## 1 – Disclosure

#### Interpretation: Debaters must provide the affirmative to their opponent if asked or say it’s a new aff.

#### Violation: they don’t – I contacted them

#### Prefer:

#### [1] Quality engagement --- disclosure allows in-depth preparation before the round which checks back against unpredictable positions and allows debaters to effectively write case negs and blocks. Quality engagement is an independent voter because the constitutive reason we debate is to engage and have clash. Its also key to fairness since I need to have prep to win.

#### Impacts: (a) outweighs any theory benefit, and is an independent voter --- the macro level reason why we do debate is to get good research skills and information and (b) constrains your ability to even vote on the aff because the debate could have been much better if the research opportunity was there.

#### Drop the debater – a] to deter future abuse b] it indicts the aff advocacy

#### No crossapps from case – I am indicting the way you are reading your case and you not disclosing skewed my ability to respond.

#### Education is a voter – it’s the terminal impact of debate and absent quality education we can’t export strategies to solve things like oppression.

#### No RVIs –

#### A] baiting – justifies abusive

#### B] substance ed – with RVIs the 1ar goes for disclosure the whole times destroying debates over other parts of the flow

#### C] illogical – I’m fair vote for me makes no sense – you don’t win for meeting your burden - logic comes first on all arguments since they need to maek sense to be evaluable

#### Competing interps – a] anything else invites judge intervention since reasonability brightliens are arbitrary – judge intervention is the worst since b] creates cohesive norms where we compare

Normsetting over in round abuse –

## 2 – State Bad K

#### You're either with the state or against it - the affirmative's cession of control of space entirely to the government and public sector, ignoring the continued domination of state hegemony. Laursen 21

Laursen, E., 2021. The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State. pg 64-68

**Who “controls” the operating system**? It’s conceived, designed, and built by human beings; once the operating system is launched, however, it begins to mold the individuals who refine and build on it, channeling their efforts and directing them to expand in certain directions according to the guidelines and constraints it imposes. Future developers and designers all have the same job, essentially, however different their specific projects: to build and reproduce the operating system. **A vast array of individuals and social strata, from capitalists and intellectuals to engineers and clerks and laborers, are all engaged in the same task: to build and reproduce the State**. To turn a well-worn assertion on its head, **if you’re not against the State, you’re for it.** Similarly, **the State** is conceived and set in motion by humans; once it is established, it **absorbs**, **regulates, and extracts value from more and more of society’s activities.** The Italian anarchist Errico Malatesta, who generally used “government” and “state” interchangeably, put it this way: “The government, though springing from the bourgeoisie and its servant and protector, tends, as with every servant and every protector, to achieve its own emancipation and to dominate whoever it protects.” 22 While their views differ on matters like war, peace, social welfare, and race relations, a vast array of individuals and social strata, from capitalists and intellectuals to engineers and clerks and laborers, are all engaged in the same task: to build and reproduce the State. To turn a well-worn assertion on its head, if you’re not against the State, you’re for it. In the tech world, users are often described as a community; that community and the machine are increasingly regarded as one. Likewise, **in the modern world, society (including civil society) and the State are increasingly perceived as one; the State is a vast simulacrum of the entire society, touching, altering, molding, imprinting its preferred pattern onto every dimension and aspect of our being.** According to Marx, the State constitutes “the illusory common interest” of a society—also known as the “public interest.” 23 Anthropologist David Graeber wrote, “States are the ‘imaginary totality’ par excellence,” a way of “imagining social order as something one can get a grip on, models of control.” 24 **When a new element or variable enters the social mix, the State must absorb it, assimilate it, and set rules for how it will operate as a component of the State**. **While laws, regulations, and customs are sometimes seen as straitjackets, they also confer identity and status within the orbit of the State** (as a soldier, a police officer, a licensed driver, a consumer with good credit, a head of household). **These designations cement our loyalty to the State or at least our acquiescence to it, but they also exploit our fear that without the State, we would have no identity. The better it is at replacing reality, the more anxiety the simulacrum creates; if it disappears, won’t the corresponding reality disappear as well?** If the State disintegrates, surely society will also? **Therefore, almost nothing is held to be more important than the security and preservation of the State: a doctrine called “reasons of State.**” Without the State, any discussion of social or economic justice, cultural expression, health and physical well- being is irrelevant. That’s one reason why so much of traditional narrative history, particularly from European and American sources, is really the story of the development of states. There’s something deeply paradoxical about the State as well. While it’s not a “thing,” it works to create a convincing façade of one in the form of buildings, monuments, roads, border checkpoints, and other physical manifestations. There’s nothing organic about a state, but it behaves in some respects like an intelligent being. It’s a human creation and consists of human beings—it’s an idea acted upon—but it behaves according to a logic of its own and molds people, including those in command, as much as they mold it. Its leadership is essentially self-selecting, but it claims to embody a wider community. It’s one and many at the same time, an “it” and a “they.” As a result, the State achieves a double deception: it provides cover for the individuals who build their personal power through it (“reasons of state”) while its leaders—especially conspicuous ones like kings, presidents, party leaders, and corporate chief executives—provide cover by giving it a relatable human face.  **We struggle to work within the State, but it resists fundamental change and remains focused always on preserving itself and extending its reach in every direction**. We also struggle to articulate our understanding of it, as shorthand names like the “system,” the “establishment,” and the “deep state” underscore. But all or most of us know what it is, in outline. When Democratic presidential candidate Joe Biden named Senator Kamala Harris of California as his vice- presidential running mate in 2020, Bill Daley, head of public affairs at Wells Fargo and former chief of staff to President Obama, told the Wall Street Journal , “I think she is a reasonable, rational person who has worked in the system. Is she progressive? Yes. Is she someone who wants to burn the building down? No. I think she wants to strengthen the building.” 25 No one had to be told what “the building” is: it’s government, but it’s also capitalism and the vast edifice of institutions, identities, and livelihoods grouped under those headings. In this book, we call it the State, but scholars and pundits have been studying aspects of it under various conceptual models for a long time. Global systems science, for example, aims to “provide scientific evidence and means to engage into a reflective dialogue to support policy-making and public action and to enable civil society to collectively engage in societal action in response to global challenges” such as “epidemics, finance, cities, the Internet, trade systems.” 26 A veritable cottage industry has grown up within academia in the last couple of decades that studies how complex global societies decline, lose legitimacy, and fall apart. Cambridge University established its Centre for the Study of Existential Risk in 2012 (“we aim to reduce the risk of human extinction or civilizational collapse”), and Princeton University established a high-profile research program in Global Systemic Risk a year later. 27 When we examine this literature closely, we find that “systems” and “societies” are nearly synonymous with the State as we’re defining it. For instance, the Princeton research program’s website tells us that a “massive and accelerating increase in international transactions beginning in the late 1970s” required “the construction of a complex system of global nodes and links providing the channels through which these can flow. The interdependence of massive global interactions and structures has caused systemic risk to increase exponentially in recent times.” Cutting through the jargon, that “complex system of global nodes and links” is the commercial side of the operating system the State molds, embodies, and presides over. When scholars and pundits express concern about the risk of collapse of “systems” or “societies,” then, what they’re really anxious about is the collapse of the State.  **State authority was, of course, founded on physical force, but as it pursued its goals and the society it governed became more complex and sophisticated, legitimacy and acceptance became just as important. The State is a hybrid creature; it exists simultaneously within the community it claims to represent, and over and above that community.** By definition, it’s a more impersonal institution than religion, the family, an ethnic or geographic community, or an economic class. From the beginning, then, the modern State has struggled to define itself in ways that persuade its inhabitants to give it their loyalty, their love, or at least their acceptance. The importance of this has only increased as populations have grown, denser urban environments absorb more people, and capitalist economies themselves become more complex and more difficult to manage.

