# 2nr

#### Space is not inaccessible – anarchist space is possible, Carson 19:

Carson, Kevin. 8th Feb 2019. “Ephemeralization for Post-Capitalist Space Exploration.” <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/kevin-carson-ephemeralization-for-post-capitalist-space-exploration>

**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:** Create a decentralized and open-source space agency.Research and develop new and better technology for space-travel/space-missions. Develop new eco-friendly fuel for space vehicles. (Rocket fuel) 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. 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. 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. Research alternative energy sources, mainly anti-matter trapped in the Earth’s magnetic field. Research and develop technology for mining minerals and resources on other celestial bodies, like the Moon or asteroids. 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. Building fuel-depots and an international network based on virtual currencies for refueling of satellites and other space vehicles. Doing research in the field of space-medicine and the effects of microgravity and cosmic radiation on living organisms.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.**

# 1NC vs. Valley SJ

## Offs

### T

#### Interp: The 1AC plan text must defend a policy action.

#### "Resolved:" the appropriation of outer space by private entities is "unjust" entails policy action:

#### 1---Resolved.

Merriam Webster '18 (Merriam Webster; 2018 Edition; Online dictionary and legal resource; Merriam Webster, "resolve," <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolve;> RP)  
: a legal or official determination especially: a legislative declaration

#### 2---Unjust.

Black’s Law [The Law Dictionary Featuring Black's Law Dictionary Free Online Legal Dictionary 2nd Ed. No Date. <https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/>] brett

What is UNJUST?

Contrary to right and justice, or to the enjoyment of his rights by another, or to the standards of conduct furnished by the laws.

#### Violation: There’s no plan, they defend the res as a general rule.

#### Prefer:

#### 1---Vagueness---debates inevitably involve the AFF defending something, but only our interp forces that to be clearly defined that from the start. Their model leads to late-breaking debates that destroy ground, for example we won’t know if asteroid mining or space exploration are offense until the 1AR, which skews neg prep.

#### 2---Topic ed---specific policies teaches lets us go deep into the topic, uniquely important given the evolving character of space law – outweighs bc we only have 2 month topics, and phil ed is solved by free textbooks – space law is inseparable from actual policy actions.

#### Fairness is a voter – it’s intrinsic to any competitive activity

#### Education’s a voter – it’s why schools fund debate

#### Competing interpretations—it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for. Reasonability is arbitrary and unpredictable, inviting a race to the bottom and we’ll win it links to our offense. I know you don’t like theory but this is not frivolous theory, and something where optimal norms matter.

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse and because the 2N doesn’t get new disads to whole rez so it’s permanently skewed.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical – you can’t say I’m fair vote for me, which is a metaconstraint on all argumentation B] baiting – people will be abusive to bait out theory and then win on the rvi, which invites infinite abuse that outweighs on magnitude

### NC

Moral theories must judge action as a unified whole.  If they did not, the separate steps in the chain of action would not be justified.  In the process of doing a whole action, the steps are not disconnected, but rather so connected that one interruption would disrupt the entire action. **Rodl 2K,** Rodl I (Rödl, Sebastian. Self-Consciousness, Harvard University Press, 2000) **Suppose** I walked from a to c, via b.  It may be that **I decided to walk from a to b, and, having got there, [then] decided to walk from b to c.  Or I decided to walk from a to c, and did**.  In the former case, I was walking from a to b, and then I was walking from b to c.  But **only in the latter case**, not in the former, **was I walking from a to c.  As a movement, an action is not an aggregate, but a unity of phases.**

**And, that requires atemporal judgements – anything else can be disregarded at any moment which destroys motivation and culpability. Rodl 2,** Rodl I (Rödl, Sebastian. Self-Consciousness, Harvard University Press, 2000)**[Because] judgments that represent changeable states cannot be the ground of an intention**, which is the principle of a movement. So the necessarily represented **[a] unity of ends must bear a different kind of temporality.** We shall now suggest that the relevant unity is a unity not of desire, but of what we shall call infinite ends. Just as the concept of desire, so is our concept of an infinite end defined by the form of a thought that constitutes adherence to it. As a man may desire noble things, so may his infinite ends be base, if base things figure in his thoughts of the relevant form. All-things-considered **[while desire] judgments join subject and action**-form **at a time.** An intention joins them progressively, guiding the progress of the action. If the representation of **an infinite end** is to **provide[s] the principle of temporal synthesis of an action [and]**, it **must [not] join subject and action**-form neither **at a time** nor progressively, but in a way that, metaphorically speaking, always already contains the whole of a temporally extended action. We shall see that **this means that its predication is time-general.** “I am getting my tools because I want to repair my bicycle”, I say. “Why do you want to repair your bicycle?,” you ask. “ I want to go cycling.” But why go cycling? It is healthy. Is this an instrumental syllogism? It appears so. Does not it represent health as an end and cycling as a means? It is true, we call **[for example if] health [is] an infinite end.** But it is an end in a different sense from repairing a bicycle; the end and what is done in its service relate differently in these cases. Infinite ends are time-general; this distinguishes them from desires. I may one moment feel like going to the movies, the next moment feel like staying home, and a minute later again think that going to the movies would be nice. But it makes no sense to say that, one moment, I cared about my health, was completely indifferent to it the next moment, and a bit later again cared greatly about it. If I want health, **then [health] manifests itself in actions at various times; wanting health is time-general and not tied to a moment.**

#### Action theory comes first –

#### 1. States of affairs only care about ethical decision making insofar as there is an entity and an action that is coherent enough to achieve that normative end. Every decision made is an action, even inaction which means the NC is inescapable.

