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#### Outer space is teeming with satellites, global positioning services, and space weapons to prime the world for dispossession. Satellite-run supply-chains materialize global colonial violence and reveal how logistics ties Empire to Capital in an ever-accelerating expansion heading for collapse, they miss the boat these are not only private capital but public capital that is a brutal edict that demands endless iterative self-improvement in the name of perfecting market conditions. This stokes the fantasy of “ethical” or “managed” capitalism, and at the level of debate, requires that participants internalize the logistical mandates of “argument refinement” in and as endless accumulation. The Aff mystifies the blurring of public and private sectors so that both may be weaponized against the racialized. For what is whiteness without space?

**Moten and Harney ‘21** (Fred Moten, Professor of Performance Studies for the Tisch School of the Arts at NYU, PhD in English from UC Berkeley, 2020 MacArthur Genius Fellow, Stefano Harney, Professor of Strategic Management for the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University, PhD in Social and Political Sciences from the University of Cambridge, co-founder of Ground Provisions—a curatorial collective, founder of the School for Study—a nomadic study collective, 2021, *All Incomplete*,)//Joey

The moment you say **it is mine** because I worked on it and improved it, or you say that **I am me** because I worked on myself and improved myself, **you start a war**. And by misattributing the initiation of this war to nature, you then codify this war as the (anti)social contract.

It is said that the (anti)social contract and the public sphere it creates is a reaction to feudalism and absolutism. But this is only half the story, and an inaccurate half at that. Perhaps it’s better to think of the (anti)social contract as emerging, as Angela Mitropoulos says, not in opposition to absolutism but as the democratization of sovereignty. Even that might have had an inadvertently anarchic quality, as every man considered himself a king. But **the (anti) social contract** not only reacts to, while also reflecting, absolutism, making every home/castle/hovel a hall of mirrors, it also emerges as a way to **explain and justify the violence of European man**. Everyone from Adam Ferguson to Immanuel Kant tries to explain **why the Africans, Asians, and indigenous people being exterminated and enslaved are so much less warlike than Europeans**. The Crusades **misled Europeans into believing their brutality was part of humanity rather than an exception**, even as religious war gave them a taste for blood that they could not ignore. So the (anti)social contract emerges less to confront absolutism than to **contain the obvious historical exceptionalism of European savagery**. Clearly the world could not be ordered around good and evil without some dire consequences for Europe. Those who conceive of the (anti)social contract mistake the wars it instigates: wars of sovereigns against contractors, and of contractors against each other, and of contractors against those whom Bryan Wagner describes as “**being subject to exchange without being a party to exchange**,” **the ones who are not one** who are **innumerable** and **un(ac)countable** even in having been **accumulated**, even in having been **financialized**.12 Perhaps, in this regard, it would be even better to think of the (anti)social contract as **emerging against a history of revolt**: the **peasant revolts** that buried European feudalism, and which Robinson understands as “the socialist exchange” comprising **Marxism’s anthropological (under)ground**, is **the revolt of nature**, prosecuted by those who are **made to stand in for nature**, having been **philosophically relegated to some essentially paradoxical state of nature** by the ones who seek to **engineer nature’s subordination to and within the socioecological disaster of improvement**.

This is to say, again, that the political half of the story, in which the social contract is understood as improvement rather than its **ge(n)ocidal imposition**, is wrong and incomplete. The (anti)social contract is not only a political theory but also **an economic practice**: the practice of the **juridical regulation and antisocialization of exchange** in the imposition of improvement. In particular, the social contract specified the **individuation of its parties**. Individuals now must be formed in order to enter into contract. And **the economic contract emerges** not in exchange but **from the idea that ownership derives from improvement**. As a result, it is not simply the individual, but rather **the individual capable of self-improvement**, who must and can enter into the contract. **The self-improving individual** can also be thought of as the **self-accumulating individual**: not possessive (this is stasis without movement), not acquiring (this still bears the trace of anarchic exchange), but self-accumulating – that is, property-gathering in order to **put property to work**, including and most especially the **properties of the self** that can be deployed and improved while being posited as eternal and absolute. “Properties of the self” is not a pun here. Properties that can be accumulated and put to work include **race**, **religion**, and **gender** but also **class**, **standing**, **trust**, **thrift**, **reliability**, and **punctuality**. These can all be used to improve where **to improve is to own, and own more**, and thus set in motion **further accumulation of self, others, and nature that all might be put to work**.

Maybe it can be stated this way: **ownership emerges in Europe as usufruct**, in the improvement of land that grants and justifies it. It is **extended and diffused throughout the regime the social contract defines in the self-ownership that will have taken its completed form in the individual** – that **brutal, brittle crystallization of an always and necessarily incomplete melding of subject and object**. Ceaselessly at work in the task of **making everything, including himself, subject to being put to work**, the European is the usufruct of man. Man’s endless improvement, in which necessity is enforced as an absolute contingency, is fixed in European thought as the **vicious grasping of its objects**, including itself. The historical unfolding of this **fixation on fixing**, the **murderous interplay of capture and improvement**, is given in and as *self*-improvement-in-*self*-accumulation’s **violence towards whatever shows up at the rendezvous of differentiation, incompletion, and affection**. The constantly changing activity of what appears to what appears as the self as the continual undoing of the very idea of the self and its eternally prospective completion-in-improvement can only be met, from the self’s myopic and impossible perspective, with **a nasty combination of regulation and accumulation**. The one who accumulates does so at the expense of what it takes to be its others – **women, slaves, peasants, beasts, the earth itself**. Thus, the social contract, as a contract between the improving and accumulating ones, is **inscribed upon the flesh of those who cannot be, and** in any case **refuse to be, a party to antisocial exchange under the terms of the (anti)social contract**. Meanwhile, as much as the contractors are united in a strategy to subject to usufruction whatever cannot or will not be a (numerable, individuated) party to antisocial exchange, they are also **dedicated to killing each other**, to **war in and as their beloved public** carried out **in the name of the improvement** of that public and its problems – that is, its denizens. The self-accumulating individual’s war, his total mobilization against the innumerable and against his fellows under the sign of ownership as improvement, carried out in order to prevent the recrudescence of the natural, **renders irredeemable the very premise of the (anti)social contract**.

And every subcontract within the (anti)social contract must result in improvement. It’s not a matter of both parties being satisfied with what they have exchanged. Such a contract was not just badly made but at odds with the desired identity of the contractors. And here we can put it the other way around: the social contract is conceived by the political theorists also as a contract amongst those capable of self-improvement, or what they called **progress**, and this is why it was essentially **destructive of the notions of exchange encountered amongst feudal rebels** (Robinson’s *An Anthropology of Marxism* is instructive here) **or of exchange encountered amongst Africans who would rather move elsewhere than enter into conflict to gain improvement** (Robinson’s *Black Marxism* is instructive here).13 Ferguson and Kant both say **war is about improvement of the European race**. And Robinson teaches us that this is carried out as a **violent intra-European racialization of difference**, a continually **barbaric festival** in which incursion and the instantiation of improvement as **militarily enforced externalities** produce Europe, and then the globe, as **dead and deadly bodies politic**, **monsters whose mechanized, drone-like simulations of spirit regulate the social** with the kind of latex affability and latent menace commonly associated with **police commissioners and university provosts**. **Antisocial sociability is the basis of the social contract**. In the end, **improvement is war**, which is why **the public sphere is war**, and why the private – in its **anti- and ante-individual impurity**, as **refuge even under constant pressure** – is **a porch**.

