## OFF

#### Interpretation – the aff may not defend that the appropriation of outer space by a certain set of private entities is unjust.

#### Entities is a generic bare plural

**Nebel 20** [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Indefinite Singular Generics in Debate” Victory Briefs, 19 August 2020. no url AG

I agree that if “a democracy” in the resolution just meant “one or more democracy,” then a country-specific affirmative could be topical. But, as I will explain in this topic analysis, that isn’t what “a democracy” means in the resolution. To see why, we first need to back up a bit and review (or learn) the idea of generic generalizations.

The most common way of expressing a generic in English is through a *bare plural*. **A bare plural is a plural noun phrase, like “dogs” and “cats,” that lacks an overt determiner**. (A determiner is **a word that tells us which or how many**: determiners include quantifier words like “all,” “some,” and “most,” demonstratives like “this” and “those,” posses- sives like “mine” and “its,” and so on.) LD resolutions often contain bare plurals, and **that is the most common clue to their genericity**.

We have already seen some examples of generics that are not bare plurals: “A whale is a mammal,” “A beaver builds dams,” and “The woolly mammoth is extinct.” The first two examples use indefinite singulars—singular nouns preceded by the indefinite article “a”—and the third is a definite singular since it is preceded by the definite article “the.” Generics can also be expressed with bare singulars (“Syrup is viscous”) and even verbs (as we’ll see later on). The resolution’s “a democracy” is an indefinite singular, and so it very well might be—and, as we’ll soon see, is—generic.

But it is also important to keep in mind that, just as not all generics are bare plurals, not all bare plurals are generic. “Dogs are barking” is true as long as some dogs are barking. Bare plurals can be used in particular ways to express existential statements. The key question for any given debate resolution that contains a bare plural is whether that occurrence of the bare plural is generic or existential.

The same is true of indefinite singulars. As debaters will be quick to point out, some uses of the indefinite singular really do mean “some” or “one or more”: “A cat is on the mat” is clearly not a generic generalization about cats; it’s true as long as some cat is on the mat. The question is whether the indefinite singular “a democracy” is existential or generic in the resolution.

Now, my own view is that, if we understand the difference between existential and generic statements, and if we approach the question impartially, without any invest- ment in one side of the debate, we can almost always just tell which reading is correct just by thinking about it. **It is clear that “In a democracy, voting ought to be compul- sory” doesn’t mean “There is one or more democracy in which voting ought to be com- pulsory.”** I don’t think a fancy argument should be required to show this any more than a fancy argument should be required to show that “A duck doesn’t lay eggs” is a generic—a false one because ducks do lay eggs, even though some ducks (namely males) don’t. And if a debater contests this by insisting that “a democracy” is existen- tial, the judge should be willing to resolve competing claims by, well, judging—that is, by using her judgment. Contesting a claim by insisting on its negation or demanding justification doesn’t put any obligation on the judge to be neutral about it. (Otherwise the negative could make every debate irresolvable by just insisting on the negation of every statement in the affirmative speeches.) Even if the insistence is backed by some sort of argument, we can reasonably reject an argument if we know its conclusion to be false, even if we are not in a position to know exactly where the argument goes wrong. Particularly in matters of logic and language, speakers have more direct knowledge of particular cases (e.g., that some specific inference is invalid or some specific sentence is infelicitious) than of the underlying explanations.

But that is just my view, and not every judge agrees with me, so it will be helpful to consider some arguments for the conclusion that we already know to be true: that, even if the United States is a democracy and ought to have compulsory voting, that doesn’t suffice to show that, in a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory—in other words, that “a democracy” in the resolution is generic, not existential.

Second, **existential uses of the indefinite, such as “A cat is on the mat,” are upward- entailing.3 This means that if you replace the noun with a more general one, such as “An animal is on the mat,” the sentence will still be true. So let’s do that with “a democracy.” Does the resolution entail “In a society, voting ought to be compulsory”? Intuitively no**t, because you could think that voting ought to be compulsory in democracies but not in other sorts of societies. This suggests that “**a democracy” in the resolution is not existential**.

#### It applies to this topic – a] entities is an existential bare plural bc it has no determiner b] The sentence “The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust” does not imply “the appropriation of outer space by private and public entities is unjust”

#### Violation – they spec Chinese private entities.

#### Standards

#### 1] Limits – they can spec infinite different entities like spaceX, etc.. - that’s supercharged by the ability to spec combinations of types of entities. This takes out functional limits – it’s impossible for me to research every possible combination of entities, governments, and appropriation.

#### 2] TVA solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff – we don’t stop them from reading new FWs, mechanisms or advantages. PICs aren’t aff offense – a] it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff being non-T b] There’s only a small number of pics on this topic c] PICs incentivize them to write better affs that can generate solvency deficits to PICs
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#### The affirmative offers a solution: implement a restriction on Chinese private entities to secure hegemony. This is the wrong approach—we exist within a “control society,” where power is exercised not through repression, but continuous control-- frame this round as an interrogation of productivity and desire.

Deleuze 92[Gilles Deleuze was a French philosopher who, from the early 1950s until his death in 1995, wrote on philosophy, literature, film, and fine art. His most popular works were the two volumes of Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Anti-Oedipus and A Thousand Plateaus, both co-written with psychoanalyst Félix Guattari, Postscript on the Societies of Control on JSTOR, Winter 1992,The MIT press,https://www.jstor.org/stable/778828?seq=1, 12-11-2021 amrita]

