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#### Theory after phil

### FW

#### Ethics must begin from the internalized and embodied – color-evasive ethics speak from nowhere and is a project of white erasure.

Yancy ‘5

[George, Philosophy @ Duquesne University, generally swell fellow. 2005. “Black Bodies, White Gazes: The Continuing Significance of Race.”] JCH-PF

I write out of a personal existential context. This context is a profound source of knowledge connected to my "raced'' body. I theorize from a place of lived embodied experience, a site of exposure. In philosophy, the only thing we learn to "expose" (and to do so brutally) is a weak argument, a fallacy, or someone's "inferior" reasoning power. The embodied self is bracketed and deemed irrelevant to theory, superfluous and cumbersome in one's search for truth. It is best, or so we are told, to reason from nowhere. The white male philosopher/author presumes to speak for all of "us" without the slightest mention of his raced (or gendered) identity. Self-consciously writing as a. white male philosopher, Crispin Sartwell observes: Left to my own devices, I disappear as an author. That is the "whiteness" of my authorship. This whiteness of authorship is, for us, a form of authority; to speak (apparently) from nowhere, for everyone, is empowering, though one wields power here only by becoming lost to oneself. But such an authorship and authority is also pleasurable: it yields the pleasure of self-forgetting or apparent transcendence of the mundane and the particular, and the. pleasure of power expressed in the Comprehension" of a range of materials. To theorize the Black body one must "turn to the [Black] body as the radix for interpreting racial experience." This particular strategy also functions as a lens through which to theorize and critique whiteness; for the Black body's "racial" experience is fundamentally linked to the oppressive modalities of the raced white body. However, there is no denying that my own racial experiences or the social performances of whiteness can become objects of critical reflection. In this chapter, I describe and theorize a variety of instances in which the Black body is reduced to instantiations of the white imaginary, resulting in what I refer to as "the phenomenological return of the Black body." These instantiations are embedded within and evolve out of the complex social and historical interstices of whites' efforts at self-construction through complex acts of erasure and denigration of Black people. These acts of self-construction are myths or ideological constructions predicated upon maintaining white power. As James Snead explained, ''Mythification is the replacement of history with a surrogate ideology of [white] elevation or [Black] demotion along a scale of human value. " I do not hold the view that Blacks only offer experiences while whites provide the necessary theoretical framing of those experiences. Consistent with my own theorizations on the subject, Lewis Gordon recognizes the historical impetus of this move toward experience and how such a move as such is not problematic. "After all," as Gordon argues, "for a long time there was the denial of black inner life, of black subjectivity; the notion of a black person's point of view suggested consciousness of the world, which would call for dynamics of reciprocal recognition." Of course, the objectives are 1} to avoid reducing Blacks to experience and 2) to avoid making whites the oracle intetpretative voices of Black experiences. By implication, it is important to avoid a relationship of dependency and to assert an agential Black exegetical role in rendering their experiences meaningful.

#### That necessitates Constructive Empiricism –

Dicken 19[Paul Dicken- “Constructive Empiricism” <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195396577/obo-9780195396577-0035.xml#obo-9780195396577-0035-bibItem-0001> Last Reviewed: May 17th 2019] UT AI

-Explanation of constructive empiricism-not a warrant for why its true.

Constructive empiricism is the view that (a) science aims to produce theories that are empirically adequate rather than true, where a theory is empirically adequate precisely if what it says with respect to the observable phenomena (those entities and processes that can be directly observed by the unaided human eye) is true; and (b) that to accept a theory involves no more belief than that it is empirically adequate. It is a view originally articulated—and almost exclusively defended—by Bas van Fraassen and is one of the most highly developed and influential alternatives to scientific realism in the contemporary literature. A principal innovation of the position is that, in contrast to earlier empiricist programs that attempted to distinguish between the observational and theoretical vocabulary of our scientific language, the constructive empiricist’s distinction between observable and unobservable phenomena is an empirical distinction and is consequently to be investigated by the very scientific theories to which it applies. Articulating such an epistemic policy has immediate philosophical consequences, and as such constructive empiricism is a wide-ranging philosophy of science, intimately connected to specific views regarding the logical structure of a scientific theory, the nature of explanation, and a deflationary account of physical modality and the laws of nature. It has also gradually emerged that constructive empiricism is intended as part of van Fraassen’s broader reconception of epistemology more generally and is to be articulated within the framework of his epistemic voluntarism—an ongoing project concerning our notions of rationality and inference and of the nature of empiricism. Most recently, van Fraassen has begun to recast constructive empiricism as a form of empiricist structuralism, a development emerging from his work on scientific representation.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Subjectivity only has meaning when it interacts with other machines – there are no intrinsic values and a failure to recognize that stratifies subjects and reifies violence.

Malins 04 [Brackets Original. Peta Malins (Program Manager of the Bachelor of Legal and Dispute Studies and a Lecturer in Criminology and Justice Studies @ RMIT University). “Machinic Assemblages: Deleuze, Guattari and an Ethico-Aesthetics of Drug Use”. The University of Melbourne. 2004. Accessed 2/19/21. http://janushead.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Malins.pdf //Xu]

