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#### Private space appropriation gives the blueprint to anarchists/is anarchist appropriation – Kevin 19:

Carson, Kevin. 8th Feb 2019. “Ephemeralization for Post-Capitalist Space Exploration.” [https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/kevin-carson-ephemeralization-for-post-capitalist-space-exploration //](https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/kevin-carson-ephemeralization-for-post-capitalist-space-exploration%20//) LHP AB

**At a time when government space programs like NASA’s seem to be in permanent retrenchment — shifting to a strategy focused on uncrewed probes, fighting to maintain an “International Space Station” that looks like a joke compared to Golden Age science fiction visions of giant cartwheel stations in orbit — a lot of people see Elon Musk’s private space venture SpaceX as a sign of hope** that we have a future in space after all. SpaceX has had considerable success developing reusable spacecraft and orbital boosters — the Dragon spacecraft has resupplied the International Space Station — and has achieved a controlled descent with tail landing by a Falcon booster. Starting with the first Dragon spacecraft to Mars, Musk has committed himself to regular Mars runs every 26 months, using low costvehicles10. The goal is an affordable and predictable cargo route, in order to encourage Mars-related research and industry. **Essentially what we’re saying is we’re establishing a cargo route to Mars. It’s a regular cargo route. You can count on it. It’s going happen every 26 months. Like a train leaving the station.** And if scientists around the world know that they can count on that, and it’s going to be inexpensive, relatively speaking compared to anything in the past, then they will plan accordingly and come up with a lot of great experiments. According to Tim Fernholz, This is akin to the way that massive container ships ply the oceans to bring components between far-flung factories. Planners don’t rely on a specific ship to make it across the Pacific at a discrete time, but instead imagine the ships as a kind of conveyor belt, constantly in motion, and plan their operations around the idea that goods are constantly in motion between two given sites. The first mission will be followed by several Dragons in 2020, and in 2022 a larger number carrying the infrastructure for a permanent base on Mars — laying the groundwork for the planned transportation of human passengers in 2024. Speaking of which, SpaceX’s Mars project — which envisions humans living in a permanent base constructed there — is easily the most famous. **But if state-directed space exploration fizzled out, let’s not accept, as the alternative, human expansion into the solar system under the direction of corporations and billionaire venture capitalists.** **Even now, there are all sorts of interesting space projects operating on relatively little capital, and taking advantage of cheap, ephemeral micro-manufacturing technology.** **Copenhagen Suborbitals, for example, is an amateur, crowdfunded spaceflight program based in Denmark11. They use a sea-based launch platform**. At the time of Aaronson’s 2012 article, the venture was “comprised of a coterie of 20-plus specialists determined to create the first homemade, manned spacecraft to go into suborbital flight.” **The estimated cost of such a mission is expected to be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, eventually falling to $63,000 a shot. The project achieves enormous economies over government (and presumably corporate) bureaucracies by using off-the-shelf components whenever possible.** **One man’s kitchen sink valve is another rocket man’s missing component. A D.I.Y. spaceflight project can start with a good rummage at your local plumbing or hardware store**. With everyday,off-the-shelf products, the guys behind Copenhagen Suborbitals found cheaper solutions to expensive, complex systems.“Instead of trying to invent our own valve for instance, why not buy one that’s been produced maybe a million times,” explained Kristian. The peer-to-peer nature of the project means much faster turnaround times or iteration cycles — “OODA loops,” in the late Col. John Boyd’s words — than is possible in government or corporate bureaucracies. **Since Copenhagen Suborbitals is bereft of the red tape and regulations characteristic of federally or commercially funded spaceprojects, Kristian explained that his team can go from a revised sketch to an improved prototype, sometimes in less than five minutes.** That’s far quicker than NASA, of course, where he helped to design new moon rovers and co-authored the agency’s Human Integration Design Handbook. **As for their achievements, so far, their accomplishments are impressive: their solid-and-liquid-fuel rocket, the HEAT-1X, is the first “amateur” rocket flown with a payload of a full-size crash test dummy, and the first to perform a successful Main Engine Cut-Off, or MECO command, and the first launched from a “low budget” sea-based platform. It’s also the most powerful amateur rocket ever flown.** Since then, Copenhagen Suborbitals has tested the Sapphire (with improved guidance and maneuver systems), and has a Nexø I & II in the work. The Spica II, the rocket actually intended to send a live person into space, is expected to be tested.Bitnation — a transnational network created to organize a variety of non-state governance services using the Blockchain infrastructure — has created a Bitnation Space Agency. The Agency intends to be a coordination platform for open-source space efforts around the world, and has its own Five-Year Plan for crowdfunded technology development and space missions. Iman Mirbioki (“Bitnation Space Agency,” A Blog About Nothing Particular, June 2, 2015), who co-founded the venture with Susanne Tarkowski Tempelhof, estimates BSA will radically cheapenspaceflight by eliminating administrative overhead altogether (an 80% cost reduction by itself) as well as open-sourcing all technologies. **Tempelhof argues that corporate efforts like SpaceX are “just the beginning of democratizing the technology”; BSA will “take it further, not just make it accessible to people outside of the government, but also make it open source, and DIY friendly” The Agency’s Five Year Plan states a list of objectives:**