**The (anti)social contract is haunted by the economic contract**, which is not a contract of exchange like one might find in friendship, but a contract based on **the claim to ownership of oneself, others, and nature** that is always tied to **what more one can make of**, which is to say **accumulate** in and through, oneself, others, and nature. In other words, the expanding universe of ownership took a contractual form that was **not limited**, as is sometimes supposed, **to free individuals** – that is, to the European subject imagined by the European theorist; it is a contractual form, rather, that requires **broad-spectrum contact** as the material ground of its exclusive and exclusionary network. What makes it truly dangerous is that it could never get free of that from which it wished to distinguish itself; what is truly dangerous to it is that what is forced to grant its exception can **refuse the contract** to which it is a third (or an innumerable or a non-)party. **Exchange**, on the other hand, is a practice that **prevents accumulation at, and as the elimination of, its source – the self-improving individual**. Instead, exchange, given in and as **the differential and differentiating entanglement of social life**, even **under the most powerful forms of constraint and regulation**, is about a **social optimum**.

What does it mean to stand for improvement? Or worse, to stand for what business calls **a ‘commitment to continuous improvement‘?** It **means** to stand for **the brutal speciation of all**. To take a stand for speciation is the beginning of a **diabolical usufruct**. **Improvement comes to us by way of an innovation in land tenure**, where **individuated ownership, derived from increasing the land’s productivity, is given in the perpetual**, and thus arrested, becoming of exception’s miniature. This is to say that from the outset, **the ability to own** – and that ability’s first derivative, **self-possession** – **is entwined with the ability to make more productive**. In order to be improved, to be rendered more productive, **land must be violently reduced to its productivity**, which is the **regulatory diminishment and management of earthly generativity**. Speciation is this general **reduction of the earth to productivity** and **submission of the earth to techniques of domination** that isolate and enforce particular increases in and accelerations of **productivity**. In this regard, (necessarily European) man, in and as the exception, imposes speciation upon himself, in an operation that **extracts and excepts himself from the earth** in order to confirm his supposed **dominion over it**. And just as **the earth must be forcefully speciated to be possessed**, man must **forcefully speciate himself** in order to enact this kind of possession. This is to say that **racialization is present in the very idea of dominion over the earth**; in the very idea and enactment of the exception; **in the very nuts and bolts of possession-by-improvement**. Forms of racialization that both Michel Foucault and, especially and most vividly, Robinson identify in medieval Europe become *usufructed* with modern possession through improvement. Speciated humans are **endlessly improved** through the **endless work** they do on their **endless way to becoming Man**. This is the usufruct of man. In early modern England, establishing title to land by making it more productive meant **eliminating biodiversity** and isolating and breeding a species – barley or rye or pigs. Localized ecosystems were aggressively transformed so that **monocultural productivity smothers anacultural generativity**. **The emergent relation between speciation and racialization is the very conception and conceptualization of the settler**. Maintenance of that relation is his vigil and his eve. For the encloser, possession is established through improvement – this is true for the possession of land and for the possession of self. **The Enlightenment is the universalization/ globalization of the imperative to possess and its corollary, the imperative to improve**. However, this productivity must always confront its contradictory impoverishment: the **destruction of its biosphere** and its **estrangement in, if not from, entanglement**, both of which combine to ensure **the liquidation of the human differential that is already present in the very idea of man, the exception**. To stand for such improvement is to **invoke policy**, which attributes depletion to the difference, which is to say the wealth, **whose simultaneous destruction and accumulation policy is meant to operationalize**. **This attribution of a supposedly essential lack**, an inevitable and supposedly natural diminution, is achieved alongside **the imposition of possession-by-improvement**. **To make policy is to impose speciation upon everybody and everything, to inflict impoverishment in the name of improvement, to invoke the universal law of the usufruct of man**. In this context, continuous improvement, as it emerged with decolonization and particularly with the defeat of national capitalism in the 1970s, is the continuous crisis of speciation in the surround of the general antagonism. This is the contradiction Robinson constantly invoked and analyzed with the kind of profound and solemn optimism that comes from being with, and being of service to, your friends.

#### The hopeful politics of the Aff to achieve a future “not-yet-realized” yearns of contingent solutions to violence that will never come. This hope creates a cruel optimism for black subjects that forces them to invest in the pursuit of their own death because it crowds out all non-politically recognized alternative. This model re-invests in the Anti-Black world.

Warren, Calvin L. "Black Nihilism and the Politics of Hope." CR: The New Centennial Review 15.1 (2015): 215-248. (an Assistant Professor in WGSS. He received his B.A. in Rhetoric/Philosophy (College Scholar) from Cornell University and his MA and Ph.D. in African American/American Studies from Yale University)//Elmer

The politics of hope, then, constitutes what Lauren Berlant would call “cruel optimism” for blacks (Berlant 2011). It bundles certain promises about redress, equality, freedom, justice, and progress **into a political object that always lies beyond reach**. The objective of the Political is to keep blacks in a relation to this political object—in an unending pursuit of it. This pursuit, however, is detrimental because it **strengthens the very anti-black system that would pulverize black being**. The pursuit of the object certainly has an “irrational” aspect to it, as Farred details, but it is not mere means without expectation; instead, it is a means that undermines the attainment of the impossible object desired. In other words, the pursuit marks a cruel attachment to the means of subjugation and the continued widening of the gap between historical reality and fantastical ideal. Black nihilism is a “demythifying” practice, in the Nietzschean vein, that uncovers the subjugating strategies of political hope and de-idealizes its fantastical object. Once we denude political hope of its axiological and ethical veneer, we see that it operates through certain strategies: 1) positing itself as the only alternative to the problem of anti-blackness, 2) shielding this alternative [End Page 221] from rigorous historical/philosophical critique by placing it in an unknown future, 3) delimiting the field of action to include only activity recognized and legitimated by the Political, and 4) demonizing critiques or different philosophical perspectives. The politics of hope masks a particular cruelty under the auspices of “happiness” and “life.” It **terrifies with the dread of “no alternative**.” “Life” itself needs the security of the alternative, and, through this logic, life becomes untenable without it. Political hope promises to provide this alternative—a discursive and political organization beyond extant structures of violence and destruction. The construction of the binary “alternative/no-alternative” ensures the hegemony and dominance of political hope within the onto-existential horizon. The terror of the “no alternative”—the ultimate space of decay, suffering, and death—depends on two additional binaries: “problem/solution” and “action/inaction.” According to this politics, all problems have solutions, and hope provides the accessibility and realization of these solutions. The solution establishes itself as the elimination of “the problem”; the solution, in fact, transcends the problem and realizes Hegel’s aufheben in its constant attempt to sublate the dirtiness of the “problem” with the pristine being of the solution. No problem is outside the reach of hope’s solution—every problem is connected to the kernel of its own eradication. The politics of hope must actively refuse the possibility that the “solution” is, in fact, another problem in disguised form; the idea of a “solution” is nothing more than the repetition and disavowal of the problem itself. The solution relies on what we might call the “trick of time” to fortify itself from the deconstruction of its binary. Because the temporality of hope **is a time “not-yet-realized**,” a future tense unmoored from present-tense justifications and pragmatist evidence, the politics of hope cleverly shields its “solutions” from critiques of impossibility or repetition. Each insistence that these solutions stand up against the lessons of history or the rigors of analysis is met with the rationale that these solutions are not subject to history or analysis because they do not reside within the horizon of the “past” or “present.” Put differently, we can never ascertain the efficacy of the proposed solutions because they escape the temporality of the moment, always retreating to a “not-yet” and “could-be” temporality. This “trick” of time offers a promise of possibility that can only be realized in an indefinite future, and this promise is a bond of uncertainty that can never be redeemed, only imagined. In this sense, the politics of hope is an instance of the psychoanalytic notion of desire: its sole purpose is to reproduce its very condition of possibility, never to satiate or bring fulfillment. This politics secures its hegemony through time by claiming the future as its unassailable property and excluding (and devaluing) any other conception of time that challenges this temporal ordering. The politics of hope, then, depends on the incessant (**re)production and proliferation of problems to justify its existence.** Solutions cannot really exist within the politics of hope, just the illusion of a different order in a future tense. The “trick” of time and political solution converge on the site of “action.” In critiquing the politics of hope, one encounters the rejoinder of the dangers of inaction. “But we can’t just do nothing! We have to do something.” The field of permissible action **is delimited** and an unrelenting binary between action/ inaction **silences critical engagement with political hope**. These exclusionary operations rigorously reinforce the binary between action and inaction and discredit certain forms of engagement, critique, and protest. Legitimate action takes place in the political—the political not only claims futurity but also action as its property. To “do something” means that this doing must translate into recognizable political activity; “something” is a stand-in for the word “politics”—one must “do politics” to address any problem. A refusal to “do politics” is equivalent to “doing nothing”—this nothingness is constructed as the antithesis of life, possibility, time, ethics, and morality (a “zero-state” as Julia Kristeva [1982] might call it). Black nihilism rejects this “trick of time” and the lure of emancipatory solutions. To refuse to “do politics” and to reject the fantastical object of politics is the only “hope” for blackness in an antiblack world.