As an assemblage, a [drug using body] has only itself, in connection with other assemblages and in relation to other bodies without organs. We will never ask what a [drug using body] means, as signified or signifier; we will not look for anything to understand in it. We will ask what it functions with, in connection with what other things it does or does not transmit intensities, in which other multiplicities its own are inserted and metamorphosed, and with what bodies without organs it makes its own converge. A [drug using body] exists only through the outside and on the outside. A [drug using body] itself is a little machine (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988: 4)1 The work of Deleuze and Guattari is perhaps best conceived of as a ‘tool box’2 –as a collection of machinic concepts that can be plugged into other machines or concepts and made to work. This is how I approach their writing, and why–despite initial misgivings–I have transformed the above excerpt (surreptitiously replacing the concept ‘book’ with ‘drug using body’) to suit the purposes of this paper. In making this transformation, I soon discovered that it became a perfect little language-machine: not only articulating where I want to take the concept of drug use, but also [through its parentheses] expressing the open applicability of Deleuze and Guattari’s work. Insert body of choice: a sexual body; a bicycle, a language; a body of art; a film–the excerpt works for them all. In this openly mutating state the passage introduces some of the key concepts in Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophical project: becomings, rhizomatic connections, and multiplicities. It also, more explicitly, outlines their project to take thought (and ethics) away from internal meanings, causes, and essences, and toward surface effects, intensities and flows. However it is the particular concept of the body activated by the excerpt–the concept of the body as machinic assemblage–that I find most useful to the task of rethinking drug use. It is a concept that unravels the modern fantasy of the body as a stable, unified, bounded entity, and gives a language to the multitude of connections that bodies form with other bodies (human and otherwise). A body’s function or potential or ‘meaning’ becomes entirely dependent on which other bodies or machines it forms an assemblage with. Colebrook’s (2002) example of the bicycle is useful here: a bicycle is a machine that doesn’t begin to work or have a particular meaning until it connects up with another machine. When it connects up with a cyclist, it becomes a vehicle; when is placed in a gallery, it becomes an artwork. A cigarette is similarly multiple: when smoked it becomes a drug; when held seductively at the end of ones fingertips it becomes an object of beauty; when shown in a film it becomes a plot device (Klein, 1993). And a drug using body is no different: when it connects up to bicycle, it becomes a cyclist; to a cigarette, a smoker; to LSD, a tripper. The drug using body is multiple. While numerous writers have begun to make movements toward rethinking drug use via Deleuze and Guattari3 , very few have explored this intersection in detail4 . In this paper I will map out some of the specific implications of rethinking the drug using body in this way. I will begin by exploring what happens to the subject (the ‘drug user’, the ‘addict’) when the body becomes a multiplicity. Like Deleuze and Guattari: I will not ask what a drug using body ‘means’ or signifies; but rather, what affects its assemblages produce and what flows of desire they cut off (its components and affects). I will then explore Deleuze and Guattari’s own particularly bleak conception of drug-use, arguing that the pessimism it engenders can be strategically sidestepped using Deleuze and Guattari’s other philosophical tools. I will explore how we might productively approach drug use via a Deleuzian ethics, and will argue for a specific ethical rethinking of drug use according to the concepts of the machinic assemblage and rhizomatic multiplicities. A strategy with implications not only for social policy, but also for how we understand ourselves. And who we might become. Subjectivity and the drug using body Bodies that fall prey to transcendence are reduced to what seems to persist across their alterations. Their very corporeality is stripped from them, in favor of a supposed substrate–soul, subjectivity, personality, identity–which in fact is no foundation at all, but an end effect, the infolding of a forcibly regularized outside. (Massumi, 1992: 112) For Deleuze and Guattari a body (human, animal, social, chemical) has no interior truth or meaning; it exists only through its external connections and affects. They write: We know nothing about a body until we know what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another body. (ATP5 : 257) So where does this leave the subject? And identity? If we are to talk only of the drug using body and its multiplicities–where does the ‘drug user’ or ‘addict’ disappear to? For Deleuze and Guattari the subject is nothing more (and nothing less) than a particular way in which bodies have become organised and stratified in the post-Enlightenment social world. In order to comprehend the ‘human’ body, the social world (or socius) reduces the complexity and chaos of an ever-changing multiplicity of bodily flux to discrete categories of meaning and constancy. Bodies become ordered and delimited according to hierarchical binary presuppositions: human/animal, man/woman, healthy/unhealthy, lawful/criminal, hetero/gay, clean/junkie. Binaries that bodies never fully correspond to: No real body ever entirely coincides with either category. A body only approaches its assigned category as a limit: it becomes more or less “feminine” or more or less “masculine” depending on the degree to which it conforms to the connections and trajectories laid out for it by society… “Man” and “Woman” as such have no reality other than that of logical abstraction. (Massumi, 1992: 86) Yet when bodies fall outside these binaries, or try to claim a different identity, they are rarely granted anything outside a third term (‘bi-sexual’, ‘reformedsmoker’) that remains reliant upon, and limited to, those binary relations. Multiplicities reduced to binaries and trinities. Manifold potential reduced to a discrete set of bodily possibilities. You will be a boy or a girl; a smoker or a non-smoker; a civilized human being (with all bodily parts fulfilling civilized ‘human’ functions)’ or an animal. Your choice. You will subscribe to modern selfhood (and all its bodily and linguistic demands) or you’ll be rejected: You will be organized, you will be an organism, you will articulate your body–otherwise you’re just depraved. You will be signifier and signified, interpreter and interpreted–otherwise you’re just a deviant. You will be a subject, nailed down as one, a subject of the enunciation recoiled into a subject of the statement–otherwise you’re just a tramp. (ATP: 159)

#### 2] Pluralistic Materialism – other theories rely on minimalistic criteria; our framework understands knowledge as changing and uses experience to base social change and revise ideas. Glaude 7Eddie S. (Eddie S. Glaude Jr. is the African-American chair of the Center for African-American Studies and the William S. Tod Professor of Religion and African-American Studies at Princeton University.) In a Shade of Blue : Pragmatism and the Politics of Black America. University of Chicago Press, 2007. EBSCOhost. (5-7)

In a Shade of Blue is my contribution to the tradition I have just sketched. My aim is to think through some of the more pressing conceptual problems confronting African American political life, and I do so as a Deweyan prag-matist. I should say a bit about what I mean by this self-description. John Dewey thought of philosophy as a form of cultural and social criticism. He held the view that philosophy, properly understood as a mode of wis-dom, ought to aid us in our efforts to overcome problematic situations and worrisome circumstances. The principal charge of the philosopher, then, is to deal with the problems of human beings, not simply with the problems of philosophers. For Dewey, over the course of his long career, this involved bridging the divide between science, broadly understood, and morals—a divide he traced to a conception of experience that has led philosophers over the centuries to tilt after windmills. Dewey declared, “The problem of restoring integration and co-operation between man’s beliefs about the world in which he lives and his beliefs about values and purposes that should direct his conduct is the deepest problem of any philosophy that is not isolated from life.”9Dewey bases this conclusion on several features of his philosophy: (1) anti foundationalism, (2) experimentalism, (3) contextualism, and (4) soli-darity.10 Antifoundationalism, of course, is the rejection of foundations of knowledge that are beyond question. Dewey, by contrast, understands knowledge to be the fruit of our undertakings as we seek “the enrichment of our immediate experience through the control over action it exercises.”11He insists that we turn our attention from supposed givens to actual consequences, pursuing a future fundamentally grounded in values shaped by experience and realized in our actions. This view makes clear the experimental function of knowledge. Dewey emphasized that knowledge entails efforts to control and select future experience and that we are always con-fronted with the possibility of error when we act. We experiment or tinker, with the understanding that all facts are fallible and, as such, occasionally afford us the opportunity for revision.12Contextualism refers to an understanding of beliefs, choices, and actions as historically conditioned. Dewey held the view that inquiry, or the pursuit of knowledge, is value-laden, in the sense that we come to problems with interests and habits that orient us one way or another, and that such pursuits are also situational, in the sense that “knowledge is pursued and produced somewhere, some when, and by someone.”13Finally, solidarity captures the associational and cooperative dimensions of Dewey’s thinking. Dewey conceives of his pragmatism as “an instrument of social improvement” aimed principally at expanding democratic life and broadening the ground of individual self-development.14Democracy, for him, constitutes more than a body of formal procedures; it is a form of life that requires constant attention if we are to secure the ideals that purportedly animate it. Individuality is understood as developing one’s unique capacities within the context of one’s social relations and one’s community. The formation of the democratic character so important to our form of associated living involves, then, a caring disposition toward the plight of our fellows and a watchful concern for the well-being of our democratic life.

#### 3] Empiricism and inductive reasoning have valuable roles to play and have historically been used for radical ends.

Jakubek and Wood, 18—Kansas State University (Joseph and Spencer, “Emancipatory Empiricism: The Rural Sociology of W.E.B. Du Bois,” Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 2018, Vol. 4(1), 14–34, dml)

Du Bois’ understanding of the links between empirical research and social policy is a direct development of his academic training (Barkin 2000; Broderick 1958; Du Bois 1968; Morris 2015; Outlaw 2000; Rudwick 1969; Wortham 2009). Du Bois earned two bachelor’s degrees from Fisk University and Harvard University before continuing graduate education at Harvard and the University of Berlin. At Harvard, he completed courses in history, philosophy, and economics and studied under influential and prominent scholars, including William James and George Santayana, among others (Morris 2015). In Berlin, his primary mentor was Gustav Schmoller, but Du Bois was also influenced by other notable faculty members, including Adolph Wagner, Heinrich von Treitschke, Max Lenz, and August Meitzen (Broderick 1958; Du Bois 1968; Wortham 2009). Schmoller and Meitzen both shaped Du Bois’ approach to empiricism and instilled a sense of the importance of empirical research for informing equitable policy.