The different internments or spaces of enclosure through which the individual passes are independent variables: each time one is supposed to start from zero, and although a common language for all these places exists, it is analogical. On the other hand, **the different control mechanisms are inseparable variations, forming a system of variable geometry the language of which is numerical** (which doesn’t necessarily mean binary). Enclosures are molds, distinct castings, but controls are a modulation, like a self-deforming cast that will continuously change from one moment to the other, or like a sieve whose mesh will transmute from point to point. This is obvious in the matter of salaries: the factory was a body that contained its internal forces at a level of equilibrium, the highest possible in terms of production, the lowest possible in terms of wages; but **in a society of control, the corporation has replaced the factory, and** the corporation is a spirit, a gas. Of course the factory was already familiar with the system of bonuses, but **the corporation works more deeply to impose a modulation of each salary, in states of perpetual metastability** that operate through challenges, contests, and highly comic group sessions. If the most idiotic television game shows are so successful, it’s because they express the corporate situation with great precision. The factory constituted individuals as a single body to the double advantage of the boss who surveyed each element within the mass and the unions who mobilized a mass resistance; but **the corporation constantly presents the brashest rivalry as a healthy form of emulation, an excellent motivational force that opposes individuals** against one another and runs through each, dividing each within. The modulating principle of “salary according to merit**” has not failed to tempt national education itself**. Indeed, just as the corporation replaces the factory, **perpetual training tends to replace the school, and continuous control to replace the examination, which is the surest way of delivering the school over to the corporation**. In the disciplinary societies one was always starting again (from school to the barracks, from the barracks to the factory), while in the societies of control one is never finished with anything—the corporation, the educational system, the armed services being metastable states coexisting in one and the same modulation, like a universal system of deformation. In The Trial, Kafka, who had already placed himself at the pivotal point between two types of social formation, described the most fearsome of juridical forms. The apparent acquittal of the disciplinary societies (between two incarcerations); and the limitless postponements of the societies of control (in continuous variation) are two very different modes of juridical life, and if our law is hesitant, itself in crisis, it’s because we are leaving one in order to enter into the other. **The disciplinary societies have two poles: the signature that designates the individual, and the number or administrative numeration that indicates his or her position within a mass**. This is because the disciplines never saw any incompatibility between these two, and because at the same time power individualizes and masses together, that is, constitutes those over whom it exercises power into a body and molds the individuality of each member of that body. (Foucault saw the origin of this double charge in the pastoral power of the priest—the flock and each of its animals—but civil power moves in turn and by other means to make itself lay “priest.”) **In the societies of control, on the other hand, what is important** is no **longer either a signature or a number, but a code:** the code is a password, while on the other hand the disciplinary societies are regulated by watchwords (as much from the point of view of integration as from that of resistance). The numerical language of control is made of codes that mark access to information, or reject it. **We no longer find ourselves dealing with the mass/individual pair.** Individuals have become “dividuals,” and masses, samples, data, markets, or “banks.” Perhaps it is money that expresses the distinction between the two societies best, since discipline always referred back to minted money that locks gold in as numerical standard, while control relates to floating rates of exchange, modulated according to a rate established by a set of standard currencies. The old monetary mole is the animal of the spaces of enclosure, but the serpent is that of the societies of control. We have passed from one animal to the other, from the mole to the serpent, in the system under which we live, but also in our manner of living and in our relations with others. The disciplinary man was a discontinuous producer of energy, but the man of control is undulatory, in orbit, in a continuous network. Everywhere surfing has already replaced the older sports. Types of machines are easily matched with each type of society—not that machines are determining, but because they express those social forms capable of generating them and using them. The old societies of sovereignty made use of simple machines—levers, pulleys, clocks; but the recent disciplinary societies equipped themselves with machines involving energy, with the passive danger of entropy and the active danger of sabotage; the societies of control operate with machines of a third type, computers, whose passive danger is jamming and whose active one is piracy and the introduction of viruses. This technological evolution must be, even more profoundly, a mutation of capitalism, an already well-known or familiar mutation that can be summed up as follows: nineteenth-century capitalism is a capitalism of concentration, for production and for property. **It therefore erects the factory as a space of enclosure, the capitalist being the owner of the means of production but also, progressively, the owner of other spaces conceived through analogy** (the worker’s familial house, the school). As for markets, they are conquered sometimes by specialization, sometimes by colonization, sometimes by lowering the costs of production. But**, in the present situation, capitalism is no longer involved in production, which it often relegates to the Third World, even for the complex forms of textiles, metallurgy, or oil production. It’s a capitalism of higher-order production.** It no longer buys raw materials and no longer sells the finished products: it buys the finished products or assembles parts. What it wants to sell is services and what it wants to buy is stocks. **This is no longer a capitalism for production but for the product, which is to say, for being sold or marketed. Thus it is essentially dispersive, and the factory has given way to the corporation.** The family, the school, the army, the factory are **no longer the distinct analogical spaces that converge towards an owner—state or private power—but coded figures—deformable and transformable—of a single corporation that now has only stockholders**. Even art has left the spaces of enclosure in order to enter into the open circuits of the bank. The conquests of the market are made by grabbing control and no longer by disciplinary training, by fixing the exchange rate much more than by lowering costs, by transformation of the product more than by specialization of production. Corruption thereby gains a new power. Marketing has become the center or the “soul” of the corporation. We are taught that corporations have a soul, which is the most terrifying news in the world. The operation of markets is now the instrument of social control and forms the impudent breed of our masters. Control is short-term and of rapid rates of turnover, but also continuous and without limit, while discipline was of long duration, infinite and discontinuous. Man is no longer man enclosed, but man in debt. It is true that capitalism has retained as a constant the extreme poverty of three-quarters of humanity, too poor for debt, too numerous for confinement: control will not only have to deal with erosions of frontiers but with the explosions within shanty towns or ghettos.

#### Distinctions between the private and public sphere do not exist-- the affirmative’s theorization of such is the latest tactic of control society to modulate the enunciation of behavior and subjectivity through fascist mechanisms.

Hardt 98 [Michael Hardt is an American political philosopher and literary theorist. Hardt is best known for his book Empire, which was co-written with Antonio Negri. It has been praised by Slavoj Žižek as the "Communist Manifesto of the 21st Century". He is currently a professor of literature at Duke University, The Global Society of Control on JSTOR, Fall 1998, Discourse Vol. 20, No. 3, Gilles Deleuze: A Reason to Believe in this World, https://www.jstor.org/stable/41389503, 12-14-2021 amrita]

There Is No More Outside The passage from disciplinary society to **the society of control is characterized** first of all **by the collapse of** the walls **that defined** the **institutions. There is progressively less distinction,** in other words, between inside and outside. This is really part of a general change in the way that power marks space in the passage from modernity to postmodernity. Modern sovereignty has always been conceived in terms of a (real or imagined) territory and the relation of that territory to its outside. Early modern social theorists, for example,from Hobbes to Rousseau, understood the civil order as a limited and interior space that is opposed or contrasted to the external order of nature. The bounded space of civil order, its place, is defined by its separation from the external spaces of nature. In an analogous fashion, the theorists of modern psychology understood drives, passions, instincts, and the unconscious metaphorically in spatial terms as an outside within the human mind, a continuation of nature deep within us. Here the sovereignty of the Self rests on a dialectical relation between the natural order of drives and the civil order of reason or consciousness. Finally, modern anthropology's various discourses on primitive societies often function as the outside that defines the bounds of the civil world. **The process of modernization**, then, in all these varied contexts, **is the internalization of the outside,** that is, the civilization of nature. In the postmodern world, **however, this dialectic** between inside and outside, between the civil order and the natural order, **has come to an end**. This is one precise sense in which the contemporary world is postmodern. "Postmodernism," Fredric Jameson tells us, "is what **you have when the modernization process is complete and nature is gone for good**."3 Certainly we continue to have forests and crickets and thunderstorms in our world, and we continue to understand our psyches as driven by natural instincts and passions, but we have no nature in the sense that these forces and phenomena are no longer understood as outside, that is, they are not seen as original and independent of the artifice of the civil order. In a postmodern world all phenomena and forces are artificial, or as some might say, part of history. The modern dialectic of inside and outside **has been replaced by a play of degrees** and intensities, of hybridity **and** artificiality. Secondly, the outside **has also declined in terms of** a rather different modern **dialectic that defined the relation between public and private in liberal political theory**. The **public spaces** of modern society, **which constitute the place of liberal politics, tend to disappear** in the postmodern world. According to the liberal tradition, the modern individual, at home in its private spaces, regards the public as its outside. The outside is the place proper to politics, where the action of the individual is exposed in the presence of others and there seeks recognition. In the process of postmodernization, however, **such public spaces are increasingly becoming privatized**. The urban landscape is shifting from the modern focus on the common square and the public encounter to the closed spaces of malls, freeways, and gated communities. The architecture and urban planning of megalopolises such as Los Angeles and Sao Paulo have tended to limit public access and interaction as well as limited chance encounters of different social subjects, creating rather a series of protected interior and isolated spaces. Alternatively, consider how the banlieu of Paris has become a series of amorphous and indefinite spaces that promote isolation rather than any interaction or communication. **Public space has been privatized to such an extent** that **it no longer makes sense to understand social organization in terms of a dialectic between private and public spaces**, between inside and outside. The **place of modern liberal politics has disappeared** **and thus from this optic our postmodern and imperial society** **is characterized by a deficit of the political**. In effect, the place of politics has been deactualized. In this regard, Guy Debord's analysis of the society of the spectacle, thirty years after its composition, seems ever more apt and urgent.4 In postmodern society the spectacle is a virtual place, or more accurately, a non-place of politics. The **spectacle is at once unified** and diffuse in such a way that **it is impossible to distinguish** any inside from outside - the natural from the social, **the private from the public**. The **liberal notion of the public**, the place outside where we act in the presence of others, **has been** both **universalized** (because we are always now under the gaze of others, monitored by safety cameras) **and sublimated** or de-actualized in the virtual spaces of the spectacle. The end of the outside is the end of liberal politics. Finally, from the perspective of Empire, or rather from that of the contemporary world order, there is no longer an outside **also in a** third sense, a properly **military sense**. When Francis Fukuyama claims that the contemporary historical passage is defined by the end of history, he means that the era of major conflicts has come to an end: in other words, sovereign power will no longer confront its Other, it will no longer face its outside, but rather progressively expand its boundaries to envelop the entire globe as its proper domain.5 The history of imperialist, inter-imperialist, and anti-imperialist wars is over. The end of that history has ushered in the reign of peace. Or really, we have entered the era of minor and internal conflicts. Every imperial war is a civil war, a police action- from Los Angeles and Granada to Mogadishu and Sarajevo. **In fact, the separation of tasks between the external and internal arms of power (between the army and the police, the CIA and the FBI) is increasingly vague and indeterminate.** In our terms the end of history that Fukuyama refers to is the end of the crisis at the center of modernity, the coherent and defining conflict that was the foundation and raison d'etre for modern sovereignty. History has ended precisely and only to the extent that it is conceived in Hegelian terms- as the movement of a dialectic of contradictions, a play of absolute negations and subsumption. The binaries that defined modern conflict have become blurred. The Other that might delimit a sovereign Self has become fractured and indistinct, and there is no longer an outside that can bound the place of sovereignty. At one point in the Cold War, in an exaggerated version of the crisis of modernity, every enemy imaginable (from women's garden clubs and Hollywood films to national liberation movements) could be identified as communist, that is, part of the unified enemy. The outside is what gave the crisis of the modern and imperialist world its coherence. **Today it is increasingly difficult for the ideologues of the United States to name the enemy, or rather there seem to be minor and elusive enemies everywhere.6 The end of the crisis of modernity has given rise to a proliferation of minor and indefinite crises in the imperial society of control, or as we prefer, to an omni-crisis.** It is useful to remember here that the capitalist market is one machine that has always run counter to any division between inside and outside. The capitalist market is thwarted by exclusions and it **thrives by including always increasing numbers within its sphere**. Profit can only be generated through contact, engagement, interchange, and commerce. The realization of the world market would constitute the point of arrival of this tendency. In its ideal form there is no outside to the world market: the entire globe is its domain.7 We might use the form of the world market as a model for understanding the form of imperial sovereignty in its entirety. Perhaps, just as Foucault recognized the panopticon as the diagram of modern power and disciplinary society, the world market might serve adequately (even though it is not an architecture; it is really an anti-architecture) as the diagram of imperial power and the society of control.8 The striated space of modernity constructs places that are continually engaged in and founded on a dialectical play with their outsides**. The space of imperial sovereignty, in contrast, is smooth. It might appear that it is free of the binary divisions of modern boundaries, or striation, but really it is criss-crossed by so many fault lines that it only appears as a continuous, uniform space. In** this sense, the clearly defined crisis of modernity gives way to an omnicrisis in the imperial framework. In this smooth space of empire, there is no place of power- it is both everywhere and nowhere. The empire is an u-topos , or rather a non-place.