#### This is Blacknesses’ time crisis where tropes of criminality make death constitutive of the world. The 1AC’s investment in linear notions of progress compounds social energy into a collective unconscious rooted in antiblackness.

Murillo’16 [John Murillo III. Quantum Blackanics: Untimely Blackness, and Black Literature out of Nowhere. Diss. Brown University, 2016.B.A., University of California, Irvine, PhD in Philosophy in Departmnet of English at Brown University]//Raunak Dua

Blackness is a time crisis. A theory of Blackness in time, and also a praxis, u a method for reading time, ethically requires this same, impossible-to-redeem, bearing witness—seeing and hearing included—to death. The deathliness that haunts and works through us, with which we are compelled or forced to work, mutilates, or telegraphs a mutilated, temporality characterized by infinities and impossibilities, arbitrariness and gratuitous violence. It resists naming in its indeterminacy. And yet it manifests in ways that, at least, telegraph its mechanics. Through the everyday murders of Black folk by police force68—Rekia Boyd, Aiyana Stanley-Jones, Oscar Grant, Michael Brown, Yazmin Vash Payne, Anna Brown, Trayvon Martin, Penny Proud, Dionte Green, Tamir Rice, Eric Garner, Renisha McBride, ad infinitum69—variously named, we bear witness to the way, time and time again, Black death repeats, and so telegraphs death’s infiniteness as a series of randomly violent and interruptive repetitions. Through the subjection to the constant disavowals of Black life that create an atmosphere, a miasma, of imminent destruction for merely being Black—sleeping on a sofa in one’s home in Detroit at age 7, playing in a park in Cleveland at age 12, knocking on a door for emergency assistance in Dearborn Heights at age 19, or defending one’s home from forced infiltration in Atlanta at age 9270—a shroud of death’s presence that is always in waiting, we bear witness to the elongation or distention of death’s time across all ages (in all senses of the word). Through the familiarity of each interruptive intrusion into life and thought, through the feeling that these many times rhyme, we bear witness to the sense that death’s time does not appear to move, which telegraphs a deathly time in stasis, frozen, cold. Time, for Blacks, is dead and yet undying, a zombified force and feature of Black being, thinking, and living in an antiblack universe, which, to us, is a dead zone, an underworld, a cosmos of death. [foot note inserted below] 67 Marriott writes, “…the death of blacks, as utter abjection, is a nothingness without history and so indistinguishable from the unhistorical nothingness of a people without time” (240). From my “Black (in) Time” essay published in the Indiana Review: “We hoped, or maybe we did not, but we knew and know the facts of Blackness in relation to the police force, double emphasis on force, as what we mean is not reducible to “police brutality” in a conventional sense because “Blackness is always-already criminalized in the collective unconscious” (Wilderson, 6), and so **subject to orders of policing that include, but cannot be simplified as, gratuitous violence by uniformed officers.** Whites and nonblacks, or Masters and their junior partners, are deputized by civil society to wield police force: the force to violently constrict, monitor, control, and punish, preemptively and without need for “evidence” beyond the supposition of Blackness (a consequence of what Fanon describes as being “overdetermined from without”); the force of being able to submit a Black, and all Blacks, to being “guilty of being a [n\*\*\*\*\*]” (Laymon, 1), a “complete captivity from birth to death” (Wilderson, 7) because “there’s no time period in which Black police and slave domination have ended” (13). This is Black time: dead, undying, and deathly time. This is untime. Time as fatally unethical. Littered with contradictions in which we are forced to wallow. Untime is as the states of water: it is cold and shows no movement, frozen; it is also ceaseless, infinite, and ever shifting via its repetitions, so fluid; and it escapes seeing and hearing, resists the tactility of definition, and obfuscating, so like a mist, a vapor—but all as once. In all, and together, unwieldy, untime becomes another telegraphic name encoding the mechanics and characteristics of Blackness in time, but also inherently incapable of “fixing” time in a double sense: “fixing” time as in binding it to the singularity of definition, securing it; and “fixing” time as in repairing or remedying the deathly and violently indeterminate relations traced here (a distinction from the very impetus for Wright’s engagement). What’s in a name is anything but salvation. What’s in the imposition of new vocabulary is only a clarification of the fullest possible shape of the problem for thought, life, and being, as a problem; there is no solution. Our ethical obligation is to bear witness to the unethicality of this force and feature of the antiblack universe in its undecipherability; this is what it is to heed Ursa’s call, to see what she’s singing, to leap into the abyss, the black hole. Neither as a form of agency or resistance to manageable forces, nor a fatalistic and helpless sacrifice to the unimaginable and omnipotent powers that be, but a bearing witness, and so a listening and a looking, a kind of taking account and surveying of what is as (blue as) it is, and of when and where we “be” in relation to it. To brokenly leap, into the untimely abyss, is to go with the flow of gravity’s tidal forces, is to break (atomize, spaghettify) into the temporal rend, into the dark and crushing opening toward the black (w)hole of the Black position (its where and when).