1. Create a decentralized and open-source space agency.
2. Research and develop new and better technology for space-travel/space-missions.
3. Develop new eco-friendly fuel for space vehicles. (Rocket fuel)
4. Develop a new generation of navigational systems, as the current GPS accuracy and maximum performance (speed and altitude) is limited due to enforced rules by the U.S military.
5. Create a cheaper technology and platform on an open source basis that enables those with limited budgets to reach space and/or do experiments in microgravity environments.
6. Develop new and cheaper space vehicles able of reaching LEO (Low Earth Orbit), GSO (Geostationary Orbit) and other celestial bodies like the Moon or asteroids.
7. Research alternative energy sources, mainly anti-matter trapped in the Earth’s magnetic field.
8. Research and develop technology for mining minerals and resources on other celestial bodies, like the Moon or asteroids.
9. Creating communication networks and datacenters in Earth orbit, beyond the reach of any state or regime to work toward totalimmunity and neutrality of the future IT-infrastructure.
10. Building fuel-depots and an international network based on virtual currencies for refueling of satellites and other space vehicles.
11. Doing research in the field of space-medicine and the effects of microgravity and cosmic radiation on living organisms.
12. Doing research on the effect of cosmic radiation on electronic components in order to develop new technology that is able to withstand the harsh environment of outer space.