#### 2. Culpability – To conceive yourself as the cause of your actions, an analysis of how one acts is a priori – otherwise we would never hold agents accountable since they would claim they were not an agent capable of generating an action with normative force.

#### I contend the aff violates the principles of action theory.

#### 1.The resolution is a passive statement – it doesn’t prescribe action but rather makes a value statement about justice so there’s no action to judge the morality of the aff by and u negate.

#### 2. The aff can’t generate an atemporal obligation because it is contingent on empirical circumstances that the aff is currently taking place in (ie uniqueness)

### K

#### 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.**

#### 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, 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!**

## Case

### OV

#### Appropriation is the process through which the subject exerts the will on the world and therefore, constitutes itself as a being with will,

#### This is literally what their framework defines as appropriation. Framework definitions obligations better –

#### A] consistency

#### B] defines our action

#### SO it outweighs at the highest layer

### Turns

#### Property is good –

#### 1] truth claim can only be proven by argumentation which contains the axiomatic assumption that freedom is good.

Kinsella 11[Stephan Kinsella, (Stephan Kinsella is an attorney in Houston, director of the Center for the Study of Innovative Freedom, and editor of Libertarian Papers.) "Argumentation Ethics and Liberty: A Concise Guide" Mises Institute, 5-27-2011, https://mises.org/library/argumentation-ethics-and-liberty-concise-guide, DOA:5-4-2020]

In setting the stage, Hoppe first observes that the standard natural-rights argument is lacking: It has been a common quarrel with the natural rights position, even on the part of sympathetic readers, that the concept of human nature is far "too diffuse and varied to provide a determinate set of contents of natural law." Furthermore, its description of rationality is equally ambiguous in that it does not seem to distinguish between the role of reason in establishing empirical laws of nature on the one hand and normative laws of human conduct on the other. ([The Economics and Ethics of Private Property](http://mises.org/resources/860/The-Economics-and-Ethics-of-Private-Property-Studies-in-Political-Economy-and-Philosophy) [EEPP], p. 313; also [A Theory of Socialism and Capitalism](http://mises.org/resources/431/A-Theory-of-Socialism-and-Capitalism) [TSC], p. 156n118) Hoppe's solution is to focus on the nature of argumentation instead of action in general: The praxeological approach solves this problem by recognizing that it is not the wider concept of human nature but the narrower one of propositional exchanges and argumentation which must serve as the starting point in deriving an ethic. ([EEPP](http://mises.org/resources/860/The-Economics-and-Ethics-of-Private-Property-Studies-in-Political-Economy-and-Philosophy), p. 345) Here he draws on the work of his PhD advisor, the famous European philosopher [Jürgen Habermas](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J%C3%BCrgen_Habermas), and fellow German philosopher [Karl-Otto Apel](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl-Otto_Apel), who had developed a theory of "discourse ethics" or "argumentation ethics." As Hoppe explains this basic approach, any truth claim, the claim connected with any proposition that it is true, objective or valid (all terms used synonymously here), is and must be raised and settled in the course of an argumentation. Since it cannot be disputed that this is so (one cannot communicate and argue that one cannot communicate and argue), and since it must be assumed that everyone knows what it means to claim something to be true (one cannot deny this statement without claiming its negation to be true), this very fact has been aptly called "the a priori of communication and argumentation." ([EEPP](http://mises.org/resources/860/The-Economics-and-Ethics-of-Private-Property-Studies-in-Political-Economy-and-Philosophy), p. 314) That is, there are certain norms presupposed by the very activity of arguing. Apel and Habermas go on to argue that the ethics presupposed as legitimate by discourse as such justify the standard set of soft-socialist policies. But Hoppe, while recognizing the value of the basic approach, rejected their application of this theory and socialist conclusions. Instead, Hoppe took what was valuable in the Apel-Habermas approach and melded it with Misesian-Rothbardian insights to provide a praxeological-discourse-ethics twist on the standard natural-law defense of rights.In essence, Hoppe's view is that argumentation, or discourse, is by its nature a conflict-free way of interacting, which requires individual control of scarce resources. In genuine discourse, the parties try to persuade each other by the force of their argument, not by actual force: Argumentation is a conflict-free way of interacting. Not in the sense that there is always agreement on the things said, but in the sense that as long as argumentation is in progress it is always possible to agree at least on the fact that there is disagreement about the validity of what has been said. And this is to say nothing else than that a mutual recognition of each person's exclusive control over his [their] own body must be presupposed as long as there is argumentation (note again, that it is impossible to deny this and claim this denial to be true without implicitly having to admit its truth). (TSC, p. 158) Thus, self-ownership is presupposed by argumentation. Hoppe then shows that argumentation also presupposes the right to own homesteaded scarce resources as well. The basic idea here is that the body is "the prototype of a scarce good for the use of which property rights, i.e., rights of exclusive ownership, somehow have to be established, in order to avoid clashes" (TSC, p. 19). As Hoppe explains, The compatibility of this principle with that of nonaggression can be demonstrated by means of an argumentum a contrario. First, it should be noted that if no one had the right to acquire and control anything except his [their] own body, then we would all cease to exist and the problem of the justification of normative statements simply would not exist. The existence of this problem is only possible because we are alive, and our existence is due to the fact that we do not, indeed cannot, accept a norm outlawing property in other scarce goods next and in addition to that of one's physical body. Hence, the right to acquire such goods must be assumed to exist. (TSC, p. 161).

#### 2] Inevitable