#### The history of blackness cannot be disentangled from the semiotic flow that humanism uses to rationalize life – only a move away from this symbolic order accepts structural death and creates the founding logic of reorienting conceptions of being

Murillo’16 [John Murillo III. Quantum Blackanics: Untimely Blackness, and Black Literature out of Nowhere. Diss. Brown University, 2016. Pg 169-172 (B.A., University of California, Irvine, PhD in Philosophy in Departmnet of English at Brown University)//Elmer/rc Raunak

Given that, in Chapter 3, we have considered how Lisa Randall wields her ‘dark matter is like Black people’ analogy in a context in which Physics seems deliberately unconcerned with the marginalization of Black people, especially Black womyn, in its own laboratories, departments and research projects, and also elsewhere in the universe with which the field remains fascinated, I worry about “everyone” and what “should matter” in Krauss’s tagline as much as I worry about “we.” He clarifies further: Every child has wondered at some time where we came from and how we got here. That we can try and answer such questions by building devices like LIGO to peer out into the cosmos stands as a testament to the persistent curiosity and ingenuity of humankind — the qualities that we should most celebrate about being human.217 Gravitational waves “should matter” at the level of the Human in a political-ontological way. Gravitational waves, their implications for the creation of new research opportunities in a new field of astronomy, for how “we” understand the universe, “where we came from and how we got here,” and for how “we” approach the fundamental, physical and philosophical questions that appear to concern ‘us,’ are a Human matter, and “we should celebrate” the fact that “we” are inquisitive enough to recognize this. This is a “we” of a paradigmatically different register than that which concerns “us” here, but the bifurcation is striking, if at all unsurprising. For being, for Humans, for being Human, gravitational waves should matter; what then, for “we” who occupy this untimely position, “we” who are nowhere—double emphasis on “are”—which is to say, for “we” who do not be, who are not Human, and who are, in fact, positioned as the constitutive antithesis to not only the categories, but to the founding logics—the “symbolic order”— that gives them meaning, force, power? How might “we” whose togetherness in this spacetime, in this untimely, labyrinthine, stanky mausoleum, this mass, structural grave, darkly matters—is like, or is dark matter—consider this Human matter, these gravitational waves? What can they tell us about what it is to be nonbeings, be antihuman, to not be, together? More precisely, what insight can the behavior of gravitational waves and the characteristics of the force of gravity, at least at the level of analogue and metaphor, offer this “we” into what it is to congregate as the universe’s dark matter? Better, what can they tell “us” about the nature of the grave—deathly—togetherness at the foundation of this “we” for whom I write this project? “We” must carefully consider the constitutive features and characteristics—the “physics,” or at least the mechanics—of how “we” inhabit and move deeper into this spacetime of contradictions, of how we do the unimaginable wake work of confronting these contradictions as they are, of how this inhabitation and movement both warp the fabric of the arrangements between “us,” and of how that collective inhabitation and movement interact with the overwhelming, crushing, spaghettifying tidal forces of the gravity of our Black (w)hole. Tina Mabry’s autobiographical film, Mississippi Damned, and Taiye Selasi’s novel, Ghana Must Go, not only meditate on and theorize about what it is to make space for direct confrontations and conversations with the contradictory presences of death, the dead, and the variously dying, but also offer devastating insight into the possibilities denied and afforded by those confrontations and conversations in this kind of space. Further, both pieces task us with seriously considering the kinds of violence that propagate intramurally through our nowhere, the iterations of destructive, warping force that play out between Black folk in ways that shatter the possibility of dealing with the structural death that shatters “us” all in both very similar, and very different ways. Both Mabry’s and Selasi’s pieces clarify the stakes, fragility, and necessity of this “we” and of performing this confrontational wake work, and both pieces, themselves, attempt to do this work—rather, both pieces work to make filmic and textual space out of the dark matter(s) of this nowhere for “us” to bear witness to what it might and might not be, to not be, together. So “together,” then, wholly devoted and broken, down the Black rabbit (w)hole we go.

#### The alternative is the embrace of the black hole.

#### To jump into the black hole is a refusal of the affective moment of 1AC creates the condition for black revolutionary violence – redemption and coalition-building are only possible in the moment of violence. To wallow within that the black hole is the only ethical role as non-blacks.

Murillo’16 [John Murillo III. Quantum Blackanics: Untimely Blackness, and Black Literature out of Nowhere. Diss. Brown University, 2016.B.A., University of California, Irvine, PhD in Philosophy in Departmnet of English at Brown University]//Raunak Dua

But this leaves Rufus alive, and ultimately must relinquish even the illusion of control to the arbitrariness of his will. Though Dana risks her corporeal life, her sentience, in both instances, especially the second, Rufus lives on, as does her subjection to untime’s force. It is only after a final escalation on Rufus’s part that Dana raises the stakes, and the level of abstraction, of her actions. Rufus attempts to rape Dana. An absolute refusal of consent, and so an absolute disavowal of Dana’s claims to her own flesh, let alone how she names or identifies it, Rufus’s willingness to finalize and hyperbolize his position as Master through rape of his Slave violently raises the stakes.95 Pinned to the bed, but armed with a knife, Dana must choose between submitting to “crushing objecthood,” specifically the pornotropic reduction of her being to sexualized flesh, which might be to continue to “exist,” but only as a sentient “object” that has been unimaginably violated; or, using the knife to kill Rufus and defend herself from the specificity of sexualized antiblack violence, which risks ceasing to exist, or never having existed.96 It is a choice that raises the stakes and the level of abstraction from the corporeal to the political ontological: from physical death, and so a loss of sentience, to a death of being, a negation of existence, itself. The choice is an impossible one, but it must be made. Dana chooses to kill Rufus. She chooses to leap, or tumble, toward the black hole. As he lay dead before her, his hand still clenched around her forearm, a kind of corporeal echo of their struggle, the darkening dizziness burgeons, and Dana “retu rns.” Rufus’s hand never lets go, and Dana’s arm, from the point of his grip and below, remains with him; her arm looks as if it has merged with the wall of the apartment. Attempting loose herself from the wall and his grip, she pulls back a severed limb, and screams in agony; she “frees” herself from his grasp and the crushing objecthood of the wall, losing a bit of herself in the agonizing process. Against the deathliness that characterizes a Black position subject to the arbitrary and gratuitous violence of untime’s force, Fanon appears to believe that violence might “be redeemed…by black revolutionary violence” (Marriott, 231). Fanon might describe this Black revolutionary violence an “explosion” that is, on the one hand, a characterization of the overwhelming and unrestrained nature of that violence, and, on the other, a willingness to embrace violent obliteration in order to produce or make a violent “upheaval” in the face. If Butler’s work maintains a resonance with Fanon’s thoughts here, what Dana chooses to do, and what happens to her as a result seems to be Butler’s speculation on what happens when we choose to run the risk of nonexistence by embracing the factuality of its presence. I read Butler’s inclusion of an epilogue to be the structural expression of a question: “What might happen if/once we embrace untime’s force, and in doing so willingly risk not only corporeal death, but absolute nonexistence?” So to conclude, I turn to it.97 After what’s left of Dana’s arm heals, she and Kevin travel to Maryland searching for confirmation of the reality of all that Dana and the slaves of the Weylin plantation suffered. On the surface, this appears to be a recuperative search on a few levels: on one, it is recuperative in the way that confirmation telegraphs a version of reason in the form of the preservation of sanity; on another, it is decidedly optimistic in its futurity, with Dana and Kevin together, on a shared journey, despite the political ontological rift between their positions, Kevin as White/Master, Dana as Black/Slave, recuperative as a subtle reconciliation of irreconcilable positions via a shared experience; and on another, it is recuperative in that it attempts to fill in the constitutive blanks in the historical archive, the many “what happened?” questions about the whereabouts and wellbeing of the people she encountered, which is an attempt at recuperating continuity and cohesion, which, fundamentally, flies in the face of “untime” and its constitutive features (which are antithetical to continuity and cohesion). But in the final line of the novel, Butler leaves a way to challenge this sort of reading. Kevin remarks, “now that the boy is dead, we have some chance” of recuperation. I understand this kind of recuperation to resonate with what Marriott reads in Fanon to be the redemptive feature of and impetus behind Black revolutionary violence, so what I read Butler to be suggesting is a speculative possibility for redemption grounded in Dana’s recourse to an explosive, Black revolutionary violence at the novel’s culmination. Black revolutionary violence does not promise redemption, but might provide a way to render the impossible and the irredeemable available to the possibility of redemption, without really offering a fixed or clear image of what that redemption could look like. The deathliness that renders time untimely in relation to Blacks, the deathliness that characterizes untime and all its constitutive features and effects, might make legible the possibility of its own redemption via a Black revolutionary violence that has, as its stakes, being, itself. Taking the risk means making the leap or taking the plunge into the black hole, means embracing the inescapability of the tidal forces emanating from its central singularity—the antiblack imposition of the fact of Blackness. As I read him, Fanon describes this unimaginable spacetime as “the zone of nonbeing,” a derelict spatiality and temporality, “an utterly naked declivity where an authentic upheaval might be born.” Only “here” and “now,” or “there” and “then,” along the downward slope(s) of the “zone,” or the inward funnel of the black hole’s gravity well, an “authentic,” which might mean “redemptive,” upheaval might become available to thought. Specifically, this upheaval might be conceived, carried to term, and brought into being (born). The “zone of nonbeing,” the “black hole,” is the only site for the (pro)creation of redemption via an embrace of obliteration; but it is also an “arid and sterile region,” constitutively infertile, or at least, resistant to the kind of redemptive creation that stages or embodies “authentic upheaval” in the form and wake of Black revolutionary violence and its attendant risk of political ontological obliteration. To heed Ursa’s call, to leap into the black hole, to enter into the dereliction of being, is to fall into unimaginable contradiction in the form of an unresolvable paradox. If Black revolutionary violence as a form of untimely, authentic or redemptive (pro)creation is what we might make, and if what we might make is constitutively contradictory to the only spacetime at which this violence and (pro)creation can even ever occur, what might our (pro)creations look like? How might we read or engage this kind of (pro)creation, understanding what is at stake—Black being, itself—when, because of untimely fact—of being Black—we don’t have time to do either? These are the questions that frame our opening, tenuously holding it open; this is when we’ve arrived, and given that (un)time is of the essence, we might do best to (t)read carefully, but quickly, moving to make the leap toward utter destruction. There is no time for anything else .