The agenda of milestone projects in the Plan — including orbital satellite launches, moon shots, probes to near-earth asteroids and the deployment of a permanent space station by the end of 2020 — seems implausibly ambitious. But to be fair, even the fully and partly funded items at the top of the list (e.g. the BULLDOG rocket launch for deploying a payload in low-earth orbit is partly funded) are quite impressive. **Extrapolate the Copenhagen Suborbitals and BSA model far enough and you get something like Openshot, a fictional open source moon shot** in a short story by Craig DeLancey14. **The open source hardware spacecraft, the Stallman, was the product of a network of ten thousand volunteers worldwide — and it beat the big corporate players in a competition to be “the first non-governmental organization to put a person back on the moon.”** Cutter, leader of one of the corporate-funded teams, warned that “the Opensource Rocket Program will have a tremendously pernicious effect on humanity and human destiny by destroying the benefit of privatizing space exploration with an unscalable stunt.” And in the ultimate irony, the Stallman‘s crew rescued Cutter’s crew and repaired his disabled ship based on crowdsourced advice from the Openshot global network. **Once you’ve bootstrapped affordable orbital ferries, the addition of 3-D printers and other cheap, open-source micromanufacturing technologies that can be used to construct interplanetary craft in orbit or construct buildings on the surface of other worlds means that the path to the entire solar system lies open. The focus by both corporate ventures like SpaceX and open-source ventures like Copenhagen Suborbital and Bitnation Space Agency, on developing bottom-up infrastructures, one step at a time, arguably amounts to backtracking to a crossroads and getting on the path that space exploration should have taken in the first place. Jim Henley of Unqualified Offerings, in a comment at Pixel Scroll, noted that the Apollo project essentially destroyed the long-term future of the U.S. space program by diverting it away from the necessary work of building a sustainable technological ecosystem:** When I was but a lad, reading Golden Age Science Fiction like Grandpa used to write, because it was what was in the middle-school libraries back in the early 70s, I was struck by how late the dates for a first moon-landing were in stories from the 40s and 50s.I think the earliest date I encountered was maybe 1978, and some of them placed it in the 1990s. And I thought, “Hah! We already got there!”But the mistake those Campbell-era authors made was assuming we’d do it right. That first we’d build a real space station, and develop a sustainable outer-space infrastructure, and then when we went to the Moon, go for keeps.Instead we raced to get there with a few cans full o’ humans, hit some golf balls, planted a flag, and – bagged the whole business. By 1978, that earliest date for a moonshot I’d encountered in fiction, it was like we’d never been there at all. **Rather than organically building an entire technological ecosystem from the ground up, with infrastructures that were immediately useful in their own right at each stage, and then using the existing stage of infrastructure as the jumping off place to build the next stage when it became necessary for the needs of the existing system, Kennedy chose an arbitrary goal for its symbolic value — and the moon has since gone unvisited for forty years while the U.S. space program atrophied. Henley also, anticipating those who point to Elon Musk’s space ventures as a hopeful sign, points out that *“the private Mars foundation gang admits that their strategic plan way underestimates the likely cost.”* But it’s worth considering that the same blockbuster projects that diverted the space program from sustainability also tended to push it towards high-cost technologies beyond the reach of voluntary associations. The effect of the space program’s focus on blockbuster projects like Apollo was to push space travel technology towards extreme capital-intensiveness, and away from the kinds of modular, granular, multi-purpose and reusable building blocks that could evolve into a sustainable technological ecosystem. Corporate space efforts like Musk’s are a first, intermediate step towards developing an affordable, sustainable infrastructure for exploring and developing outer space. And projects like Copenhagen Suborbital and Bitnation Space Agency are completing the evolution by relying entirely on open-source hardware, and replacing high-overhead managerial bureaucracies with peer-network governance. Things look genuinely optimistic for the future of space exploration and human expansion into the solar system. The reason for hopefulness doesn’t lie with the state; and with luck, maybe it won’t lie with Elon Musk for much longer either.**

#### 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 leave the state. 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 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.**

#### There is a possibility of optimistic understanding of the state one in which we can escape violence, but the aff dooms us towards being stuck within the violent system – previous liberation strategies like afro and indigenous futurism require the alternative - 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.**

#### 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, Bevensee:

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 alternative is an anarchist space program – anarchists leave the Earth to establish new colonies free from state capitalist exploitation. The aff makes this impossible by banning private appropriation and re-entrenching the power of the state – the alt occurs outside the realm of the state. Revolution on earth is doomed. Debord

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 fidelity to the truth – dedication to a shared horizon is liberatory and space is the best horizon of all, Dean 19:

Dean, Jodi. Comrade: An essay on political belonging. Verso, 2019. // LHP BT + LHP PS