#### This may seem innocuous, but it creates a war on difference, a new totalitarian model that is premised upon reactive orientations to desire, leaving only a simulation of political participation creating fascism-- that turns case.

Karatzogianni and Robinson 13. [Athina Karatzogianni is a Senior Lecturer in Media and Communication at the University of Leicester (UK), Andrew Robinson is an independent researcher and writer, “Schizorevolutions vs. Microfascisms: A Deleuzo-Nietzschean Perspective on State, Security, and Active/Reactive Networks,” Selected Works, July 2013, http://works.bepress.com/athina\_ karatzogianni, 8-17-2019, amrita]

Thesis 2: The threatened state transmutes into the terror state. The return of state violence from the kernel of state exceptionalism is a growing problem. It is grounded on a reaction of the terrified state by conceiving the entire situation as it is formerly conceived specific sites of exception and emergency (c.f. Agamben, 1998, 2005). New forms of social control directed against minor deviance or uncontrolled flows are expanding into a war against difference and a systematic denial of the ‘right to have rights’ (Robinson, 2007). The project is not simply an extension of liberal-democratic models of social control, but breaks with such models in directly criminalizing nonconformity from a prescribed way of life and attempting to extensively regulate everyday life through repression. This new repressive model, expressing a kind of neo-totalitarianism, should be taken to include such measures and structures as the rise of gated communities, CCTV, RFID, ID cards, ASBOs, dispersal zones, paramilitary policing methods, the ‘social cleansing’ of groups such as homeless people and street drinkers from public spaces, increasing restrictions on protests and attacks on ‘extremist’ groups, the use of extreme sentencing against minor deviance, and of course the swathe of “anti-terrorism” laws which provide a pretext for expanded repression. This increasingly vicious state response leads to extremely intrusive state measures. The magazine Datacide analyses the wave of repression as ‘the real subsumption of every singularity in the domain of the State. From now on if your attributes don't quite extend to crime, a judge's word suffices to ensure that crime will reach out and embrace your attributes’ (Hyland n.d.). To decompose networks, the state seeks to shadow them ever more closely. The closure of space is an inherent aspect of this project of control. While open space is a necessary enabling good from the standpoint of active desire, it is perceived as a threat by the terrified state, because it is space in which demonised Others can gather and recompose networks outside state control. Hence, for the threatened state, open space is space for the enemy, space of risk. Given that open space is in contrast necessary for difference to function (since otherwise it is excluded as unrepresentable or excessive), the attempts to render all space closed and governable involve a constant war on difference which expands ever more deeply into everyday life. As Guattari aptly argues, neoliberal capitalism tends to construe difference as unwanted ‘noise’ (1996: 137). Society thus becomes a hothouse of constant crackdowns and surveillance, which at best simulates, and at worst creates, a situation where horizontal connections either cannot emerge or are constantly persecuted. Theories such as those of Agamben and Kropotkin show the predisposition of the state to pursue total control. But why is the state pursuing this project now? To understand this, one must recognise the multiple ways in which capitalism can handle difference. Hence, there are two poles the state can pursue, social-democratic (adding axioms) or totalitarian (subtracting axioms), which have the same function in relation to capitalism, but are quite different in other regards. State terror involves the replacement of addition of axioms (inclusion through representation) with subtraction of axioms (repression of difference). This parallels the distinction between ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ power in international relations. Crucially, ‘hard’ power is deflationary (Mann 2005: 83-4). While ideological integration can be increased by intensified command, ‘soft’ power over anyone who remains outside the dominant frame is dissipated. Everyday deviance becomes resistance because of the project of control which attacks it. It also becomes necessarily more insurrectionary, in direct response to the cumulative attempts to stamp it out through micro-regulation. What the state gains in coercive power, it loses in its ability to influence or engage with its other. But the state, operating under intense uncertainty and fear, is giving up trying to seem legitimate across a field of difference. A recent example of this concerns the treatment of whistleblowers: Bradley [Chelsea] Manning and by extent the publisher Julian Assange in the WikiLeaks case (for a discussion of affect see Karatzogianni, 2012) and Edward Snowden in relation to the recent revelations about NSA surveillance program PRISM (Poitras and Greenwald’s video Interview with Edward Snowden, 9 June 2013). This is not to say that it dispenses with articulation. It simply restricts it tautologically to its own ideological space (Negri 2003: 27). Legitimation is replaced by information, technocracy and a simulation of participation (Negri 2003: 90, 111.). There is a peculiarly close relationship between the state logic of command and the field of what is variously termed ‘ideology’ (in Althusser), ‘mythology’ (in Barthes) and ‘fantasy’ (in Lacan): second- order significations embedded in everyday representations, through which a simulated lifeworld is created, in which people live in passivity, creating their real performative connection to their conditions of existence and bringing them into psychological complicity in their own repression. Such phenomena are crucial to the construction of demonised Others which provides the discursive basis for projects of state control. ‘[Conflict is] deflected... through the automatic micro-functioning of ideology through information systems. This is the normal, ‘everyday’ fascism, whose most noticeable feature is how unnoticeable it is’ (Negri 1998a: 190). In denial of generalisable rights, the in-group defines social space for itself and itself alone. The result is a denial of basic dignity and rights to those who fall outside "society", who, in line with their metaphysical status, are to be cast out, locked away, or put beyond a society defined as being for "us and us only" (the mythical division between social and anti-social). The neo-totalitarian state resurrects the tendency to build a state ideology, but this ideology is now disguised as a shared referent of polyarchic parties and nominally free media. Failing to think in statist terms is no longer any different from criminal intent. Romantically crossing an airport barrier for a goodbye kiss is taken as a major crime, for the state, being terrified, responds disproportionately; the romantic is blamed for producing this response (Baker and Robins, 2010). He should have thought like the state to begin with, and not corrupted its functioning with trivialities such as love. Such is the core of the terror-state: constant exertion of energy to ward off constant anxiety, at the cost of a war on difference. Networks under Threat - Network Terror Thesis 3: Networked movements escape the state-form. Thesis 4: State terror targets and terrifies movements. Thesis 5: Movement terror is an outcome of state terror against movements. At the intersection of the threatened state and the sources of its anxiety lies the collapse of marginal integration and ‘addition of axioms’ in neoliberalism. Capitalism has been clenching its fists on the world for some time, and many spaces and people are falling through its fingers. The formal sector of the economy is shrinking, leaving behind it swathes of social life marginalized from capitalist inclusion. Much of the global periphery is in effect being forcibly ‘delinked’ from the world economy as inclusion through patronage is scaled down due to neoliberalism. For instance, ‘Sub-Saharan Africa has almost dropped out of the formal international economy’ (Mann, 2005: 55-6). Religious, militia and informal economic organisations have replaced