#### The state is more than an institution: it is a system of power designed to reproduce itself—it desires to shape how all things within it run, including the affirmative’s rhetoric – the Kritik is against this system, Laursen 21

Laursen, E., 2021. The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State. pg 57-63

Weber is still correct that the State’s authority is built on a monopoly of force and on the willingness of the population to accept it. Marx was correct that the State acts in the interests of a particular group, caste, or class and is intimately linked to capital, but Kropotkin was right that the ruling elite has a more complex, evolving structure than this suggests. Lenin was right to focus on the State as a mechanism for wielding power. Landauer accurately pointed out that **the State is not just an institution but part of our social psycholog**y. Foucault saw rightly that **all power relationships within society are regulated, to some extent, by the State;** he was also correct that **the State’s primary activity is reproducing itself**. Painter and Jeffrey were right to stress **the State’s need to surveil and control the population as well as the fact that this activity has a trajectory that has developed and intensified over time**. However, if we’re not inclined to accept the State as a given—that it is what there is—then we’ll need a more comprehensive and skeptical understanding than most of these writers provide. Weber ignored the question of who controls the State and for what purposes. By his definition, a drug cartel could, in the right circumstances, be a state. Marx defined the groupings that control the State too narrowly, denying that the State has any “will” or trajectory of its own. Kropotkin, likewise, failed to see the State as more than just the sum total of the selfish interests behind it. Lenin effectively canceled out the possibility that any society could function unless it wielded power the same way the State does. Foucault left out any substantial discussion of the State’s objectives, other than to reproduce itself. Landauer’s definition is too narrow; more than a type of relationship, **the State has infrastructure, tools, and symbols of power** as well. Painter and Jeffrey left out the economic rationale and underpinnings of the State. Most important, these **definitions** omit much of the modern State’s complex extensions beyond government, what’s essential to it, and what makes it different from other, previous systems of political, social, and economic control. They **make a misleading distinction between the State itself and the people who control it** and whose interests the State serves. **When people on the left talk** (as they once did) **about the “system**” or the “establishment” **and** **people on the right about the “deep state,” they use shorthand for a vaguely defined, powerful group who direct the State—and from whom, presumably, it needs to be liberated**. Most definitions also assume a distinction that doesn’t really exist between the political and the economic realm, even when the economic is said to dominate the political, as in Marxism. **If we think of the State as a machine controlled by a specific group**—the landed aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, the capitalist class—**we understand only part of it, and we risk assuming that it can be abolished or reformed by abolishing or disempowering these groups. If we think of the State as merely a relationship or a practice, we end up ignoring the details, and we fail to understand its full dimensions. Above all, we fail to understand the magnitude of the task of creating true alternatives and counter-communities —and the opportunity to do so.** **The State is not a conspiracy**, controlled by some all-powerful clique; while a great deal of its activity is cloaked in secrecy, **its pattern of behavior is fairly easy to trace.** Let’s try something different, but also more familiar and contemporary. **The State is not synonymous with government, and its borders are not strictly physical** (even though establishing and enforcing boundaries is one of the ways it wields power). Nor is it a conspiracy, controlled by some all-powerful clique of politicians, gangsters, or wealthy capitalists; while a great deal of its activity is cloaked in secrecy—and this penchant for secrecy is growing— its pattern of behavior is fairly easy to trace. **Instead, the State is a vast operating system for ordering and controlling functions and relations among human society, economy, populations, and the natural world, analogous to a digital operating system like Windows, Linux, or macOS.** An operating system, or OS, is defined by Wikipedia as “system software that manages computer hardware, software resources, and provides common services for computer programs.” Like the State, it’s one of the defining creations of the modern world; it can trace its lineage back to “analog” classification and data analytic schemes developed in the early centuries of the modern State. 17 The chief characteristic of an operating system is that it enables a computer to operate quickly and efficiently and to multitask; “distributed” operating systems can also network multiple computers together and cause them to function as one. “Time-sharing operating systems schedule tasks for efficient use of the system and may also include accounting software for cost allocation of processor time, mass storage, printing, and other resources.” The operating system thus serves “as an intermediary between programs and the computer hardware,” directing “hardware functions such as input and output and memory allocation.” Operating systems are the backbone of an enormous range of devices, from supercomputers to smartphones to web servers to video game consoles.  **Like a state, an operating system “governs” the programs and applications under it and networked with it as well as, to some extent, the individuals who avail themselves of these tools and resources. It defines us in relation to itself, and each other, as “users,” and can reward us, reject our requests, or even bar us from access according to its needs**. It can also monitor and surveil us. Referring to giant metaplatforms like Android and Apple, the German sociologist Philipp Staab observes, “Their own systems are continuously optimized for maximum convenience, to reduce the need to switch to another system. On the other hand, they make it as difficult as possible for users to use certain services outside their own ecosystem.” 18 This is our starting point for understanding the State. Its central feature is the legal, administrative, and decision-making structure we refer to as government. But **the State is** a much larger, more complex phenomenon, **a comprehensive means of organizing and exercising power that, once it’s launched, expands to cover more and more aspects of existence according to a direction and logic of its own. “The state could never be the means for any special or definite end, as liberalism conceived it to be**,” the German anarchist Rudolf Rocker wrote in his classic, Nationalism and Culture ; “**it was rather, in its highest form, an end in itself, an end sufficient for itself.”** At the same time, and again like a computer operating system, the State is not a material object or entity. The various pieces of “hardware” we associate with it—big, imposing neoclassical buildings fronted by Greco- Roman columns quite often come to mind, along with military bases, roads, and monuments—are merely material containers and symbols of the immaterial reality. An operating system is soft ware, a collection of embedded commands that direct a machine called a computer. **The State, too, is “software”: a collection of ideas, doctrines, commands, and processes that direct the deployment of human beings and their deployment of physical resources**.  **The State is at once a political, social-cultural, and economic entity.** Like an operating system, **it networks together institutions, organizations, and less formal groups including government but also many others: corporations, banks, other financial institutions (state-chartered, as it happens), and other underpinnings of capitalism;** eleemosynary (nonprofit and charitable) institutions; so-called civil society groups and political parties (especially “established” parties like the Democrats and Republicans in the United States, which have evolved into quasi-state institutions); and even basic nits like families and households. Other institutions and groupings that form part of the State furnish cultural and even paramilitary support to the social order, strengthen organized religion, and reinforce racial and gender stratification: for instance, the extreme wings of the nativist Alternative for Germany; the Hindu nationalist Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) in India; and the American Legion, the Ku Klux Klan, the National Rifle Association, militia groups, the Proud Boys, and the Southern Baptist Convention in the United States.  **Any organization recognized and regulated by law is a component of the State; so are many illegal or extralegal organizations that rely on State institutions and infrastructure in some respect, such as informal or gray markets. The State licenses (or tolerates) these organizations for specific reasons of its own, most importantly that they strengthen and legitimize the State itself; it sets explicit or implicit rules for how they can act (laws, regulations, guardrails, tacit boundaries); and it exercises the power to overrule and even terminate them if it sees a reason to do so. What these entities have in common is that they all reinforce the State even as they depend on the structure of the State to survive. ‡ This is what makes the State a total operating system, not just a legal or administrative structure.** § Government is, of course, the core institution of the State, but government depends on many of these other institutions and organizations to fulfill vital functions. Government especially depends on private capital as a partner in generating economic growth. Historically, many social and economic functions have shifted back and forth from government to private-sector control while always remaining within the State’s power to regulate and legislate—and, in reality, the line between government and the private sector is profoundly blurred. In the United States, for example, homeschooling is subsidized in many states, which effectively means the State has been enlisted in a project to promote religious education, generally underpinned by a right-wing political ideology. Trump education secretary Betsy DeVos said in early 2020, during the COVID crisis, that she would force public school districts to spend part of the rescue funds they were receiving from Washington on private-school students—even those from affluent families. 19 Another example emerges from the ongoing right-wing campaign to dismantle the U.S. Social Security system. While shifting some or all of the payroll taxes that fund the national pension system into personal investment accounts is often described as “privatization,” in reality it is something else. Under most proposals, workers’ payroll taxes would not be refunded or reduced; instead, all or part would be funneled into a preselected menu of private investment funds. The power of the state bureaucracy would be harnessed to achieve a set of free-market goals, calculated to promote the State’s objective of increasing its power through faster economic growth. 20 In both examples, the government does not step aside; instead, it takes an active role, directing outcomes favored by the private sector but that private enterprise could not fully achieve on its own. Like a computer operating system, the State manages relationships between government, capital, nonprofits, and other entities to make them work together easily and efficiently, many parts operating at the same time. Like an operating system, it lets us do things—make computations, write, communicate, learn, play, create art, make a living—but always within boundaries that it prescribes and manipulates. Like an operating system, it provides a user-friendly interface that makes it much easier for us to conduct our business inside rather than outside its boundaries. Consider citizenship, passports, and other personal identification; it’s possible to live in the modern world without them, though barely, and it is extremely inconvenient, to say the least. Or consider the highways, rail lines, and postal systems the State and its private-sector components offer. Or, for businesses, the infrastructure of trade treaties, customs services, and ports that facilitate commerce. There are ways around these, but it’s so much easier to use the platform the State provides. Just like an operating system, too, the State gives us error messages when we do something wrong. It tells us when we’ve stumbled by inflicting the police on us, hauling us into court, jailing us, declaring us incompetent, or, in the wider reaches of its network, subjecting us to social and peer pressure or economic hardship. Like an operating system, **the State defines us in relation to itself and each other**. It defines us, for example, as “citizens” or “residents,” “households” and “taxpayers.” **And these definitions make clear whether the state approves of our behavior: “productive citizens,” on the one hand, and “delinquents,” “criminals,” “illegals,” and “burdens,” on the other,**