The idea that comrades are those who belong to the same side of a political struggle leads to the fourth thesis: **The** relation between comrades is mediated by **fidelity to a** truth**;** practices **of comradeship** materialize **this** fidelity**. The “same side” points to the truth comrades are faithful to—the political truth that unites them**—**and the fidelity with which they work to realize this truth in the world.** “Belonging” invites attention to the expectations, practices, and affects that being on the same side generates. The notions of truth and fidelity at work here come from Alain Badiou. In brief, **Badiou rejects the idea of truth as a proposition or judgment, arguing instead that** truth is a process**. The process begins with the eruption of something new, an event.** **Because an event changes the situation, breaks the confines of the given, it is undecidable in terms of the given; it is something entirely new**. Badiou argues that this undecidability “induces the appearance of a *subject* of the event.”[60](about:blank) **This subject isn’t the cause of the event. It’s an effect of or response to the event,** “the decision to *say* that the event has taken place.” Grammar might seduce us into rendering this subject as “I.” **We should** avoid this temptation and **recognize the subject** **as** designating an inflection point, **a response that extends the event.** **The decision that a truth has appeared, that an event has occurred, incites a process of verification**, the “infinite procedure of verification of the true,” **in** **what Badiou calls an “exercise of fidelity**.”[61](about:blank) **Fidelity is a working out and working through of the truth, an engagement with truth that extends out into and changes the world. We should recognize here the unavoidably collective dimension of fidelity: in the political field, verification is a struggle of the many.** Peter Hallward draws out some implications of Badiou’s conception of truth. First, it is subjective. Those faithful to an evental truth involve themselves in working it out, exploring its consequences.[62](about:blank) Second, fidelity is not blind faith; it is rigorous engagement unconcerned with individual personality and incorporated into the body of truth that it generates. Hallward writes:Fidelity is, by definition, ex-centric, directed outward, beyond the limits of a merely personal integrity. To be faithful to an evental implication always means to abandon oneself, rigorously, to the unfolding of its consequences. **Fidelity implies that, if there is truth, it can be only cruelly indifferent to the private as such.** **Every truth involves a kind of anti-privatization, a subjective collectivization. In truth, “I” matter only insofar as I am subsumed by the impersonal vector of truth—say, the political organization, or the scientific research program.**[**63**](about:blank) **The truth process builds a new body**. This body of truth is a collective formed to “work for the consequences of the new” and this work, this collective, disciplines and subsumes the faithful.[64](about:blank)Third, collectivity does not imply uniformity. The infinite procedure of verification incorporates multiple experiments, enactments, and effects.Badiou writes, “An organization lies at the intersection between an Idea and an event. However, this intersection only exists as process, whose immediate subject is the political militant.”[65](about:blank) We should amend this statement by replacing *militant* with *comrade*. Comrade highlights the “discipline of the event,” the way that political fidelity cannot be exercised by a solitary individual—hence, the Marxist-Leninist emphasis on the unity of theory and practice, the barren incapacity of each alone. Comrade also affirms the self-abandonment accompanying fidelity to a truth: its vector, its unfolding, is indifferent to my personal experiences and inclinations. For communists, the process of truth has a body and that body is the party, in both its historical and formal sense. Already in *Theory of the Subject*, Badiou recognizes the necessity of a political body, the party as the “subject-support of all politics.”[66](about:blank) He writes:The party is the body of politics, in the strict sense. The fact that there is a body by no means guarantees that there is a subject … But for there to be a subject, for a subject to be found, there must be the support of a body.[67](about:blank) **As a figure of political belonging, the comrade is a faithful response to the evental rupture of crowds and movements, to the egalitarian discharge that erupts from the force of the many where they don’t belong, to the movement of the people as the subject of politics.**[**68**](about:blank) **Comrades demonstrate fidelity through political work; through concerted, disciplined engagement. Their practical political work extends the truth of the emancipatory egalitarian struggle of the oppressed into the world.** Amending Badiou (by drawing from his earlier work), we can say that the comrade is not a faithful subject but a political relation faithful to the divided people as the subject of emancipatory egalitarian politics.[69](about:blank) **For us to see the revolutionary people as the subject in the struggles of the oppressed, for their subject to be found, we must be comrades.** In *Ninotchka*, Nina Ivanova Yakushova can’t tell who her comrades are by looking at them. The party has told her who to look for, but she has to ask. After Iranoff identifies himself, Yakushova tells him her name and the name and position of the party comrade who authorized her visit. Iranoff introduces Buljanoff and Kopalski. Yakushova addresses each as comrade. But it’s not the address that makes them all comrades. They are comrades because they are members of the same party. **The party is the organized body of truth that mediates their relationship. This mediation makes clear what is expected of comrades—disciplined, faithful work.** Iranoff, Buljanoff, and Kopalski have not been doing the work expected of comrades, which is why Moscow sent Yakushova to oversee them in Paris. That Kopalski says they would have greeted her with flowers demonstrates their *embourgeoisment*, the degeneration of their sense of comradeship. But they are all there for work. Gendered identity and hierarchy don’t mediate relations between comrades. The practices of fidelity to a political truth, the work done toward building that truth in the world, do. The solidarity of comrades in political struggle arises out of the intertwining of truth, practice, and party. It’s not reducible to any of these alone. **Comrades are not simply those who believe in the same truth—as in, for example, the idea of communism. Their fidelity to a certain truth is manifested in practical work.** Work for the realization of a political truth brings people into comradely relation. **But carrying out similar tasks in fidelity to the same truth isn’t sufficient for comradeship. The work must be in common; no one is a comrade on their own. Practices of comradeship are coordinated, organized. The party is the organization out of which comradeship emerges and that comrade relations produce. It concentrates comradeship even as comradeship exceeds it.**

## Case

#### Queer people can engage in the reproductive order – ie queer people can adopt children or prolong their legacy through the symbol of the Child, which takes out the impact of the K – queer people can be included into the political order. Uniquely excludes queers with wombs and positions them as comrade to reproductive futurity in their bodies, denies them choice, frames them as traitors for what may even be a result of rape, precludes understanding couples with trans people in them as queer. independent reason to vote.