the state on the ground across swathes of Africa, and ‘whole regions have now become virtually independent, probably for the foreseeable future, of all central control’ (Bayart, Ellis and Hibou, 1999: 19-20). These spaces are the locus of the state’s fear of ‘black holes’ where state power breaks down and insurgents can flourish (Korteweg, 2008; Innes, 2008). On a human scale, exclusion, or ‘forced escape’, is even more noticeable. Arif Dirlik argues that capitalism controls enough resources that it no longer needs to control the majority of people; it can simply ignore and exclude four-fifths of the world (1994: 54-5). William Robinson refers to a new stratum of ‘supernumeraries’ in countries like Haiti, who are completely marginalised from production, useless to capitalism and prone to revolt (1996: 342, 378). This became even more evident with the extreme recent seismic event in January 2010 a paradigmatic failure to save lives. This stratum is another locus of the state’s fears. Such people are in Žižek’s terms the ‘social symptom’ of the current world order, ‘the part which, although inherent to the existing universal order, has no ‘proper place’ within it’ (Žižek, 1999, p. 224). Hence, as Caffentzis puts it, ‘Once again, as at the dawn of capitalism, the physiognomy of the world proletariat is that of the pauper, the vagabond, the criminal, the panhandler, the refugee sweatshop worker, the mercenary, the rioter’ (1992: 321). Viewed in affirmative terms, these excluded sites and peoples are associated with the network form. The last few decades have seen a proliferation of network-based movements -- some emancipatory, others less so -- drawing their membership from marginalised groups and creating autonomous zones in marginal spaces. In the South, such movements often grow out of the everyday networks of survival which ‘provide an infrastructure for the community and a measure of functional autonomy’ (Hecht and Simone, 1994: 14-15; c.f. Lomnitz, 1977; Chatterjee 1993). The discontented excluded lie at the heart of today’s asymmetrical wars. For instance, Giustozzi has investigated the origins of the Pakistani Taleban, revealing that it flourishes mainly among young people who do not receive ‘peace, income, a sense of purpose, a social network’ from the established structure of tribal power (Giustozzi 2007: 39), while Watts (2007) has referred to what is known locally as the ‘restive youth problem’ as central to the conflict in the Niger Delta. One can also refer here to mass protest revolts such as those in Greece and the French banlieues, and spectacular revolts against state power in which police stations and state symbols are attacked, such as the Boko Haram revolt in Nigeria and the uprising of Primero Comando da Capital (PCC) in Sao Paolo. Ignoring for the moment the distinctions among such movements, their vitality can clearly be traced to their networked and marginal loci. Resisting or eluding the terror-state’s grab for space, horizontal networks flow around the state’s restrictions, moving into residual unregulated spaces, gaps in the state’s capacity to repress, across national borders, or into the virtual. Repression drives dissent from open to clandestine forms, creating a field of diffuse resistance and deviance, which ‘returns’ as intractable social problems and inert effects**.**

#### Endorse community-based radical organizing built around collective solidarity—the aff plan is doomed to failure if it is tied to discussions of hegemony and war. Space has the radical potential to be different and you should affirm a subversion of their politic—no perms.

Battaglia 12 [Debbora Battaglia is a professor at Mount Holyoke College. “Arresting hospitality: the case of the 'handshake in space,” The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, Vol. 18, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41506671>., 12-14-2021 amrita]

Towards an extra-territorial ethics of hospitality While acknowledging that anthropologists of play and ludic limits could have a field day with some of this paper's ethnographic material,26 I have tried to do something more far-reaching here – seeking in the complex exchanges of various natural, techno- cultural, and social force-fields the features of an extra-territorial ethics of hospitality, for shaping possible nature-culture futures on the ground. Circling by degrees around 'handshake' scenarios that are basically all about social relations crafted in small actions of non-sovereignty, I seek to posit the diplomatic strategy of suspending welcome as an emblematic action of denying power claimed in the name of territory (Boden)27: Apollo and Soyuz may have sourced to state structures and geopolitical security concerns, but the project could go beyond these. Denying rights to hosting, authoring, or authorizing hospitality other than mutually (as we saw in the hard fact of androgynous technology and manoeuvres for mutual rescue), astronauts and cosmonauts replaced sovereign claims to space with their own relational code — one in which 'the welcomed guest is treated as a friend or ally, as opposed to the stranger treated as an enemy (friend/enemy, hospitality/hostility)' (Derrida 2000: 4). But the ethnography exceeds Derrida's anthropocentrism. Because both spacecraft and humans are as much of space as in it, we are moved to appreciate the value of cutting 'guest' and 'host' free to engage nature-culture relations. To take up sidelong the point that Agamben (2005) carries forward from Carl Schmitt for defining sovereignty, space-as-itself is here the only possible sovereign power: that to which exceptions to human laws source. It is in this sense that the cosmonauts and astronauts of Apollo-Soyuz were acting both humbly and boldly as 'little gods' who would deny a politics of territory a place of privilege in space or on Earth, even as the nations to which they owed their allegiance committed to this value officially in rhetorics of colonization and/or conquest. It is thus that space creates space for a God concept in the company of which both religious orthodoxies and orthodox science can only be uncomfortable (cf. Derrida 2002). It follows that forms of civility become visible in this instance as protentive actions for laws not only in suspension but in submission to space-as-itself — the extreme testing-ground of laws beyond arbitrage, by which the values of the nominal are not only appreciated but strongly felt, as fieldworking astronauts' and cosmonauts' first-person narratives show. Long-duration space station missions enabled by the techno-logical advances of ASTP will in future lend their micro-spaces more readily to narratives and images of sovereignty, including the sovereignty of property. But not in the spacetime of the welcome withheld. It is because purposeful ruptures of nominal conduct interfere with nature-culture business-as-usual that hospitality can abide there, as it were in the aporia. Beyond being merely tolerated, gifts of disruption within insider space communities seized the moment for ‘worlding’ differently than by fixed rules of engagement. Bruno Latour writes in War of the worlds: what about peace?, ‘Modernism distinguishes itself from its successor—what should it be called? "Second modernity"? ... — in this one small respect: from now on the battle is about the making of the common world and the outcome is uncertain. That's all. And that's enough to change everything’ (2002: 33, emphasis added). Derrida takes this anthropological turn when he speaks of hospitality arising not from 'the love of man as a sentimental motive' — it is not about philanthropy — but (quoting Kant) from 'the right of a stranger not to be treated with hostility when he arrives on someone else's territory'. Hospitality is to be thought of as a universal ‘obligation, a right, and a duty all regulated by law’ (2000: 4).28 And this is more or less precisely stated by the USSR Command Centre spokesperson in a post-flight statement to the world press: The flight was conducted in accordance with an agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America. This document foresaw the execution of projects for the creation of joint means of motion and docking of the Soviet and American manned spacecraft and stations, with the purpose of increasing the safety of spaceflights and securing the possibility of realizing in the future joint scientific experiments.29