#### The evocation of common heritage of “mankind” always excludes those who are the constitutive excluded—mechanisms like the Moon treaty purport to be for the good of common humanity, but they in fact just reinforce the nation-state’s ability to make sovereign decisions over space. Cornum 18,

Cornum, Lou. “Event Horizon.” Real Life Mag, 12 Mar. 2018, https://reallifemag.com/event-horizon/.

The word *pioneer*, usually attached to innovation, is never too far from people like Jeff Bezos or Elon Musk or Peter Thiel. These men’s careers in tech startups, their origins in the digital commerce boom, and their pioneer identities were forged on the electronic frontier. Like pioneers of industry in the colonial expansion of the Americas, these men operate on the knife’s edge of sovereignty as it cuts a path for both state and capital to consolidate power. In space, these men see a chance to loosen further the bonds that still restrain the endless capital they’ve been chasing in their imagined rocket ships. Investors, architects of the financial and material future, have taken to using the term “NewSpace” to refer to the almost accessible ventures of asteroid mining, space shipping, spaceship travel, and other forms of space commerce. Still, there are minor contractual obstacles. **Even at the void’s edge, there is a treaty.** A couple of treaties actually. **Out there the governments still rely on these dusty remnants of the dying beast of nation-state sovereignty and the apparatuses of international relations first created to aid and abet the global distribution of white men’s control. The Outer Space Treaty of 1967, which has a more precise formal name** — Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies — **may seem surprisingly benevolent. It is sometimes summarized as saying that *nobody can own space*. But while it outlaws national appropriation, it allows incorporation without the state.** In a demotion from the sensual feel of its phrasing, “celestial bodies” become the body politic, managed sites of bans and requirements. While the U.S. did sign the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, it did not sign the 1979 Moon Treaty**,**more formally known as the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. The Moon Treaty, among other directives, bans any state from claiming sovereignty over any territory of celestial bodies; bans any ownership of any extraterrestrial property by any organization or person, unless that organization is international and governmental; and requires an international regime be set up to ensure safe and orderly development and management of the resources and sharing of the benefits from them. It also bans military activity such as weapons testing or the founding of extraterrestrial military bases (though it’s hard to see U.S. presence anywhere in the stars or on Earth as anything other than militaristic). **Evoking the common heritage of “mankind,” the Moon Treaty could appear a pie-in-the-sky attempt at more equitable relations to land than have been established on Earth since the advent of private property and national borders. But it is of course expressed only in the stop-gap measure of treaties that assign power to states, governments, and resource-management regimes. The power of the treaty is in its possible revoking. In making the decision to sign the treaty or not sign the treaty, the collectives state their unquestioned right to make decisions in space at all. Space is a place where old and new sovereignties, like asteroids desired for mining, are colliding or sometimes colluding. There is a line connecting the Dutch East India Company, the Hudson Bay Company, and SpaceX. These companies begin as corporate endeavors, but then as now the nation-state is sticky: It finds a way to adhere.** Take the case of Luxembourg, a polity that lives on tax loopholes (allowing large corporations to move money in and out of the nation with utmost secrecy and minimal charges) where, as Atossa Araxia Abrahamian [reports for the *Guardian*](https://www.theguardian.com/news/2017/sep/15/luxembourg-tax-haven-privatise-space), private space companies are finding their funding allies for financed trips to the moon, Mars, and the interstellar spots for satellites. The mixing of business and research mixes the money and power hungering of technocrats who don’t just want to own businesses but want people to see their businesses as the shareholders of humanity’s future.In middle school we didn’t have model U.N., but we did have model Earth. For field trips we’d be taken away to Biosphere 2, a site for space-colonization experiments built by Space Biosphere Ventures but owned by Columbia University by the time I visited. In these field trips to the desert outside a town auspiciously named Oracle, we walked around the display vivarium, always being reminded to call it biosphere *two*— biosphere *one* was the earth outside, the one we had momentarily left behind and one day might leave behind for good. That old planet was a past prototype. But the new prototype was itself already a defunct research facility. The closed-system experiment with human subjects had failed twice in the ’90s, and it now rests as one of the many dreams littering the desert of a new world.When a world is new, it creates alongside a space held for the older worlds. This is the drama between what can be brought from before and what will be made anew. It is why Aeneas carried his dying father Anchises on his shoulders out of Troy on his way to found Rome. The traveler always brings baggage. Jeff Bezos would like to be the one who carries that baggage to space or controls the robots and poorly paid temporary laborers who accomplish the carrying. In this supposedly new space, the regimes of inequality will be quite familiar. The space-goers insist it is something called humanity, with the ingrained hierarchical legacies of this category, that will be going.Leaders in industry who have always wanted to be world leaders are now positioning themselves as leaders of outer worlds. Elon Musk makes union busting seem like a cosmic necessity for the continuation of human life. The material and subsequent cultural valorization of certain kinds of work in the tech industry, wherein the “great minds” make all the money and those who maintain the machinery of day-to-day existence are treated like the shit they’re supposed to take, does not end at the stratosphere.Even the more lofty moral considerations of outer-space ethics (e.g., is terraforming ever morally acceptable?) often ignore their fundamental basis in deathly processes still very much situated on Earth. Any outer-space endeavor today or in the near future will be an extension of the life-destroying capacities of capitalists and their colonial countries. On the [Deep Space Industries page](https://deepspaceindustries.com/mining/) for asteroid mining, the exploitation and extraction of minerals is heralded as “an unlimited future for all mankind**.” The endless extension of capitalist accumulation comes with an extension of this delusion of “all mankind.” As if all such projects, the project of humanity itself, has not always been an exclusionary one.** SETI may appear to inhabit a different realm of speculation than that of the grandstanding services-and-commodities pioneers. But its project also follows a willful ignorance about human history and the exclusions that make humanity as a class possible. SETI proponents, much like Musk and his ilk, view themselves at the forefront of a new breakthrough not necessarily of capital but of knowledge. Their sites of expansion are not centered so much on the territories capital requires in order to enclose, privatize, and extract until depletion (though they can be intimately connected, as in the development of the university and research centers as global actors of dispossession), but on sites of encounter. Outer-space commerce and funded extraterrestrial contact-seekers operate on and reinforce damaging notions of land, life, and the future that actually hinder the survival of most Earth dwellers rather than provide anything like meaningful hope. Stories of contact are only ever understood as colonial stories. Every inquiry of future contact with extraterrestrial life, from academic and government-funded to amateur and whimsical, relies on the same stale comparisons of colonial conquest. Columbus, of course; Captain James Cook, often. Every episode of the podcast *Making New Worlds: Why Are We Going?*features historical authorities commenting on colonial situations of the past and comparing them to hypothetical situations with extraterrestrials. The topics convened by those who are granted the authority to speak on them are conducted under the tyranny of certain givens, the most persistent and damning of them being contact as conquest.