#### Accepting the inescapability of death is a prerequisite of jumping into the abyss and forming collectivity

Murillo 16 [John III, Quantum Blackanics: Untimely Blackness, and Black Literature out of Nowhere. Diss. Brown University, 2016. Pg 209-213 (B.A., University of California, Irvine, PhD in Philosophy in Departmnet of English at Brown University)//Elmer

But she also gives us an opportunity to imagine “what might be” should the loss and grief made real in the wake of death be accepted, embraced as unifying, as the source of spatial (and by extension) temporal possibility as opposed to its negation. Kweku’s death becomes a force that collapses the many distances created and nurtured by his family members. Fola and Olu make arrangements for the family to travel to Ghana to mourn their loss. Here and together they invite death into their collective ritual arranged to confront the fact of Kweku’s departure. Fola deciding who to put where—who will be with whom in which room, who will share beds and converse in this space of mourning, what will be said, there; and the rearrangements the children make so that they might confront the pain and grief that comes with sitting in the room with loss. They have, like the coffin maker on the beach, aspired to make “a home…for the homeless, a home in the space after bodies, before” and so with an through them; in and through the flesh, each of the many distances so manufactured and sanctified by Sadie, Taiwo, Kehinde, Olu, Ling, and Fola collapses as each becomes a conduit for the kind of creation and resolution that death will speak through them. The prospect of this creation-from-collapse, creationwith-death, creation-in-mourning is “absurd in one sense, wild, fantastic in another,” this and these strange spaces in peculiar shapes, carved at the nexus of intimacy and confrontation, love and shame, living and dying, in and in the wake. It is only here that Olu can fully and finally melt into Ling. A body in heat heeding the repeated command, “make love;” “piercing” and “pushing,” falling “deeper, in, farther, down, down” into the warmth of the gesture that entangles body with body, flesh with flesh; a “rounded and destructible and soft” tying up, binding, and becoming, against the static, “sharp-edged” sterility, whiteness, and coldness of their white-light box back there, and “so a home.”252 It is only here that the “knot” of real shame, rage, and pain between Kehinde and Taiwo unravels, making way once more for their otherworldly intimacy; their telepathic connection returns, “her thoughts in his head,”253 his in hers, the resolution of a too-long longing for communication beyond the bounds of speech and gesture. Here, that Sadie might fill the void she’s created in her body, between herself and her mother, and between herself and her siblings, with the exuberance and fulfillment of movement that is dance. Here, that Fola can make space to finally converse with the dead.254 Small and large gestures of intimacy founded upon the fact of death create a space for mourning. Irreducible and imperative are the bodies in motion, bodies entwined, bodies connected by way of touch, confession, confrontation, love, shame, and pain, to the way-making and wake-keeping required to create space for the dead, the dying, and those in proximity to death through the brokenness and untimeliness of their flesh. Creation elsewhere and otherwise produced only the lonely fantasies of manufactured intimacies, distances, and isolated bastions; creation elsewhere and otherwise could not achieve or think to do the impossible with which our wake work tasks us. To keep working in the wake, to make way for death and all the resonant loss and grief that inevitably travels with it, is to attend wholly to the need for intimacies in the flesh, imagination, and being that do not (try and fail to) forego or forget the fact of death. Selasi affords us a glimmer of hope without forgetting the pessimism that laces the reality of the entanglement between Blackness and death, the inescapability of death and its force and labyrinthine structure for Blacks. If we are to foster love, connection, intimacy, family, collectivity, we must make way for death, the dead, and dying; we must invite it, a place in the imagination where death, “all of it comes and sits calmly beside” us. It is, like the coffin salesman, like Kehinde imagining doing the same, and also like Hartman as she writes of Mattie Nelson, to carefully carve a space out of the space of the nowhere where we are—to use the refuse of our broken flesh, what’s written there, what’s given, to make arrangements that might house us, together, with all the death and loss we bring, in mourning, with love. Only at this knot entangling death with creation might we make way, make a way, out of no way, out of nowhere, one that is not a fantastic escape, but an inhabitation. To do the wake work, to work in the wake, to make space, to boldly go, then, speak with, think through, imagine in the presence of, and be with death. Nothing less, nowhere else, with no time to spare.

#### Framework: Plan Focus is bad – The Role of Judge is open communal spaces of care that create spiritual affirmation undisturbed by antiblack discourse. That means you vote negative if I win that the affirmative’s rhetoric requires the killing of forms of black social life OR replicates forms of antiblackness.

1. Escapism DA – Your ballot can not make the affirmative magically pass into action but it is a referendum on the way that antiblack practices get naturalized. The repetitions of rhetorical forms of antiblackness naturalizes forms of antiblackness within debate that makes it a parasitic activity. The move to “weigh the aff vs the K” is the way that they never have to be held accountabile for saying violent things ie. absent our interp – they could say the N word but still win the round because because the plan is a good idea. Only our interp can facilitate a more inclusive model takes out method cards– that structures procedural fairness because it determines the ability to access the benefits of their model.