While his training in Berlin provided the foundation for his empirical agenda, his time at Harvard with James and Santayana also influenced his emancipatory empiricism. James’s concept of a radical empiricism emphasizes values, social meanings, and intentionality in influencing social experience, academic observations, and empirical measurements (James [1912] 2008). Social science empiricism, for James, was inevitably shaped by the interpretations of social action by observers (James [1912] 2008). Measurements of social phenomena are therefore shaped by both their contents and their context, something that Du Bois insightfully connected to the lived experiences of racial inequality. Santayana’s influence can be seen in the modernist orientation of Du Bois’ work and his turn away from Victorian ideals and conceptions of social class and culture. Santayana was noted at the time for asking questions about the nature of man and society that opposed Victorian institutions and “puritanism” in intellectual discourse (Singal 1982:4). Many of these same tensions are echoed in Du Bois’ sociological work.

Du Bois’ exposure to the ideas of his mentors very likely aligned with his unique experiences of being an educated Black man. Du Bois’ empiricism was, by its very nature, a radical and modernist empiricism as it was constructed from a primarily marginalized position, and it was largely aimed at clarifying the experience of marginalization itself. His empiricism was focused on combatting inaccurate and often racist depictions of African Americans that frequently found a home in the grand theory of academic thought. When he returned to the United States in 1896, Du Bois noted that much social policy surrounding racial inequality needed revision (Du Bois 1997). Consequently, he directed his first sociological inquiries toward the pursuit of social justice and more equitable social policy surrounding race (Du Bois 1968; Williams 2006; Wright and Calhoun 2006).

American Sociology, Social Darwinism, and Racial Emancipation

Embodying Marable’s Black intellectual tradition, Du Bois understood the social construction of racial categories by linking his academic training and lived experiences as a Black man (Du Bois 1968; Marable 1986, 2013; Morris 2015; Rabaka 2010; Williams 2006; Zuckerman 2004). Marable (1986) described this tradition as a link between the lived experiences of African American scholars and the foci and goals of their research. The emancipatory empiricism of Du Bois’ sociology truly champions this framework. Raised in New England and living in the American South both before and after he lived in Germany, Du Bois’ varying experiences of racial inequality directed his research toward the link between race and social development (Du Bois 1968; Williams 2006; Zuckerman 2004). Du Bois traveled extensively throughout Europe while living in Germany and described various social interactions as unencumbered by the weight of racial discrimination and prejudice he experienced in America (Du Bois 1968:160). Differences among his experiences in different regions of the United States and abroad helped Du Bois conceptualize racial categories as social constructions that are historically embedded within certain social institutions (Du Bois 1968; Lewis 2000).

Du Bois’ emancipatory empiricism provided the professional justification to reject social Darwinism within academic thought. This also led him to critique tendencies within American sociology toward grand theories of social stratification that reified the social order (Du Bois [1904] 1978). Pushing instead for empirical methods and objective participant observation, Du Bois desired an accurate understanding of inequality that was far from the “prejudiced eyes” of racialized grand theory (Du Bois [1904–1905] 2000; Du Bois 1997:75; Rabaka 2010; Wright and Calhoun 2006). Du Bois wrote about the connections between his training and his desire for an emancipatory empiricism, “Above all I began to understand the real meaning of scientific research and the dim outline of methods of employing its technique and its results in the new social sciences for the settlement of the Negro problem in America” (Du Bois 1968:160). Inductive methods were also critically important for combatting the prevailing stereotypes found within American academic discourse as Du Bois set out “to study the facts, any and all facts, concerning the American Negro and his plight, and by measurement and comparison and research, work up to any valid generalization which I could” (Du Bois [1940] 2007:26).

Eager to establish an American sociology which would more accurately describe and theorize racial relations, Du Bois focused his empirical attention on Black communities and their social development (Rabaka 2010; Wright 2002c; Wright and Calhoun 2006). Already teaching at both Wilberforce University and the University of Pennsylvania after returning to the United States, Du Bois accepted an invitation from Atlanta University’s president, Horace Bumstead, for a professorship in history and economics in 1897 (Horne 2009; Lewis 2000; Wright 2002a). Atlanta University was just starting its research series, the Conference on Negro Problems, in which Du Bois directed 16 studies between 1897 and 1914 (Wright 2002a). While a faculty member at Atlanta University, Du Bois forged the first department of sociology in the country and spearheaded much of the groundbreaking work conducted by the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory from 1896 to 1917 (Wright 2002a, 2002b, 2002c). Importantly, it was during the early years of this period that Du Bois completed his most rigorous rural studies discussed later in this article. Recent research has shed new light on the work of Du Bois and other scholars associated with the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory as pioneering in several areas, notably the sociology of the South and regionalism (Wright 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2009, 2016). We complement this expanded application of Du Bois’ work by suggesting that some of these early studies also serve as pioneering works for the field of rural sociology.

Du Bois’ Emancipatory Rural Sociology

Du Bois’ rural interests were evident while still a student in Berlin, where he conducted multiple political-economic analyses of American agrarian production. Most notably, he conducted a dissertationlevel analysis written in 1893 focused on of the production differences between small and large farms in the American south. This study, “The Plantation and Peasant Proprietorship System of Agriculture in the Southern United States,” was an in-depth statistical inquiry of farm tenure, size, and production rates in which Du Bois challenged popular theoretical assumptions within Western economics about larger farms’ being more efficient and productive (Du Bois 1968, [1899] 1973; Rudwick 1974). As a professional sociologist, many of Du Bois’ earliest empirical investigations took place in the American rural South, and it was there where he first used his methodological training to describe the social and economic conditions of rural Black communities (Lewis 1993; Rabaka 2010; Wright 2014). Rural spaces offered a unique setting to observe the social and economic progress of Black communities in the years after the Civil War. The turn of the twentieth century was a time of great social change, and Du Bois knew the potential for social development that would accompany many of those changes. Recognizing this, he consciously focused his empirical research on the opportunities for progress that faced rural populations in the modernizing American South.

Du Bois’ most elaborate investigations of rural spaces were funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, known then as the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1897, Du Bois requested funding from the commissioner of the bureau, Carroll Wright, to complete a two-tiered research plan to systematically determine the communal and economic progress of southern rural Black communities (Du Bois 1968:202). In the first tier, Du Bois would conduct several community case studies, collecting data on various topics such as geographic density of population, occupations, wages, home ownership, health and longevity, morals and manners, crime and law, labor opportunities, religion, education, literature, and art. This first set of studies would “locate and define difficulties” in sociological investigation of rural communities and “indicate lines upon which a larger investigation could be carried to success” (Du Bois 1997:41). The second tier consisted of larger regional and national studies and used census and archival data to develop more generalizable information. It was through the combination of local community studies and aggregate regional data that Du Bois wished to formulate a truly accurate depiction of Black communities in the American South (Morris 2015; Rabaka 2010). His methodological toolkit included household surveys, semistructured interviews, participant observation, ethnographic data collection, archival and census research, and statistical analysis (Morris 2015).

Such rigorous methods were required if objective and accurate scientific activity were to lead to the benefit of Black communities and the emancipation and growth of Black individuals (Du Bois 1968). Importantly, Du Bois noted in his request to Wright that these preliminary studies would provide a framework for a research agenda building off subsequent findings that would likely challenge racist and stereotypical images of Black people. The results from the Department of Labor studies “could be published and would by allaying false notions and prejudices prepare the public mind for the larger work” that would follow (Du Bois 1997:41). Du Bois received funding to conduct five studies for the Department of Labor lasting from 1898 to 1905. The five commissioned studies are “The Negroes of Farmville, Virginia: A Social Study” (Du Bois 1898), “The Negro in the Black Belt: Some Social Sketches” (Du Bois 1899), “The Negro Landholder in Georgia” (Du Bois 1901b), “The Negro Farmer” (Du Bois 1904b), and “The Sharecropping System in Lowndes County, Alabama.” Importantly, “The Sharecropping System in Lowndes County, Alabama” was censored by the Department of Labor and never published, because, Du Bois believed, it was too critical of the social sources of rural poverty and social inequality in its findings (Aptheker 1980; Rabaka 2010). These studies represent the pinnacle of Du Bois’ rural sociology but are not exhaustive of his emancipatory interests in rural spaces and agrarian production. He also conducted other less empirical studies and wrote quite poetically about rural spaces in The Souls of Black Folk (Du Bois [1903] 1989) and other work.1 We emphasize the studies funded by the Department of Labor as representing his pioneering work that still resonates with research in the broad field of rural sociology. The Department of Labor studies align with the historical emphasis on community and the structure of agriculture within rural sociology.