#### The aff must defend their epistemic orientation and not just the causal consequences of the plan:

#### Interrogation DA: A dissection of the aff at the level of scholarship is crucial to ensure that reactionary logics are not being reproduced in the debate space.

#### Desire DA: Their desire for excessive distinctions allows the state to further traverse its power into the realm of space. Hold them to their representations of war and violence in space to have an effective understanding of how state power is increased through the war on difference.

## Case

### Gen

#### Nuclear winter is rooted in divisive technostrategic discourse that prevents effective anti-nuclear activism – their ev might be rights that debates about nuclear war are good but it shouldn’t center around nuke winter

Joenniemi, PhD, 87

(Pertti. PoliSci@Copenhagen, SeniorResearchFellow@COPRI, "DECODING NUCLEAR WINTER; HAS WAR LOST ITS NAME?" Current Research on Peace and Violence 10, no. 1, 20-31)

The discourse established might also have the weakness that it only indirectly calls for concrete countermeasures and action to stop the nuclear arms race. The image of nuclear winter rebels against the dominant forms of conceptualizing essential security matters, but is societally very mild and sophisticated in its consequences. It results in appeals rather than demands. The descriptions of nuclear winter, developments that might render Earth uninhabitable, no doubt frighten the public. But this does not as such impel people to take a stand against nuclear weapons and dominant strategic thinking. The net result could also be one of inactivity, staying aside and observing the rather sophisticated debate of the experts and their cautious advice to the decision-makers. Nuclear winter, being a product of the scientific community, takes the form of expert knowledge. It has already from the beginning been connected with an effort to increase the understanding of the public of the various physical, biological and medical consequences of the large scale use of nuclear weapons. It stands for an endeavour to inform, but also to inform in a particular and selective way. The view put forward on Nature tends to be orgasmic and mechanistic. This is what all the map-making and model-building is about. There is an emphasis on the rational and the calculable with complicated computer models seen as the final, decisive proof. This way of presentation splits and divides rather than opens and invites for a broad and comprehensive dialogue in issues that require unifying understanding. The abstraction of nuclear winter and the nuclear winter theory are therefore two different things working in different ways. This narrowness of the theory also comes out in the way of reporting results. In preparing a study on the environmental consequences of nuclear war the International Council for Scientific Unions stressed the need for a report that "would be unemotional non-political, authoritative and readily understandable" (Crutzen 1985, p. 7). The terms established for informing about the nuclear winter theory are quite selective. They divide rather than unify. The approach chosen is an explicitely reductionist one openly acknowledging that the way of presentation is fragmentized. This mode of presentation might have its merit if seen strictly from a scientific point of view. But there is more to it, more than logic and physics. There is also metaphysical dimension, that is the images, visions and symbols and not only the logical propositions. As these metaphysical aspects are laid aside in the presentations the discourse becomes narrow and elite oriented. It adds to the alienation among the public rather than reduces it. Also values, emotions and human feelings are by and large excluded from the discourse, not to speak of judgement on moral or ethical issues. It excludes a number of qualities and aspects that would be quite familiar to the public. War, with its social and cultural aspects, is reduced to a natural catastrophe to make it more approachable. With the stress on authoritative presentations, backed by the prestige of the natural sciences and scientists, a dialogue is created that easily places the public in the position of a listener, an object rather than subject and participant in an exchange of views and judgements. The dialogue with its stress on instrumentality is reduced to those aspects that are particularly favourable to the natural scientists. For example the issue of human life is approached in the following way: "Recent studies projecting the consequences of nuclear war estimate that from 750 million to 1.1 billion humans in the Northern Hemisphere could die from blast, thermal, and radiation effects of large-scale nuclear war. In addition, the number of individuals suffering serious injury and trauma, many of whom would not recover, could reach hundreds of millions." This text (Grover 1984, p. 7) resembles to some extent those of strategists and nuclear planners. It refers in its narrative to entities rather than human beings, persons, citizens and individuals. Also the strategic parlance is devoid of values, human feelings and ethics. In a similar vein it aspires to the unemotional, nonpolitical and authoritative. In the above text there is no reference to imply that it would speak about "us". Death is presented as something happening to others, not to us. The victims have no specific characteristics or personality. This tends to leave the reader outside uninvolved in regard to the issue described. It makes him an object and bystander rather than a subject with deep concern for what is being described. The text does not bring home its human dimension strongly enough. Consequently, it is not easy for the reader to identify with millions and to be a part of the picture. The holistic approach and the communal ideology underlying the nuclear winter discourse turns easily into an anti-individualistic stance. The text above is perhaps not too different from those that sometimes use the deeply dehumanizing concept of "megabodies" in describing the potential effects of nuclear war. This is a measure equal to a million human deaths. By using this measure strategists and researchers in nuclear policies may approach their subject unemotionally, without too much risk of identification and attachment of feelings. "Megadeath", like nuclear winter, allows the discourse to stay unemotional and authoritative. By its very essence it deprives the audience of opportunities for intense moral reactions of ought and ought not. As nuclear issues are not classified into good or bad they offer few opportunities for linkages with our group feelings. We can extend our "we" feelings to our parents, ancestors and children, and in this way gain an increased sense of security and certainty. But nuclear issues are nebulous, and reduce our perceptions of life, the world, and our boundaries, as has been observed by Rita R. Rogers. Linkages to ancestors and progeny are nonexistent. "Our lives possibly become more "now" oriented, more hedonistic, more frantic and also more diminished in feelings. The nuclear threat creates only feelings of bland, non-participatory aloofness" (Rogers 1982, p. 18). The image of nuclear winter does not even strive to meet and mobilize our emotional capacities. It aspires to the unemotional and gives in general the impression that it is something particularly for top politicians, not ordinary people, to worry about. This is not as things should be. Far too often the nuclear winter parlance is devoid of emotions and human feelings. It deliberately strives for expressions that are technical in their essence and tend to preserve a distance from what is discussed. It approaches the receiver in an exact, rational and distinctively informative way. Thus it also avoids approaching the mental structures that for the individual are decisive for a stand to be taken. The nuclear threat, in spite of its existence and our cognitive awareness of it, does not fully penetrate our human fantasy. It remains there and we here. We tend to see it as another realm. Nuclear winter further adds to this awareness but does not sufficiently increase the psychological and cultural armament to deal with the issue. It seems that the theory of nuclear winter goes some way in preparing the ground. It is something of a counterconcept initiated by a scientific community that has thus far not very strongly engaged itself in matters of security and nuclear war. It is as such an important sign of resistance and rethinking within this community. However, as to society at large no real breakthrough has taken place.

