic part of an ongoing experience in society: of the poor, the disadvantaged, the voiceless, the unrepresented, the powerless” (Said 1994: 84). In the specific case of critical security studies, this means placing the experience of those men and women and communities for whom the present world order is a cause of insecurity rather than security at the center of the agenda and making suffering humanity rather than raison d’etat **the prism through which problems are viewed**. Here the project stands full-square within the critical theory tradition. If “all theory is for someone and for

### Advantage 1

#### Their Ravanel Card misunderstands the thesis of the K, its not that people are passing skewed analysis or biased data, its that the conclusions that your authors reach justify further securitization; especially since most people AREN’T EVEN AWARE OF unconscious securitization that make challenging securitization w/o the K impossible

#### Tons of examples of securitization in places as high up as the the U.S gov

#### 1.) Bush invading Iraq to stop “WMDS”

#### 2.)U.S support of the Mujahideen

#### 3.) Cuban missile crisis almost triggering nuclear war

#### People get fired and ousted in post, people like Cheney and Bush Jr. Prove

#### 1. 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.**