#### Only pragmatism’s understanding of interactive knowledge production can mitigate entrenched violence by understanding that relations are dynamic and decentered.

Kadlec 8, Alison. "Critical pragmatism and deliberative democracy." Theoria 55.117 (2008): 54-80. (doctorate in political science from the University of Minnesota and bachelor's degrees from Michigan State University in political theory, constitutional democracy and English literature.)//Elmer and UT AI and Dulles AS

Social Intelligence: The Critical Potential Lived Experience Though human nature is intersubjectively generated on an ongoing basis, we are not merely the products of Platonic conceptions of ourselves. Individuals are cultivated in and by society through experiential processes in which we are acted upon, and act back upon a dynamic environment. For Dewey, 'experience' connotes a very specific process that stands in stark contrast to the traditional conception of experience as a matter of private consciousness. Because Dewey's notion of experience is **social, active, and educative,** what he calls the 'experiential continuum' is the process by which we are best able to develop social intelligence. The 'experiential continuum' is characterised by our enduring and undergoing the consequences of our actions, and intelligence is to be understood as the self-conscious and ongoing process of adjusting our attitudes in light of these consequences.25 In The Public and Its Problems , Dewey gives this view of intelligence a decidedly deliberative spin when he says, 'we lie, as Emerson said, in the lap of an immense intelligence. But that intelligence is dormant and its communications are broken, inarticulate and faint until it possesses the local community as its medium'.26 In 'Ethical Principles Underlying Education', Dewey is more explicit in explaining his view of the relationship between social intelligence and the normative commitment to democracy in his declaration that 'ultimate moral motives and forces are nothing more nor less than social intelligence the power of observing and comprehending social situations and social power trained capacities of control at work in the service of social interest and aims'.27 Dewey's unflagging faith in the transformative potential of social intelligence intrinsic to democracy as a way of life **is not Utopian**, nor is it based on a belief that all problems are finally solvable. Rather, it expresses a moral commitment that suggests that a working faith in social intelligence is our best shot at crafting habits and institutions that will further encourage us to identify **new opportunities for the expansion of our capacities** moving forward. The upshot here is that democracy as a way of life means, above all, that we stop thinking of democracy as a thing and start thinking about it as a way. Democracy is belief in the ability of human experience to generate the aims and methods by which further experience will grow in ordered richness. . . . Democracy is the faith that the process of experience is more important than any special result attained, so that the special results achieved are of ultimate value only as they are used to enrich and order the ongoing process. Since the process of experience is capable of being **educative**, faith in democracy is all one with faith in experience and education. All ends and values that are cut off from the ongoing process become arrests and fixations. They strive to fixate what has been gained instead of using it to open the road and point the way to new and better experiences.28 On this account, social intelligence is not a possession, it is a de-centred and educative process of ordering our **experiences** through manifold **communication**. The guiding principles, then, of social intelligence are 1) the protection and expansion of our capacity for free and communicative inquiry and 2) the protection and expansion of our capacity to perceive the shared consequences of our habits and policies. We judge the goodness or badness of these consequences by evaluating the way they act back on and impact our individual capacities for free inquiry that inform the ongoing development of social intelligence In turn, the 'proper conditions' for social intelligence then are those that increase our ability to perceive the complex shared consequences of our choices and practices. Intelligence is social in pragmatism because it requires the development of both firstand second-order attitudes that can only take place in an ongoing process of communication. Free inquiry is not just a matter of having the opportunity to seek information that will allow for the generation of thoughtful attitudes about issues, it is also a matter of appreciating and harnessing the democratic potential of second-order attitudes (attitudes about our attitudes). We are not passive receivers of information, **but dynamic interactors**, and therefore intelligence is intrinsically communicative. Free inquiry is the engine of social intelligence, which is in turn based on our willingness to have our firstorder attitudes adjusted in light of our second-order attitudes.29 The ongoing mutual adjustment of our first-order and second-order attitudes through a back and forth process between the two emerges only to the extent that we have the opportunities to communicate freely with others, and this is none other than the 'method' of social intelligence. The goal of communicative inquiry then is to build an ever richer context for the ongoing development of our ability to perceive the relationship between our beliefs, practices, and institutions. By taking a principal focus on increasing our ability for evermore sophisticated perception of the consequences of our habits of thought and action, we will be better equipped to distinguish between those habits that improve and those that impede our capacities for free inquiry. This is the material of problem-solving, as it is just this capacity for free inquiry that makes it possible to identify common problems in a way that they may be productively addressed. Turning back to the challenges leveled by radical democratic theorists, we can begin to see the opportunities made possible by critical pragmatism. Tapping into the critical potential of lived experience under conditions of unalterable changefulness begins with the therapeutic recognition that there is no such thing as a unified field of power directed entirely by stable and fixed interests. The first implication here is that there are always new opportunities to exploit cracks and fissures in various structurally **entrenched forms of power**. Second, the essentially complexity and flux of our world is always **producing new opportunities for transformative resistance** and for the development of more creative approaches to meaningful deliberation. Critical pragmatism pivots on the notion that under such conditions what we most need are not fixed and static foundations, we need the flexible habits of inquiry and **communication** that make it possible to both identify pernicious obstacles to deliberation and to challenge, circumvent, or neutralise their impact. Vested interests, interests vested with power, are powerfully on the side of the status quo, and therefore they are especially powerful in hindering the growth and application of the method of natural intelligence.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with pragmatic deliberation.

Medina 17 [José Medina (Walter Dill Scott Professor of Philosophy with affiliations in the Department of African American Studies and the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies @ Northwestern University). “Pragmatism, Racial Injustice, and Epistemic Insurrection” in “Pragmatism and Justice”. Oxford University Press. 2017. Accessed 7/3/21. https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190459239.001.0001/acprof-9780190459239 //Xu]

Insurrectionary publics and vibrant communities of resistance can be understood according to the pluralistic notion of democratic publics and communities available in pragmatist philosophies such as Dewey’s. Properly pluralized and contextualized, Dewey’s notions of community and public contain the seeds of an insurrectionary pragmatism. But much work lies ahead for the development of such a pragmatism. I hope to have shown that an insurrectionary pragmatism needs an account of epistemic resistance that incorporates forms of insurrectionary communication and activism in order to address issues of social apathy, complicity, and social invisibility, which are the epistemic side of racial oppression. I have made some modest contributions to such an account with my recent and ongoing research. But more substantial contributions to an insurrectionary pragmatism that properly addresses racial injustices can be found in the contemporary scene in the works of Harvey Cormier, Eddie Glaude, Bill Lawson, Gregory Pappas, Melvin Rogers, Shannon Sullivan, Paul Taylor, Cornel West, and—I would say—Leonard Harris himself.9 In this chapter I hope to have shown how epistemic insurrection can, at least in principle, be accommodated in a pragmatist view of subjectivity, community, thought, and action.

#### Prefer Additionally –

#### 1] Performativity- when you enter debate, you presume that you can discuss the topic because of deliberation. This means denial of my framework is impossible and all objections should be ignored on face because responding to my framework requires my framework to do so.