#### Anarchist revolutions are fragile; they need space apart, space to grow strong – and the process of reading the kritik is one of creating revolutionary spaces outside the state. The aff can never do this – all movements in space are under organizational structures in their world, Bevensee no date

Bevensee, Emmi. No Date. “Anarchists Need Space Because We’re Fighting in All Directions.” <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emmi-bevensee-anarchists-need-space-because-we-re-fighting-in-all-directions>

**Anarchism requires creative experimentation and needs all the spaces possible to achieve its goals.** Because these spaces and projects are vulnerable we need all the defenses with the least tradeoffs we can muster. **Space-friendly anarchism offers us new horizons** to create, explore, and practice while simultaneously generating new and more defensible dynamics for our radical networks. **Whether as roaming insurrectionary pirates or horizontalist communes, we must make a case for space-centric anarchism** and then work through the intricacies of its ethics and practical requirements. Our Vulnerability is Our Strength. **Our enemies**, especially tankies, **always gloat over the fact that anarchists always get slaughtered**. “An anarchist revolution has never succeeded!” **Regardless of this misunderstanding of longstanding anarchist projects and societies, and the backhanded glorification of brutalist authoritarian regimes, they’re right in that it is hard to protect anarchism especially while it blossoms**. **We abhor unnecessary games of domination and the manipulative power plays that they require.** **We shy away from the zero-sum outlook that characterizes most of these so-called “successful revolutions” of the authoritarian communist or corporate capitalist varieties alike. We want to build societies where people don’t have to destroy each other to get their needs met.** We want societies where people have positive freedom not just social contracts with cartels of state and corporate violence. But we don’t just want it. **Anarchists are practical. We dream but we also birth these visions into the world.** We struggle against coercion at every level. It’s exhausting but,to an anarchist, everything is a front in the struggle for positive freedom. We are in constant struggle even if many parts of it just look like love and joy. **We don’t take the simple comfort of picking our battles as a movement even if we prioritize projects individually. For this reason our movements are diversely rich... and vulnerable.** Because we don’t focus on the game of thrones for power we are vulnerable to those that do. Our enemies seek to master the weapons that we rightfully fear. It corrupts them but they get better and better at it. It’s no coincidence that so few anarchist societies have thorough weapons training and the ability to practically defend themselves. **We don’t want to build power. We’d much rather try to build a world where a focus on offensive violence is unnecessary. So even in places where anarchists, or societies that practice anarchist values have found the ability to defend themselves such as Rojava, Spain, and the Zapatista autonomous zones, our physical defense has often either still eventually failed or succeeded because of their relationship with other, often creative, strategies.** But it’s not just monopolies of violence that we’re bad at, it’s also politics in general. We lean extraparlimentary as a movement and often try to build parallel movements outside of the reign of deeply compromised electoral politics. So while we’re building our own infrastructure and ways of doing things, the career politicians who are intimidated by us are always amassing their forces against us whether through the ballot or the police. These examples are just a taste of the ways in which our greatest assets, the very core of what we love, are some of our largest attack vectors. Insurrectionary, Parallel, and Creative Spaces for Experimentation **Because we’re vulnerable on all sides, we need space. In the immediate sense we need a place to meet, virtual or physical. We need to spread out.** **Space can be the abstract and general notion of the distance between two objects or the concrete but expansive area beyond our atmosphere.** The fact that they share a word in English (and many other languages) is itself evocative of what we want. **In our love of outer space, we are actually committing to our love of the path between things. The heart of anarchism is creative experimentation and the interplay between theory and practice. Our attempts at traversing these paths are often delicate**. Our experiments have the advantage of being decentralized and as such generate resilience. You can’t pick off our leaders if we have none. You can’t destroy our movement if it’s completely dynamic and constantly adapting it’s edges and vectors. They attack one point and that point just changes form or gets mimicked somewhere else. We have the power of whack-a-mole. **But that resilient adaptivity alone isn’t enough.** Tankies take this problem and use it to justify authoritarian centralism. “You can’t have a revolution without gulagging the saboteurs and enemies of that revolution! You need domination to create freedom!”Because we recognize the interdependent relationship between ends and means we fundamentally doubt the viability of movements that employ such tradeoffs and search for strategies without them. **Insurrectionary anarchism seeks to create these spaces through creative and stigmergic revolutionary pockets. In the joy of liberation people can experiment with alternative modes of self-organization**. Insurrection carves out the spaces in time and place that allow us to build without the constant attacks and pressing dynamics of power as it is. The longstanding gradualist processes and parallel infrastructures that we’ve been working for in the margins are then able to come in and take roots. We defend these spaces from all sides using a variety of means.

#### The state occasionally subverts capital in the name of stabilizing the overall system. Do not be deceived—the only way to get rid of capitalism is to get rid of the state.