#### 1. China commercial space fails

Liu et al 19 (Irina, Evan Linck, Bhavya Lal, Keith W. Crane, Xueying Han, Thomas J. Colvin, IDA Science and Technology Policy Institute) Evaluation of China’s Commercial Space Sector, Institute for Defense Analysis Science & Technology Institute <https://www.ida.org/-/media/feature/publications/e/ev/evaluation-of-chinas-commercial-space-sector/d-10873.ashx> EE

China’s commercial space sector is also beset by several challenges. First, most companies are relatively unsophisticated from a business perspective, and do not have a clear idea of who their customers are. The Chinese VC ecosystem is also not as robust as that in the United States; Chinese VCs set shorter timelines for returns on investment than U.S. VC firms. Since most companies are watching the successes of American commercial sector, being a second mover, even as a fast follower, limits their opportunities. Second, while the companies have support from the central and provincial governments, some parts of the government bureaucracy and some SOEs are dismissive of the emerging space companies, which makes it difficult for them to become true competitors to the incumbent SOEs. Third, China has a “brand image” problem, which could hurt foreign sales, especially in countries that tend to be closely affiliated with the United States. Fourth, as with other high-tech sectors, Chinese commercial space companies are experiencing labor market pressures as salaries in the aerospace sector have risen sharply, and they face intense competition for trained staff, which may limit their ability to grow. Lastly, the lack of commercial space-specific regulations and policies may hurt the sector, as businesses would prefer the stability of rules, and the legitimacy they bring, rather than relying on one-off relationships with government officials.

#### 2. No solvency – the plan doesn’t get rid of most Chinese innovation

Liu et al 19 (Irina, Evan Linck, Bhavya Lal, Keith W. Crane, Xueying Han, Thomas J. Colvin, IDA Science and Technology Policy Institute) Evaluation of China’s Commercial Space Sector, Institute for Defense Analysis Science & Technology Institute <https://www.ida.org/-/media/feature/publications/e/ev/evaluation-of-chinas-commercial-space-sector/d-10873.ashx> EE

1. Definition of a Commercial Company

Prior to examining the commercial space industry, we first define what companies we include in our evaluation, as the boundary of what includes a commercial company in China varies depending on whom is asked. For example, many SOEs conduct commercial activities with the private sector, buying and selling goods and services from and to households and businesses. However, many of these SOEs prioritize state goals over profitability and do not face traditional market pressures (e.g., they may receive funding from the state to offset losses if costs exceed revenues). In China, therefore, a commercial company is an enterprise that has a primary goal of pursuing profits, rather than meeting government policy goals.

Notably, this definition of commercial differs from the conception of commercial in the United States. The 2010 National Space Policy defined the term commercial as:

space goods, services, or activities provided by private sector enterprises that bear a reasonable portion of the investment risk and responsibility for the activity, operate in accordance with typical market-based incentives for controlling cost and optimizing return on investment, and have the legal capacity to offer these goods or services to existing or potential nongovernmental customers.

Commercialization, under a U.S. perspective, has two dimensions:

1. risk-taking, especially financial, by entities other than the government. Generally, for a company’s activities to be considered commercial, at least some private capital must be at risk or the company must sell to the private sector.

2. the breadth of the customer base, which includes both governmental and nongovernmental customers

Although the above definition fits well with companies in the United States and Europe, ownership in China can be complex (Szamosszegi and Kyle 2011). For example, a majority state-owned company may sell services to households and businesses commercially and have some private investors. Many of the Chinese experts with whom we spoke would consider such a company to be commercial, despite being backed by the state, provided its primary purpose was to sell commercially in pursuit of profits.

Alternatively, a company that is mostly privately-held that has some investment from provincial or municipal VC firms or from the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) and sells solely to the government would also be considered commercial. As such, we use a different framework than one used in the United States for defining “commercial,” as we believe it is more appropriate. Although both these hypothetical companies would be considered commercial, they would be referred to differently in Chinese. Companies that are more privately-held are referred to as 民营企业 (mínyíng qǐyè), meaning a company operated by a civil entity. Companies that are majority-owned by the state fall under the label 国有企业 (guóyǒu qǐyè), meaning state-owned enterprise.

Interviews and a literature review revealed that Chinese nationals do not consider all SOEs that offer commercial services as commercial companies. This distinction was manifested in literature and news reports on China’s commercial space industry, as authors often differentiate between commercial space (商业航天, shāngyè hángtiān) and space commercialization (航天商业化, hángtiān shāngyèhuà), with the latter referring to government-focused SOEs selling their space products and services in commercial markets 4 and the former referring to both commercially-focused state-owned companies and privately-held companies selling to commercial markets.

As ownership does not necessarily determine how a Chinese space company operates, for the purposes of this report we define a commercial company in China as an enterprise that is primarily operated in pursuit of profit, as opposed to an organization that conducts commercial activities primarily to meet public policy goals, which is characteristic of SOEs. Notably, this definition can include companies that are fully state-owned. We make a distinction between state-owned enterprises, which pursue the goals of the state, and state-owned companies, which pursue profits, rather than public policy goals, even though their shares are owned by state entities.

In classifying a company as commercial, we evaluated each company on the basis of three questions (the third question departs from the definition above):

• Does the company have some private parties taking risk (through ownership, investment or other means), even if the majority shareholder is an SOE? 4

• If not, do they sell their products to customers other than the Chinese government, in domestic or foreign markets?

• Even when they are fully or partially state-owned, do they appear to demonstrate independence from their parent SOE or government agency?

These questions are meant to identify companies that have some separation from the Chinese government that could play a role in the global space market. Although we use an inclusive definition for what constitutes a commercial company, we do break these companies into three categories: state-owned, mixed-ownership, and privately-held, as ownership can affect other attributes of their businesses.

a. State-owned

Most SOEs are owned and controlled by the State-owned Assets and Supervision and Administration Commission (SASAC) of the State Council or similar commissions organized by provincial, municipal, or county governments. SOEs in turn may fully or partially own subsidiaries. Partially owned SOE subsidiaries may be joint ventures with domestic or foreign private sector groups, funded by public or private VC, or publicly traded. As the goal of this report is to examine China’s commercial space sector, we do not examine SOEs or their large subsidiaries that do not focus on making profits. They include CASC or its major subsidiaries such as the China Academy of Launch Vehicle Technology 4 This assumes that private owners always have a profit perspective, which may not always be the case for all private companies. An example is Blue Origin in the United States, which, until recently, had operated more as a philanthropically-driven technology development company rather than a profit-driven commercial one. 5 (CALT), Shanghai Academy of Spaceflight Technology (SAST), or the China Great Wall Industry Corporation (CGWIC) that sells CASC’s products and services, including those of the China Academy of Space Technology (CAST). In our statistics, we include some fully state-owned companies, such as Expace, as these companies are primarily focused on making profits and show some independence from their parent SOE.

b. Mixed-ownership

A number of the commercial space companies we identified have a mix of public and private ownership. This does not mean that the government dictates how these companies operate or what they do. We find mixed-ownership companies fall into three categories.