#### 2] Epistemic Death – a failure to align with the pragmatic method is the core of racialized violence and only epistemic relationality can cultivate collective liberation.

Medina 17 [José Medina (Walter Dill Scott Professor of Philosophy with affiliations in the Department of African American Studies and the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies @ Northwestern University). “Pragmatism, Racial Injustice, and Epistemic Insurrection” in “Pragmatism and Justice”. Oxford University Press. 2017. Accessed 7/3/21. https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190459239.001.0001/acprof-9780190459239 //Xu]

Stewart’s descriptions of racial oppression emphasize its epistemic side: “there are no chains so galling as the chains of ignorance—no fetters so binding as those that bind the soul, and exclude it from the vast field of useful and scientific knowledge” (1987, 45). She describes the epistemic oppression that was at the core of antiblack racism in the United States as resulting from being excluded from access to and participation in knowledge practices (education, research, public deliberation, etc.), and from being confined to manual labor under extreme conditions of exploitation. Stewart developed an understanding of epistemic oppression as a form of “deadening” and “numbing” of mental capacities that foreshadows what I have called epistemic death. 4 She writes: I have learnt, by bitter experience, that continual hard labor deadens the energies of the soul, and benumbs the faculties of the mind; the ideas become confined, the mind barren, and, like the scorching sands of Arabia, produces nothing; or, like the uncultivated soil, brings forth thorns and thistles. (1987, 47) As argued above, in the egalitarian pragmatist notion of human flourishing we can ground the commitment to promoting the flourishing of all persons and communities, but especially of those who find themselves disempowered and with diminished status and agency. Dewey’s notion of education can be seen as in line with this egalitarian pragmatist notion of flourishing, and as an heir to Stewart’s notion of education as a form of self-empowerment and resistance against epistemic oppression. Stewart saw in education and knowledge practices a venue for activism, for critical interventions and subversion, and for self-empowerment; in short, for fighting the epistemic side of racial oppression with epistemic insurrection: “Turn your attention to knowledge and improvement; for knowledge is power” (1987, 41). Stewart insisted that a crucial part of the struggle against racial oppression was the creation of social and civic institutions dedicated to the educational and intellectual empowerment of African Americans. This form of epistemic self-empowerment was insurrectionary at the time. As Carter puts it in his description of Stewart’s proposal of epistemic self-empowerment, Needless to say this was a rather subversive idea in the United States in the early-19th Century, especially as it pertained to the enslaved population at the time for whom such activity was in many places illegal. In characteristically insurrectionist fashion, Stewart seeks simultaneously to transform the character of individual persons, and to create institutions of the sort that will effect a radical transformation in the existing society. (2013, 66–67) A great strength of Stewart’s view of epistemic insurrection is the way in which her view enables us to link individual acts of resistance in our personal life with collective actions of resistance in our public life. Carter notes, “A salient feature of Stewart’s feminist insurrectionist ethics is the understanding that making oneself into the kind of person that the larger society denies that one can be is itself a subversive activity” (2013, 68). Becoming who you are can be a subversive struggle of insurrection when you have not been given “full personhood” and when the kind of person you are defies social scripts and the social norms underlying available institutions and accepted values. In those circumstances, the personal struggle to become who you want to be and to express yourself is simultaneously the insurrectionary struggle for rearranging social relations and social settings in which subjects act and express themselves. This is not at all surprising, but fully explicable in relational views of identity such as those we can find in classic pragmatists such as James and Dewey, for indeed, according to these views, we do not make ourselves in isolation from others and from the practices and institutions that support us and in which our thoughts and actions can be developed. And, just as individual subjectivities don’t make themselves in isolation but in communities, subversive subjectivities also need the support of social movements and communities of resistance that cultivate insurrectionary practices.

#### 3] TJFS - Frameworks should be fair/educational like any other argument

#### A] Inclusion – Prag definitionally is a procedural for allowing almost any argumentation in the debate space which controls the internal link to inclusion which is an impact multiplier

#### B] Resource Disparities- Discursive frameworks ensure big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity and require a higher level of analytic thinking that small schools have.

#### C] Topic Ed –

Schwartz and Milligan summarize in 21 [Dr. James S.J. Schwartz (Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Wichita State University and author of The Value of Science in Space Exploration) and Dr. Tony Milligan (Senior Researcher in the Cosmic Visionaries Project, a member of the Department of Theology and Religious Studies at King’s College London). ‘“Space ethics” according to space ethicists’. The Space Review. February 1, 2021. Accessed 1/23/2022. <https://www.thespacereview.com/article/4117/1> //Xu]

4. Space ethics helps us gain perspective. Part of carefully examining our assumptions about space is ensuring that we look at space-related issues from as many perspectives and conceptual frames as possible. It is rare that American space advocates ever have to grapple with non-American, non-Caucasian, non-libertarian conceptual frameworks and value systems. But examining a broader spectrum of human cultures and perspectives is absolutely vital for increasing our confidence that we are doing the right things, for the right reasons, in the best ways. If we fail to do this, we invite the risk that the projects we begin will not be continued by others. In the case of multi-generational projects such as human expansion into space, this is particularly important. What we do should make sense to those who come after, and one of our best guides to whether it will do so or not is the way in which it addresses concerns which can be seen from multiple perspectives and across multiple cultures. This is not wokeness or assault, but a concern for the stability of projects, given the strong likelihood of cultural and political change over time. Here, it is worth noting that space advocacy in the past and, to a receding but still concerning degree in the present, tends to marginalize the perspectives of women, of persons of color, of indigenous persons, of persons from African, Asian, European, or Middle Eastern cultures, of disabled persons, as well as members of the LGBTQIA community. Taken together, these are not a woke minority but the majority of humans on our planet. If space truly promises a boon to all of humanity, then it should be possible to demonstrate this without relying solely on some fairly narrow perspective from either end of the political spectrum, or perspectives which show an unhealthy obsession with the state versus market debates of the 20th century. While space ethics teaches us to seek a wider perspective, it is not the only fount of perspective. We should also seek insights from anthropologists, historians, political scientists, sociologists, astronomers, engineers, poets, artists, and dancers. Few fields of inquiry or modes of creative expression fail to add value to our understanding of space exploration as a human endeavor.

### Offense

#### I affirm Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. Spec and definitions in doc.

The – “used to point forward to a following qualifying or defining clause or phrase”. Google. <https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.2103j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

Appropriation – “an act or instance of appropriating something”. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/appropriation>

Of – “indicating an association between two entities, typically one of belonging”. <https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60.1494j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

Outer Space – “the physical universe beyond the earth's atmosphere”. <https://www.google.com/search?q=outer+space+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=outer+space+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60.2363j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

By – “identifying the agent performing an action.”. <https://www.google.com/search?q=by+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=by+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59.1433j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

Private Entity – “(A) In general Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.”. <https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&height=800&iframe=true&def_id=6-USC-625312480-168358316&term_occur=999&term_src=title:6:chapter:6:subchapter:I:section:1501>

Is – “dialectal present tense first-person and third-person singular of BE”. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is>

Unjust – “not morally right; not fair”. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust

#### The appropriation of space by private entities isn’t value neutral but is sutured in a discourse of the cosmic elite and unequal IR.