#### Alt re-entrenches violence - Being pessimistic and accepting no future is not only incorrect but masks heteronormative and racist violence – hope and utopianism is uniquely key in the context of queer and black youth which means only the K can solve.

**Muñoz 09** prof/chair of performance studies @ NYU (José Esteban, Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity

We know that many of these white friends on the Lower East Side, such as O’Hara and Allen Ginsberg, were also a little lavender. The interview works as a mild disavowal of the play’s ending, a display of ambivalence that ignores its queer affect and tenor. The author’s need to justify his end as the appeasement of his immediate social world needs further scrutiny. A turn to Hegel via Judith Butler’s recent meditation on the longing for recognition can further explicate the stakes in this moment of contact and interracial intimacy.22 Butler tells a tale of recognition, made famous by G. W. F. Hegel in *The Phenomenology of Spirit.23* It is a representative moment that signals the spirit of German philosophical idealism in which Bloch and other utopian thinkers participate, and it further illuminates the play’s ending. Reflecting on the paradigm of the master and the bondsman, Butler outlines the relation to self and other: The moment in “Lordship and Bondage” when the two self-consciousnesses come to recognize one another is, accordingly, in the “life and death struggle,” the moment in which they each see the shared power they have to annihilate the Other and, thereby, destroy the condition of their own self-reflection. Thus, it is as a moment of fundamental vulnerability that recognition becomes possible, and need becomes self-conscious. What recognition does at such a moment is, to be sure, to hold destruction in check.24 The Hegelian narrative is enriched when we insert Frantz Fanon’s contribution to the very central philosophical thematic of self/other and the drama of recognition. If we consider the vicissitudes of the fact of blackness, the radical contingency that is epidermalization, the narrative fills out further and the tale of vulnerability is fleshed out. Recognition, across antagonisms within the social such as sex, race, and still other modalities of difference, is often more than simply a tacit admission of vulnerability. Indeed, it is often a moment of being wounded.25 In this sense I offer *The Toilet* as a tale of wounded recognition. It marks and narrativizes the frenzy of violence that characterizes our cross-identificatory recognition. *The Toilet* teaches us that the practice of recognition is a brutal choreography, scored to the discordant sounds of desire and hate. With that stated, its semidisowned ending speaks to the sticky interface between the interracial and the queer. **The interracial and the queer coanimate each other, and that coanimation, which is not only about homosexuality but about blackness and how the two touch across space and time, takes the form of not only the amalgamation of movements that rate a seizure but also the fragmented gesture that signals an endurance/support, queerness’s being in, toward, and for futurity. Utopian hermeneutics like those invoked in the project of queer futurity consider the forward-dawning significance of the gesture**. Thus, the play’s dramatic conclusion is not an end but, more nearly, an Agambenian means without an end. **Recognition of this order challenges theories of antirelationality that dominate queer criticism, such as Edelman’s** and the Leo Bersani of “Is the Rectum a Grave?” and**,** to a lesser degree, *Homos.26***The act of accepting no future is dependent on renouncing** **politics and various principles of hope that are, by their very nature, relational**. By finishing on a note not of reconciliation but of the refusal of total repudiation—a gestural enduring/supporting—The *Toilet* shows us that **relationality is not pretty, but the option of simply opting out of it, or describing it as something that has never been available to us, is imaginable only if one can frame queerness as a singular abstraction that can be subtracted and isolated from a larger social matrix. In *No Future* Edelman takes on Cornel West’s referencing of futurity** in an op-ed for the *Boston Globe* that he wrote with Sylvia Ann Hewitt titled “A Parent’s Bill of Rights.”27 The title is disturbingly smug (as if biological parents of the middle class did not already have uncontested rights to their children!), and the editorial is a neoliberal screed on behalf of the culture of the child. But Edelman’s critique never considers the topic of race that is central to the actual editorial. West’s pro-children agenda aligns with his other concerns about the crises of African American youth. Edelman’s critique of the editorial, with which for the most part I am deeply sympathetic, is flawed insofar as it decontextualizes West’s work from the topic that has been so central to his critical interventions: blackness. In the