• The first group is SOE-backed companies that have large percentages of private ownership, such as APT Satellite. These companies demonstrate a large degree of independence from their parent SOE, but may rely on it for certain services (e.g., satellite manufacturing).

• The second group of mixed-ownership space companies are spin-offs from CAS institutes and universities, such as Chang Guang Satellite. Spin-offs from CAS often give CAS a minority stake, in exchange for in-kind subsidies, such as use of CAS facilities or researchers. The remainder of the shares is divided among the founder, members of the board, some employees, and public and private VC firms.

• The third group of mixed-ownership companies are otherwise privately-held companies that have received some investment from a provincial or municipal VC firm. Provincial and municipal governments offer this investment to attract high technology businesses and jobs to their areas. Beyond influencing where a business locates itself, this investment does not appear to affect business decisions.

c. Privately-held Non-state-owned space companies we identified can be divided into four (somewhat overlapping) categories.

• Perhaps most important for this report are China’s space start-ups, which are much like the start-up space companies elsewhere in the world. In general, these companies have existed since 2014 and have business plans similar to those of other New Space companies in the West. The largest of these companies have over $100 million in VC funding and several hundred employees; the smallest are still PowerPoint companies with little funding and few employees, but big goals. 6

• The second group of companies are small, privately-held companies that have had time to become established. Many of these companies were founded to act as component suppliers to SOEs. Today, they still supply SOEs but may also supply other private companies.

• The third group of companies are older, more established companies that initially supplied SOEs, but are publicly traded (e.g., Zhuhai Orbita). Several of these companies have pivoted in recent years to owning and operating their own satellites. • The last group of companies include large, publicly traded non-space companies that have acquired small space companies or expanded into space markets (e.g., Tatwah Smartech).

#### Extinction reps in debate suck – prefer my ev its debate specific

Bjork ’93 [Rebecca Bjork; 1993; Former Associate Professor at the University of Utah; Reflections on the Ongoing Struggle; Debater's Research Guide 1992-1993: Wake Forest University, Symposium, <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Oudingetal1992Pollution.htm>]

I remember listening to a lecture a few years ago given by Tom Goodnight at the University summer debate camp.  Goodnight lamented what he saw as the debate community's participation in, and unthinking perpetuation of what he termed the "death culture."  He argued that the embracing of "big impact" arguments--nuclear war, environmental destruction, genocide, famine, and the like-by debaters and coaches signals a morbid and detached fascination with such events, one that views these real human tragedies as part of a "game" in which so-called "objective and neutral" advocates actively seek to find in their research the "impact to outweigh all other impacts"--the round-winning argument that will carry them to their goal of winning tournament X, Y, or Z. He concluded that our "use" of such events in this way is tantamount to a celebration of them; our detached, rational discussions reinforce a detached, rational viewpoint, when emotional and moral outrage may be a more appropriate response.  In the last few years, my academic research has led me to be persuaded by Goodnight's unspoken assumption; language is not merely some transparent tool used to transmit information, but rather is an incredibly powerful medium, the use of which inevitably has real political and material consequences. Given this assumption, I believe that it is important for us to examine the "discourse of debate practice:" that is, the language, discourses, and meanings that we, as a community of debaters and coaches, unthinkingly employ in academic debate.  If it is the case that the language we use has real implications for how we view the world, how we view others, and how we act in the world, then it is imperative that we critically examine our own discourse practices with an eye to how our language does violence to others. I am shocked and surprised when I hear myself saying things like, "we killed them," or "take no prisoners," or "let's blow them out of the water."  I am tired of the "ideal" debater being defined as one who has mastered the art of verbal assault to the point where accusing opponents of lying, cheating, or being deliberately misleading is a sign of strength. But what I am most tired of is how women debaters are marginalized and rendered voiceless in such a discourse community.  Women who verbally assault their opponents are labeled "bitches" because it is not socially acceptable for women to be verbally aggressive.  Women who get angry and storm out of a room when a disappointing decision is rendered are labeled "hysterical" because, as we all know, women are more emotional then men.  I am tired of hearing comments like, "those 'girls' from school X aren't really interested in debate; they just want to meet men."  We can all point to examples (although only a few) of women who have succeeded at the top levels of debate.  But I find myself wondering how many more women gave up because they were tired of negotiating the mine field of discrimination, sexual harassment, and isolation they found in the debate community. As members of this community, however, we have great freedom to define it in whatever ways we see fit.  After all, what is debate except a collection of shared understandings and explicit or implicit rules for interaction?  What I am calling for is a critical examination of how we, as individual members of this community, characterize our activity, ourselves, and our interactions with others through language.  We must become aware of the ways in which our mostly hidden and unspoken assumptions about what "good" debate is function to exclude not only women, but ethnic minorities from the amazing intellectual opportunities that training in debate provides.  Our nation and indeed, our planet, faces incredibly difficult challenges in the years ahead.  I believe that it is not acceptable anymore for us to go along as we always have, assuming that things will straighten themselves out. If the rioting in Los Angeles taught us anything, it is that complacency breeds resentment and frustration.  We may not be able to change the world, but we can change our own community, and if we fail to do so, we give up the only real power that we have.

### AT: Patel

#### 1AC 1:

#### 1] Whoops! They left off the next paragraph of their own evidence which flows neg and admits Chinese space companies aren’t even private – vote neg on no solvency
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1AC Patel 21 — (Neel V. Patel, Neel is the space reporter for MIT Technology Review, and he writes The Airlock newsletter. Before joining, he worked as a freelance science and technology journalist, contributing stories to Popular Science, The Daily Beast, Slate, Wired, the Verge, and elsewhere. Prior to that, he was an associate editor for Inverse, where he grew and led the website’s space coverage., “China’s surging private space industry is out to challenge the US“, MIT Technology Review, 1-21-2021, Available Online at https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/01/21/1016513/china-private-commercial-space-industry-dominance, accessed 1-11-2022, HKR-AR) recut DebateDrills EE

Until recently, China’s space activity has been overwhelmingly dominated by two state-owned enterprises: the China Aerospace Science & Industry Corporation Limited (CASIC) and the China Aerospace Science and Technology Corporation (CASC). A few private space firms have been allowed to operate in the country for a while: for example, there’s the China Great Wall Industry Corporation Limited (in reality a subsidiary of CASC), which has provided commercial launches since it was established in 1980. But for the most part, China’s commercial space industry has been nonexistent. Satellites were expensive to build and launch, and they were too heavy and large for anything but the biggest rockets to actually deliver to orbit. The costs involved were too much for anything but national budgets to handle.

That all changed this past decade as the costs of making satellites and launching rockets plunged. In 2014, a year after Xi Jinping took over as the new leader of China, the Chinese government decided to treat civil space development as a key area of innovation, as it had already begun doing with AI and solar power. It issued a policy directive called Document 60 that year to enable large private investment in companies interested in participating in the space industry.

“Xi’s goal was that if China has to become a critical player in technology, including in civil space and aerospace, it was critical to develop a space ecosystem that includes the private sector,” says Namrata Goswami, a geopolitics expert based in Montgomery, Alabama, who’s been studying China’s space program for many years. “He was taking a cue from the American private sector to encourage innovation from a talent pool that extended beyond state-funded organizations.”

As a result, there are now 78 commercial space companies operating in China, according to a 2019 report by the Institute for Defense Analyses. More than half have been founded since 2014, and the vast majority focus on satellite manufacturing and launch services.