Stockwell 20 [Samuel Stockwell (Research Project Manager, the Annenberg Institute at Brown University). “Legal ‘Black Holes’ in Outer Space: The Regulation of Private Space Companies”. E-International Relations. Jul 20 2020. Accessed 12/7/21. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/07/20/legal-black-holes-in-outer-space-the-regulation-of-private-space-companies/> //Xu]

The US government’s support for private space companies is also likely to lead to the reinforcement of Earth-bound wealth inequalities in space. Many NewSpace actors frame their long-term ambitions in space with strong anthropogenic undertones, by offering the salvation of the human race from impending extinction through off-world colonial developments (Kearnes & Dooren: 2017: 182). Yet, this type of discourse disguises the highly exclusive nature of these missions. Whilst they seem to suggest that there is a stake for ordinary citizens in the vast space frontier, the reality is that these self-described space pioneers are a member of a narrow ‘cosmic elite’ – “founders of Amazon.com, Microsoft, Pay Pal… and a smattering of games designers and hotel magnates” (Parker, 2009: 91). Indeed, private space enterprises have themselves suggested that they have no obligation to share mineral resources extracted in space with the global community (Klinger, 2017: 208). This is reflected in the speeches of individuals such as Nathan Ingraham, a senior editor at the tech site EngadAsteroid mining, who claimed that asteroid mining was “how [America is] going to move into space and develop the next Vegas Strip” (Shaer, 2016: 50). Such comments highlight a form of what Beery (2016) defines as ‘scalar politics’. In similar ways to the ‘scaling’ of unequal international relations that has constituted our relationship with outer space under the guise of the ‘global commons’ (Beery, 2016: 99), private companies – through their anthropogenic discourse – are scaling existing Earth-bound wealth inequalities and social relations into space by siphoning off extra-terrestrial resources. By constructing their endeavours in ways that appeal to the common good, NewSpace actors are therefore concealing the reality of how commercial resource extraction serves the exclusive interests of their private shareholders at the expense of the vast majority of the global population.

### Method

#### 1] 1AR theory is legit – anything else means infinite abuse

#### – drop the debater – 1AR is too short to make up for the time trade-off

#### – no RVIs – 6 min 2NR means they can brute force me every time

#### – competing interps – reasonability narrows the theory debate to one issue of brightline, making it easy for the Neg to collapse to the issue in the long 2NR

#### – 1AR theory is the highest layer – the NC has 7 minutes to be abusive and 6 minutes to leverage the abuse against 1A theory in the 2N, making checking abuse lexically impossible

#### 2] Give me new weighing in the 2AR for 1AR shells – I don’t know what arguments will be read in the 2NR so 1AR weighing is impossible as I don’t know what to weigh against.

#### 3] Procedural fairness is a voter and outweighs

#### a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity

#### b] probability – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews which means the only impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins

#### c] it internal link turns every impact – a limited debate promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education.

#### 4] Nothing has triggered it, but presumption and permissibility affirm

#### a) We always default to assuming something true until proven false ie if I told you my name is Daniel you would believe me

#### b) Unjust[[1]](#footnote-1) is “not morally right; not fair” and permissibility disproves the positive obligation which is aff ground

#### c) empirics

[Shah, Sachin. “A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF SIDE-BIAS ON THE 2019 JANUARY-FEBRUARY LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE TOPIC.” NSD Update, National Symposium of Debate, 16 Feb. 2019, http://nsdupdate.com/2019/a-statistical-analysis-of-side-bias-on-the-2019-january-february-lincoln-douglas-debate-topic/.] //LHPSS

As a final note, it is also interesting to look at the trend over multiple topics. In the rounds **from** 93 TOC bid distributing tournaments (**2017 – 2019** YTD), **the neg**ative **won 52.99% of ballots** (**p-value < 0.0001)** and 54.63% of upset rounds (p-value < 0.0001). **This suggests the bias might be structural, and not topic specific, as this data spans six different topics.**

### Disclosure

#### Interp – debaters may not lie about disclosure.

#### Violation – they said all round reports for this topic – missed Blake which is JF

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### 1] Clash – prereq to debate

#### 2] Academic dishonesty –

#### They will say missing one round isn’t that bad – a] makes it significantly more suspicious b] only went to one tourney for jF – ow on proportionality

### AFC

#### Interp – negs must concede the aff’s framework if it is not morally repugnant or descriptive, and the advocacy is whole rez.

#### Violation – its preemptive

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Time skew- Winning the negative framework moots 6 minutes of 1AC offense – that outweighs on quantifiability and reversibility – I can’t get back time lost and it’s the only way to measure abuse

#### 2] Topic Ed- Every debate would just be a framework debate which means we never get access to core topic lit – that outweighs on time frame – we only have 2 months

#### No RVIs on 1AC theory – justifies a 7 min all in which is a death sentence

#### CI for 1AC theory – anything else justifies 7 minutes of just defense which creates a race to the bottom

#### DTD on 1AC theory – they knew it was a bad norm since it was preemptive which means on deterrence solves.

### Adv

#### Commercial Space Industry requires an enormous increase in launches – that causes pollutants and warming.

Gammon 21 Katharine Gammon 7-19-2021 "How the billionaire space race could be one giant leap for pollution" <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2021/jul/19/billionaires-space-tourism-environment-emissions> (I’m an award-winning independent science journalist based in Santa Monica, California. My interests range from culture and nature in public lands to the lives of scientists to the complexity of baby brains. Before I became a professional journalist, I served in the Peace Corps in Bulgaria, and attended MIT and Princeton University.)//Elmer

Last week Virgin Galactic took Richard Branson past the edge of space, roughly 86 km up – part of a new space race with the Amazon billionaire Jeff Bezos, who aims to make a similar journey on Tuesday. Both very wealthy businessmen hope to vastly expand the number of people in space. “We’re here to make space more accessible to all,” said Branson, shortly after his flight. “Welcome to the dawn of a new space age.” Already, people are buying tickets to space. Companies including SpaceX, Virgin Galactic and Space Adventures want to make space tourism more common. The Japanese billionaire Yusaku Maezawa spent an undisclosed sum of money with SpaceX in 2018 for a possible future private trip around the moon and back. And this June, an anonymous space lover paid $28m to fly on Blue Origin’s New Shepard with Bezos – though later backed out due to a “scheduling conflict”. But this launch of a new private space industry that is cultivating tourism and popular use could come with vast environmental costs, says Eloise Marais, an associate professor of physical geography at University College London. Marais studies the impact of fuels and industries on the atmosphere. When rockets launch into space, they require a huge amount of propellants to make it out of the Earth’s atmosphere. For SpaceX’s Falcon 9 rocket, it is kerosene, and for Nasa it is liquid hydrogen in their new Space Launch System. Those fuels emit a variety of substances into the atmosphere, including carbon dioxide, water, chlorine and other chemicals. The carbon emissions from rockets are small compared with the aircraft industry, she says. But they are increasing at nearly 5.6% a year, and Marais has been running a simulation for a decade, to figure out at what point will they compete with traditional sources we are familiar with. “For one long-haul plane flight it’s one to three tons of carbon dioxide [per passenger],” says Marais. For one rocket launch 200-300 tonnes of carbon dioxide are split between 4 or so passengers, according to Marais. “So it doesn’t need to grow that much more to compete with other sources.” Right now, the number of rocket flights is very small: in the whole of 2020, for instance, there were 114 attempted orbital launches in the world, according to Nasa. That compares with the airline industry’s more than 100,000 flights each day on average. But emissions from rockets are emitted right into the upper atmosphere, which means they stay there for a long time: two to three years. Even water injected into the upper atmosphere – where it can form clouds – can have warming impacts, says Marais. “Even something as seemingly innocuous as water can have an impact.” Closer to the ground, all fuels emit huge amounts of heat, which can add ozone to the troposphere, where it acts like a greenhouse gas and retains heat. In addition to carbon dioxide, fuels like kerosene and methane also produce soot. And in the upper atmosphere, the ozone layer can be destroyed by the combination of elements from burning fuels. “While there are a number of environmental impacts resulting from the launch of space vehicles, the depletion of stratospheric ozone is the most studied and most immediately concerning,” wrote Jessica Dallas, a senior policy adviser at the New Zealand Space Agency, in an analysis of research on space launch emissions published last year. Another report from 2019 penned by the Center for Space Policy and Strategy likened the space emissions problem to that of space debris, which the authors say creates an existential risk to the industry. “Today, launch vehicle emissions present a distinctive echo of the space debris problem. Rocket engine exhaust emitted into the stratosphere during ascent to orbit adversely impacts the global atmosphere,” they wrote. “We just don’t know how large the space tourism industry could become,” says Marais. A new market report estimates that the global suborbital transportation and space tourism market is estimated to reach $2.58bn in 2031, growing 17.15% each year of the next decade. “The major driving factor for the market’s robustness will be focused efforts to enable space transportation, emerging startups in suborbital transportation, and increasing developments in low-cost launching sites,” the report says. In the past, most space transportation has been focused on cargo supply missions to the International Space Station and satellite launch services, but currently, this focus has shifted to in-space transportation, planetary explorations, crewed missions, suborbital transportation and space tourism. Several companies, including SpaceX, Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic, have been focusing on developing platforms such as rocket-powered suborbital vehicles that will enable the industry to carry out suborbital transportation and space tourism. People have pointed out that the money these billionaires have poured into space technology could be invested in making life better on our planet, where wildfires, heatwaves and other climate disasters are becoming more frequent as the globe warms up in the climate crisis. “Is anyone else alarmed that billionaires are having their own private space race while record-breaking heatwaves are sparking a ‘fire-breathing dragon of clouds’ and cooking sea creatures to death in their shells?” the former US Labor Secretary Robert Reich tweeted last week. Marais says that there is always an element of excitement to new developments in space – but it’s still possible to be responsible while doing something exciting. She urges caution as the space tourism industry grows, and says there are currently no international rules around the kinds of fuels used and their impact on the environment. “We have no regulations currently around rocket emissions,” she says. “The time to act is now – while the billionaires are still buying their tickets.”