2] Spirit murder DA – debate around what states ought to do result in racial battle fatigue

Sullivan ‘17 (Shannon Sullivan, Chair of Philosophy and Professor of Philosophy and Health Psychology at UNC Charlotte, “Setting Aside Hope: A Pragmatist Approach to Racial Justice”, 2017)//Raunak

IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY, significant racial inequalities and anti-black violence continue to be rampant in the United States. Decades, even centuries, of political and legal struggle have deco lisle to change that fact. This chapter will argue that black Americans need new tactics and strategies for responding to the white class privilege and white supremacy that fundamentally structure the country.' They need to increase the number and type of tools in their racial justice toolkit, expanding beyond liberal faith in civil rights and white people's good intentions to cooperate with racial change. The political and legal work that black and other people of color (along with some white people) have done to eliminate antiblack racism isn't working. Pragmatists in particular need to be able to face up to that fact given that we value the practical work that ideas, concepts, and truths can do. Why then, as Calvin Warren pragmatically asks in the epigraph above, would we expect people fighting racism to keep doing the same thing? Why would anyone hope that the same failed actions and strategies would mm out any differentia the future? This kind of hope can function as a cruel optimism that "works" by keeping black people focused on the very thing that undercuts their flourishing (Warren 2015, 221). In line with Warren's concerns, I argue that black America' hope that political struggle can achieve racial justice tends to be a harmed emotion they should avoid. I maim my case in a pragmatist spirit that opposes Comet West's influential argument for black hope In contrast to West, I contend that pragmatists and others concerned about racial injustice would do better to draw on Derrick Bell's racial realism and Warren's blank nihilism to develop alternative strategies for addressing antiblack racism In related ways, Bell and Warren urge their readers to reckon with the permanence of racism and to give op hope that additional political struggle will eliminate it. After exploring their complementary accounts, I augment them with concrete evidence from the health sciences that black hope can be physically harmful to black people, weathering their bodies nod damaging their psychosomatic health such that they are less able to withstand the inequities of anti-black racism. I conclude by arguing for the advantages of reading Bell's and Warren's claims about the permanence of racism pragmatically, that is, by assessing the truth of their claims via their effects. The result m the working hypothesis that black people will have a much greater chance of developing new practices, habits, and strategies of flourishing in an anti-black world if they no longer hope that political struggle will eliminate racism.

[Sullivan Continues Later 6 pages omitted for readability ]

De facto white class privilege in the form of racial microaggressions contributes to people of color's "racial battle fatigue," which entails "the constant use or redirection of energy for coping against mundane racism which depletes psychological and physiological resources needed in other important, creative, and productive area of life" (Smith, Hung, and Franklin 2012, 40). Racial battle fatigue has been linked empirically to depression, tension, and generalized anxiety disorder in African Americans, and the stress associated with all of these psychological problems also contributes to physiological weathering that harms black health, contributing to high rates of hypertension, cardiovascular disease, pre-term birth rates, and infant mortality to name a few (Smith, Hung and Franklin 2012, 37, 40; D. Smith 2012). The effects of white racism literally get inside and help constitute the bodies of black people in harmful ways. They wear down the body's various systems by creating a high allostatic load via stressors that accumulate over time. The results are health problems such as disproportionately high rates of pre-term birth, infant mortality, cardio-vascular disease, diabetes, and accelerated physiological aging (Blitstein 2009). Racism hurts—literally—and it also kills in ways that am subtler but no less deadly than the lyncher's noose or the neighbors Met (Drexler 2007). These effects, moreover, can be transgenerational, physiologically passed onto subsequent generations through various epigenetic changes (Sullivan 2013).

#### 3] You had infinite prep – and got to choose what to say and how you said it – you should be held accountable for that – anything else moots over 5 minutes of the AC in favour of a 5 second plan text.

#### 4] Fairness only matters if they win debate as an activity is good which begs the question of our offense

#### 5] You should be able to predict debating antiblackness kritiks – if you can’t then you haven’t been listening to the voices of black and brown debaters for the past 10 years – which is why our interp is more predictable for marginalized debaters but proof that they use the procedures of debate to shield them from being held accountable.

#### 6] Even if our interp is slightly unfair – you should be willing to risk it as an educational moment to challenge antiblackness

Waren 11Warren Waren University of Central Florida, Orlando, Using Monopoly to Introduce Concepts of Race and Ethnic Relations The Journal of Effective Teaching, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2011, 28-35

Undergraduate **students** often enter our classrooms convinced that the battles of the Civil Rights Era solved the issue of race in America. They are generally unacquainted with the long history of race in the United States and almost universally **underestimate** the **structural forces which carry racial disparities** into their new century. As sociologists and teachers, it is our responsibility to tell that story and explain those forces. Our new challenge is: How do we teach students the extent of racism in America when, from their point of view, the problem of the color-line has been solved? One option is to use a game. Sociologists have used games or simulations to spark the sociological imagination (Dorn, 1989; Jessup, 2001; Fisher 2008), to stimulate critical thinking (Pence 2009), and to introduce social stratification (Ender, 2004; Waldner & Kinney, 1999). **When students from relatively privileged backgrounds “experience” a temporary bout of unfairness in a** simulated **game, it creates the opportunity to change** their **perspective** (Coghlan & Huggins, 2004; Haddad & Lieberman, 2002). The injustice of the situation, if directly connected to broader theory, can lessen a student’s social distance from marginalized groups. A game may help a student to understand some of the previously inexplicable attitudes and behaviors of actors on either side of a power rela- tionship. Also, as this paper demonstrates, a properly constructed simulation can give the student a sense of the structural nature and lasting legacy of racial discrimination—a fuller sense of the “history and biography” of race in the United States (Mills, 1959). The great advantage of a game is that it is a completely controlled environment—there are no unexplained variables. In fairness to all the players, all rules are explicitly stated at the outset of game play and apply to all players equally (Waldner & Kinney, 1999). Ordinarily, in a competitive game this assumption of fairness supports an ideology of individualism. However, a pedagogical game is concerned with learning, not winning. In order to disentangle a complicated issue, the instructor may purposefully introduce inequality into an otherwise “just” world. Again, because all rules are explicit (even unfair ones), the problem exists in the game without confounding effects. This simplification allows students to easily focus on the nature and development of the problem. By extension, it is hoped that the game encourages students to reassess similar problems in the real world. Use of Pedagogical Games Dorn (1989) identifies multiple criteria for games or simulations to be effective in the classroom as pedagogical tools. He argues the games must: reflect reality; motivate students through "experience"; develop awareness of personal values through moral and ethical implications of the game; connect abstract concepts with concrete experiences; create a shared experience from which the students can draw; offer a form of debriefing to both address emotional issues and to connect theory to experiences. In the technique I describe below, I try to incorporate these ideas with Straus’ (1986) emphasis on simplicity for in-class games. In teaching and learning, the goal of simulation is the “experience” itself. Jessup (2001) argues that simulation should be the “experiential anchor for the elaboration of conceptual tools” (p.108). Therefore, **this game is created to offer a chance for** relatively **privileged students to experience the unfairness** of structural inequality. After temporary exposure to an analog of racial discrimination, students with no prior familiarity of racial discrimination will have a deeper understanding of the effects of racism on many levels. Pedagogical games are used to challenge our assumptions about how the world works (Waldner & Kinney, 1999). For example, the basic assumption of **competitive** games is **fairness**. This **assumes that the world is fair** (i.e., a meritocracy) and that individual effort or talent is the main factor in success (i.e., an ideology of individualism akin to Ross’ (1977) fundamental attribution error). In competitive games therefore, groups are treated equally and the best players win. But a pedagogical game may challenge the assumption of fairness directly by having structural inequality built into the game. **The experience of a good player losing an unfair game creates cognitive dissonance—that** cognitive dissonance **is our teaching moment.** I assume that students as game players can easily identify games that are “unfair” based on unequal outcomes for equivalent behavior. As a peda gogical tool, I want it to be relatively easy for them to spot the explicit rules which cause the inequality.