Laursen, E., 2021. The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State. pg 109-111

**The immediate interests of the State and capital are not always congruent— and when they are not, usually it is the State that determines the agenda**. For example, in 1834 the British Parliament downgraded the rich and politically powerful East India Company into a managing agency for the British government in India and in 1873 dissolved it (after a final dividend payment and stock redemption). The European carve-up of the developing world into colonies and protectorates, at around the same time, which in reality was sparked by political ambitions, territorial rivalries, and proxy warfare, not to mention the need to supply military and civil posts to members of polite families, was rationalized as a business proposition. But European capitalists and businesses underinvested in these territories, which served primarily to extend the State’s military and political control. Commercial exploitation took place mainly in other parts of the developing world, such as the Americas, that Europe did not politically control, and later in the former European colonies after they (re)gained independence. **More recently, the U.S. government for strategic reasons has forbidden American companies from doing business in post-revolutionary Cuba**, despite the fact that other governments have allowed their businesspeople to pursue opportunities there—**and U.S. companies have largely accepted the edict**. In 2020, the Chinese government shut down the initial public offering of Ant Group, the enormous Internet finance firm, when its controlling shareholder criticized Chinese regulators. 21 Meanwhile, the Trump administration pursued a damaging trade war with Beijing, regardless of the preferences of major corporations and agricultural interests that by then were intimately and profitably connected with China. Likewise, when the United States returned Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi to the throne of Iran in 1953 and replaced the UK as his government’s dominant foreign partner, it took over 40 percent of what had been Britain’s stake in Iranian oil production. U.S. oil companies initially weren’t interested, preferring cheaper Saudi Arabian oil, and had to be persuaded to participate in an enterprise that was primarily about extending Washington’s influence in the Middle East. But they understood their role to be, in part, as agents of Washington’s foreign policy in the region, and so, of course, they went along. A further instance occurred during the post–Cold War period in the 1990s, when the U.S. defense budget shrank—temporarily, as it happened—in the wake of the Soviet Union’s collapse, and the Defense Department forced the merger of dozens of American military contractors into three giants: Boeing Company, Raytheon Company, and Lockheed Martin Corporation. 22 Finally, there is the close cooperation Washington has exacted from high-tech and communications companies since 9/11 in its effort to expand its surveillance capabilities. **These examples underscore the State’s knack for taking the long view and the willingness of capital and big business to follow its direction, knowing that in the end, they all contribute to the same project. Lacking both the leadership and the protection (from itself) extended by the State, capital would either destroy itself or be quickly brought down.** **More fundamentally, the State dictates the environment in which capital functions, and unless a regime is directly hostile to capital itself, business and financial interests will play ball.** Following months of street protests against Beijing’s increasing encroachment on Hong Kong’s autonomy, for example, many large foreign-owned banks, trading houses, and other enterprises were expected to relocate from the island city to other parts of East Asia, perhaps crippling the territory’s economy. But it quickly became clear that wasn’t going to happen. “Global financial institutions that are deeply rooted in Hong Kong ... have already been adapting to a changing business environment,” the Wall Street Journal reported weeks after a repressive new national security law was imposed. “They have ramped up hires of Mandarin speakers and Chinese professionals [Hong Kong residents’ principal language is Cantonese] and positioned themselves to win more deals and attract more money from Chinese companies and investors.... Western banks ... have been careful not to say anything critical of Chinese policy or the national-security law.” Just as the law was coming into effect, Hong Kong “played host to a blizzard of stock sales,” the Journal noted, and “the city’s famously expensive real- estate market has been resilient.” To bolster confidence, regulators announced new rules making it easier to move money across China’s borders. 23 If Beijing wanted to crack down on civil liberties in Hong Kong, multinationals were not going to let that get in the way of business. **Capitalism, then, is not a closed or all-encompassing operating system; it needs the State to function**. But the State needs capital to realize its goals. **The Left tends to see this relationship quite differently, if it sees the relationship at all**. “Capitalism is not the solution to urban America’s problems,” anthropologist and geographer David Harvey wrote in response to the economic collapse during the COVID crisis; “capitalism itself is the problem.” “Unless we address the root causes of those problems in the structure of our economic system,” he declared, “we’ll never be able to solve them.” 24 This is true so far as it goes, but **unless we first understand the capitalist system as a component of the larger system of the State, any attempt to move beyond capitalism will only lead to a further buildup of the State and, in the end, the reproduction of capitalism in some form. This was precisely the outcome at the end of the “socialist decades” following the Russian Revolution and the heyday of social-democratic governments in Europe and elsewhere. The more that social movements and collective and cooperative practices were integrated into the State, the more likely they were to be displaced by practices that relied on capital. To get rid of capitalism requires getting rid of the State.**

#### A ban on private appropriation destroys the possibilty of indigenous and afrofuturism, where people imagine spaces of state outside of any organizational structure, where they can be one with the stars, meaning the state will subsume their movement, Cornum 15.

https://thenewinquiry.com/the-space-ndns-star-map/

**For indigenous futurism**, technology is inextricable from the social. **Human societies are part of a network of wider relationships with objects**, animals, geological formations and so on. **To grasp our relationship with the non-human world here on Earth, we must also extend our understanding of how Earth relates to the entirety of the cosmos.** We live on just one among millions of planets, each an intricate and delicate system within a larger, increasing complex structure. For the indigenous futurist endeavor, striving to understand the ever-multiplying connections linking us to the beginning of the universe and its constant expansion also entails unraveling the intricate relations that make up our Earthly existence. Zainab Amadahy, who identifies as a person of mixed black, Cherokee and European ancestry, grounds her writing practice in illuminating and understanding networks of relationships: “I aspire to write in a way that views possible alternatives through the lens of a relationship framework, where I can demonstrate our connectivity to and interdependence with each other and the rest of our Relations.” **Her** 1992 novel ***The Moons of Palmares*** examines the relationships, both harmful and collaborative, between indigenous peoples and descendants of slaves in an outer space setting that merges histories of the Black Atlantic with the colonial frontier. In a provocative bit of plotting, she casts an indigenous character, Major Eaglefeather, as an oppressive foreign force in the lives of an outer space labor population that has shaped its society in remembrance of black slave resistance in North/South America and the Caribbean. The story **follows Major Eaglefeather’s decision to reject his ties to the corporate state and support a rebel group of laborers**. The name Palmares is taken from a real-world settlement founded by escaped slaves in 17th-century Brazil, which is also known to have incorporated indigenous peoples and some poor, disenfranchised whites. In a chronicle written in the late 17th century, these *quilombos* are described as networks of settlements that lived off the land and were supplemented by raids on the slave plantations where the inhabitants were formerly held**. It is said that in Palmares the king was called Gangasuma, a hybrid term meaning “great lord” composed of the Angolan or Bandu word *ganga* and the Tupi word *assu*. The word succinctly captures the mixture of cultures that banded together in Palmares to live together on the margins of a colonialist, slave-holding society. While Palmares was eventually destroyed in a military campaign, it lives on as a legend of slave rebellion and utopian possibility that Amadahy finds well suited for her outer space story about collaborative resistance to state power and harmful resource extraction processes. Outer space, perhaps because of its appeal to our sense of endless possibility, has become the imaginative site for re-envisioning how black, indigenous and other oppressed people can relate to each other outside of and despite the colonial gaze.** Amadahy’s work is crucial for a critical understanding of the space NDN. **The space NDN cannot allow him or herself to fall into the patterns of domination and kyriarchy that have for too long prevailed here on Earth as well as speculative narratives of outer space. Afrofuturists have looked to space as the site for black separatism and liberation. If the space NDN is truly committed to being responsible to all our relations, it is imperative for our futurist vision to be in solidarity with and service to our fellow Afrofuturist space travelers. Our collective refusal of colonial progress (namely, our destruction) means we must chart other ways to the future that lead us and other oppressed peoples to the worlds we deserve.** *The Moons of Palmares* works toward this end by revealing the strong connections between indigenous and black histories, narratives and ways of living. **Indigenous futurism is indebted to Afrofuturism: Both forms of futurism explore spaces and times outside the control of colonial powers and white supremacy.** These alternative conceptions of time reject the notion that all tradition is regressive by narrating futures intimately connected to the past. SF and specifically the site of outer space give writers and thinkers the imaginative room to envision political and cultural relationships and the future decolonizing movements they might nourish. This focus on relationship, especially as posited by Amadahy, also accounts for those forms of indigeneity that persist among peoples either stolen from their lands or whose lands have been stolen from them. As the writer Sydette Harry recently posted on Twitter, “Black people are displaced indigenous people.” However, because of the processes of forced relocation and slavery and continuing anti-black racism, black people are often denied claims to indigeneity. There is also a pernicious erasure of black NDNs in America and Canada. **In exploring outer space, black authors are also able to assert their own relationship to land both on Earth and in the cosmos.** The Black Land Project (BLP), while not an explicitly futurist organization, fosters the kind of relationships to land on Earth that futurist authors and thinkers envision in outer space. In a recent podcast, *Blacktracking through Afrofuturism*, BLP founder and director Mistinguette Smith discusses how walking over the routes of the Underground Railroad brought forth alternate dimensions and understandings of time outside the settler paradigm of ownership. These are aspects of relating to land that the Afrofuturist and the space NDN (identities which can exist in the same person) bring with them on their travels. This focus on relationship rather than a strict idea of location speaks to the way in which the space NDN can remain secure in their indigenous identity even while rocketing through dark skies far from their origins. This is not to demean the work of land protectors and defenders who risk serious repercussions for resisting corporate and state encroachment on indigenous territories. The space NDN supports those who are able and choose to remain on the land, while also hoping to broaden understandings of indigeneity outside simple location. **Locations of course are never simple. It is the settler who wishes to flatten the relation between place and people by claiming land through ownership. Projecting themselves forward into faraway lands and times, the space NDN reveals the myriad ways of relating to land beyond property.**