#### unregulated commercialization triples debris and renders satellites unusable.

Fabian 19 (Christopher; January 2019; B.S. from the United States Air Force Academy, thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a M.S. from the University of North Dakota, approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee and in coordination with Dr. Michael Dodge, David Kugler, and Brian Urlacher; University of North Dakota Scholarly Commons, “A Neoclassical Realist’s Analysis Of Sino-U.S. Space Policy,” <https://commons.und.edu/theses/2455/>)

b. Defect/Defect The ubiquity of space technology has also yielded the negative externality of overcrowding the space domain. Despite its seemingly unlimited size, there are a limited number of useful earth-centric orbits to optimize terrestrial coverage. It is projected that there are over 300,000 medium sized objects capable of causing catastrophic failure of a satellite upon collision currently in earth’s orbit.159 Of these objects, 20,000 are actively tracked by the comparatively robust space surveillance network (SSN) of the United States Air Force, only 1,000 are active payloads, and even fewer have maneuver capability.160 Recent trends indicate that the problem of orbital congestion will only worsen in the coming decades as the barriers to entry are reduced. Launch service cost is rapidly decreasing due to an increased number of service providers and technology revolutions such as reusable rockets. Also, the miniaturization and simplification of satellite payloads further reduces the cost and infrastructure needed to be a spacefairing nation.161 This is evidenced by the near doubling of state operated satellites from 27 in 2000 to over 50 in 2012, coupled with a near doubling in total space objects from 1997 to 2007.162 The accumulation of space debris is a vital concern to the sustainable development of the space environment due to the increased probability of conjunction between active payloads and all other objects that results from crowded orbits. This increase in collision probability occurs proportionally to the number of objects in a given orbital domain. The tripling of orbital debris projected to occur in the next century, due to routine use and accumulation alone, would cause a tenfold increase in the probability of collision. In the event of a catastrophic collision between two objects, the resulting debris cloud could cause a cascading effect. Each successive collision increases the probability of another occurrence in a given orbit until an instability threshold is reached. At this threshold, debris removal due to decay would be negligible compared to debris created by subsequent collisions. As the propagation of debris continues, the cost of launching a satellite would eventually outweigh the benefits received due to the probability of that asset being destroyed by errant debris, effectively rendering the given orbit unusable. This debris propagation model and the dangers associated with it are colloquially referred to as the Kessler Syndrome. Kessler asserts unstable regions of low earth orbit (LEO) currently exist and that, barring the addition of more debris, a major collision would occur once every 10-20 years. If debris doubles, as it has in the last decade, the collision rate would increase to 2.5 years. Although most models’ time scales are on the order of centuries, it is widely accepted that the current rate of debris accumulation will render critical orbits unusable unless immediate measures are taken to return stability.163 There is near universal acceptance of the danger space debris presents, yet little substantive action has been taken to solve the problem. Current debris accumulation and propagation models show that earth orbiting domains are finite resources. Continued unsustainable development moving forward may preclude future usage, making earth orbits rivalrous goods.164 Furthermore, orbital domains are made a non-excludable good by the OST which states, “Outer space… shall be free for exploration and use by all States without discrimination of any kind.”165 As a non-excludable public good, space succumbs to the tragedy of the commons where the privately beneficial strategy of space utilization differs significantly from the socially optimal strategy promoting orbital stability.166 Understandably, most analysis has focused on solving the problem of orbital instability by addressing the market failure responsible for debris creation. The current reasoning suggests that if actors creating space debris internalize the cost of their actions, a solution can arise. Proposed solutions run the gamut of ideologies from free market tax incentives, to command and control legislation, to restructuring orbital property rights. Scientific solutions have also been proposed, but technological feasibility and cost remain major problems. Furthermore, analogous environments susceptible to the tragedy of the commons have been examined in hopes that they may prove applicable to the problem of orbit instability.167 This analysis is ultimately useful if the problem is to be solved under nominal conditions, but there is an underlying problem that needs to be addressed before any of these proposed solutions can realistically be enacted.

#### Debris causes ecological destruction because of environmental contamination.

Stockwell 20 [Samuel Stockwell (Research Project Manager, the Annenberg Institute at Brown University). “Legal ‘Black Holes’ in Outer Space: The Regulation of Private Space Companies”. E-International Relations. Jul 20 2020. Accessed 12/7/21. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/07/20/legal-black-holes-in-outer-space-the-regulation-of-private-space-companies/> //Xu]