same way all queers are not the stealth-universal-white-gay- man invoked in queer antirelational formulations, all children are not the privileged white babies to whom contemporary society caters. Again, there is for me a lot to like in this critique of antireproductive futurism, but in Edelman’s theory it is enacted by the active disavowal of a crisis in afrofuturism.28 **Theories of queer temporality that fail to factor in the relational relevance of race or class merely reproduce a crypto-universal white gay subject that is weirdly atemporal—which is to say a subject whose time is a restricted and restricting hollowed-out present free of the need for the challenge of imagining a futurity that exists beyond the self or the here and now**. The question of children hangs heavily when one considers Baraka’s present. On August 12, 2003, one of his daughters, Shani Baraka, and her female lover, Rayshon Holmes, were killed by the estranged husband of Wanda Pasha, who is also one of Baraka’s daughters. The thirty-one- and thirty-year-old women’s murders were preceded a few months earlier by another hate crime in Newark, the killing of fifteen-year-old Sakia Gunn. Gunn was a black transgendered youth who traveled from Hoboken to Greenwich Village and the Christopher Street piers to hang out with other young queers of color. Baraka and his wife, Amina, have in part dealt with the tragic loss of their daughter by turning to activism. The violent fate of their child has alerted them to the systemic violence that faces queer people (and especially young people) of color. The Barakas have both become ardent antiviolence activists speaking out directly on LGBT issues. Real violence has ironically brought Baraka back to a queer world that he had renounced so many years ago. Through his tremendous loss he has decided to further diversify his consistent commitment to activism and social justice to include what can only be understood as queer politics. **In the world of *The Toilet* there are no hate crimes, no lexicon that identifies homophobia per se, but there is the fact of an aggression constantly on the verge of brutal actualization. The mimetic violence resonates across time and to the scene of the loss that the author will endure decades later. This story from real life is not meant to serve as the proof for my argument**. Indeed, **the play’s highly homoerotic violence is in crucial ways nothing like the misogynist violence against women that befell the dramatist’s family or the transgenderphobic violence that ended Gunn’s young life**. I mention these tragedies because it makes one simple point. The future is only the stuff of some kids. Racialized kids, queer kids, are not the sovereign princes of futurity. Although Edelman does indicate that the future of the child as futurity is different from the future of actual children, his framing nonetheless accepts and reproduces this monolithic figure of the child that is indeed always already white. He all but ignores the point that other modes of particularity within the social are constitutive of subjecthood beyond the kind of jouissance that refuses both narratological meaning and what he understands as the fantasy of futurity. He anticipates and bristles against his future critics with a precognitive paranoia in footnote 19 of his first chapter. He rightly predicts that some identitarian critics (I suppose that would be me in this instance, despite my ambivalent relation to the concept of identity) would dismiss his polemic by saying it is determined by his middle-class white gay male positionality. This attempt to inoculate himself from those who engage his polemic does not do the job. In the final analysis, white gay male crypto-identity politics (the restaging of whiteness as universal norm via the imaginary negation of all other identities that position themselves as not white) is beside the point. **The deeper point is indeed “political,”** as, but certainly not more, political than Edelman’s argument. **It is important not to hand over futurity to normative white reproductive futurity. That dominant mode of futurity is indeed “winning;’ but that is all the more reason to call on a utopian political imagination that will enable us to glimpse another time and place: a “not-yet” where queer youths of color actually get to grow up. Utopian and willfully idealistic practices of thought are in order if we are to resist the perils of heteronormative pragmatism and Anglo-normative pessimism. Imagining a queer subject who is abstracted from the sensuous intersectionalities that mark our experience is an ineffectual way out. Such an escape via singularity is a ticket whose price most cannot afford. The way to deal with the asymmetries and violent frenzies that mark the present is not to forget the future. The here and now is simply not enough. Queerness should and could be about a desire for another way of being in both the world and time, a desire that resists mandates to accept that which is not enough.**