#### The alternative is an anarchist space program – anarchists leave the Earth to establish new colonies free of capitalist exploitation. The aff makes this impossible by banning private appropriation. Revolution on earth is doomed, and through the alternative we are imagining utopia that exists outside the state, a form of anti-statae rhetoric, Debord 2020,

Debord, Syzygy. 2020 “Another Galaxy for Another Life.” <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/syzygy-debord-another-galaxy-for-another-life>

Closed Doors Brings Open Minds **Life on this planet being, at best, an utter bore and, at worst, entirely grotesque** — **there remains to open-minded, irresponsible, thrill-seeking pro-revolutionaries only to disregard the government, build our own spaceships, and establish outer-space autonomous communities.** The world of Tomorrowland is already yesterday with the totality of capitalism complete. **If the socialistic alternatives couldn’t defeat the capitalist system in its earliest stages, what hope is there in the present? Or worse, how much longer must one wait for the material conditions for a revolution to be appropriate? Accepting the existing order in one way or another is absurd. What is needed is an alternative to the alternative.** **A program that begins with the rejection of the spectacle’s permanence and holds no definitive end.** An alternative that yields to individualist self-determination in place of concessions to reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries. **The only alternative possible: autonomous astronauts. “It’s easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism,”** so says some benign theorist. **But! We have no need to imagine either if we leave this planet. Let the capitalists fret over their sacred private property.** Let the Earth cowards cling to their faith of monetary riches. Let these Terran revelers keep their third world, third rate, third class slum known as “America.” **They can have this wretched heap they are so fond of, their patriotic submission**. They can stay behind and suffocate on the noxious fumes of pollution while battling yet another carnivorous disease. **Let them enjoy their skies cluttered by ugly fucking buildings and their repugnant light pollution that asphyxiates the night. Such archaisms are of no use to us. We won’t even give a minute of our life in the hope that the multitude will suddenly become aware and take off! If the gravitationally oppressed are not ready to raise the launchpad, this is a problem of the gravitationally oppressed**.[[1]](https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/syzygy-debord-another-galaxy-for-another-life#fn1) **Let us begin by detailing why we have abandoned the socialist alternative on Earth. Assuming even a poor understanding of dialectics, with capitalism serving as the thesis and the socialistic tree as the antithesis — the synthesis is always a reinforced spirit of capitalism**. Perhaps in some instances the abuses of the capitalist system against the working class lessen, but overall, **the socialist and communist antitheses only serve as mere corrections and additives to the initial thesis of capitalism. Nothing truly changes.** Not even in what you feel. **In our hearts, we all know Earth will not be saved.** Every revolt is cut off from its mode of success in advance. The empire squats solidly upon its own immunity! **However, this does not mean the proposed systems in space will necessarily fail. What will a socialistic community look like without imperialism imposing on self-determination? What will anarchistic communities look like when freed of the threat of state violence? What objectives, what plans, what lives, what adventures are there when the oppressions are abandoned and we float away from the world; not disabled by disillusionment, but unburdened by it? No gods, no masters, no gravity** – no problem! lways Falling **Life on this planet is unsatisfactory. Yet we are not resigned to it. We refuse to be fooled. We fear nothing: being misunderstood, being criticized, being labelled ‘jokers’ or ‘insane’, suffering, life or death – nothing. We are neither dreamers nor idealists nor unrealistic…** The AAA is an attitude of reaction, defiance, and distrust. A distrust of the illusory philosophies at the level of the naïve, a distrust of unctuous and sonorous morals… No galaxy is obscure… So as not to be overloaded with rhetoric or cloying sincerity, the astronaut’s message is no less a song in which emotion’s modesty dismisses fine transports. When a spider flings itself from a fixed point down into its consequences, it continually sees before it an empty space in which it can find no foothold, however much it stretches. And yet, it finds corners and crevices to build its place of rest, its source of nourishment. So it is with the AAA; before us is continually an empty space, and we are propelled by the conditions that lie behind us. **What is going to happen? What will the future bring? I do not know, I offer no presentiment. Those who consider our goals impossible to achieve will necessarily find our methods impossible to think.** **Trapped in the false permanency and ahistoricism of the spectacle, these “realistic” pro-revolutionaries are quick to assure our naivety and imploring failure. But why not fail? Is the guarantee of dying from boredom recourse from the risk of dying from spaghettification?** Perhaps knowing there is no future is our greatest freedom. Waiting With The Coffins Under Heaven **The AAA is not a strand of Posadism and does not share their helpless hopes of communistic Alien salvation or global collapse. Their yearning is the same as the pious Christians, waiting for Christ’s return and direction to a better place in a better time.** The lathe of heaven does not exist. It must be built. Nor does the AAA urge a resignation to one’s docile fate on this planet. **However much it hurts to hope for the impossible, to imagine a future we don’t believe in (the Earth being saved, Global revolution, etc.), what matters is the strength we feel every time we don’t bow our heads, every time we destroy the false idols of civilization, every time our eyes meet those of our comrades, every time that our hands set fire to the symbols of Power**. **In those moments we don’t ask ourselves: ‘Will we win? Will we lose?’ In those moments we just fight. Even if we have no future on this planet, we can still find life on it today**. One does not have to return to sleep after the alarm clock rings. **Most importantly, we are not advocating a definitive plan for leaving this planet or for what ought to be done in space. It is left to the self-determination of individuals and unions to decide what is appropriate and ideal for them. The accent is placed not on the content of a choice proposed, but the fact of choosing.** **Thus, the AAA decision is a decision to decide no longer (that is, the free activity of space without geography would be betrayed if it is subordinated to some conception beforehand.)** As I could sit here and lament about Stanford Toruses, O’Neill Cylinders, and my frothy daydreams of surgically implanting bonsai trees into lungs and dining at souvlaki space stations, but why burden this manuscript with frivolities? **Better to go out without constraint later, when day is done, to perfect the design – grown greater in the uncertain twilight of mere dream – in that inward moment that turns upon itself, yet never repeats itself. The AAA is less of an organization than it is a network of individuals and unions cooperatively working toward a defined beginning – leaving this planet.** All that can come from the AAA are tools, not answers. Because as much as this reads as a manifesto, it isn’t one. It is an invitation. I’ll see you on the dark side of the moon… **Astronauts of all determinations, unite! We have a world to lose, but a universe to gain!**