Space debris can be defined as non-purposeful man-made objects that reside in space; made up of inactive parts from former space operations and fragmentations of spacecraft, there are nearly 30,000 pieces of debris in the Earth’s orbit (Pellegrino & Stang, 2016: 25). Despite most debris being centimetres or millimetres in size satellites often travel at the speed of a bullet, meaning that a collision between the two could be catastrophic in terms of environmental, mechanical and financial damage (Black & Butt, 2010: 1). Since the development of the Kessler Syndrome thesis in 1978 – which predicted that space debris may become so dense as to trigger a chain reaction of major collisions – space debris is considered more of a threat to security operations in the near-term than military space activity (Quintana, 2017: 95). Difficulty over determining whether a collision was accidental or a purposeful act further exacerbates this problem, given that “every object in orbit is a threat to everything else in orbit, regardless of its intended function” (Faith, 2012: 86). Such developments have led to the US administration increasingly adopting a securitisation discourse around orbital debris (Bowen, 2014: 47), which may cause concerns as to whether policymakers may react to future American satellite collisions in a militarised manner. A number of NewSpace actors are likely to complicate these worries even further through recent satellite proposals. Whilst Boeing is proposing a constellation of up to 3,000 satellites, SpaceX has even grander goals of creating a constellation consisting of 4,425 satellites, eventually expanding to 12,000 satellites in the near-future (Kosiak, 2019: 7). Putting this into context, there are currently just around 1,400 active satellites in orbit around the Earth, highlighting the scale of these projects. The collision between a single US privately-owned Iridium satellite and state-owned Russian Cosmos satellite in 2009 underscored not only the sheer amount of debris caused by these collisions – over 1,500 pieces – but also foreshadowed the possible geopolitical tensions that may arise from them (Wang, 2010: 87-88). Given the number of various commercial satellite constellations possibly going into orbit in the near-future, this raises questions over the possibly devastating security hazards they could pose once in orbit or when they eventually become defunct. Yet the proliferation of these commercial satellite plansalso pose significant environmental issues. Article IX of the OST asserts that: “States shall pursue activities of outer space in a manner that avoids any harmful contamination or adverse environmental changes on Earth” (UN, 1967). However, the use of terms like ‘harmful’ or ‘adverse change’ underscores the lack of specificity over what exactly constitutes environmental damage, or for whom it must refrain from harming. There is also a failure to address the explicit problem of space debris since the discourse is primarily concentrated on chemical effluent pollution, undermining attempts to facilitate the removal of floating wreckage(Gupta, 2016: 26). The inability of the OST to properly promote environmental considerations in space has been mirrored in the NewSpace community, where there has been a woeful lack of ecological consideration: “The hundreds of articles and books on outer space resource development seldom mention that such actions may adversely affect the environment in ways that will potentially disadvantage their enterprises and the humans that will be required to implement them” (Kramer, 2017: 136). Such images evoke the types of difficulties that private firms have encountered on Earth reconciling capital with the environment in a way that doesn’t damage profit margins (Magdoff & Foster, 2011: 61-66). Yet in doing so, this neglect is only likely to result in the proliferation of extra-terrestrial debris that the UN OST failed to address. Indeed, despite its vastness there is only a narrow region of orbital space that is either useable or beneficial for prolonged human missions (Brearley, 2005: 2), meaning that the increase in space debris from these massive commercial satellite constellations will likely be at the detriment of developing nations who have yet fostered spacefaring capabilities. Elon Musk’s SpaceX company has already caused complications for Earth-bound astrologists. The brightness of his recent ‘Starlink’ satellite constellation system in comparison to other satellites has been obscuring telescopic images (see Grush, 2020). More concerningly, Starlink may be much more visible during twilight hours which could be problematic in identifying potentially hazardous asteroids in a timely manner (The Verge, 2020). In this sense, whilst private space entrepreneurs are able to increase their profitability from being able to establish constellations, such endeavours are spoiling the scientific work of researchers on Earth that may complicate the monitoring of Earth-based asteroid impacts.

#### Prevents extinction.

Sears 21 (, N., 2021. Great Powers, Polarity, and Existential Threats to Humanity: An Analysis of the Distribution of the Forces of Total Destruction in International Security. [online] ResearchGate. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350500094> [Accessed 22 November 2021] Nathan Alexander Sears is a PhD Candidate in Political Science at The University of Toronto. Before beginning his PhD, he was a Professor of International Relations at the Universidad de Las Américas, Quito. His research focuses on international security and the existential threats to humanity posed by nuclear weapons, climate change, biotechnology, and artificial intelligence. His PhD dissertation is entitled, “International Politics in the Age of Existential Threats”)-re-cut rahulpenu

Climate Change Humanity faces existential risks from the large-scale destruction of Earth’s natural environment making the planet less hospitable for humankind (Wallace-Wells 2019). The decline of some of Earth’s natural systems may already exceed the “planetary boundaries” that represent a “safe operating space for humanity” (Rockstrom et al. 2009). Humanity has become one of the driving forces behind Earth’s climate system (Crutzen 2002). The major anthropogenic drivers of climate change are the burning of fossil fuels (e.g., coal, oil, and gas), combined with the degradation of Earth’s natural systems for absorbing carbon dioxide, such as deforestation for agriculture (e.g., livestock and monocultures) and resource extraction (e.g., mining and oil), and the warming of the oceans (Kump et al. 2003). While humanity has influenced Earth’s climate since at least the Industrial Revolution, the dramatic increase in greenhouse gas emissions since the mid-twentieth century—the “Great Acceleration” (Steffen et al. 2007; 2015; McNeill & Engelke 2016)— is responsible for contemporary climate change, which has reached approximately 1°C above preindustrial levels (IPCC 2018). Climate change could become an existential threat to humanity if the planet’s climate reaches a “Hothouse Earth” state (Ripple et al. 2020). What are the dangers? There are two mechanisms of climate change that threaten humankind. The direct threat is extreme heat. While human societies possesses some capacity for adaptation and resilience to climate change, the physiological response of humans to heat stress imposes physical limits—with a hard limit at roughly 35°C wet-bulb temperature (Sherwood et al. 2010). A rise in global average temperatures by 3–4°C would increase the risk of heat stress, while 7°C could render some regions uninhabitable, and 11–12°C would leave much of the planet too hot for human habitation (Sherwood et al. 2010). The indirect effects of climate change could include, inter alia, rising sea levels affecting coastal regions (e.g., Miami and Shanghai), or even swallowing entire countries (e.g., Bangladesh and the Maldives); extreme and unpredictable weather and natural disasters (e.g., hurricanes and forest fires); environmental pressures on water and food scarcity (e.g., droughts from less-dispersed rainfall, and lower wheat-yields at higher temperatures); the possible inception of new bacteria and viruses; and, of course, large-scale human migration (World Bank 2012; Wallace-Well 2019; Richards, Lupton & Allywood 2001). While it is difficult to determine the existential implications of extreme environmental conditions, there are historic precedents for the collapse of human societies under environmental pressures (Diamond 2005). Earth’s “big five” mass extinction events have been linked to dramatic shifts in Earth’s climate (Ward 2008; Payne & Clapham 2012; Kolbert 2014; Brannen 2017), and a Hothouse Earth climate would represent terra incognita for humanity. Thus, the assumption here is that a Hothouse Earth climate could pose an existential threat to the habitability of the planet for humanity (Steffen et al. 2018., 5). At what point could climate change cross the threshold of an existential threat to humankind? The complexity of Earth’s natural systems makes it extremely difficult to give a precise figure (Rockstrom et al. 2009; ). However, much of the concern about climate change is over the danger of crossing “tipping points,” whereby positive feedback loops in Earth’s climate system could lead to potentially irreversible and self-reinforcing “runaway” climate change. For example, the melting of Arctic “permafrost” could produce additional warming, as glacial retreat reduces the refractory effect of the ice and releases huge quantities of methane currently trapped beneath it. A recent study suggests that a “planetary threshold” could exist at global average temperature of 2°C above preindustrial levels (Steffen et al. 2018; also IPCC 2018). Therefore, the analysis here takes the 2°C rise in global average temperatures as representing the lower-boundary of an existential threat to humanity, with higher temperatures increasing the risk of runaway climate change leading to a Hothouse Earth. The Paris Agreement on Climate Change set the goal of limiting the increase in global average temperatures to “well below” 2°C and to pursue efforts to limit the increase to 1.5°C. If the Paris Agreement goals are met, then nations would likely keep climate change below the threshold of an existential threat to humanity. According to Climate Action Tracker (2020), however, current policies of states are expected to produce global average temperatures of 2.9°C above preindustrial levels by 2100 (range between +2.1 and +3.9°C), while if states succeed in meeting their pledges and targets, global average temperatures are still projected to increase by 2.6°C (range between +2.1 and +3.3°C). Thus, while the Paris Agreements sets a goal 6 that would reduce the existential risk of climate change, the actual policies of states could easily cross the threshold that would constitute an existential threat to humanity (CAT 2020).

1. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust
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