#### Negative queer pessimism is inherently colorblind and disavows bodies who are racialized –meaning their epistemology could never escape Eurocentric epistemic lens and understanding of hope and dispossession—independent reason to vote neg

**Bliss 15** (Hope Against Hope: Queer Negativity, Black Feminist Theorizing, and Reproduction without Futurity Mosaic: a journal for the interdisciplinary study of literature, Volume 48, Number 1, March 2015, pp. 83-98 (Article)

**I want to begin, then, with some reflections on the project of queer negativity**. In the hands of literary theorist Lee Edelman, the antirelational position developed across the oeuvre of Leo Bersani has shifted from a critique of the sanitization of sexuality into a position against the reproduction of society—futurity—itself. Edelman’s 2004 monograph, No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive, offers an iconoclastic revision and re-envisioning of the antirelational project. Edelman’s text positions itself against **“reproductive futurity,” or “the dominant ideology of the social [. . . that] represents futurity in the image of the innocent child”** (Dean, “Antisocial” 827). This image of the Child is central to Edelman’s work, insofar as the force of its presence polices queerness and queer politics. **For Edelman, the Child “remains the perpetual horizon of every acknowledged politics, [and] the fantasmatic beneficiary of every political intervention” (3). Thus, Edelman offers a vision of a queer ethics that is against the future and against the Child that symbolizes the future.** Indeed, the force of Edelman’s polemic obtains in his insistence that queers embrace the very disorder imputed to them by the dominant society. In a much-cited passage, Edelman argues that resistance must affirm “what the Law and the Pope and the whole of the Symbolic order for which they stand hear anyway in each and every expression or manifestation of queer sexuality: fuck the social order and the Child in whose name we’re collectively terrorized; fuck Annie; Fuck the waif from Les Mis; fuck the poor, innocent kid on the Net; fuck Laws both with capital ls and with small; fuck the whole network of Symbolic relations and the future that serves as its prop” (29). For Edelman, this is precisely to argue that “what is queerest about us [. . .] is this willingness [. . .] to insist that the future stop here” (31). **In other words, the queer “is the figure currently capable of unraveling the libidinal economy of signification through which a particular dominant socius reproduces itself”** (Keeling 567-68). It is in the rejection of the future—indeed, an embrace of this rejection—that Edelman discovers the possibility of fundamentally undoing the dominant social order. Critiques of Edelman have run the gamut from accusations that **his arguments amount to little more than a dissembled optimism, that he ignores the polymorphous perversity of really-existing children, that he misapprehends Lacan entirely, and that his polemic is overwritten by an intransigent, smirking whiteness that limits the applicability of his conclusions**.1 Fair enough. For my part, I am interested in how the latter critique has been marshaled by some utopian (or, to borrow from José Muñoz, anti-antiutopian) **queer theorists whose critiques rely on the figure of the “other” child.**2 In a 2007 GLQ roundtable, Judith Halberstam described Edelman’s project as “utterly compelling [. . .] for certain subjects in certain social locations. For others, that place of pure critique might constitute epistemological self-destruction” (Dinshaw et al. 194). To which Edelman challenged, especially for Halberstam’s “unidentified ‘others,’” “why not endorse, to the contrary, ‘epistemological self-destruction’ for all? Why not accept that queerness, taken seriously, demands nothing less?” (195) **In their endorsement of Muñoz’s Cruising Utopia, Halberstam restates this position, that “for some queers, particularly for queers of color, hope is not something one can afford to lose and for them giving up on futurity is not an option.”**3 Indeed, **Muñoz himself offers that “the future is only the stuff of some kids**. **Racialized kids, queer kids, are not the sovereign princes of futurity”** (95). For Halberstam and Muñoz, **Edelman’s stubborn refusal of futurity is structured by the privilege of having a guaranteed future, foreclosing the possibility that his project can speak to the concerns of non-white queers**. **More interesting, perhaps, is to consider how Edelman’s avoidance of race weakens his critique of the Child and futurity**. Neither Edelman nor his utopian critics seem willing or able to imagine a mode of reproduction that is not reproductive futurism; that is, Black reproduction. On this score, we can consider Hortense Spillers’s seminal essay, “Mama’s Baby, Papa’s Maybe: An American Grammar Book.” In her gloss of the Moynihan Report, Spillers seems to anticipate Edelman’s wellknown passage, quoted above: “According to Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s celebrated ‘Report’ of the late sixties, the ‘Negro Family’ has no father to speak of—his name, his law, his symbolic function mark the impressive missing agencies in the essential life of the black community” (204). On Spillers’s reading, the father, the L/law, and the “whole network of symbolic relations” that Edelman rejects in the name of the queer are foreclosed a priori for the Black. Spillers marks how “the Black family” is refused entry into the symbolic order except negatively as a site of pure dysfunction. This incoherence that accrues around Black filiation is also what Orlando Patterson has labeled “natal alienation.”