#### 7] Extinction is inevitable and the squo for black folx – but civil society is inherently parasitic on blackness – this means that infinite future black generations would be forced to suffer in the antiblack world – extinction is capped at a magnitude of 7 billion people – Which means out impacts outweigh on magnitude – you should be willing to let the world collapse if we win that its antiblack.

#### 8] 1AR Claims that extinction forecloses future VTL – a.) requires them to win a UQ claim that the future will have more value which is empirically disproven – links back to our to our cruel optimism offense but or b.) says that value to life is inevitable which is antiblack – it’s the same logics slave masters used to say hey at least the slaves are alive so we shouldn’t do anything.

#### 9] C/A the last Murrilo card I read as an impact turn to viewing death as a biological finality – answers their arg that life is a pre-req.

#### 10] Util is the logic of all lives matter -- Their rhetorical privileging all lives in the face of the 1NC’s demand for black life to be prioritized is the way that the issue of antiblackness is always sidelined and non-black people are never held accountable for racism.

### Case

#### OST Fails

**Evanoff 17** [Kyle Evanoff, Kyle is a research associate in international economics and U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations 10/10/17, "The Outer Space Treaty’s Midlife Funk," Council on Foreign Relations [https://www.cfr.org/blog/outer-space-treatys-midlife-funk accessed 12/11/2021](https://www.cfr.org/blog/outer-space-treatys-midlife-funk%20accessed%2012/11/2021)] Adam

Half a century later, however, the Outer Space Treaty has entered something of a funk. Despite the universal aspirations of the UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, which molded the document into its completed form, many of the principles enshrined within the text are less suited to the present than they were to their native Cold War milieu. While the anachronism has not reached crisis levels, current and foreseeable developments do present challenges for the treaty, heightening the potential for disputes. At the crux of the matter is the ongoing democratization of space. During the 1950s and ‘60s, when the fundamental principles of international space law took shape, only large national governments could afford the enormous outlays required for creating and maintaining a successful space program. In more recent decades, technological advances and new business models have broadened the range of spacefaring actors. Thanks to innovations such as reusable rockets, micro- and nanosatellites, and inflatable space station modules, costs are decreasing and private companies are crowding into the sector. This flurry of activity, known as New Space, promises nothing less than a complete transformation of the way that humans interact with space. Asteroid mining, for example, could eliminate the need to launch many essential materials from Earth, lowering logistical hurdles and enabling largescale in-space fabrication. Companies like Planetary Resources and Deep Space Industries, by extracting and selling useful resources in situ, could help to jumpstart a sustainable space economy. They might also profit from selling valuable commodities back on terra firma. As a recent (bullish) Goldman Sachs report noted, a single football-field-sized asteroid could contain $25 to $50 billion worth of platinum—enough to upend the terrestrial market. With astronomical sums at stake and the commercial sector kicking into high gear, legal questions are becoming a major concern. Many of these questions focus on Article II of the Outer Space Treaty, which prohibits national appropriation of space and the celestial bodies. Since another provision (Article VI) requires nongovernmental entities to operate under a national flag, some experts have suggested that asteroid mining, which would require a period of exclusive use, may violate the agreement. Others, however, contend that companies can claim ownership of extracted resources without claiming ownership of the asteroids themselves. They cite the lunar samples returned to Earth during the Apollo program as a precedent. Hoping to promote American space commerce, Congress formalized this more charitable legal interpretation in Title IV of the 2015 U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act. Luxembourg, which announced a €200 million asteroid mining fund last year, followed suit with its own law in August. Controversies like the one surrounding asteroid mining are par for the course when it comes to the Outer Space Treaty. The agreement’s insistence that space be used “for peaceful purposes” has long been the subject of intense debate. During the treaty-making process, Soviet jurists argued that peaceful meant “non-military” and that spy satellites were illegal; Americans, who enjoyed an early lead in orbital reconnaissance, interpreted peaceful to mean “non-aggressive” and came to the opposite conclusion. Decades later, the precise meaning of the phrase remains a matter of contention. While the Outer Space Treaty has survived past disputes intact, some experts and policymakers believe that an update is in order. Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX), for instance, worries that legal ambiguity could undermine the nascent commercial space sector—a justifiable concern. Russia and Brazil, among other countries, hold asteroid mining operations to constitute de facto national appropriation. And while there are plenty of asteroids to go around for now (NASA has catalogued nearly 8,000 near earth objects larger than 140 meters in diameter), more supply-side 22saturation could lead to conflicts over choice space rocks. The absence of clear property rights makes this prospect all the more likely. Plans to establish outposts on the moon and Mars present a bigger challenge still. Last week, prior to the first meeting of the revived National Space Council, Vice President Mike Pence described the need for “a renewed American presence on the moon, a vital strategic goal” in an op-ed for the Wall Street Journal. His piece came on the heels of SpaceX Founder and Chief Executive Officer Elon Musk’s announcement at the 2017 International Astronautical Congress of a revised plan to colonize the red planet, with the first human missions slated for 2024. Musk hopes for the colony to house one million inhabitants within the next fifty years. While mining might require only temporary use of the celestial bodies, full-fledged colonies would necessarily be more permanent affairs. With some national governments arguing that mining operations would constitute territorial claims, lunar and Martian bases are almost certain to enter the legal crosshairs. And, even under the favorable U.S. interpretation of the Outer Space Treaty, states and private companies would need to avoid making territorial claims. If viable colony locations are relatively few and far between, fierce competition could make asserting control a practical necessity. Even so, policymakers should avoid hasty attempts to overhaul the Outer Space Treaty. The uncertainties associated with altering the fundamental principles of international space law are greater than any existing ambiguities. Commercial spacefaring already entails high levels of risk; adding new regulatory hazards to the mix would jeopardize investment and could slow progress in the sector. While the current property rights regime may be untenable over longer timelines, it remains workable for now.