#### The Role of the Ballot is to vote for the debater with the best discourse that discredits and resists the state. Discourse makes visible the true evil nature of the state, enabling a state overthrow that does not simply reproduce state violence – psychological elements are key to overthrow, Lauren 2021

Laursen, E., 2021. The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State. pg 217-220

**However we do it, constructing relationships outside the State enables us**— compels us—to build a body of knowledge and experience that adds up, in Bakunin’s words, to “a real force at hand which knows what to do” **when the opportunity presents itself to shake off the State.** But where does that opportunity come from and how do we seize it? **States have disappeared or been overthrown multiple times in living memory**; the collapse of the USSR and the **disintegration of the Libyan and Somali states** are examples. The Islamic State of ISIS arose, created a semiviable system of administration and finance, and then disintegrated in just a few short years. Drug cartels in Colombia and Mexico have carved out quasi-states that sometimes interact as equal players with governments and powerful agencies like the CIA. **But in modern times, no revolution has ever overthrown the State: not yet . Each time, the next regime, whatever it calls itself, has replicated the form and its components: military, police, governmental structure, financial system, cultural** **institutions, and more. What does it take for a large enough mass of people to conclude that they are better off abandoning the State and organizing outside it? No revolution has ever been successful unless it was against a system that had discredited itself in the eyes of a large portion of the population. When that happens, small acts of resistance**—everything **from civil disobedience, mass protests, and tree-sits to various forms of industrial, military, and digital sabotage—can mushroom into mass uprising.** The **Russian Revolution succeeded because the tsarist regime had been completely discredited** by its disastrous performance in World War I. The **Soviet regime** was **discredited** when it led the people into an unwinnable war **in Afghanistan** and failed for over twenty years to solve the problems pulling down its economic structure. The **Irish revolution against British rule succeeded because the Crown discredited itself when it decided to execute the leaders of the Easter Rising, losing the loyalty of the majority of people.** The Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam) failed almost from the start to secure its people’s allegiance due to its spectacular corruption and incompetence. **For the State itself to be discredited, it** must fail in all three of the ways it needs to legitimize itself. It **must** • **fail to provide a degree of personal security; • fail to establish a shared identity and a sense that one’s voice is being heard; and** • **fail to provide a path to material well-being. When a state disgraces itself in any one of these dimensions, it becomes vulnerable to overthrow and replacement by another version of the State. If the crisis is severe enough, and particularly if it fails in all three, the entire edifice of the State could be at risk**. Of course, states have recovered from such disasters plenty of times: after the tsarist empire fell and was dismantled, the new Soviet regime essentially put it back together again in just a few years. **But it’s up to the people to initiate the social revolution that will prepare them to abolish the State once it discredits itself—and not to let another new, improved version take its place in their psyche. The current moment is promising because, for perhaps the first time and in part thanks to the increasing interconnectedness of every national economy, it’s no longer individual states that are failing to perform in these three areas; it’s the State itself, and the System of States that supports it. In the face of global warming and the COVID-19 pandemic, the State has failed to provide security. As nearly every country becomes more multiethnic and multicultural, the State has failed to expand its definition of identity and has actually narrowed the space for people outside the Core Identity Group to have a voice. By clinging to neoliberal policies, it has exposed vast portions of humanity to poverty or economic precarity, further destabilizing them socially and geographically.** How long can this continue? In the developed world, the Core Identity Group itself is shrinking, creating a growing problem for the State. According to 2020 U.S. Census Bureau numbers, the white portion of the U.S. population was 60.1 percent, down from 69.1 percent in 2000 and from almost 80 percent in 1980. In 2019, for the first time, more than half of the population under age sixteen was a racial or ethnic minority, signaling that racial diversity in the United States is accelerating. The previous decade was the first in which the white population did not grow, which means that population expansion was entirely because of growth in the nonwhite segment. “Racial and ethnic diversity will be an essential ingredient of America’s future,” wrote William H. Frey, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, yet anti-immigrant, nativist movements are growing within white America. 23 Europe, the birthplace of the modern State, is also becoming more racially and culturally diverse—and more xenophobic as members of the Core Identity Group feel increasingly under siege. France and Germany, which were close to all-white decades ago, are now 8.8 percent and 6.1 percent Muslim, respectively, and becoming more so. As these societies become more multicultural, xenophobia has spread. In eastern European countries, which have vanishingly small nonwhite and non-Judeo-Christian populations, paranoia about migration and ethnic variety is, if anything, even stronger. This has exacerbated anti-Jewish and anti-Roma sentiment as well. At the same time, the population of almost every large continental European country is declining, suggesting that immigrants and ethnic minorities will assume a higher profile in coming decades. 24 **Ethnic diversity is** not a problem in and of itself, providing the society accepts it and is open to accepting new populations on an equal footing. But it is **a severe problem for the State, whose legitimacy**, not to mention its power base, **is lodged in the Core Identity Group. This is evident in countries like Hungary, Croatia, Italy, and Japan, all of which have shrinking populations and are among the most reluctant to accept immigrants. New populations might not be as likely to accept the State’s legitimacy** or lend it their support; if the State reaches out to these new groups, on the other hand, it risks alienating the Core Identity Group. In some places, ethnic and cultural minorities have been increasingly accepted over time—Irish, Jewish, and southern and eastern European immigrants in the United States were eventually accepted as “white,” for example—but new groups have never been accepted from such a wide variety of backgrounds and in such numbers as at present. Thanks to the disruptions wrought by neoliberalism and a more mobile global population, the world’s future is multicultural; but the State, in country after country, is less prepared to accommodate the shift. **A century or even a half century ago, when the world was less interconnected, these problems could conceivably be handled by individual governments through their own administrative and economic processes. Now they can only be solved through governmental cooperation across borders and a massive rethinking of the State’s priorities by the global elite.** Following World War II, the State created institutions aimed at helping the System of States to solve global problems or at least providing the appearance that it could. In recent decades, those institutions have either been dismantled or allowed to atrophy. The result has been the **sad farce around the Paris Agreement on climate change, the tragic failure to establish a global strategy on migration or pandemics, the continuing refusal of institutions like the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, and the U.S. Treasury Department to accept any new thinking about global economic policy, and the European Union’s stubborn adherence to austerity in the midst of economic hardship**. Creating a functioning world government that’s able to address these problems within the context of the State—the ideal of thinkers from Dante and Kant to Bahá’u’lláh and H. G. Wells—is one step the State shows no sign of taking. **Shaking off the State, then, will require both organizing locally to achieve the “impossible” and connecting local with global struggles to find solutions to the problems for which the State has abdicated responsibility. It also means being prepared for the worst. The State has spent centuries creating a vast web of control, assimilation, and identity. Like any living organism, it will fight to preserve itself at all costs. This will include both a physical and a psychological dimension: violent repression as well as strong appeals to the identities the State creates for us, fostering fear of the unknown and of each other. There will almost certainly be an armed struggle at some point as activists confront a violent reaction and the majority of the population either stays loyal to the present system or else stops cooperating with it. But the State will not go away until we force it to.**

## 2 – T appropriation?

## Case

#### Not only does the aff plan do nothing, it legitimates the fiction that private companies alone are responsible for space colonization – really, it’s the public that’s doing all the work. The fact that that’s not a part of their plan is a travesty. Klinger 18

Klinger, J. M. (2018). *Rare earth frontiers: From terrestrial subsoils to lunar landscapes*. Cornell University Press.