For example, Galactic Energy, founded in February 2018, is building its Ceres rocket to offer rapid launch service for single payloads, while its Pallas rocket is being built to deploy entire constellations. Rival company i-Space, formed in 2016, became the first commercial Chinese company to make it to space with its Hyperbola-1 in July 2019. It wants to pursue reusable first-stage boosters that can land vertically, like those from SpaceX. So does LinkSpace (founded in 2014), although it also hopes to use rockets to deliver packages from one terrestrial location to another.

Spacety, founded in 2016, wants to turn around customer orders to build and launch its small satellites in just six months. In December it launched a miniaturized version of a satellite that uses 2D radar images to build 3D reconstructions of terrestrial landscapes. Weeks later, it released the first images taken by the satellite, Hisea-1, featuring three-meter resolution. Spacety wants to launch a constellation of these satellites to offer high-quality imaging at low cost.

To a large extent, China is following the same blueprint drawn up by the US: using government contracts and subsidies to give these companies a foot up. US firms like SpaceX benefited greatly from NASA contracts that paid out millions to build and test rockets and space vehicles for delivering cargo to the International Space Station. With that experience under its belt, SpaceX was able to attract more customers with greater confidence.

Venture capital is another tried-and-true route. The IDA report estimates that VC funding for Chinese space companies was up to $516 million in 2018—far shy of the $2.2 billion American companies raised, but nothing to scoff at for an industry that really only began seven years ago. At least 42 companies had no known government funding.

And much of the government support these companies do receive doesn’t have a federal origin, but a provincial one. “[These companies] are drawing high-tech development to these local communities,” says Hines. “And in return, they’re given more autonomy by the local government.” While most have headquarters in Beijing, many keep facilities in Shenzhen, Chongqing, and other areas that might draw talent from local universities.

There’s also one advantage specific to China: manufacturing. “What is the best country to trust for manufacturing needs?” asks James Zheng, the CEO of Spacety’s Luxembourg headquarters. “It’s China. It’s the manufacturing center of the world.” Zheng believes the country is in a better position than any other to take advantage of the space industry’s new need for mass production of satellites and rockets alike.

Making friends

The most critical strategic reason to encourage a private space sector is to create opportunities for international collaboration—particularly to attract customers wary of being seen to mix with the Chinese government. (US agencies and government contractors, for example, are barred from working with any groups the regime funds.) Document 60 and others issued by China’s National Development and Reform Commission were aimed not just at promoting technological innovation, but also at drawing in foreign investment and maximizing a customer base beyond Chinese borders.

**“China realizes there are certain things they cannot get on their own,”** says Frans von der Dunk, a space policy expert at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. Chinese companies like LandSpace and MinoSpace have worked to accrue funding through foreign investment, escaping dependence on state subsidies. And by avoiding state funding, a company can also avoid an array of restrictions on what it can and can’t do (such as constraints on talking with the media). Foreign investment also makes it easier to compete on a global scale: you’re taking on clients around the world, launching from other countries, and bringing talent from outside China.

Although China is taking inspiration from the US in building out its private industry, the nature of the Chinese state also means these new companies face obstacles that their rivals in the West don’t have to worry about. While Chinese companies may look private on paper, they must still submit to government guidance and control, and accept some level of interference. It may be difficult for them to make a case to potential overseas customers that they are independent. The distinction between companies that are truly private and those that are more or less state actors is still quite fuzzy, especially if the government is a frequent customer. “That could still lead to a lack of trust from other partners,” says Goswami. It doesn’t help that the government itself is often [very cagey about what its national program is even up to](https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-54076895).

And Hines adds that it’s not always clear exactly how separate these companies are from, say, the People’s Liberation Army, given the historical ties between the space and defense sectors. “Some of these things will pose significant hurdles for the commercial space sector as it tries to expand,” he says.

#### 2. Their author also admits funding issues make Chinese commercial space exploration extremely difficult
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Other challenges

None of these new companies are yet profitable, and it will be quite some time before they are. “There isn’t any sign of indication that this industry will flop,” says Hines. “But many experts do think a lot of these companies will go out of business.” Apart from the challenge of attracting customers outside China, many companies are still trying to figure out who exactly their customers ought to be.

American companies like SpaceX and Blue Origin had billionaire founders ready to burn cash to take on large risks, push past big failures, and finally get off the ground. And while a Chinese billionaire [entered the industry last year,](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-03/geely-to-make-satellites-as-billionaire-li-follows-musk-to-space?sref=E9Urfma4)“there is no Chinese Elon Musk to push these riskier ventures forward,” says Hines. It’s also unclear whether Chinese companies, even those supported by wealthy backers, will have that appetite for risk.

## Xtra

#### Their reliance upon the Westphalian nation-state system and analysis of IR won’t work in space – an unclear division of territory demands a new approach that decenters control societies but their commitment to the existing legal paradigm commits us to eternal war.

Nayebi 11 [Nima Nayebi is a J.D. candidate at University of California Hastings College of the Law, 2011; Production Editor, Hastings Law Journal. The Geosynchronous Orbit and the Outer Limits of Westphalian Sovereignty. HASTINGS SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY LAW JOURNAL, Vol. 3:2, Summer 2011 recut 12-13-21 amrita]

Because the technological capabilities of states in relation to space remain in their infancy, it is probable that space law will evolve to accommodate change. However, arguments for changing sovereignty over the GSO by analogy to current bodies of international law is both difficult and logically flawed. Such arguments conflict with technological development in less developed countries because they restrict the orbit to the current space-faring countries. Rather than attempting to determine the ownership of the GSO by analogizing to traditional notions of national sovereignty, we should acknowledge that outer space is a new human venture that needs its own sui generis legal regime. An alternative system—a system in which national sovereignty is not the core norm—has the potential of promoting unity among human beings and may ultimately provide us with an alternative to our arguably outmoded Westphalian system of sovereign and separate nation-states. I do not propose a specific system for the fair administration of the GSO, nor do I advocate a sovereignty-free GSO for the benefit of current space-faring countries. I only suggest that the notion of a world divided in piecemeal fashion among various countries is not the only—nor the best—guideline for establishing an outer space regime. I do not advocate a chimerical idealism—for we all face the many inescapable realities of the world—but outer space is an opportunity for humankind to establish new realities and new legal regimes. Attempts by the Bogota 8 to extend national sovereignty into outer space not only undermine the Outer Space Treaty’s prohibition of sovereignty, but also undermine the possibility of a gradual shift away from nationalism and toward supranational solutions. V. Conclusion Starting with Sputnik I in 1957, technology has progressed rapidly. The first human beings landed on the Moon in 1971, and an unmanned spacecraft landed on Venus that same year.'wl Dennis Tito, the first space tourist, blasted off from Earth in a Russian Soyuz rocket in 2001.Today, a myriad of Earth objects circulate in space and the International Space Station is under construction in low Earth orbit.162 Despite these accomplishments, humanity has not yet achieved the level of space sophistication that would make the promulgation of a definitive body of international outer space law an urgent necessity. As the exploration of outer space intensifies, however, lawyers and politicians have the opportunity to create a relatively novel body of law with the benefit of historical hindsight. In a more advanced future space age, it is feasible that our Westphalian model of sovereignty will eventually be outmoded, although such a development is difficult to fathom from our own early twenty-first century perspective.161 In 1795, Prussian philosopher Immanuel Kant wrote, “the right to the earth's surface ... belongs to the human race in common,” and envisioned that through increased contact between the peoples of the various countries, the Earth will eventually enjoy a “cosmopolitan constitution.”161 With its fundamental principle of non-appropriation, space law may provide a model which may one day make Kant’s vision a reality. Irrespective of the current political makeup of Earth, we have much to learn from space law and its aims of promoting global unity and peace.