#### Russia and China say no, or the plan gets watered down.

**Bahney and Pearl 19** [Benjamin Bahney and Jonathan Pearl, 3-26-2019, "Why Creating a Space Force Changes Nothing," BENJAMIN BAHNEY and JONATHAN PEARL are Senior Fellows at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory’s Center for Global Security Research and contributing authors to [Cross Domain Deterrence: Strategy in an Era of Complexity](https://archive.md/o/Hlbi1/https:/www.amazon.com/Cross-Domain-Deterrence-Strategy-Era-Complexity/dp/0190908653). Foreign Affairs, [https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/space/2019-03-26/why-creating-space-force-changes-nothing accessed 12/10/21](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/space/2019-03-26/why-creating-space-force-changes-nothing%20accessed%2012/10/21)] Adam

As Russia and China continue to push forward, U.S. policymakers may be tempted to use treaties and diplomacy to head off their efforts entirely. This option, although alluring on paper, is simply not feasible. Existing treaties designed to limit military competition in space have had little success in actually doing so. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty bans parties from placing nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in space, on the moon, or on other celestial bodies, but it has no formal mechanism for verifying compliance, and places no restrictions on the development or deployment in space of conventional antisatellite weapons. Even if it were possible to convince Moscow and Beijing of the benefits of comprehensive space arms control, existing technology makes it extremely difficult to verify compliance with the necessary treaty provisions—and without comprehensive and reliable verification, treaties are toothless. Moreover, regulating the development and deployment of antisatellite weapons is extremely difficult, both because they include such a broad and diverse range of technologies and because many types of antisatellite weapons can be concealed or explained away as having some other use. Unsurprisingly, Russia and China’s draft Treaty on the Prevention of Placement of Weapons in Space, which they have been pushing for several years now, has an unenforceable definition of what constitutes a “weapon” and does nothing at all to address ground-based antisatellite weapons development.

#### Squo debris thumps

**Wall 21** [Mike Wall, Michael Wall is a Senior Space Writer with [Space.com](http://space.com/) and joined the team in 2010. He primarily covers exoplanets, spaceflight and military space. He has a Ph.D. in evolutionary biology from the University of Sydney, Australia, a bachelor's degree from the University of Arizona, and a graduate certificate in science writing from the University of California, Santa Cruz. 11/15/21, "Kessler Syndrome and the space debris problem," Space, [https://www.space.com/kessler-syndrome-space-debris accessed 12/10/21](https://www.space.com/kessler-syndrome-space-debris%20accessed%2012/10/21)] Adam

Earth orbit is getting more and more crowded as the years go by. Humanity has launched about 12,170 satellites since the dawn of the space age in 1957, [according to the European Space Agency](https://www.esa.int/Safety_Security/Space_Debris/Space_debris_by_the_numbers) (ESA), and 7,630 of them remain in orbit today — but only about 4,700 are still operational. That means there are nearly 3,000 defunct spacecraft zooming around Earth at tremendous speeds, along with other big, dangerous pieces of debris like upper-stage rocket bodies. For example, orbital velocity at 250 miles (400 kilometers) up, the altitude at which the ISS flies, is about 17,100 mph (27,500 kph). At such speeds, even a tiny shard of debris can do serious damage to a spacecraft — and there are huge numbers of such fragmentary bullets zipping around our planet. ESA estimates that Earth orbit harbors at least 36,500 debris objects that are more than 4 inches (10 centimeters) wide, 1 million between 0.4 inches and 4 inches (1 to 10 cm) across, and a staggering 330 million that are smaller than 0.4 inches (1 cm) but bigger than 0.04 inches (1 millimeter). These objects pose more than just a hypothetical threat. From 1999 to May 2021, for example, the ISS conducted 29 debris-avoiding maneuvers, including three in 2020 alone, [according to NASA officials](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/station/news/orbital_debris.html). And that number continues to grow; the station performed [another such move in November 2021](https://www.space.com/space-station-dodging-chinese-space-junk-spacex-crew-3), for example. Many of the smaller pieces of space junk were spawned by the explosion of spent rocket bodies in orbit, but others were more actively emplaced. In January 2007, for instance, China intentionally destroyed one of its defunct weather satellites in a much-criticized test of anti-satellite technology that generated [more than 3,000 tracked debris objects](https://swfound.org/media/9550/chinese_asat_fact_sheet_updated_2012.pdf) and perhaps 32,000 others too small to be detected. The vast majority of that junk remains in orbit today, experts say. Spacecraft have also collided with each other on orbit. The most famous such incident occurred in February 2009, when Russia's defunct Kosmos 2251 satellite slammed into the operational communications craft Iridium 33, producing [nearly 2,000 pieces of debris](https://swfound.org/media/6575/swf_iridium_cosmos_collision_fact_sheet_updated_2012.pdf) bigger than a softball. That 2009 smashup might be evidence that the Kessler Syndrome is already upon us, though a cataclysm of "Gravity" proportions is still a long way off. "The cascade process can be more accurately thought of as continuous and as already started, where each collision or explosion in orbit slowly results in an increase in the frequency of future collisions," [Kessler told Space Safety Magazine in 2012](http://www.spacesafetymagazine.com/space-debris/kessler-syndrome/don-kessler-envisat-kessler-syndrome/).

#### Low risk of collisions

**Fange 17** [Daniel Von Fange 17, Web Application Engineer, “Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped”, 5/21/2017, <http://braino.org/essays/kessler_syndrome_is_over_hyped/> accessed 12/10/21] Adam

The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions.

Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over.

High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue.

Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here.

GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here.

How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be?

Let’s imagine a worst case scenario.

An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space?

I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total. For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000.

#### No Kessler---takes centuries and mitigation checks.

Hugh Lewis 15. Senior Lecturer in Aerospace Engineering at the University of Southampton, “Space debris, Kessler Syndrome, and the unreasonable expectation of certainty.” Room, <https://room.eu.com/article/Space_debris_Kessler_Syndrome_and_the_unreasonable_expectation_of_certainty>

There is now widespread awareness of the space debris problem amongst policymakers, scientists, engineers and the public. Thanks to pivotal work by J.C. Liou and Nicholas Johnson in 2006 we now understand that the continued growth of the debris population is likely in the future even if all launch activity is halted. The reason for this sustained growth, and for the concern of many satellite operators who are forced to act to protect their assets, are collisions that are expected to occur between objects – satellites and rocket stages – already in orbit. In spite of several commentators warning that these collisions are just the start of a collision cascade that will render access to low Earth orbit all but impossible – a process commonly referred to as the ‘Kessler Syndrome’ after the debris scientist Donald Kessler – the reality is not likely to be on the scale of these predictions or the events depicted in the film Gravity. Indeed, results presented by the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) at the Sixth European Conference on Space Debris show an expected increase in the debris population of only 30% after 200 years with continued launch activity. Collisions are still predicted to occur, but this is far from the catastrophic scenario feared by some. Constraining the population increase to a modest level can be achieved, the IADC suggested, through widespread and good compliance with existing space debris mitigation guidelines, especially those relating to passivation (whereby all sources of stored energy on a satellite are depleted at the end of its mission) and post-mission disposal, such as de-orbiting the satellite or re-orbiting it to a graveyard orbit. Nevertheless, the anticipated growth of the debris population in spite of these robust efforts merits the investigation of additional measures to address the debris threat, according to the IADC.

#### Untrackable debris thumps

Gourav Namta 19. Mechanical engineer. “Let's talk about space debris”, Sat Search, March 26th 2019, https://blog.satsearch.co/2019-03-26-lets-talk-about-space-debris.html

As harmless as those 128 million tiny objects ranging from 1 mm to 1 cm might seem, many of them are present in Low Earth Orbit traveling at speeds of approximately 17,500 mph (20x faster than a bullet). When even the smallest objects travelling at this speed collide with satellites or other technology, the results can be very serious. In 2016 for example a tiny object (likely a paint flake or small metal fragment) no bigger than few thousandths of a millimeter across caused a 7 mm diameter circular chip in the cupola window of the International Space Station (ISS).