On November 24, 2015, US president Barack Obama signed the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act, which grants US citizens the legal right to claim outer space resources and to bring civil suits against enti- ties that pose “harmful interference” to the exercise of private property rights in outer space. Chapter 513, section 51303 states: “A United States citizen engaged in commercial recovery of an asteroid resource or a space resource under this chapter shall be entitled to any asteroid resource or space resource obtained, includ- ing to possess, own, transport, use, and sell the asteroid resource obtained in ac- cordance with applicable law, including the international obligations of the United States.” This legislation, which passed with bipartisan support,24 is an oblique attack on the reigning res communis regime espoused in the OST and the Moon Treaty. By granting US citizens property rights, primarily over asteroid resources and secondarily over “space” resources, the legislation attempts to present itself as consistent with the very international treaty obligations it undermines. It is physically impossible to mine rare earths for profit on the Moon or on any other body in outer space in a manner that is consistent with the provisions of the OST. **Mining obliterates a given landscape, while profiteering requires exclusive access. This is precisely why mining is so useful for extending territorial control to historically elusive places: because it quite simply, brutally, and unam- biguously eliminates the possibility for other uses of the site in question.** If it is a US company, rather than a US public venture, that establishes an exclusive min- ing site in outer space, the geopolitical ambitions of the United States would, in theory, be served either way. **In this case, the private sector can do the dirty work25 of fulfilling the state’s geopolitical agenda while the public sector provides protections and guarantees to the private sector.** But in fact, **a distinction between the public and private sector obscures more than it clarifies.** After all, many of the new space industries were founded by former state space agency personnel, and many of the most effective advocates for the privatization of space have backgrounds in both finance and government. **State promotion of the private sector in pursuit of lunar mining closely resembles the cases reviewed in the previous two chapters, wherein the private sector was selectively enlisted to execute the territorial agenda of the state.** In this case, **the national government provides force and backing to a risky and illegal venture in exchange for anticipated geopolitical advantages**. This is where critical geopolitics helps us see further than conventional geopolitics. Conventional geopolitics would hold that this is simply twenty-first- century statecraft instrumentalizing the private sector to further national inter- ests. For the moment, this particular contrivance of a public-private divide is conceived as enabling US actors on all sides to maximize benefits and dodge in- ternational treaty obligations while they territorialize the Moon. The flaw in this reasoning is the assumption that all interests are wedded to the US national interest, so the newly empowered private sector is imagined as acting as an extension of government interests. But there is no such guarantee. Critical geopolitics, by contrast, challenges fixed notions of the state and therefore fixed notions of public and private sector interests. Private sector firms, newly em- powered by the US government to sue any entity that damages their private interests in outer space, are free to contract with any paying customer regardless of their national origin or the integrity of their enterprise. With the case of the Moon, the stakes of the state’s investment in private sec- tor mining differ from those discussed in previous chapters. It is not just a matter of pursuing profit and geopolitical control, but of maintaining the status quo of the global political economy. Under the terms of the OST—to which all state ac- tors advancing space mining are party—any mineral extracted from the Moon would have to be distributed in a way that is “to the benefit of all peoples” on Earth. To pursue lunar mining in compliance with the OST would fundamentally change the global political economy of resource production and consumption from profiteering to sharing. There is no having it both ways—the terms of the OST have made it thus. Any state or nonstate entity doing otherwise would clearly be operating with impunity regardless of the verbal gymnastics involved in legislative attempts at the national scale to sidestep these agreements. But by insisting on a false premise of legal ambiguity at best and “chaos” at worst (Whit- tington 2013), **private sector actors can do the dirty work of the state, until such time that international treaties are supplanted or other parties acquiesce to violation as the new norm.** For a particular government to assert the right of its citizenry to mine resources in any particular place, and to secure for that citizenry the right to pursue puni- tive legal action against any entities who interfere with the exercise of their prop- erty rights is, by definition, an assertion of sovereignty over those places, whether they are scattered across multiple celestial bodies or consolidated in one place, such as on the Moon. Such claims directly and unambiguously contradict existing international treaty obligations of the United States. The SPACE Act attempts to evade this by concluding with a Disclaimer of Extraterritorial Sovereignty, elabo- rated in Section 403: “It is the sense of Congress that by the enactment of this Act, the United States does not thereby assert sovereignty or sovereign or exclusive rights or jurisdiction over, or the ownership of, any celestial body.” The United States need not assert sovereignty over an entire celestial body in order to claim a particular territory therein. After all, that is how the political ge- ography of Earth is organized: no single state controls the entirety of the celestial body we call home, but that does not negate the sovereignty of 192 national gov- ernments over their respective territories. The verbal gymnastics of the SPACE Act do not succeed in side-stepping the OST’s prohibition of assertions of national sovereignty “by means of use or occupation, or by any other means” (UN 1967, Article II). None of this is to suggest that a coherent agenda exists between the state and the private sector. Advocates of privatized space exploitation have multiple per- spectives on the role of the state. Some denigrate civilian space exploration as too slow (Wingo, Spudis, and Woodcock 2009) and bogged down in bureaucracy, which inhibits the fantastic innovation potential of the private sector (Jones 2013). Others see the state as critical to securing their investments. Of the signing of the SPACE act of 2015, Eric Anderson, cofounder and cochairman of Planetary Re- sources, Inc. gushed: “This is the single greatest recognition of property rights in history. This legislation establishes the same supportive framework that created the great economies of history, and will encourage the sustained development of space” (quoted in Navarro 2015). Regardless of their perspective, **private sector interlocutors are working toward capturing maximum possible support** and minimal regulatory intervention **from the public sector**. This effectively translates into massive transfers of public wealth to private hands while reducing oversight mechanisms concerning the use of that wealth. This coheres with the extensively theorized relationship between the “re- treat of the state” and the “financialization of everything” under contemporary neoliberalism. But as with other cases examined in this book, this is not simply a case of deregulation, but also of reregulation. **The proliferation of commercial space agencies represents not a retreat of the state per se, but rather a reconfiguration of state functions to support a program of redistributing public assets into the private sector in the name of beating a bogeyman from the East.** Indeed, the most vocifer- ous political, public, and legal opinion holds that the private sector should lead the way, and that “**the** **government should focus on its role as enabler**” (Whitehorn 2005). This is overwhelmingly compatible with the US government’s approach since the end of the Cold War (United States House of Representatives 1998).

### Alt Solves Case

#### Alt solves case – their roberts card is in the context of Musk and bezos appropriating but anarchists leaving it is different

### Roberts 21

#### Sandy grandy – cap is the exploitation of the earth and theft of indigenous land for 1 percent.

Socialism and communism is theft for 99 percent

#### -who appropriates

#### The private

#### Marx 20 – your socialization of space can never help indigenous people

### Robinson Keefe 20

#### Revolution on earth is impossible

#### Your utopia is bad which means theres no perm ours is better