#### Alt bites back into itself and destroys any chance of solving anti queer violence - Embracing queerness as the death drive depends on the deferral of futurity, which locks their resistance into a repetitive cycle of symbolic opposition

Snediker 06 (Michael Snediker, Visiting Assistant Professor of American Literature at Mount Holyoke College, 2006, Postmodern Culture, Vol. 16, No. 3)

The thrill of the death drive, thus instantiated, is less in knowing one's relation to a funnel of semen than in not knowing. The death drive, for all its externally imposed Tarantino-esque luridness, depends on the contingencies of knowing, themselves dependent on a horizon in which contingencies might themselves come to fruition (or to recall Edelman's reading of The Birds, come to roost). The death drive, then, doesn't oppose futurity so much as depend on the deferral of futurity so as to extend as long as possible the Jamesian project of waiting. The death drive, even in its cathexis to deferring, is futurally organized. The death drive may be impulsive (the manner of drives), but maximization of its concomitant pleasures requires patience, in requiring and being ravished by the tick of minutes, hours, days, in between the fever-dream of possibility and its coming or not coming (as it were) to pass.

#### Overkill denies queerness by focusing on the violence and ignoring the true queer gesture –after the bashing, holding one’s battered lover and so creating a breath of queer future. The k is the same heteronormative logic of the homophobic parent crying because their kid is queer and they wanted the kid to grow up happy, framing love as impossible for queer people.

Munoz 07 [Munoz, Jose Esteban. 2007. “Cruising the Toilet: Leroi Jones/amiri Baraka, Radical Black Traditions, and Queer Futurity.” GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies 13 (2): 353–67.] // SJ AME

Battered and bruised, shattered by internal and external frenzies of homophobic violence, the combatant lovers nonetheless have this moment of wounded recognition that tells us that the moment in time and in this place, the moment of a pain-riddled youth, is not all there is, that indeed something is missing. The gestural speaks to that which is, to use Bloch’s phrase, the not-yet-here. The gesture is not the coherence or totality of movement. Gesture for Giorgio Agamben is exemplary of the politics of a “means without ends.” The gestural exists as an idealist manifestation and not as a monolithic act directed toward an “end”: “What characterizes gesture is that in it nothing is being produced or acted, but something is being endured and supported.”15 The gesture interrupts the normative flow of time and movement. The image of the lover holding/enduring/supporting the other’s battered body is poignant when we recall that Foots, who is always doing/running his mouth or his feet, is finally still, living within the queer temporality of the gestural, a temporality that sidesteps straight time’s heteronormative bent. The politics of queer utopia are similarly not based on prescriptive ends but, instead, on the significance of a critical function that resonates like the temporal interruption of the gesture. Bloch rejected what he called “abstract utopias” that, within the frame of Agamben’s writing, would indeed be a prescriptive “end.”16 The queer futurity that I am describing is not an end but an opening or horizon. Queer utopia is a modality of critique that speaks to quotidian gestures as laden with potentiality. The queerness of queer futurity, like the blackness of a black radical tradition, is a relational and collective modal- ity of endurance and support. The gesture of cradling one’s lover’s head, a lover one has betrayed, is therefore not an act of redemption that mitigates violence; it is instead a future being within the present that is both a utopian kernel and an anticipatory illumination. It is a being in, toward, and for futurity.